

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 8. No. 55

25th August 1928

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

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Fifteenth Session.

28th. July 1928 (afternoon).

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin.

Comrade BILLOUX (France):

One of the tasks before the Congress of the Communist International is, to determine the political lines of the work of the **Young Communist International**, in view of the fact that the latter will have to elaborate at its own Congress the necessary means and methods for the application of decisions made here.

The Y. C. I. and its sections must study very carefully their present position and must endeavour to find **new methods of work** which will enable them to gain influence over large sections of young workers.

An important problem for the Y. C. I. is the removal of the disproportion which exists in most Leagues between their influence and their organisational strength. This question has already been considered by the E. C. and the Plenums of the Y. C. I. But we must admit that hitherto the results are not satisfactory. All weaknesses must be exposed by sane self-criticism; they must be remedied so as to promote the development of our organisation.

But the work of the Y. C. I. has also produced satisfactory results.

This applies particularly to **anti-militarist work** and also to relations between the Parties and the Y. C. I.'s.

A great clarification of anti-militarist problems has been achieved. In a number of Parties we had to struggle against a certain tendency to under-estimate work in the army, against certain pacifist tendencies, for instance in the Communist Parties of the United States, Czechoslovakia, and Great Britain.

Everywhere this clarification was supported and sometimes even directed by the Y. C. I.

Among the successes achieved in anti-militarist work we must not forget the action of the Y. C. L. G. B. during the **General Strike** and the **Coal Struggle** and also at the time of the intervention of British Imperialism in China, the activity of the Y. C. L. F. at the time of the war in **Morocco** and **Syria**, the action of our **American comrades** in the military training camps.

Frequently, Communist Parties look upon the Y. C. L. as the anti-militarist section of the Party; they do not sufficiently realise that they must be the political leaders in the anti-militarist work and must not rest content with only helping the Y. C. L.

The reorganisation of the military apparatuses of the bourgeoisie compels us to study carefully the role of the **social democratic youth organisations**, which follow the lines of the social democratic parties. But the traditional antimilitarist spirit of the working youth compels them to be cautious. We must,

therefore, turn our attention to the demagogical phraseology of the young socialist leaders and must expose them ruthlessly.

Another question is that of pacifism which manifests itself among young workers. The bourgeois is endeavouring to give a definite direction to this tendency through its organisations. While carrying on an energetic struggle against the bourgeois pacifist organisations we must not forget that it is only by propaganda, by energetic mass action in factories, barracks, on ships and in military training camps, in fact wherever young workers congregate, that we will succeed in getting them away from the illusions of "pacifism" and negative anti-militarism in order to draw them into the Bolshevik antimilitarist struggle.

In regard to relations between the Y. C. L.'s and Parties I would like to give the example of the close connection between the **Young Communist League** and the **Communist Party of France**. The Y. C. I. and its sections take up a definite attitude and carried on an energetic struggle against various opportunist tendencies. Our anti-militarist work has also been one of our means of struggle against certain social-democratic and opportunist tendencies which still existed in our Party.

In 1927 the Young Communist League was the first in France to react to the errors and mistakes committed by our Party. The "Open Letter" issued last November was mainly due to the initiative of the Y. C. L.

The Y. C. L. played a rather important role in the rectification (redressement) policy not only by participating in the discussion but by practical work on the part of the whole League.

The participation in this rectification policy took first of all the form of work intended to bring clarity into all the spheres of the French Communist Party where a considerable confusion of ideas existed among middle and basic cadres in regard to the new tactic.

In his report, Comrade **Schuller** spoke of the important role and the new experiences of our League at the time of the election. One should certainly not consider the participation of the Y. C. L. in the elections from the viewpoint of one or two candidates. The important thing is that for the first time the whole Y. C. L. was mobilised for the popularisation of Y. C. L. slogans throughout the country. We took advantage of every opportunity during the election campaign to explain to young workers what the Young Communist League is and the importance of its work. Thanks to our material and to the staff of agitators whom we were able to place at the disposal of the Party, we could place before the working youth at all elections meetings slogans of particular interest to it, above all our anti-militarist slogans.

We took an active part in the work of the Party, trying to avoid all tactical errors, especially in regions where we were likely to have difficulties with the basic or regional cadres. To all the errors — and one must admit — dirty tricks which were played during the election campaign members of the Y. C. L. were the first to react vigorously, showing that in this respect the Y. C. L. has fully realised what the role of our Party should be in an election campaign.

Our work in the trade union movement must help the Communist Party to solve trade union problems. It is evident that the question of rectification must be considered by the Party not only in regard to election tactics but in all the spheres of its activity, especially in the trade union movement.

The Y. C. L. of France did not rest content with criticising the adult comrades in the central committee. At the last national conference the Y. C. L. delegation brought forward a series of amendments to the draft resolutions of the Party. After this Congress the French Party will have to proceed with a serious political consolidation of the C. C. so as to enable it to pursue in all its domains and organisations the rectification policy initiated some time ago.

It is only by continually participating in the activity and general work of the Party that the Y. C. L. will be able to do its duty to the Party.

We have organised a Party nucleus in our League and we want to develop it. We must have more Y. C. Leaguers working

in the Party without leaving the Y. C. L. Thus, they enable the whole Y. C. L. to benefit by their experiences and work in the Party. We think that this policy should be adopted by most of our Leagues and Parties.

Although the Young Communist League must develop its methods of work so as to become a mass organisation of the youth and extend its influence through the intermediary of auxiliary organisations, it must remain a political Communist organisation. The experience gained by the Y. C. L. in the past period enables it to play an important role. That is why we invite all Parties to help to develop our brave youth movement.

Comrade MAHMOOD (India):

Comrades! The youth movement in India has taken a new turn by the formation of "Nawjawan Bharat Sabha" (Indian Youth Association), and other similar organisations, in India. Up till 1925, the youth movement of India was confined to idealist students who came mostly from the middle class elements of the population. These young idealists only used nationalist phraseology, and cared very little either for an economic programme, or for any connections with the toiling masses of India. The masses were mere cannon fodder to them, to be guided only to promote the nationalist interests. No doubt there were always some intellectuals taking part in revolutionary activities, but their activities were limited to bomb throwing, or committing political atrocities.

The non-co-operation movement of Gandhi in 1920—22 brought them close to the pacifist platform of the Indian National Congress, but, realising the fallacy of the movement, the radical elements of the youth reverted to terrorism. Some of them may still adhere to the philosophy of Gandhi, but day by day, as the revolutionary current is swelling within the country, they are deserting from Gandhi's pacifism. The Young Communist movement has played a great rôle in diverting the current of the Indian youth movement towards the masses. New Communist revolutionary ideas are really taking root in their midst. They are beginning to realise the impracticability of the non-co-operation programme, and also that of terrorism, and are rallying around the revolutionary organisations and parties which are under the influence of the Communists, and even sometimes organised by them.

The Indian youth movement dates from about 1905, when the students as a body came out to support the Boycott of British Goods movement in protest against the partition of Bengal. Various organisations were formed, but they were either terrorist or of a reformist type. It was only after the various Bolshevik conspiracy cases, and the activities of those few comrades who had gone back to India after some training in Moscow in 1921—22, that any real Communist propaganda could begin in India. The manner in which this Communist call has been responded to by the Indian youth spells great hope for the revolutionary cause. This new youth movement is surely going to play a definite rôle in establishing proletarian hegemony for the Indian revolution. The movement is progressing slowly but steadily. Every day brings us some kind of success. There was a time when Communism was looked upon with suspicion. This attitude has not only changed, but in many parts Communism is hailed as the only way out. Even those who are not with the Communists — for instance, the youth of the left Swarajist movement — have openly declared that Independence could be achieved only through a Nationalist and Labour alliance. The Communist movement of Northern India (Punjab) has done a great service to the cause of revolution by bringing influence to bear upon the student community engaged in the Hindu-Muslim religious fights.

The Indian Government, being exceptionally vigilant, took strong repressive action to suppress this young movement, and particularly the handful of Communists. Their offices were searched, literature confiscated and leading workers arrested. However, these repressions, instead of killing the young movement, have imparted to it a new fighting energy.

The "Nawjawan Bharat Sabha" of Lahore was formed at the beginning of 1926 by the radical student and urban youth elements of Northern India, under the guidance of Communist

groups. The real organisers are the Communists, and this organisation is mainly active among **young peasants and industrial workers**. Day by day it is gathering strength and is becoming more and more centralised. The organisation is also spreading throughout the country, as well as to the factories. They have taken an active lead in the recent strike wave through which India is passing. A systematic campaign is also proceeding to capture the youth within the trade unions and peasant organisations, which are still in the hands of the Nationalists and reformists.

Mainly thanks to this Communist youth movement and the Communist groups, the Indian working class have also begun to celebrate **May Day**, to show their international proletarian revolutionary solidarity, a festival which was unknown in India up to 1923. Under the auspices of "Nawjawan Bharat Sabha", a huge mass meeting was held on May 1st in Lahore to celebrate May Day, and was attended by some thousands of workers. Resolutions were passed condemning the action of the Indian police in firing on strikers, and the attitude of the British imperialists towards war against Soviet Russia; solidarity with the British workers and the International proletariat was expressed. Similarly in **Bombay** a mass meeting of over 10,000 workers was convened to celebrate May Day, and similar resolutions were passed which included the following:

"The meeting sends fraternal greetings to the workers throughout the world, realising that only through International Working Class Solidarity can the workers break the bonds of capitalism and obtain those conditions which will give a full and free life to all. The meeting demands the immediate ratification of the Washington Agreement, eight-hour day, minimum living wage, state aid for unemployed, Old Age Pensions, Workmen's Compensation, Universal Adult Suffrage, compulsory education, and abolition of child labour."

All these resolutions were unanimously passed, and there was a great enthusiasm when the history of the **Russian Revolution** was related.

All this shows that in India the youth movement, though not so developed as in the European countries, is already playing a great part in revolutionising the masses, both workers and peasants. What is mainly missing in the Indian Youth movement is an All-India centralised **Youth Party**, and its direct contact with the Youth International, as well as with the Youth movement of Great Britain, for better co-operation in the common fight against British imperialism.

Comrade HERWIK (Poland):

Comrades! The international appearance of a **Left wave** among the masses of workers prevails also in **Poland**. This Left wave parallels a tremendous activation of the working class. In the last two months a great strike wave has extended over the whole country. There was a big textile strike in Western White Russia, there was a whole series of strikes in small enterprises and also a series of major economic actions in the biggest branches of industry.

In this situation the role of the Party, the work of the Party, its tactical line on the field of economic struggle, is of highest importance. Unfortunately in our case the same mistakes were made as in the German Party, which were most severely criticised by the Profintern Congress. At the time of the big textile workers' strike in **Bialystok** we also had an immediate strike situation in the field of the textile industry in **Lodz**. At a time when the workers, against the will of the reformists, expressed their readiness in many meetings to enter the struggle, and when the reformists were forced to accept a resolution which stated that the strike was a necessity, matters did not come to a strike because the leadership of the Lodz organisation had a wrong position. In this question there were serious differences of opinion in the Central Committee and between the trade union department of the C. C. and the Executive of the Lodz organisation. The trade union department proposed to carry on the strike action independently, against the will of the trade union leaders. But the Right comrades in the C. C. took the position that we cannot carry out a strike against the will of the trade

union leaders. These comrades, and also the leadership of the Lodz Party organisation, did not change their position even when the reformists came out for the strike in principle, but without fixing a time for it. The repeated proposals of the trade union department were rejected as allegedly ultra-Leftist and putschist. The result was that we missed an immediate strike situation.

In order to avoid such mistakes in the future the Polish Commission must give a clear appraisal of the Lodz action.

Of course the serious differences of opinion which existed in the Party leadership have permeated deep down into the Party. The Right group of our Party leadership has not succeeded in getting a majority in the Party. That is why they took to the road of splitting. In order to prepare for this they actually poisoned the atmosphere in the Party.

In an address sent by these comrades to the **Young Communist League of Poland**, the leadership of the Y. C. L. is reproached with having proceeded against the Right with "the same police means with which the fight is waged against the Communist movement". And this was directed against the leadership of the Y. C. L. which in the course of the last few years elevated its organisation into the ranks of the best sections of the Young Communist International, and which has waged a heroic struggle against the Fascist dictatorship. It is interesting to note that despite their efforts to split the Y. C. L., the group of Comrade **Kostrcheva** could not charge the C. C. of the Y. C. L. with a single political mistake. The splitting attempts on the part of the Right in the Warsaw organisation also proceeded in the same manner.

Comrades, we have done everything possible to avoid this catastrophic situation. We presented one commission proposal after another, but everything was rejected. The comrades wanted to confront the VI. Congress with a condition in which the former minority of the Party in Poland was completely eliminated.

The result of these splitting efforts of the former majority group was that the Warsaw organisation, the Y. C. L., a large section of the **Dombrov** organisation and a number of comrades expressed the greatest indignation against this anti-Party attitude. Only 30 or 40 comrades in Warsaw agreed to the split position of Comrade **Kostrcheva's** group.

The situation in the Party is very serious. The comrades have waged a ruthless struggle against the Left in the Party, a struggle which weakens the Party and which may undermine the confidence of the proletariat in the C. P. P.

Comrades **Kostrcheva** and **Brandt** did not find a single word here today with which to justify this outrageous policy before the Congress. I consider it to be one of the chief tasks of the Congress to condemn most sharply this policy, which is now a question for the entire Communist movement, and to adjust directly the situation in the Polish Party.

