

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol 9. No. 40

PRESS

20th August 1929

CORRESPONDENCE

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

Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Full Report.

First Session.

3rd July, 1929 (morning).

The International Situation and the Tasks of the Communist International.

Report of Comrade Kuusinen.

I. The Economic Antagonisms of the Present Period.

Dear Comrades,

We had to divide the report on the first agenda item. I will report on one part, and Comrade Manuilsky on the other. The report has been divided so that I will deal with the general questions connected with the character of the present period. This includes the leftward development of the working class, and also our general strategical line. On the other hand, Comrade Manuilsky will deal with tactic and the tasks of the individual Communist Parties.

Against the Overestimation of the Technical Development of Capitalism.

Of course it is not up to me to give a new analysis of the economic or political world situation. There is no occasion for this, because the analysis given in the resolutions of the VI. World Congress, does not require alteration. We have only to throw light on the most important features of this analysis on the strength of the experience gained from events after the VI. World Congress. Hence, my task is much more modest than an analysis of the entire economic and political world situation.

When dealing with the present period, I would like to take up first of all the Right deviation which, in my opinion, is a serious deviation involving principle, although it assumes sometimes a rather "innocent" form. I mean the deviation

of overestimation of the technical development of production by contemporary capitalism, especially in the present period. You know that such an overestimation of the development of production has happened, for instance, among the German conciliators (memorandum by Ewert and others), and in a particularly sharp form in the draft theses of the Majority of the American Party for the last convention of the C. P. of the United States (Lovestone and Pepper), which spoke even of a "second industrial revolution" which is alleged to be going on in America. This expression has been used before, prior to our VI. World Congress, in an article of the London "Times". In this connection, there is a tendency to record every new technical invention as economic progress of capitalism, and also to ignore the economic limits and impeding factors of the further technical development characteristic of capitalism in general and of monopolist capitalism in particular.

In my opinion, this tendency leads to the revision of the foundation of Marxism. Therefore, our comrades must be well armed for the struggle against this deviation.

What is for us the general decisive criterion in the estimation of economic progress under capitalism? Not every technical invention has in itself a social-economic value. Big technical inventions are made which do not prove of special economic value at once, or even at all. For instance, radio, aircraft and some (not all) chemical discoveries, important in

themselves, are for the time being of relatively small economic importance. Only the view-point of the development of the productive power of labour can be a decisive economic criterion. Not every technical improvement, even if it be valuable in itself, is compatible with the given profiteering or accumulation conditions of capitalism, especially in the period of monopolist capitalism.

How can one ignore this fact? Has not, since the birth of monopolist capitalism, the contradiction between the technical development possibilities of production, on the one hand, and the profiteering interest of monopolist capital, on the other hand, been a well-known fact? Marx has already particularly emphasised this contradiction and its tendency to become accentuated in the course of capitalist development.

A big further development of the productive power of labour is certainly going on now in the capitalist world through technical improvements of the means and methods of production. This is a fact. But parallel with this, is also the tendency of stagnation, of retarded development of the forces of production. This is also a fact. How is it possible suddenly to forget what Lenin has written about this last fact, about parasitism and the disintegration of monopolist capitalism, about the tendency towards stagnation, towards a rentier State, etc. I will read you what Lenin says on this question in his "Imperialism":

"As monopolist prices are introduced, be it only temporarily, the incentive to technical and consequently to every other progress, disappears to a certain extent; There arises to the same extent the economic possibility to impede technical progress artificially."

In this connection, Comrade Lenin gives, as an example, the invention of an American named Owens for the improvement of the manufacture of bottles. This invention was bought by German bottle manufacturers to prevent its application. We read last year in the press that this invention has only been taken up now in the bottle business. — Lenin goes on to say:

"The possibility of decreasing the cost of production and increasing profits by technical improvements, certainly encourages innovations. But the tendency toward stagnation and disintegration characteristic of monopoly, does its work and gets the upper hand for certain periods in some countries and branches of industry."

But can anyone assert that this is no longer in accordance with the present capitalist system?! One has only to put this question clearly for every one to understand that this is more true today than ever before. In spite of the, in some cases, considerable technical development of the Social production apparatus which is actually going on now, it is clearer than ever before that the urge of the social productive forces to further development is much greater than there is scope for it within the framework of capitalist production conditions, that the capitalist mode of production is no longer wide enough for the development of the productive forces of labour to the extent of the existing prerequisites of technical sciences and possibilities.

