

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8. No. 58

1st September 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, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Seventeenth Session.

Moscow, July, 31st, 1928 (afternoon).

At to-day's session the Congress, under the chairmanship of Comrade Serra, commenced to deal with the second item of the Agenda: "Methods of the Struggle against the Danger of Imperialist War".

Methods of the Struggle against the Danger of Imperialist War.

Report of Comrade Bell:

Comrades: The war question in the past has been treated, in my opinion, rather haphazardly. We have had many grandiose resolutions, rhetorical manifestoes, analytical discourses upon theoretical problems associated with the question of war. But the situation is such today that we must get down to the practical tasks that lie before the various Parties, in preparation for what will prove to be the biggest test upon the Communist International since its foundation in 1919.

We have also a wealth of material, of articles, writings bequeathed to us by Comrade Lenin and our great Bolshevik leaders. But those statements and articles are rather scattered and diffused, and not always accessible for the Parties when formulating their attitude in specific cases, or in the general struggle, against war. This thesis has therefore attempted to bring together the various ideas and propositions, and also to connote the experiences of the Bolshevik Party, of the Spartacus Bund and the various revolutionary groups, that

did not succumb to the great war of 1914—18, into a single document that will, we hope, be a fundamental document for the future guidance of the Communist International in its struggle against war.

The Preparatory Commission is not going to pretend that the thesis is not open to amendment or to improvement in a number of respects.

It was our desire at first to try to produce something in the nature of a short model thesis, that would be brief, concrete and to the point, and include all that was practical. But when we came to make an examination of the materials available in the archives of the Comintern, we were amazed at the lack of information regarding the activities of the Parties, either in the general fight against war, in their anti-war propaganda in specific cases, and in a number of outstanding political situations where the anti-war work of the Parties ought to have been in evidence. The absence of these materials

brought home to us that, in approaching this question of the war, we are dealing not merely with organisational problems, but with the fundamental theoretical weaknesses on the part of a number of our sections as to the methods of conducting the struggle against war.

Finally, in the discussion we want to know what the Parties can do in the immediate situation we are faced with and, moreover, what they will do in certain eventualities.

The thesis takes as its starting point the imminence of war. I remember at the VIII. Plenum, during the discussion, Comrade Bela Kun and Comrade Kolaroff raised the question of Communists being imbued with the idea of the inevitability of the war and the passivity that arises from the belief of such inevitability. But I am of the opinion that passivity may equally arise from an opposite point of view. We must treat the fight against war here as an important part of the day-to-day activity of the Communists against imperialism and not to divorce it from the particular tasks of this struggle.

It is desirable before going any further to make some examination of the objective factors that are before us. After the very exhaustive debate which we had from this tribune on the international theses, it is hardly necessary to dwell upon the predisposing causes that make for war. All Communists understand that wars are inevitable within the framework of the capitalist system; that the predisposing causes of wars are to be found in the imperialist rivalries for sources of raw materials and for markets and to secure fields of investment. These circumstances led to the great first world war in 1914-18. But we know today that this war did not solve the problem fundamentally. It only brought about a certain temporary readjustment accompanied by ever sharpening contradictions and now we see ourselves moving into a new crisis which is ripening under imperialism and which becomes more acute due to the hostility of the imperialists to the U. S. S. R.

The basis of the present crisis is again the problem of the new markets to absorb the increased productivity that is accruing from the present period of rationalisation. Secondly, the old distribution of the colonies and the spheres of influence no longer suffice for the purpose of capitalist economy. The Versailles Treaty, we know, was advantageous to certain powerful groups. Today, these particular groups feel that they are strong enough to take what they want by force of arms but for fear of certain forces which they may call up that they would not be able to control, there is a certain retarding influence being brought to bear upon them.

We have, in our written report, made certain groupings of the imperialists. During the debate on Comrade Bukharin's theses, the strongest emphasis was laid upon the antagonism and rivalry between the imperialism of America and that of Great Britain. Anglo-American antagonism necessarily takes the first place in our consideration of the relationship between the various imperialist groups. The war of 1914-18, it is common knowledge, raised the bourgeoisie of the United States to supremacy in world politics. The Washington Conference sealed once and for all the fate of the English bourgeoisie, which hitherto claimed that the British navy was mistress of the seas. In this connection I would suggest as a very interesting study a comparison of the arguments being used by the British bourgeoisie to justify the increased building that is going on in naval forces as compared with the increased building that is going on in America.

From this we are brought to ask ourselves the question whether in this particular armament race it is possible for the rival of the U. S. A. to overcome the American imperialists. We are bound to acknowledge that at the present moment we are in the throes of an armament race more intense even than the armament race preceding the Great War of 1914-18.

With regard to the possibilities of overcoming the power and strength of the American bourgeoisie in the building of its armaments it is quite obvious that the American bourgeoisie is economically strong enough to build ship against ship, unit against unit, against both Great Britain and France combined, and that consequently there can be no thought that there are possibilities of the weaker British, French and the other groups of imperialists being able to overcome the American bourgeoisie.

In this connection I want to draw attention to the twenty years programme that was brought forward in the American Senate involving a cost of 2,570 millions of dollars, and to the remarks of the American Admiral Plunkett when in an interview he said that "we are nearer than ever to the danger of war because we pursue a trade policy of competition and of ousting other nations". To the question that was put to him when he was speaking of 'ousting other nations' as to whom he meant — the Admiral had no hesitations in declaring: "I have in view Great Britain or any other nation, the interests of which can be touched." With regard to the Anglo-American antagonism it is clear that these are at present the fundamental imperialist antagonisms that we have to keep in mind when discussing the perspective of a new war.

Comrade Bukharin, in his speech on the international situation, spoke of the attempts that were being made and the success that had been met with by the American bourgeoisie in squeezing Great Britain out of another continent, particularly in connection with rubber and oil. He also referred to the penetration of India for cotton, the penetration of Canada and Australia with finance. We are all familiar with the penetration of the Almighty Dollar into Central Europe. We all knew that the rivalry of German industry was only made possible by the lavish help which was accorded to the German bourgeoisie by the American bourgeoisie under the Dawes Plan. To the question when and where this antagonism between America and Great Britain will or may break out, this is a question which can only best be answered hypothetically. What we are certain of is that the rivalry or antagonism between them will inevitably lead to increased armaments, will inevitably lead to friction and conflicts in different parts of the globe, which must inevitably be solved by force of arms. There is no other way out of the impasse the imperialists are getting into.

Another group of the imperialists, we have designated as the French, Italian and British group. It is common knowledge that the British policy following the war was very largely directed against the industrially growing strong French bourgeoisie in Central Europe. For a period Great Britain leaned towards Italy in order to check-mate the growth of French industrialism and, vice versa, for a time the French bourgeoisie was interested in a closer rapprochement with the German bourgeoisie. Now we see the British bourgeoisie getting closer to France and exercising a certain pressure upon Italy when it is in the interests of the British Entente to do so. The changes in the tactics that are being pursued we might designate as 1. the ever increasing differences between Britain and America and the striving for some European coalition to check-mate the growing power and strength of America in opposition to Great Britain; 2. the break of Anglo-Soviet relations and in connection with this the active anti-Soviet policy of Great Britain which is endeavouring to realise a united anti-Soviet front of the European states; 3. the growth of the economic power of Germany whose rivalry must undoubtedly bring in its wake the revival of the old Anglo-German differences; 4. the stabilisation of the French currency which resulted in the consolidation of France on the international field, in the sense that France is now becoming more and more independent with regard to foreign politics.

In any case we see a definite orientation towards a rapprochement between the two main imperialist powers of the European continent.

The relations between the Italian, French and Yugo-Slavian group, are influenced by the interest of Great Britain and of France. In recent times the situation between these groups has been assuming a very strange aspect. The danger in the Mediterranean at one moment was exceedingly acute and is by no means removed. What is evident, is that the conflict in the Mediterranean is bound to provoke a situation that will undoubtedly involve the important European powers and lead to another world war.

Great Britain's desire to predominate in the Mediterranean is due to her traditional hold upon the routes to India, her tremendous influence and interests in Middle Europe and in North Africa, all of which make it absolutely necessary that the British bourgeoisie should not lose any chances so far as the naval strength in the Mediterranean is concerned.

Another important grouping is the **Franco-German-British** group in view of the industrial revival of the German bourgeoisie. Germany, it is true, had to rely upon a certain measure of support by the London market to carry through the Dawes Plan, but in view of the acute international situation in British economy, Germany can no longer look for that co-operation as in the past. The possibilities of a revision of the Dawes Plan which will be brought to the order of the day in the immediate future, depend more upon the bourgeoisie of the United States than on the bankers of London.

Germany is once more a powerful industrial rival. The international negotiations for cartels, for agreements, that have been proposed with a view to drawing together the heavy industry of Germany with the heavy industry of Great Britain, has not so far materialised to any substantial degree.

Another important group is the group of America-Japan and Britain. The antagonisms between these three rivals are at the moment exceedingly acute. The story of the relations, particularly between Great Britain and Japan, is one of the most interesting political studies one might engage in. There was a period when, under the dictation of America, Great Britain was compelled to tear up the old Anglo-Japanese alliance. Just following upon that, began the building of the base at Singapore. On the other side we see the prohibition of Japanese emigration to America in 1924 and the increased naval bases in the Pacific. Here are all the elements of rivalry and all antagonisms that are charged with the possibilities of war in the immediate future.

It is difficult for us to forecast exactly as to the possible outcome of these antagonisms. What we do see here is a certain see-sawing, first from the one angle and then from the other, involving certain readjustments in accordance with the increased economic power and political influence accruing from alliances, pacts arrangements and agreements between the imperialist nations.

With regard to the increase in armaments, it is not necessary for me to bring forward statistical material to prove that in all imperialist countries the military budgets are rapidly rising. These budgets include not only provision for an increase in the number of troops, in the number of territorial militias, and so forth, but they also include expenditure particularly for the mechanisation of the armies. So, for the moment, we can dismiss all the rhetoric and flamboyant talk of the diplomats who are continually trying to assure the masses of workers that "as a matter of fact, when we are improving our mechanisation this means a diminution in the number of troops employed and will lessen the loss of life in the event of war becoming inevitable". It is a law that the greater the means of destruction, the greater becomes the loss of life.

The budgets for the five big Powers for the years 1923, '24, '26, '27 and '28, represent a considerable increase in expenditure. The numerical strength of the land armies alone, the five big Powers taken together, when compared with 1913, show an actual numerical increase of 112,000 units. The number of fighting aeroplanes that are on the active list, has increased by 100 per cent. The same applies to the tonnage, and the aeroplane carriers, a new type of machine which belongs to the present period, and which was unknown during the last war. It is necessary to realise that the armaments race which is going on at the present time is a very serious proposition, and one which completely disqualifies the arguments of the diplomats and the bourgeoisie, that there is no real increase in armaments or any armaments race at the present time.

Objectively we must regard these figures as a certain proof of the inevitability of war. We cannot expect that the imperialists will go on increasing their expenditure, the number of military and naval units for the mere love of producing these particular instruments. We are justified in assuming that this increase is prompted by a certain nervousness in each of the countries against the other bourgeois states, with regard to the possibilities of the future, and the desire and the necessity for making some preparations in advance. Each power is exerting the utmost of its strength in the "defence" of its own imperialist interests.

But there is one enemy common to all the imperialists. No matter what may be the degree of antagonism between the

British and the American, or between the French and Italian states, etc., — all the bourgeois states have this common enemy, the **proletarian state of the U. S. S. R.** This brings us to the final grouping, which is the most important grouping of all, which combines the whole of the capitalist and imperialist countries against the **Federated Soviet States of the U. S. S. R.** The hostility of the capitalists to the U. S. S. R. is obviously due to the fact that the U. S. S. R. is the centre of the proletarian revolution. Moreover, the imperialists are concerned with the growing example of the U. S. S. R. to the world proletariat and the colonial peoples as to the way out of the morass which the suppressed nationalities in the whole world outside the U. S. S. R. find themselves in. The strengthening of the bourgeoisie, and the weakening of the working class due to the offensive of the bourgeoisie against the workers, has had the effect that the plan of the imperialists to wage war on the U. S. S. R. is ripening. The fact of the increased rationalisation, side by side with the exhaustion of old markets, forces the imperialists to be always turning their eyes towards the Russian market, and the possibilities involved in that market.

Under these circumstances we see a considerably increasing pressure upon the Soviet Union. During the last two years there has been an almost complete unanimity amongst the British bourgeoisie with regard to the severance of relations with the U. S. S. R. We know that there has been a certain tendency in some circles, of some industrialists in Great Britain to oppose the policy of the Conservative Government, which has been anxious for a long time to have a complete break and an open declaration of war upon the U. S. S. R. But on the whole, the fundamental antagonism remains.

Today, the financial blockade is one of the new features of the antagonism to the U. S. S. R. We see a growing irreconcilable attitude of the French bourgeoisie in their negotiations with the U. S. S. R., and persistent attempts of French-German economic circles to bring about a uniform policy with regard to the U. S. S. R. Financial and industrial centres of Great Britain and the United States are also entering into negotiations on the question of concessions in the U. S. S. R. in order to exercise a certain pressure on the U. S. S. R. The same is true in the case of Germany's negotiations with the Soviet Union, and the breaking off of these negotiations under the pretext of the arrest of the German engineers.

All these facts go to show that there are potentialities for war in these economic arrangements between the imperialists — in the economic pressure that is being brought to bear upon the U. S. S. R. They all go to show that the antagonisms between the U. S. S. R. and the imperialist powers are sharpening to a considerable degree. They illustrate that the capitalists will one day be compelled to discuss whether or not the time has come to try a militarist solution to the problem which they can only prepare but not solve by economic and financial pressure.

The British bourgeoisie is leading this campaign in the organising of an anti-Soviet bloc. After the Anglo-Soviet break, we observed anti-Soviet tendencies increasing everywhere. In the attitude of France in connection with the Rakovsky incident and the increased anti-Soviet attitude of the French imperialists generally, in the growth of the anti-Soviet tendencies of Germany, which is turning more and more towards the imperialists and away from the U. S. S. R., the increasing hostility of Poland, particularly after the coup d'Etat of Pilsudski.

A number of other illustrations can be brought to bear on this point, particularly the tendencies of the Baltic States and the Near East, all going to show that the relations between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist world are becoming sharper and more acute every day.

Everyone here will remember that during the period of the Chinese revolution, we had in England the General Strike and the lockout of the miners which lasted 8 months. There is no question about it that, in this period, the fact of the General Strike and the long drawn-out miners' lockout had a certain deterrent influence upon British anti-Soviet policy. While they were occupied with the General Strike and the miners, they were not in the same position to exercise such a free hand in Chinese affairs as now. Freed from the General Strike, and having crushed the miners, and having committed a considerable number of the unions in Great Britain to industrial

peace, the British bourgeoisie feels that it is now in a better position to concentrate upon the situation in China, and especially in organising the anti-Soviet bloc. The British rapprochement with France is a manifestation of this policy, a certain danger in so far as it means the reconciling and bridging over of certain European differences and antagonisms, which while being a certain checkmate upon America, are increasing the possibilities of an encirclement of the U. S. S. R.

Further, the anti-Soviet campaign in Japan is increasing with considerable intensity. The terror against the Communists and the legislation against them is an illustration of the growing authority which the Japanese bourgeoisie wields in this particular area. This we must take into account as part of the preparations for the establishment of the anti-Soviet bloc. Moreover, I think it is necessary for us to pay more attention to the situation which obtains on the Mongolian front, where the forces of reaction are becoming strengthened.

The last series of groupings is the role of the western neighbours and the U. S. S. R. In 1926 alone, quite a number of hostile agreements were concluded: Franco-Roumanian, Italo-Roumanian, which all go to indicate the strengthening of the attempts to increase the encirclement by these powers of the U. S. S. R. Not only so, but the annual war expenditures of these particular countries are increasing. These are signal facts with regard to the role of the western neighbours which we must take into consideration.

When we consider all these objective facts we see here that the war danger against the U. S. S. R. has considerably grown and is growing rapidly at the present time. Some comrades may speculate on where and when the war will come. Some comrades are obsessed with the idea that Poland is necessarily a jumping off ground for the war against the U. S. S. R. But I want to say that while speculating we must not make the mistake of being obsessed with that one particular centre of war danger but must try to have our eyes so fixed as to take an international kaleidocope of the situation. It is necessary to do this so that we are not taken unawares. We must always observe and remember the advice of Comrade Lenin that wars come upon us stealthily, that they are prepared secretly and may arise from mere sparks, and in certain areas which we have thought had little or no importance for the moment. The important thing for us to realise is — that the mobilisation of the forces of the Communist International against the imperialist war is the most important task and obligation upon the Communist Parties. This obligation is heavier on us today than at any time in the history of the Communist International.

In this discussion, some comrades are fond of speculating and trying to put into water-tight compartments the retarding factors. They speak of rivalries, antagonisms, increased armament, large armies of unemployed as being accelerating factors. On the other hand, the fear of revolution in their own countries, the fear of revolution on an international scale — these are argued as certain retarding influences. But comrades, we cannot approach the question of accelerating influences and forces or retarding influences and forces from a static and mechanical approach. We must regard this question from a dialectical point of view, estimating these accelerating and retarding forces in the measure that the condition of the particular countries change and incite certain changes of political situations.

It is very important for us to have in mind the tremendous propaganda of the bourgeoisie and the reformists for disarmament that is going on today. At the present moment, this hypocritical propaganda recalls the period of the Hague Peace propaganda of 1912, when they were handing out peace prizes for those who were able to produce the best essays on how to prevent war. In this connection the parties must be able to expose the political significance of this sham disarmament propaganda, and its implications in the preparations for war. The greater the increase in armaments, the louder becomes the "peace" talk.

I must say we are in danger of committing some other serious mistakes now. At the present moment, this disarmament propaganda is being conducted under the sign of the League of Nations. Some comrades are inclined to think that we are

paying too much attention to the League of Nations. It is my opinion that the League of Nations exercises a very great influence amongst the masses of the workers at the present time. Moreover it is necessary for us to follow clearly every movement on the part of the League of Nations in order that we can combat its hypocritical disarmament propaganda.

The proposals of the Soviet Delegation at Geneva upset all the plans of the imperialists. The Soviet proposals of November 1927 and of February 1928, undoubtedly have put the imperialists in a difficult position. In putting forward these proposals the Soviet Government, by exposing the hypocrisy of the diplomats and their pacifist allies, undoubtedly secured for the Proletarian State a certain tactical advantage over that of the imperialists. The bluff of the imperialists has been exposed and they are revealed naked before the working class for the charlatans that they are. But immediately following these proposals of the Soviet Union it was to be expected that the imperialists would not allow the Soviet Union to occupy such a tactical position for long. The peace proposal of Briand submitted to Kellogg and the Kellogg reply to Briand in the nature of a supposed world pact on the outlawry of war represents the attempt on the part of the imperialists to try and checkmate the Soviet Union and take away the tactical advantage it secured in bringing forward its proposals for a complete disarmament. The American proposals forced the imperialists to show their hand with regard to their relations to the Soviet Union. The Kellogg proposals were only accepted by Briand with certain provisions, that they were not in any way to prejudice the rights of "self-defence", or in any way to lead to a revision of the treaties that had been entered into by the French bourgeoisie.

The treaties of the British in this connection were even more emphatic. Chamberlain declared that as the right of "self-defence" was the concern of the British Government alone, that the existing treaties between the British bourgeoisie and their allies must be respected; that, so far as the British colonies are concerned, the British Empire was more important to the Tory Government than the League of Nations and all its treaties. But the most important part of the declaration was that the universality of the application of a Pact to outlaw war was absolutely impossible for very particular reasons. Those reasons were that there were certain states in world politics, which were unable to secure their internal order and were a menace to external order. Obviously, they refer to the Chinese Revolution and to the U. S. S. R. In practice, therefore, we may say that the Kellogg Note and the whole disarmament propaganda of the imperialists simply implies that they are trying to find ways and means of arranging amongst themselves such a system of treaties as will enable them to go on increasing their military preparations in provision for the day when they will be called upon to try a military solution to the problems that confront them. Meanwhile, they postponed going to war in order that they may try to sort out for the time being the differences amongst themselves, to secure unanimity in trying a military solution to the struggle against the U. S. S. R. This is another screen for the preparations of war.