Comrades! the consolidation policy which the Comintern instructed the Polish C. C. to carry out, was not put into effect by the majority of the C. C. They have proven thereby that in this serious situation by which we are now confronted in Poland, the leadership of the Party cannot be left to them.

Comrade **Brandt** raised the question here as to how it is possible that the general line of the Central Committee can be recognised as a correct one, but that nevertheless the line of the Right is wrong. This is no contradiction. After all, the work of the C. C. was a result of our collaboration. Thus, e. g. the first Plenum of the C. C. accepted the theses proposed by the Minority, and even to this day they are the foundation of our Party work. But when the Central Committee adopted the resolution of the Right on the **West Ukrainian** question, then the C. C. made a mistake which later had to be corrected by the Comintern.

Comrade **Brandt** reproached us today with a large number of opportunist mistakes. I have read telegrams in which Comrade **Brandt** in the "Imprecorr" declared that the Polish Left did not recognise the war danger against the Soviet Union as acute. Furthermore, Comrade **Brandt** charged us with taking the position that it is now the task of the Communist Party to embrace the whole village. These accusations are of course taken

out of thin air. And they are made by the same comrade who in his pamphlet on the peasant movement says the following:

"The high prices of agricultural products facilitates the shift towards the bottom, the boundary between the peasant economies which suffice for the maintenance of one family and those which are insufficient for this. In this manner the number of these upper peasant strata which are not interested in the agrarian revolution is reduced."

And in the question of the war danger from Pilsudski, he wrote that this danger is "a historical tendency, although it is not yet the reality of the present day."

As we see from this, Brandt gives no Marxist estimate of the stabilisation policy of Pilsudski, he does not understand the pauperisation process of the peasant masses, and he also gives an absolutely wrong perspective in the question of the war danger.

Comrade Mikolos touched upon the attitude of the minority in the Vassilkov affair. Comrade Mikolos defends a position which in my opinion incorrectly judges the catastrophic split carried out by the West Ukrainian Party. I believe that Comrade Mikolos was one of the fathers who indirectly contributed to this tremendous mistake made by the leadership of the West Ukrainian Party, as a result of his constant past praise of the Vassilkov group as the only Leninist group in our Party, and his minimising of its mistakes. If now after Vassilkov has gone over into the counter-revolutionary camp, he continues to deny that Vassilkov only temporarily was in the Communist movement, then I must tell him that this is in direct contradiction to the February resolution of the Communist International.

Comrades, our situation is a very serious one. The Congress must put an end to this situation in our Party, it must adjust it, it must understand that the Right Wing in our Party leadership cannot carry out the consolidation of our Party. And from this the Congress must also draw the necessary conclusions and must take practical measures to adjust the situation in the Polish Party, to normalise it, in order to create a firmer leadership, a solid united Party, in order that it may achieve the victory of Communism.

* * *

A number of delegations visited the session for the purpose of greeting the delegates to the VI. World Congress.

After greetings from a delegation from the pencil factory "Krossin", a delegation from the "International Factory" presented the Congress with a portrait of Comrade Bukharin which had been drawn by the workers in the factory. (Applause.)

Comrade Kripunov brought the greetings of 3,500 textile workers from the Dyedovo factories, and their wish that the workers of the whole world would follow the example of Soviet Russia. The workers of the Dyedovo factories are ready at all times and at all places to help the world proletariat.

A woman worker, Comrade Kossenkovo, greeted the VI. World Congress of the Communist International in the name of 3,000 working women in the "Clara Zetkin" factory:

"We are all attentively following your activity because we know that the Communist International is the front rank fighter of the proletariat, and that it strives for the liberation of women throughout the whole world. Your decisions will show us how we in the Soviet Union are to continue our work in the building of socialist economy. We working women, jointly with the whole working class, will determinedly carry out your decisions.

Long live the VI. Congress of the Communist International!

Long live the world revolution!"

*
Comrade MELZERICH:

I bring to the Congress of the Communist International the greetings of the Young Communist League, which has been decorated with the order of the Red Banner, and of the functionaries of the Moscow organisation. (Applause.) Our Y. C. L. and the whole of the youth, follows the development of the

revolutionary movement with particular attention. The terror, the reaction in the capitalist States, is responded to by our youth with a ten-fold increase of energy in the industrialisation of our country, in the socialist rationalisation of our production. Tell the Young Communists of the whole world that we stand by them, that we see the difficulties of their struggle, that we are ready to help them.

Long live the unflinching leader of the proletariat, the Communist International!

Long live the coming world revolution! (Applause.)

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

Comrades! Among the many greetings that we receive daily, there are 3 telegrams which are of special significance which I will therefore bring to your attention.

First a telegram in which a group from the crew of a Greek steamer, greets the opening of the VI. World Congress of the Comintern and sends to the delegates of the staff of the world revolution, their warmest congratulations and fraternal greetings.

The second telegram reads:

"On July 20, in honour of the VI. World Congress of the Comintern in the district of Loktiev, district of Rubtsov, a Commune was organised under the name of 'VI. World Congress of the Comintern'. We send our greetings to the proletariat of the whole world.

Council of the Commune — Loktya."

Our factory nucleus in the largest chemical works of Europe, the Leuna works, sends a letter of greeting to the Congress, in which it states:

"The factory nucleus of the Leuna Works sends its warm fraternal greetings to the VI. World Congress of the revolutionary world Party of Communism, and wishes it the best of success in its deliberations. True to the teachings of our unforgettable leader, Lenin, we assure you that we will work unceasingly to make 'our' factory a real stronghold of Communism, and to mobilise especially this vast factory personnel against the threatening imperialist war against the Soviet Union. No red soldiers shall be murdered by Leuna gasses! Sacred for us is the country of the first socialist construction. And therefore we — and with us the whole revolutionary working class — will defend the Soviet Union with our lives."

The discussion in then continued.

Comrade OPITZ (Germany):

Comrades! I should like first of all to make a few remarks concerning the statements of Comrade Kostcheva. She attempted to seize upon remarks of Comrade Thälmann on the necessity for the absolute subordination of the minority to the majority, as applicable to the unheard-of measures applied by the group of Comrade Kostcheva against the Warsaw organisation and against the Y. C. L. Central Committee. This must be repudiated with all decisiveness. Such measures completely ignore the principles of democratic centralism. No mistake that may have been made by the minority of the C. P. can justify such measures as were taken by the C. P. P. And the remarks of Kostcheva only prove that she and her group intend to persist along this line. The Congress must oppose this.

Comrades! In the German Party also we had great difficulties in the disputes over the Trotskyist opposition. In such a situation the Berlin organisation was also for a certain time opposed to the Party leadership, to the C. C. But the German Party spurned such methods of persuasion as were applied by the Kostcheva group in the Polish Party, and thereby made it possible for our Party to march forward united and consolidated.

The German Party, on the basis of the recent economic struggles and of the elections, has been able to strengthen its political influence considerably in the decisive districts of Ger-

many. From this the C. P. G. has also drawn tactical conclusions. It put in the foreground of its tasks: first, the deepening of its work in the factories and trade unions, and second the execution of the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress, for only if the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress are carried out is there a possibility for the German Party and also for the other Parties to make use of the Left development in a revolutionary sense. In the discussion of the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress there were however, some objections and open resistance. The resistance was such as appeared among those comrades who have an erroneous attitude towards the Social Democrats, comrades who raised, as the central demand in their programme of action at the present time, the slogan of the control of production. Among them is comrade **Tittel**, although he tried to weaken this in his remarks.

The demand for control of production at the present time is identical with the demand which also the reformists put forth.

Comrades, similar resistance and false views were revealed also in the carrying out of the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress.

It was likewise a friend of Comrade **Tittel** who voted for the decisions of the Profintern Congress here, but who, upon his return to the German Party voted against the decisions and also worked factionally against the Party. In a decision proposed at a meeting in **Hamburg**, the Right comrades said that our work must move only within the limits of the statutes and decisions of the trade union bureaucracy. This is a respect for the reformist trade union laws which makes it impossible for us to launch and to lead struggles against the will of the trade union bureaucracy, as is demanded in the decisions of the Profintern Congress.

The struggle against false conceptions with respect to the **Left Social Democrats** must be considerably increased. The election returns in Germany show that without this Left Wing in the Party the Social Democratic Party cannot successfully fool and deceive the workers. The Left Social Democrats try to confuse the workers by a radical phraseology, while in practice they carry out the policy of the most Right Social Democrats. This role played by the Left Social Democrats was best characterised by such a left leader himself, at the **Kiel Party Congress of the S. P. G.** It was none other than **Liebmann**, one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Left of Saxony, who told the Party Executive in all clarity that they should be glad that he is carrying on such a policy. If this were not carried on there would be no workers left in the Social Democratic Party. But the Left Social Democrats carry on their crooked game also in the economic struggles of the German working class. They have not a word to say when the Right put through their splitting policy in the trade unions, on the other hand we see how by means of radical phraseology they try to hold back the Social Democratic workers from their march into the Communist Party.

On the other hand, the Left Social Democratic leaders support the **coalition policy**. Unfortunately there are still individual comrades and also individual newspaper organs in the German Party who fall into the traps of the Social Democratic leaders. The "**Frankfurter Arbeiter Zeitung**" wrote an article about the joint May Day demonstrations which we arranged with the Left Social Democrats in **Chemnitz**, and where we published a joint manifesto, which said: "Joint May Day in Chemnitz — the Socialist League calls for the election of Communists: two heralds of the coming victory of the proletarian united front over the unholy split."

In another article this demonstration and this manifesto is designated as a piece of the road towards unity with the Social Democratic Party. This paper also maintains that in the S. P. there were not only tactical differences but also differences of principle.

The Left Social Democratic leaders do not dream of effecting a split in the Social Democratic Party, they are particularly insistent upon the unity of their organisation. This under-estimation of the Left Social Democratic leaders is all the more **dangerous** because it is certain — and this has been repeatedly stated by various speakers at this Congress — that we are confronted with an **acute war danger**. And always, at times when the workers oppose the bourgeoisie to an increased extent,

the Left Social Democratic leaders will line up against the workers. This is the treacherous role which the Left Social Democratic leaders play.

Comrade **Ewert** reproached the German Party with a failure to understand how to exploit the tactical differences in the Social Democratic Party sufficiently. But in his speech Comrade **Ewert** gave an absolutely erroneous presentation of the development and the relations within the Social Democratic Party. He pointed out above all that the nine million votes cast for the Social Democracy in Germany are a proof that the workers are orientating themselves in the direction of coalition politics. Such a position is fundamentally false. The opposite is the case. The workers, in voting for the Communists and for the Social Democratic, did not offer a testimonial for the coalition politics of the Social Democratic Party, but instead they voted for the **anti-capitalist front** — and from this we must draw practical conclusions for the Communist Party. If in our agitation and propaganda among the Social Democratic workers, we were to put the question as Comrade **Ewert** has done, then we would not be in a position to mobilise the workers against the **Left** leaders, or to take a decisive step forward. The remarks of Comrade **Ewert** are based upon the conception that the Social Democratic Party in Germany is an absolute entity that cannot be overrun. This is an absolute misconception of the situation in the S. P. G. One must also take into consideration that the Left Social Democrats played a decisive role in the election struggle and before the election struggle. Of the nine million workers who voted for the Social Democratic Party at least 3½ million stand behind the Left leaders. A further erroneous presentation of Comrade **Ewert's** was the under-estimation of the fighting chances of the German proletariat. He does not see the tremendous opportunities which the German Party has for carrying out economic struggles in the present period, also against the will of the trade union bureaucrats. He did not recognise that the Party, based on the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress, and upon its own organs in the factories and trade unions, has tremendous opportunities to exploit the Left development of the proletariat on behalf of the revolutionary situation. Therefore we believe that the policy of the Party as conducted by the majority of the Party is not only in general correct, but that it is the only policy that gives us the possibility of leading the broad masses of German workers into struggle, against the will of the reformist leaders, which gives us the best possibilities to carry out the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress, to separate the masses of workers from the reformists, and to organise a solid, firm, united Party, a Party which, based upon the decision of the VI. World Congress, is in a position to carry out its policy. In this sense we will get to work.

Comrade GRÜNBAUM (West Ukraine):

Comrade **Herwick** attacked an old Bolshevik Comrade, Comrade **Mikolos**, who has been a member of the Bolshevik Party since 1897, and who was one of the organisers of the October Revolution. I must state here that Comrade **Mikolos** was the first one who called the attention of the C. P. W. U., and of the C. P. P., to the fact that a nationalist deviation was developing in the C. P. W. U., and also subsequently Comrade **Mikolos** at all times supported the minority of the C. P. W. U. in their struggle against the renegade group. In the name of the **West Ukrainian delegation** I repudiate the outrageous charge of Comrade **Herwick**.

Comrade **Kostrcheva** dealt with the preparations of international imperialism for an attack upon the Soviet Union, on one sector of the front, viz. **Poland**. I should like to add a few remarks to this presentation, on how the policy of the Fascist class foes and Polish occupation forces is determined completely by the war preparations, also in the occupied areas of **Western Ukraine** and **Western White Russia**; and how it is identical in both of these countries.

The **Pilsudski Government** has intensified the old Colonisation tendencies of the National Democrats, by the so-called "**Jagellon idea**", which is summed up in the slogan: **Poland from sea to sea** — from the Baltic to the Black Sea. This idea however means not only the perpetuation of the subjugation

of West Ukraine, but also the subjugation and enslaving of the 30 million strong worker and peasant State, the Soviet Ukraine.

