

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 48

PRESS

11th August 1928

CORRESPONDENCE

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

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Ninth Session.

25th July 1928 (afternoon).

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin.

Chairman: Comrade Foster.

Comrade REBEKKA BUNTING (S. Africa):

Comrades, I want to deal with another part of the Comintern work which was overlooked by Comrade Bukharin in his report, and that is work among the women, which I think is very important.

I do not know whether the Parties everywhere have facilities for setting up special departments to carry on that work. We in S. Africa have not. Our full time Party workers are limited to one or two, the rest of us have to do Party work in our spare time.

This Congress is evidence in itself that not enough work is done among women. Why are there so few women delegates here?

We find that among our primitive native people in S. Africa, too, the men do not like their womenfolk to attend meetings, although the women are often themselves workers (sometimes going to work with their babies on their backs) and are very keen to take an interest in the emancipation of their class, indeed they have on occasions shown greater interest in the cause than the men themselves.

But in the eyes of the man they are mere possessions, purchased from their fathers for a couple of oxen. To earn these (as well as to pay the taxes and support himself and his dependents) he has to go to work, to be exploited by modern capitalism in up-to-date mines, shops and factories. His wife is in his eyes something of a chattel, in defence of which he will fight, but still in no way his equal. It will be our Communist duty to hasten the breaking down of these tribal traditions and promote the coming together of African men and women to discuss and solve their common problems.

In time of strikes too, the wife, as a result of being kept in ignorance, becomes an active strike breaker. She knows nothing except that she is deprived of the few miserable shillings her husband brought home every week when working, and so she does all in her power to prevent him from striking or being a militant trade unionist, for fear lest he should lose his job. She thus, so far from strengthening the labour movement, becomes a positive source of weakness to it.

Comrades, I think the activity among women should not be the activity of the women only, but should be vigorously taken up by the men and by the Party as a whole.

Comrade KEMENY (Hungary):

The Fascist features of State power in the countries of South-Eastern Europe and of the Balkans, have a character more or less different from the classic type, but they are nevertheless to be looked upon as a variety of Fascism. One might say that these so-called "impure forms" of Fascism in Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria, etc., consist in that the capitalist-imperialist state itself, of its own accord, seeks to widen its social basis by broadening the traditional State apparatus through social organisations of the lumpen-proletariat, declassed intelligentsia, petty bourgeoisie, etc., by making a section of the permanent army of unemployed hostile to the class conscious workers and by trying to organise them into nationalist labour unions which are intended to play the role of strike-breakers. These attempts to broaden the State apparatus through social organisations are accompanied by attempts to bribe the entire labour movement by means of a conservative social welfare policy, the State endeavouring to appear as arbitrator between the classes. This involves a peculiar sort of Bonapartism, of a State power that is nothing else than a variety differing from the classic forms of Fascism. The bourgeois terror against the working class, and particularly against its class conscious vanguard, is supplemented here by the method of socio-political bread-and-jam, and the Fascist transformation of the structure of the State power is cloaked here by a formal preservation of parliamentarism.

In Hungary we see a pure form of what might be called "dry fascism", a fascism which from the very beginning is a state-official form. The Hungarian counter-revolution resorts to all the means of Bonapartism; violence against the Communists and Left-inclined workers; workmen's insurance parallel with deprivation of the right to strike and the nationalisation of the trade unions. What is most important is that, the Hungarian social democracy actively fosters and supports these Bonapartist-fascist plans and deeds of the counter-revolution. It welcomes the Fascist social policy, it supports the compulsory State arbitration system, it is ready to accept a nationalisation of the trade unions, even though not formally, at least in fact. In this way the social democracy makes superfluous an open terroristic destruction of the independent class organisations of the proletariat by the Fascist State, it itself becomes a link in the social system of Hungarian Fascism, it itself brings about a peculiar Fascisation of the labour movement. The first question is: is this Hungarian Social Democracy still a "Liberal" Labour Party? We believe that it is no longer possible to characterise it exhaustively with this appellation. Such a social democracy is on the road of transforming itself from a liberal into a Fascist Labour Party, it swings to and fro between the policy of a liberal and of a Fascist Labour Party.

Does this apply only to the Hungarian Social Democracy? We believe that this is not the case. I need point out only the compulsory arbitration, the British Trade Union Bill, etc. The role of the social democracy consists in that it tries, by the so-called "peaceable" grafting of the labour movement on to this Bonapartist system, to make it superfluous for the imperialist State power to take the classical fascist path of bloody suppression of the working class. The aim, the result, remains the same. Only the way, the means, seem to be different.

The second question on which the Hungarian Delegation wants to express its position is the peasant question.

What is happening in the peasant masses of the European agrarian countries? We believe that there are essentially two processes involved here. The first is the process of the gradually progressing separation of the toiling strata of the peasantry from the bourgeoisie with which, after the war, particularly in countries which went through their so-called national emancipation, they had formed a national united front. A means for this united front between the dominant nationalist bourgeoisie with the peasantry were the various bourgeois land reforms of this period. Of course this tendency of division is also being counter-acted by contrary retarding tendencies. Among these are the so-called measures in aid of agriculture: credit aid, customs protection, etc. In Hungary, for example, quite a large scale agricultural co-operative movement is being cultivated by the State. The bourgeoisie is trying to maintain

a united front with ever broader strata of the peasantry. Aside from the political point of view, the economic point of bolstering up the home market is decisive here. Secondly, we have the process of the progressing differentiation of the peasantry, the impoverishment and proletarianisation of the great mass and the enrichment and rise of the small upper strata. The masses of working peasants — on the basis of this process — are swinging towards the Left, and since the Communist Parties have thus far been incapable of reckoning organisationally and politically with these changes in the peasantry, they have fallen under the leadership of the oppositional or nationally oppressed bourgeoisie, as is the case in Roumania and Yugoslavia. In Hungary the separation of the peasantry from the counter-revolution, and its differentiation, took on a peculiar form: the Hungarian Peasant Party, the party of small farmers was completely dissolved in the ruling party of big bourgeoisie and big landlords, so that this party no longer exists on a national scale but merely eke out an existence in some local organisations. In this manner, by the bribery of the leading upper strata, the organisation of the Hungarian peasantry has been smashed. What stands out is this, that while the Hungarian counter-revolution on the one hand has practically smashed the peasants' own political organisations, on the other hand it tries to call into existence broad state-fostered social organisations of the peasantry. The Fascisation of the village is proceeding under the leadership of the village intellectuals, the State officials and big farmers. This Fascisation therefore means a so-called apolitisation of the masses of the peasantry, whose degree of organisation of course declines greatly, due to the bribery and Fascisation of the peasant upper strata. From this it follows that the main question in the revival of the Communist Party's peasant work, aside from its political policy, slogans, etc. consists in finding organisational forms fitted to the Leftward swing, this differentiation, this organisational degradation of the peasant masses. The revival of the work of the Peasant International is of course very important. But this revival cannot merely consist in first rank, in the revival of the apparatus of the Peasant International, but rather in that we find in every country the proper concrete organisational form for the Peasant International.

A further question. It will be necessary to realise concretely the co-ordination of the actions of the various Parties on certain questions, above all, questions of foreign policy. There is, for example, the question of the revision of the Trianon Treaty, a question under the slogan of which the Hungarian counter-revolution is carrying on its secret arming and its war preparations. This question involves not only our Party but also the Parties of Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Yugoslavia and also Italy, for Italian Fascism is the main protector of the Horthy regime in its war preparations. Such a co-ordination of the work of the Parties is all the more necessary since thereby we overcome the spirit of provincialism. And the elimination of this provincialism is in fact urgently necessary, especially in the small Parties, which stand aside of the main sectors of the International class struggle.

Comrade CANNON (America):

Comrades, the draft thesis of Comrade Bukharin calls for a stronger struggle against reformist tendencies by the Communist Parties. This policy, which is correct on an international scale, also applies to America despite the attempts to "exclude" America from this international policy and set it aside as an exception. There is a Right danger in America and this Right danger is accentuated by the opportunistic policy of the majority of the Central Committee — the Lovestone-Pepper group.

The conditions of the present period of American imperialism create the possibilities and the prospects of growing struggles of the American workers, and provide our Party with abundant opportunities to press forward as the leader of these struggles. The growing world antagonisms, the mass unemployment, attacks on the workers, rationalisation, wage cuts and so forth are features of the present situation in America. There is a deep crisis within the labour movement in America, which is being seriously weakened and undermined under the blows of the employers and the treachery of the bureaucrats.

On the other side, as a reaction to these circumstances, there is a growing series of struggles of the workers and a readiness for struggle on the part of the semi-skilled and unskilled masses.

In the face on this deepening discontent of the workers, of their readiness for struggle, the majority of the Central Committee has an over-cautious attitude. It has a conservative outlook and policy which it pursues in every sphere of Party work. This policy of the Central Committee of the Party is paralysing it in the midst of the greatest opportunities of its career.

In a document which we have presented to the American Commission, we have enumerated the situation in great detail. I want to point out a few of the particular and general errors of the Central Committee of the Party proceeding from its wrong analysis and its failure to draw the correct conclusions.

In this changing of the class struggle in America, the beginning of the sharpening of the objective conditions and the passing of the workers over from the period of apathy to the period of fight, all members of the Central Committee have shown certain confusion and have been guilty of certain errors. The minority have made some errors, but there is a deep distinction in this respect: that our errors have been incidental, they have been recognised and are being corrected, whereas the majority has followed a consistent wrong line and adheres to it to this very day.

Let me cite one of the basic errors of the Central Committee showing its false estimate of the Socialist Party and its calculations upon a Left wing within it, which would help us to fight for a labour party. At the time when the Socialist Party had reached a state of its most complete degeneration and was merging itself openly with the American Federation of Labour bureaucracy, the police and the government, in the fight against the workers — our Central Committee was capable of such a proposal that we sent members of the Communist Party into the Socialist Party to "bore from within".

That was not merely an incidental or isolated error — it flowed from the wholly false conception, and the motions of the minority to reject such a policy as absolutely false were defeated by the Polcom. Following from such a conception, we had the internationally "Panken policy" of our Party. In New York City, there is a Socialist judge named Panken, and he has been a judge for long years and is a typical Social Democrat, that is to say, an enemy of the workers. When he came up for election our Party conceived the brilliant policy of voting for Mr. Panken in the election. We fought against that, but our fight was unsuccessful. They said the Panken election was a question of "a united front against reaction".

Who composed this "united front"? First of all the Socialist Party and then the Republican Party of New York City endorsed Mr. Panken to show that they had confidence in him.

The same thing happened in Boston in the Berk case and in Milwaukee where the proposals were made not to put up our own candidates against Mr. Victor Berger, the Socialist Chairman of the Socialist Party of America.

Not only in the sphere of the estimate of the Socialist Party and tactics regarding it has our Party majority followed a false and stubbornly opportunistic line, but the same thing has been done in the field of trade unionism. The American Federation of Labour is steadily declining and becoming restricted to a caste of highly skilled workers. The mass unions of the A. F. of L. are being broken up. For a number of years this policy has been going on and the trade union leadership has merged more and more with the whole governmental apparatus and capitalist machine in general. The obvious conclusion is, orientate the Party's policy on the organising of the unskilled masses into new unions. The R.I.L.U. and Comintern have been hammering upon the Party with this line. The minority of the Party has pressed for this. But the biggest obstacle to the Party proceeding to do this duty is precisely the delaying, the hesitancy, the opportunistic policy of the majority of the Central Committee of the Party.

One can cite a number of instances beginning with the mine strike, at the beginning of this strike more than a year

ago a project for the holding of a National Left Wing Conference was made by the minority as a prelude to the organisation of the struggle to wrest the control from the Lewis gang, which is now taking place. This was rejected by the Central Committee as a "dual union policy" and was delayed for eleven months. The strike was a year old and had spent its force before our Party organised the National Conference of the Left wing, the prelude to the formation of the new union. In a number of fields, opportunities have been presented to the Party to organise new unions which have not been grasped. Is that merely incidental? No. That failure proceeds also from the conservative estimate that they make of the situation in America and of the prospects for struggle.

We say there is no more stubborn resistance anywhere in the International to the resolutions of the last Congress of the R.I.L.U. than in the leadership of our Party. The same conservatism before the power of American capitalism and the bureaucratic American Federation of Labour paralyses the Party in this as in all other fields; and it all proceeds from this false estimate and incapacity to lead the Party in the period of growing struggles.

In the election campaign we have the same thing: a hesitancy, delay, refusal to enter our Party candidates until after the Socialist Party was already in the field, a calculation as far back as March that there might yet be a Labour Party in America for the 1928 elections. The Labour Party has been estimated as the leader of the masses. A whole series of articles has appeared in the "Daily Worker" referring to the Labour Party as the "emancipating force" of the American masses and the only hope of the workers. In the united front, in the trade union work, in co-operatives, in women's work — touch any phase of Party activities and you find the same thread of opportunistic policy I have mentioned in these other cases.

And what does the leadership of the Party do in the face of this? They denied the existence of the Right danger in America. In the Plenum of the Party, held only last May, not one single word was mentioned in the political resolution or in the political reports against the Right danger, and the whole debate was a polemic against those comrades who are criticising the Party from the standpoint of the policy of the Comintern and R.I.L.U. The majority of our Party has consolidated itself into a close-bound faction, with all the discredited remnants of the Lore group, with all the Right wing and opportunistic elements of the Party. They deny that there is any such Right danger.

They cover up their opportunistic policy by misrepresentations of the position of the minority of the Central Committee and then fight against the straw men set up by these misrepresentations. We had an example of it from this tribune only yesterday in the person of the internationally known exponent of correct political policies, Comrade Pepper. He read out of our document words that were not in it and then polemised against the words which were not in our document. He spoke for nearly an hour against us on the ground that we say American imperialism is "already on the decline", — when we say nothing of the sort, as our document shows. And one might ask, are such methods possible in the Communist International?

We have in America big objective possibilities. We have possibilities before our Party to put itself at the head of great struggles of the workers. They are already in progress and they are growing. Strikes are imminent in a number of great industries and this situation calls for a resolute, clear, aggressive Communist policy. The opportunities of the Party to establish itself as a real leader of the masses is paralysed by the leadership of the Party, by its opportunistic outlook, by its fight against precisely those comrades who want to straighten out the line of the Party. The Communist International must correct the Right errors in the Party and establish guarantees of the carrying out of the correct policy.

Our struggle is for a correct Communist policy which will give the Party the opportunity to make the most of the great objective possibilities in the present and immediate future situations.

Comrade JILEK (Czechoslovakia):

For over a year Czechoslovakia has been experiencing a boom; in the industrial domain it exceeded the pre-war level. The boom in Czechoslovakia is not so much due to internal causes, as to the boom in Germany. According to official statistics which embrace only a section of the unemployed, unemployment has never been so low since the establishment of Czechoslovakia. The boom is reflected on the money market which has never been so animated as now. Foreign trade is also booming. But the remarkable slump in the textile industry which is connected with the decreasing boom in the United States and Germany, and with the present situation in the other States of Central Europe, indicates that the Czechoslovak boom has reached its highest. There are difficulties in the sugar industry, three-quarters of which depend on export. Great Britain's protective tariff policy is a menace to this branch of industry. The sugar magnates are making use of these difficulties to extort subsidies from the State treasury and are reducing workers' wages for the next season with the help of the reformists. The capitalist class has been making lately enormous profits out of this boom: last year excess profits constituted 200%. On the other hand, the position of the workers has become worse. In some branches of industry workers have succeeded in enforcing a small wage rise, but this rise is neutralised by the high cost of living and the introduction of a protective agrarian tariff. The bourgeoisie is making attacks on the workers from all sides. Class differences have become more acute, and this has also its effect on the political life of the country.

In the industrial domain, we have had lately several big strikes in addition to a considerable number of wage movements in all branches of industry. These wage movements are the workers' answer to the offensive of the capitalist class. The masses are becoming radicalised. The May Day demonstrations of our Party were better attended than ever before, considerable success was achieved this year in the miners' strike in North Bohemia and also in several other wage struggles; the C. P. Cz. polled more votes in municipal and factory council elections than ever before.

Our bourgeoisie would like to see Czechoslovakia competing with other countries on the world market. At the same time it is making big preparations for war. The reformists are always ready for compromises with the bourgeoisie although the latter is not inclined to make big concessions to them. The reformists do more for the maintenance and prosperity of the bourgeois State than the bourgeoisie itself. In connection with the Rothermere action, the Social Democrat, Dr. Derer, wrote as follows: "We are interested in the defence and protection of Czechoslovakia"; he was persuading Great Britain that in the present situation Czechoslovakia is the most reliable defence against the Soviet Union. The reformists vote all military credits on the plea that it is their duty to protect the Czechoslovak State. Their opposition to the bourgeois government is merely waiting for the right moment to enter once more into the government. The bourgeois foreign policy of Czechoslovakia has the backing of both the Czechoslovak reformist parties. In the Moravian-Ostrau region the German Social Democrats make common cause even with the Fascists in the factory councils against the Communists. In this struggle against the Communists they have the support of the oppositional elements we have expelled from our ranks. They are working for a split in the co-operative movement, as they have already done in the trade union movement. The German Social Democrats are trying to split the freethinkers and gymnastic movement. In all recent strikes the reformist leaders adopted "extreme forms of class treachery" — strike breaking methods. By these methods they succeeded in many cases in inflicting defeats on the workers. This shows that the workers must carry on a ruthless struggle against the reformist leaders. We must admit that the C. P. Cz. has not carried on the struggle against the reformist leaders with the necessary energy.