Comrades, the Soviet proposals, as I have stated, have a tremendous influence upon us. Some comrades have regarded these proposals as a gesture and have not understood how it is possible for the workers in power to bring forward proposals for disarmament, for the very obvious reason that the Workers' Government has no imperialist designs on territory and therefore can bring these proposals forward genuinely. Our parties have not always brought forward this idea of the genuine character of the proposals of the Soviet Union in connection with the propaganda for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie as they ought to have done to the advantage of our practical fight against the imperialists. I am sure that this Congress will agree that the proposals of the Soviet Union advance the struggle of the international proletariat against the bourgeois preparations for a new world war.

But comrades, it is necessary to distinguish between the proposals of the Soviet Union for disarmament and the anti-war work and tactics of our brother Parties. The Soviet Union as the State of proletarian dictatorship can and ought to come out for full disarmament, while our Parties must first overthrow the bourgeoisie of their own particular country. The proposals

of the Soviet Union, as I have said, have given the proletarian State a certain tactical advantage, and it is the duty of the Communist Parties to exploit this tactical advantage to its utmost, but at the same time to link it up with the main task of the Communist Parties, the task of carrying on the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie on all possible fronts, to weaken and disintegrate capitalism, to work for and to popularise the slogan of the Communists: "For the Arming of the Proletariat", for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

Now, a few words regarding the Social Democrats. In 1914, the Social Democrats proved to be mere chauvinists and abandoned all that they had ever pretended to know or understand of Marxism. Today the attitude of the Social Democrats towards war is even more shameful. The attitude of the Ministerialists of the II. International, the MacDonalds, the Vanderveldes, the Paul Boncours, and the other heroes of the II. International of today is one of open defence of their bourgeois Fatherland. They stand today not as mere chauvinists, but have passed into the camp of the social imperialists. They have become open defenders of imperialism even more than the imperialists themselves. At the same time we should not make the mistake of simply denouncing these ministerialists as the tools of the imperialists and ignore the fact that they still exercise a considerable influence over large sections of the workers.

The pseudo Lefts of the Social Democrats, these most dangerous enemies of Communism, are, as always, today hopelessly confused. Some of them bring forward the disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union, clothing them with radical and pseudo-Left phrases, concealing the fact that the overthrow of capitalism is a preliminary condition to complete disarmament. In many cases they pretend to be more ardent defenders of the Soviet Union than the Communists themselves. Some fall into the camp of pure and simple pacifists. But comrades, we are sorry to say we must acknowledge that the pseudo-Lefts in some cases have been better able to utilise the proposals of the Soviet Union and to take all the advantages out of them for the Social Democracy than the Communist Parties have been able to do for the C. I. I have in mind, for example, incidents in Great Britain where, in the case of the recent manoeuvres that took place at Hendon, London, we found there that it was the people belonging to the No More War Movement, the people of the pure and simple pacifist type who were flooding the area with their literature, while the Communists were conspicuous by their absence. This occurred in a number of cases in America and other sections of our Communist International movement where significant and important occasions are often allowed to pass by the Communists, while the pseudo-Pacifists have been able to go in and take the advantage for their own particular Social Democracy, or to put it still clearer for their "own" bourgeoisie.

I have given examples in my written report of the Social Democrats, how they have differentiated, how the Social Democrats in Germany have followed the military programme of their own bourgeoisie. The international political policy of the German bourgeoisie is the model of the foreign policy adopted by its Social Democrats. In France, the Social Democrats limp behind the policy of the French bourgeoisie. In Britain the MacDonald Party — the Labour Party with its Social Democrats — are continuing the policy of the Tory bourgeois government in international affairs with certain pseudo-pacifist modifications.

With regard to these "Lefts", however, of all shades, we see them caught up in this wave of pacifism and disarmament discussion, we see them united with the "rights" in their defence of the League of Nations as the one body which they believe capable of securing "no more war", but which is in reality the instrument for war preparations.

Comrades, the danger of the Left socialists in their pretence at fighting war is even more dangerous just at the present moment when there is a certain radicalisation amongst the workers and a certain swing to the Left. By phrases about opposing all wars, about international arbitration, about individual refusal of military service, about mass refusal of military service, about renunciation of all violence, these Left Socialists constitute the danger of being able to steal from us, the Communists, those slogans which aptly appeal to the more radical and politically conscious workers who are seeking for

a way out of the possibilities of war. In this connection it will occur to every comrade's mind here Lenin's formula with regard to the fight against the Lefts about the boycott of war, of individual refusal to serve, of the boycott of war being a stupid phrase. Yes, in the sense of folded arms in face of the approaching war the boycott of war is a stupid phrase, but nevertheless many of our comrades are apt to forget this phrase of Lenin's and to make a fetish out of the boycott of arms and refusal of military service. In combatting these slogans we should distinguish between a pacifist refusal to serve which has for its aim purely humanitarian reasons, for religious motives, or for certain cultural or aesthetic objections to taking life, and the workers' refusal to fight for imperialism. This passive refusal we must transform into a revolutionary movement against imperialism, aiming at the utilising of the workers for the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war.

We must explain to all those workers how impossible it is for them to keep out of the war once the bourgeoisie have decided upon trying a militarist solution to the problems they are up against. We must explain to those workers that those who want to keep out of war instead of fighting it are in reality helping imperialism.

In this connection, I want to refer to a very interesting example of an inquiry which was conducted by our comrades in the German Party. Our comrades of the German Party issued a questionnaire to the various local organisations, and also to the workers in a number of important factories — textile factories, metal factories, and factories of various kinds. They received a very important series of answers, which enable us to get a very good estimate as to what the workers are thinking with regard to the possibilities of war. In reply to this questionnaire, we find that one section of the workers did not believe that imperialist war was possible. Another section imagined that war was possible, and that it should be left to the League of Nations to prevent the war. Only a small section believed that war on the Soviet Union was possible, indicating that they were the victims of a certain amount of social democratic propaganda. On the whole the workers were not clear as to the best means of combating imperialist war.

Comrades, this questionnaire is the best evidence of the tremendous field that is before us for our propaganda. And from the replies that were given to our German Party, there was revealed a certain passivity on the part of our own Communists inside the factories and the workshops. I believe that the situation revealed as a result of this questionnaire within the German Party can be considered as fairly typical and fairly representative of the situation within the other parties.

Some of these workers thought they could wait until the war came and then act. How do they propose to act? Some said, "by refusing to serve", "never again will we fight". Others believed that it was possible when war was declared to call a general strike. Those views I believe are typical of the views and illusions held by the workers in a number of countries.

The lessons which this questionnaire teach us are the necessity for being more active in our propaganda, in carrying forward our anti-war work. They show us that we must not be content with beautiful resolutions, with pious phrases with regard to the question of war. They show us the necessity of having a heart to heart talk with the workers, of appealing to the workers in an understandable way so that they will be able to realise what are the best methods for combating war.

This questionnaire also shows a certain weakness in our trade union work, especially in those particular industries which were specified by the 8th Plenum as being essential for successful struggle against war. If we mean to use the strike weapon, then it is essential that this trade union work should be considerably strengthened. This questionnaire revealed, moreover, a certain passivity of the Communists in carrying through their propaganda. Passivity in face of the class character of the next war is criminal so far as the Communists are concerned. We know that during the last war there were certain things committed that were unheard of in the history of humanity. The last war was child's play compared with the atrocities of the next war. The fury of the bourgeoisie in

a war against the Soviet Union will be unexampled. This means the class war *par excellence*.

With regard to passivity in combating the imperialist war, the draft programme of the C. I. speaks of Fascism turning the discontent of the masses owing to the passivity of the Social Democrats to the advantage of Fascism. Everyone knows that it was due to the passivity of the Social Democrats that the Italian workers were driven out of the workshops and factories they had occupied and the Fascist regime was made possible. But Fascism assumes many varied forms in other countries. We are all familiar with Fascism as expressed in Italy, Poland, Hungary and other Balkan countries. But there are certain aspects and forms of Fascism — or stages of preparations for the introduction of Fascism, to be more accurate — on which we should have a clear understanding, especially in the present period of rationalisation of production in preparation for war.

The fundamental tactics of Fascism, no matter where it is the open terroristic kind in Italy or in Poland, or another kind of fascism, are the destruction of the Communist revolutionary movement and the strengthening of reaction. Fascism approaches the masses not always in a mechanical and schematic way. For example, I am inclined to regard *Mondism* in England as a veiled form of Fascism or at least the preparations of Fascism in England. In Syria we see the yellow trade unions that not only carry forward the programme with revolvers but also bring forward practical demands which make a special appeal to the masses. In Germany, company unions, yellow unions, organisations like the "reconstruction of the Reich" that are unofficially subsidised by the big industrialists are important preparations for Fascism, especially during the period of war. In Austria, the National Defence League, which is supported liberally by funds from the big industrialists, is another illustration of how the bourgeoisie is preparing for the Fascist defence of the State in the event of war.

Out of the lessons of the period of 1914 the bourgeoisie are perfecting their armies, navies and air forces, in mechanising their armies, increasing their chemical laboratories, subsidising all kinds of auxiliary organisations such as *Mond's* silk factories which are easily convertible for war purposes on short notice. The industrial peace campaign is part of the general preparations of labour organisations for the war against the Soviet Union and for the defence of the bourgeois State. It is necessary that we understand what this *Mondism* means. It is not peculiar to Great Britain, it is manifesting itself in America, in reviving Germany, in France, Austria and other countries throughout capitalist Europe. This form of propaganda is an essential part of preparations for Fascism in the event of war being declared, and for the defence and maintenance of the bourgeois State.

Fascism has made recruits at the expense of the passivity of the Social Democrats. It seeks to harness the grievances of the workers in a skilful way to the bourgeois state at the expense of the Social Democrats. But Communist passivity may also objectively lead to the same results. There are comrades who have not learnt to bring forward any opposition to this *Mondism*, to these various industrial peace programmes. They are unable to mobilise the workers against them and arouse the revolutionary trade union groups in the respective countries. Unless we find a way to the workers we too may be responsible for a certain passivity which may lead the workers into the camp of the Fascists. Therefore it is necessary not only to carry through anti-war propaganda inside the armies, inside the air forces, and in the navy, but also amongst the broad masses of the workers. We should not neglect in our trade union work to bring forward a practical programme of demands to meet every situation. Unless we carry through this work in the labour movement, a certain passivity of the Communists may, to a certain extent, lead to advantageous results for Fascism.

All our Sections must be alive to this manifestation of Fascism in their own countries and carry on a systematic fight against it.

Then, another form of passivity is to be found in the attitude of certain workers, for instance, who do not see clearly the bourgeois propaganda that is intended to confuse

them in regard to Fascism. Take for example, the attitude of certain French workers who are apprehensive of Italian imperialism crossing its own frontiers, and therefore fall into the arms of French chauvinism and think that the greater danger is Italian Fascist imperialism, rather than French imperialism. The same in regard to certain workers in Yugoslavia and various Balkan countries who feel that they are being menaced by Italian Fascism. It is necessary that our comrades have a clear understanding as to the relations of the Communists to the national wars, the question of the "Defence of the Fatherland", to distinguish between the Socialist fatherland and the defence of the bourgeois fatherland, and in all these other questions in which Communists are involved, in this very question of aggressiveness of Fascism.

In regard to England, for example, our bourgeoisie has conducted for a long time a steady anti-American propaganda. It is not unusual to read in our labour press certain scathing remarks by certain labour journalists with regard to America and American imperialism, American institutions and American traditions. This is all skilful propaganda on the part of the British bourgeoisie preparing for a struggle against the American bourgeoisie. This campaign, I say, is part of the preparation for Fascist, patriotic organisations, and we can all, in our own countries, observe this particular feature.

Comrades, during 1914—1918 numerous colonial countries were roused to struggle for independence. We saw during the period of the war tremendous nationalist movements in India, in Egypt, in China, in Morocco and in the Middle East. Throughout the colonies, the semi-colonies and the dependencies there was a tremendous revolutionary movement and the imperialists had considerable difficulties to keep this movement in check. By systems of mandates, by the promise of constitutional reforms, in many cases by military bluff and suppression of the masses, those revolutionary movements were frustrated.

The war was responsible for a certain industrialisation going on in these colonies. The military demands placed upon the peoples quickened the political life of the colonies. The imperialists having secured a certain stability at home turned to suppress these colonial movements with blood and iron. Since the 5th Congress we have seen many insurrectionary movements. The Moroccan, Syrian, Irak and Indonesian insurrections and the great Chinese Revolution are all manifestations of a tremendous colonial revolutionary movement that has a special significance for revolutionary development in event of an imperialist war.

The development of capitalism, the growth of the proletarian class, gives us the objective basis for this revolutionary ferment in the mother countries. At the same time the next war, whether it is a war between two imperialist powers or whether it is a war of all the imperialists against the Soviet Union is bound to release this repressed colonial mood which is demanding an outlet at the present moment. The difficulties of the imperialists will prove to be the opportunities of the revolution of the oppressed colonies and we must expect that millions of colonial peoples will not remain silent in the event of the imperialists being once more embroiled in another world war. From this it follows that our colonial activity, which is very sparse at the present time, must be strengthened. We must attach importance to the visits of the British labour representatives to India, etc. etc., to the attempts of the Second International to get a footing in the East by having some kind of an alliance with the Kuomintang. Here we see manifestations of the Second International with a new policy with which they are going to challenge the Communist leadership of the revolutionary colonial movement, and try to win the workers in these colonial movements away from the influence of the Communists, the banner-bearers of the anti-imperialist war.

With regard to the colonial organisations of our movement in the West and in America it is a fact that we are so feeble that the imperialists today are able to send their troops to China, to Nicaragua, and to any part of the world wherever they propose to do so. This is a fact which we are forced to recognise and it is futile for us to talk about the possibilities of a general strike to prevent war, of the possibilities of disintegrating the bourgeois armies, and to use phrases about the transforming of the war into civil war, to use phrases about

the arming of the proletariat, for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, when we are not able to stop a single ship from leaving the shores of Britain for China, or those leaving the shores of America to go to Nicaragua and elsewhere, and when we are not able to induce the soldiers going to the colonies to fight imperialism instead of defending it.

The problem is not the problem of the American and British Parties, it is a universal problem as far as the majority of the Parties are concerned. The same might be applied in regard to the passing of guns to Hungary. The same passivity, the same weakness, the same inability to do anything, the same feebleness in our anti-war propaganda throughout all our Sections. We will only begin comrades, to speak seriously of helping our colonial brothers and sisters when we can stop those troops from leaving the metropolitan countries to go to the colonial countries. Inside the colonial countries we have large professional mercenary armies from the metropolitan countries. We must frankly confess that at the present we are merely touching the fringe of penetrating these imperialist armies. In any colonial organisation in the event of a colonial revolutionary movement it is absolutely necessary that propaganda be carried on inside the imperialist organisations. The disintegration of the imperialist armies, the propagation of desertion to the side of the nationalist armies can only be achieved when there is a strong propaganda, a strong activity on the part of the Communists inside the imperialist armies, inside the Metropolitan countries and also inside the imperialist armies in the colonial countries. The combined activities of the colonials, the workers in the metropolitan countries, therefore, from a military point of view is not a question merely of international solidarity, it is a question of the practical means of disintegrating the bourgeois armies and States.

Such a non-party organisation like the Anti-Imperialist League which has such great potentialities for mobilising large masses of the workers in the Metropolitan countries, and linking them up with the colonial workers and countries, is still very weak. This must be remedied.

Coming then, comrades, to the Parties, I will only say this it is a defect that we have such little information regarding the activities of the Parties. One of the fundamental defects which we gather from the literature, reports, and information to hand, is the failure on the part of the Parties to appreciate the imminence of war. I am convinced that many comrades do not believe that the war is coming. The most recent example is the occupation of Shantung. The manifesto of the Comintern was hardly acknowledged by a single Party. Not a single response or reaction in any country over an event which had such far-reaching effects so far as the preparations for war against the Soviet Union were concerned.

The weakness of our propaganda in defence of the Chinese Revolution is a question that the Executive Committee has already taken up and underlined as one of the biggest defects of our Communist activity. The failure to respond on the part of all Sections in regard to the various provocative acts against the Soviet Union is additional evidence of the weakness of our Parties. So, too, is the lack of an international sense amongst our Sections. But, comrades, the question of strengthening our international sense in the various Parties is not a mere organisational question, it is a political one of the most fundamental importance. It is obvious that our Sections have still to learn how to link up the daily political incidents in their own countries with the international problems as a whole.

We must always have in mind Lenin's warning that from small sparks a world conflagration may arise. The Parties must be able to link up every one of these questions with the war preparations of the imperialists. There is need, in my opinion, for a much deeper theoretical training of the whole Sections with a view to raising the political ideological level of the Sections, especially on the linking up of these questions with preparations for war. As yet we must acknowledge our Parties are too schematic in fighting the war danger. They either treat it abstractly or theorise about it, or treat it, which is worse still, as the job of specialists. Of course it is necessary we should have a correct theory, that we should indulge in certain speculations, that we should have specialists for certain activities. But the struggle against war must be the

duty of the Party as a whole, and not the obligation of a Section of the Party, not only a specialised form of activity in the Party. It is necessary to arouse the widest possible mass activity and to explain to the masses the inherent war danger that is imminent in every particular question. Especially must all parliamentary activities be linked up with this kind of mass agitation of our Parties outside parliament in the streets. It is necessary that our Parties go to the soliders, to the masses in the fighting forces, to tell them the truth with regard to the policy of the government, with regard to the objects of the imperialists, to bring forward practical demands that will make an appeal to the soldiers and win them over to the side of the Communists. We cannot seriously talk about the disintegration of the capitalist State, or of the proletarian Revolution unless we are able to know how to appeal to the soliders and win them over to our side. The mechanisation of the armies and militarisation of certain industries also give rise to a number of new problems to which our Parties must pay attention.

I have already referred to greater activity in the industries and the labour organisations concerned with them. Activity in this direction has hardly begun, and yet it is essential if we are going to conduct our anti-war propaganda in the principal industries to have these factory committees in which the Communists can exercise their influence on the working masses. We cannot speak of organised resistance to the war, we dare not speak about a General Strike, of preparing for a General Strike unless we have seriously begun to tackle the question of organising and activising factory committees.

Since the Third Congress our slogan has been: "Go to the masses", and "go to the trade unions". I can recall that during the time of the General Strike, it was brought home to us very forcibly that our work for the promotion of international trade union solidarity had hardly begun. That it was not possible in the most important countries adjacent to Great Britain to stop the sending of a single ton of coal. The same applies to various other labour disputes: It will not be disputed that the work of our Sections in the trade union field at the present time leaves very much to be desired. We must not forget how the trade unions were enlisted in 1914 with the state apparatus in order to secure the production of munitions, and to secure the prosecution of the war for the imperialists.

I have already referred to the steps that are being taken by the imperialists to prepare the unions in the event of war. It is an essential part of our fight against war to make it impossible for the unions to be made part of the capitalist state machine, and to be utilised in the interests of the imperialists.

Further I want to say a word with regard to the lack of attention that is given to the seaport towns. I have referred to our weakness in not being able to prevent ships from leaving the metropolitan countries to go to the colonial countries. It is a fact that at the present time, while some of our Parties have big Sections and exercise influence in many industrial centres, there are many harbour towns and seaport towns where Party organisations do not exist, or where their influence is nil or infinitesimal. It is necessary, if we are seriously going to make the revolution against the imperialists, that we pay more attention to the local organisation of the Party in such a way that the Party's influence will be felt, not only in the industrial centres but also in the harbour and seaport towns, where there may be great potentialities for work among the sailors, which is an essential part of our anti-war work.