The whole policy of Fascism in West Ukraine is completely subordinated to this aim: the attack upon the Soviet Republic.

The Fascist government of Poland realises that it must win over or at least neutralise a part of the subjugated population if the struggle is not to turn out fatally for it.

This is the aim of the agrarian policy of the Pilsudski government which is also of a certain importance for the occupied — primarily agrarian — territories. This is the aim of the financial policy towards the co-operative and cultural institutions, which has the purpose of making the heads of these mass organisations dependent upon the Fascist government economically, and hence also politically, and thereby making them the tools of Fascist imperialism. This is the intended aim also of the parcellation policy of the Fascist government, which is apparently changing the military and civil colonisation of the so-called border States which had been instituted by Pilsudski, in order thereby to make possible the spreading of false illusions that the Fascist government is able to give a positive solution to the most important question in West Ukraine, the land question. This is the purpose finally, of the policy of the Fascist Pilsudski government towards the "National Minorities", which aims at corrupting a little group of intellectuals, but which is more inconsiderate than ever towards the broad toiling masses. All this is accompanied, however, by a Liberal and democratic phraseology and by a wild incitement against the Soviet Union and Soviet Ukraine.

I must admit that this policy has met with certain success. Not only has the Ukrainian bourgeoisie, which has more and more lost the leadership of the national liberation movement to our Party, the C.P. of West Ukraine, and which, seeing the magnificent Socialist construction in the Soviet States, must give up its hopes for the degeneration of the Soviet Ukraine into a kulak State, very gladly went over to the side of the Polish occupation in order to save its menaced class interests. But there has been found in our own ranks a small group of renegades who surrendered to the onslaught of the hostile forces and who went over into the camp of the enemies of the Soviet Republics, into the camp of our class enemies.

In the midst of the sharp election struggles the Vassilkov-Turianski group, which hitherto had the leadership in the C. C. of the C. P. W. U., effected a split, allied itself with the Ruth Fischer-Trotskyism and in the face of Fascism and war preparations attacked the correct national policy of the C. P. S. U.

At the same time, however, I must underline with all energy that the masses fully showed their mettle, that the former minority in the C. C., with the actual and moral aid of the Comintern, including also Comrade Mikolos and the C. P. S. U., and under the direct leadership and vigorous aid of the majority of the C. C. of the C. P. of Poland, succeeded in an unbelievably short time in mastering the extremely dangerous situation and in isolating the little, renegade group from the Party and from the toiling masses. Two examples will suffice: in the elections which took place a month and a half after the split, the renegade group in Lemberg, for example, received 106 votes against our 3,600; and in the Drohobycz district, which contains the Borylsau Basin, they polled 28 votes for their legally recognised ballot, whereas the outlawed Party ticket got 4,800. This irrefutable victory was possible only because we had a correct line, the line of the Comintern, and we were able to prevent the prevailing tendencies to carry over the factional struggle into the West Ukraine.

I am in a position to state that our whole Party ratifies the policy of its C. C., which is identical with the policy of the majority of the C. C. of the C. P. P., and Comrade Lenski will not be able to deny this. But this by no means signifies that we have already escaped from all dangers. The ever-growing war danger shows that all sections of the Comintern, but first of all the C. P. P. and the C. P. W. U., are menaced by unprecedented dangers.

Our delegation, which represents here the uniform opinion of the whole Party, realises that in this situation the Right danger must unquestionably be designated as the main danger. The situation demands a united authoritative leadership with a

correct political line. Proceeding from these grounds, we, the C. P. W. U., have supported with all our energy the correct line of the C. P. P. and of its parliamentary fraction, and have also combated the Right and ultra-Left deviations of opportunist comrades with all necessary firmness.

In connection with the old stale theory of the organic incapacity of the Kostcheva group, put forth by Comrade Lenski I must declare that we deny any group a monopoly in being "Left". To your group, Comrade Lenski, which only just before May had in its bouquet, in addition to all the opportunist mistakes of the Party as a whole, also a series of the worst opportunist deviations from the correct line of the Party, we deny absolutely the right to put forth theses about inorganic incapability. We look upon the factional struggle, which paralyses the activity of our Party, in which the correct instructions of the leadership are neither executed nor respected, as ruinous for the Party, and, in the present situation, as counter-revolutionary. We demand for the Central Committee, which is carrying out a correct policy, a firm majority, while drawing in all healthy revolutionary elements for active Party work. We demand an iron Bolshevik discipline and a subordination of the minority to the decisions of the majority. In short we join in the demand of Comrade Kostcheva: that point 12 of the 21 conditions shall be applied to our Party as well as to the German Party, because our Party in this situation needs unity more than any Section in the Comintern, because only a united and firm leadership can give a guarantee that the approaching imperialist war against the Soviet Union can be transformed into a civil war for the overthrow of the capitalist order and for the socialist revolution.

Comrade STERN (Czechoslovakia):

We join in the view expressed here by a representative of the Y. C. I., that the events of "Red Day" deserve the greatest attention from the Comintern. We are however of the opinion that here at this Congress it will be impossible to discuss this question in all its details as thoroughly as is necessary. This will have to be done in the Länder-Secretariat (secretariat for several countries). We therefore intended to present only the position of the Central Committee of the Party, which is simultaneously the position of the majority of the delegation, while at the same time stating clearly and openly that in the Central Committee and in our delegation, there are also opinions which differ from this position. This was what Comrade Jilek has done in his speech.

The speech of Comrade Reimann, however, gives a wrong impression, as though the main differences in our delegation and in the Party Central Committee are those existing between the position of the Central Committee and the position of the group to which Comrade Reimann belongs. We hold that the really deep differences are in another direction. There is in our Party a tendency which has a Rightist conception of the "Red Day". This tendency is represented by the views of Comrade Zapotocki. We see the really deep difference between the view of this small but important group, and the position of the Party. Comrade Zapotocki also declares that the main danger is to the Right, that the danger of opportunist deviations is decisive. But the whole criticism of the results of the "Red Day" by this group is a criticism from the Right. They think that we attempted too much, while our conception is not that we undertook too much but that we did too little and that we did not apply a correct policy to make this action successful.

Some of the comrades of this group take the position that it was not a decisive mistake that on the "Red Day" itself, nothing was attempted with the 6 or 7 thousand workers who appeared for the demonstration. We also are of the opinion that one could not have made an action which had failed, into a big mass action at the last minute, that nothing would have been essentially different. But we are of the opinion that it was a very serious mistake that there was not at least an attempt to organise a demonstration with these 7,000 workers who had appeared for a demonstration. Then the character of the defeat would have been a very different one. We see in this a quite different appraisal of the defeat.

If we were to present the differences of opinion between the views of the Central Committee and the position of the group for which Comrade Reimann has spoken here, we would find it

very difficult to do so. Not only because in my opinion there are no big, deep, fundamental differences but also for another reason. In this group there are united all the comrades who in some way or other are not entirely satisfied with the position of the Party Central Committee. The result is that in this group there are a whole series of divergent opinions. We can state also that the opinions held by the members of this group change from day to day. Comrade Reimann, e. g. first presented the position, that he wanted to advocate here, to the Delegation in such a way that even all the comrades who belong to that group were opposed to the delivery of this original speech outlined by Comrade Reimann. I believe that most of the representatives of this group would not declare the speech of Comrade Reimann to be made in their name nor would they identify themselves with it.

A large part of the charges that Comrade Reimann presented in his speech have already been set forth by our own previous decisions. Another part of the speech of Comrade Reimann is a confirmation of what Comrade Bukharin said about the mistakes of our Party. Of course we are in complete agreement with this section. We will even supplement this very considerably because, as a matter of course, it was impossible for Comrade Bukharin to say everything here that might be said by way of criticism of our Party.

But aside from these sections which are not disputed, there are also, as with most of the comrades of this group, a series of exaggerations and incorrect statements. Comrade Reimann says that the chief question is the question of the correctness of the political line. We also are of the opinion that after such a defeat the political line should be subjected to thorough study. But we do not share the opinion of Comrade Reimann, that if we admit serious political mistakes were made, therefore the political line must unquestionably be wrong. Here Comrade Bukharin, in that section of his speech which dealt with China, stated that with the application of a correct political line there the most serious political mistakes were made. If we therefore hold that the political line was right, it does not mean that we do not realise that in practice the most serious political mistakes were made. The question of studying the political line means that we want to find out where the mistakes are.

We believe that the analysis of the situation in Czechoslovakia which was given by our Party, and the statement of the tasks resulting from this analysis, was in general correct, but that serious opportunist mistakes have been made in the application of this line.

Comrade Reimann offered a few newspaper clippings here in order to show how wrong was the line of the Party. He forgot to add, however, that not one of us has ever stated that at the "Red Day" there were 100,000 workers on the streets, no one agrees with the statement in the "Rudo Pravo" in which the responsibility is sought to be shifted to the broad masses.

Comrade Reimann acts here as if our whole economic analysis consists in that we recognise the boom in Czechoslovakia. He makes this reproach particularly to Comrade Jilek. It was stated correctly that, as a matter of course, Comrade Jilek in a short report could not possibly give an exact analysis of the situation in Czechoslovakia, and that this analysis would follow in the Commissions. Also at our National Conference, which Reimann refers to, we of course did not content ourselves with taking note of the good business situation. Comrade Reimann attended this conference and he was in agreement with its analysis of the economic situation. In our appraisal of the situation we have always pointed out that the incapacity for existence on the part of Czechoslovakia sharpens the crisis and still further increases the dependence of Czechoslovakia.

His criticism in the trade union question is likewise exaggerated. We have criticised our work in the trade union question, but I cannot understand how Comrade Reimann can declare that only after the IV. Congress, in the midst of big wage struggles, did our Party recognise that the organisational methods of the Red Unions constitute a danger. Every child knows that from the very beginning we pointed out this danger. Whether we always fought on this field with the necessary energy — that is another question.

Comrades, we are nevertheless of the opinion that the tendency, which underlies this group is correct. This group does not want anything other than what we also want. After a defeat of

this kind the whole policy, the whole condition of the Party must be seriously studied, down to the smallest detail, and we must not merely content ourselves with an open free discussion of this condition throughout the whole Party but we must also relentlessly expose and overcome the mistakes and shortcomings that have been made. These comrades have the correct feeling that this time things must not remain as so often in the past: we have criticised, we have even exercised "self criticism", which is now in fashion, but the greater part of this criticism remained on paper. Just because in this respect this group wants the same as is expressed in the decisions of the C. C. and as is necessary, there is no need for pessimism over the present condition of the Party. We differentiate ourselves from some of the comrades of this group also in that we say we do not as yet have a crisis in the Party. It would be truly a miracle if we did not have any differences of opinion now. But notwithstanding these differences of opinion there prevails in the Party this time a will for a thorough and serious renewal of the Party from top to bottom, since we make the previous condition of the Party responsible for the defeat. We see clearly that the Party was not what it should have been. And we want to have the relentless exposure and elimination of these mistakes lead to a situation in which the Party in new struggles can fulfill its tasks.

Comrade SCHÖNFELDER (Austria):

Comrades! The Austrian delegation has already stated its position on the Theses of Comrade Bukharin. We are in agreement with them and want to make only certain clearer formulations with respect to Austro-Marxism, the question of Fascism and a few others. The statement in the Theses that the process of differentiation in the working class expresses itself on the one hand in the strengthening of Communist influence and on the other hand in a temporary growth of Social Democracy, has shown itself also in Austria. Only the depression in the working class following upon July 15 not only failed to bring a strengthening to the C. P. A., but even a weakening of the Party. In order to avoid illusions it is necessary to remember that the process of leftward development does not go forward in a straight line but in contradictions, and it may be accompanied by a growth of the social democracy.

I believe furthermore that in the Theses the possibility of revolutionary movements and uprisings as a result of the inner contradictions and antagonisms of capitalism should be more strongly emphasised, and that they will not be launched solely by war activities.

In presenting the opinion of the minority of the Austrian C. C. I should like to emphasise only a few of our disputed questions.

In the Austrian Party differences concerning the tactics of the Party arose after the uprising last year. The Executive blamed the Party for not having raised the slogan of Workers' Councils. I am in agreement with the formulation of the Draft Programme on the preconditions for the issue of this slogan. These preconditions however did not prevail in Austria. From the point of view of its political power the bourgeoisie was in a state of consolidation, and appeared on the arena with determination and unity. The C. P. A. had no influence worth mentioning on the working class and was not organisationally anchored in the decisive strata of the workers. In the social democracy both the Right as well as the so-called Left acted jointly against the uprising. Despite all its weaknesses the Party put itself openly at the head of the uprising and called upon the workers to form armed fighting troops, and also tried to carry this out organisationally. The Party would not have been in a position to carry out the slogan of Workers Councils in the rising phase of the struggle.

2. After the defeat of the uprising the Executive, in an open letter to the Party, spoke of the bankruptcy of Austro-Marxism and identified it with the collapse of the social democratic party as a party. It is true that Austro-Marxism is ideologically bankrupt and that after July 15 its basis was severely shattered. The development during the last year shows us however that its influence on the big masses of the Austrian workers is, for the time being, not weakened. After July 15 the social democracy

even increased its influence among both the workers and the petty bourgeoisie, the perspective of the Executive and of the whole C. C. of the Party has therefore not proven true.