The accentuation of the class struggle and of international antagonism is accompanied by accentuated persecution of the revolutionary movement and its leader — the Communist Party. By forbidding and making impossible the political education of our Party members, the bourgeoisie wants to deprive us of the possibility of an adequate cadre of efficient functionaries.

By its press censorship it prevents rapid and correct information for the masses. By interfering with the immunity of our deputies, by confiscating their speeches it prevents a proper utilisation of the parliamentary platform by our Party. The bourgeoisie has tried several times, with the help of the reformists, to disintegrate our Party from inside. When attacks on the executive proved of no avail, it adopted methods of intimidation.

It persecuted the Red trade unions and the class-conscious sport movement. The Party did not react energetically enough to these attacks of the bourgeoisie. In most cases proclaimed meetings and demonstrations did not come off. Traditional respect for bourgeois laws is still deeply rooted, even among our members. The successful International Youth Day in Prague, the splendid demonstrations in connection with the X. Anniversary of the Soviet as well as successful demonstrations for more adequate social insurance show that political manifestations are possible in spite of all the tricks of the bourgeoisie and the reformists, provided there is solidarity among the masses.

Just a few words about our Red Day. This action ended for us in defeat. As we announced the Red Day immediately after the prohibition of the Spartakiade, the impression was created among the masses that the Red Day was an act in retaliation for the prohibited Spartakiade. This narrowed down the platform of our agitation. In our efforts to remedy the evil we had to overcome enormous difficulties. The press — our greatest help — was confiscated whenever it made the least allusion to the Red Day and the prohibited Spartakiade. Neither was the Parliamentary platform fully utilised for our agitation. Moreover, the utilisation of the parliamentary platform was made very difficult through the confiscation of our Deputies' speeches concerning the Red Day. Therefore the Red Day demonstration was in reality only an action of our most active Party members to whom we were able to communicate the arrangements in good time by means of a circular. No Red Day agitation was carried on in enterprises. Fraction activity is still very weak in our Party, that is why we could not win the sympathy of the masses which remained passive.

On the other hand, the government made gigantic preparations. The bourgeois and reformist press wrote every day about the coup d'état which was being prepared. The entire police and gendarmerie apparatus was mobilised. In some localities the military were called out. A few days before and during the Red Day Prague was under martial law. All the avenues to Prague were barricaded. In the provinces the gendarmerie tried to prevent the departure of our comrades for Prague. Many arrests were made already before Red Day. There were 10,000 gendarmes in Prague on July 6th, armed with revolvers and rifles, in addition to swords they always carry; even machine-guns were stationed in various places. In spite of all these precautionary measures several thousand workers came to Prague even from distant parts of the republic. In spite of all the measures of the government, demonstrations were held in Carlsbad, Reichenberg, Ostrau and in Slovakia. Some of them had a mass character, which was even admitted by the bourgeois press. In spite of its failure the Red Day had also a positive side. 1. The bourgeoisie was so frightened that it brought the whole State apparatus into motion. 2. The organisations and the active Party cadres displayed unprecedented energy. The action was led more systematically than any former action. 3. During the preparation and carrying out of the action, all the defects of the Party were exposed.

None of us has the least intention to minimise our defeat. The experience gained by the Red Day and its preparation were thoroughly discussed in a Bolshevik manner at the session of the Central Committee of the C. P. Cz. which was also attended by the secretaries of the most important regions of our Party. After a two-days discussion the following declaration was endorsed:

"The political situation made the Red Day action necessary. The defeat suffered by the Party on this occasion is accentuated by the fact that after announcing for weeks an important action which was necessary in the interests of the proletariat, no attempt was made at the last moment to carry out this action. Such defeats cannot be explained

away by mistakes and shortcomings which can occur in any action. There must be serious causes for it which have their origin in the whole position of the Party, and which led to very serious errors."

The mistakes and shortcomings which caused the fiasco of the Red Day were as follows:

1. The united front tactic was inadequately used on the preparation of this action. Although correct slogans were adopted the Party did not succeed in bringing home to the masses the real political meaning of the Red Day and in making full use of the sympathy of the non-Communist masses, so as to guarantee the success of the action. The difficulties of the situation were not sufficiently considered.

2. Preparations for the action were made only in the most active section of the Party: they did not include the mobilisation of the masses.

3. The date fixed for the action of the Red Day turned out to be a tactical mistake. It made manoeuvring difficult for us, it robbed us of the possibility of retreat and prevented us dispelling the erroneous conception of the masses that the Red Day was an act of defiance in answer to the prohibition of the Spartakiade.

4. Vacillations on the part of some members of the Executive who were not convinced of the necessity and importance of the action and partly allowed themselves to be intimidated by the tactic adopted by the bourgeoisie.

5. Inadequate activity of many of our members particularly in Prague. Complete absence of any work in factories and in the factory council movement, and also of any fraction work in mass organisations. A small section of the Party worked very energetically, unfortunately not on correct lines. Nevertheless an impetus was given to the work of the Party through the preparation of the Red Day.

6. Inadequate arrangements re stewards and liaison, with the result that they broke down just when the demonstration was to begin.

7. Erroneous agitation in the press which was too much in the nature of advertisement, and failure to explain the political importance of the Red Day; inadequate utilisation of the parliamentary platform for legal propaganda and agitation.

8. Failure of the speakers appointed for the demonstration to make any attempt to save the situation on July 6th; they disobeyed the instructions of the Executive and did not even try to make the Executive aware that new instructions were required. The Executive was not energetic enough in enforcing its instructions and was not wide-awake enough to find a way out of the difficult situation: no arrangements were made for a possible retreat during the preparations.

The defeat has serious consequences for the Party and for the workers. The bourgeoisie is sure to make use of our weakness for further attacks. The prestige of the Party and the confidence of non-party masses and also of our own members in our Party has suffered considerably.

The Party must carry out a reorganisation from the bottom to the top and must combat and get rid of all its defects, so as to win back the full confidence of the masses and the whole membership. This defeat should not prevent the Party continuing its militant actions whenever the situation demands it. Two false extremes must be combated: underestimation of the serious defeat and down-heartedness which might lead to doubting the correctness of our policy and the necessity of resisting all attacks on our revolutionary organisation. If we are to expose our mistakes and shortcomings, we must have a thorough discussion in which every member should have an opportunity to exercise frank and ruthless criticism.

At the session of the C. C. of the C. P. Cz. two dissenting tendencies made their appearance. One of them was formulated in Comrade Zapotocky's report. He argued that political mistakes were at the bottom of the failure of the Red Day, namely, inappropriate slogans, erroneous appreciation of the situation, romantic and sectarian conception of the action instead of utilisation of the united front tactic.

The other tendency was expressed by the District Secretary, Comrade Slansky. He said that for energetic struggle against the Right peril, for the removal of all defects in the Party apparatus, a stronger Bolshevik attitude of the Party Executive and its extension through the co-option of Bolshevik elements are necessary.

In the discussion at the session of the Czechoslovak delegation comrade Reimann asserted that such a defeat would not have been possible if the policy of the Party is really correct.

In conclusion, a few words about the situation in the Party. For a long time to come the enemy will be found in the Right wing of the Party. Our Party is a genuine mass Party, it has at present 150,000 members. Since the last Party crisis, in 1925, the membership has almost doubled. Since the last Party Congress the membership increased by 10%. Six nations are represented in the ranks of our Party; over one-third of the Party are active workers. The Party has under its influence over 1,000,000 voters, i. e. a seventh of the whole electorate. The basis of the C. P. Cz. is in the factory nuclei. The Party Executive as well as district executives, have on the whole improved their work in most cases. Our chief mistake is that we do not make factory nuclei the centre of gravity of our actions. Moreover, our Party is very much inclined towards Provincialism. It does not react sufficiently to international questions. The Party suffers from lack of functionaries. The education of the members is unsatisfactory. However, the Party has made a beginning with systematic education of the membership and we hope that, in spite of all difficulties, the biggest difficulty — that of functionaries — will be overcome in the not far distant future. There are many defects in our fraction work, we have not yet succeeded in forming fractions in all proletarian mass organisations. We have not paid sufficient attention to factory councils which take an active part in the political movement. Except in big enterprises, no preparations are made for factory council elections. The trade union work of our Party is bad, and up to quite recently the Y. C. L. has also completely neglected trade union work. We are very backward in regard to work among the peasantry.

The process of bolshevisation has been slowing down lately. If, under the leadership of the E. C. C. I., the Party utilises properly all the experiences of the Red Day, if it accelerates the process of bolshevisation, it will make a big stride on the road to a victorious proletarian October in Czechoslovakia.

Comrade SHAREGI (Persia):

Comrades, the Persian delegation in the main agrees with the Theses of Comrade Bukharin. Yet I should like to support also the declaration of the Balkan Delegation and to point out that the agrarian question, which is raised so sharply in all oriental countries, has been dealt with by Comrade Bukharin in his Theses only incompletely and without sufficient clarity. At the present time, when practically all oriental countries are confronted with the problems of the agrarian revolution, when all Communist Parties in these countries are taking into their tactical programme the concrete slogans of the agrarian revolution, this question undoubtedly deserves more and clearer discussion.

Comrades, the situation of the peasantry of the countries in the Near East, especially in Persia, is a very onerous one. At the present time the Persian villages are arenas of class struggle. of differentiation of the peasantry. Almost regularly, every year, there are peasant uprisings. All this is the result of the exploitation and the bad situation of the Persian peasantry. The new reactionary Rhesa monarchy of Sha Pechlevi, which got into power by cunning and treason through the aid of British imperialism, and which is the representative of the interest of the big landlords, has even further worsened the onerous situation of the peasants. With us in Persia, as in all Eastern countries where national capital is unable to compete with the foreign capitalists, all available nationalist capital is put into land. In practically all parts of Persia the merchants are buying land instead of building new factories or any sort

of industrial enterprises. When these merchants enter into the field of agriculture in this way, naturally they do not change anything in the forms of Persian agriculture, but on the contrary, they adopt the methods of exploitation that have existed under feudalism. As a result of this inhuman exploitation we have in Persia a powerful peasant movement. In the interim between the V. and VI. World Congresses we had in Persia four big mass uprisings of the peasantry, as well as many smaller revolts. In these uprisings the peasants marched in solid columns under the general slogans of "Down with the landlords and their government". They raised their class slogans, beat and murdered the landlords, set fire to their barns, etc. All this proved that the Congress, and the Comintern, must give greater attention to the peasant question and must deal more in detail with this problem which interests us.

A further question which Comrade Bukharin touched on but slightly in his Theses, is the question of the Near East. British intrigues in the countries of the Near East are taking on menacing dimensions, especially at the present time when we are confronted with a real danger of a new imperialist war.

The Near East has always been of great importance in world politics, it was the cause of bloody wars and played no small role in the world war, either. At the present time, comrades, British imperialism is preparing for a new war and is working towards the establishment of firm strongholds for itself in these countries. It is concentrating big forces, it is mobilising its troops on British borders for an attack upon the U. S. S. R. In case of war the Near East will be the arena of major war operations, quite regardless of whether or not the countries of the Near East want to remain neutral.

In view of the importance of this question, Comrade Bukharin in his Theses and in his Report should have gone into greater detail concerning the importance of these countries as well as the policy which the Communist Parties there are to follow.

In his Report, Comrade Bukharin spoke about the attitude of the West European Communist Parties towards the Social Democratic Parties. While we have no Social Democratic Party, we do have similar parties, such as Socialist, Nationalist, etc. For a long time we were working in a bloc with the Socialist Party, but in recent times it has developed into a typical opportunist party and has frequently come out openly against the C. P. and has betrayed it.

The Persian Socialist Party has never been a mass Party, and it never will be, and in the not too distant future the C. P. will put an end to the political adventure of the leaders of this party. Unfortunately, the Comintern has no definite clear line in this question either. The Comintern should also organise its work better in other directions, for example with respect to information.

In the latest elections in Persia our Party acted independently, with a programme of its own. Of course it did not go off without mistakes, but I believe that for a young Party this may be forgiven. After my arrival here, however, I learned that similar mistakes were made also in other Eastern countries. If the Comintern had given us timely information about these mistakes we might perhaps have avoided them. Since it failed to do this, however, similar mistakes were made by us.

I should like to touch upon the mutual relations between the Communist Parties of different countries. In past Congresses there was much talk about a unification, about a contact between the Communist Party of the Metropolis and the Communist Parties which work in the colonies and semi-colonies of this country. The Theses of Comrade Bukharin even contain a special point on this. We must regretfully state, however, that thus far we have seen nothing positive in this direction. The Communist Party of Great Britain, for example, might do a great deal for the Persian Party, as well as for the Indian Party, it might help them in many things. The same applies to the French Party with respect to Syria and other countries. Unfortunately, however, nothing is being done by these Parties. I believe that the Congress must direct the attention of the delegations from these countries, to this extremely important question in order that in the future there will be a close contact between these Parties, and that national isolation will disappear. (Applause.)

Comrade BITTELMAN (U. S. A.):

Comrades I agree with the main line of the thesis submitted by Comrade Bukharin. The thesis correctly presents the war danger as the main danger confronting the working class and as the main problem confronting the world communist movement.

In this coming war American imperialism is going to play a leading role. We know that American imperialism is actively preparing for war. It is therefore necessary that the Communist Party of America with the help of the Comintern, begins to have a correct orientation upon its own position and its own possibilities.

In view of this the so-called "Kellog Peace Offensive" assumes very great importance and must be combated by the Comintern and by our own Party much more energetically than is the case. The Kellog Peace Offensive is nothing more or less than a smoke screen to hide war preparations. It is a manoeuvre to counteract the fight of the U. S. S. R. for peace and disarmament.

Comrades, pacifism in the United States is a factor not to be ignored. There is a tremendously large volume of pacifist illusions among the American masses. So much so that our own party, the Communist Party of America, on various occasions became infected with pacifist illusions. I need only refer to a couple of such instances:

First the protest published by the American Central Committee against the murder or death of the American marines in Nicaragua.

Second the theory of the Central Committee some time ago was that American imperialism in China is following the lead of Great Britain and is serving as a cat's paw of British imperialism in China; and the very last theory is that American imperialism is supporting Japanese imperialism and does not follow its own independent and aggressive line. Later there were several very objectionable pacifist slogans initiated by us in the Nicaraguan campaign. When you realise this you will understand how important it becomes to carry on a fight against pacifism and pacifist illusions.

I wish now to pass over to the world economic situation as presented in the thesis of Comrade Bukharin. I believe it is correct to say as the thesis does, that the basic structural changes in world economy, resulting from the war and post-war crises of capitalism, are sharpening to the highest degree every contradiction in the capitalist system. The thesis concretises especially the outer contradictions, mainly the inter-state conflicts and coming struggles as well as the conflicts of today. But in my opinion, some more concretising is necessary for the internal contradictions; — what effect do they have on the conditions of life of the masses and in the developing struggle of the working class generally? I am also of the opinion that the thesis does not sufficiently bring out the effect of the sharpening outer contradictions upon the sharpening and maturing of the inner contradictions and vice versa.

It is my opinion, comrades, that on America a new word needs to be said by the Communist International. Let me enumerate some of the things which in my opinion make necessary a new word to be said in regard to the United States.

First, basic changes have taken place in American capitalist economy.

Secondly, there have taken place revolutionary shifts in the class composition and class relationships in the United States. It is for this reason that I believe that merely to say today that American imperialism still continues upward is not correct, particularly so for the reason that in our American Party there prevails a very much one-sided and very wrong conception of what the rapid rate of development of U. S. A. capitalism means for our perspectives, policies and tactics.

What are the peculiar characteristics of American capitalism in this period? I will quote very briefly from the document which the minority of our Central Executive Committee submitted to the Anglo-American Secretariat in Moscow. It reads like this:

"Two basic factors determine the condition of American capitalism in the present period. 1. The maturing inner contradictions of American capitalism are beginning to produce qualitative changes in the whole economic system. 2. The inner contradictions are maturing in the surroundings of a declining world capitalism and the socialist growth of the U. S. S. R. which sharpen, intensify and accelerate the development of the contradictions of American imperialism.

An analysis of the degree of ripeness of these contradictions, will show that American capitalism is about to reach the apex of growth and that further expansion leads American capitalism to further and more drastic attacks upon the standards of life of the American masses and to an attempt at an armed redivision of the world market and spheres of imperialist domination, both of which only further intensify these contradictions leading to the downfall of American imperialism."

The other night Comrade Pepper made a very unsuccessful effort to prove that this document maintains that American imperialism has already entered the period of decline. Now everyone of you can judge for himself what this document says, and what Comrade Pepper presented it as saying.

Now as to these inner contradictions. Permit me to bring before you some figures which tell a very interesting story. First, about the disproportion between the rate of expansion of productive capacity and the rate of expansion of volume of production. In the steel industry, between 1923 and 1928, capacity of production has grown 14%, while production has grown only 6%. It is a fact that even in the record years production never reached more than about 80% capacity. Secondly, the disproportion between the growth of production and consumption. We are faced with the following very important tendency namely, the decline of the buying power of the majority of the American population, the working class and poor or working farmers. In 1920 employees — which include not only wage earners but also salaried employees — received 59% of the total national income; in 1925 the wage earners received only 38% of the total national income. Farm labourers, four million of them, received as their share of the national income in 1920 2.3% and in 1924 1.3%.

With regard to the farmers in 1919, 16% of the population gainfully employed in farming received a net income of 11.8% of the total national income. In 1924, 14.3% were gainfully employed, receiving 6% of the national income.