In one "sphere of production" alone, the application of technical inventions makes really brilliant progress; not in the sphere of the production of means of production or consumption, of raw materials and semi-manufactured articles, but in the sphere of the production of the means of destruction, in the sphere of war technique. It is, for instance, a well-known fact that a considerable section of the chemical industry in the imperialist countries at present owes its development to the support of the governments for war purposes. The same applies to civil aviation, etc. One has only to realise to what extent technical progress in all the spheres of useful social production lags behind the triumphal march of war technique, to get an objective picture of capitalist development and to lose all desire to praise the alleged role of contemporary capitalism in regard to the enormous development of the social forces of production.

Capitalist Rationalisation.

But capitalist rationalisation is used as an argument against this conception. Rationalisation, the large scale, thorough reorganisation of production in whole branches of production, in some big industrial countries, such as Germany and the United States in almost all important spheres of production, —

this big reorganisation of production — does it not prove something quite different from what I have just said?

No, we must only understand what capitalist rationalisation is in reality. We have dealt with this question already at the 7th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. But I think that we must go now a little more fully into this question.

The capitalists themselves and the capitalist writers of course interpret "rationalisation" as various forms of reorganisation of production and distribution by which the enterprises can increase their profits. For instance, all elimination of middlemen, almost complete economising of constant capital, every normalisation, typisation, standardisation of production, etc. But this is not capitalist rationalisation in the real sense. It belongs to other categories which have been already known a long time under other, more suitable names. Capitalist rationalisation, in the real sense, is reorganisation of the labour process according to a definite system with a definite, dominating purpose of exploiting human labour power to the utmost.

Its original idea was launched by so-called "scientific management". But this idea was to a great extent put into practice through the conveyor system (with certain modifications in the building industry, offices, etc.).

We dealt at the VII. Plenum "with the capitalist rationalisation swindle". We were right in deciding against it, although the term "swindle" was not appropriate because capitalist rationalisation is a very real fact. But it is more serious that there was at that time no full clarity or unanimity in our ranks: if we should simply oppose capitalist rationalisation, or if we should only struggle against its "consequences", maintaining otherwise a certain kind of "neutrality". The German comrades felt instinctively that capitalist rationalisation would worsen enormously the position of the workers. This was correct, and they therefore protested against any attitude of neutrality in this question. But another conception cropped up in the then discussion, which placed capitalist rationalisation on a par with technical development in general. It was said that capitalist rationalisation has two sides, a technical and a social side, which are certainly inseparably connected. But this was a very inaccurate definition. It is not conducive to clarity, if the special feature of capitalist rationalisation is left out of account: capitalist rationalisation is economic progress, but it has pernicious consequences for the workers, under capitalism. Introduction of any new machinery shows this pernicious "social side" under capitalism. But here this "social side" is just the crux of the matter.

Under capitalist rationalisation, there can be improvement of machinery, in fact there is such an improvement in most cases, but it can proceed without this improvement. But there is one thing which always happens under capitalist rationalisation, namely, intensification of labour. To intensify labour, the conveyor system is introduced, it also happens (although not always) that machinery is appropriately renovated, etc. Thus, capitalist rationalisation in the true sense means enforcement of maximum intensification of labour for every individual worker through the reorganisation of the process of labour according to the conveyor system, or according to a similar system of automatic speeding up and control of labour intensity.

The difference between this definition and the above-mentioned is seemingly small, but very great in reality. One can see this clearly by asking oneself the question if the character of capitalist rationalisation consists in an increase of the productivity of labour or not. According to the former definition, yes, according to the latter definition, no!

According to Marx, increased productivity of labour means enabling the worker "to produce more with the same expenditure of labour, in the same time." This takes place mainly through the improvement of the means of labour. But intensification of labour means: "increased expenditure of labour in the same time, increased strain put on labour power, a denser filling in of the pores of the labour time, i. e. 'condensation of labour', 'condensation' of labour time, or, as Marx says; "compression of a bigger volume of work in a given space of time".

Thus, these are two different things. Both of them produce the same result for the employer: a larger quantity of goods produced by one worker in a definite space of time. What difference this constitutes in the creation of value, I

will not discuss here*). More important in this connection is the difference that increased productivity through the introduction of new machinery is, as a rule, accompanied by increased intensity of labour; intensity of labour, however, can also take place without an increase of its productivity, without technical improvement of the means of production.