During the last year the Communist Party has even suffered political and organisational setbacks. It has lost influence among the masses. The majority of the Central Committee is of the opinion that despite these contrary facts a **Leftward development** has taken place within the Austrian working class in the past period, and that it is solely due to the wrong policy of the C. C. and to its organisational shortcomings that the Party has been unable to record successes. It is correct to say that the Party suffers from a series of big organisational shortcomings and serious mistakes. This however does not explain everything. I believe that we all, the C. C. and the Executive, have over-estimated the situation in Austria, and also that we have overlooked the fact that a depression immediately follows a defeat of the workers.

The leftward development of the Austrian working class had begun already long before July 15. The tempo of this development however was checked immediately after the July defeat, but it is again being accelerated since the causes of the Leftward development prior to July 15, viz., the progressing rationalisation offensive and the growth of Fascism, have become stronger, and also in connection with the international leftward trend. Precisely in this period, a clear and intensified activity on the part of the Communist Party against the treacherous social democracy is of greatest importance. The Executive must undertake a thorough study of the situation in Austria and must give a policy conforming to the strength and to the actual conditions. Due to the disproportionality between the perspectives and the actual development there has been revealed in recent months a tendency in the Party to pessimism, and in part even to serious **Right** deviations. Against these dangers the C. C. carried on the fight united, and emphasised the necessity of a sharpened struggle against the S. P.

Comrade **Khitarov** in his speech yesterday talked about the danger of the disappearance of the Austrian Communist Party within the big social democracy. I believe that he can offer no proofs for this statement and that despite all the shortcomings and mistakes of the Party, this danger does not exist. It is necessary, however, that the Comintern should give the greatest possible attention and support to the Austrian section in its severe struggle against the most dangerous enemy of Communism, against the Austrian social democracy.

Comrade **MICKIEWIECZ-KAPSUKAS** (Lithuania):

At the present time the danger of an armed conquest of **Lithuania** by **Poland** is again extremely acute. **Pilsudski**, who enjoys the full support of the British and French imperialists, is again preparing for decisive action against Lithuania. A Congress of Legionnaire Societies has been called at **Vilna** for the middle of August, at which **Pilsudski** is to speak, and manoeuvres by four divisions are to take place on the Lithuanian boundary. The Polish, French and British press is engaged in preparing the ground for **Pilsudski's** decisive action against Lithuania. The social democratic press is helping the imperialist press. The whole bourgeois and petty bourgeois public opinion of Poland, all the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties including the P. P. S., are uniting around **Pilsudski** on this question. Only the vanguard of the Polish working class, headed by the Communist Party and a section of the poor peasantry which has liberated itself from the influence of the bourgeoisie and has made an alliance with the working class, is opposed to this policy of imperialist Poland for the conquest of Lithuania, in which they see above all the first step towards war against the Soviet Union.

Are the Sections of the Communist International now ready to resist decisively these efforts of the imperialist robbers, which are directed not only against the independence of Lithuania but primarily also against the Soviet Union? Unfortunately I must say that this is probably not the case, despite the fact that the events in Lithuania may constitute the beginning of an open offensive against the Soviet Union. Are the Communist Parties of **Poland** and **Lithuania** ready to counteract these events effectively? Conscious of my full responsibility for these words, I

must declare that they are not. Due to the blows of the raging Fascist terror the Communist Party of Lithuania is at present in a critical state, while the Communist Party of Poland is engaged above all in factional struggles, and despite its big influence on the masses of workers and peasants and the important election successes, it has not been able to organise any extensive protest action against the robber policy followed by **Pilsudski** with respect to Lithuania.

The Communist International has had to occupy itself with **Polish questions** for a long time. In the C. P. P. there have been extremely serious **Right** and also **ultra-Left** deviations. The V. Congress of the Communist International condemned the **Right** deviations of the C. P. P. and pointed to the circumstance that the **Right** group was able to issue good **Bolshevik** slogans but was not in a position to follow a revolutionary **Bolshevik** tactic. Since then the Party has learned a good deal. Since then we had in the C. P. P. a dangerous **ultra-Left** deviation, led by **Domsky**, which was likewise in reality a **Right** deviation. Furthermore we had the extremely serious mistake in **May 1926** which was made by the whole C. C. of the C. P. P., including the group of Comrade **Kostrscheva** as well as that of Comrade **Lenksi**.

The IV. Party Congress of the C. P. P., which was held in 1927 with the active collaboration of the C. I., subjected all of the mistakes of the C. P. P. made after **May 1926** to a thorough study and criticism, and came to the conclusion that both groups had made mistakes, but that in general the line of the Party was correct.

After the IV. Party Congress the mistakes of the C. P. P. became still smaller than before the Congress. This has been stated by the Communist International. Certain mistakes have been made by the one as well as the other group. If there is any reason for so much talk about them here it is primarily because there is a bitter factional struggle in the C. P. P. In such cases mistakes long since admitted and liquidated, are brought before the Congress of the C. I.

Among such mistakes is the mistake made by the minority of the C. C. of the C. P. P. when, at the time of the **Sejm** elections, it proposed to make an offer of a united front to the P. P. S. This was a grave **Right** error. It was recognised as such by the minority only under the pressure of the E. C. C. I. The minority, however, did not cling to this mistake and the majority of the C. C. of the C. P. P. had no occasion to pay so much attention to it. By doing this the majority proves that it is unable to find any other serious mistakes on the part of the Minority now. On the other hand this serious **Right** error of the former minority, proves that it is utterly wrong for the minority to lay claim to a monopoly of **Left** policy.

One mistake of the former majority was, furthermore, the proposal made with respect to an open **election bloc** between the Communist Party and all the organisations lending support to the Communist Party. Under **Polish** conditions this was unquestionably a wrong tactic but also in this respect the minority of the C. C., even though not so openly and decisively as in the first case, admitted its mistake.

The error on the question of the "**entire village**", ascribed by **Brandt** to the former minority, the "**entire village**" which takes in also the big peasant who allegedly is also able to wage a revolutionary struggle, is a direct distortion of the mistake made in the question of the "**entire village**" by the former majority of the C. C. of the C. P. of **West Ukraine**, which supports the **all-Polish** minority.

The Majority does not point out any more serious mistakes that the Minority of the C. C. is supposed to have committed since the IV. Party Congress.

Now I will go over to the mistakes of the Majority. The Minority refers above all to the **West Ukrainian** question. In this question there were serious differences of opinion in the C. P. P. It is true that the Majority of the C. C. of the C. P. P., prior to the IV. Congress and also during the Congress, made a big mistake when it at first supported the former group of the C. P. of **West Ukraine**, and then put this error into too mild a light, failing to recognise the deep-going antagonism that was proceeding in the **West Ukrainian** village, the transition of the **West Ukrainian** big peasant to the side of **Polish** Fascism, and the

fact that the Wassilkov-Turjanski group reflected this change in the West Ukrainian village. They failed to recognise that this represented a serious Right opportunist deviation. Also after the IV. Party Congress the majority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. did not sufficiently expose and criticise the mistakes of the Wassilkov-Turjanski group. It must be said that the majority of the C.C. of the C.P.P., in the main defended the position of the C.I., which repeatedly dealt with the West Ukrainian question after the IV. Party Congress. The best proof of this is the fact that the Wassilkov-Turjanski group, which had stood unchallenged several years at the head of the C.P. of West Ukraine, was able to drag out with it nobody except a little heap of intellectuals. The ludicrously small number of 106 votes which this group was able to muster in the capital of West Ukraine in the last elections is the best illustration of this. After the secession of the Wassilkov-Turjanski group, which took place already in January, and their going over into the counter-revolutionary camp, the majority and former minority gave an identical estimate of this group. At the present time this group is completely smashed. How was this accomplished? By a correct policy of the C.C. of the C.P.P. and of the C.C. of West Ukraine.

Another question is the pamphlet of Comrade Brandt. I agree with the view that among the comrades of the majority of the C.P.P. there has been and still is to be observed a certain over-estimation of the possibilities for the extension of the home-market in Poland and an under-estimation of the efforts of Polish capitalism to expand its borders. Nevertheless one certainly cannot conclude on the basis of the Brandt pamphlet that the majority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. underestimates the danger of a war against the Soviet Union. It seems to me that the accusation that the danger of a war against the Soviet Union is under-estimated should be based, not upon the Brandt pamphlet, but upon the campaigns and actual activity developed by the Party in connection with the war danger. In this respect neither the majority nor the minority has succeeded in organising mass protests against the intended conquest of Lithuania by Poland, nor did they succeed in developing the work in the army. In the C.P.P., in the C.P. of West White Russia, and in the C.P. of West Ukraine the various organisations quite obviously under-estimate the importance of this work, and the blame for this lies as much upon the supporters of the majority as on those of the minority.

Furthermore, the minority makes the accusation against the majority that the latter has a wrong estimate of the opportunist parties and that it applies the wrong tactics towards them. Among other things they cite the speech made by Comrade Warski in the Sejm. I must say that this accusation is based upon exaggerations, upon certain unhappy expressions, on certain mistakes such as happen in every Party. The view presented here by Comrade Kostscheva with respect to the social democracy is the view of the Party and of the former majority of the C.P.P. and is entirely correct. The same applies to the application of the united front tactics. The biggest mistake in this respect was made by the former minority at the time of the elections. In the organisations many isolated mistakes were made, in which both the adherents of the former minority and the adherents of the C.C. majority participated, e. g. in White Russia.

It is entirely obvious that the chief danger in the C.P.P. and in all Baltic countries, as well as the other Parties in capitalist countries, at present consists in the Right danger, that the most important mistakes are Right mistakes. The fight must be concentrated especially against these. This is particularly obvious in the Baltic countries — in Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, etc.

But can anyone maintain that one group in the C.P.P. is a Right group, and the other a Left group? The Communist International has replied to this question in the negative, after a painstaking study of the C.P.P. and its inner Party struggles. In both groups the mistakes are mainly towards the Right. Taking this into consideration not long ago an extremely responsible meeting of the C. P. of West White Russia, which was attended by outstanding representatives of both groups, unanimously adopted a decision according to which neither the former majority nor the former minority are the bearers of the Right or ultra-Left danger, which dangers arise rather primarily from the objective conditions under which the Party

works and from the inadequate Bolshevik steeling of the Party cadres. This proposal was voted for both by the former majority and also by the former minority.

It is altogether clear that the various mistakes to be observed both in the former majority as well as the former minority of the C.P. of the C.P.P., do not justify the relentless factional struggle that is being waged by both groups. I emphasise the two-sided character of the factional struggle, which leads the Party into disintegration and ruin. At the already mentioned meetings this was admitted both by the representatives of the majority and the representatives of the minority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. Here however they only see mistakes and crimes on the other side. Such an attitude cannot be condoned. For what happened in Warsaw no one faction is to blame but both factions. The Secretariat of the C.C. by a majority of one vote undertook an impermissibly criminal step — the dissolution of the Warsaw Committee and of the Central Committee of the Y.C.L. On the other hand, however, the Warsaw Committee systematically carried on a policy of non-subordination to the C. C. and an incitement against the majority of the C.C.; the C.C. of the Y.C.L. took active part in the factional fight on behalf of the minority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. What has happened in Warsaw only shows how far the mutual factional struggle in the C.P.P. has gone, it shows that its continuation must not be tolerated, that an end must be made to it without delay. The letters and expressions of a whole number of Party functionaries who belong to various groups confirm the fact that the membership emphatically demands the cessation of the struggle. Active functionaries from White Russia expressed themselves on this as follows:

Comrade Brunski, Secretary of the Grodno district, supporter of the minority of the C.P.P. said: "In the past year not a single local functionary was engaged. After the arrest of functionaries everything falls apart. The Party membership only sees the bickering. It reacts strongly to this squabbling and looks upon the fight as unjustified. The authority of the Party declines among the workers. Practical work in recent times is extremely weak. There is not a single meeting that produces anything new. We will not get forward unless we put an end to the inner struggle. We have done nothing positive. If the factional fight continues then we will degenerate as a mass Party and change into a group of faction members who do nothing except fight one another."

The Party masses and the whole working class are full up with this faction fight which already gnaws at the C.P.P. for almost two years. The VI. Congress of the C.I. must put an end to it. The C.P.P. has a far too important post to allow its leaders to continue unpunished this factional fight which is unjustified by any sort of inner differences. This question must be settled quickly, because the factional struggle does not stand still, it is going forward. Without waiting for the end of the Congress we must set up a Commission to liquidate the mutual faction fight in the C.P.P.

Comrade TSCHEN-KUANG (China):

I am in complete agreement with the Theses and speech of Comrade Bukharin.

It is well known to every one of us that the fight against the war danger, for the defense of the Soviet Union, against the intervention and division of China by the imperialist states constitutes the central task of the international Communist movement in this period. But in fact almost all sections of the Comintern have neglected this central task. This is expressed also at this Congress in that the speakers, in discussing the tasks of the Communist International, spend very few words on how practical support can be given to the revolutionary movements in the colonies:

The great Chinese revolution of 1925—27 took place in the so-called second period of the post-war times. In this irregular development of the world revolution the Chinese revolution took on major international significance. But our brother Parties gave too little attention to it. The imperialists of Great Britain, Japan, U.S., etc., were able unhindered to send their warships and troops to China during the three Shanghai uprisings, they

were able to bombard Nanking and to launch a general offensive against the Chinese revolution, and thereupon force the surrender of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and its representatives, the new militarists, and suppress the heroic uprisings of the Shanghai workers. Aside from the manifold support of the Chinese revolution by the toilers of the Soviet Union we must record that, at the moment, when a vigorous defense of the Chinese revolution by the world proletariat might have created an immeasurably more favourable situation for the proletariat, our brother Parties, while they did adopt revolutionary resolutions for the Chinese Revolution, they did not carry them out.