When you consider that the bulk of the workers and farmers constitute the very basis of the home market, you will realise that the diminishing buying capacities of the masses must inevitably retard the growth of production at home and sharpen imperialist aggression of American capitalism abroad.

The third factor is the decline of the rate of growth of production. For the benefit of Comrade Pepper, I speak here not of the decline of American imperialism, but of the declining rate of the growth of production. Between 1919—1923, production in the extracting industries has grown in America by 36.3%; between 1923—27, it was only 1.9%. In manufacturing industries, between 1919—23 production increased 20.2% and between 1923—27 only 5%. Industrial production generally: between 1919—23 it increased 21.6%, while between 1923—26 it increased only 5% — a very obviously declining rate of growth of production.

If you examine the figures of the rate of growth of the export trade of the U. S. A. you will find the same tendency of a declining rate of growth in the export trade. I think it is only in the light of these tendencies and the sharpening competition on the world market that we can really understand why the American imperialist class is actually preparing for war.

The next thing I want to deal with are the contradictions of rationalisation and mass production, and the outstanding factor of unemployment.

Between 1924 and 1927, manufacturing production has increased 12.7%, but the number of workers employed in manu-

January 1928, the railroads dismissed 209,055 workers. At present the railroads are employing about 400,000 men less than in 1920. In five years 20% of the railroad shopmen have been displaced permanently from industry. 300,000 miners are out of employment as a result of the changes in structure and composition of American capitalist economy.

The growth of the export of capital was tremendous and continues at a very high rate. We must not forget, however, the contradictions created by the export of capital. America exports capital into Latin America and Europe, thus building up competitive industries in these countries that still further narrows down the scope of expansion of home industries, at the same time intensifying the growth of the parasitic and decaying elements in the economic system.

Now, comrades, I will pass over to Comrade Pepper's criticism which he made last night. He says that we believe that American imperialism has already begun to decline. We do not. It is not our duty or the task of any Communist to engage in advertising the might of American imperialism. We want no advertisements but a Communist analysis of American imperialism. You do not as yet realise the menace of this kind of attitude to our Party.

One little incident which is characteristic of Comrade Pepper's "Marxian" analysis of the American and world situation. He says: How can you maintain that American imperialism is not growing upwards, when it is precisely because it is growing upwards that it is driving towards war? Assuming that Comrade Pepper correctly states our point of view, which he does not, the question arises: What about England? She is on the decline and yet she is preparing for war as much as any other capitalist power of the world.

Comrade Pepper the other day wrote an article published in the "Pravda" on July 17th. He said:

"No bourgeoisie in the world has such unlimited possibilities for the corruption of wide strata of workers as the American."

Mind you, unlimited possibilities.

Now comrades, seeing this analysis you can understand why Comrade Pepper's orientation and perspective is for the growth of the American Federation of Labour and not for the growth of new unions, led by the left wing. You can understand his contention that there is no right danger in our party, and that there is no right wing in our party.

Comrades, we have presented to the Anglo-American Secretariat, a document which charges our Central Committee with pursuing a Right wing line. This is a serious charge to make, but we stand ready to prove every single accusation contained in our charge and in our document.

Comrade Pepper the other night gave the impression here that he was the first man in America to discover opportunism in America. All right. But what was it? When Comrade Pepper was finally compelled to begin to examine the American Party from the angle of Right Wing mistakes, he found them in the election platform of our Party in 1924 — four years ago. Why did he not examine the platform of 1928? There he would have found a political demand reading like this: "That the American Party in 1928 demands the abolition of the Senate, the abolition of the Supreme Court and the abolition of the veto power of the President."

The American Communist Party in 1928 demands to reform the capitalist state. Why, Comrade Pepper, go so far back as 1924? 1928 has a more direct bearing upon the work and policy of our Party.

Another thing, Comrade Pepper, in his usual style and method to confuse and muddle the discussion, made the following statement that nine months ago the minority came to Moscow and claimed that the entire American working class were becoming bourgeoisified, and now, today, this same minority comes to the Comintern and claims that the whole working class of America is becoming almost Communist. Well, comrades, what we said nine months ago was correct and the Comintern said it was. The upper stratum of the American working class, the labour aristocracy, is bourgeoisified and exerts a certain influence upon the lower strata of the workers. We

demand an intensive campaign to fight against this bourgeoisification. Today, do we claim that the American workers are already following the Communist Party? No, we don't. We mean that the working class of American who for the last three or four years was in a state of continual retreat before the capitalist class, that particularly the unskilled, semi-skilled and unorganised masses are now beginning to manifest militancy and readiness to fight. We believe that these masses are becoming radicalised, and we do not hold the point of view of the Central Committee of our Party, Comrade Lovestone's and Pepper's, that because the bureaucrats of thirteen railroad unions endorsed Hoover, therefore all the railroad workers are for Hoover. We do not take the bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labour and the railroad unions as the indicator of the moods and opinions of the masses. We see the rationalisation drive of the capitalist class. We see wage-cuts, increased exploitation of the workers, speed-up, unemployment, etc. We say that this condition sets in motion a process of radicalisation primarily among the semi-skilled and unskilled workers, which our Party must utilise to organise the masses and lead them in struggle. This is our conception and by this we stand.

We do not do what the Central Committee does, namely; that any time you criticise it, the answer is: "Don't touch us, we are a small and young Party." Permit me to say that in September, 1929, the American Party will be ten years old. True, we are a small party, but I say that policies which are built upon the theory that American imperialism is big and all-powerful and our Party is small and weak, that these policies are not going to build a Communist Party in America. (Applause.)

Now, comrades, we do not want to give the impression that we, the minority, have not made mistakes. This is far from being true and we never have maintained any such attitude. We have made mistakes. Some of the errors of opportunism made by the Central Committee we have shared in. But when we have realised these mistakes we have recognised them, analysed them and corrected them. But the majority of our Central Committee has not done any of these things. We are convinced that the policies of the Central Committee are such that our Party cannot grow. We want to correct the Party's policy and set a correct Communist line.

When Comrade Pepper wrote on the 9th Plenum of the Comintern in an article in the American "Communist", it was to prove that when the Comintern speaks of a Leftward drift, this means Europe and not America. America is exempt. When the 9th Plenum laid emphasis on increasing the militancy of the Communist Parties, Pepper's contention was that that was for Europe and not for America. We maintain that although America is not Europe, the general line of the Communist International is the line also for our Party and this line we want explained, understood and applied also by the Communist Party of America. (Applause.)

Comrade DIMITROV (Bulgaria):

Owing to their special geographical position the Balkans constitute an extremely important military-strategical basis for the armed attack on the Soviet Union which is being feverishly prepared now. Moreover, the Balkans are an important source of raw material for the big industrial countries and an outlet for their produce.

It is not surprising that the struggle of the imperialist states for predominance in the Balkans is at present in full swing. Apart from the three rivals: Great Britain, France and Italy, the reviving German imperialism is making once more its appearance in the Balkans. The powerful United States is also beginning to intervene with ever increasing energy in Balkan policy and Balkan conditions. This continuous intervention of the imperialist powers in the Balkans and their mutual rivalry, which does not prevent them in the least adopting a common counter-revolutionary policy towards the Soviet Union and the revolutionary movement in the Balkan countries, intensifies and accentuates the old and new antagonisms and conflicts between the Balkan countries themselves, conflicts which are fraught with military complications of an international character and with international consequences.

The Balkan countries do not have an independent national policy. Through the collaboration of the bourgeois classes of the Balkan countries and of the dynasties which in their struggle against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, the peasantry and the oppressed nationalities are looking to the imperialists for support, the Balkan countries have been transformed into semi-colonies of the imperialist powers. The serious internal economic and political crisis is intensified and accentuated through imperialist pressure, the intrigues of the imperialist states which maintain chaos in the Balkans and endeavour to impede the development of the productive forces there. The formation of a Venizelos government in Greece and the signs of renewed internal military conflicts which accompany it, the assassination of a Deputy in the Yugoslav Skupschina, the outbreak of the national struggle in Yugoslavia and the extreme accentuation of Serbian-Croatian antagonisms, the powerful peasant movement against the Bratianu-regime in Roumania in which there is a temporary lull, the process of disintegration in the "Demokraticeski Zgovor" (Democratic League), the assassination of General Protogerov, renewed sanguinary conflicts in the nationalist Macedonian organisations (V. M. R. O.) and the evident possibility of renewed military coups d'Etat in Bulgaria, the preparation for the proclamation of Achmed Zogul, King of Albania and the renewed accentuation of relations between Albania and Yugoslavia, the growing white terror and the Fascist offensive in the Balkans, etc., — all these important processes and recent events bear witness of a serious and ever-growing crisis in the Balkans which the bourgeoisie is neither able to keep down for any length of time nor to solve. On the other hand, the terrible destitution and incredible suffering of the masses, the ruthless exploitation of the workers, the feudal agrarian conditions and the spoliation of the peasants, the national oppression and the violent denationalisation and colonisation policy lead to the revival of the workers and peasant movement and of the national-revolutionary movements of the Balkans.

At the same time the prospects of the coming agrarian and national revolutions in the Balkans — in Yugoslavia, Roumania, Albania and Greece are becoming clearer. However, under the existing conditions in the Balkans and in the present international situation, no agrarian or national revolution can be victorious except in conjunction with the proletarian revolution, through a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, the peasantry and the oppressed Balkan nationalities under the leadership of the proletariat and its Communist vanguard.

One can safely say that the capitalist stabilisation is nowhere so transitory and the antagonisms which develop on the basis of this stabilisation so considerable and acute, as in the Balkans. The Balkans are, no doubt, one of the weakest and most vulnerable points of the world rule of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. Just now, when imperialism is doing its utmost to make the Balkans a reliable base of the international counter-revolution and to establish an anti-Soviet bloc of the Balkan states, it is our paramount duty to create in the Balkans strong positions for the international proletarian revolution. But for this purpose, it is not enough to make efforts for the construction of Bolshevik mass Parties, the Comintern should also pay special attention to the situation of the Balkans and the struggles going on there.

Comrades, the Communist movement in the Balkans has suffered in the last years a series of very heavy defeats and internal crises, owing to Fascism and white terror and also owing to certain serious errors of its Executive. But with the help of the Comintern, the Balkan Communist Parties have succeeded in emerging from the period of internal crisis by making use of the experience gained through their errors and defeats. They have adopted a correct policy and correct tactics, they are recovering from their defeats and proceed courageously with their Bolshevisation and their transformation into genuine mass Parties of the revolutionary proletariat in spite of the enormous difficulties confronting them. There are three main features in this process of development:

1. The Communist Parties have driven from their ranks the social democratic and semi-social democratic elements who are alien to them, for instance, the Shivot Milokovitch group and others in Yugoslavia, the Kordatos-Dimitraros and

Maximos-Poliupolos groups in Greece, the Christesku group and others in Roumania; the Sakarow-Manov, Lidor-Todorov-Klintscharov and Lukanov-Popov groups in Bulgaria. These groups and individual liquidators were unable to take with them proletarian elements.

2. Some of the former leaders of the Communist Parties proved to be unfit to lead the Communist Party under the new conditions and had to be replaced by new Party functionaries from the ranks of the proletariat who are imbued with the Bolshevik spirit. The problem of training and educating energetic Bolshevik leaders and Party cadres in the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries is still one of the most important problems of the Communist movement in the Balkans.

3. The further Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties in the Balkan countries is effected by energetic and continuous struggle against the Right and against capitulation tendencies which, in a situation of white terror, have the support of the privileged sections of the proletariat and of the petty-bourgeoisie. These tendencies are at present the greatest danger to the Communist movement in the Balkans. Bolshevisation is also effected by overcoming ultra-Left and sectarian moods which still prevail in some places.

Comrades, the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries have certainly influence among the proletariat; but this influence has not been made secure organisationally.

Contrary to the big capitalist countries, the social democratic party in the Balkans has no influence on the mass of the proletariat and is in a state of steady decline. This is mainly due to the fact that the privileged sections of the proletariat on which the social democrats generally rest, are infinitesimally small in the Balkan countries, owing to special historical, economic, social and political conditions. On the other hand, this is also due to the acute class struggle in the Balkan countries which is the result of the just mentioned circumstances.

But this does not mean that social democracy is no longer dangerous to the revolutionary movement. By its rôle of agent of the bourgeoisie and pace maker of social fascism among Civil Servants and petty bourgeois elements, it does great harm and the struggle against it must be continued with unabated energy.

Trotzkyism found no followers in the Communist Parties of the Balkans and among the proletariat. Its champions in the Balkans were the social Fascists and the most shameless renegades of the Communist movement.

According to the Bulgarian Delegation the main tasks of the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries are as follows:

Organisational consolidation in the proletariat and internal Bolshevik consolidation.

Establishment and extension of contact with the masses as their vanguard and leader.

Formation of adequate Bolshevik cadres.

Establishment of an alliance between the proletariat and the poor peasantry and also of a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, the peasantry and the oppressed nationalities for the struggle against the capitalist offensive, the white terror regime, national oppression and the relics of feudalism, against the pressure of the imperialists, the danger of an imperialist war and the danger of an armed attack on the Soviet Union. This struggle is to be linked up with the immediate interests of the workers and peasants and is to be conducted under the slogans: "For the workers' and peasant government" and "For the Balkan Federation of workers' and peasant republics."

A considerable number of the tasks confronting the Balkan countries concern the Balkans as a whole and can only be carried out through continuous collaboration and joint efforts by all the Balkan Parties. The formation of a revolutionary Balkan bloc of the proletariat, the peasantry and the oppressed nationalities, the establishment of contact between the agrarian and national revolution on the one hand, and the proletarian revolution, on the other hand, under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat, is the task which is confronting now all the the revolutionary Parties of the Balkans. The struggle

against the capitalist offensive in the Balkans cannot be successful unless there be close collaboration between the proletariat and its trade unions in all the Balkan countries. Finally, the campaign abroad against white terror and fascism in the Balkans is the common task of the Balkan Communist Parties.

The Balkan countries are so closely connected that the success of the proletarian revolution in each Balkan country depends directly on the situation in the adjoining Balkan countries and on the strength and development of the revolutionary movement there.

In view of all these circumstances, the accentuation of the Balkan crisis and the approaching war danger, it is more necessary than ever to strengthen and develop the Communist Balkan Federation (ex-Socialist Balkan Federation) which was established in 1910.

The only duty of the Communist Balkan Federation, which is not an intermediate organ between the Comintern and individual Balkan Communist Parties, which have direct relations with the E. C. C. I., is to help them to carry out their revolutionary tasks which concern the Balkans as a whole. It is an important political necessity for the Communist movement in the Balkans, and the Balkan Communist Parties must do their utmost to strengthen it and to encourage its activity; they must also insist on the Comintern giving every encouragement and support to the Federation. Vacillation and hesitation in this respect can do much harm.

The only Balkan country where no Communist Party exists, is little Albania. But the necessary premises for the establishment of a Communist Party are being created there.

The Bulgarian Delegation is convinced that under the leadership of the Communist International and with its continuous help, the proletariat in the Balkans and its vanguard will be able to do their duty by the Soviet Union and the cause of the proletarian revolution and Communism, in the coming serious events and struggles in the Balkans against imperialism. (Applause.)

Comrade WEINSTONE (America):

Comrades, it is unfortunate that the sessions of the World Congress have been turned into sessions of the Anglo-American Secretariat to study in detail the issues within the American Party.

I must say, comrades, that the opposition is largely artificial and unprincipled in the charges that it makes against the Central Committee. For example, Comrade Cannon, who has spoken so eloquently against the Right dangers, states that the Central Executive Committee is paralysing the growth of our Party. And yet, within the past few days Comrade Foster, who is associated with Comrades Bittelman and Cannon declared at the R. I. L. U. that the Communist Party leads all big strikes in the United States and has the hegemony over the Left wing within the country. I should like to ask which is correct: the statement of Comrade Foster or the statement so lightly made by Comrade Cannon. The thesis proposed by Comrade Bukharin states that the Communist Party has been the stalwart leader of fierce class battles within the country. Can we say that such a Party that has valiantly led a struggle of the miners for a period of fifteen months and a struggle of over 50,000 needle trades workers for eighteen months, that is the rising leader amongst the textile workers, — that that Party suffers from a disease which is paralysing its development.

It would be folly to deny that there is a Right danger within our Party. But when we analyse the mistakes made by the Party, we see that the comrades of the Opposition have been as responsible as the comrades of the majority of the Central Committee for such errors and in addition they have made some errors that the Central Committee has rejected.

The Panken case has been made much of by Comrade Cannon and yet what about it? In the New York District Committee where this error has been made, all the comrades un-animously made this error.

The same comrades charge that the Central Executive Committee had a wrong policy towards the Socialist Party. Basically

the line was correct but some errors were made. Were these comrades exempt from the errors which the Party committed? Take the question of the **Open Letter to the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party**. This letter was initiated by Comrade Bittelman and was voted for by Comrades Cannon and Foster as well as other members who constitute themselves here as minority members of the Central Executive Committee. It was wrong to send this letter, this united front from above at a time when the leadership of the Socialist Party had become completely reactionary and when the policy should have been that of a united front with the Socialist workers against their leaders.

Comrade Cannon has mentioned errors on the matter of the **Labour Party**. But how is it that Comrade Cannon, has kept silent on the proposal of Comrade Bittelman that in addition to trade unions as a basis for the Labour Party we shall build up Labour Party clubs on individual membership — a policy which was proposed by Lore who was expelled as a Right wing leader by our Party? Such a policy, decisively rejected by the Political Committee, would indeed have evolved a completely opportunistic policy and an opportunistic line on the matter of a Labour Party.