There is an element in the capitalist rationalisation which is progressive in itself: elimination of superfluous motions of the workers from the labour process, or, as Marx says, "reduction of an unproductive consumption of labour power". But in comparison with the enormous intensification of labour, this is of secondary importance. The technical renovation of machinery, more or less regularly connected with capitalist rationalisation, is not, as already said, its inevitable corollary; it can be theoretically distinguished from it and included in the category of all other technical improvements, certainly with the following very important reservation: in connection with capitalist rationalisation, the technical development of machinery, and above all of the labour machine, is given a definite dominating direction: to adapt itself to the conveyor system and to enforce also, on its own part, an ever-growing intensification and automatic control of the work done. Formerly too intensification of labour always accompanied technical improvement whereas it has become now the main object of the technical improvement of the means of production.

Can we take up a neutral attitude to this, saying "this does not concern us"? Certainly not, and the decision of the VII. Plenum said so. Under what conditions could we remain neutral in the face of such a reorganisation of the Labour process? Only under the following conditions: 1. If more intensive labour is compensated to the worker by a corresponding curtailment of the working day and an increased real wage, 2. if, moreover, the increase in the intensity of labour does not go beyond a certain limit when it can be no longer compensated, when excessive strain brings with it detrimental consequences for the health and the normal living conditions of the worker in spite of a shorter working-day and higher wages, and 3. if in regard to compensation and also in regard to the required limitation of the intensity of labour the age difference (young and old workers) is taken specially into consideration. But are such conditions taken into consideration in the capitalist rationalisation? Nowhere in the capitalist world. Consideration of such conditions in the organisation of labour is to be found only in the Soviet Union. If, apart from the aforesaid three conditions, the fourth condition is carried out, i. e. if the working class itself becomes the owner of the means of production, in that case we are prepared not only to take up a neutral attitude to rationalisation, but to get reconciled to it. But in that case, it would not be capitalist rationalisation.

The Sinking of the Standard of Living of the Working Class.

The question of compensation for increased intensity by raising wages is connected with the following question. It is said in our Draft Theses that capitalist rationalisation is lowering the standard of living of the working class. Comrade Varga, who in his pamphlet published for the VI. World Congress ("Economy in the Period of Capitalist Decline After Stabilisation") has given due prominence to the intensification of labour in the capitalist rationalisation and has also drawn a line between this and increased productivity, has objected in the Presidium to our assertion re the lowering of the standard of living of the working class through capitalist rationalisation. Well, I think that in this very place we might as well declare that capitalist rationalisation brings with it an absolute worsening of the position of the working class (Interjection: Hear, hear!). But I also think that what is said in our draft resolution, is also correct. One can speak of the absolute worsening of the position of the working class even when real wages are rising, namely, in the sense as Marx says in the first part

of "Capital", that "in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the labourer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse". (page 708). This was Marx' view. But one can also defend the assertion of our draft, provided one understands correctly the formulation. Comrade Varga's proposal in regard to this point is, however, quite unacceptable. He would like to replace our formulation by the following words: capitalist rationalisation "reduces their share (the share of the workers, K.) in their own product." Yes, the capitalist rationalisation certainly does this, capitalist development has always done this. Not this, but something more is the question here.

Firstly: the standard of living of the working class certainly includes also the standard of living of the unemployed. Comrade Varga himself laid stress, and rightly so, on the enormous significance of mass unemployment in the United States and in several other countries. Can he have forgotten now this important fact?

Secondly, I would like to ask Comrade Varga a question: if the wage is lower than the value of the labour power, would this mean a lower standard of living for the workers or not? I think the answer is yes. It is in this sense that we have understood the matter and have written about it. This reduction of wages below the value of labour power, is no doubt the rule under capitalist rationalisation. Comrade Varga identifies standard of living entirely with "real wage" in the narrowest sense of the word, and there is an end of it. Let us assume that what he asserts is true: that the "real wage" of the workers is raised and not lowered through capitalist rationalisation. There is no certainty about this, but even if it were so, is this a proof that in reality the wage does not sink below the value of the labour power? (Interjection: Considerably below!) According to Marx, the wage rise means an actual reduction of the wage below the value of the labour power, "if the increased wear and tear of labour power, inseparable from a lengthened working day, be not compensated by higher wages." Moreover, one must not overlook that, according to Marx, "the value of a day's labour power is estimated from its normal average duration, or from the normal duration of life among the labourers, and from corresponding normal transformation of organised bodily matter into motion." ("Capital", Vol. I, p. 577—578.)