I want to draw attention to the important part which the unemployed masses will play. Outside the factories there are millions of workers who might be attached to the factory organisations; millions of workers who are outside of the trade unions. It is necessary that we pay attention to this particular strata of workers and not neglect them. It is from the unemployed workers that the bourgeoisie will be able to secure a big percentage of their recruits.

The militarists are preparing with all means the mechanisation of war. I have referred to the one-man tanks, the aircraft manoeuvres, in connection with which the bourgeoisie

try to create the impression that machinery will lessen the toll of human life. These aircraft manoeuvres are being conducted by the bourgeoisie in such a way, that it is always the defence corps which loses in the attack. That is used as a reason for demanding increased expenditure in connection with the air forces.

Incidentally, it might interest some of the comrades to observe that, at the recent manoeuvres in London, the target that was attacked was a replica of the Kremlin — a very significant point which our propagandists ought not to miss. This example gives us an opportunity to bring home the political objective of the imperialists in carrying through their manoeuvres.

I am sure that the Young Communist League in Great Britain has shown considerable courage, and has done a considerable amount of work in exceptional difficulties. But it is necessary that every conceivable manoeuvre on the part of the bourgeoisie should be brought to the light of day, and every opportunity should be taken to do propaganda for our struggle against imperialist war.

In speaking of militarisation, it is necessary to draw attention to a very important part of our activity, which is very often neglected. I refer to the Communist activity among the women. Large masses of women, we know, are particularly susceptible to pacifist propaganda. The pacifist movements, No More War movements, and various religious pacifist institutions make a special appeal to the women. Large numbers of women participate in these movements, because they do not want war. Some Communists are inclined to neglect, or to treat rather scornfully these so-called bourgeois pacifist institutions amongst the women. I am of the opinion that this is one of the most fertile fields for our Communist propaganda. Amongst the women in these pacifist and No More War movements we have large numbers of our class; women who can be won over to the side of the revolutionary struggle against war, and who can play a very important and significant part in the struggle against war and in the preparation for the proletarian revolution.

I want to emphasise, moreover, that the housewives are able to make a special appeal to the youth, to their own sons and the sons of their relatives; they can exercise an influence over their husbands and brothers and the various relatives in the family.

In addition to the housewives, we have an excellent opportunity also to do propaganda amongst the women engaged in industry, who are paid very low wages, and who are obliged to work under the most appalling conditions.

We must know how to link up the fight for the improvement of the living conditions of these women workers with the struggle against war, as these particular women will be the special object of propaganda in the event of war and be won over as recruits to the munition industries, to the war auxiliary industries.

We must therefore understand how to utilise women's hatred for war in general, to rouse them against the war makers; win them away from the influence of the pacifists, from the religious bourgeoisie; show them that not by way of pacifism but by way of militancy they must fight against the imperialist war makers and war.

By Leninist work and Leninist struggle against the war-makers, we can win the women over to Communism. In this connection I want to commend the splendid example of the women in the British Party who have found a correct way of getting to the women through going to the factories and houses. The housewives are approached by street meetings, door to door canvass; the factory workers are approached by the Party women going to the factories, calling meetings, organising demonstrations to the towns where the provincial women keenly interested in town life are drawn into the mass movement of the women for the demands of the Communist Party.

Of course, it is necessary at this point to say that this work is not women's work alone. The work of the women and amongst the women is part of the common Communist work of the Communist International. This is not a special

women's question; it is simply a special directive for Communist activity better carried through by the women comrades than by the men.

In a similar way we have to have in mind the huge peasant countries where large masses of peasantry do not want to engage in any form of war. On this basis there is a special appeal to the peasantry. The achievements of the peasantry under the proletarian revolution must be brought home in our propaganda. By bringing forward the example of the peasantry of the U. S. S. R. we should organise them to fight against the bourgeois organisations and to come over to the side of the revolution.

In addition to the peasantry, our greatest field for anti-war work is amongst the youth. A war exacts demands and takes its heaviest toll from the young men. Capitalism is especially hard on the young workers. In our modern towns at the present time hundreds of thousands of young workers are being reduced to mere vagabonds because of the failure of capitalism to provide for them skilled occupations, to afford prospects for the future. The capitalists know how to appeal to them as the Young Communists do not seem to understand. They appeal to the youth in connection with camp life, sports of all kinds. In this way they are preparing the youth for the purposes of cannon fodder in the event of war.

Comrade Thälmann spoke on the traditions of youth activity in the sphere of anti-war work, and I endorse his sentiments. Many of our youth are more taken with the glamour of Karl Liebknecht's life than understanding the method in which Karl Liebknecht carried through his anti-war work. Our youth must find the correct way of reaching those young workers who are dispirited with the failure of capitalism to give them work and a future. On the other hand we must be active in the camps, and so forth. Our young Communist League must know how to appear to these young workers and to win them over to the side of the Young Communist movement through the gun, camp, sport movements, which, if combined with revolutionary camaraderie can be an asset for us.

Then, Comrades, the war of 1914—18 was conducted under the sign of freedom for small nationalities. In effect, the Treaty of Versailles accentuated this problem anew by forcibly redistributing territory on an artificial scale to suit the conquerors. There is evidence to show that the National Minorities in Central Europe still play a certain role in world politics. We have endeavoured to pay attention to this question in our theses. The Communist Parties must know how to utilise these movements especially in relation to war.

After the VIII. Plenum, a number of our Parties paid a certain attention to the popularising amongst Party members of the correct Leninist conception of the principles underlying the struggle against imperialist war. But I must say from my observation of the theoretical press and popular press that these fundamental principles have been treated in a rather superficial way. The Parties have still, among other tasks, to learn how to bring forward the partial demands for the men in the fighting forces and this is coincident with the failure of many sections to undertake systematic anti-war work of a mass character. It is not sufficient simply to send one or two young Communists in the bourgeois armies for the purpose of distributing leaflets or carrying through a certain means of spreading propaganda but we have to learn how to link up the grievances of the sailors, soldiers, recruits and those in the air forces with the demands of the industrial workers outside of the forces and conduct the mass propaganda in the army.

Comrades, we cannot speak about bringing about the disintegration of the bourgeois armies until we know how to penetrate the bourgeois armies, how to conduct the propaganda within them in the most skilful way. I say it is fundamental for a Leninist Party that we should have parallel with our legal organisations, which we must never voluntarily abandon, our illegal apparatus. Can we say at the present time that if a war comes all our Parties will be able to insure the continuation of our Communist activity? I am of the opinion that unless we strengthen our illegal apparatus many of our Parties will be found sadly wanting the day war is declared, and

cease to function as Communist organisations. During a war, outside the Soviet Union, we shall all be under conditions of illegality. It is therefore necessary that we prepare our apparatus now. It is necessary that we strengthen our international ties. Comrade Thalman spoke of the possibility of this being the last Congress we shall hold in peace conditions. Comrades, it is necessary for us to take the opportunity now to prepare to fulfil our obligations to Lenin and the heroes of Bolshevism whose labour made it possible for us to meet even in peace, to meet in Red Moscow.

The Communist International was forged in the heat of the war of 1914—18. It has been a powerful instrument in the hands of the revolutionary proletariat these ten years. It has a record of achievement worthy of its great founders and ideological leaders, Marx and Engels. For my part, with all our defects I refuse to believe that the Comintern will not find a way to continue its historic task as the leader of the proletariat when the world war breaks out.

The last world war closed with definite gains for the international proletariat. 1. It conquered one sixth of the globe for socialism; 2. It gave rise to a new army — the army of the Communist International under a single general staff and with millions of sympathetic adherents outside its ranks.

Let the imperialists dare to launch another world war. I am of the opinion and I am sure that you will agree, that if they do Nemesis awaits them.

Let us resolve and make all necessary preparations that another world war will bring the final collapse of imperialism; the victory of the world proletariat over its age-long class enemy, the International bourgeoisie.

Telegram to General Sandino.

Comrade WALLACE (U.S.A.).

In the name of the delegations of all the Latin American Parties and the Delegation of the Workers' (Communist) Party of the United States, I propose to send the following telegram to General Sandino:

"The VI World Congress of the Communist International sends fraternal greetings to the workers and peasants of Nicaragua, and the heroic army of national emancipation of General Sandino, which is carrying on a brave determined struggle against the imperialism of the United States.

American imperialism is becoming ever more aggressive and subjugating the Latin American Republics with the might of its capital and its armed forces, and wishes to convert them into its economic Hinterland.

The struggle for the freeing of the Central American Republics from the yoke of imperialist capitalism is the cause of all the oppressed peoples, of all the exploited workers and peasants of the world. In the front ranks of this struggle against the imperialism of the United States must stand the workers of the United States and the workers and toiling peasants of the Latin American Republics.

The VI World Congress of the Communist International calls upon the Communist Parties, all working class organisations and the entire proletariat of all countries to support the struggle for emancipation of the workers and peasants of Nicaragua.

**Down with the robber imperialism of the United States!
Hands Off Nicaragua!**

Long live the common struggle of the Communist Parties of the Latin American countries and the United States of America against the common enemy — American imperialism!

Down with the imperialist war — long live international solidarity!

Signed: Communist Party of Mexico, Workers' Party of America."

We propose this for the adoption of the Congress.

(Unanimously accepted.)

(Close of Session.)

Eighteenth Session.

Moscow, 1st August 1928 (afternoon).

Co-reports of Comrades Garlandi and Schneller.

CHAIRMAN: Comrade Manuilsky:

COMRADE GARLANDI (Italy):

Comrades, the estimate of the world situation given here by us in the general discussion which was confirmed and emphasised by Comrade Bell, leads us to the conclusion that war is imminent. It is of the utmost importance that this should also be the view of every worker and peasant.

To get a clear picture of the world situation and its war perspectives it is absolutely necessary to give a correct idea of the position of Italy in regard to the war danger.

I will divide my exposé into three parts:

- a) Fascism, as element tending to modify the international status quo.
- b) The Italian proletariat and its experiences in the anti-war struggle.
- c) Our tasks in the face of the approaching war.

The characteristic feature of the post-war economic situation in Italy is the development of the apparatus of production and also the fact that the peace treaties have not given Italy colonies which would have solved the old problem of raw material and outlets. The world war, far from solving this problem, has only aggravated it.

This state of affairs compels Italian capitalism to compete on a market already occupied by foreign capitalism, and to produce cheap goods for this purpose.

Comrades, you know that Italy has neither raw material nor much capital. Reduction of the cost of production in regard to manufactured articles was always obtained in Italy by strong pressure on the working class. This explains why in Italy class differences became accentuated and made their appearance already a long time ago. But in the situation created by the general economic post-war crisis, Italian capitalists did not venture to attack the workers with the old methods. Our capitalists discovered a special political method for the destruction of the strong positions gained by the workers and the deterioration of the economic, and consequently, political conditions

of the working class. In the peculiar economic, social, political and historical conditions of Italy, this method is Fascism.

The Fascist policy is a policy of attack on workers' wages, and generally speaking, on the returns of labour; it is also a policy of war preparations by Italian imperialism.

In the ideological and organisational domain of the State the Fascist war policy manifests itself through an excessive protectionist policy and through the material preparation of all the means of war.

The money inflation period of 1924—1925 gave a certain impetus to the Italian industry; but prolonged inflation in a country which has no big reserves would have headed for catastrophe. Having robbed the Italian population of milliards of lire by inflation, the powers that be, decided on a revalorisation period which laid bare the formidable contradictions of the Italian economy.

Forms of State capitalism which are fairly developed in Italy were able to arrest the development of the new crisis. Recourse to foreign capital (approximately eight milliard lire up to the present) has helped the Italian economy to get out of tight corners and to avoid panics; but the outbreak of the crisis is merely postponed, whereas the elements which will contribute to its extension are accumulating: the industrial reserve army which consists of hundreds of thousands of unemployed (there are at present about one million unemployed in Italy including rural districts) is assuming a permanent character because agriculture can absorb only a very small number of these unemployed, and even then only for a few months of the year.

Apart from the industrial crisis, there is stagnation in agriculture, showing signs of regression. This is the result of a serious crisis which will make thousands of small peasants swell the ranks of agricultural labourers. Consequently, the internal market is shrinking and this frustrates the efforts of big industry to entrench itself on the internal market while it is preparing for external expansion. The serious shrinkage of the internal market in a country where industry produces mainly for consumption, makes the isolation of trade complete and restricts production. Another cause of the shrinkage of the market is the high price of manufactured articles, which limits the exchange of goods between town and country. Internal trade is to a great extent paralysed.

On the other hand, the biggest industrial firms have debts abroad. To enable industrialists to pay interest to their creditors production ought to increase to the amount of the annual payments which the industries have to make to their creditors; but all this pre-supposes a market, the possession of markets. Hitherto, industrialists have satisfied their creditors by making incursions into workers' wages and peasant revenue. Mussolini has come to the conclusion that in the course of last year industrialists have been able to "realise", that is to say, to steal several milliard liras by reducing workers' wages by 20, 30 and even 40%. The "realisations" which the Fascist State has secured by raising taxes by 30% (through the stabilisation of money) have not yet been calculated.

Expansion has become a necessity for Italian capitalism. Fascism proclaims this necessity in the press, in the speeches of its orators and by means of "Colonial Days". "Expansion or collapse" is the slogan of Italian Fascism. War is the only means by which Fascism can hope to overcome the economic crisis.

The organisation of the Fascist State tends also to secure to capitalism more complete control over the masses. The Fascistisation of the youth and the military training given to it in return for all sorts of privileges, the plans for industrial organisation — especially in the chemical industry — which are made in agreement with the military authorities, the intervention of the Fascist State as shareholder in newly established companies of chemical products, manufacture of arms and equipment material, reform in the army and the general staff as well as the big programme for the construction of air-craft — all this reveals fascism as one of the most active elements in the preparation of war.

The State budgets, which are clearly faked, declare that Italy spends six milliard a year for the military budget and one

and a half milliard for the upkeep of the police, which means that roughly 35% of the total revenue are spent for the army and internal defence.

These forms of State capitalism, by accentuating the interdependence of politics and economics, endow Italian capitalism with more power than it had in the past. State capitalism strengthens the State apparatus, especially in regard to the oppression of the masses. This policy gives the State the necessary power to make war.

The aspirations of Italian imperialism are directed towards the Balkans, the Near East, the Red Sea countries and North-West Africa. But it is essential to make the meaning of this expansionist tendency quite clear.

What capital can Italy export? It has endeavoured to explain its lack of capital by over-population, and to discover a road for its expansion by dragging the rags of our destitution along the roads pursued by the foreign capitalists and their appendixes, the Italian capitalists, or by being a means of connection between the colonies and semi-colonies of the big imperialists.

But this policy is the policy of today in view of the fact that Italy aspires to the possession of wealthier colonies, capable of giving it excess profits and enabling it to create new capital. It is self-evident that whichever way Italy turns, it comes into collision with other imperialisms.

Italy cannot have an independent policy: it must move within the orbit of the policy of bigger powers. In the struggle which broke out in the post-war period between Great Britain and France for hegemony in Europe, Fascism was drawn towards Great Britain, and Great Britain made good use of Italy in its political game; it supported Italy whenever British interests did not clash with Italian aspirations; inasmuch as British policy against the U. S. S. R. is concerned, Fascist Italy was a valuable ally.

But it would be nevertheless a mistake to think that Italy subordinates its policy entirely to the wishes of Great Britain and does not try to have certain freedom of action. This freedom is valuable rather from the viewpoint of diplomatic blackmail than for concrete gains. It is, however, a token that any day Fascist Italy might sever the ties which bind it to Great Britain.

If we consider the development of the struggle for European hegemony between Germany and Great Britain, we cannot exclude the possibility of Italy seeking in the near future alliance with Germany against Great Britain. Already in the past capitalist Italy has betrayed alliances and so-called "friendships". If it is true that Italy cannot have an entirely independent policy, it is just as true that Italy can barter away at a given moment its alliance to obtain real gains. In a conflict between Germany and Great Britain for European hegemony all the vanquished countries will be behind Germany or will tender their support to the Entente in order to get compensations from it. It is very probable that Italy, which is for the revision of all the peace treaties of 1919—1920 and the equal distribution of the colonies, will ally itself with Germany and will blackmail the Entente to exact compensations.

There was still quite recently a general belief, which was also shared by the Fascists, that they might let loose war at any moment. The attitude of Fascist Italy in Corfu, Albania and in regard to Yugoslavia, Mussolini's provocative speeches and articles in the Fascist press gave the impression that Fascism was prepared to let loose war. Mussolini had prophesied that 1925 would be a "Napoleonic year". But all this was in the nature of blank cartridge shots to flabbergast the Italian petty-bourgeoisie. Mussolini has not the least intention to break his head in a war in which he would find himself in an isolated position. His last speech delivered in the Senate was that of a man who is coming back to prudence. Mussolini does, of course, everything to keep alive existing antagonisms. But he will not throw himself into a conflict which will not involve the big Powers or in which he will not be supported by the Big Powers. We must explain this unexpected prudence on the part of Mussolini not only by the serious internal situation of Italy, but also by the fact that the big powers are

preparing war against the U. S. S. R. before which all other conflicts must give way.

Comrade Ercoli has already quite correctly remarked that the struggle for hegemony between the imperialists must be considered by us as an aspect and a phase of the imperialist struggle against the U. S. S. R., and that it is precisely in the imperialist struggle against the U. S. S. R. that the struggle between the big imperialisms for hegemony will develop.

Fascist Italy, appendix of the world policy of the stronger imperialism, is not only an instrument of struggle against the U. S. S. R. — it delights in supplying with an ideology the world anti-Soviet coalition by setting Rome against Moscow, that is to say, by setting the so-called "Latin civilisation" against "Asiatic barbarism". What is Communism? It is the question Monsieur Rossoni was asking himself lately, and his answer was that Communism is the product of a monstrous coupling between Chaos and the Apocalypse. Fascists like to pose as one of the poles of the conflict between armed capitalism and proletarian revolution.

One cannot deny that in Italy the struggle against the U. S. S. R. began six years ago; against the vanguard which the U. S. S. R. has in our country, namely, against the revolutionary Italian workers and peasants.

We have frequently asked ourselves the question: what will be the attitude of Italian workers in a war which will bring them into collision with our brothers in the U. S. S. R.? I do not know any other big country in the world, except Russia, where the proletariat has shown as much internationalism as the Italian proletariat. Comrades of North, South and Central America, of France, Belgium, Switzerland and Australia, you know that the Italian proletariat is not chauvinistic, that it is anti-patriotic. The early development of class differentiation and the early intensification of class differences were the result of the rapid concentration of modern industry in the North of Italy and of the permanent destitution of the working classes of the countryside; already long ago they made Italian workers associate the term "fatherland" with the bourgeois class.

The first colonial war in 1893, the war in Erytrea, was undertaken against the will of the people and even against the will of a section of the bourgeoisie. Labour and peasant insurrections in 1896—98 threw open the gates to a wave of socialism in Italy. Neither was there solidarity between the proletariat and the peasantry on the one side and capitalism on the other side in 1911, at the time of the war in Libya.

But, comrades, the Italian proletariat has also had a third experience: that of the world war.

You know that the United Socialist Party was one of the few Socialist Parties in Europe which opposed the war and Italy's entry into the European war. The experience of the Libyan war — as Lenin said during the world war — was utilised by the Italian proletariat in 1914; the secession of Mussolini and a group of intellectuals did not make any difference to the attitude of the Italian Socialist Party which remained solid in its opposition to the World War.

Unfortunately, the position taken up by the Italian Socialist Party was not a revolutionary but a centrist position. The formula "Neither adherence nor sabotage" was defended by this Party at Zimmerwald and Kienthal.

The consequences of the centrist attitude was that the discontent of the workers at the front and in the country itself was not utilised. In reality this formula was translated in the armies and in the interior of the country into the slogan "desertion".