Why did not Comrade Cannon further mention that Comrade Bittelman recently proposed that the Party should take the initiative in calling off the present strike of the mine workers? We Communists were not responsible for the calling of this strike. At this moment it is announced that the strike is called off and sold out by Mr. Lewis which gives the Party the opportunity of exposing this reactionary bureaucracy of the United Mine Workers.

If we are really fighting deviations in our Party, we must mention not only Right errors, but also Left errors within the Party. Neither Comrade Cannon nor Comrade Bittelman mentioned the proposal made by the latter, that in the present situation in the United States we shall advocate **political protest strikes** in our everyday agitation. Such a proposal is surely not adapted to the present economic and political conditions in the country and would only help to isolate the Party from the masses. Or another error of an ultra-Left character which was made by Comrade Bittelman only a week before the delegation sailed, when he proposed that the Party endeavour to get the Trade Union Educational League, the American Negro Labour Congress and the Farmers' Educational League to endorse the candidates of the Communist Party and its platform which includes the dictatorship of the proletariat. And if the Central Executive Committee has rejected such a proposal is it to be condemned as a Right wing?

How frivolously some of these comrades make charges against the Central Executive Committee is shown by the way in which Comrade Dunne handles the question of the **Negro work**. It must be emphasised that we have been woefully lacking in our Communist duty and that we can be severely criticised in not paying sufficient attention to the question of organising Negro workers in the United States and not giving sufficient attention in this major task of Communist activity. But when Comrade Dunne places all the responsibility for this inattention of the entire Party at the door of the Central Executive Committee; when he furthermore assigns to the Central Executive Committee errors which it has not committed; when, for example, he holds the Central Executive Committee responsible for an article which appeared in the R.I.L.U. organ "The Negro Worker", a petty bourgeois article that has no place in any Communist press, then he makes himself ridiculous in the charges which he levels against the Central Executive Committee. For who are the comrades editing this organ? Comrades Dunne and Ford, — and they reprinted this article without an editorial note, or without an editorial comment.

That all these charges against the Central Committee are largely unprincipled is seen from the fact that these comrades at the **May Plenum of the Central Executive Committee** never made a single motion indicating that the Central Executive Committee is a Right wing committee or following a Right wing policy. They never made a counter-proposal to the resolution adopted in May of this year by the Central Executive Committee on the political tasks of our Party. They never uttered a word when they adopted in May of this year a letter from the C.I. in the writing of which Comrade **Johnstone** and

Comrade **Dunne**, according to Comrade Petrovsky, were responsible for every word of the document. This letter declares "that the Central Executive Committee session of February itself was a convincing proof of definite achievements in the political consolidation of the Party". Where were these comrades to point out the line of danger of the Right wing within the Party?

Since the policy of the Central Executive Committee regarding the Socialist Party and the Labour Party have been caricatured here, it is necessary to state that the theses adopted in the February Plenum of the C. E. C. and further emphasised in the Political Committee in April of this year declared:

1. That the Socialist Party has been going completely to the right;
2. That it has abandoned an independent line within the trade unions and
3. Has become a mere appendage of the bureaucracy;
4. That it has aligned itself with the police in the struggles against the workers.

Under these circumstances the policy of the Party declared that it is necessary to sharpen the attack against the Socialist Party, that no united front be made with the leaders but with the workers against the Socialist Party officials and leadership. No voting for Socialist Party candidates as a general rule.

The **Labour Party policy** has been modified by the Party in the May Plenum. We very much welcome the modification proposed by Comrade Bukharin's thesis and we believe it is identical with the policy proposed by the Central Executive Committee.

The policies which we have adopted are 1) that today the Labour Party is a slogan of propaganda; 2) that we can form a Labour Party only against the bureaucracy of the trade unions and the leadership of the Socialist Party; 3) that the whole problem of the Labour Party is tied up with the question of the organisation of the unorganised and its organisation is bound up with the extent of our success in forming new unions; 4) that we must build mill, shop and mine committees as one of the bases for the organisation of a Labour Party.

Allow me to comment upon Bittelman's accusation that the C. E. C. advertises the power of American imperialism. In this respect the C. E. C. is in very good company. Comrade Bukharin said in his speech that "American imperialism is marching forward" and that you may call him a pessimist for describing the tremendous growth of American Imperialism. Is this advertising the power of American imperialism or describing it for the purpose of laying down the line for the destruction of its power. The kernel of Comrade Bukharin's thesis on America is stated in the following words:

"With the transference of the world's economic centre to the United States of America and her **imperialist aggressiveness resulting from that it must be recognised as an important factor in the modern development of capitalism generally**", etc. Whereas Comrade Bukharin's theses maintain that the aggressiveness of American imperialism is due to the fact that it has become the world's economic centre, Comrade Bittelman's thesis is that the "aggressiveness of American capitalism follows from a correct analysis of the **diminishing reserve forces of American imperialism**".

The thesis of Comrade Bukharin correctly stresses the necessity for more energetic efforts for the organisation of the unorganised. This is a task of the entire Party; it is a short-coming of the entire Party. It has been slow, as the C. E. C. has itself declared, in orientating quickly enough upon the unorganised masses. But at the same time, it must be contended that the Party in the case of the miners' struggle has been developing a new union; in the needle trades struggle it has been developing a new union; in the textile struggle, it has been developing a new union. As a declaration of fact, these efforts must be pointed out.

The main line in the internal situation followed by the Central Executive Committee has been correct and a process of consolidation of the active forces of the party has been going on. Comrades Bittelman and Foster have been as much in dis-

agreement on political questions as has Comrade Bittelman with the Central Executive Committee. An examination of the minutes of our Political Committee will show that a process of political consolidation has been going on which can be only impeded by the charges which have been raised here and the opposition of the minority comrades that appear at this Congress.

Last year the present leadership of the Central Committee was correctly criticised for having a too narrow internal line, but since that time the main line in this respect has been in the direction of a process of consolidation and unification. The task of the Central Executive Committee is to combat every one who wishes to introduce again a factional struggle within the Party. Today the comrades of the Opposition who raised the banner of a struggle for unity last year, have completely abandoned this platform. Today, these comrades stand on the platform of permanent factionalism within the Party. These comrades will not succeed in achieving this. It is against the interests of the Party. The unification of our Party is needed in order to carry out the tasks of organisation of the unorganised, and to take advantage of the favourable situation for Communist work within the country, for overcoming the shortcomings in our Negro work. To this the Central Executive Committee is committed, and despite the factional course of the Opposition and their factional provocation it will continue along the line that it has adopted for ridding the Party of the disease of factionalism on the basis of the line of the Communist International.

Comrade PADI (Indonesia):

Comrades, the Indonesian Delegation are in agreement in general with the thesis of Comrade Bukharin, but we want to insert a few more paragraphs. The recent international situation is being characterised, as Comrade Bukharin says, by the simultaneous movement of the proletariat in the industrial States and the oppressed peoples in the colonies. It is remarkable that in this present situation, the II. International is becoming more active than ever before to influence the national emancipation movements in the colonies. In the coming Congress of the II. International which will take place in August, the colonial problem will take an importance place.

In any case, it is no accident that the II. International is paying more attention than before to the colonial problems. The II. International will make every effort, the same as it is doing in Europe, to confuse the issues of the oppressed peoples and to weaken the organisation of the colonial proletariat under the oppressive imperialist yoke. The Social Democrats will point out to the international bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie the danger of unchaining the national revolution, that this revolution cannot be utilised by us to revolutionise the broad masses, etc., etc.

It is becoming evident that the national bourgeoisie with the experience in China is becoming more reactionary than before. We must therefore pay special attention to it and we are of the opinion that in the thesis of Comrade Bukharin, emphasis should be laid on the necessity to establish and strengthen the Communist Parties in the colonies. It should also be stressed that the European Parties should give their full support to the strengthening of the international sentiments.

It is true that some weeks ago the Indian reformist trade union leaders, who were invited to the Congress of the Labour Party in London, withdrew from the Congress as a protest against the imperialist attitude of MacDonal. This does not mean that these Indian reformist leaders are willing to co-

operate with us. We must strengthen our Parties in the colonies therefore, in order to be able to act against these national reformist tendencies.

Further, we are of the opinion that in the thesis of Comrade Bukharin, a special paragraph should be inserted pointing out the influence of the protection policy on the sharpening of the imperialist contradictions. We believe that just now, as a result of the growing competition among the imperialist States, the policy of protection plays an important role.

Under the heading "The State Power of the Bourgeoisie and the Re-Grouping of Class Forces", we read:

"In the great majority of capitalist countries the politics of the bourgeoisie are at the present time determined by two main tasks: 1. the further increase in competitive power, i. e. the further development of capitalist rationalisation, etc., etc." Our suggestion is:

"...through the further development of capitalist rationalisation and through introducing or intensifying a protection policy."

Further, we are of the opinion that the thesis of Comrade Bukharin should contain a special paragraph about our Party in Holland, to remind our Dutch comrades to intensify their activity, as the ideology of our Party in Indonesia, to a certain extent, is influenced by our Party in Holland.

The Indonesian delegation considers it necessary to give a short report regarding the latest events and the uprisings in Indonesia. The Party in Indonesia is very young, since it was only established in 1920, and during the development of the Party, we worked without any guidance of the Communist International, so that mistakes were inevitable.

Despite the extraordinary and brutal white terror of the Dutch Government, our Party grew rapidly and gained great influence among the masses.

During our legal existence, from the year 1920 to 1925, our Party was able to eliminate the reformist leaders of the national movement and to create through the revolutionary movement Communist tendencies in the trade unions and peasant movement. These unions are completely in the hands of the Communist Party. Our influence was not limited to the proletariat but extended also to the peasantry, the army, police force and some intellectuals.

The Government arrested and deported hundreds of Communist leaders, ordered the closing of the Party headquarters and arrested the members of the Central Committee.

We consider it to be a serious mistake — that during the uprising which lasted two months, the Communist International remained inactive. The blame cannot be put on our Dutch Party because our comrades did what they could to support the rebellion. The Communist International ought to have instructed all its Sections, especially in Germany, France and America to support the uprising and to make a campaign with demonstrations, through the press, etc., in favour of it. But this has not been done. It is a sad experience of the Communist International and we hope that such a mistake will not occur again.

In the name of the Indonesian Delegation, we hope that now as so many of us are arrested, an agitation in Europe shall be made to demand the immediate release of our comrades who are sentenced for many years, and it is by such an agitation that our comrades will be immediately released.

Close of Session.

Tenth Session.

26th July 1928 (Morning).

Continuation of the Discussion on Comrade Bukharin's Report.

Chairman: Comrade Cachin.

Comrade WICKS (America):

Comrades, it was said here yesterday that our Central Executive Committee of the American Party has a tendency to advertise American Imperialism. The reason we are accused of advertising American imperialism is because we approve the correct estimation of American imperialism as is to be seen in the thesis of Comrade Bukharin.

We cannot correctly estimate American imperialism in the manner, for instance, in which Comrade Bittelman tried to estimate it by pointing out certain maturing inner contradictions — "new discoveries" which are not new discoveries at all.

Comrade Bittelman speaks of the disproportion between productive capacity and the volume of production. Now is this disproportion anything astonishing? Emphatically, no! Considering the fact that the United States is trying to produce for the entire world market, it is essential that the productive capacity be much greater than actual production. Furthermore, how did it happen that there is this disproportion between productive capacity and actual production? Is that anything new? Certainly not! The United States during the World War increased its productive capacity tremendously and this increase of productive capacity continued at an enormous pace even after the war and is continuing even today. Naturally when European reconstruction took place with the revival of economy in the various countries of Europe, it was quite certain that there would necessarily be a disproportion between productive capacity and actual production in the United States.

Furthermore, there is one important element in this situation that Comrade Bittelman entirely overlooked and that is the fact that there is today a deliberate policy on the part of the imperialist masters of America to increase their productive capacity and to place industry in such a condition that within a very short time it can be changed from a peace time basis to a war time basis. Do you mean to say under these conditions, that a new discovery has been made regarding internal contradictions in American economy that is in opposition to the thesis? I say such an attitude is ridiculous.

Now regarding the question of reaching the apex of development. Is there any indication that the apex of development in the United States is about to be reached? Absolutely not! There is no such indication at the present time. Quite the contrary, the thesis correctly says that American capitalism is still on the upgrade. When we speak of a nation reaching its apex of development that means that it is very near a point where it will soon be on the downgrade because imperialist society, at this stage does not remain stable. If these comrades today speak of an apex they naturally expect tomorrow a decline and we cannot accept any such thing.

Also, these so-called statistics of Comrade Bittelman — another new discovery — regarding the disproportion between the actual national income and the wages the workers receive. What does that indicate? Comrade Bittelman takes the relative wage as compared to the entire national income, but he forgets the fact that even though national production is rising and the relative wage may be falling, nevertheless, as Comrade Varga correctly stated yesterday, the real wage of large sections of the American working class is actually rising. That is the situation at the present time and so Comrade Bittelman cannot bring up as one of the contradictions in capitalism the claim that the whole working class has suffered reductions in real wages.

And now why is this emphasis placed upon the internal situation? We can say that there will be, there are certain tendencies in American Imperialism leading to catastrophic conditions. But these catastrophes in American political economy, will first be external because of the strengthening of the position of American Imperialism in the entire world at the expense of the other powers, especially at the expense of England and Japan. If the comrades of the opposition would seriously study the thesis of Comrade Bukharin, instead of trying superficially to point out defects that are phantasies, they would speak of that great disproportion between the economic power of American Imperialism and is colonial possessions and recognise the fact that it is at this moment driving relentlessly forward, particularly in Central and South America, as well as in China, in order to remedy this disproportion. This is the basic fact that determines the vicious role of American Imperialism as one of the most malignant forces making for another world war.

In the thesis of Comrade Bukharin we were criticised regarding shortcomings of our Nicaraguan campaign. That criticism is justified. We failed to make the Nicaraguan campaign our central campaign. I want to emphasise also that one of the reasons why the Nicaraguan campaign was not the kind of a campaign it should have been, is because the head of the Anti-Imperialist League in the United States had factional protection in his incompetence. I say that was an omission on the part of the Central Committee in not taking drastic action in this case, even though we might have been charged with factional removing of an incompetent comrade.

This anti-imperialist work is most important at the present time. There is a new danger in Mexico as a result of the situation there. There is a menace of intervention. The United States is striving in every conceivable way to consolidate its power in Mexico and in Latin America, in order that it may be able effectively to wage war against its great imperialist rivals. This campaign in Latin America in turn cannot be separated from the campaign of the American Government internally against the working class, against the Labour Movement. We must be able to link up the fight for the colonial and semi-colonial peoples with the fight for the interests of the working class, and impress upon the workers the fact that this is one fight.

Regarding our inner Party situation. It is certainly deplorable, comrades, that this question had to be brought up. For five years there has been a certain group of so-called, or would-be leading comrades in our Party who have stood as a solid group in varying political issues. I say that such a permanent condition of factionalism in a changing political situation emphasises the unprincipled character of this group that is fighting at the present time against the Central Committee.

Now yesterday Comrade Cannon spoke sacrastically of one of the representatives of the Central Executive Committee, Comrade Pepper, as "an internationally known exponent of correct policies." I happened to be in the same room with Comrade Cannon before he came over to make this speech, and he read to me a document containing the identical words he later uttered here. This document shows from what source Comrade Cannon got his material to criticise this "internationally known exponent of correct policies". And I want to say that Comrade Cannon should have given credit to this source. The source from which he obtained it was a 100-page criticism of the Draft Programme of the Communist International, written by ex-Comrade Trotsky.

One more point I want to make, and that is this: the criminal attempt on the part of the opposition in our Party of trying to make a factional football of the Negro problems that we have to face in the United States. They talk of white chauvinism. I want to remind these same comrades that in the city of Detroit a ball was given in behalf of miners' relief, and their principal supporter, Comrade Goetz, was responsible for excluding Negroes from that ball. The District Committee of Detroit took drastic action against this comrade, removed him from his office, and laid down the correct policy that, even if a few hundred dollars were involved, and if it would have meant the breaking up of the dance and starting a riot they ought to have fought to admit the Negroes.

When these comrades bring in these issues of white chauvinism in connection with the Negroes, they bring it up only for the purpose of factionalism. I have here a letter from Goetz, wherein he tries to explain and apologise for his position. It is one of the most disgraceful documents that ever was written by a Communist.

I say that we positively must, with the assistance of the Communist International, overcome the menace of a recurrence of factionalism in our Party. There are tremendous tasks ahead for us. For instance, as the situation sharpens, we must be able to prepare again for an illegal existence of our Party in the United States, and the Communist International must help us to enter this period free of the blight of factionalism.

Comrade HEIDAR (Palestine):

I think that Comrade Bukharin is quite right in speaking of the **governmentalisation tendency of capitalism** as such without going into details concerning the forms of this governmentalisation, because the meaning of this tendency does not consist in the nationalisation of private enterprises, but mainly in the fact that the State apparatus as such merges with the capitalist economic apparatus. As far as we are concerned, the existing situation is determined by its inevitable consequences which are:

1. The economic apparatus of the capitalist society grows and extends. Rationalisation restricts the labour apparatus. Although rationalisation increases productivity and cheapens production, the number of parasitic elements among whom the capitalist class must distribute its excess profits grows ad infinitum. The high state officials are no longer content with power and honours, they demand a definite share, namely the lion's share of the profits of manufacturers, traders, etc.