Well, this is taken into consideration in our resolution. But is it taken into consideration in the capitalist practice? It is not. Monopolist capital enforces not only monopolist prices for goods but also monopolist prices for labour (only in the opposite direction), it enforces the reduction of the price of labour power below its value. Appropriation of surplus profit in this latter manner takes place especially through capitalist rationalisation, through the enormous intensification of labour.

Comrade Varga declares that in America the "real wage" shows a tendency to rise, but he does not investigate how big or how small the rise is, although such an investigation would have made him realise that the standard of living of the workers is not rising in reality. In his above-mentioned pamphlet he gives, moreover, the following very strange explanation:

"The expenditure of labour power enforced by the conveyor system is only possible if there be proper feeding and a relatively short working day, otherwise the worker collapses in the place of employment itself. Just as cattle are better fed when they work very hard, capitalism is compelled to give the human automaton who are working with unprecedented intensity, more food and more rest than before."

This sounds very plausible, especially as Comrade Varga refers in a footnote to Marx (!). Nevertheless it is untrue, or it is at the utmost a half truth. True is the statement that cattle are as a rule better fed when they have to work very hard. But the workers' misfortune lies precisely in the fact that under capitalism they are not in as lucky a position as cattle, their food is not increased proportionately with the intensity of their labour. As to the quotation from Marx, it can hardly be said to confirm Varga's assertion concerning the necessity of a wage rise, because there isn't a single word about wages in the quotation. Moreover, this quotation is the only place in Marx' works (as far as I know) which in my opinion, requires now,

*) Through increased productivity of labour the value of the articles decreased, so that the greater volume does not constitute an increased total value. But through intensification of labour the value of articles does not decrease, consequently the produced greater volume has a correspondingly greater value.

in the light of the capitalist rationalisation, I will not say, revision but a certain amount of completion (although I am not quite certain if a Red professor would not be able to ferret out some sentence in Marx' works as a proof that Marx had even taken the effect of the conveyor system into consideration).

The Intensification of Labour and the growth of Mass Unemployment.

This is what Marx says:

"Nevertheless the reader will clearly see, that where we have labour, not carried on by fits and starts, but repeated day after day with unvarying uniformity, a point must inevitably be reached, where extension of the working day and intensity of the labour mutually exclude one another, in such a way that lengthening of the working day become compatible only with a lower degree of intensity, and, a higher degree of intensity, only with a shortening of the working day." ("Capital", Vol. I p. 447.)

Substantially, this is still correct. The point where intensification of labour and extension of the working day collide or mutually exclude one another, can still be reached, except that through capitalist rationalisation this point has been pushed much further and deeper. The conveyor system determines the degree of the intensity of labour; once fixed, the tempo of labour no longer depends on the smaller or greater individual capacity of the labourer. Either he can keep pace or he cannot. If he can, he must work exactly at the fixed tempo; if he cannot, away he goes, he is no longer a labourer for the given enterprise, he is a labour corpse which is replaced by another labourer. This is the meaning of capitalist rationalisation: the juggernaut of capitalism is capable of crushing the generations of labourers much more rapidly than before.

This Marxist analysis of new phenomena corresponds entirely with the general tendencies of capitalism shown by Marx. "The self-destructive intensity of labour" which he has described, has become to a great extent the order of the day through capitalist "rationalisation". Comrade Varga himself quotes in his pamphlet the following very characteristic remark of Prof. Düring:

"The performance will remain at this point (when fatigue sets in) the same as before, — the labourer is not at all conscious of the state of fatigue" (this is a gross exaggeration, K.) "neither can it be objectively proved, as the performance has remained the same... The gradual increase of the hardness of the work is not felt by the labourer himself because it is such a very gradual process... Some slight ailment can, however, suddenly reveal the state of the labourer, or he himself will begin to see as time goes on 'that he can no longer get along'... This impossibility to recognise the creeping process of exhaustion is one of the saddest facts which baffles any scientific limitation (?) of admissible labour intensity."