The December uprising in Canton was a heroic protest of the toiling masses in the period of the defeat of the revolution. There were, however, many organisational and military mistakes and shortcomings to be recorded on the part of the C. P. of China. It nevertheless opens up a new period of the revolution in China. Its international significance is indisputable. The uprising itself ended in defeat, but the Soviet established by the workers, peasants, soldiers and city poor in Canton, under the leadership of the proletariat, the Soviet idea concerning which the broadest masses of workers, in the South as well as the North, were enlightened through the uprising, gave a mighty impetus to the rapidly developing agrarian revolution. Not only did the brother Parties of Western Europe and America fail to support this action but there were even comrades who sought to dispute the importance due to this revolutionary struggle. I mean above all Comrade Pepper who at the IX. Plenum took the greatest pains to present the December action in Canton as a premature uprising, as an uprising which was supposed to be the mother of all the putschist mistakes in the subsequent period. This is a position that had the same starting point as the Trotskyist opposition, only he did not venture to draw consistent conclusions.

The present international situation is more tense than ever. If most of our brother Parties do not go to work vigorously in this direction, and if they content themselves as heretofore with resolutions and manifestoes, then they will find themselves surprised by an imperialist war against the Soviet Union.

There are comrades who have very superficial and erroneous opinions on the development of the Chinese revolution. When e. g. Comrade Pepper spoke about the Canton uprising and about the Chinese revolution in general, he argued that the bloc of the imperialists, the landlords, the gentry, the national bourgeoisie and the new militarists was an unbreakable one, just as though there were no antagonisms within it. He spoke just as vigorously and imposingly as at present at the Congress when he described American imperialism, and he completely forgot the indisputable leading rôle of the proletariat in the revolution, the deepening and broadening of the agrarian revolution over the country. It is therefore not surprising that he proposed that the peasants might, under the reactionary regime, lead a movement for self-administration in the rural districts. In the eyes of the masses of revolutionary workers and peasants in China, this is nothing else than the demand of the leaders of the third Party, Tan Ping-schan, Deng Yen-da, etc., It is entirely clear to every comrade that the Chinese revolution in its present stage does not develop in the spirit of Sun Yat-sen, but in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. The successors to Sun Yat-sen who grew up in the spirit of Sun Yat-senism, both the Right, such as Chiang Kia-shek and consorts, and the Leftists, such as Sung Kieng-ling and Deng Yen-da and their colleagues, are elements which must unquestionably be overthrown in the course of development of the victorious revolution of the toiling Chinese masses.

A few words on the Party relations between the Comintern Sections in the Eastern countries. The Chinese revolution has unquestionably a very important position in the proletarian and nationalist movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of Eastern Asia, therefore the connections of the C. P. of China with the brother Parties in these countries is also extremely important. The Chinese revolutionary masses, particularly the Chinese Communists, have always followed with great attention the development of the Communist Party of Japan, the activity of the Korean Communists in Korea and Manchuria, the events along the East China Railway, the powerful strike-wave in India,

the unfortunately inadequate work of the C. P. of France in Annam, the relations between the Indonesian Communists and the Chinese immigrants there, etc. It is a fact that our brother Parties have done a good deal in the past period, but it is also a fact that there is either very weak connection or none at all between the C. P. of China and these brother Parties. This shortcoming must unquestionably be corrected immediately.

We are of the opinion that the revolution in the East can be victorious only when the Chinese revolution, the proletarian movement in Japan and the Indian revolution, these three mighty links in one chain, are set into motion simultaneously. It is necessary that practical contact between the Comintern Sections in the Eastern countries shall be established at this Congress. The contact between the Communist International and the revolutionary movements in eastern Asia must also be made still closer. The Communist International must not only lead this movement organisationally and politically, as in the past, it must also give it more support in practical work.

In conclusion a few words about the international character of the deviations within the Communist Sections. That the Trotskyist opposition in the C. P. S. U. became an international opposition is a historical fact and also that the other Right and Left deviations in one Party must necessarily reach over into other brother Parties. Comrade Bukharin spoke about the Leftward movement of the masses as one of the most characteristic features in the third period of post-war times. Precisely with a big shift of forces in the strata of the working class, all kinds of mistakes find expression among a section of the Communist leaders. Some, as in China, incline towards putschism and isolate themselves from the masses; others, in their fear of the enemy, put too much value on legalism and thereby commit outspoken opportunist mistakes.

This Right danger might become very serious at the outbreak of the world war, especially an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. Comrades, let us remember our terrific defeat at the outbreak of war in 1914 and let us fight, with the greatest energy, jointly against the international Right danger in our own ranks!

Comrade KORTSCHIK (West White Russia):

As the arena of future military operations, White Russia has a particularly high importance as the next hinterland of the fascist dictatorship in the war against the Soviet Union. This importance of West Russia, as well as of West Ukraine, is appraised correctly by the Fascist dictatorship of Poland which is therefore doing everything possible to smash the revolutionary movement in Western White Russia and to strengthen the basis of the Fascist occupation there, in order to divert the masses from the road of revolutionary struggle to the road of compromise with Fascism. The nationalities policy of the Fascist dictatorship is an integral part of its military preparations. This policy aims above all, by means of the most ruthless terror against the broad masses of the proletariat and working peasantry, and against the national liberation movement, to paralyse the masses, to shatter their revolutionary organisations. On the other hand, by making concessions to the well-to-do elements of the White Russian village, by concessions to the big peasantry, it tries to bring them over to its side, while by small charities and various manoeuvres it tries to awaken illusions among the broad masses of the peasantry, primarily the middle peasantry, to create vacillation in the national liberation movement and to break down this movement.

This policy of the Fascist dictatorship has met with considerable success in recent times. We must note as an indisputable fact, that the topmost strata of the White Russian village, the big peasantry, has finally gone over into the camp of Fascism, and has entered upon the road of active struggle against the revolutionary movement; it has become the pace-setter of Fascism in the White Russian village.

Likewise Fascism has also succeeded in awakening illusions in certain strata of the peasantry, primarily among the middle peasantry.

The whole policy of the Fascist dictatorship, however, leads only to still greater exploitation. This further intensifies the

struggle in the West White Russian villages, and sharpens the struggle of the main masses of the peasantry against the big landlords and big peasants.

Parallel with the consolidation of the Fascist forces there is a process of consolidation and amalgamation of the revolutionary camp around the Communist Party, a process of the strengthening and entrenchment of our influence.

While pointing out these achievements, however, we must also note a series of shortcomings. One of the chief shortcomings consists in that our Party in its composition is still preponderantly a peasant party. The proletarian core of our Party is exceptionally weak. Under our West White Russian conditions, in view of the weakness of local atomisation of the proletariat, in view of the mighty revolutionary wave among the peasantry, this is particularly dangerous and we consider it our chief task to extend our influence among the proletariat, especially the proletariat of big industry, and to strengthen the proletarian core of our Party. In a situation in which the work of our Party is carried on in petty bourgeois circles, where the pressure of these petty bourgeois elements upon our Party is extraordinarily great, the danger of vacillations in our ranks, of Right mistakes and Right deviations in our own Party, is particularly great. Therefore we are concentrating the attention of our Party upon the combating of the Right danger, the main danger in our Party. That this danger is an acute one is confirmed also by the fact that the mistakes we have made in our work are preponderantly of a Right nature. These mistakes of our Party and of the Central Committee were, however, criticised and exposed promptly. It is, therefore, entirely wrong for comrades of the former majority of the C.P.P. to maintain here that they expose and criticise these mistakes. Certainly our III. Conference which took place in 1926, made a big mistake when it issued a slogan for support for the demand for autonomy. This mistake, however, was made by the whole Central Committee of the C.P.P., and the whole Central Committee bears the responsibility. We realised our mistake and corrected it in 1926. Comrade Brandt claims here that our Party has the position that the whole village, including the big peasants, can be led into the revolutionary struggle. This is the worst sort of distortion, which can be explained only by the factional attitude of Comrade Brandt on this question. We saw clearly that the big peasantry had to be combated; but we made another mistake which consisted in a certain under-estimation of the class features of the nationalist movement, and which consisted further in that we, to some extent, under-estimated the change that had taken place in the West White Russian village as a result of the partial capitalist stabilisation in Poland and the policy of the Fascist government. Immediately after the Fascist coup d'Etat we raised the principle that the Party must get the broadest possible masses, wherever possible the whole village, into the struggle against national oppression. This mistake was criticised and corrected at our VIII. Plenum and consequently also at our Party Congress. Comrade Brandt, who indulged here in a tendentious criticism of our mistakes, puts forward in his pamphlet the fundamentally wrong idea that the policy of the Fascist government strives for the enrichment of the entire village, the development of the poorer elements into middle peasantry, and of the middle peasantry into big peasants. This is a serious opportunist mistake of the highest degree, from which, however, the majority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. has still not withdrawn.

We were the first who initiated the struggle against the nationalist and opportunist errors of the former leadership of the C.P. of West Ukraine, of the Vassilkov group. It was precisely the former majority of the C.C. of the C.P.P. — the Kostsheva group — which completely shared the views of the Vassilkov group, both in the question of the Ukrainian national united front, and in the view that the workers' and peasants' organisation (Sselrob) should not withdraw from the general-national Ukrainian Club.

Comrade Mikolos, instead of matter of fact criticism, raised the silly charge against the former minority of the C.P. that it solidarised itself with Comrade Domski. These methods of Comrade Mikolos in the struggle against the former minority of the C.P.P. are not new. In the past, Comrade Mikolos maintained that the minority of the C.P.P. calumniated the C.P. of West Ukraine and looked upon the whole history of the C.P. of West Ukraine as only a mask behind which was hidden the

nationalist essence of this Party. This in no sense corresponds to the facts. Our accusations were not directed against the C.P. of West Ukraine, but against the Vassilkov group which in fact never overcame its nationalist ideology and which has now landed in the camp of the enemy. But we never identified the Vassilkov group with the C.P. of West Ukraine.

The C.P. of West White Russia ratified fully the political line of its Central Committee, simultaneously pointing out the mistakes made in the activity of the Party and which our C.C. had criticised already previously. This resolution was adopted unanimously, but there were differences of opinion with respect to the report of the C.C. of the C.P.P. We admit, comrades, that the political line of the C.P.P. and its Executive were in general correct after the IV. Party Congress of the C.P.P., but we maintain, however, that in carrying out this policy a series of mistakes were made, and a series of deviations of a Right character took place. The majority of the C.P.P. of West White Russia pointed out these mistakes without regard to whether this involved the mistakes of the Lenski group or of the Kostsheva group of the C.C. of the C.P.P. The minority in the C.P. of West White Russia had a different position however. It refused to make any criticism of the Right errors of the Kostsheva group and voted against our amendment which pointed out these mistakes. It also abstained from voting on the resolution on the report of the C.C. of the C.P.P. which emphasised the mistakes of the Kostsheva group.

We are fully conscious of the harmfulness of the factional struggle and want to consolidate our Party on the line laid down by the IV. Party Congress of the C.P.P. We are of the opinion that this consolidation must be arrived at through the struggle against the Right danger in our Party, by relentless criticism of the Right mistakes. We were not in agreement with the proposals made to us with respect to the structure of the future Executive of the Party.

Comrade BENEDIKT (Austria):

Comrades, the majority of the Austrian Delegation has authorised me to make certain statements with regard to the declarations made by Comrade Schoenfelder in the name of the minority. Comrade Schoenfelder polemised here above all against the fact that the Executive, during the July uprising, considered it necessary to advise the Party to issue the slogan for Workers Councils. Comrade Schoenfelder says that there were no premises for a slogan of that kind because the bourgeoisie was not disintegrated, and above all because the Communist Party had no influence worth mentioning on this uprising. What greater shake-up can there be for the capitalist regime than the proletarian uprising itself? It is also a fact that the Communist Party stood its ground well on July 15, and it did have influence on the masses. And, comrades, this is self-understood, for it was the Party which championed the slogan of arming the workers. When on July 15, the working class spontaneously made this slogan of arming its own, the Party had a broad influence on the movement but it did not know how to give this uprising a broad organisational framework. In this connection it was a mistake not to issue the slogan of the Workers Councils precisely as an organisational basis for the further development of the July uprising. The Party quickly recognised this mistake. Already in December it recognised the correctness of the Soviet slogan for the July uprising. But the Party made a number of serious mistakes also after July 15. After July 15, the Communist Party of Austria, for the first time in many years, had a chance of actually unleashing the process of eliminating the social democratic party as a mass party of the industrial proletariat. But the Party made the mistake of failing to differentiate itself sharply enough from the social democracy.

After July 15, the Party issued the slogan for the municipalisation of the police and thereby contributed to the maintenance in the masses of illusions about the social democracy. The Party issued the slogan of not putting up its own candidates in the Vienna Factory Council elections, and thus failed to bring into sharpest expression before the masses its position of principle against the Social Democracy.