2. The smaller cost of the apparatus brought about by the capitalists means a terrific rise in what Marx calls "faux frais" of the capitalist system. The state budget is growing and so does expenditure for the army, as well as smaller expenditure for custom offices and other state requirements, and this impedes further development.

3. But the main thing is: the capitalist class loses its much vaunted freedom of initiative, and its profit opportunities are more restricted. The capitalist class as such deteriorates into an agent of the big dictators — trust and syndicate capitalists. The capitalist economic apparatus merges, therefore, with the state bureaucracy, and bureaucracy which still reigns supreme in the bourgeois state becomes the scourge of the capitalist economy.

Thus, stabilisation means first and foremost "fascisation" of the capitalist economy. The bankrupt bourgeois democracy in Italy and other European countries sought in fascism salvation from the revolution, and has probably found it for the time being. The declining capitalist system in Great Britain has to be saved by Mond, i. e., also through economic fascism. Mond in economics is the same as Mussolini in politics.

In my opinion, one cannot divide the capitalist countries, as Comrade Bukharin has done it, into countries with or without colonies. There is not a single country which can exist without a colonial market, without colonial raw material. Even Germany which, formally, has no colonies, carries on "colonial" trade, probably not to a lesser extent than France; it competes with Great Britain in the latter's own colonies. This is shown

by the custom reports of Egypt, Syria, Palestine and a number of other big colonies. I think that in regard to the stabilisation question, the feverish tempo of the investment of European big capital is of the utmost importance. The result of such stabilisation will be a more intensive crisis on a broader basis.

A few words about our mistakes. We are, of course, pleased that Comrade Bukharin has mentioned, although only in a few words, the Eastern Department. Today, when Egypt is the arena of important events, — dissolution of the Egyptian parliament, disintegration of the Egyptian coalition, — when in Syria we witness the intrigues of the French who would like to establish a monarchist regime, it would have been as well to pay a little more attention also to events in Egypt and Arabia. Unfortunately, in Comrade Bukharin's theses no mention is made of Egypt, the Arabian East and the intrigues of Italy and France. I think that the 6th Congress must put this right.

Comrades, with your permission, I will say a few words about the attitude of all comrades, including, of course, Comrade Bukharin to the problem of such small but nevertheless important countries as Egypt, Arabia, and the Arabian East. Egyptian history in the last ten years is a history of uninterrupted spoliation and arbitrary rule of British pirates, French usurers and in generally speaking European profiteers over the millions strong Fellaah-population. I would like to know: where was our British Communist brother Party when its lords, generals and commissioners destroyed Fallaheen villages in Egypt and Sudan, brought dozens of innocent nationalists to the gallows, threw proletarian revolutionists into prison, and destroyed labour unions and parties? Where was the Comintern? What was the French brother Party doing when French generals put down with fire and sword the insurrection in Syria? For two years the Syrian revolutionists carried on a heroic struggle against the mighty French army — but where was the European proletariat and what was its vanguard, what was the Communist movement doing? Comrades all this means that a thorough change must take place in the attitude of our sections and of the E. C. C. I. itself to the problems of the Arabian East, regardless of the size of the countries in square kilometres, the number of inhabitants, etc. The actuality and the acuteness of the questions alone must be considered.

We cannot ignore the fact that just during the last two years the reformists have worked energetically in the East and particularly in the regions I just mentioned. In Palestine they have an excellent organisation with several thousand members, political and trade union organisations which ensure the further development of Amsterdam and Second International ideology in Egypt, Syria, etc. A number of prominent leaders of various reformist and Amsterdam organisations tour these countries (Kenworthy, Braun, Vandervelde and others) and do their utmost to land the Arabian proletariat in their net.

We must, therefore, develop an energetic activity among these masses to counteract the work of these adventurers from the Second International. In the meantime, our Parties are left to fate or their own devices. We do what we can by our own efforts without any kind of help either from the Comintern, the French Party, or any other Parties. Comrades, this cannot go on any longer. There must be a change in the attitude of our sections to the Arabian East; we have there a strong reserve of revolutionary fighters, for this part of the world is a crater from which the indignation and excitement of the masses pours like a stream of lava.

Comrade KATO (Japan):

Comrade Bukharin emphasised in his report that the struggle against the danger of a new imperialist war, the defence of the Chinese Revolution and the defence of the Soviet Union, are three main tasks of the world proletariat at the present time. The Delegation of the Japanese Party is not only in complete agreement with this statement, but in view of the active role played by Japanese imperialism in the Pacific, the C. P. of Japan is aware of its specially great responsibility in carrying out these tasks.

The young Japanese capitalism had a militaristic character from its beginning. Once Lenin wrote in his article on "Im-

perialism and the Split of Socialism", characterising Japanese imperialism that the military position in China, or so to say the military monopoly supplants the monopoly of financial capital. In Japan the state capitalist system is so developed that the State capital amounts to 3.5 milliard yen compared with 7 milliard yen of private capital. Since the financial crisis in April of last year, concentration of big private capital has been accelerated and the direct union of big capital with the State power has become stronger. The next step was the development of military State capitalism, which finds its political consummation only in war. Along with this process the State power in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the landowners became rapidly more and more reactionary. Parliament has become more and more an organ to deceive and oppress the people. The abolishment of the monarchy is an energetic demand of the working class. The Mikado is again playing a role in the interests of the imperialists. Moreover, Japanese imperialists intend to make the ex-Emporor of the Ching Dynasty, Pu-i the formal head of Manchuria instead of the son of the dead Chang Tso-lin. The Japanese reactionary government raided the C. P. of Japan last March, threw 1,000 militant workers and peasants into prison, sent 55,000 soldiers and 55 battleships to China, and placed Manchuria and the Shantung Provinces under their military regime as their colonies. This action aimed to crush the Chinese Revolution: it has been the first step to a world war. Since the spring of 1928 Japanese and British imperialism came in to closer contact for the purpose of crushing the Chinese revolution and attacking the Soviet Union. The antagonistic relation between Japan and the United States has been intensified. Japan's mask of "friendship to the Soviet Union" is being torn off.

Japanese imperialism is the stronghold of reaction in Asia. It is the great international task of the C. P. of Japan not to allow a single Japanese soldier to stay in China, to frustrate all attempts of the Japanese bourgeoisie to intervene in the Soviet Union, and to turn an imperialist war into a civil war against the Japanese bourgeoisie.

At present, the movement of resistance on the part of the workers and the peasantry is growing spontaneously all over the country. A strong Communist Party, which can weld together the fighting strength of the broad masses, is above all necessary.

During its existence the C. P. of Japan committed various mistakes. In spite of illegality of the Party, legalism, which restricted our activity within the limits of bourgeois law, liquidationism, which aimed to liquidate the independent existence of the Party and to dissolve it into Left mass organisations, ultra-Left sectarianism, which isolated us from the masses and fractional struggle hampered the development of the Party. In the July thesis in 1927, the Comintern pointed out the mistakes and errors of the Party in detail, and instructed the Party to make a reorganisation on the strict lines of Leninism. Since November, 1927, the Party was reorganised on the basis of factory nuclei. The Party became a workers' Party, by enrolling workers, who constitute 80% of the total membership and expelling some inactive intellectuals. The Party overcame legalism, liquidationism, and ultra-Left sectarianism which prevailed hitherto. A fraction which did not submit to the revolutionary discipline of the Party was expelled, and the unity of the Party was attained. The C. P. began to propagate its revolutionary policy before the masses and preserved its independent existence towards the Left mass organisation. At once our Party gained the support of the masses, and became the leading centre of the revolutionary masses, an independent political factor.

At present, the Japanese government detains some 500 workers in prison, and intends to sentence them to 10 years imprisonment. General Tanaka declared his intention to liquidate the C. P. completely. Contrary to their expectations the M. O. P. R. movement, the industrial amalgamation movement in the trade unions and other mass movements are spreading and the support of the masses for the C. P. is more and more increasing. It is true that the C. P. received a heavy blow, but it is working well as an illegal Party. It is no more a sectarian group, but enjoys the support of the revolutionary masses. Our Party will become a mass Party in deed. No one can prevent its growth.

In Japan, the struggle against social democracy has become especially important. Without the fight against Social Democracy there is no strengthening of the C. P. Together with the bourgeoisie, they are in favour of the invasion in China, a world war and the attack upon the Soviet Union. Among the Japanese Social Democrats, there are three currents. The first group is Suzuki Abe and Co. who get their support from the Right wing labour organisations and the S. D. P. They are in close connection with the International Labour Office and with Chiang Kai-shek, and promote the idea of a Pan-Asiatic International.

They are monarchistic and chauvinistic.

The second group is the so-called Left social democrats — the leaders of the centrist mass organisations. In contradiction to the Leftward tendency of the masses after the arrest of the revolutionary workers they are moving towards the Right. The third one is the group of liquidators, who seceded from the C. P., i. e., Yamakawa, Arabata, Sakai, Inomata, etc. They accuse the C. P. of being pushed by the leftward development of the mass struggle, but they are dwindling down. It is characteristic of Japanese S. D. in contrast to their colleagues in Europe, that they are more open strike-breakers, warmongers, monarchists and supporters of the invasion in China.

In connection with the international tasks which confront the C. I., the importance of the peasant question must be emphasised once more. The question of an agrarian revolution is the basic question of the liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In a different sense, in Japan also, the peasant question has a big importance. After the invasion in Shantung, the Japanese bourgeoisie engaged in a fierce chauvinist propaganda in the villages. They tried to create the illusion among the peasants that the invasion in China would be a solution of the land problem in Japan. The majority of the Japanese troops are peasants. Our aim is to solve the land question by the armed uprising of the peasants. The slogan of the confiscation of big landed property without compensation must be emphatically propagated in the Japanese villages.

One word about our brother Party of Korea. The revolt of the Korean workers and peasants has a great importance for the Chinese revolution and for the destruction of Japanese imperialism. But the long fraction fight of the Korean comrades prevents the building of a unified Party. We propose that the Comintern adopt concrete measures for the building up a unified Bolshevik Party in Korea.

Comrade HORSKY (Czechoslovakia):

I will deal with two questions, the peasant and the national question.

In his speech Comrade Bukharin mentioned the defects of the Peasant International and the inadequate work of the individual Sections of the C. I. and also the collective responsibility of the C. I. for this state of affairs.

In connection with the question of the seizure of power, one must not neglect the village, i. e. the question of our ally. If we leave to chance or the bourgeoisie the decision of the peasant question which is subject to certain vacillations, we would soon notice the detrimental effect of this in our revolutionary struggles.

We must estimate correctly the class differences in the peasantry, we must promote differentiation in the country side and must smash the slogan of agrarian capital which is, for instance, in Czechoslovakia: "The village is a family", because this slogan is intended to disguise the diverse class interests of the countryside, to make impossible the neutralisation of the middle peasantry and to create a gulf between us and the biggest section of the peasantry — the small peasants and the semi-proletariat.

We must admit that even with the sections of the rural population which will become bearers of proletarian dictatorship, namely, the agricultural labourers, we have not yet established that close connection which is so necessary if we are to fulfil our mission.

The situation in Czechoslovakia is as follows: Since the coup d'état in 1918 the Czech Agrarian Party has been the real ruler in the government, just as in the period of the so-called "socialist government". Apart from this big Czech Agrarian Party, every nationality has its own agrarian Party; then there is also a clerical party in Slovakia which not so long ago was in the opposition, but is today in the government. The accentuated class struggle compelled the hostile bourgeois parties to unite; a united front of the bourgeoisie of all the nationalities of Czechoslovakia was formed. It is directed against the proletariat and the peasantry and is representative of social, political and cultural reaction, that is to say, Fascism.

Apart from the discontent of the proletariat there is enormous discontent among the peasants, particularly the landless peasantry. The Agrarian Party is endeavouring to allay this discontent by agrarian reform.

However, the agrarian reform was carried out in a manner which disillusioned the peasantry, not only the hundreds of thousands who had demanded land and had gone away empty handed, but also those who were given land but became thereby the victims of agrarian and finance capital.

On the other hand, agrarian reform produced a new agrarian aristocracy, for the creatures of the Agrarian and Peoples' Parties, including the social democratic leaders, were the first to receive land. Moreover a considerable number of big landlords and all church land was exempt from confiscation.

Besides, if we take into consideration that the peasantry is overburdened with taxes and that new legislation is contemplated which is to consolidate the economic positions of the bourgeoisie, we will get a fairly correct picture of the coming crisis among the peasantry.

Hitherto, this discontent of the lower strata has not been expressed in an organised form. Economically, the peasantry depends mainly on the bourgeoisie.

The Agrarian Party has very well organised co-operatives, mainly dairy, credit, consumers, building and distilling co-operatives. In Czechoslovakia alone, there are 1600 such co-operatives.

Owing to our inadequate fraction work in the Agrarian and Clerical Parties, and also in the industrial enterprises and organisations of the Republic, the position of the Agrarians is very strong, in spite of the discontent of the peasantry. But the facts which I have just given must be an incentive to us to intensify our work among the disillusioned peasantry.

It is said in the theses that the C. P. Cz. pays too little attention to the peasant question. I think that this is not a question of lack of attention but of the work itself. De facto it was only the IV. Congress of the C. P. Cz. which dealt seriously with the peasant question.

After the IV. Party Congress a Commission was appointed in the C. C. for work among the peasants. This commission is working according to a definite plan. There are also commissions for this work in the regional executives. Directions are issued to the districts in regard to this work, Party workers are instructed and a conference has taken place at which the plan of the Central Committee was discussed. All the same, we must admit that, in this respect, we have not got beyond the initial stage.

The Party's department for work among the peasantry has been carrying on its work on the following lines after the reorganisation in 1927:

a) Extension and consolidation of the network of village nuclei, establishment and activation of commissions for work among the peasantry in the regional, district and village nucleus executives.

b) Formation and support of the Left wing and the oppositions in all parties and organisations which embrace the mass of the working rural population; formation of fractions in agricultural organisations and in co-operative and credit institutions. Support for oppositional unions of the small peasants and cottagers in their efforts to penetrate into the mass of the working peasantry.

As it is impossible to form legal unions in Slovakia and Carpathian Ukraine, we are obliged to discover new forms of organisation so as to gain influence over the peasant masses. They are **United Front committees of the working peasantry**. Our experience with them in Slovakia shows that this form of organisation is correct, at least for the transition period, and can satisfy the every day demands of the peasantry provided there be correct leadership.

I will deal now with the national question.

You know that Czechoslovakia is a second and worse edition of the defunct Austria. Six nationalities live on this small area. Compared with other nations, the ruling Czech nation is in the minority and therefore the Slovaks were incorporated into the Czech nation. Thus a foundation was created for the Czechoslovak state in which the ruling nation can retain power only by violent means.

In the annexed regions of Slovakia and in Carpathian Ukraine we witness colonial conditions in the most brutal sense of the word.

The administrative reform introduced lately in the Czechoslovak Republic gives Czechoslovakia first place among police-states.

The standpoint of the C. P. Cz. up to the second Congress of the Party was: that Czech workers and Communists would not understand the demand for self-determination up to separation and that they would turn away from Communism.

Even after the V. World Congress, when the national question was solved, self-determination was declared impossible among the Magyars on the plea that self-determination did not mean anything to them because Horthy rules in Hungary.

The decisions of the V. World Congress smashed the question of a Czecho-Slovak nation "one and indivisible" and recognised the right of the Slovaks to self-determination including separation, just the same as for the other national minorities. The Carpatho-Ukrainian question was solved in the same manner. In July 1926, the C. P. Cz. decided, at a conference of the Slovak sections, to put into practice the theses of the V. World Congress. This decision was circulated in Slovakia in the form of a manifesto. The main slogans kept within the limits of the Leninist theses. Another slogan was brought forward: removal of the bourgeois apparatus of power from Slovakia and plebiscite of the working population to ascertain the relation to the other nations, in Czechoslovakia. In November 1926 it was decided at the Carpatho-Ukrainian conference to substitute the Russian by the Ukrainian orientation, in accordance with the theses of the V. World Congress.

In September 1927, the conference of the German regions dealt with the national question and adopted, in principle, the same decisions as Slovakia.

In theory, the C. P. Cz. adheres to the decisions of the V. World Congress, but, in practice, there are many shortcomings, namely:

1. The theses and their concretisation were not sufficiently popularised.
2. They have not become the common property of the Party, particularly of the Czech section, and therefore.
3. they were not properly carried out.

From the Leninist viewpoint, the proletariat of the ruling nation must lay stress in its agitation and practice on the right to self-determination including separation. On the other hand, the proletariat of the oppressed nations has laid stress on voluntary cohabitation of the nations.

In this respect mistakes were made. The manifestoes were correct, but there is no sense in spreading the Slovak manifesto among the Slovaks, the Ukrainian among the Ukrainians and the German among the Germans.

Inadequate ideological preparation is very evident in such concrete cases as the **Rothermere action**. This incident was not sufficiently utilised by the sections, also on an international scale. Only the Hungarian brother Party gave us effective help by its standpoint.

The action was not carried out on a national scale, and thereby we made it possible — just in the election campaign — for the oppressed German bourgeoisie and also the Slovak bourgeoisie which was going through a serious crisis because of the betrayal of the anti-Czech Programme, to consolidate themselves. Even the social democrats who are bankrupt in Slovakia, pulled themselves together for a time and placed themselves at the head of the chauvinist and anti-Soviet campaign. This shows that we cannot rest content with making correct decisions, correct principles must become the common property of the workers.

I have linked up the peasant question with the national question because they have much in common.