In 1916 and 1917 spontaneous insurrections took place throughout Italy. In 1917 the proletariat was particularly active. Comrades, we also had our 1917. When the news of the Russian February Revolution was received in Italy the soldiers refused to fight. The population was tired and protested. I will tell you of an episode which is rather significant. In the summer of 1917 a delegation sent by the Russian provisional government visited Italy. It was composed of Mensheviks and social revolutionaries, among them Goldenberg, Smirnov and others. This delegation was touring Europe to assure public opinion that Russia would continue the war side by side with

its allies. Well, at the Labour Exchange in Turin the delegation was greeted with "Long Live Lenin!"

A few days later, in August, 1917, an insurrection broke out in Turin. Lenin's name was heard everywhere; this was a few days after the July insurrection in Petrograd which was suppressed by the provisional government. During the Turin insurrection, which lasted four days, five hundred soldiers and workers were killed. Eleven years after this great event which lives in the heart and mind of every revolutionary worker in Italy, we want to pay homage to these five hundred proletarian heroes of Turin, at the VI. Congress of the Communist International.

At the time when the Russian proletariat was overthrowing the provisional government and was seizing power, three Italian armies deserted the war front. The fact is known in history as the "military defeat of Caporetto".

The centrism of the Italian Socialist Party could not but land in Caporetto. Centrism is "peace without victors and vanquished", it is peace pure and simple, it is inert desertion.

Hundreds of soldiers threw down their arms and went home. This insurrection without arms enabled the State to resume control over the military and political forces of the country, and the war went on for another year.

But all these experiences were not a dead loss. The solidarity of the Italian proletariat with the Russian Revolution is deeply rooted and has manifested itself repeatedly in favour of the Russian Revolution, during the war between the U. S. S. R. and Poland and during the famine. The train-loads of arms directed towards Poland were very seldom allowed to cross the frontier. Railwaymen organised an effective control. In the arms factories workers sabotaged the production of arms ordered by Poland. Thousands of projectiles lay idle because they could not be used by the Polish army.

The experience which we had gained was also used by us to prevent the dispatch of soldiers to Albania in 1920. The mutiny in Ancona in 1920 was accompanied by the slogan "evacuation of Albania".

All these experiences have greatly helped to develop the post-war subjective revolutionary elements in Italy and you know that if in 1920 the proletariat did not take up openly the struggle for power this is due to the fact that the centrism of 1915—1917 dominated the policy of our Socialist Party in the post-war period. We have had no Party which can be called the Party of the revolution. Centrism throttled the revolutionary elan of the masses in 1917—1919—1920.

Today we must add the Fascist experiences to all the others.

We occupy a special position in regard to the war danger. The slogan "transformation of imperialist war into civil war" can be translated by us in Italy into the slogan "transformation of the Fascist war into civil war against Fascism". This interpretation is more comprehensible to the masses and is also understood by the anti-fascist petty bourgeoisie. The defeatism of the proletarian class of the world towards the government of the bourgeoisie which lets loose war is, with us, also the defeatism of the people towards Fascism which is preparing to let loose and wage war.

Although the Italian regime concentrates maximum power in the hands of the big bourgeoisie it contains also many negative elements in the event of the bourgeoisie having to call out the masses for war. With a terrorist regime at home, one cannot carry on, with any chance of victory, a modern war without endeavouring to do something to appease the people.

In the Italian political situation the tasks of the Communist Party are different from those in the other countries in regard to the so-called labour party and the parties of the petty bourgeoisie which have been dissolved by Fascism and whose activity has been suppressed. But what will be the position of these democratic and social-democratic parties in the face of an international coalition against the U. S. S. R.? The Italian social democrats and reformists have already shown their solidarity with the international social democracy by taking up an anti-Soviet Russia attitude. A document of the reformist

socialist party of Italy declares that Fascism will not be destroyed in Italy until the Bolshevik Utopia is destroyed. In the event of an imperialist and social democratic war against the U. S. S. R. this can lead to a united front between social democracy and Fascism.

The struggle against social democracy which we have been pursuing relentlessly for years, must be intensified at the base, ideologically as well as politically. All of us are convinced that the conflict between us and the social democrats, that is to say, between the revolutionary proletariat and capitalism together with its social democratic ally, will be in the end solved by force of arms. The coming wars and the war against the U. S. S. R. will be directed, ideologically and politically, by social democracy on an international scale. Therefore, we must make the proletariat react immediately to this new unheard of treachery for which social democracy is preparing.

Comrades, we have also other ideological tasks before us. There have been deviations in some sections of the Italian proletariat and even in our own circles. One of these deviations asserts that the liberation of the proletariat from Fascism can only come through war which alone will put arms into the hands of the workers. The second is: we must encourage war. This deviation made its appearance at the end of 1926 and in 1927, especially among the Italian immigrants in France. It asserts that in the event of war between France and Italy the proletariat of the two countries must support "democratic France" against Fascist Italy.

These two deviations express the desire of the proletariat to struggle against Fascism. One must not underestimate the fact that in both cases we witness the ardent desire of Italian workers for arms; but in the first case, we must explain to our comrades and the workers that war is manslaughter on a large scale and that we must prevent it by all the means at our disposal, because only by such means will we be able to transform it, once it has broken out. In the second case we must come to an agreement with the French comrades — among whom there are unfortunately still some who suffer from the chauvinist and democratic disease — that a war between Italy and France would be a war between two imperialisms and that in such a case the duty of the proletariats of the two countries will be to take up arms against the government of the two countries for the seizure of power by the proletariat, an indispensable condition for the realisation of a genuine peace policy and true liberty.

Fascism is preparing the youth for war. In this domain special tasks are confronting our **Young Communist League** which has glorious anti-militarist traditions, and also our Party. Struggle against Fascism in all domains, struggle for the capture and organisation of the masses, work in rural districts, work among women, must be intensified owing to the imminence of war.

But the fundamental question on which we must concentrate our attention is improvement of our Party so as to enable it to direct the revolutionary policy of the masses in case of war. This problem all the Parties have in common; this was also emphasised in Bukharin's report. I think that the Org Department of the C. I. must make this question the order of the day. This question is connected with the exchange of experiences gained by illegal parties and with the problem of collateral liaison and liaison with the Executive of the C. I. in the event of war. These problems must be carefully studied and solved.

As soon as war breaks out the problem of transforming imperialist war into civil war will become the order of the day in all the belligerent countries. To secure influence in works and factories becomes a fundamental problem. We cannot develop our trade union work during the war but we must establish ourselves now more firmly in the factories. If we remained outside the factories we would estrange ourselves from the masses. The factory is part of the war front. Defeatism is: letting loose class struggle not only at the front but throughout the country.

In the rural districts too we must link up our work with the imminence of war. In the next war the percentage of peasants in the armies will be bigger than in 1914—18. The anti-war and anti-imperialist struggle in the countryside helps

our struggle in the army. Therefore, all the problems of illegal work and organisation must be revised, even in the case of illegal parties. I think that I need not enlarge on this argument here.

Comrades, past experience and the fighting capacity demonstrated on various occasions by the Italian proletariat tell us that the struggle against war and Fascism will find Italian workers at their post. It goes without saying that struggle against war before and after its outbreak is a very difficult struggle; it is the most difficult struggle to which a Communist Party can be called, it is the struggle for revolution. If we succeed in understanding the great tasks in store for us, if we are able to pursue a correct energetic and unhesitating policy, we will succeed in Italy and in the other countries to transform the next imperialist war into a **Red October of the world proletariat**.

Before the next speaker takes the floor the chairman, Comrade **Manuilsky**, informs the Congress of the arrival of Comrade **Bela Kun**.

Comrade SEMARD:

Comrades! Comrade **Bela Kun** has returned and is now again among us.

We must emphasise before the VI. World Congress that thanks to the action of the international proletariat, thanks to the agitation initiated in all countries against his extradition and for his liberation, Comrade **Bela Kun** has been torn from the claws of the reaction. Our Comrade **Bela Kun** was menaced with surrender into the hands of the Hungarian dictator, in order that the latter might have its revenge against the fighter who had stood at the head of the Hungarian revolution. Today our Comrade **Bela Kun** resumes his place in the ranks of the revolutionary fighters.

Comrades, even though it is not customary in our International to give way to noisy demonstrations in welcoming courageous revolutionary soldiers who are victims of class reaction, we must nevertheless hail, in our Comrade **Bela Kun**, the brave **Hungarian revolutionary fighters**, the innumerable victims of the White Terror and Fascism, and the revolutionary movement in the various countries, especially in **China**. At our Congress, at our Party meetings, and in our class army which the Communist International represents, we must put upon the agenda the honouring of these courageous revolutionary class fighters.

Comrades, the Presidium proposes that Comrade **Bela Kun** be elected a member of the **Presidium of the VI. Congress** (Applause).

Comrade **Bela Kun** is thereupon unanimously elected to the Presidium of the Congress.

Comrade SCHNELLER (Germany):

Comrades, it is necessary and important to make clear to our own comrades that our struggle against the war danger cannot merely be a question of simply avoiding the mistakes made by the Social Democracy in the August days of 1914, as if the Social Democrats for the first time 14 years ago, in the August days, had suddenly departed from the revolutionary path — this policy was only then revealed to the masses — and secondly, as if we did not have to carry out our work under utterly different conditions than did the International Labour movement of 14 years ago. I should like to make a few remarks on this very difference between the conditions of our struggle 14 years ago and those of the present time, in order to make clear thereby how tremendous is the present responsibility of the Communist Party and of the Communist International, and, at the same time, how great are the opportunities which the Communist Parties have to-day in all countries for the conduct of successful struggle against the imperialist war danger.

What are the most important conditions, factors and features which distinguish the situation today from that which we faced 14 years ago. In the camp of the imperialists there have unquestionably been big changes. First, new powers have arisen. Secondly, the grouping of forces which prevailed 14 years ago no longer exists to-day, other alliances and blocs have come into existence, which in their mutual contradictions have not taken on a consolidation, a development, like that prior to 1914; the relations are much less stable, other contradictions have come to the foreground and these contradictions have a far more extensive effect than was the case 14 years ago.

The second thing that must be recognised is that the bourgeoisie has drawn its lessons from the world war of 1914—18, that today militarism, connected up with a growing State capitalism, permeates social life and all fields of activity of capitalist society far more inclusively than was the case before 1914. I will elucidate this in greater detail on the basis of the German example. The third factor is the existence of the League of Nations as an instrument of imperialist war policy against the Soviet Union and against the revolting oppressed peoples. The fourth factor is the strengthening of reaction in all imperialist countries due to the most varied causes, both for the purpose of preserving exploitation generally and for the execution of the war policy in particular. The fifth factor is the crystallisation of fascism as a special movement, and the sixth is the changed position of reformism, the integration of the heads of the reformist bureaucracy with the State apparatus and with the employers' associations.

And what factors have developed on the revolutionary front? 1. we have to-day a Communist International, which not only has Sections in all oppressed countries, but which also has a big influence over the mass organisations of the proletariat; 2. the existence of the Soviet Union with a constantly growing socialist construction; 3. the colonial revolutionary movement in China, India and other countries; 4. the great strengthening of the Leftward development, the radicalisation and the revolutionary movement generally in all countries; 5. the radicalisation, extending beyond the proletarian camp into the ranks of the peasantry, and into the ranks of the urban petty bourgeoisie.

From these changes, which may be further supplemented, we see quite clearly, as a perspective, that the world wars which will result from the imperialist conflicts, will set into motion far greater masses and will take on a far greater scope than did the war of 1914—18. We see furthermore from the above enumerated facts that the class character of the reactionary wars "par excellence", that war against the Soviet Union, against the oppressed peoples, is much harder to camouflage than was the case prior to 1914. We see furthermore that the bourgeoisie is forced to mobilise all the reserves it has at its disposal — economic, military and in the masses, in order to get a guarantee that it will be able to carry on its war policy and emerge from the war with prospects of success. But it is less able than in 1914 to choose the favourable moment for the blow. It is far less master of its own policy than was the case to a certain degree prior to 1914. Furthermore, we see that for the Communist International the conditions of the struggle are unquestionable more favourable than they were prior to 1914 for the relatively small groups of revolutionists. We see at the same time, however, that the Communist International, precisely because it exists as a well knit organisation, has a much greater responsibility to the working class than was the case prior to 1914, when the responsibility lay upon the shoulders of those who, in relatively small and loose organisations heroically took up the struggle against the war policy. Every mistake today made by the Communist Parties will have a much more fateful effect than the minor mistakes made by revolutionists during the great slaughter of 1914—18. And precisely from this we must draw the conclusion that the Communist Parties must approach the fulfilment of their tasks with greater responsibility, with greater energy, conscientiousness, penetration, and determination.

The War Policy of the New German Imperialism.

The defeat of 1918 temporarily destroyed German imperialism, for the time made Germany dependent upon the im-

perialist world powers, disarmed Germany and subjected it to tribute. Comrades, the result was that the position of Germany in the imperialist world became a source of danger to the bourgeoisie in the whole of Western Europe, a source of danger of proletarian revolution. And all through the years 1918—23 the German bourgeoisie was therefore able to a large extent, in the struggle against the proletariat, to count upon the vigorous support of the West European imperialist powers. But on the other hand the German bourgeoisie tried to exploit the antagonisms of the imperialist powers of the West both among themselves and with the Soviet Union, by determining upon a certain eastward orientation, and for a time it sought closer contact with the Soviet Union, as expressed in the Rapallo Treaty.

Comrades, in 1923 the menace of Germany's position to the entire imperialist world was recognised, especially by America. The Western Powers, especially Britain and America, offered an opportunity through their credit policy, for the building of a new German imperialism which was able to get on its feet thanks to the fact that the Social Democratic Party, through its tremendous apparatus, and vast influence, supported this reconstruction of German imperialism with all its might.

With its increased productivity and improved technique, German monopoly capital dominates the most important industries to a far greater degree than prior to 1914. More than 80% of total production is in the hands of monopoly capital in the following industries: iron smelting, coal, chemicals, clay mining, electric industry, car building, ship building, ocean and coast shipping, public utilities, (gas, water, electricity) etc. This monopoly capital, which was able to develop in the course of recent years, is however burdened in its development by the following factors: 1. The Dawes Plan, which demands from Germany an annual tribute of 2½ milliards; 2. the lack of colonies and adequate spheres of interests, adequate participation in the world market; 3. the lack of an adequate army and navy, by the occupation of the Rhinland and finally also by the boundaries fixed by the Versailles Treaty. German Imperialism has built itself up anew; it now seeks to play a more powerful independent role. These attempts are bound up with the entrance of Germany into the League of Nations and its Council, and the German bourgeoisie is utilising every chance to put on the trappings of a big power already at the present time, and to demand that the other powers shall respect German imperialism. In the Italian-Yugoslavian conflict, Germany immediately offered to play the role of mediator, and now Germany is intervening in the present Polish-Lithuanian conflict. Since 1925 Germany has achieved a certain freedom in the concluding of customs agreements and trade treaties. Naturally Germany makes broad use of this opportunity in order to further its imperialist interests. Recently Germany tried to strengthen its imperialist position by a pronounced leaning towards America. The Kellogg Pact of the American bourgeoisie is of course solely directed towards the deception of the broad masses throughout the world; it is not only an election manoeuvre, but at the same time it is a signal that the United States of America is trying to intervene more than hitherto in European affairs, in order to prevent the exploitation of the League of Nations or the various prevalent European constellations, for the creation of a broad bloc against the United States under Franco-British leadership. The Kellogg Pact is thus an attempt to utilise the contradictions in Europe itself for the benefit of a strengthened position of the United States, and Germany immediately understood this situation and put herself in the forefront of the propaganda for this Kellogg Pact. This Pact, like all others in the past into which Germany entered, (entrance into the League of Nations, signing of the Locarno Treaty, etc.), is consciously directed against the Soviet Union. I only call to your attention to the fact that in replying to the Kellogg Pact the British negotiator made the express reservation that such powers as the Soviet Power must be excluded from participation in this Pact from the very beginning. The German Government also ratified the proposal that for the time being it is not possible to include the Soviet Union and thereby admitted that the Pact is directed against the Soviet Union. By this the character of Germany's policy is clearly expressed and there is no doubt that since the Locarno Treaty, since the entrance of Germany into the League of

Nations, Germany is more and more ostentatiously and openly adopting the Western orientation; at the same time she is playing with the idea of assuming or maintaining closer relations with the Soviet Union only in the hope of obtaining certain concessions. Of course the German bourgeoisie strives to get the highest possible price for this open and complete compliance, and what is most important for the German bourgeoisie is that the disarmament provisions of the Versailles Treaty shall be suspended and that certain boundary changes shall be made in the East. Certainly, in the question of disarmament Germany adopted a different position towards the Soviet Union than did Great Britain. The German bourgeoisie flirted a bit with this proposal. The bourgeoisie is only interested in obtaining "justice" in the disarmament question, that means "as long as the other States do not disarm we also want to be able to arm in proportion to our strength and political necessity, in proportion to our population", etc.

The German bourgeoisie declares itself bound by the so-called Berlin Neutrality Treaty between the Soviet Union and Germany, and claims that it does not intend taking part in this war activity; in case of a war, Germany would remain neutral. Well, this neutrality phrase is not only championed by the German bourgeoisie, it is advocated to a much greater extent by the Social Democracy. Certainly, comrades, it is conceivable that for a certain time the German bourgeoisie would remain formally neutral, but only formally. For Germany is the predestined jumping-off place, the best mustering ground and armoury for the struggle against the Soviet Union, and there is not a country in Europe which has such great economic reserves as Germany with regard to armament industry, and none of them can be so speedily made ready as the German armament industry. It is the most highly monopolised, the most powerfully organised country on a State capitalist basis; it is most quickly adapted to the production of war material. The German bourgeoisie, which is striving to play an independent role, knows perfectly well that only if it interferes with all its energies in such conflicts will it be able anew to play a role among the imperialist powers.

And if we consider the economic situation, if we perceive that the German bourgeoisie is engaged in a constantly increasing competition with France and Great Britain in Europe itself, and how German industry is more and more orientating towards trade relations with the Border States, if we see that Britain is being systematically crowded out there, if we perceive furthermore that in all recent economic negotiations the German bourgeoisie has tried to raise the question of the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union, that it has allied with the French bourgeoisie to put through its demands, then it should be quite clear that the rising will-to-power of the German imperialists is seeking an outlet. It sees in the crushing of the Soviet Union the relatively best means by which the German bourgeoisie can share in a new division of the world market, getting a sufficiently big piece for itself and at the same time effecting changes with respect to the Dawes Plan, armaments etc. Even if Germany were not driving directly towards an open conflict for the extension of its position, she is certainly participating in every sharpening of hostility against the proletarian State in one way or another. Just as she exploits every imperialist conflict, simultaneously she concentrates her forces in an increasing degree upon the "solving of the Eastern problem".

But, comrades, we must not under-estimate the fact that Germany has also prepared armaments in a military sense which puts her into a position to raise an effective army in the shortest time. The former Reichswehr Minister, Gessler, a year ago stated quite openly that the disarmament provisions were valid so long as no conflict broke out in Europe; as soon as it breaks out these provisions are not valid any more. Still more clearly was the role of the newly arising militarism characterised by the present Reichswehr Minister, Gröner, who says that the immediate tasks in the military policy of the German bourgeoisie is to put Germany in a position to participate in any League of Nations Executive in accordance with the fighting forces of Germany, that the most important question of foreign policy is the abolition of the disarmament provisions.

The German bourgeoisie needs a very strong ideological influence in the direction of positively winning over the broad

masses for its policy. The measures carried out by the German bourgeoisie in recent years for the purpose of protecting its rear and of preventing the strengthening of Communist influence may be briefly sketched as follows:

1. A sharp attack upon the Red Front Fighters League. I need only mention the threatened prohibition, the interdiction of anti-militarist propaganda in connection with its parades, etc.