Comrades, the Communist Party and the Central Committee have tried to correct their mistakes. But the more these mistakes

were corrected, the more there developed in the Party a **Right opposition** which repeatedly tried to force the Party back to the old mistaken line. Comrade Schoenfelder has said that a fight must be waged against the Right. But there has never yet been a Right opposition whose chief slogan was not that one must fight against the Right. Now what were the mistakes made by the group of Comrade Schoenfelder in their analysis? He says that it is not correct to say that the workers in Austria during the past period have likewise been in a process of Leftward development, and he polemises against the decision of the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. He says that the social democratic party is growing, while the Communist Party has not grown, it has even declined, that the best proof that the great masses of workers are going towards the Right is the Social Democratic Congress. These comrades take the position that Renner's victory is an expression of the will of the masses. But how do matters really stand? It has frequently been said that the process of Leftward development is a very complicated affair: Not only the Communist Party but also the social democratic party profits from this development. But the workers who are streaming into the social democracy are coming from the Right, out of the bourgeois and indifferent camp, and with respect to the Party Congress it must be stated that this represents no expression of the will of the masses. Renner was victorious, but there is a deep process of differentiation and polarisation in the proletariat and in the S. P.

Comrades, how dangerous is Comrade Schoenfelder's formulation of the question is shown by the orientation of the Communist Party of Austria prior to July 15. Because we did not realise this radicalisation process we failed to drive July 15 forward to the extent that was necessary and possible.

It is no miracle that precisely those comrades represented here by Schoenfelder, speak of a Rightward development. Prior to July 15, they advocated the position that the Austrian working class was imbued by a feeling of impotence. July 15 showed how dangerous is such a position of pessimism. It is correct that the Communist Party has not become stronger, but that is no miracle. If the Party wavers, if it does not differentiate itself from the social democracy, then it is self-understood that those strata of workers who are already wavering will not come to the Party, because they see too little difference between the Communist Party and the social democrats.

Now, in conclusion, the question of **Austro-Marxism**. Under the impress of the Congress, Comrade Schoenfelder has revised his position here. He has admitted the correctness of our position that Austro-Marxism is ideologically bankrupt. Nevertheless he polemises against the resolution on the July uprising. He says, yes, Austro-Marxism is bankrupt but the social democracy is growing. It is therefore impossible to talk about the collapse of the social democracy. This is based upon the confusion of two concepts. We did not say that the social democracy is bankrupt, but Austro-Marxism, this pseudo-revolutionarism, is bankrupt. The social democratic party is not bankrupt. On the contrary, it is developing on the same basis as the other open uncamouflaged reformist parties of the world.

The Communist Party of Austria is unquestionably a weak Party. This makes all the more difficult the mastery of all those tasks that confront it. It is precisely we from Austria who can state that in Austria rationalisation is being effectuated particularly at the expense of the workers, but that as a result of this rationalisation offensive, the will of the workers for struggle is growing more and more. We must have a Communist Party which will energetically take up the struggle against Fascism and the social democracy. It can be this only if it liquidates its mistakes and its pessimism. If the Communist Party will succeed in this, and I believe that with the aid of the VI. Congress it will succeed in overcoming these mistakes and this pessimistic line in the Party provided the International helps us — and helps us more than in the past — then the Communist Party will stand its ground. Then it will develop into a healthy and good Party, and it will be fully equal to the great historical tasks which confront it. (Applause.)

Comrade PIONEROFF (China):

Comrades, the fact that a special report on the activity of the **Young Communist International** is upon the agenda of the VI. Congress of the Comintern shows that the Congress pays the greatest attention to the youth movement. Nevertheless the fact must not be passed over in silence that the Communist Parties devote insufficient direction and support to the work of the youth organisations.

On the whole and in the main, we agree with the report of Comrade Schüller. However, it must be pointed out that the Y. C. I. has not fulfilled all of the tasks which confront it. In connection with the process of capitalist rationalisation the role and importance of the youth in production has risen. One of the main shortcomings in Y. C. I. work in the past is that, on the basis of the new situation, it did not apply in time the change in the direction of new forms of work, of the deepening of the work among the masses of the youth and the organisation of the struggle for their interests.

Comrades, we are approaching a second world war. In this respect the role and task of the youth is an extremely serious one. Therefore the activity of the Y. C. I. must also be directed primarily towards the application, on the basis of these objective conditions, of new forms of work, for the conquest of broad masses of the worker and peasant youth, and their rallying for the active struggle against imperialism, against the danger of a new war against the U. S. S. R., against imperialist intervention and forcible division of China.

In his report Comrade Schüller pointed out that the Parties have not given the requisite attention to the work among the youth: more than that, in some trade unions the youth are not given equal rights with the adult members. If in our Communist ranks the youth suffers such a degradation, it is nothing else than a social democratic deviation. This is not merely a mistake but it is actually a disgrace.

In his speech Comrade Vassilief reproached the Y. C. I. with carrying on too much politics while under-estimating the importance of organisational work. We cannot agree to this point of view without reservations. Let us take for example the Y. C. L. of China. There matters are quite different from what Comrade Vassilief thinks. It is true that we are giving great attention to political work, but for this reason we never neglect our organisation tasks, we never forget or minimise the work among the masses of the toiling youth. Furthermore, at this critical historical turning point in the Chinese revolution, the Y. C. L. of China most actively supports the line of the Communist International, helping the C. P. of China to overcome the opportunist mistakes of its Executives, participating most actively in the fulfilment of the essential political tasks of the Party. And it must be recognised that the Y. C. L. of China acted correctly in this.

In his report Comrade Schüller emphasised the particular political merits of the Y. C. L. of China in the struggle against the opportunist mistakes of the C. P. The actual situation at that time was by no means exaggerated by the reporter. Nevertheless certain comrades in the Chinese Delegation to this Congress expressed their dissatisfaction with this and declared that such a presentation of the activity of the Y. C. L. of China by the reporter was a deprecation of the C. P. and a boosting of the Y. C. L.

Quite regardless of the premises from which this position springs, it must nevertheless be stated that it is false. The Party must look upon the Y. C. L. as the vanguard of the proletarian youth, which fights under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Communist Party must look upon the work of the Y. C. L. as a part of its own work. A counter-position of Y. C. L. and Party is a point of view which should have no place in our ranks.

It is understandable that the Y. C. L. of China should reveal many shortcomings. It is not yet mature, especially politically. This mistake became clearly evident in the combating of the opportunist mistakes of the Party; here was revealed in the Y. C. L. the infantile sickness of radicalism. Strengthening of the political training of the membership, raising of its political consciousness and combining this task with the practical every-

day work — this is one of the main tasks of the Y. C. L. of China at the present time.

The Y. C. L. of China must direct its activity towards the practical realisation of the policy of winning broad masses of worker and peasant youth, of drawing them into all revolutionary actions, and in the course of these struggles to transform the Y. C. L. into a real mass organisation of the proletarian youth. The political line of the Y. C. L. of China must be clear and understandable to the broad masses of the worker and peasant youth.

In his report Comrade Bukharin referred only to the danger of Left deviations in the C. P. of China. The facts, however, argue that after the correction of the Left deviations in the C. P. of China, a Right deviation has arisen. Of course we must continue the struggle against the danger of Left deviations, but in no case can the danger of Right deviations be forgotten, they are much more dangerous than the Left and may lead to the resurrection of opportunist mistakes.

Despite the severe conditions under which the Y. C. L. of China must fight, the young revolutionists, under the leadership of the C. P., will be able to fulfil their tasks with the same success as they have done in the previous period.

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

I have the following declaration to bring to the attention of the Plenum:

Comrade Tittel made a speech here at this Plenum which obviously was intended as a demonstration of the methods with which the Right group in Germany tries to work, methods of discrediting and lying in the name of self-criticism. I will not speak of the many absurd statements made by Comrade Tittel but will only make two corrections:

First, according to the stenogram Comrade Tittel said:

"Comrade Thälmann in his speech talked about the 9 million social democratic votes as being to a large part petty bourgeois votes."

According to the stenogram of my speech I said: "It may be estimated that approximately, by way of estimate — there are no exact figures — of the 9 million votes cast for the social democracy, 3 million were petty bourgeois votes." The statement of Comrade Tittel is therefore untrue.

Secondly, Comrade Tittel maintains in his statement: "Comrade Thälmann said that the Right group in Germany is a menace that stands on the borderline of treason to the Party."

This statement likewise is untrue. I stated: "Also some of the leading comrades in the districts deprecate and gloss over the meaning of the theoretical deviations of the Right group, as well as the opportunistic practices, which frequently reach to the border-line of betrayal of the C. P. G."

What I said in this sentence is unfortunately all too true. What is the meaning of those cases where, under the pressure of the reformists, our comrades have made declarations condemning the struggle of our Communist press against the trade union bureaucracy and its treason? What does it mean when Communist trade union employees refuse to work openly for the Communist Party in the election struggle, while the whole trade union apparatus is openly at the disposal of the S. P. G.? What does it mean when comrades vote for a treacherous calling-off of economic struggles by the reformists, against the instructions of the Party? My statement is, therefore, entirely correct and the insinuation of Comrade Tittel is rather out of place.

Comrade KHITAROV (Y. C. I.):

Comrades, allow me to claim the attention of the Congress for the following declaration:

In my speech I declared with respect to the Austrian question that if the Comintern does not help our Austrian brother Party to effectuate an inner clarification, there is a danger that our

Party, confronted with the mighty social democratic party, will more and more tend to disappear.

Comrade Schoenfelder declared in this speech that this was a superficial remark which had better not had been made. I did not have time in my speech to enter into the subject matter of the Austrian question. My remark intended only to express the fear that in case the Right tendency, which prevails in the Austrian Party and which has already taken on a firm form, is not combated with full determination and eliminated, the danger to the existence of the Party will be an extraordinarily grave one.

That this remark was not a "superficial" one is best of all shown by the speech of Comrade Schoenfelder himself, which once more showed in all clearness that the danger which I indicated is certainly a real one.

Comrade ULBRICHT (Germany):

Comrade Ewert in his remarks stated that also the majority of the leadership can degenerate into a group. As against this I said that this conception reminds one of the organisational conceptions of Trotskyism, and I stated in connection with this question that the agreement of Comrade Ewert to the formulations of the Russian Delegation was given under reservations, i. e. that if in a certain situation Comrade Ewert considers it advisable to advocate a different policy then he will say: "I am not bound by discipline, for the majority is on the road of disintegration." I stated further: "That is what Trotzky also said against the majority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." These formulations are absolutely correct. In connection with the same question I then further declared: "If Comrade Ewert does not carry out the decisions in a disciplined manner, shoulder to shoulder with the comrades of the C. C., then he will wind up in Trotskyism." This formulation I do not believe is correct. I withdraw this formulation and change it in the following manner: "Then Comrade Ewert may become the rallying centre for all those who advocate an opinion deviating from the position of the Party."

Comrade PEPPER

makes the following declaration:

Comrade Lominadze made the outrageously untrue charge here in the Congress that I had designated the Canton uprising as a putsch. He was not able to offer here a single article that I have ever written, nor a single speech that I have ever made, in proof of this.

My speeches which I made on the problems of the Chinese revolution were distributed to all members of the IX. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive. I am compelled to give certain citations from my speech verbatim:

"The first sentence which must be expressed in connection with the Canton events is the following: 'We stand in favour of the Canton uprising of the Chinese workers'. This sentence must be the principal sentence in our appraisal of the Canton uprising. In what consists the significance of the uprising in Canton? I tried to summarise the importance of the uprising on the very evening on which the uprising was defeated, and this before we had any opportunity whatever to speak with the comrades who participated directly in the uprising. At that time — on the evening of the defeat — I wrote the following, and I still stand by these sentences today:

'The establishment of the Soviet Republic in Canton is of historic importance, it is the most glorious deed of the Chinese proletariat, it marks the highest stage of development which the Chinese revolution has thus far attained.' And furthermore:

'The bourgeoisie registers only the defeats of the revolution and refuses to see what a tremendous advance of the revolution is signified by the establishment of the Soviet power in one of the most important centres of the Far East. There is a symbolic significance in the fact that Canton, the cradle of the bourgeois revolution, has now become also the cradle of the proletarian revolution in China. The Canton of Sun Yat-sen has now become the Canton of Lenin.'

And as the last sentence in this evaluation of the Canton events I wrote the following:

'Severe is the defeat, but it is not final, it is the source, the guarantee of future victories.'

Thus and not otherwise read the appraisal of the Canton uprising as I tried to write it on the evening of the defeat, and not on the morning of the victory. I do not believe that we have any cause whatever to revise in any way this evaluation of the significance of Soviet Canton."

Thus read the first sentences of my speech in the Chinese discussion that we had in the Comintern just prior to the IX. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive. Comrade Lominadze was present when I made this speech. In my closing speech in the same discussion I conducted a direct polemic against any conception which condemned — not merely the mistakes made in connection with the Canton uprising — but the uprising itself. In the following manner I polemised against Comrade Lozovsky:

"In conclusion just a short modest remark on the statements of Comrade Losovsky. Losovsky here spoke incorrectly about the uprising in Canton. He attacked the Canton uprising itself. That is wrong. One may well attack the mistakes of the uprising, but not the uprising itself, not the struggle of the workers."

Lominadze was present when I made this concluding speech. I must therefore state that Lominadze stated here an untruth, a conscious untruth, when he maintained that I had ever designated the Canton uprising as a putsch. This untruth, this conscious untruth is not the first, but we hope it will be the last, that has been uttered by Lominadze in his brief, but just as little glorious guest-role in the Executive of the Communist International.

It was extremely characteristic how self-criticism was employed here by Lominadze, who poses here as the arbiter of all five continents and all 50 Sections of the Communist International. He did not mention here by one single word, that the IX. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive most sharply condemned his whole theory of the permanent revolution in China as a Trotskyist view and a harmful view, as a mistake analagous to the one made by Trotsky in 1925.