I think that our errors should be discussed, because this is the only way to profit by them and to become a big Bolshevik mass Party, capable of establishing proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade PETRULESKU (Roumania):

Comrades, the Roumanian Delegation fully supports Comrade Bukharin's theses.

We must point out that Roumania is the country where the fleeting nature and the rottenness of capitalist stabilisation are shown up more clearly than anywhere else.

We witness in Roumania the gradual revolutionisation of the workers and peasants owing to the economic crisis. In spite of the weakness of our Party and of white terror, which is nowhere as virulent as in Roumania, the labour movement is developing. We have a strike movement and also an organised unemployed movement in a number of Roumanian provinces. We want to draw attention also to the peasant movement. The Roumanian peasant movement is a series of spontaneous separate movements which has frequently assumed the form of insurrections particularly in **Bessarabia**, **Dobrudja** and others. There was, for instance, a peasant insurrection this year in the Ilfov region, in the Zinkawesh village where the peasants attacked the gendarmerie with pitchforks and scythes. Many peasants were injured and shot down, and hundreds of them were thrown into prison. Similar insurrections took place about the same time also in the Delde and Braschov regions. Finally we draw attention also to the big peasant demonstration in **Alba-Julia** where 150,000 peasants from various Roumanian provinces came together at the call of the National Peasant Party. A characteristic feature of this peasant demonstration is that thousands of workers from the neighbourhood of **Alba-Julia** participated in it. This shows that there is a strong desire for alliance between the working class and the peasantry. But owing to the disorganised state of our Party this movement could not develop and was betrayed by the leaders of the National Peasant Party. This peasant movement, which has not come to a standstill and has assumed the form of a national-revolutionary movement in a number of the newly annexed Roumanian provinces, bears testimony that the political and economic stabilisation of Roumania is only of a fleeting nature. At the same time it shows us that our Party is confronted with important tasks in regard to gaining influence over the peasantry and securing the leading role in the peasant movement.

As to the social democrats, they are very weak in Roumania. Moreover, in Roumania, just as in the other Balkan countries, they are the worst variety of Social Democracy. With us they are nothing but agents of the "Siguranza" (secret police) who betray all strikes and labour movements. That is why they are losing their influence over the masses. They have still a certain amount of influence in Transylvania, in the Banat and Bukovina where formerly strong Social Democratic organisation existed. In other parts of Roumania Social Democratic influence is being gradually reduced to nought. We can judge by a whole series of strike movements to what extent workers turn their backs on the Social Democrats. An example of this is the strike in **Brailov**. The workers there were organised in Amsterdam trade unions. But after the strike had been sabotaged by the Social Democrats, they have left these unions. The same happened also in **Vala-Julia**, one of the biggest industrial centres of Roumania. Tens of thousands of

workers left work there. However, the strike was sabotaged and hundreds of workers were thrown into prison.

All this goes to show that Roumania offers a favourable ground for the work of the C.P. But our Communist Party has been up to quite recently in a state of crisis. The leaders of the Party committed a number of very serious opportunist mistakes in regard to the trade union question, the united front at the elections and also in regard to relations with the peasantry and the national question which plays an important role in Roumania. Apart from these mistakes there were also strong legalist illusions in the Roumanian Party. Owing to white terror which is particularly brutal in Roumania and owing to its opportunist mistakes, the Party has been lately in a disorganised state. It lost its organising centre and had only a few scattered local organisations. For a long time we had also in the Party Executive one of the biggest opportunists, Cristesku, who has gone now to the Congress of the II. International as its delegate. This is the path chosen by this traitor to the working class. The Party had to make enormous efforts in order to get rid of these opportunist elements who are now outside our ranks. The **Balkan Federation** has not been elastic enough, it was unable to get in contact with the individual Balkan Parties so as to put right a whole series of mistakes and to overcome the opportunist traditions which have still a strong hold on these Parties, from the Social Democratic times.

All this shows that our Party stands in great need of active support and direct intervention on the part of the Comintern. Lately, the Comintern has been paying more attention to us. The letter of the E. C. C. I to our Party concerning **Alba-Julia** and various organisational measures taken recently by the Party have enabled it to overcome the crisis which had been paralysing its activity. Our present executive is confronted with very important and extremely complicated tasks. We hope that the Comintern will give this new Executive the necessary support. We think at the same time that for the consolidation of our Party and of the other Balkan Parties measures should be taken for the coordination of their work.

Comrade EDWARD ROUX (South Africa):

Comrades: I wish to draw the attention of this Congress once more to the question of Africa. The enormous development of the colonial revolution in Asia has diverted the attention from the African colonies. Africa remains an enormous country where imperialist exploitation is developing almost unchecked. But already there are beginning to appear in Africa indications of colonial revolt. It is the task of the Communist International to lead this new movement into the world movement against imperialism.

In the process of rationalisation which the British capitalist class is now attempting, the enormous resources of British colonial possessions in Africa are playing an important part. In Africa we see a rapid development of motor and air transport. These are all preliminaries to the further exploitation of the African people, the alienation of the land and reduction of the African people to the condition of proletarians working under the yoke of imperialism and producing profits for the British capitalists.

In Africa today, the most highly developed form of monopolist capital comes into contact with the most primitive form of tribal Communism. This makes the exploitation of the African masses very intense and at the same time there is no bourgeoisie or class of native intelligentsia to lead the revolt of the Africans. Conditions are complicated in Africa by the fact that imperialism has assumed two antagonistic forms: on the one hand, we have the local African imperialism, with its headquarters in the **Union of South Africa**; on the other hand, we have the broader imperialism with its headquarters in Europe. Both of these imperialisms agree in their desire to exploit the African proletariat, but they differ as to the means to be employed. Of these two imperialisms, the local African imperialism is by far the most oppressive and is hated most by the African workers. Africanism is based on the class of white landowners supported by a white aristocracy of labour. It has as one of the features which always accompanies it, an industrial, social, political and economic colour bar preventing the African people from becoming anything more

than unskilled labourers. On the other hand, British imperialism in its West African form allows the natives to keep their land, it encourages them to produce crops on their own land and exploits them commercially by compelling them to pay large sums for manufactured goods and giving them in return very small prices for the tropical agricultural products which these people produce.

In British West Africa there is no colour bar. Imperialism requires a certain number of natives to do skilled work, such as engine drivers, clerks, brick layers, etc. Owing to the climatic conditions it is impossible to introduce a large class of white aristocracy of labour and so it must promote the development of a certain number of skilled black workers.

In South Africa, on the other hand, there is a large class of whites including workers of all sorts as a result of which it is illegal for a native to do skilled work. Capitalist rationalisation in Africa would involve the policy of the abolition of the colour bar in industry. But the South African capitalist is forced by the politically organised white workers to employ only white workers for skilled work. The present South African government is a government of the land-owners, the petty bourgeoisie, and the aristocracy of labour, and is directed on the one hand against the big industrial capitalists and on the other hand against the oppressed native workers. This fact must be taken into consideration when an estimate is made of the situation in South Africa.

At the same time this antagonism between the two forms of imperialism is seen also in East Africa, in the adjoining British territories of Uganda and Kenya. Uganda is becoming an important cotton producing country. In Uganda the native peasants receive every encouragement from the government to produce on their own lands and then sell to the merchants.

By this means the British cotton spinners in Britain wish to become independent of American cotton. In Kenya, on the other hand, the best land has been alienated to white settlers because in Kenya there are highland regions where whites can live. In Kenya the natives are not allowed to grow cotton because the Kenya land owners believe that if the natives will be allowed to grow cotton in their own reserves, they will be able to pay their taxes and will not have to come to work for the whites. That is why there is this antagonism between Kenya and Uganda.

In Kenya all the iniquitous features of the South African system are introduced — the colour bar, the Pass Law whereby every native must carry a pass with his thumb mark upon it; the native is under the supervision of the police all the time and is reduced to a condition of mere slavery.

In Uganda on the other hand, he is much better off. This antagonism between the two forms of imperialism is a very important feature and the native workers even think that British Imperialism is more friendly to them than the local imperialism.

I just wish to say one word about the II. International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International and their activities in Africa. These people have never been in the past very interested in colonial countries, but today they are showing a remarkable interest in them. This interest does not mean that they have changed their policy, they only wish to secure the leadership of the new movement of revolt which is growing up in Africa, turn it into social democratic channels and prevent it from developing into a revolutionary movement. It is the duty of the Communist International to give us in Africa the necessary assistance and attention in order to combat this reactionary attempt of the Social Democrats.

Comrade RACAMOND (France):

Comrades! Before the war France was a country where industry was only of relative importance; but since the war, by the conquest of the Lorraine iron basin, by the favourable change which has come about in her internal financial situation, capitalist France has been able to transform itself into a great industrial power. Further, in the discordant clash of rival imperialists, French imperialism is searching for ways of win-

ning markets. It has not only to struggle for exterior markets, but also for its own internal market. This necessity forces it to institute pitiless rationalisation in the factories. The French employers have taken advantage of the favourable situation created for their plans by the revaluation of the franc and the economic crisis which followed, by unemployment, to carry out a vigorous attack on wages and hours of labour. The first results of rationalisation in France have therefore been a considerable reduction in wages and repeated contravention of the eight hour law. Then followed the introduction of slave driving methods, the conveyor system and chronometers. Finally the French employers resigned themselves to undertaking some slight improvement in their equipment. With the help of the government they are now developing electric power throughout the country. By the use made of her waterfalls, by the setting up of dams, France is becoming a real industrial nation in the very districts where coal, the primary material used until now, does not exist.

In order to assist the process of rationalisation, Poincaré's government has brought about legal stabilisation of the currency. This carefully considered operation has made the work of the big industrialists secure. This has not occurred without serious consequences. Such are in particular the raising of the cost of living, further aggravated by the institution of very high custom duties, by the inevitable increase in taxation and now in addition an energetic campaign is being carried on for an increase in house rents. This situation, comrades, has caused an even greater deterioration of their standard of life for the poor proletariat of France.

In order to make sure of their aim, the French employers cleverly dole out apparent concessions at the same time as their oppression of the workers increases. It is thus that we see the development of the system of family allowances which give workers with families an appreciable addition to their wages. We see the institution of funds for assistance in case of illness and subsidies to sport clubs. In France, as in other countries, the system of employers lodgings has been instituted which attaches the worker to the factory, which makes an absolute slave of him, on the double ground of his exploitation at the factory and his exploitation as the tenant of his employer. Parallel with these reforms — all illusory and all paid for by the workers — the employers and the government relentlessly repress the real trade unions, the revolutionary organisations. The trade union groups are systematically destroyed in the factories. The militants and the workers who belong to our trade unions are dismissed. Police repression is added to the repression of the employers. The Prefect of the Seine police, Monsieur Chiappe, could boast a few weeks ago of having in two years turned out eight thousand foreign workers from Paris alone. I add to this, comrades, that in spite of this the influence of our revolutionary trade unions amongst the foreign workers grows continuously, thanks — it must be said — to the constant devotion of the militant immigrants in France. Governmental repression is directed equally against the French, and when the militants of the Communist Party are struck, inevitably also the militants of our revolutionary trade union organisations are also struck.

In the Socialist Party, as in the whole of the social democracy, the struggle is carried on in favour of "capitalist rationalisation". Citizens Spinasse, Montagnon, Dubreuil, etc., hold meetings all over the country, in favour of the American paradise stating that there is in America a really high standard of life for all the workers. It is said in France that one worker in five in America possesses a villa and a motor car.

Side by side with the campaign conducted by the Socialist Party there is the even more reactionary activity of the reformist trade union organisation. This is the integral alliance both in form and in practice between the militants of the C. G. T. and the capitalist and governmental organisation in the heart of the National Economic Council. All methods for rationalising industry as well as the political and economic direction of the country are examined and all decisions are taken with complete agreement between the leaders of the C. G. T., the representatives of the government and the representatives of large scale industry. If you want an example of the degree of integration of the militants of the C. G. T. into the capitalist machine. I will show you that the report on the

rationalisation of the French colonies was prepared by one of the secretaries of the French C. G. T., Citizen Nillion. This report tallied so well with what capitalism expects of the colonies that it was unanimously adopted almost without modification.

The certain result of these conditions is first the certain increase of revolutionary feeling among the poorer strata of the population, witnessed in France by the occurrence of more and more strikes. In the month of June, 1928, for instance, there were 102 strikes in France of which 85 were for increased wages, 7 against rationalisation, actually so-called, and 10 for solidarity.

These 102 strikes were really directed against rationalisation. Whether they were strikes against the reduction of wages or for increases in wages, or strikes of solidarity, or strikes against "rationalisation" actually so-called, they were all directed against the rationalisation plan of French capitalism and its socialist and trade union allies. Trade union work has been one of the main activities of our Party. At the time of the last National Conference the matter was very seriously discussed. It is one of the most important bases of its definite rectification.

We agree with Comrade Bukharin's report calling for a correct line of work in the trade union sphere. We must struggle first and foremost against reformist deviations, for — and we know this from experience — as soon as one tries to bring into the trade union movement all the problems which are the immediate concern of the workers, if there is not in existence a firm party with alert militants then at that moment purely professional preoccupations come on top, and there is a risk of creating serious reformist deviations unawares. It is against this danger that we must fight, and hence it is essential that all workers in the Communist Party should always preserve a revolutionary attitude in the heart of the trade union organisations, and know how to link up immediate demands with the aims of the revolutionary movement. That is to say, to link them up with the struggle against war and for world revolution.

But in addition to this, comrades, if we are agreed on this ground there is a deviation which consists in the party leading the trade union movement more by words than by carrying on the right kind of activity inside the trade unions. The national conference of the French Communist Party has declared that the factory nuclei should be the Communist organ which animates the trade union group, that they should bring forward the Communist point of view in the heart of the trade union organisation, without ever hiding the standard of communist thought on any grounds whatsoever inside the particular factory.

Besides this the conference of the Party paid great attention to the performances of the tasks laid down by the Fourth Congress of the R. I. L. U. We are already working for their realisation by serious organisational work inside the trade unions and the party itself, by the development of our network of fractions. In France, these fractions exist at the centre, they are being reconstituted on a logical plan and it only remains to make them function in all the divisions for the tasks of organisation laid down by the Fourth Congress to be realised as quickly as possible by the C. G. T. U.; we must also struggle against the C. G. T., not against the workers, but against the leaders, against the staff; we must expose them as active defenders of capitalism. We must also make great efforts in the important industrial districts and in the big enterprises; we must secure the protection of our trade union section by adequate means; watch over the creation and protection of our trade union sections; organise the strike movements; make use of the unrest caused by the circumstances which I have been describing, for our propaganda and our activities, in order that we may organise the strike movements so that they may not always be sectional movements. We must make sure of the leadership of these movements.

Then, comrades, we must work for the realisation of trade union unity, for immediate demands and for social demands. This necessitates real work by party members inside the trade unions so as to bring about a united front between the workers who belong to our revolutionary trade unions and those who

still preserve their illusions, and also in order to win over the unorganised workers. We believe that by this method we shall come nearer and nearer to the class unity of the proletariat.

We in the French Communist Party now believe that we have already made some progress since the last National Conference and since the Congress of the R. I. L. U. We believe that the Congress of the C. I. will give us new strength to develop our work in this sphere. We are sure that in the coming months the Communist Party leading the revolutionary trade union organisations will be able to gather round it the ever growing mass of workers.

Comrade KATAYAMA (Japan):

Comrades! The Japanese delegation is in full accord with Comrade Bukharin's report and Theses. I want to refer to a few points to underline what Comrade Bukharin said in his report.

First, with regard to international relations between the sections and the Comintern, and between the sections themselves, between the proletariat of one country with another; and finally, between the mother country and its colonies, we must recognise that all these relations are weak and quite imperfect, and hinder the leadership of the Comintern over the revolutionary activities of the sections.

The apparatus and leadership of the Comintern must be greatly strengthened, and if necessary, thoroughly reorganised to make it more efficient, mobilising the very best elements of the sections for this purpose.

The relations of the Comintern with colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially of the Far East, are far from being perfect. Furthermore, the language difficulty prevents quick action on both sides; while inadequate information, together with the slowness in transmitting directives from headquarters, hinder the development of revolutionary activities and result in grave mistakes being committed, as in the case of the Chinese Communist Party.

The relations between the mother country and its colonies are very unsatisfactory. Comrade Lenin very strongly emphasised the necessity for the mother country giving every assistance to the revolutionary movement in its colonial countries. In can point to the criminal neglect of the British Party with regard to Ireland and India in the past, and of the Dutch and American Parties with regard to the Philippines and Indonesia. The mother countries must correct this inactivity on their part, and give every assistance to the revolutionary movement in these colonial countries.

The relations between the various sections of the Comintern are also far from being satisfactory. As has already been pointed out by Comrade Bukharin and other speakers here, all the sections should give greater attention to their international obligations. Especially is it necessary that each and all the sections should pay serious attention, and give full support, to the Chinese revolution, as also to the Indonesian and Indian revolutionary movements against imperialism.

As ably presented for the first time at the Congress, the Negro problems should be seriously considered and a policy decided upon for the immediate future. The Negro question was fully discussed at the II. Congress by Comrade Lenin and the American delegates, and certain principles were laid down for this work, as the II. Congress considered the Negro question to be of great importance. Comrade Lenin considered the American Negroes as a subject nation, placing them in the same category as Ireland. At this II. Congress, the American Party was instructed to investigate the possibility of calling a Negro Congress, first in America, and then a World Negro Congress. The criminal neglect of the Negroes on the part of the American Party, as already pointed out by the Negro representatives, is solely due to the fractional struggles in the American Party.