2. An intensified struggle against the Young Communist League and against the Spartacus Bund.

3. The prohibition especially of anti-militarist work of the C. P. G., of the mobilisation against the war policy of the German bourgeoisie. I would remind you that on no field are there so many prohibitory measures and persecutions as precisely on this field. The struggle against our work in the Reichswehr, among the police, is waged with unparalleled determination. These measures in the struggle against the Communist Party are supplemented by the general measures against the proletariat. I would remind you of the youth laws which are directed against the activity of the Y. C. L., the national school law, which was quite clearly presented by our speaker, Comrade Clara Zetkin, in the German Reichstag as one of the means of training willing and cheap instruments, by means of clericalisation and cultural stupefaction, for the war policy and naturally also for the whole intensified exploitation policy of the German bourgeoisie.

I would remind you of the arbitration system, and also of the attempts by means of the slogan of the "united state" to bring about a further strengthening of the power of the bureaucracy, a restriction of parliamentarism, and democratic rights.

And finally the German bourgeoisie is doing everything possible in supporting the nationalist organisations in the winning of women and youth, and in their work in the rural districts.

The Fascist Movement.

But the most important role in the war policy of the bourgeoisie, and naturally also in its imperialist policy as a whole, is played by the Fascist movement and by reformism.

Comrades, the fascist movement in Germany, which, as in various other countries, in former years had the chief task of suppressing the labour movement, of demoralising the labour movement, above all in the interest of capitalist stabilisation, at present is increasingly placed in the direct service of the war plans of the imperialists. This is shown very clearly for Germany in the way that the stahlhelm, the strongest armed organisation of the bourgeoisie, more and more clearly adopts an imperialist policy. The Fascist movement alone would unquestionably not represent a very great factor in the present situation. But we must see the possibilities of development and activity which it has, before all in the bourgeois sport movement where 5 millions are united, a good part of them workers, small farmers and members of the middle class, furthermore the big organisations of the Red Cross, with over a million members; the Young Christian and Young Nationalist organisations which comprise more than 1½ million youths, and the Christian and Nationalist Women's Associations which have hundreds of thousands of women in their ranks. We see what a role is played by the Fascist organisations in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Roumania and Italy, and there it is clearly shown that these organisations are the reserves for supplementing the standing armies, the reserves for the imperialist armies, for the blackleg organisations and the militarisation of the factories in a new war. At the same time one must bear in mind that the Fascist organisations are gaining influence in the State apparatus to a greater extent than hitherto, and they are consciously working for the permeation of the State apparatus. This movement could establish itself and get a footing in various countries not only thanks to its own strength, but also to a large extent owing to the policy of the Social Democracy. It is characteristic also for Germany that certain relations between the Fascist and reformist movement are becoming ever closer because they are more and more clearly marching towards the same goals. A section of old Social Democrats, who have a long tradition, have formed

a Fascist organisation under the title of "Old Social Democratic Party", which collaborates with avowed Fascists. The role of reformism in imperialist policy and the collaboration of reformism and Fascism as instruments of the bourgeoisie is of decisive importance not only for Germany but for all countries.

The Role of Reformism.

Comrades, this position of the II. International is closely bound up not only with a support of bourgeois democracy and of the imperialists, but also with a conscious sharp turn against the Soviet Union. I will quote very briefly from last year's May Day Manifesto of Amsterdam, in which it is stated:

"Dictatorship means a constant danger of war, regardless of the form in which it appears, regardless of what colour it wears: Fascism with its black, Bolshevism with its Red Army clash with the powers of capitalist imperialism in order to incite the peoples once more against each other."

And still more frankly than the Amsterdamers, the leadership of the II. International say the same. I will only remind you of the **Marseilles Congress of the II. International in 1925**. At this Congress the question of war was dealt with and in a resolution on the war danger in the East the position of the II. International towards the Soviet Union was clearly formulated. It is necessary, at our Congress, to remind the workers of this decision.

In this decision "the Russian people" are called upon:

"...to strive for the establishment of complete political and trade union liberty in the Soviet Union, and to resist all annexationist policies of their own government as well as all propaganda aiming at forcible intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries.

The L. S. I. is conscious of the fact that the war danger would be greatly diminished if the decision on war or peace would not lie in the hands of a dictatorial power, but in the hands of the peoples of the Soviet Union themselves. The International therefore emphatically supports the efforts of the Socialist Parties of the Soviet Federation to bring about the democratisation of the regime in the Soviet Union and the establishment of political freedom."

Quite consistently Kautsky interpreted this resolution last year in such a way that the intentions of intervention by the imperialist powers must be supported provided that they would permit a greater freedom of Social Democratic propaganda in the interior of the country. He converts himself into a propagandist for the measures carried out by the imperialists in various stages and with various methods, in order to encircle the Soviet Union, in order to discredit and provoke the Soviet Union.

Comrades, the decisions made during the last years by the various bodies of the Second International all aim at propagating that bourgeois democracy and monopolist capitalism, as they exist today, are developing more and more in the direction of securing peace. Democracy means peace, League of Nations means peace. But the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet Union, these mean danger of war, the disturbance of peace. Comrades, when in these days the II. International, the so-called international, comes together in Brussels and makes a decision on the disarmament theses, we should make use of the weapon which it places in our hands in order to expose and to defeat reformism on the broadest front. This resolution, which was adopted in February of this year in Zürich at a preliminary discussion of the war question by the II. International, is a document that must be studied by all Sections of the Communist International and must be utilised in the every-day propaganda in combating reformism. Because of the limited time I will not quote any details from the document.

We need emphasise only one point: on the question of the constitution of the armies it is stated that complete freedom must be given to each of the powers to choose whatever army constitution it wishes. Every social democracy can adapt itself to "its" own bourgeoisie. This wonderful international has

therefore refrained from making any decision of its own as to a positive solution of the question.

Well, we must realise that our position towards the reformists was a simpler one at a time when the reformists acted, so to say, in contradiction to their own decisions. Now they have created a theory with which they attempt to persuade the proletariat that their policy is a socialist policy. Socialist policy in support of imperialism! Thereby they try to lull the toiling masses to sleep, to create such passivity as will smother all resistance to war preparations in their inception, while at the same time furnishing the basis for a campaign of incitement against the Soviet Union as a disturber of peace, in the social sphere and as a disturber of peace on a world scale.

The theoretical basis of this position of the reformists is the theory of ultra-imperialism, as it was again developed by Hilferding at the Kiel Party Congress of the German Social Democracy, in order to justify the whole policy of support by the German Social Democracy for the new German imperialism, with all the concomitant phenomena which belong to it: State capitalism, economic democracy, coalition policy, pursuance of a split policy in the proletariat. And this policy is what the Social Democratic leaders call a "real" pacifism, connected with a real propaganda for defence of the fatherland, of the League of Nations and of the imperialist treaties which proclaim that wars of attack are forbidden, that armaments are only necessary against the disturbers of peace, and for the defence of the allied nations.

If there should be need for proofs of the effects of this policy they were furnished best of all by the German Social Democrats in their present coalition government: who raised as the most essential programme item the "enlargement of the Reichswehr within the bounds of possibility". Thus the German Social Democracy has obviously adopted the armament programme of the new German imperialism. The deceitful pacifist propaganda of the Social Democratic Parties has already attained a stage at which it transforms itself into social Fascism. I take as an example the Reichsbanner movement in Germany. This movement is at present being built up as a political organisation which will be able to defend the "fatherland" in case Germany is "threatened". Thus it is already a nationalist-inclined organisation. And this rôle as a nationalist organisation is combined with an intensified struggle against the Red Front. Just as in Poland the Social Democratic "monitors" are incited against Communist demonstrators, we see the same phenomenon in Germany; it has revealed itself in the various election struggles, in the election demonstrations, and it is particularly revealed after the election struggle in the slogan: Reichsbanner! Turn left against the Red Front!

The policy of the Social Democracy not only shows a general turn against the Soviet Union but especially in the present situation the Social Democracy makes itself the whip of German imperialism against the Soviet Union. It was precisely the Social Democratic leaders who, on the occasion of the breaking off of trade negotiations owing to the arrest of the engineers for acts of sabotage in the Don Basin, demanded that sharper measures must be initiated against the Soviet Union, that a struggle must be waged against the foreign trade monopoly. Not one pfennig more credit for the industry of the Soviet Union, etc. One step further is taken by the present Reichs Chancellor, Herman Müller, who declared in February of this year that Germany must defend itself against the foreign policy of the Soviet State which still contains elements of the former Czarist policy, and which if it only could, would attack Germany.

This policy of the Social Democratic Parties and of the II. International as a whole would not be effective to a greater extent, just at this time of Leftward development, when the masses are seeking new ways to defend their interests, if the Social Democracy was not propped up by the policy of the "Left" Social Democracy. The policy of the "Left" in the Social Democracy reveals itself more clearly than anywhere else on the field of the struggle against the imperialist war policy — how by means of sham radical phrases it is attempting to prevent a real Leftward development and to camouflage the policy of the leaders of the International.

The "Klassenkampf", the political organ of these "Lefts" in Germany, states in an article that the best weapon for the struggle against the war danger is the strongest possible, united proletariat, and that the unification of the proletariat is only possible in the struggle against reformism. And this article is immediately followed by another which states that the unification of the proletariat must be realised, that the greatest obstacle to this unity is the fact that the largest sections of the proletariat have been cut off by Bolshevism, which is the enemy of the proletariat.

The situation is similar with respect to their attitude towards the Soviet power. They shout with all their might: Hands off the Soviet Union! They write enthusiastic articles on the Red Army, but, in the same breath, they discredit the Soviet Union and its policy as one of building up capitalism, as a policy which sacrifices the interests of the workers for the benefit of a newly rising bourgeoisie, and at the same time accusing the Soviet State of "red imperialism". The "Left" Social Democratic leaders know perfectly well that precisely on the question of the Soviet Union, in the question of attitude towards the war danger and also in the question of power in general, the workers are most distrustful towards the Social Democracy, that they are beginning to doubt their party on these most fundamental questions. And that is why the "Left" Social Democratic leaders are binding the masses in this direction. They even go so far as to declare that the best guarantee for the maintenance of the dictatorship in Soviet Russia is the West European democracy. And in this way they try to prove that the Social Democracy is a factor in support of the Soviet power, a factor in the struggle against the imperialist war plans against the Soviet Union.

Comrades, they naturally also try, in part, to fake up apparently radical measures before the proletariat, such as their support of the movement of the conscientious objectors, which has unquestionably been under-estimated by us in Germany. In a relatively small district with a population of 500,000, the "Left" Social Democrats succeeded in getting 80,000 signatures pledging individual refusal of war service. They assert furthermore, that in the most important industrial district, in the Ruhr, they have collected 200,000 signatures. Since this question plays a role also in another connection it will be necessary to concretise the struggle against this pseudo-radical pacifist slogans in such a manner that we will not simply take up a negative attitude and say that this does not concern us, that this is nonsense, but instead we must understand how to oppose cleverly to this action which speculates on mass sentiment, our revolutionary propaganda. For we must realise that here is an element of danger, viz. the exploitation of the pacifist sentiments of the workers for a policy in favour of the social imperialists and directed against the Soviet Union. I should like to emphasise this particularly on the basis of experiences we had in connection with the incitement of the Social Democracy over alleged supplies of munitions and poison gas from the Soviet Union to Germany, where we did not intervene in time in order to expose the swindle and the diversion manoeuvres of the Social Democracy. We realise that with the intensification of the situation against the Soviet Union the role of the Social Democracy and above all of its pacifist wing will become more and more dangerous. Let us just consider briefly the role that the Social Democracy will play at the outbreak of the war or immediately preceding it. We have an example of the British Social Democracy how it behaved in the blockade and intervention by British warships against the Chinese revolution. Here the Social Democracy came forward with a warning to the Chinese revolutionists, and there can be no doubt that with the adoption of more drastic measures against the Soviet Union the Social Democrats will come forward and warn the Soviet State to maintain peace, to surrender, and they will say: the responsibility rests with you. And also during the war they will pose as pacifists and seek to cover up their social patriotic, their anti-Communist, their counter-revolutionary role with hypocritical speeches, saying: the Soviet Union must give in, the Soviet Union must surrender. And in addition they will at the same time appeal to the workers of all countries with the outrageous lies that they must help "the oppressed workers and peasants in the Soviet Union", that only the dictatorship is to blame for the war, while the imperialists are not guilty.

Comrades, this dangerous role of the Social Democracy and of the "Left" leaders of the Social Democracy must be kept in

mind if we want to estimate the tremendous responsibility which rests upon us in the struggle against reformism, against the imperialist war danger, in the struggle for the fulfilment of the tasks with which we are confronted.

And now I come to the last part, to our tasks. The question of the war menace, of the struggle of the Communists against war policies, should not be raised as a special task detached from the whole of our policies, as if the question of war was an independent and separate question, and not the continuation of policies by other means. We cannot afford to bide our time until the outbreak of the war, to launch then our slogan: "Convert the war into civil war"; but we are rather confronted with the task of opposing the war policy already during the period of preparation for war, by taking advantage of the Left wing movement, of the intensification of the class contradictions, and of the mass struggles, to mobilise for the social revolution.

We are fully alive to the fact that the existence and the policy of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern are a great hindrance to the bourgeoisie in the pursuit of its imperialist policies. The more active our struggle, the more energetic we are in the pursuit of our aims and in the mobilisation of the masses, the greater are the chances that the revolutionary movement will to a greater extent delay the war measures, and even prevent in a certain sense the outbreak of war. Of course, as long as capitalism exists the outbreak of war cannot be prevented in the sense that we can prevent war altogether, but if we were to put the case so that wars are inevitable, that it is impossible to develop beforehand revolutionary movements, this would mean that we do not fully understand our task.

We must realise that the bourgeoisie has gone already very far in its war preparations and war policies against the Soviet Union; that the conflict of interests is steadily growing; but we must realise at the same time that we have great possibilities of activity, of asserting our revolutionary influence. The more we utilise these possibilities during the period of war preparation, even with the goal of social revolution where an acute revolutionary situation exists; the more we influence and mobilise the masses in this direction, the better we shall wage the fight against the war policies, and the easier it will be for us to face the situation on the outbreak of war when it will be our task to convert the imperialist war into civil war.

The bourgeoisie has fully grasped the significance of the Communist movement in this respect. It now behoves us to bring this fact home not only to ourselves and to our organisation, but also to the largest masses of the toilers.

I say there are great possibilities for pursuing an active policy against the war policies of the imperialists, and for the defence of the Soviet Union; these possibilities consist in the general radicalisation of the masses of the proletariat, in the country and among the urban petty bourgeoisie, in the great sympathy movement for the Soviet Union which goes far beyond the ranks of the proletariat, and last but not least, in the anti-militarist sentiment which has strongly developed in Germany in connection with the most recent events. The question is whether we shall be able to take advantage of these sentiments and possibilities so as to consciously guide them in the direction of the fight against the war danger and against the designs of war on the Soviet Union. Mass activity is the main thing! All special work must be subordinated to and incorporated with this work, if we really wish to be successful.

The linking up of legal and illegal work essentially depends upon the extent to which we understand how to concretise the work among the masses. Unfortunately we must state that we have still failed in sufficiently anchoring this work among the masses, that our Party organisation conducts the fight against the war danger more or less in an abstract manner, without being properly informed of the specific phases of the measures now taken by the new German imperialism in the special preparation for war. The concretisation of these measures, and the concretisation of our agitation, will enable us to arouse the revolutionary initiative of the proletariat; this renders necessary the combination of legal and illegal work. This is essential for the furtherance of this task in general.

Such is precisely the case with our anti-militarist activity. Of course, anti-militarist work is much more difficult in Ger-

many under the system of a mercenary army than it is in countries where general conscription is in force. But it is quite impossible to state in the Theses that the work in a mercenary army is very difficult and that the work in such a mercenary army should be considered as working against the officers of an army based upon conscription. I consider this to be a big exaggeration. There absolutely exists a possibility of working even in a mercenary army like the German Reichswehr, although this work is very difficult, if there is the proper attitude towards this army as well as towards the militarised police forces — among the Party generally and among the proletariat outside of the Party. Finally, one more point: it is essential, on the basis of our experiences and of the facts mentioned by Comrade Bell, that each individual party be charged with the task of drawing up concrete plans for the activity against the menace of imperialist war.

We are quite aware of the fact that in the campaign against the Soviet Union there will be tremendous importance attached to strikes, above all, to strikes in such industries which are particularly important to an imperialist war. The work in the trade unions and in the factories must be pursued with particular persistence and energy in the essential districts and enterprises which may be of importance to an efficient anti-war action. It is, therefore, essential to include in this plan all that has been said by Comrade Bell in regard to the activity among the women, among the peasants, among the youth, among the petty bourgeoisie, etc. All this must be incorporated in the plan, and we must see to it that the Comintern should carefully control from time to time the work accomplished on the different points.

Comrades, we must certainly take advantage of the different possibilities arising in connection with war conflicts. We cannot rely entirely upon one particular situation, we must adapt our organisations to the different possibilities which may present themselves, utilising the necessary energy and ability in every phase of the fight against war. So far we have lacked this manoeuvring ability. We have seen this in the German Party in connection with various possibilities, both in connection with support of the Chinese Revolution, when it was a case of preventing the shipments of munitions to the bourgeois counter-revolution, and in connection with the recent militarist preparations against the Soviet Union.

I should like to refer here to an experience we had in regard to mass activity. In Germany we have in the Red Front League an organisation which has the special task of combating fascism and the imperialist war danger. This organisation has splendid successes to record, and there is no other defence organisation in Germany that is so popular among the masses as is the R. F. L. There is not a single fascist or any

other bourgeois defence organisation that may count upon such widespread sympathy as the R. F. L. Here we have tremendous possibilities. Nevertheless, the utilisation of the activity of the R. F. L. should not be limited to the gathering of wide sympathies for the R. F. L. among the workers and to the working up of a wide wave of sympathy for the Soviet Union; the essential factor is to get all this under the organised influence of the Communists.

Comrades, now I come to the conclusion of my argument. It is perfectly clear that the Party, if it wants to fulfill its tasks, if it wants to pursue its work with all energy, must pursue the **united front policy** upon a much more extended scale which should not only find its expression in the shape of united front organs and organisations, but also in the real mobilisation of the masses in the daily struggles of the proletariat. The active measures carried out by the Communist Party in the fight against the imperialist war menace and for the defence of the Soviet Union, will largely depend for success upon the extent to which we have mobilised the masses in the course of the daily struggles, thus working up a broad wave of proletarian indignation and of proletarian activity, a big wave of new mass initiative and spontaneous mass action, because we are conscious of the fact that great fights today, more than ever before, can be of the greatest political effect. Comrades, we are all agreed that this work can be carried out only if all the sections will pursue tremendous work of Party schooling and education, if the Parties will realise the tremendous responsibility of utilising all the possibilities of work and of putting right any mistakes which may arise, so that they should start right now and not after the outbreak of war, to defend the Soviet Union, take up the fight side by side with the Russian workers and peasants by combating the bourgeoisie of their own countries, having as their aim the overthrow of their own bourgeoisie.

Comrades, in the Theses of previous years fraternisation of the imperialist armies with the Red Army in the shape of going over to the Red Army, was represented as one of the most essential tasks. Let us work in this direction throughout our whole activity. We must clearly realise that it is our duty today and at all times to make widely popular among the masses the call of the Russian workers and peasants, the call which says: "Come and join us"; the call which says: "Settle your account with your own bourgeoisie". Only through the overthrow of the bourgeoisie can an end be put war. Only through the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in the different capitalist countries can the defence of the Soviet Union and the victory of socialism really be secured.

(Close of Session.)

Nineteenth Session.

Moscow, Aug. 2, 1928 (afternoon).

Reports of Comrades Lovestone and Barbé.

Chairman: Comrade Murphy.

Comrade Murphy opens the session and states that two workers' delegations have come to greet the Congress.

Comrade Protassov will address the Congress in the name of the workers and employees of the "Chemical Factory No. 1"; and Comrade Vassiliev will speak for the workers of the Aircraft Factory:

Comrade PROTASSOV:

In the name of the workers and employees of the "Chemical Factory No. 1," we bring to the VI. Congress of the Communist International, the leader of the world revolution, our flaming greetings and our wishes for the complete success of its work. (Applause.)