Comrade LOMINADZE:

I said in my speech that Pepper's attitude to the Canton insurrection is as follows: prior to the Canton insurrection, Comrade Pepper was against it, he was also against it while it was going on and after it. I assert that there are enough written and oral proofs of this; all those who participated in the Plenum and especially those who participated in the discussion which took place before the IX. E. C. C. I. Plenum know this as well. Comrade Pepper did not exactly call the Canton insurrection a putsch, he did not have enough courage for this. But the only conclusion to be drawn from what he said was: — that the Canton insurrection was a putsch. I did not say

today that Comrade Pepper has called the Canton insurrection a putsch, I quoted an article by Reiberg. It is Reiberg who makes the following assertion:

"The Canton insurrection has been defeated and it could not be otherwise because the social basis of the insurrection was not broad enough, because the premises for a victorious insurrection in Canton and the Kwantung province had not yet matured, because the real relation between the military forces of the revolution and the counter-revolution was not favourable to the insurrection, because the moment chosen for the insurrection (December 11) was not the right one."

I said in regard to this quotation that it contains everything to justify the conclusion that the Canton insurrection was a putsch. Only the word "putsch" was missing. Then I went on to say that this Reiberg could be quite well a synonym of Pepper because the arguments of the two were identical in regard to substance and form. But what did Comrade Pepper say here? He gave quotations from his speeches which show that at the time of the insurrection he was on the side of the Canton workers. Surely he could not have been on the side of General Tchan Fa-heui! However, in the speech quoted by him, as well as in many documents in the possession of the E. C. C. I., Comrade Pepper declares that already before the outbreak of the insurrection he had been against it and that he was right when he said that the Canton insurrection was premature because it lacked the necessary social basis. To put it in a nutshell, all that was needed was the superstructure — the word "putsch" which was not uttered. But this does not, of course, do away with the fact that in substance, Pepper's description of the Canton insurrection amounts to a putsch.

Comrade Pepper thought it fit to declare here that it is a good thing for the Comintern that I am going. I think that the question of my work in the Comintern is not my private affair and still less Comrade Pepper's affair, it is the affair of the Party. It, and not Pepper decides in this question. But I have my doubts as to it being a good thing for the Comintern that Comrade Pepper remains in it. (Applause.)

Comrades, Comrade Pepper has asked me to mention, on this occasion, also permanent revolution. Before the IX. Plenum I asserted that the revolution in China was developing into a socialist revolution. I am surprised that Comrade Pepper makes charges against me in regard to this. In the same quotation which he gave here, he declares that the Canton insurrection means the beginning of the socialist proletarian revolution in China (laughter). He has shown more courage than myself. I only said that the revolution was developing into a socialist revolution, whereas he said that the proletarian revolution has already begun. In the face of all this Comrade Pepper has the impudence to make once more the charge of Trotskyism against me.

I am compelled to reiterate what I have already declared in the discussion of the Chinese Conference: Comrade Pepper is a capable and experienced man but his demeanour — petty intrigues and quarrelsomeness — makes it impossible to treat him with the consideration due to a serious politician. (Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Sixteenth Session.

Moscow, July 30th, (morning).

Comrade Schüller's Speech in Reply to Discussion on the Report on the Activity of the Young Communist International.

The Chair was taken by Comrade Remmele.

Comrade SCHÜLLER:

Comrades, it is to be regretted that few representatives of the Parties have spoken on questions relating to the youth movement. I take it that this circumstance is due to two facts.

Firstly, that there is still a certain amount of indifference and a lack of sufficient interest among the adult comrades concerning these questions; secondly, that the Parties and Delegations could not or did not wish to raise any essentially different proposals on the question of the youth movement than those which have been developed in the principles and ideas of the report.

A praiseworthy exception was furnished by Comrade Thälmann. In his speech he alluded to the great interest taken by the German Party leadership in the youth movement. This is by no means accidental. We have really seen in Germany, particularly of late, a progressive improvement in the co-operation between the Party and the youth.

On the question of the Party and the youth I should like to refer to the increased support given youth by the Party. A good deal of criticism has been levelled here at the Youth Leagues; but, comrades, the Leagues are affiliated to the respective Parties in the different countries, and if any mistakes and shortcomings are found in the Leagues, the Y. C. I. is as much to blame as the respective Party. I believe on these grounds that the Parties should have a better understanding on questions relating to the youth movement.

If the Parties were to carry out such a simple decision as has been repeatedly passed by the Congresses of the International, namely that each Party organisation should have its affiliated youth organisation, it would have meant a substantial increase in the strength of the youth organisations. This is only one example out of many that might be quoted.

Nearly all the speakers in the discussion have expressed themselves in the sense that the delegations were in agreement with the general line and propositions of the report. This shows that this Congress is generally in agreement with the principles and the main line which we have taken over from Lenin, according to which the political activity of the Y. C. I. should not be reduced and that the Youth Leagues should be maintained as educational and militant organisations of the political struggle. Furthermore, the fact is to be welcomed that at this Congress we do not hear any more proposals of the kind which suggest the formation of a shapeless semi-Communist Youth movement apart from the Y. C. Leagues.

Now I should like to pass one remark on the subject of self-criticism. Some comrades here believed the youth was not practising enough self-criticism. This is not true. We appreciate the full revolutionary role and value of self-criticism at this particular moment in the whole of the Communist International, in the C. P. S. U., in all the sections of the C. I., and also in the Y. C. I. However, there are comrades who see the situation in the Y. C. I. worse than it is in reality, and who come along with remedial proposals that are not in accord with our principles and the real situation. If we refuse to accept these proposals, it is interpreted by these comrades as a lack of self-criticism. This is the wrong position to take up. The situation in the youth movement is serious enough. This we ought to admit and draw the conclusion from the facts. Nevertheless there ought to be no exaggeration.

Lenin himself had occasion now and again to take an attitude on the youth question and to subject the youth movement to fairly severe criticism, particularly during the war when the Youth International as a whole was still on the side of the revolutionary class struggle, but at the same time was committing mistakes. In those days the following was written by Lenin in the "Youth International":

"Of course, there is still no theoretical lucidity and firm principles in the organ of the youth, and perhaps there will be none, just because it is an organ of the burning, stormy, and path-seeking youth. Yet quite a different attitude ought to be taken in regard to lack of theoretical lucidity among such people than we would take in regard to the lack of theoretical clearness and revolutionary consistency in the minds and hearts of our C. C. members and others. It is one thing to have to deal with adult people who have misled the proletariat and are still pretending to lead other people; they must be positively combated without any pity and consideration. But it is quite a different thing with the youth organisations which declare openly that they still have to learn, that their main task is to obtain the aid of socialist Party workers. Such people must be assisted in every way with the utmost patience, by trying to point out their mistakes, and above all, by convincing them by means of persuasion, not by combatting them. It frequently happens that the representatives of the adult and old generation do not know how properly to approach the youth, so that the latter have to come to socialism in quite different ways and forms than their fathers did. For this reason alone we must advocate the organisational independence of the youth Leagues, not only because this independence is feared by the opportunists, but for the sake of independence itself. Because without complete independence the young people will not be in the position either to become good socialists or to prepare themselves to make propaganda for socialism.

"Complete independence for the youth organisations, but at the same time, complete freedom for comradely criticism of their mistakes. We must not flatter the youth..." And again he said:

"Once again: these mistakes must be disproved by trying with all our might to get nearer to the youth organisations and to help them in every possible way. But they must be approached with understanding."

Lenin has shown here quite clearly the proper line and the proper methods for the Party leadership and the adult comrades to adopt in regard to the youth Leagues, both as regards criticising their mistakes and in regard to educational leadership in general. What Lenin said here about organisational independence is also applicable, I believe, to the Polish Party. In some of the other Parties, for instance, in the Bulgarian Party, we have not met with sufficient consideration in recent years.

We welcome criticism and we believe it to be useful and constructive. On the whole we believe that from criticisms a tremendous amount of good may come to the young Communist movement, to the Y. C. I., and to the C. I. as a whole.

The crux of the situation consists chiefly in the great drawback that our membership does not correspond to the growing influence of our Leagues.

Politically, we shall depend very much on the necessary change which will be outlined by our V. Congress.

The problem consists in that we must organisationally consolidate our growing influence among the masses and that we must extend and improve our activity among the masses. It is true, theoretically we conceived the need for mass activity all along, but it was not uniformly carried out in practice, whilst no sufficiently concrete methods were applied.

In order that the comrades might better realise wherein this change should consist, it will perhaps be expedient to tell them how we as the Youth International have looked for the way towards this change and, I believe, have found it. The Comrades Rust and Blenkle have already alluded in their speeches to the facts and examples how their Leagues and the Youth International have been working in this direction for the last two or three years, having already gained some practical experience in this matter. Yet in spite of the fact that we have already conceived the need for this change in the past, we have effected it only in a small minority of the Leagues and to an insufficient extent, and it is, therefore, the present task of the Y.C.I. as a whole, to work in this direction. At any rate, the fact that we have arrived at this on the basis of practical experiences goes to show that we have a firm basis for activity in the future.

Already our IV. Congress laid categorical stress upon the unsatisfactory condition of the Y.C.I. from the standpoint of its numbers as a mass organisation.

Yet we cannot say that the IV. Congress did already point out the way to a solution. Although it passed a few good resolutions, nevertheless it did not give us precise and definite instructions as to the chief questions on which we ought to concentrate. On the contrary, at the Plenum held at the beginning of 1925, the Y.C.I. sought to solve the problem by means of mechanical slogans. For instance, we were given two slogans: "Doubling the membership until the end of the year", and "Re-organising all the youth Leagues on the basis of factory nuclei during the period from March till September". This was really a mechanical way of solving the problem, and it stands to reason that such solutions cannot be carried out in practice.

However, the Y.C.I. has learnt also something better in the process of practical work. Thus, at the Plenum of the E.C. in March 1926 we had passed important resolutions and outlined already then the proper tasks. And it is to be regretted that we did not carry them out. We have surely lost a good deal of time by this neglect. Nevertheless it was not due to any evil intention, but it was exceedingly difficult under the historical circumstances to effect this transformation of the youth organisations from the position of vanguardist young parties into real youth organisations.

Our Plenum in January 1927 took a further step forward, particularly in regard to the question of youth sections and youth commissions in trade unions. In regard to the youth organisations in trade unions it was resolved to ask the V. Congress to alter the principle under which we ought not to form any special youth organisations in the trade unions, and generally to urge the need of having auxiliary and mass organisations of the youth in trade unions.

And the fact of the matter is that in the different countries we have already our youth commissions, youth committees, and even revolutionary youth sections in the trade unions.

Our Plenum in March 1928, which properly gave the instructions for our V. Congress, has even more clearly and precisely formulated this decision. It has clearly and definitely removed the last obstacles which still existed in the youth organisations in trade unions, and it has given the instructions for the wide formation and utilisation of such organisations. It has generally emphasised the need for us to effect a change towards livelier mass methods to attract the youth, e. g., on the question of factory nuclei, on the question of live agitation and propaganda, on the question of the sport organisations, the Jungsturm, and the mass organisations and subsidiary organisations in general.

Comrades, you might tell me that all this was very well, that this shows that we have looked for a way and have found it, but that it will yet take a long time to carry it into effect. This is quite right. The fact of the matter is that some comrades

do not realise the fact that no mass organisation of the youth of a distinct Communist type has yet existed. There have been existing mass organisations of the youth of the social-democratic type, there are also youth mass organisations of the bourgeois type, but so far there has been no youth mass organisation of a Communist type anywhere outside of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the youth movement of the Comintern has no ready model to copy. It has taken over certain principles of the socialist youth movement of 1907. Yet on the whole it must try to create a new form of the youth movement, a Communist mass organisation of the youth. This has required a good deal of time, owing to historical reasons. But we believe that thanks to our practical experiences, we have now before us a clear and precise picture of the type of Communist youth organisation which we are to build.

Therefore, we may now carry out a change, or rather, consolidate a change which we have effected since our last Congress. This change should be carried out upon the firm basis of realising the character of the Y.C.L. as a political fighting organisation, and it will consist of the following points: 1. What Comrade Blenkle has described as "Youth Politics", i. e., taking up the political, economic, military, and cultural questions of the youth, which arise from the general political questions, and also those which are of particular interest to the youth. 2. The activity in the mass organisations and for them. Here we must above all have in mind the activity in the trade unions, where we must form our own specific youth commissions and sections. We must also turn our attention to the organisation of the unorganised youth. In the newly-formulated Draft Theses of the Russian Delegation the proper attention has been given to the question of organising the unorganised youth. At the present time there are very few young workers generally accepted by trade unions. We are, therefore, confronted with the burning question of what is to become of these unorganised young workers. Here we agree that these young workers, since the trade unions do not accept them, should be brought together under some form of a strong organisation for the youth. How this shall be carried out, whether in the shape of factory, apprenticeship, or general economic youth organisations, this we are going to investigate at our Congress. This new proposal is generally in keeping with the present Communist tactics in regard to trade union activity, as pursued by the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. It means that we must render ourselves more independent of the trade union bureaucracy which leaves the young workers in the lurch, just as it betrays the fights of the adults. Next comes the question of the sport organisations and the subsidiary organisations which we must form, such as the Jungsturm, etc.