The Negroes have been awakened since the last war, during which they showed great capacity for struggle, as demonstrated in the Negro riots in Chicago, Washington, Saint Louis and Oklahoma.

The American Party has never utilised these revolutionary factors for the advancement of the revolutionary movement. This

was particularly marked when the Anti-Lynch Bill was before the Congress, which gave immeasurable possibilities for gaining national sympathy for the Negro race. The American Party failed to utilise the occasion of the passing of this Bill for revolutionary propaganda in the country. This Bill passed the House, in spite of the solid opposition from the South, but the Senate shelved the question, where it is still lying. The Party should take up this Bill and utilise it for energetic propaganda against the white oppression and persecution of the Negroes.

Comrades! I spent twenty-six years in America as a worker and was connected with the American movement. I have therefore a right to regard the American Party as mine. I think the American Party should be sharply criticised for its age-long fractional struggle. It is time to stop this struggle, so that the Party can get on with positive work against American imperialism. Every new question that comes up before the American Party is first dealt with in a factional manner and drags along, and is never satisfactorily carried out. Unless the American comrades liquidate their factional struggles, the American Party will not develop into a mass party. You cannot say that you are really exerting your influence to get the Negroes into the Party. Of course, you have to overcome the social prejudices and impediments to conduct Party work among the Negroes, but it is your duty to carry out the instructions of the Comintern. Increase the Negro membership in the Party, and let them solve their own problems by themselves under the guidance of the Party.

We are fighting against imperialism, and you against American imperialism. The very best way to strike at American imperialism is from the colonial countries, or in this case, from Central-South America. It is your prime duty to co-operate with these countries in striking at American imperialism. The Mexican Party have been asking you to co-operate with them for a long time, ever since the Mexican Party came into direct contact with the Comintern, but in the past you have utterly neglected this. This Congress should smooth out the petty differences between the two sections, which should co-operate with each other in the work against American imperialism.

Finally I want to say a few words about the League Against Imperialism. As Comrade Bukharin has emphasised in his reports, it is an urgent necessity to strengthen this organisation, in order to prepare the fight against war and to defend the Soviet Union. The League against Imperialism has infinite possibilities before it, if proper attention is paid to every section of the Comintern. The British, American and German Parties have done something in this respect, but this is not enough. More attention must be paid to this part of the work against imperialism, especially with regard to the war danger. Experience has shown that the League Against Imperialism is able to mobilise masses for the anti-war movement.

The All-India Congress has officially affiliated to the League, and the December Conference of the League at Brussels unanimously passed a resolution to ask for the affiliation to the Pan-Pacific Labour Congress, and if this decision is properly carried out, the biggest Trade Union Federation in the world — the Russian Trade Union Council — will be a member of the League. When the war comes the League will play a big role in fighting against the war from within the colonial and semi-colonial countries. So I support Bukharin's proposal to strengthen the League against Imperialism. One of the Dutch delegates objected to the strengthening of any auxiliary organisation, as it had had a bad experience with the branch of the League in Holland. But this generalisation is utterly unjust and unfair, because the Dutch Party left the control of the League branch to an utterly unreliable Social Democrat, Schmidt. There is talk of liquidating the League altogether, but it is wrong to come to such a hasty conclusion before everything has been tried to improve the leadership of the League. The colonial and semi-colonial peoples are looking towards the League against Imperialism to assist them in their struggle, and the Sixth Congress should instruct all the sections to take up the anti-imperialist work in this League, and mobilise the broad masses against imperialism and imperialist war, and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Comrade HANSEN (Norway):

The Norwegian Delegation thinks it perfectly proper that Comrade Bukharin in his report has outlined the perspectives of the new imperialist war, and particularly of the war against the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, prognosticating in this connection the international collapse of capitalism through revolutionary civil war.

This does not mean to say that we wish to revive the well-known theory of Kautsky that a victorious revolution can come only as the result of war. No one has thought of giving up the Leninist law concerning the uneven degrees in the development of capitalism and imperialism. Besides, it would be perfectly wrong to divide the course of events into three periods: 1. the period immediately after the war which was associated with an acute revolutionary situation throughout capitalist Europe; 2. the second period of acute revolutionary situations in the colonial countries, and finally; 3. the third period when there would be neither one nor the other, but simply a series of strikes and conflicts which would suddenly burst out in a new world war. It is quite reasonable to expect acute partial crises in individual European countries, and it is our task to prepare for such eventualities. The Report as well as the Theses have emphasised and laid stress upon the internal contradictions of stabilisation, the colossal importance of the growth of the Soviet Union, the Chinese Revolution, and the revived antagonisms among the imperialist Powers themselves, all these factors leading relentlessly towards the catastrophe, towards new wars and revolutions. This constitutes altogether a revolutionary outlook on current history, and by no means a theory of real and solid stabilisation of capitalism. Comrade Bukharin has brought up for discussion the problem of the international character of our movement. In this respect we are going to be helped by the economic developments. Don't you believe that there is a greater spirit of internationalism among the class-conscious English workers now than there was before the great miners' strike? It is not a fact that in spite of all our weak points, our international campaign in connection with world events, such as the Chinese revolution, have resulted in developing a mighty sentiment of internationalism among the workers in Europe? Who does not see the significance of the war in Morocco, and particularly of the war menace against the Soviet Union, in regard to this development? Even the Second International, the most essential subsidiary organisation of the imperialist bourgeoisie, has to reckon with the spirit of proletarian and democratic internationalism which is growing among the European workers.

In a country like Norway, where the spirit of provincialism was rampant, where Tranmael had the best of us owing to the narrow-minded spirit of nationalism, we find today a strengthening of the international spirit, whilst the rapid international trustification of our economy is accelerating this process. Nearly the whole of the Norwegian working class stood behind the Communist Party in the summer of 1927 when, upon orders from the British Government, the persecution of Communist propaganda among the British naval forces in Norwegian waters was undertaken. The great majority of the workers in the trade unions gave vigorous support to our policy of trade union unity and of co-operation with the Russian trade unions. In spite of the attitude of Amsterdam, and of the deliberate protraction of the ratification of the Copenhagen Treaty both in Norway and in Finland, there is no ground whatever for pessimism, as regards the ultimate success of the Copenhagen Conference. In vain are the efforts of the corrupt Amsterdam leaders to stave off this blow. This policy follows the clear-cut course of the class struggle, fully answering the interests of the working class. It answers also the interests of the international proletariat and of the growing international sentiments of the Scandinavian workers. Our tactics are those of the utmost vigilance, of the utmost mobilisation of the workers from below against their Centrist leaders, in favour of ratification. The Scandinavian-Finnish-Russian basis of unity is and remains an important and positive foundation for the whole of our struggle, in favour of the united front. The Scandinavian-Finnish front of the international trade union movement is furthermore of tremendous international importance to the whole of our struggle for unity, for the struggle for the revolutionary hegemony in the international trade union movement.

The Norwegian example of the "Labour Government" of February 1928 has shown once again that Centrism, whether in the shape of Tranmaelism or of Austro-Marxism, is absolutely compatible with coalition policy, with the policy of social peace and ministerial socialism. Now we are told by the Centrists that by taking over the purely bourgeois functions of government they were doing so upon "revolutionary" grounds, and that the forming of a Social Democratic government was a manoeuvre against the bourgeoisie, a sort of "united front tactics" against the bourgeois parties for the purpose of drawing away the backward elements of the working class from the bourgeois influence and into the ranks of the "revolutionary" Labour Party.

The Tranmaelites in Norway carry on their coalition policy and ministerialism rather after the recipe of the Austrians and of the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" than after the model set by the Herrman-Müller clique of leaders. All the more dangerous is this tactic of deceiving the masses, and we should wage a most vigorous fight against this "radical" hoax serving as a cloak for the coalition with the bourgeoisie. We were prompted to take up an independent line of policy not only because of the pronounced course taken by the Right Wing section of the Social Democracy towards the imperialist bourgeoisie, but also because the "Left" phraseology of the Centrists in some countries is still constituting a barrier between us and the masses of the workers who are turning towards the Left. In view of the difficult situation of the Norwegian bourgeoisie it is quite likely that we are going to have a second Labour Party government in the course of the present parliament. There are already Social Democratic leaders in Norway who take up collections among the workers in order to "save big industrial enterprises for the fatherland", in order to prevent them getting into the hands of the foreign capitalists. Already there were propagandists in the Labour Party who advocated the restoration of the shipbuilding industry through co-operation between the trade unions and the shipbuilders, the bankers, and the State organisations. Already there are strong tendencies within the bourgeoisie itself towards conciliation with the trade unions, towards friendly parliamentary co-operation with the Social Democratic Labour Party. All these tendencies are concealed and shielded by the Centrists. Therefore the intensification of our struggle against Centrism constitutes a political necessity.

The last unauthorised strike in Norway was a strike against the verdict of the state arbitration court which had the full backing of the authority of the Government and the State. It was a strike which grew into a real class struggle imbued with the political aim of not only wrecking and destroying the arbitration machinery, but also the whole anti-strike legislation of the country. The apparatus of the bourgeois State was mobilised upon a large scale for the fight against the workers, and the government instituted 10 different measures of administrative, political and police character, in the effort to force the working class to surrender.

The strike was declared and organised by the Communists. Our Party took the direct leadership in all the strike centres, through the strike committees which were formed everywhere upon our initiative. The strike showed that under certain conditions we are able to form our own strike leadership, and that the Communists are able to gain the necessary confidence among the strikers.

The slogan of the Communist Party for mass violation of the so-called prison law, i. e. the slogan of carrying on the illegal strike by all means available, so as to force the legalisation of the trade unions, was followed by the large masses of the workers. Tens of thousands of Norwegian workers defied the bourgeois laws, and in spite of all threats by the government, in spite of all warning by the reformists, in spite of all the persecution by the police and the class courts, hundreds upon hundreds of workers were sentenced and fined for defying the bourgeois law against the rights of the workers. It was openly said in the bourgeois press that the authority of the State was seriously threatened, that the compulsory arbitration law was a direct menace to the existing order of the State.

The strategy of breaking up the employers' front was successfully employed. Many of the employers, particularly the

unorganised, defied on their part the verdict of the arbitration court.

The Communist Party succeeded in rallying the organised workers of the trade unions to its line of policy, whilst the reformist trade unions and even the leaders were forced by the pressure of the masses to support the illegal strike. The press of the Social Democratic Labour Party was constrained partly to support and defend the strike.

The strike was economically, and particularly politically successful; the wage cuts and other bad conditions were not carried out to the extent which was authorised by the arbitration verdict. The bourgeoisie was forced to admit quite frankly that the compulsory arbitration law had been defeated, and that it would be senseless to try and invoke that law again. In the future it will be extremely difficult to protect strike-breaking by means of "law and order" measures.

A severe blow has been generally dealt to anti-trade union legislation. The authority of the State and of the laws has been undermined to a considerable degree, whilst the ideological emancipation of the working masses from the fetishism of bourgeois laws has been furthered, and the fear of the masses before class justice has been overcome to a considerable extent.

The victory has been a victory for revolutionary tactics. Reformism has been weakened, and the working class has turned towards the Left. The trade union and political prestige of the Communists has unquestionably gained by their proper attitude. When settling the dispute, our Party did not stubbornly insist upon the principle of no wage reduction, but followed the tactics of accepting a certain reduction whilst rejecting the proposed reduction and regulation of the index in the course of 1929, and this line of policy was widely approved by the masses of the workers. This fight constituted a turning point, the beginning of a wide counter-offensive by the Norwegian proletariat. Already the trade unions in the paper industry have demanded a 15% rise in wages, and it seems pretty certain that in spite of all the Mondists the metal workers will soon take up a fight for wages. This process of passing from the defence to the offensive in the class struggle has already set in. The class struggle is rising to a higher stage of its development.

This strike has constituted in the present period the first big and successful fight in Europe against an arbitration verdict. In Germany we are still to a great extent in the stage of propaganda for a strike upon these grounds. The Norwegian strike has shown that it is possible to defeat the "binding and solemn" verdict of the arbitration court by means of mass action, that it is possible to defeat the existing bourgeois legislation, and that the workers can be victorious only by following the methods of revolutionary tactics. This strike has shown that it is possible to wage the struggle also against the reformist trade union leaders. Naturally, we should not lose sight of the fact that our success was already foreshadowed by the strong position which we had won in the trade unions. In all the strike centres we had already gained the leading trade union positions in the building trades. This had naturally contributed a good deal to the successful conduct of the strike, lending great strength to the line of action taken by the Communist Party.

I believe the time has come when we should no longer confine ourselves to a policy of defence, but should endeavour to take up the offensive. This policy of the offensive must be particularly directed against the institute of compulsory State arbitration, in order to wreck the whole of the anti-labour legislation, to emancipate the trade unions from the yoke of State regulations and compulsory arbitration, and to transform the trade unions into the instruments of the consistent class struggle against trustified capital and against the State authorities which are tied up with trustified capital.

Now a word or two about the sources of inner Party deviations, and the methods to overcome them. These we have already in the objective situation, in the slackening of the pace of revolution, in the fact of the consolidation of capitalism in various domains, in the pressure of the "Left" Centrism upon certain sections of the working class and the Party, in the seductions of Parliamentarism and "real politics" in the municipal councils, in the trade unions, in the co-operatives, etc., in our own insufficient maturity and ability to give wide poli-

tical revolutionary meaning to the daily struggle of the workers, in our inadequate theoretical schooling, in the feeble Communist consciousness among certain of our cadres, and last but not least, in the organisational weakness of our Parties. The five year history of the Norwegian Party is in the highest sense the history of the struggle against Opportunism, against the opportunistic legacy of the old Labour Party. It were wrong to assume that in ousting Schefflo, Stoestad, etc., we have done away with opportunistic dangers once and for all. Besides the historical legacy, there are also constantly arising dangers of right deviations which are intimately connected with the existing political situation. The duty of our Party leadership is to signalise such dangers in time, to diagnose the sources of such deviations, to carry on profound educational work, to carry on profound discussion on tactical problems, to state clearly the Party's line upon every question, to resort to the pedagogical method of persuasion, and thus to obviate and avoid deviations and opportunistic dangers as far as possible. Whenever the deviations become clearly and concretely pronounced, when they constitute a menace to the political line of the Party and to our movement generally, then they must naturally be combated with all vigour and with all the consequences. Clarity of our political line, concentration of our practical Party work, this must be our slogan. (Cheers.)

Comrade GARLANDI (Italy):

Comrades, it would be interesting to determine on the basis of the objective situation the regrouping of social strata in rural districts, their orientation in regard to us on an international scale and the progress made in regard to the formation of the workers and peasant bloc.

I will not attempt to make such an analysis here. Comrade Kolarov gave us some examples of the radicalisation of the poor sections of the rural population. This radicalisation is mainly due to the repercussion of stabilisation in the countryside. Stabilisation which is accompanied by a development of the productive industrial forces, tends to change the relations between town and country and to bring differentiation into the latter. Through the penetration of finance capital into the rural districts the old bloc between agrarian capitalism and working peasantry has been broken up. This process has thrown a section of the more wealthy middle peasantry into the arms of big capital and tends, objectively, to drive the poor peasants towards the workers and peasant bloc.

Stabilisation has shown that agrarian reforms granted to the peasants in the post-war period were introduced by the bourgeoisie only to prevent the formation of a workers and peasant bloc. By its clever policy the bourgeoisie has succeeded in bribing certain sections of the peasantry who have betrayed the interests of the small working peasantry. We witness the collapse of millions of small rural homesteads, the collapse of strong economic positions which the peasants had secured after the war. Inflation had already dealt a severe blow to the economic positions of small peasants. Industrial rationalisation will reduce the purchasing capacity of the workers by increasing unemployment. Moreover, rationalisation leads to higher prices for manufactured goods. In this manner capitalism endeavours to compensate itself for smaller profits. The bourgeois taxation and credit policy is contrary to the interests of the working peasantry. The agrarian crisis is already affecting many countries.

The bourgeoisie is evidently making enormous efforts to maintain its influence over the peasantry. New agrarian reforms have been promised. The bourgeoisie is proceeding to form peasant parties. I would like to remind you in connection with this of the land reform advocated by Lloyd George in Great Britain which will be adopted almost in its entirety by the British labourites. I would like also to emphasise the growing tendency in Germany to form peasant parties and the efforts of the French bourgeoisie to maintain its political influence in the countryside. How has the C.I. carried out the tasks laid down in the theses of the Second Congress and in those of the V. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I.? Comrades, work among the peasantry has been almost entirely neglected by us. I was very much surprised to find that the C.I.'s task of developing intense activity among the peasant masses is mentioned in Comrade Bukharin's theses in a tiny paragraph which deals perfunctorily with the general work among the masses. I know very

well that Comrade Bukharin does not under-estimate work among the peasant masses. Nevertheless, I am obliged to point out that not sufficient emphasis is laid in the theses on the conquest of the peasant masses, this in spite of the almost general indifference of all the big and some of the small sections in regard to this very important question.

I think that we should indicate in greater detail, in the first part of the theses, how differentiation and radicalisation develop in the countryside. In the part which deals with the tasks of the C.I. and the Parties, emphasis should be laid, in a special paragraph, on our work in rural districts; there should be also a brief critical remark to the effect that the C.I. has hardly done anything in this domain, particularly in Europe.

Comrades, have we an agrarian policy? I do not think so. We have merely agrarian theses.