Comrade Bukharin in his report stated that our breathing spell was approaching its end. Comrades, let all the Chamberlains and their henchmen know that our patience also is not boundless. Long enough, comrades, have they played hide and seek with us. The Russian proletariat has long been ready to fight, we will fight with united forces, and throughout the whole world we will win victory for the revolution.

Comrade VASSILIEV:

Dear Comrades! In the name of the State Aircraft Factory No. 4, named "Frunze", I greet the VI. Congress of the Communist International. (Applause.)

We wish you success in the work of the Congress so that the oppressed and the toilers may finally shake off the yoke of capitalism.

We, the workers and employees of our factory, believe that our aircraft industry lags but very little behind that of other countries. You probably read last year about the brilliant flight of our great pilot, Comrade Schetakov, to Japan, a flight covering 22,000 kilometres, in which he remained in the air for 52 hours in a plane produced by our factory. You have also surely heard, Comrades, of the flight of our pilot, Chukhnovsky, in saving the wrecked Nobile expedition. We hope to continue to make progress in our aircraft industry. In no country on earth can the proletariat show such achievements on a social, political and cultural field as in the Soviet Union. But despite our achievements we are in danger. International capitalism does not want us to live according to our own mind, it wants to grind us down. But we, the workers and employees of our factory, put our hopes in you and call upon you to stir up the international proletariat into readiness for the struggle, so that in the moment of necessity it will come to our aid and overthrow the enemy.

We hope, comrades, that with firm will and powerful fist, following the heritage of Comrade Lenin, you will shake the world and help us to bring the work we have begun to a conclusion.

Long live the VI. Congress of the Communist International!

Hail the toilers of the whole world!

Hail the Communist Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union!

Comrade MURPHY (Chairman):

Comrades, fourteen years ago to-day we were on the verge of the great imperialist world war. This event has stamped itself upon history in no uncertain way. It lives in our memories and I am sure that everyone of you will agree with the Presidium of the Congress that it has done right in preparing a manifesto to the workers of the world in commemoration of these days. I am therefore going to call upon Comrade Bell to read the manifesto which has been approved of by the Presidium of the Congress. The Manifesto recalls the significance of these days and is asking the workers to remember their importance and to prepare for the fights which are ahead. I shall ask you to endorse this manifesto immediately Comrade Bell has read it. Comrade Bell will now read it.

Comrade BELL (Great Britain):

"To the Workers and Peasants of all Countries.

To the Oppressed Peoples of the World.

To all Communist Parties.

Fourteen years have elapsed since the beginning of the great world massacre of 1914—1918. The imperialists and their lackeys of all shades have told you again and again that that was the last world war. Millions upon millions of workers and peasants, who hate and dread the idea of such another monstrous butchery, have lent an ear to these promises.

But look around at what is actually happening in the capitalist world on this 4th August 1928. You will see that events themselves prove the capitalists and their "socialist" and "pacifist" agents to be liars and hypocrites, who, whilst they talk of peace and foster the pacifist illusion of disarmament, feverishly prepare for war.

Open military intervention by the imperialists in the Chinese Revolution has now been going on for years. Tens of thousands of workers and peasants have been and are being slaughtered in defence of the imperialists' claim to control the Chinese market. But never has the intervention in China been so widespread and menacing to world peace as it is to-day, when it assumes the form of an occupation and of the military partition of China.

The preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. by the feverish arming of the Border States, military and diplomatic agreements, and systematic anti-Soviet propaganda, are becoming clear to every thinking worker. Simultaneously, the imperialists of all countries are reorganising and reinforcing their armies, are spending tens of millions upon battleships, guns, aeroplanes, poison gases, naval dockyards and air bases, in anticipation of the gigantic new conflicts to which their struggle for the conquest of markets and raw material is bound to lead.

Still more than they did in the last years before 1914, the imperialists are camouflaging their systematic war preparations by clever "peace" propaganda. Conferences on disarmament summoned by the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact for the "outlawry of war", intensive pacifist propaganda of all kinds against war in general — these and other devices are being called into play.

The object of all of them is the same — to make the workers and peasants believe that some way of abolishing war can be found within the framework of capitalist society. The imperialists want to hide from the peasants and workers the "dangerous" truth that the only way to end war is to overthrow capitalism and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. They want to divert their attention by means of a deceiving trick, which will enable them to draw the masses unawares into a so-called "defence of the Fatherland" war, as they did in 1914 thanks to jingoist propaganda and the intoxicating war.

The Communist International calls on every worker and peasant to realise that the "Socialists" and "Pacifists" who give active help to the imperialists in their endeavour to spread these illusions, are nothing but conscious agents of the capitalists. The Communist International has emblazoned on its banners:

'Down with the imperialist war! 'Struggle by all possible means against the imperialist war and take up your stand resolutely with the U.S.S.R., against your imperialists!' It calls upon all workers, upon all revolutionary peasants, upon all the oppressed, to make this slogan theirs on this 4th of August 1928, by raising the standard of struggle against imperialist war, against the hypocritical "socialists" and "pacifists" who help the imperialists in their war preparations.

That fight must begin here and now. Together with the heroic Chinese proletariat and peasantry who are collecting their forces for a new upward surge after their defeat, a steel wall of resistance to war and intervention must be built up by the whole working class.

The gathering war clouds around the Soviet Union, the first Socialist Republic, must arouse all workers and peasants who are conscious of their class interests and must make them determined to take immediate and energetic measures for the defence of the U.S.S.R. by all and every means.

It is only by an active struggle on these two fronts that the working class can prepare itself as it should for resistance to the new imperialist war which becomes more and more inevitable since it springs on the one hand from the increasing antagonisms of the capitalists among themselves, and on the other hand, from their common hatred of the Soviet Union.

Only by resolute and vigorous daily action on the part of all Communists and revolutionaries, all workers and peasants, against their exploiters, will the urban and rural workers be prepared, in spirit and in organisation, for the transformation of the future imperialist war into a national and international civil war of all the oppressed against the imperialist bourgeoisie — the only road which will lead to the suppression of war.

On this 4th day of August, fourteen years after the first great world butchery which gave birth to the first socialist revolution, the Communist International calls on the workers and peasants of all countries to prepare for the transformation of the next world war into a world Socialist Revolution, by rallying around the slogans of: Long live the Chinese Revolution! Long live the first Socialist Republic! Down with World Imperialism! Long live the Socialist Revolution!"

Comrade Murphy (Chairman): Are you all agreed that we endorse this manifesto. Please show. **Agreed unanimously.**

We will now continue with the reports on the war question.

Comrade LOVESTONE (U.S.A.):

American aggressive imperialist policy is coloured largely by two outstanding features of the international situation since the last World War. These are: 1. the shifting of the economic centre of gravity from Europe to the United States; 2. the terrific breach in the imperialist front through the establishment of the Soviet Union.

The first and most far reaching influence of the United States on the world situation to-day is that which it exercises as the leading capital exporting country.

In the first, the immediate post-war stage, American capital was exported primarily for the purpose of crushing revolutionary movements, helping to drown the revolutionary uprisings of the working class of Europe in blood.

In the second stage, after having been the so-called safety valve force, American capital was employed primarily for helping to stabilise capitalist Europe.

In the third, or present period, American capital exports to Europe serve primarily to strengthen competitors and thus through its very strengthening of other competing capitalist Powers there develop everywhere contradictions and conflicts amongst the imperialist powers. If we keep in mind these changing periods and objective effects of the export of American capital we will be able to understand more clearly its specific aggressive imperialist role to-day.

A few words should be said about the tremendous resources of American imperialism in order to estimate correctly these aggressive policies. The national wealth of the United States is four hundred billion dollars. American imperialism still controls at least one-half of the world's monetary gold. With only 7% of the world's population, the United States controls the bulk of the world's resources. For instance, 44 out of every 100 tons of coal produced; 70 out of every hundred barrels of oil; 52 out of every 100 tons of steel; 60 out of every 100 bales of cotton; 60 out of every 100 bushels of corn and at least one half of the railway mileage, copper and pig iron produced in the world.

Mass production, tremendous accumulation of capital and huge concentration of capital characterise American industry to-day.

Let us briefly sketch the trend in the export of commodities and export of capital by the United States. From 1898 to 1913 American export commodities doubled. From 1913 to 1926 these exports doubled once more. To-day nearly 60% of American exports are manufactured goods. This brings about a shifting of destination of the exports — more and more to non-European countries which are less industrially developed.

The total amount of capital exported by the United States to-day is about 25 billion dollars.

The American bourgeoisie receive a billion dollars a year in interest on their exported capital. The trend is still upward; America has definitely displaced Great Britain as the world's creditor. Within the last seven years America has exported 6 billion 836 million dollars, while Britain has exported only 4 billion, 124 million. It is especially interesting to note that the ratio of exported capital to that of capital invested in domestic industry is only a fifth in the United States while the British ratio of export capital is 56% of all issues.

Why is the export of capital so large? First of all, there is a surplus plant capacity said to be on the average, 26%. Thus, in such industries like in automobile, we find the surplus plant capacity to be 26%, agricultural implements 39%, rubber tires 34%, furniture 21%, men's clothing 28%. Secondly, there is a surplus of credit in the country. Evidence of this was shown recently in the lifting of the ban on the export of capital to France though the debt funding agreement between France and the United States has not yet been officially ratified. Thirdly, the depression in the United States proper. Fourthly, there is a relative shrinkage of the domestic market due to the greater rate of increase in productive efficiency than to the forces making for an increase in the domestic market. Here we must also take into consideration the fact that the agrarian crisis has made for a narrowing of the domestic market. Fifthly, we must register the continued increasing competition from Europe — the international cartel movement.

But in speaking of the export of capital by the United States we must keep in mind the following differences between the United States and England.

First, England imported lots of raw material; the United States is more self-sufficient.

Secondly, at its height England exported 8% of its available capital (1907—13); the United States to-day exports only about 1.25% of its available capital. The United States has

only a limited colonial demand for capital but a huge domestic market.

Let us examine the effects of the export of capital and the contradictions it develops. These are: 1. on the standard of living. When American imperialism exports to China, Italy, India or any country which is less developed industrially, it is in a position to dominate the industries of those countries and to manufacture there commodities at lower cost, at lower wages than in America. This very process of American Imperialism which temporarily allows the bourgeoisie to have super-profits so as to give a few crumbs to the labour aristocracy, this feature thus develops a contradictory element in it. This contradictory element is the danger of lowering the standard of living of the great mass of workers because of the very increase of the export of capital.

The textile owners in the North are moving to the South where they can get production at a lower cost. Thus, if the American capitalists, through their export of capital to the lesser industrially developed countries, will be able to secure cheaper labour power in European or Asiatic countries they will either reduce their American working forces or slash the wages of those working forces at home.

Second: the increasing conflict between finance and industrial capital — for instance, over the tariff issue now developing in the U. S.

Third: An increasing integration of the state apparatus with big business. The increasing export of capital means increasing aggressive imperialist policy. This, in turn, means the leading organs of the government being dominated by such figures as Dawes, Mid-western banker; Morrow, a member of the firm of J. P. Morgan and Company; Hoover, himself a multi-millionaire; and Mellon, said to be the richest man in the country.

Fourth: The consequent increasingly political character given to the struggles between workers and employers.

Fifth: The development of a parasitic, rentier class.

Sixth: The drive towards a collision of imperialist powers — imperialist war.

It is true the United States formally has no big colonial possessions when compared with such countries as England and France. Yet, there are one hundred million people living in Latin America and in the Pacific possessions of the United States who are virtually colonial or semi-colonial in their relation to the United States. No continental European country since Napoleon's day has extended its territorial domain in the same proportion as the United States has.

Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama and Santa Domingo are American protectorates. Within the last thirty years America has intervened over thirty times in nine supposed sovereign states. The intervention lasted from a few days to a dozen years. In four such supposedly sovereign states there are American customs collectors. The technique of American imperialism in Latin America is usually to manoeuvre to secure a properly disposed government into power, negotiate with it a treaty which includes a loan guaranteed by customs control or other revenues and concessions which turn over the wealth of the country to the American companies on the ground. Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and Panama illustrate this point. In Liberia, for example, the Firestone Plantation Company, with the assistance of the American State Department, is introducing a system of colonial slavery. In Cuba, American investors, supported by the State Department, give aid and recognition to a government especially notorious for political imprisonment and assassinations of workers. In Chile, the United States State Department supports a dictatorship that crushes the labour movement and gives preference to American nitrate interests. In Haiti there are thousands of peasants deprived of their land through loans put through by puppet president, Borno, after murdering thousands of defenceless Haitians by American marines.

It is this "painless imperialism" that has served as the primary source of financial support for Mussolini and fascism. American imperialism is casting longing glances also at Africa and the Far East. Thus, Manchuria, is now being classed by Wall Street as the "Belgium of the Far East".

The United States sees Europe in a state of unstable equilibrium. Canada is often called the 49th state. Politically it is a British colony. In the case of the economic field, however, it is an American colony. This is true, despite the fact that Canada is a land of rising capitalism and even exports means of production.

The driving forces for the growing aggressiveness of American imperialism are: 1. the fight for new markets for its commodity and capital surplus. 2. the fight for sources of raw material (rubber, oil, nitrates, etc.), for instance the United States though it produces 70% of the world's oil, controls only 12% of the oil resources of the world.

American aggressiveness shows itself in Europe, in Asia (the recent manoeuvres with the Nanking Government), in Latin America (crushing of Nicaragua), the vigorous hostility to the Soviet Union (refusal to recognise), sharpening of Anglo-American relations (the struggle over the size of the navy, of beating back the British imperialist front in every field like in the oil and rubber sources, etc.).

American imperialism is now engaged in vigorous war preparations. The war preparations are manifested in seven main ways:

1. **Ideological.** Admirals and Generals are touring the country emphasising the fact that the United States has never been defeated in a war and demanding increased naval, military, and aerial appropriations. Military training schools are being extended and military training is being introduced into an ever larger number of educational institutions. Propaganda is being made for the building up of a bigger and more reliable officers corps, selected from the biggest business interests. Position in the standing army is becoming more and more a good reference for business. Active hatred of Japan, Great Britain and the Soviet Union is being propagandised. Coolidge is demanding that the press should be 100% loyal to the Government policies without the slightest criticism or reservations in foreign affairs.

2. **The Pacifist Offensive.** The Havana Conference had as one of its principal objectives the mobilisation of the reserve resources of the Latin American countries for a clash with European imperialist powers under the guise of peace. We must keep in mind that there are eighteen Latin American countries in the League of Nations.

Here we should examine the so-called Kellogg Treaties to "outlaw war". These treaties can be characterised in the following manner:

a) An attack on the League of Nations, b) the laying of further emphasis on the United States as the world centre, c) trying to play with and to perpetuate divisions amongst imperialist powers in Europe; d) an answer to and an attack against the disarmament plan of the Soviet Union with a view to help isolate the Soviet Union; e) a freer hand for an attack against the colonial peoples; f) preparation for 1931 when the Washington Conference Agreement shall have expired.

The cheating, bluff and hypocrisy of these treaties are obvious. Secretary of State Kellogg has declared in comment on these treaties that: "Political questions cannot be arbitrated". Those treaties aim to "outlaw" war everywhere except where it is likely to occur. For instance, in the hypocritical slogan of self-defence, for the Locarno commitments, for the League Covenant commitments, for the safe-guarding of certain special interests like in Latin America, in the Near East, etc.

While the United States is pretending to be for peace, it is engaged in a war on Nicaragua and is participating in the attack on China.

3. **Military, Naval and Aerial Preparedness.** The United States now maintains the largest military and naval forces it has ever had at any time of peace. In the last six years, a quarter of a billion dollars have been expended for airplanes. Last year alone, 2300 airplanes were built. The Caribbean and Latin-American airline, presently proposed for commercial reasons are military highways. After the fiasco at the Geneva Naval Limitations Conference, the American Congress recently passed the second biggest naval budget in the history

of the country. In the last four years, more than a billion and a half dollars have been spent on the navy. The General Board of the Navy demands "a navy equal to the most powerful maintained". The total amount spent for armaments by the United States in 1927 is the biggest spent by any country. The following table is instructive:

Country:	Amount spent in 1927	Increase over 1913
United States	580,000,000	124%
England	509,000,000	65%
France	274,000,000	2%
Japan	215,000,000	264%
Italy	182,000,000	15%

In the year just ended, 82% out of every dollar spent by the government went to navy and war expenses. The National Defence Act of 1916 lays the basis for immediate mobilisation of millions of soldiers and broadens the basis of the trained nucleus of the conscript army.

4. **Militarisation of industry and mechanisation of the military forces.** The American War Staff is studying the mechanisation of the army. An extensive investigation of the mechanisation of battle field forces has been completed by the General Staff of the Army.

Industry, under the National Defence Act, is also organised with a view toward the swiftest mobilisation for operations on a war basis and for the transformation of the most efficient, biggest factories, as centres of war supplies production.

5. **The integration of the State apparatus with big business.** The huge private armies maintained by the big employers and the extension of the executive power of the Government are evidences of the greater efficiency for war that this phenomenon develops.

6. **The repression of the workers.** A national anti-strike law is being prepared by the American Bar Association, consisting of the leading big finance capital lawyers, in co-operation with the official leaders of the trade union movement — **Woll and Green.** The open shop offensive is proceeding apace through backdoor methods, definite steps have already been taken to institute a registration of foreign born workers.

7. **The extension of the domination of the world market.**

Here we note the recent adoption of the **Jones Ship Subsidy Bill**, the decision to build a new canal since in ten years the Panama Canal will be too small, the granting of special privileges to American exporters, etc.

Hoover is responsible for getting Congress to appropriate many millions to determine to what extent American interests are threatened by foreign monopoly. Hoover has proposed that Congress should encourage American trustification to meet foreign competition. We recall the sharp attack on the British rubber monopoly made by Hoover. An attempt is also being made to secure tax exemption for American investments abroad. The State Department is actively supervising the export of capital with a view of considering "the possible national interests involved". This is usually interpreted to mean the withholding of American capital for increasing the armaments of other countries, for aiding foreign monopolies (refusal to make a German potash loan), hostility to a government representing another class (Soviet Union).

Main Policies of American Imperialism.

1. **Isolation.** This policy was actually in vogue in the very first years of the national independence of the American bourgeoisie. It is still resorted to for propaganda purposes at home to cover up aggressive plans.

2. **The Monroe Doctrine** is a closed door policy in the first instance against all other imperialist powers in Latin America. Its latest and most complete form of application is shown in the recent invasion and crushing of Nicaragua.

In the course of the development of the Monroe Doctrine, we find a certain number of corollaries which indicate the growing aggressiveness and the domination of American imperialism. 1. no Latin American State may voluntarily give or sell any territory to any other power except the United States; 2. the United States is the arbitrator in all ordinary disputes between Latin American countries themselves or between Latin American countries and other powers already possessing land on the continent; 3. no private non-American corporations are permitted to secure harbours or other concessions of this sort; 4. the United States looks with disfavour upon any economic concessions to European or Asiatic powers; 5. the United States is authorised to use military and naval forces to settle conflicts within the Latin American countries; 6. the United States has the right to intervene on the pretence of preventing the developing of a condition which might demand intervention by European or Asiatic powers; 7. when a supposed sovereign state of Latin America fails to maintain "order and disturbs international obligations", the United States may assume financial and political control of such a state; 8. what is known as the Coolidge corollary makes Latin America, particularly Central America, an exclusive preserve of American imperialism and turns the Caribbean into an "American lake" or an "American Mediterranean".

3. **The Open Door policy** formulated by **John Hay** is a recognition of the fact that American Imperialism has entered the Far Eastern field later than other imperialist powers and seeks to secure for itself the equality of opportunity for American imperialists so that in time this field also can be dominated by Wall Street. American imperialists are convinced that the future of **China** is the key to the future of **Japan and America** as world powers. The question of the **Philippines** is also of utmost importance to American imperialism not only as a tremendous reservoir of raw materials but also as a naval and aerial base.