And now we come to the question of lively working methods of agitation and propaganda. We have already gained a good deal of experience in our youth Leagues in Germany and in Russia. These experiences we must utilise. On the whole we must endeavour to adapt the life of the Leagues more and more to the requirements of the young workers, and to devise the methods that are most suitable to their understanding. The young worker who comes to a factory nucleus or to a local organisation and is entertained to a dry discussion on organisational questions will not be likely to come again. The inner life of the organisation must be made more lively and interesting. New methods have to be devised in regard to recruiting and propagandist activity, e. g., revolutionary art evenings, film displays, "blue blouses entertainments", "red cabarets", agitprop groups, etc. Considerable success has been achieved by national or district meets of the youth. In connection with these meets, as with all demonstrations, we must display a certain amount of solidarity and discipline. In this connection I should like to mention that to my mind such uniforms as are worn by the German Jungsturm, the Y.C.L. and similar organisations, are likely to prove attractive to the young people. We have the intention of working out a certain uniform manner of clothing on the basis of the experiences of the German and other youth Leagues. This will render our appearance outwardly more impressive and will considerably contribute to deepening our influence.

However, the main thing is to take part in political life, to discuss concretely the questions relating to the youth, and to be active in the mass organisations.

The 4th point in the change is that, finally, we must also improve our **organisational** activity and our work in the factories.

Comrade Vasilyev reproached us in his speech that the youth League dabbles too much in Party politics. This reproach is naturally unjustified. It is entirely wrong to take the participation in the political life of the Party and the proper activity of the youth to be two things of an opposite character. The two things are connected. It is necessary to connect them properly, as well as to conduct the Party politics by methods that are accessible to the understanding of the youth. We have already indicated how generally — with two exceptions — the participation of the Y. C. L. in the life of the Party was right and proper, how it followed the Bolshevik line, and how it was of great advantage to the Y. C. L., to the Y. C. I., and to the C. P. concerned.

But Comrade Vasilyev has referred to two examples, which must be dealt with. The first example was that our factory nuclei are making no headway. Well, things are not at all so bad as they are pictured by Comrade Vasilyev. He stated that in 1924 there were 620 factory nuclei, and that now there are only 270. This is not quite correct. We still have 630 factory nuclei today. Here we have the same stability as with regard to membership. I admit that we have some weak points as regards the factory nuclei, even if Comrade Vasilyev's figures are not quite correct. His other example is altogether wrong. As an "example" that we are carrying on too much Party politics among the youth he says that the decision of the V. World Congress concerning the transformation of the Communist youth Leagues into mass organisations has not been carried out. Comrade Vasilyev could not have meant it quite so crudely as it has come out. No one could imagine that a Communist youth organisation, or any Communist organisation, could be turned into a mass organisation in such a short time. One has to bear in mind the historic circumstances of 1924 and the concrete conditions of development in our movement. No mass organisations can be turned out at such speed.

At our V. Congress we have an important further task. We are going to accept a **Programme** which will certainly contain the principles which we have always maintained and which we shall have to follow in the future, but at the same time there will be a certain new formulation of our tasks. In this Programme we are going to furnish a complete picture of the Communist, youth, how it should be formed, and how it should work today. The fundamental idea of the new draft programme is the formulation laid down directly by Lenin, that the Young Communist League is the **mass school of communism** for the young workers. Comrade Lenin was untiring in laying stress upon the fact that the proper task of the youth was to study.

And when Comrade Lenin spoke of study and education, he took equal care to point out what was meant by study, and how this study was to proceed. He emphasised again and again that this study must be effected upon the basis of the struggle for the interests of the working youth in all domains, upon the basis of taking part in the fight for Communism.

If we pursue this line we shall avoid many mistakes. It is not enough to lay stress upon "communism" whilst ignoring the mass character of the work. We must stick to these three things: the mass school of Communism for the young workers, the mass character and the organisation of Communist education upon the basis of taking part in the class struggle, and the **communist-political** character of the organisation.

On the whole, the discussion has shown substantial agreement upon the main lines and proposals which we have to pursue. The Congress has given some advice which will be of tremendous importance to all our sections. The contradictions of capitalist stabilisation are growing more and more acute. The inner antagonisms are growing in intensity, and the social clashes and crises are becoming more and more acute. The outward contradictions are growing more and more ominous. The war danger grows imminent. And the youth is going to play a tremendous role in connection with all these questions. In this struggle for Communism it is the task of the Communist International to gain the young workers, and consequently the future, for the Comintern. We believe, comrades, that upon the firm principles laid down by the Congress of the Young Communist International we shall fulfill our tasks. (Lively cheers.)

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

Comrade Bukharin will now deliver his concluding speech.

(The speech of Comrade Bukharin in reply to discussion has been already published in a special Number. See Inprecorr No. 49, 13th August, 1928. Editor.)

Comrade EWERT (Germany):

I have to make the following declaration:

At this Congress the statement was made that I, and a number of other comrades, voted for the proposals made by the delegation from the C. P. S. U., only under reservations. We declare that this is not so. Our misgivings, which I expressed in my speech, apply solely to the inner-party attitude of the majority of the Party leadership of the C. P. of Germany, as expressed at this Congress in the speeches of Comrade Ulbricht, Opitz and Lominadze. These speeches, partly made on the instruction of the delegation, show that our fears that the carrying out of the resolution by the decisive forces in our Party leadership will be utilised against the sense of the proposals of the C. P. S. U. delegation, for the purpose of changing the inner-Party course of the Essen Party Congress, are well founded — now as in the past. This is shown also in the absurd and dishonest charge of Trotskyist and anti-Soviet attitude, raised against me by Comrades Ulbricht and Lominadze, with the approval of the majority of the German delegation. The subsequent declaration of Comrade Ulbricht in no way obliterates this charge. It reveals itself above all in the charge that we constitute the chief danger in the Party, a charge which likewise was in no way withdrawn in the later declaration and interpretation by Comrade Thälmann in the meeting of the German delegation.

I take note of what Comrade Bukharin said, on behalf of the Bureau of the C. P. S. U. delegation, about the impermissibility of tendencies to remove me from the Party leadership. It is self-understood that if I or other comrades represented the chief danger in the Party we should have to be removed also from the Party leadership.

The statements made by these comrades not only confirm our justified misgivings with respect to the inner-Party course of the C. P. G., but at the same time also characterise the methods that have been brought into application. In our opinion such a method of fighting contradicts the contents and spirit of the resolution, which imposes upon the leadership the duty to work for the consolidation of the Party, and to effect a concentration of all comrades who stand by the decisions of the C. I. and of the Essen Party Congress of the C. P. G. Therefore, we protest against these methods.

The statement made by Comrade Ulbricht that there was an intention on my part to provide by subterfuge for the liquidation of the Essen Party Congress decisions, can only be designated as an attempt consciously to mislead the Congress. I will submit to the Presidium a statement as to the cases referred to by Comrade Ulbricht.

Comrade KOLAROV (Bulgaria):

In his concluding remarks, Comrade Schüller declared that in Poland and Bulgaria the Communist Parties were not devoting the necessary attention to the Youth. I consider it necessary to declare that this statement does not hold good insofar as the Bulgarian Party is involved. In fact, absolutely normal relations prevail between the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Young Communist League of Bulgaria. The Party recognises the organisational autonomy of the Y. C. L., gives willing heed to all demands of the youth and supports the work of the Y. C. L. with all its forces. The statement of Comrade Schüller was probably occasioned by some sort of misunderstanding. I consider it necessary to make this declaration in order to render all misunderstandings impossible.

Comrade HERWIK (Poland):

Comrade Mitzkevitch considered it necessary to question my statements concerning the mistakes of the Party during the strike in Lodz. I declare that I have with me all the material on this question and that I will put it before the Congress.

Comrade SCHÜLLER:

A few words on the declaration of Comrade Kolarov. I gave a report on the whole recent development of the Y. C. I. and its relations to the Parties in recent years, and in looking back I noted that, among others, also the Bulgarian Party did not give sufficient observance to the principle of the organisational independence of the Young Communist League. On this there were in the past a series of examples. I recall the fact that at the Party conference there were various tendencies which proposed a fundamental change in the relations between the Party and Y. C. L., and which wanted to draw various organisational conclusions from this. If this has changed recently, as would appear from the words of Comrade Kolarov, we are the first to welcome this.

Comrade THALMANN (Germany):

Comrades, the remarks of Comrade Bukharin with respect to the leadership of the German Party, and likewise the declaration of Comrade Ewert, may create the impression that the comrades of the leadership of the German Party were of the opinion, or perhaps even are of the opinion, that there is an intention to remove Comrade Ewert from the leadership. I state here before the Plenum of the VI. World Congress that the whole leadership of the German Party never had such an opinion, but that the fact is that Comrade Ewert for a certain time in narrow circles advocated the view that there should be a change in the leadership of the German Party which had been recognised as the only correct leadership, even at the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. and in the Russian and German Delegations, in agreement with, and having the approval of the Russian delegation.

The second fact — Comrade Ewert declared that the charge made by several comrades in the Plenum of the VI. World Congress that certain reservations were expressed on his part, was not so. I believe that despite the fact that today in his declaration Comrade Ewert stated that he has no reservations to the amendment of the Russian Delegation, there is a little contradiction in the speech of Comrade Ewert, because his remarks, according to their whole contents, were an attack, and they did not show that conciliatory tone which was expressed, for example, in my remarks.

The third fact is the following: I would remind you that the Right danger is the greatest inside the labour movement, and hence also inside the Party. If in this situation Comrade Ewert persists in his political and inner-Party course then he will become what Comrade Stalin told him in the joint meeting of the German and Russian delegations — the rallying point of all malcontents and all Right elements, who will all gather around Comrade Ewert.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The E. C. C. I. recommends that the Theses of the Russian Delegation be accepted as a basis, and that they be considered, together with the amendments proposed by the various delegations, in a commission, after which they are to be acted on finally by the Congress.

Does anyone wish to speak on this? Since this is not the case we will come to a vote. (A vote is taken.)

I declare the proposal adopted unanimously, without any abstentions.

The German Delegation submits a motion which reads as follows:

“The VI. World Congress endorses the activity of the E. C. C. I., of the International Control Commission, and of the Young Communist International, during the past period.”

The motion is adopted unanimously, without abstentions.

We now come to the election of the commission which is to discuss the Theses and proposed amendments. The Presidium proposes the following comrades for this commission:

Bukharin, Stalin (alternate Molotov) U. S. S. R., Thälmann — Germany, Semard — France, Ercoli — Italy, Murphy — Great Britain, Jilek — Czechoslovakia, Kostrcheva — Poland, Lovestone — U. S. A., Li Kuang — China, Lozovsky — Communist Fraction of the Profintern, Khitarov — Y. C. I., Kilboom —

Scandinavia, Kolarov — Balkans, Kuusinen — Baltic States, Manabar — Indonesia, Haidar — Near East, Lacerda — South America, Kato — Japan, Sikander — India:

Responsible for the calling of this commission: Thälmann; Secretary — Yablonsky.

Those delegations which are not represented on the Commission will submit their proposed amendments to the commission in writing and have the right to advocate their proposals orally.

The proposal of the Presidium was adopted unanimously, without abstentions. This disposes of the first point on the agenda.

In conclusion the representative of the Ukrainian delegation makes the following declaration:

Comrade LOVITZKY:

Comrades! The delegates of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Ukraine to the VI. Congress of the Comintern, protest categorically against the political attacks made by Comrade Herwik, the representative of the Minority of the C. P. of Poland, which were directed against Comrade Mikolos. Comrade Mikolos is an old Bolshevik, and is a member of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

In his criticism against Comrade Mikolos' work in the C. P. of West Ukraine, Comrade Herwik permitted himself to designate this comrade as the “spiritual father of a great mistake”, and to declare that the views of Comrade Mikolos on the crisis in the C. P. of West Ukraine are in contradiction to those of the Comintern.

The delegates of the C. P. U. find themselves compelled to state thereupon that Comrade Mikolos' many years of work in the C. P. of West Ukraine, which was of greatest importance in the Bolshevisation of this Party, were carried on entirely on the instructions and on the basis of the directives of the Comintern, and that it enjoyed the complete endorsement and support of the C. C. of the C. P. U.

The position of Comrade Mikolos on the question of the crisis in the C. P. of West Ukraine and the treason of the Vassilkov group is identical with the position of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine, which was expressed in the March resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine. This resolution reads: “The Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine confirms and endorses the policy conducted by the C. C. of the C. P. U., both with respect to direct relations as well as with respect to the representative of the C. P. U. to the Comintern. The Plenum ratifies the work of its representative, Comrade Mikolos, in the C. P. of West Ukraine and states that his work was carried out entirely upon the basis of the instructions of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine, and in conformity to the decisions of the Comintern.”

The political attacks made by Comrade Herwik in his speech before the Plenary session of the Congress on July 28th, can therefore be interpreted only as an attack directed against the C. C. of the C. P. of the Ukraine.

The speech of Comrade Mickiewicz in the same meeting, which again stated the generally known fact that all important decisions on the question of West Ukraine in the last year and a half were adopted by the E. C. C. I., and that actually Comrade Herwik and his colleagues were attacking not the policy of the majority of the C. C. of the C. P. of Poland in the Ukrainian question, but the policy of the Comintern, releases us from the need to carry on any further disputes on this matter with Comrade Herwik.

We only desire to declare in all sharpness before the VI. Congress that the members of the Minority of the C. P. of Poland, who in the most recent past have upon their conscience the heavy burden of nationalist-opportunist mistakes of the worst sort (the pamphlet by Comrade Bronovitch, the Manifesto by Bukinsky, etc.) and particularly Comrade Herwik, get themselves into a ludicrous situation when they undertake a task for which they are certainly not big enough, the task of teaching the C. C. of the C. P. U. and Comrade Mikolos a correct national policy.

(Close of Session.)

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. A.	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.