We cannot limit ourselves to setting Lenin's theses against the agrarian "national" programmes of the social democrats. We must have national agrarian programmes which, taking as their starting point the history and analysis of the rural economy and social changes in the countryside, must give us an outline of the position and tendencies of the population and of the political orientation of the peasantry. We must give our present demands a more concrete form; they must become the demands of the entire revolutionary working class and of the Communist Party.

But the mere elaboration of an agrarian programme cannot satisfy our demands in regard to an agrarian policy. How are we to capture the peasant masses? This is the problem confronting us. Only by struggling for the partial demands of the peasantry, only by organising the rural workers. If we neglect this elementary work, we will leave the peasants under the influence of the social democrats and we will prepare objectively the basis for reaction and fascism.

The necessity of struggling for the partial demands of working peasants and small farmers as a necessary premise for increasing our influence among them, must be emphasised in the political theses. The workers and peasants bloc has not yet become a reality. Our activity among peasants is political work which should interest all our comrades and not only a few so-called "experts" who frequently get caught in bureaucratic routine for lack of proper leadership and control.

But it would be wrong to criticise only our Parties in this respect. The leading centre of the C.I. has been very remiss in initiating this work.

We were told that an agrarian Commission was formed last year in the E. C. C. I. The few comrades who take an interest in the agrarian policy of the C.I. look in vain for a special report of the Agrarian Commission in the general report on the activity of the C.I. I have been told that the Commission is dead long ago.

The absence of an agrarian policy in the C.I. has also paralysed the Peasant International. Comrade Kolarov has already pointed out that the Red Peasant International has not yet succeeded in becoming a mass organisation. What is exactly the Peasant International? Is it the Executive of the Communist Peasant Fractions or the central organ of a Peasant mass organisation? We always thought that the Red Peasant International should be a mass organisation, that it should organise the work among the peasantry, that it must put up a fight for the partial demands of the peasants by linking them up with the general demands which form the basis of the workers and peasant bloc.

The Peasant International is not known among the European peasantry. It has no definite programme and has not studied the problems which arise now in the various countries.

The whole position of the Peasant International must be revised, if the Peasant International is to be an effective organisation.

I want to remind you that the agrarian theses of the V. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive of the C.I. condemn very severely the formation of peasant parties by us. Nevertheless, there were cases when the Communist Parties have formed peasant parties and in some countries this is still going on.

We do not agree with the arguments brought forward by Comrade Kemeny of the Hungarian C.P. who advocated the

formation of peasant parties in Hungary. If it is true — and we all agree that it is — that a process of radicalisation is taking place among the poor sections of the peasantry, this shows that, to attract the poor peasantry, we must not attempt to organise peasant parties but must adopt forms of organisation which will lead to the formation of a workers and peasant bloc in which the proletariat must not be the political equal of the peasantry but rather its leader.

What is the chief premises for satisfactory work in the countryside? Reinforcement of the political and ideological positions of our Communist Parties, and their fitness to work for the conquest of the masses. Those who advocate that revolutionary peasant parties should be formed at our initiative use very weak ideological and political arguments. These comrades forget that there cannot be a distinction in regard to policy between us and the peasantry, neither can there be a distinction between the aims of the vanguard of the proletariat and those of the poor peasantry. The demands of the poor peasants are identical with those of the revolutionary proletariat. If this be made the principle of our revolutionary work, Communist Parties will be in duty bound to work effectively in rural districts, to study peasant problems and agrarian questions.

I drew attention here to several problems on behalf of the Italian Delegation, to remind the C.I. that our work among the peasantry is very inadequate. The theses of the VI. Congress must give a bigger place to work among the peasants and must criticise our past work in this domain.

Comrades, war is not far distant, let us pay more attention to the countryside!

Comradè ZAPOTOSKY (Czechoslovakia):

Czechoslovakia is one of the new states which have emerged since the world war. Owing to her mighty industrial development and agricultural progress, Czechoslovakia was able relatively quickly to overcome the consequences of the war-time devastation, and as the result of excessive rationalisation and trustification, she succeeded in achieving partial stabilisation.

Naturally, this rapid development served also to intensify the class antagonisms and the development of the class struggle, accompanied by increased wage fights, conflicts and strikes. We might cite a whole series of instances to corroborate the truth of Comrade Bukharin's Theses in which it is stated that the bourgeoisie, under the stress of the intensified class antagonism, is forced to resort to complex forms of economic and political corruption of a certain portion of the working class by gaining control over their political and trade union organisation. Even when the socialist parties in our country do not directly take part in the government, nevertheless, their interests are closely associated with the capitalist state and not with the interests of the working class. The different jobs of officials, of pension funds, social insurance, urban and rural administration etc., are filled with these people. These jobs are not retained by conducting the class struggle, but rather by the absolute loyalty of the social-patriots to the existing regime. Here are the roots of the opportunism of the so-called "socialist" parties which preach supreme loyalty to the interests of "our state", to which they subordinate the interests of the working class. The result of this attitude of the reformist trade unions is that not only do they not hinder the achievement of capitalist rationalisation and stabilisation, but on the contrary, they give their direct support to these processes. This naturally leads to the substitution of the class struggle by the policy of industrial peace and conciliation.

In order to pursue the policy of industrial peace and prevent the conduct of any strikes, the reformists, wherever strikes break out, deliberately endeavour to defeat them, so as to demonstrate to the workers the futility, and even the harmfulness, of militant strike action. In this effort the reformists do not even shrink from the organisation of blacklegging, in order to prevent the possibility of victory. This fact was lately observed in the course of a number of strikes, and the latest case of this kind could be mentioned in connection with the big strike of builders in Reichenberg.

The reformist trade unions take over the role of traitors which used to be played by the yellow and fascist trade unions maintained by the employers, and by combating at the same time the development of class consciousness in the labour movement, they contribute to the growth of the yellow and fascist trade unions.

The reformist trade unions, pursuing the policy of industrial peace and of avoiding any fighting, are endeavouring in accord with the government and the employers to isolate completely the Red trade unions, i. e. to debar the representatives of the Red trade unions from all negotiations on the demands of the workers, so that they might not raise their militant demands to disturb the benevolent negotiations of the reformists with the capitalists, publicly inform the workers about the progress of the negotiations, and mobilise them into the fight. As an instance might be mentioned the signing of the collective agreement on behalf of the building workers in Prague.

It is hard to counteract these tricks and treacheries of the reformist trade union leaders, and this task is rendered even more difficult by the fact that our Party has a good many defects and shortcomings in the domain of trade union activity which render it difficult for us to carry out well conceived plans, and to wean the workers from the influence of the reformists. In the reformist trade unions our influence is not sufficiently utilised and organised through the fractions. The Communists who are in the reformist trade unions do not pay sufficient attention to the proper daily work of the trade unions in order to gain the confidence of the masses, to oust the reformists from the leading positions, and to capture the important positions for themselves. They try before conferences and meetings, as well as before other actions, to work up opposition to the reformist leaders on the grounds of their tactics and actions, but since this is not preceded by sufficient activity in the trade unions, they are unable to gain sufficient confidence among the members, so as to oust the influence of the reformist.

In the Red trade unions the Communists hold all the leading positions both ideologically and organisationally; nevertheless, the majority of the Communists do not know how to carry on real bolshevist activity in the trade unions and how to follow a consistent revolutionary line in them. The majority of the trade union officials are of the old reformist school, and they cannot imbue their work with the proper revolutionary content. The apparatus of the Red trade unions does not conceive that the new situation and the changed relations in production are calling for new working and fighting methods. They do not conceive the importance of rationalisation, concentration and trustification, believing it possible to go on today with the wage fights and actions in the same manner as was followed by the trade unions when they had to deal only with unorganised individual employers. Equally difficult it is for our trade unionists to conceive the linking up of the economic and political fight, and the passing of the former into the latter.

Thus it happens that, for instance, the actions of the police against the strikers, the arresting of strikers, and even the shooting upon groups of strikers, is very little utilised in the sense of arousing the spirit of international solidarity. We find that such big actions as the General Strike in England or the persecution of the trade union movement in China have not been properly utilised in Czechoslovakia. There is not sufficient criticism of the reformists to show up the real character of their treacherous activity. As a matter of fact, the Red trade unionists themselves, in many cases, succumb to reformist arguments. Hence the Red trade unions, with all the influence and confidence they possess among the workers, nevertheless fail to counteract consistently the plans of the reformists and to carry out the tasks to which they are pledged as revolutionary organisations.

Lately our Party has been carrying on systematic activity to eliminate these defects in the Red trade unions, and to raise their fighting capacity in the sense of the resolutions passed by the IV. Congress of the R. I. E. U. The fulfilment of these resolutions clashes against many difficulties and obstacles. On the one hand, the backwardness and weakness of the trade union apparatus which is unable in many cases to develop sufficient activity to carry out the resolutions, and on the other hand, we are handicapped by the fact that many of

our comrades are trying in many cases to substitute fractional work and systematic educational activity by mere mechanical dictation. Nevertheless we may record the fact that as regards the reorganisation of the Red trade unions in the course of a few weeks since the R. I. L. U. Congress a number of the resolutions has already been carried out.

It should further be noted that the Party press has reflected neither the carrying out of the reorganisation nor the discussion which took place before the R. I. L. U. Congress. Nevertheless this reorganisation resulted in the increased activity of the Red trade unions. In the course of the last 6 months, i. e. from January to the end of June, the red trade unions were joined by 31,000 new members, and there is hope that there is going to be an improvement as regards the fluctuation of the membership, to which considerable attention has been drawn.

Our most painful problem continues to be the question of the **proper strike strategy**. To carry this out, the strength of the Red trade unions alone does not suffice, bearing in mind that the correlation of the forces is 12:88, and that it will be necessary for us to increase our activity and make proper use of the united front tactics in the reformist and independent labour movement. In the majority of cases we do not work out the proper plans for our fights, but they break out rather spontaneously. It is quite conceivable that under such circumstances the strikes are not always properly timed to our advantage. A further characteristic feature is that generally the financial question is considered uppermost in connection with any strike. Hence, the question of a strike is not discussed entirely from the standpoint of necessity, the conditions, aims, and preparatory plans of the struggle, but simply on the grounds of how much money the organisation will be able to pay out in strike benefits. On the other hand, the wrong thesis was evolved to the effect that the greatest revolutionary spirit was shown by a trade union if it paid out the largest amount in strike benefits, giving recognition to any strike and fight brought about casually and without plan. In this respect there were lately some very severe mistakes committed in our trade unions which would have led to serious consequences if persisted in. It is, therefore, the most essential task of the Party to lay stress again on the fact that the revolutionary tactics amount above all to the plan-like preparation of the fight, to increased activity and sacrifice both on the side of the organisation and of the strikers, to the fighting solidarity and mutual support of the whole working class, as well as to increased and determined conduct of the activity of the factions.

A further important task is the **organisation of the young workers** and attracting them into the trade unions. The different independent strikes of the young workers point to the fact that the Youth Commission, which is formed substantially by the meetings of the youth delegates in the factories, constitutes the best form of attracting the young workers to trade union activity.

Very important in Czechoslovakia is the question of **factory committees and councils**. As it was pointed out in Comrade Bukharin's Theses, we have not yet succeeded in making full use of these institutions to further our revolutionary actions and aims as we might have done.

To sum up, the following may be said:

In the domain of trade union activity, the C. P. of Czechoslovakia has yet a good deal to accomplish. The fractional work of the Party in the trade unions must be further strengthened both in the reformist and the Red trade unions. It is necessary to arouse the interest for trade union activity not only among individual groups, but among the entire membership.

In this connection I wish to emphasise that the chief task of the Party is the struggle against the social democratic traditions, the opportunist deviations, and the liquidatory tendencies, i. e. that the chief enemy of the proper revolutionary line of the C. P. in Czechoslovakia, lies in the direction of Right Wing deviations.

A fruitful and successful struggle against this danger may be conducted only upon the basis of systematic, deliberate and persistent Bolshevik activity, and not upon the basis of empty revolutionary phrases.

Comrade PILLOT (France):

Comrade, I have intervened at this Congress with the sole object of clearing up the ambiguities which appeared at the IX. Plenum concerning the differences which exist between our Party and the leaders of the Paris region. Comrade Bukharin's Report puts the Left and Right divergencies and mistakes, which have appeared in our Party, on the same footing. The Right dangers are considered only from the point of view of election tactics, the dangers of the Left consist equally in the rejection of the united front and the ignoring of the trade union problem. On these particular points use has been made in the discussion of the theses of the IX. Plenum for the rectification of the Party in order to separate the leadership of the Paris region, the "Region Committee" from the base. Our March Conference rectified this passage in the Thesis of the IX. Plenum.

We were anxious to note down our disagreements on this point solely in order to prevent the resolution of this Congress being once against wrongly interpreted.

What was our point of view on the trade union policy on which disagreement existed? The proposed trade union thesis put forward the principle of "neutrality" and said that it is "only through the trade union movement that our Party expresses itself". These two points of view represent an opportunist and not a centrist line. Our Paris Region reacted against this proposed thesis which, as a matter of fact, was modified at the National Conference.

As regards the question of the united front Bukharin's proposed thesis puts "the rejection of the united front" to the account of the Left. Comrade Bukharin makes a mistake in saying that the Left tendencies of the Paris Region — no such tendencies have been found in the provinces but Social Democratic ones are said to exist — reject the united front. We want this point in Bukharin's Thesis which is only directed against the minority in the Paris Region, to be corrected. To say that the Paris Region has rejected the united front is false. Some instances: Even before the Christmas Congress of the Socialist Party some factories had been roused and work was done there for the united front in order to give substance to the proposals for a united front made to the Socialist Party. Everyone knows of the answer made by Paul Faure, who said that the policy of the C. P. was evident in the spontaneity of these proposals for a united front. What we can say is that the workers' delegations were received at the National Conference in January, that they there worked out their programme of demands which were then adopted by our Party, and that this gave us a firm basis on which to develop our work for the united front.

And again at the time of the elections. Were there factory delegations in the popular assemblies? Yes, but they were only in the minority. None the less it was a first step along the line indicated by the C. I. which had laid it down that the election campaign should be pivoted on the enterprises. The wish to do this is clear. Were we 100% successful? No. There was another breeze blowing — the strongest — wanting to work on a local basis. I shall cite examples of the work accomplished in the Paris Region during the election campaign:

In the 6th District: 45 meetings of which 31 were held in enterprises.

In the 4th District: 34 meetings of which 27 were held in enterprises.

In the 8th District: 15 meetings in the localities and 25 in enterprises.

The discussion which took place in our Region before the National Conference was concerned with the theses which were subsequently modified almost 100% by the National Conference; these theses had in general an opportunist basis apart from a few points which were correct.

We think that the trade union thesis in particular has had the effect of giving an opportunity in the Paris Region to the opposing elements in the trade union movement, to those who held back the strike movements, who made use of this "neutrality" in order to do nothing, in order that the nucleus should be only a part of the trade union section in the enterprise. Do the comrades who accept such a policy put them-

selves in the centre? We say no. We regard those who take up this line as being on the Right. They are much like the other Right elements which we know well. The Centre does not turn towards the Left but more and more towards the Right: resistance to the election tactics, a wrong trade union policy, indeed a policy taken up by the Central Committee in May when the question was already asked as to whether we are only at the stage of professional struggles. On this particular point Bukharin's report emphasises that every strike connected with repression and rationalisation has a political meaning and significance. This essential point has been the cause of certain divergencies.

The second point was the theory of "stages". We are opposed to this theory of "stages", according to which our Communist movement must only consolidate its position in the trade union movement in proportion to the extent to which the trade union movement has become a mass movement. Our Party must always consolidate itself in its role of directing the masses in the trade union movement, and not only when the latter has a mass meaning. For when the trade union become a mass movement the danger of reformist deviations will be even more acute unless our Communist Party shall have worked consistently inside the trade unions to impregnate them with Communist ideology and to win over the masses to the Communist policy.

The question of the formal leadership of the trade union movement is posed in Bukharin's thesis. We say that it is not only the formal conquest of the trade unions which interests us but the conquest of the masses in the trade unions.

For us the struggle against the Right tendencies manifested amongst the whole of the Party is very important. And as regards the elements which it is attempted to designate as "centrist" we consider them as dangerous as the Right elements.

The opinion of the centre was shown in the resistance to the Open Letter, in a wrong trade union policy, in the conception of "active" reformism which means revisionism in the trade union movement. We say that the centre is connected with the Right and so long as these distinctions are made these elements will be allowed to manoeuvre inside the Party. Our most important tasks are the struggle against these so-called centrist elements, the struggle against the danger of war, the essential pivot of our struggle against social democracy — the struggle against the Right elements in our Party. We say that the Right constitutes a serious danger not only for the French Party, but for the whole International, and that a serious battle must be engaged in, a battle which cannot be decided by the establishment of majorities for the united front, but by majorities formed on a clear policy, a clear programme, understood by all members of the Party and by the International. This will be the role of the next Congress of the French Communist Party; a majority and a lead given to this majority.

Chairman: Comrade CACHIN:

After a discussion with the various delegations, the Presidium proposes to appoint a commission for the examination and eventual revision of the statutes of the Communist International. This commission is to consist of the following comrades:

Bernard (France); Jilek (Czechoslovakia); Limanovski (Young Communist International); Lovestone (America); Manuilsky (Soviet Union); Piatnitsky (Soviet Union); Rossi (Italy); Schulte (Germany); Tschang-Kuang (China); Vitkovsky (Poland); Secretary: Heymo.

TO OUR READERS!

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

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| England | 2 sh. |
| America | 50 cents |
| Germany | 1.50 marks |
| Austria | 2 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 "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.