4. **The Dawes Plan** reaches the most complete form of exercising economic hegemony by American imperialism. It gives the American imperialists a virtual mortgage on the resources of Germany to an increasing extent. The Dawes Plan is not viewed by the American imperialists merely as a plan for Germany but variations of it have been suggested for all countries. For instance, there has been suggested the **Hurley plan** for France when French imperialism was weaker. A similar plan has been suggested for **China**. It is significant that 60% of the German reparations are retransferred through the Dawes Plan, as if by a conduit pipe, to Washington.

The outstanding fields of conflict of American imperialism today are the following: a) **Anglo-American.** This conflict today occupies the place in the realm of conflicts amongst the imperialist powers that the **Anglo-German** did prior to the last war. Let us merely enumerate the sources of conflict between Great Britain and the United States: 1. The decisive defeat administered to British capitalism in **Canada** by American capital. 2. The sharp conflict of interests in **Central and Latin America.** 3. the beating back of the British imperialist interests in the Far East by the American. 4. The Struggle for the mastery of the world's oil resources. 5. The attempt of Britain to break the virtual American cotton monopoly through its aggressive plans in **Egypt.** 6. The increasing closeness marking the relations between **Australia and New Zealand** on the one hand and the United States on the other as a sign of the disintegrating force of the British Empire. 7. The complications arising out of the debt question. 8. The conflict for supremacy in the field of the export of capital and over the difficulties arising from the gold standard on the conditions under which the United States has within its possession at least half the world's monetary gold. 9. The extreme suspicion with which Great Britain views the increased American interests in **India.** For instance, American trade with India rose from 162 million dollars in 1913 to 537 million dollars in 1927. 10. The conflict over **rubber.** America is trying to break the British monopoly through developing its own plantations in **Liberia** and the **Philippines.** 11. Last but not least, the struggle over mastery of the sea lanes and **naval power.** When the American Congress passed the ship subsidy bill, the Executive Council of the Shipping Federation of Great Britain declared that legislation of this

character "amounts in substance if not technically, to a breach of comity of nations".

b) **Latin America.** Except for Argentina, Brazil and Chile, Latin American countries are virtually protectorates of "Uncle Shylock". Any attempt made by any of these countries at some measure of independence is met with sharp rebuke. For instance, the recent vigorous reply of Coolidge to the efforts of **Porto Rico** to secure slight measures of relief from American imperialist domination. In Latin America as a whole, American foreign investments are increasing at a rapid pace. Today, the total amount of capital invested in Latin America by the United States is over five billions and a quarter. The rate of increase is greatest in those countries like **Argentina** and **Brazil** where British capital had hitherto unlimited sway.

c) The fight against the **Soviet Union.** American imperialism continues to maintain an energetically hostile policy towards the Soviet Union. In order to mislead the masses among whom there is considerable sentiment for the Soviet Union, the official government policy ostensibly seeks to differentiate between the Government of the Soviet Union and the people. The real reason for this hostility is the fact that the sharpness of the different classes controlling the various governments in existence today is nowhere brought out in bolder relief than in the class character of the Government of the United States and that of the Soviet Union. But the increasing need for new markets and outlets for its surplus capital are bound to change in certain respects in time the American government's attitude toward the Soviet Union.

d) The **conflict in Europe.** Today, the United States imperialists are conducting so-called political flirtations with **Germany** in order to prevent any merging of Franco-German capitalist interests. It is manoeuvring in **Poland** and dominating **Polish** Government finances and industry in order to secure an additional outpost against **England**. In the conflict over priority of payments, between the reparation payments and the interest and principal payments for the loans made by private bankers, we have another force making for increasing domination by American imperialism in Europe. The whole conflict over debts and tariff questions makes for increasing aggressive participation by the United States in European affairs.

e) **Conflict in the Pacific,** here the central conflict grows out of the clash of interests with **Japan**.

The reactionary trade union bureaucracy is part and parcel of the whole imperialist apparatus of the United States. The **Pan-American Federation of Labour** founded by Gompers is merely an agency of the Pan-American Union which is in turn an instrument of Wall Street to crush the Latin American countries. The American Federation of Labour Executive Council does not issue any declarations involving an attitude towards an international question without first having these documents approved by the State Department.

The **Socialist Party** is organically bound up with the Trade Union Bureaucracy and is integrally part of it. **Mr. Hillquit** is an active propagandist for America's entry into the League of Nations. This intellectual leader of the Socialist Party even proposed to give the League of Nations power to regulate the export of capital.

The Presidential Candidate of the Socialist Party, the Reverend **Dr. Norman Thomas**, is a vociferous supporter of the Kellogg treaties.

The role of the petty bourgeoisie is equally disgraceful. Their opposition to imperialist war plans is weakkneed at best and their conduct is treacherous. Thus, speaking on the attitude of the United States towards the League of Nations, **Mr. Borah** recently said: "We fought the League of Nations because we thought that it was a political alliance but we cannot refuse to co-operate when the situation concerns the markets of the United States".

And defending the American imperialists' policy in **China**, **Mr. Borah** declared:

"We are simply sending our men there to do police duty."

Especially disgraceful was the conduct of the so-called progressive senators representing petty bourgeois interests,

Borah, Norris, Shipstead, on the question of **Nicaragua**. These so-called progressives worked hand in hand with the representatives of big capital in maintaining the marines in **Nicaragua** to supervise a framed-up election.

The only source of conscious vigorous opposition to American imperialism and to the imperialist war danger is the **Workers Party**. The American Communists have broken in the main with pacifist errors, though we still have considerable work to do to rid ourselves of all pacifist illusions. The pacifist danger in the United States is great.

In fighting this danger we have placed our Communist position very sharply. Thus the keynote at our last National Nominating Convention was "turn the imperialist war into a civil war".

The Party has done considerable practical work on a limited scale, it is true, in the fight against the war danger. Relative to the war in **Nicaragua**, demonstrations have been organised before **Navy Yards** and on the eve of the sailing of the marines. This was the case in **New York** and **Philadelphia**. Leaflets were also distributed in the **Boston Navy Yard** amongst the sailors and marines. There took place a distribution of letters to the second shipment of marines from **Norfolk, Virginia**. A beginning has been made in practical work in the navy. Here we note the fraternisation of the Young Communist League members with sailors in **Philadelphia**. The beginning of work amongst these forces on the West Coast can be registered after the overcoming of the most serious pacifist mistakes our Party has made. We have already begun some work in the army through the sending in of some members. We have formulated demands for the soldiers. Here also can be noted a successful distribution of leaflets to soldiers from the inside on the eve of the sailing for service in the colonies. During the war manoeuvres in **New York**, there was an adequate distribution of leaflets. Our press is being utilised increasingly among the military forces. We have established a special servicemen's and ex-servicemen's column in the "**Daily Worker**". A mailing list of soldiers and sailors for the purpose of receiving weekly propaganda letters is being built up. A good reaction to some of these letters has already been evidenced.

The **National Guard** was recently called to do strike-breaking duty in the **New Bedford Strike**. We issued an appeal which had some effect and increased the difficulties for obtaining volunteers to serve in this capacity.

In reference to the attitude towards the **C. M. T. C. (Citizens' Military Training Camps)** the policy has been changed for some time. We no longer boycott this institution but on the contrary send selected workers into it.

In all our propaganda work, we are emphasising defeatist slogans. This is particularly to be noticed in the campaign against the war on **Nicaragua** where we openly called upon the American marines to desert the forces of Wall Street and join the army of **Sandino**. The Party is engaged actively in mobilising sentiment for the victory of the **Nicaraguan** forces led by **Sandino** among the American marines.

Our "**Hands Off China**" campaign was particularly successful in the way of street demonstrations. A very important section of our anti-war work is the campaign for the defence of the **Soviet Union**.

We must work out the concrete practical ways of securing the maximum co-operation between the American Party and the Latin American Section of the Comintern. The American Party can be of real help to the Chinese Communist Party through the mobilising of the resources amongst the Chinese masses in America. Here also the two Parties should work out a number of practical joint activities.

The American Party has not viewed the imperialist war danger as an abstraction but as a concrete immediate danger. Thus, our women's work has concerned itself appreciably with fighting the war danger. In our work amongst the **Negroes** we have splendid opportunities for mobilising masses to fight against the war danger. The special mistreatment of **Negro** soldiers, as evidenced in the brutality of the **Houston** martyrs in which **Negro** soldiers were given the maximum penalty,

shows us the extent to which the American bourgeoisie are ready to go to crush the Negro masses.

Our Party has also secured some results in organising World War Veterans. This has found appreciable support in certain sections of the organised trade union movement.

In preparation for the impending war danger our Party must pay greater attention to the setting up of an **illegal apparatus**. One of the main ways in which we have fought pacifism and against the hostility to the Soviet Union is to be noted in our repeated propandanda for the Red Army and our efforts to popularise the Red Army amongst large sections of the American working class.

We have complicated problems in our anti-imperialist war work in the question of relations to the national bourgeoisie in such colonies as the **Philippines**. Here certain sections of the national bourgeoisie are increasingly becoming tools of the imperialists.

We have had the closest co-operation between the **Central Committee and the Young Communist League** in our anti-imperialist war work. This is in a measure responsible for the success we have had in such demonstrations as recently held in Wall Street on the 4th of July before the offices of J. P. Morgan and Company.

Let me close with the statement that our Party has worked out a concrete, practical programme to fight American imperialism, for the defence of the Soviet Union, and to beat back the rising war danger.

Our Party is certain that with the increasing war danger and the clarification of the issues involved in fighting the war danger itself, we will become a more effective force in combating American imperialism and American Imperialist aggrandisement. (Applause.)

Comrade BARBE (France):

I should like to go into the policy of French imperialism from a practical, though, to be sure, somewhat narrow angle: How is French imperialism actually preparing the imperialist war? How is it developing a most consistent policy aiming at the imperialist war?

Prior to the world war of 1914-18, when French capitalism was already preparing very vigorously for the imperialist war, the **French military budget** amounted to a milliard gold francs. At present the budget of French imperialism for the year 1927-28 amounts to 10 milliard paper francs, this means 2 milliard gold francs, an increase of 100% in the war budget since the last war.

In the **naval budget** a still greater increase is to be noted. This budget has risen from 772 millions in 1922 to 2,552,000,000 francs in 1928, viz. it has become four times as great.

French imperialism, which must defend a very important colonial territory, which it seeks to make an object of value and which it also intends to broaden, must give the greatest attention to its naval policy. For this reason it demands credits for the building of new war ships. These credits have risen from 360 million in 1920 to 1,341,000,000 in 1928, they are thus 4.5 times greater than in 1920.

Simultaneous with the increase in the size of its armaments, French imperialism is also improving its war equipment qualitatively.

As an example I may cite the **French submarines**. French imperialism not only plans a considerable increase in the number of submarines - 125,000 tons in 1938 - but we may at the same time note that the most recently built submarines are of 1560 tons and have a cruising radius of more than 8,000 miles without need to replenish supplies. This is a considerable advance in the naval armament of French imperialism.

All the comrades present here have heard of the **big naval review** recently held by French imperialism in **Havre**. In the last eight months French imperialism has been organising, blow upon blow, demonstrations of the fleet in all waters.

The review at Havre was designated in France as the greatest review and the greatest demonstration organised by

the government since 1914. There were 84 warships participating. The armament of these vessels has been extraordinarily modernised and perfected, a "progress" which is designated by the French bourgeoisie as a rebirth of the naval fighting forces of French imperialism.

In all the discussions in our Party, and in recent times also in all of the meetings of the Communist International, great significance has been ascribed to the **military laws** which French imperialism began to carry through in the course of the last year.

These military laws are of tremendous importance not only for France, but also for a series of other countries. They confront our French Communist Party with new and very serious tasks. These tasks will confront also a number of our brother Parties, for the policy of bourgeois governments of several countries - especially Belgium and Czechoslovakia - is already being influenced by French experiences with these new military laws.

It is an error, however, to assume that the military laws of French imperialism signify only a modernisation and improvement of the French army. These military laws express a whole plan which coordinates all the political, economic, military and technical means for the next imperialist war in order to realise the aims of French imperialism. The French bourgeois government, by leaving it entirely to the social democrats to propose these laws have brought it about that these imperialist war laws have an appearance of being, so to say, "democratic". The Social Democracy justified their championship of these laws by representing them as a better method of defence for a democratic state, as a means of lightening the military burdens of the population, and especially as a means to bring about a shortening of the period of service.

A more cynical, more candid and much more clear presentation of the aims which French imperialism wants to attain by enforcing these military laws is to be found in the official organ of French militarism, "**France Militaire**". There it is stated:

"The new army must be organised on the one hand with a view to the world war, and on the other hand with a view to the daily life of the nation, with a view to that daily life which eventually leads to colonial wars (like the Moroccan war, and of such wars there will always be more and more) or to revolts in the interior which must be smothered (of Communists also there will always be more and more)."

This is in fact the most striking characterisation of this law, which provides all means in preparation for the imperialist war.

The introduction of **universal military training** has certainly a greater importance in France than in many other capitalist countries. It includes a system of universal, compulsory, practical military training which already begins in the schools of the bourgeois State in order to train the youth morally and physically for the new imperialist war. A French general designated this training as "the development of objective patriotism, which is intended to convince all strata of the French youth of the necessity of blood sacrifice". This characterises the general military preparations, the first realisation of which may be observed in the bourgeois schools of France, and the purpose of which is to bring about an education of the children that is more clearly orientated on colonial politics, to found a number of societies intended to extend military training to the youth. The almost complete **reorganisation of the army** provided for in these laws is likewise of great importance for the international labour movement because French imperialism, in forming its new army, takes into consideration all the military experiences made in a number of countries. One may say that after its reorganisation the French army represents a synthesis of the various military forms of the whole world, combining the old system of a standing Democratic army with the cadre army, the most reliable military formations of imperialism.

An examination of certain figures will show the value and the importance of the reformation of the French army. Every year 240,000 young workers and peasants are called in; they are balanced by 150,000 professional petty officers and soldiers, 30,000 officers, 45,000 gendarmes and 200,000 colonial and semi-colonial troops.

There are several reasons for the transformation of the army and of the military system of French imperialism:

1) French imperialism is confronted by the necessity of adapting its military system to the physiognomy and economic structure of post-war France.

2) French imperialism absolutely must have a stronger, more thorough and more systematic military training of those strata of the toiling population which did not participate directly in the imperialist war, and especially the strata of the youth of 25, 27 and 28 years etc.

3) French imperialism must try to weaken the class antagonisms which have very markedly grown up in its army in recent years, for these antagonisms have already resulted in a number of movements of discontent in the army and navy of French imperialism.

4) French imperialism must defend its colonial territories and fight to extend them.

5) Finally, the imperialist government of France must take into consideration the existence of our Communist Party and of the considerable influence which it has been able to attain in the army and navy and among the strata of young workers and peasants.

In addition to the military reform, which is the most important feature to be noted in the first section of these military laws, the general organisation, from an economic point of view, of all the forces of the country is the next important feature.

Recently the Chamber of Syndicates of the Metal Industry of the Paris district held a conference, in which one of the generals who participated most actively in the formulation and execution of this military law made a report on the preparation for the complete mobilisation of industry by the metal industry, and on direct preparations for the event of a partial industrial mobilisation so as to prepare the way for eventual general mobilisation for all industries. In this report the principles were laid down that are contained in the military law: industrial mobilisation, preparation of all fields of industry and economy in France, organisation of all agricultural, military, political and administrative forces under the direction of a General Staff Officer, in order to coordinate the whole policy of a district and also of the whole country for the conduct of the imperialist war.

The new military laws also give consideration to the colonial question. French imperialism is creating a colonial army which is divided into two parts: the first part consists of 90,000 men and has the task of defending the policy of French imperialism in the colonies themselves. The second section of the army remains in the mother country and is to see to the maintenance of order at home; it is to be applied as a first class force against the working class in the mother country. The military law also finds application in the organisation of the independent defence of the colonies in North Africa. The inferiority of French naval forces in the Mediterranean in comparison to the British and Italian fleet confronts French imperialism with the necessity of defending the North African colonial territory. This policy is concretely expressed in a whole series of measures adopted by French imperialism for the purpose of coordinating the activity of its three colonial possessions: **Tunis, Algeria and Morocco**. In this connection the building of the **Trans-Sahara Railway** plays a quite special role, it not only has the purpose of increasing the economic productive capacity of the French colonial territory, but it is almost exclusively intended to coordinate all practical means of military resistance in the North African colonial area. With the aid of this railway it will be possible for French imperialism to throw reinforcements into the North African colonies from its other African colonies in the quickest possible way. To this must be added also the organisation of a series of war industries in the North African colonial area itself.

The policy of French imperialism is still more characteristic in the Far East. It is strengthening its military and naval bases in **Indo-China**, it organises military manoeuvres in Indo-China, it initiates a system of military training courses for natives and is preparing systematically to annex certain **South China provinces** to its domain. This will increase the economic value of this colonial area and will also guarantee greater security for its Indo-Chinese colony.

French imperialism wants to solve the task of maintaining "order at home" on the basis of its military laws: by strengthening its cadre army. It is establishing a professional army which is to serve against the working class in any political situation. But this cadre army is combined with an unparalleled strengthening of the police. Furthermore this strengthening of the means of preserving domestic order has already been tested by the French government in a whole series of demonstrations in recent times, especially in certain important strikes which took place in 1927 and 1928.

Another new side of this policy for the maintenance of internal order is the official and legally anchored militarisation of the trade union movement, as provided for and carried out by the military laws.

The general conclusion to be drawn is that these military laws represent the most powerful imperialist war machine for French imperialism, which is simultaneously a machine for the destruction of the colonial peoples and also for the destruction of the masses of workers in the mother country.

Parallel with this policy of French imperialism, which is making its preparations for war with a cynical frankness and lack of concealment, there are revealed also the most characteristic features of social imperialism in our Social Democracy. French Social Democracy, in carrying out all these unparalleled measures in preparation for the imperialist war, has not only played the role of the accomplice and agent of imperialism, but it has even been the ideological and actual pace-setter of French imperialism in the working out and execution of these military laws. The most important part of these laws, viz., that which deals with the general organisation of the country for war, with the mobilisation of everyone irrespective of age or sex, was presented already in 1922 by **Paul Boncour** himself.

In recent years the French Social Democracy has constantly supported the policy of French imperialism and has defended it before the working class. At the last Congress of the Socialist Party, Paul Boncour, when the question was taken up as to whether he was to continue to be a representative of the League of Nations, declared:

"I shall remain in the League of Nations because the foreign policy of France is developing along the lines of that of the Socialist Party. Let me continue my clever activity in the League of Nations."

And he added to this that it would be enough to "recognise that our ideas are being realised in history". "The pact and the decisions of the League of Nations appear to me to coincide with the ideas of international Socialism."

This is the best characterisation that Paul Boncour could give of the foreign policy of the French Socialist Party. Proofs can be found in the whole line of the French Socialist Party that the foreign policy of the French Social Democracy is identical with that of French imperialism.

Prior to the war the Social Democrats employed quite radical formulae at their Congresses in branding the colonial policy of French imperialism. At the Congress of Nancy, before the war, a Social Democrat said:

"The peaceful penetration of the colonies is only a myth... The Socialist is a determined foe of colonialism, which is based on forcible conquest and which organises the subjugation of the Asiatic and African peoples."

To-day, however, the Social Democracy describes the colonial policy of French imperialism as follows:

"The Socialist Party can propagate, for the colonial peoples, a gradual and progressing adaptation to the principles of French democracy. It is not a question of granting the right to vote to all natives without regard to their cultural level. It is only a question of an élite among the natives, viz., only those colonial natives who speak and write French and who may participate in an administration of their country on an equal basis with the representatives of the French citizens."

If one puts these two quotations side by side one sees quite clearly the present imperialist policy of the French Social Democracy.

In recent times the French Social Democracy has made considerable efforts to present this policy to the masses of toilers from the point of view of a traditional continuation of Socialist policy.

In the face of the tremendous indignation of all workers the French Social Democracy was forced to deny its quite open bourgeois attitude on the question of the suppression of the labour movement, on the question of the organisation of the army and of the new military system, but the facts are stronger than all their attempts at denial. This is the typical policy which is conducted by one of the biggest parties in the II International.

I should now like to speak about the experiences of our Party in the struggle against the military laws, against the policy of French imperialism and Social Democracy.

At the meetings of the Communist International the activity of the C. P. F. has at times been sharply criticised. We have in general been in agreement with this criticism, but it must be admitted that our Party, particularly on the field of practical activity, has made very great progress in the direction of its transformation into a real Communist Party. Mistakes and shortcomings are still to be found in this activity of the Party, but for the French labour movement we see a quite new positive side and a new result.

In pre-war times the anti-militarist struggle and the struggle against the war developed, particularly in the French labour movement, mainly along an anarchist line. To-day these anarchist traditions have been eliminated. Among the broad masses in France there is now an activity which is not based on general agitation and propaganda, but which combines this agitation with the most difficult revolutionary work in the imperialist army and navy. This is one of the most important positive results of our Party in France.

The struggles against the Moroccan war in 1925 was the first important struggle which our Party had to lead in the recent period. It was, I believe, the first time that a Section of the International was confronted with the necessity of carrying out the Leninist principles of the struggle against the imperialist policy and against the colonial policy of a big imperialist power. I believe that the policy of our Party in the Moroccan war was correct. It had a positive side that was particularly interesting for our Party. Not only did it make clear to broad strata of workers and peasants the position of our Party against the colonial war, not only did it show the will of our Party to support the oppressed colonial peoples, but it also enabled us to stamp out the few remnants of social patriotism that still prevailed in our Party. This was a big step forward in the crystallisation of the Communist Party of France.

Another important problem which confronted our Party, and which still retains acute importance, is the problem of the Franco-Italian conflict. Our Party has successfully shown the position which Communists must take on the question of this struggle and it has also been able to counteract the very serious tendencies and currents that showed themselves inside our Party.

These tendencies pushed to the foreground first the struggle against Italian Fascism, in order to turn later against French imperialism. This tendency was of course very dangerous because French imperialism is ideologically preparing for the next imperialist war against Italian Fascism by counterposing to Fascism — the French democracy and French "civilisation" which is being furnished to colonies.

The practical struggle of our Party against military laws is concentrated particularly upon the new methods to be applied by our Party, both politically and also with respect to the organisation of the masses.

How did our Party conduct the struggle against the military preparations under the new system of French imperialism? Societies were formed in which we explained our policy to young people who were entering the army. I should like to speak here about the organisation of recruits' societies. For our Party and the Y. C. L. this was one of the most effective means of mobilising the young workers against the policy of French imperialism and its military laws.

I will cite only one example of how a Young Communist worker describes the way in which he organised and developed a recruit society. This was in a town where there was no Young Communist League in existence.

"Three comrades were assigned to form the society. The first difficulty was the question of finances. We decided to arrange a billiard tournament. The affair netted us 450 francs. With this money we organised a concert and ball. Of 550 who attended, 200 were young workers. Between two of the items a comrade explained the aims of the society and concluded with an appeal to join. Forty young workers immediately applied for membership and later each of the members of the society brought along a new member to the meeting. At the calling up of the second contingent of the 1927 levy, the society arranged a farewell party in which 25 comrades participated. Recently we organised another billiard tournament and established a library with the net profits made here. A permanent functionary works two days a week to disseminate military instructions. We have a newspaper for the society which appears once a month. Our society meets about every month and at each meeting a lecture is given to the future soldiers. It is our intention to form, within the society itself, a reservists group who are to have the same rights as the other members of the society. There is no doubt that with persistent work on this field we will have good results."

A second example of this work which our Party has done in recent times is the foundation of a series of broad organisations to take in the reservists.

These organisations defend the partial demands of the reservists. They are based upon a tradition prevailing among certain strata of reservists and among old soldiers, who are accustomed to form societies for mutual support and entertainment.

In recent times our Party has made big progress in the organising of working women and housewives for the struggle against the military laws and against the policy of war preparations and French imperialism. By its opportunities for work and activity, it can become the centre of a very broad organisation of working women, housewives and peasant women for the purpose of forming a powerful base of support for our Party in the struggle against French imperialism.

But in this mass work our Party has not contented itself with this general agitation against the military laws of French imperialism. The most important part of the work, which has given the best results, was the propaganda of our Party in the army and in the navy. This struggle is based not only upon the general discontent of the soldiers and sailors, and it is not directed merely generally against the military laws, but also above all on a combination of partial demands of the soldiers and sailors with the slogans of our Party in the struggle against imperialist war.

Now that the policy of French imperialism has completely changed the appearance and class relationship of the imperialist army in France, and also the general military forces of French imperialism, our Communist Party must proceed to base its policy upon a broader foundation, it must not only work for the disintegration of the army and navy, and of the pre-military and colonial units, but it must have a special policy and tactics for the disintegration of the vast cadre army which French imperialism builds up under its new military laws. This confronts our Party with new problems: the class struggle of the military formations attains a new significance, the class relations inside the military units must be investigated anew, the forms of struggle in these military formations must be determined anew, etc. If our Party does not immediately embark upon a correct policy and put into application disintegrative tactics to supplement its general work of disintegration in the army, then when the time comes it will not be able to resist the complete industrial, political, economic and military mobilisation and it will be unable to meet the duties imposed upon it. Therefore our Party must be able to solve this problem at once. It is a test for the greater struggle that will come at the moment of the outbreak of the imperialist war.

Of course the experiences of our Party reveal a series of weaknesses and mistakes in the struggle against the war policy of French imperialism. On the other hand, on the field of anti-militarist struggle numerous examples can be given characteristic of the class struggle in the French army. They show that our Party has not only made certain progress but that it has also become a far larger, far more determined and avowedly

Communist organisation, precisely by these struggles and by the correction of these mistakes. Our Party has gained ground among the broadest strata of the French proletariat and of the toiling masses. And it has created a really Leninist tradition of struggle against the imperialist war, against the robber policy of French imperialism in the colonies, against the policy of profiteering wars which are characteristic of French imperialism. In this struggle our Party has trained an entirely new generation of proletarian fighters. In conclusion, I should like to greet the best representatives of the new generation which is growing up in the French proletariat, this generation which to-day has more than 100 comrades in the prisons, and whose best representatives are the young sailors who are continuing the struggle in the prisons despite the blows of French imperialism. These comrades are the best elements of the proletarian struggle against imperialism and imperialist war. We must also greet dozens of soldiers and reservists who were sentenced to prison last year because of the struggle against militarist laws during the training period, and who are continuing the struggle against French imperialism in the prisons despite torture and blows. We greet, finally, also the native comrades in the colonies, who were deported to the most barren desert areas, to the worst districts in Southern Algeria, because they fought French imperialism and tried to carry the slogans of the Communist Party into the heart of the colonies.

This new generation gives to the Communist International, to the French labour movement, to our Party and to the toiling masses of France, full assurance of the determination of the Communist Party to continue the struggle against French imperialism to the end. In the event of imperialist war, the Communist Party, with the aid of this generation and of the broad strata of workers and peasants, will transform the imperialist war into the civil war that shall liberate the masses.

Comrade MIKOLOS (Poland):

Comrade Herwik while speaking about the Vassilkov group, the group of the former leader of the C. C. of the C. P. of West Ukraine, who, as is well-known, has turned traitor to the Comintern, who has been expelled from the Comintern and who now actively supports Fascism, used the following expression: "Mikolos is the spiritual originator of the serious political mistakes made by this group in the West Ukraine". The seriousness and gravity of the accusation raised by Herwik compels me to reply and to lay claim to your attention.

I realise, comrades, that in political struggles passions may flare up, as they have flared up in the ranks of the C. P. P. I have often had the opportunity of participating in the events and affairs within the Polish Party, and in the capacity of representative of the Bolshevik Party of the Ukraine, to attend the conferences and congresses of the Polish Party and of the Communist Party of West Ukraine. In dealing with the national question there, I had to fight out struggles at a time when the C. P. of Poland, prior to its II. Party Congress, still had a majority in favour of the position of Rosa Luxemburg and opposed to the correct policy of Lenin. Already at that time I found myself compelled to fight against these views. This, however, is a matter of the past. Yet, also later it was not infrequently necessary for me to oppose the mistakes of the C. P. P. on the national question. Thus for example the C. P. of West White Russia in place of the Leninist slogan for "the right of self-determination to the point of separation", as raised by the V. World Congress of the Comintern with respect to Western Ukraine and Western White Russia, raised in 1926 the slogan of the separation of these occupied territories from Poland and their affiliation to the Soviet Union. At that time the representatives of the present minority of the C. P. P. substituted for the Leninist slogan, one calling for support for the demand for autonomy of Western White Russia inside the boundaries of Poland. At that time I waged a struggle against this before the Enlarged Plenum of the Comintern, and was supported by the C. C. of the C. P. of West Ukraine, whereas the resolution of the E. C. C. I rejected the opposition in principle on the national question.

In the same year, in 1926, I once more had to oppose the deviations of the C. P. P. on the national question, this time

a Polish-Nationalist deviation. The representative of the Polish minority, Budzinski, submitted to the IV. Congress of the C. P. P., a Pan-Polish manifesto with a strong nationalistic tinge, from which the Pilsudski-ites could today take a great deal for their struggle against the U. S. S. R. and against Communism. Since this document is very little known permit me to read an extract, from it:

"All of the programme points provided for (in the programme of action for the democratic workers' and peasants' government) can be realised and can attain their full significance only in the event of Poland giving up its orientation towards the capitalist States and turning towards collaboration with the U. S. S. R. which, just like Poland, is a child of the workers' and peasants' revolution in the former Czarism. We must express this in a political and economic accord between Poland and the U. S. S. R., since only such an accord would allow Poland:

a) to accept the disarmament proposals made by the U. S. S. R. in 1923 and 1924 and to reduce its army in conformity to the reduction of the Red Army, without having to entertain any fears for its western boundary;

b) to find a market for its manufactures and raw materials in the U. S. S. R., to utilise the transit route to the near and far East, and to exploit its geographical position as a connecting link between the U. S. S. R. and the countries of the West (Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany etc.);

c) to obtain a temporary market for Upper Silesian coal, the absorption power of which market will depend upon the tempo of development of the entire industry of the U. S. S. R. and that of its coal industry, to obtain the richer iron ore to which Polish metallurgy was accustomed, and finally, to obtain cotton for the textile industry (by means of concessions Poland can obtain land from the U. S. S. R. in Turkestan and Trans-Caucasia to establish its own cotton plantations);

d) to get fields of colonisation for our rural population — in Siberia, the Far East and also in the Kuban and Trans-Caucasia — without this and also, without the diversion of the surplus labour power from the countryside to industry, it is impossible to solve the problem of the agrarian surplus population in Poland, which has increased in severity after the agrarian reform.

In order that the alliance of workers' and peasants' shall really embrace all Polish workers and peasants, and in order that the workers and peasants of Poland may appear on the world stage, both before the capitalist world and before the proletarian-peasant U. S. S. R., with the desirable weight and the necessary prestige, it must be consolidated, united and powerful. This unity and power will not be achievable however as long as Poland persecutes the oppressed peoples and national minorities. This unity and power can be achieved only by a 'deed of donation' (nadawania), by the assurance of freedom and a manifold development of national life (zucia narodowago) of the non-Polish peoples. We, the Polish majority in the Polish State, must above all change our position from an oppressor of foreign and subjugated peoples, in which we find ourselves at present (Ktory has upalda), into the lofty position of first among equals. This can only be effectuated by granting (nadania) the right of self-determination of nationalities, including the right of separation, to all the oppressed peoples that are held by force in Poland. Only under this premise will Poland become a voluntary and free union of peoples, a country whose borders will be honoured by the U. S. S. R. and above all by Soviet White Russia and by the Soviet Ukraine. All these demands can be fulfilled only by a workers' and peasants' government, which alone has sufficient energy to bring this to life and which represents a real alliance of the united working class with the united peasantry."

Budzinski's draft was of course rejected by the majority of the C. P. P. conference. I had to come out against the national Bolshevism of Budzinski at the time. I ask however, were Herwik and his colleagues against Budzinski? Did they unmask

his views? Did they carry on a struggle among the Polish proletariat against these views, which in reality are nothing else than a theoretical justification of the Fascism of Pilsudski? Exactly the opposite is the case. In 1927 the Polish Minority brought it about that this same Budzinski, who never withdrew his views in the press, was elected to the IV. Party Congress of the C.P.P. by the Warsaw organisation, which was a citadel of the Polish Minority, and which is now instigating an uprising against the C.C. of the C.P.P.

In other cases also I had to fight against various mistakes and deviations of the C.P.P., for example against the transferring of Radek's Schlageter-ism, to Polish conditions during the II. Party Congress of the C.P.P., against the Trotskyist sympathies of those who to-day are prominent among the Polish majority of the 1924 Comintern commission, against the Right deviations of the C.P.P. at the III. Party Congress, against the national Bolshevism of the C. P. of West White Russia in 1924, against the putschist deviation of the C. C. of the C. P. of West White Russia in 1925, against the ultra-Left deviation of Domski in 1926, against the mistakes of the C. C. of the C.P.P. during the May coup of Pilsudski in 1926, in the commissions and at the IV. Party Congress of the C.P.P.

And finally, after fighting the nationalist deviation of Schumski in the C.P. of Ukraine, as the representative of the Comintern to the Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of West Ukraine in April 1927, I first had to expose the nationalist deviations of the former leadership of the C.P. of West Ukraine and then, literally alone, by means of numerous speeches and press articles, by several reports to the C.C. of the C.P. of Ukraine, by three reports to the E.C.C.I. in August and December 1927 and January 1928, I had to take up the struggle against the nationalist deviation in the C. P. of West Ukraine and against the betrayal of the Vassilkov-Turianski group. After all this Herwik has the cheek, yes I stand by that expression, he has the cheek to come upon the tribune of the Congress and make an absolutely unproven and untenable declaration that I bear the responsibility for the views and dealings of the Vassilkov-Turianski group against whom I, and I alone, carried on the struggle primarily.

The declaration of Herwik amounts to the following: the C.C. of the C.P. (b) of the Ukraine, and of Mikolos, its representative, had influence in the C.P. of West Ukraine; the C.C. of the C.P. of West Ukraine listened to their advice and acted accordingly. According to the logic of Herwik this means that the blame and responsibility rests upon the C.C. of the Ukrainian Party and upon Comrade Mikolos, when the Vassilkov-Turianski group, acting against the advice of the C.C. of the C.P. of West Ukraine and disregarding the struggle conducted by this same Mikolos, took a wrong road and then became traitors. And here it is forgotten that the secession of this traitor group was a result of their struggle against the C.P. of the Ukraine and against Comrade Mikolos, and that the Communist Party of West Ukraine remained sound, and quickly overcame the effects of the betrayal of the Vassilkov-Turianski group, to a considerable extent due to the influence of the Ukrainian Party.

With respect to the line carried out by the Ukrainian Party and by me as its representative, I have before me a resolution adopted in August 1927. At that time the E.C.C.I. adopted the following resolution on the question of the nationalist deviation in the C.P. of West Ukraine, a question which had been raised by our memorandum:

"The Executive Committee of the Comintern ratifies completely the nationalities' policy of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Ukraine, which has been most fully

expressed in its latest memorandum to the E.C.C.I., and considers the line taken by the C.P. (b) of the Ukraine in its struggle against both the deviations of a great Russian chauvinism and against the deviation of a Ukrainian chauvinism, as entirely correct."

The question was dealt with in August of last year in the E.C.C.I. and also by the special Ukrainian Commission called into existence by it, where there were present also representatives of the Polish Minority who followed the line expressed in Herwik's speech, which was repudiated as wrong by the E.C.C.I. On the other hand, the statement on the deviation of the C.P. of West Ukraine, which was proposed by the Ukrainian Party and supported by the majority of the Polish C.C., was endorsed without change — first by the Ukrainian Commission of the E.C.C.I., then by the Executive itself.

As regards my attitude, and the line which I took in this question with respect to the West Ukrainian and Polish Parties at their Party Congresses and conferences: I acted on behalf of and as the representative of the Central Committee of the C. P. (b) of Soviet Ukraine. I must remark that the declaration of Herwik was shared also by several representatives of the Polish Minority and by two or three comrades from the Ukraine and in the Comintern. That is why I demanded a special treatment of this question. This question was discussed in our C.C., and in its plenum of March 1928 the C.C. of the Ukrainian Party adopted the following resolution, which was printed in No. 27—28, July 13, of the Comintern's theoretical organ, "The Communist International".

On page 39 we find the following:

"The plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. (b) of the Ukraine, confirms and ratifies the line applied with respect to the C.P. of West Ukraine, both directly through the Polit Bureau of the Ukrainian Party and by the representative of the Ukrainian Party in the Comintern. The Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. (b) of the Ukraine endorses the work of its representative, Comrade Mikolos, with respect to the C.P. of West Ukraine, and states that his work absolutely and fully conforms to the instructions of the Polit Bureau and that it was carried out in harmony with the decisions of the Comintern."

I believe that this completely and absolutely refutes the declaration given by Comrade Herwik, in the name of the minority of the Polish C.C., viz. that I had followed any sort of a special independent course, which led to the events in the C.P. of West Ukraine.

You must understand, comrades, what is the meaning of the charges raised against me by Herwik, Comrades, I practically never met him except two or three times at the Party Congress of the C.P.P. and at the plenum of the E.C.C.I. Now he appears at the Congress of the Comintern and charges that the former leading group of the Communist Party of West Ukraine in one of the most responsible fields, where in a short time there will be a battle raging between imperialism and Communism, between Fascist Poland and Socialism, where the leading heads committed treason, there was a preceptor, Comrade Mikolos, a spiritual leader who impelled them to commit treason, to desert into the camp of Fascism. The seriousness and the importance of such a declaration is sufficiently characteristic. I believe that after the decisions of the Comintern and of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Ukraine, which I have cited here, the speech of Comrade Herwik can only serve to prove how terrible the atmosphere in the Communist Party of Poland has been poisoned and polluted thanks to Comrades of the type of Herwik. (Applause.)

Comrade HERWIK (Poland):

Comrades, in the name of the minority of the Polish delegation I declare the following:

We deny categorically that the reply of Comrade Herwik to the speech of Comrade Mikolos was directed against the C. C. of the C. P. W. U. and its resolutions. Comrade Herwik addressed his reply to the baseless charges which Comrade Mikolos brought forward against the Minority of the Polish Party. This is not the first time that Comrade Mikolos has made such charges. There were such cases in the past, e. g. at the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. At the very time when the Vassilkov group refused to carry out the decisions of the E. C. C. I., when they opposed the national policy of the C. P. W. U. and prepared to split the C. P. W. U., Comrade Mikolos found it necessary to level unfounded charges against the minority of the C. C. of the Polish Party, the same minority which from the very beginning had called the attention of the Party and of the Comintern to the nationalist and opportunist mistakes of Vassilkov, and which during this whole

period had waged a struggle against the support given the Vassilkov group by the majority of the Central Committee of the C. P. of Poland. At the IV. Party Congress it was the minority which unreservedly shared the estimate of the E. C. C. I. on the Vassilkov group, whereas the majority in its declaration opposed this estimate. While conducting a sharp struggle against the Vassilkov group we have simultaneously most sharply emphasised at all times the merits of the C. P. W. U. in the Bolshevisation of the West Ukrainian Party.

We deny categorically that the minority of the C. C. of the C. P. P. took a position for autonomisation. This is a calumny.

Comrade Herwik was also justified in protesting against the lying calumny with respect to Lenski.

We regret that the Soviet Ukrainian Delegation, without first getting thorough information, has repeated the unfounded charges of the Polish right wing against the alleged national Bolshevism of the minority of the Polish C. C.

TO OUR READERS!

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

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

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

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

The Business Manager.