Well, if even the scientists of capitalism experience difficulties in limiting "admissible labour intensity", the capitalists themselves have certainly no occasion to limit the intensity of labour. Formerly, it was to a certain extent in the interest of the employer himself not to allow the intensity of labour to go beyond a certain point in relation to the length of the working day. Now "rationalisation" gives him more liberty to work the labourers to death. The very heart-blood of the labourer is sucked out for the sake of profit.

Hence also the enormous mass unemployment. It is just as Marx has said:

"The condemnation of the working class to enforced idleness through the overtime of the other section and vice versa, becomes to the individual capitalist a means for enriching himself." (Free translation, Tr.)

And in this connection Marx adds in regard to Great Britain:

"If labour in general were to be limited tomorrow to a rational proportion, and if it were graduated for the various sections of the working class according to age and sex, the available working population would not suffice for the continuance of the national production at its present rate." (Free translation, Tr.)

One can see in what sense Marx understands real rationalisation. But rationalisation in this sense is to be found only in the Soviet Union where it is possible through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All this is extremely important to us in our practical work. It shows that our struggle for higher wages and especially for the shortening of the working day has gained in importance since the introduction of capitalist rationalisation. One can see how obsolete is our former slogan of the 8-hour day. One can also see the importance of explaining correctly and concretely to the mass of the workers the enormous worsening of the position of the working class as a result of capitalist rationalisation, of bringing it clearly home to them.

It is to the credit of Comrade Varga that he has laid the necessary stress not only on the importance but also on the new character of the present mass unemployment in the United States, Great Britain and Germany. Certainly, it has already become a general law of capitalist accumulation that, the greater the progress of the concentration and centralisation of capital, the greater the growth of the industrial reserve army. But one cannot explain by this alone the present volume of mass unemployment. I cannot agree with Comrade Varga's attempt to construct a general law or a general tendency out of the absolute diminution of the number of labourers. But inasmuch as he establishes a causal connection between the enormous growth and the chronic character of mass unemployment in the capitalist world in the last 5 years and capitalist rationalisation, as well as the relative tightness of the export markets of the respective capitalist countries, he is certainly right. The unemployed reserve army for the contemporary American, British and German capitalism must certainly be big, but that it should be as big as is actually the case, exceeds already the limits of what is in the interest of the profits of the capitalism of the respective countries. Unemployment as a means of bringing down the wages of the employed, is alluring to the capitalists who are out for profits, but beyond this, enormous numbers of unemployed who do not create surplus value for years, is not at all as it should be. These labourers are after all "their" labourers, labourers of capitalism, but they no longer create surplus value, and this is not as it should be. This is a serious sign of the crisis of capitalism.

Is Capitalist Planned Economy Possible?

What does finance capital undertake under these circumstances? Firstly, further concentration of production, further centralisation of capital, further monopolisation in all the important capitalist countries. The mechanism of finance capital is brought into a "still greater state of perfection" by further fusion of bank and industrial capital, by monopolist control over ever extending economic spheres, the transport service, the internal and external trade, etc.; lately for instance, the new big export monopolies of the United States have become very prominent. Furthermore, the centralisation of bank capital goes on steadily. In a word, all the methods of finance capital are constantly developed for the "peaceful organisation" of its monopoly system, the system which was praised last autumn by the participants in the Zurich conference of the League For Social Politics, with Werner Sombart at their head, as a wonderful system of stable, harmonious, properly "regulated" or "confined" national economy. Sombart himself has certainly become rather sentimental in his old days; he no longer speaks of "high capitalism", he speaks of "late capitalism". But as a substitute for the lost beauty of high capitalism, the Sombart late capitalism has been freed from all dangerous contradictions. The gist of this is a prophecy on the part of Sombart of another quiet 100 years or more for capitalism (a prospect such as an old professor would probably wish for himself).

Herkner, another old well-known figure, is not as sentimental as Sombart, he is more optimistic, and he made at this conference an idyllic comparison:

"Perhaps capitalism resembles a barrel of wine of a celebrated vintage which is fed from time to time with a new socialist wine, but without depriving it of its maturity."

It is a pity that Karl Kautsky was not there, the chief Marxist of the II. International; he could have agreed without much ado with the peaceful ultra-imperialism of Sombart, as well as with the capitalist-socialist-optimism of Herkner, for hasn't he said in his last work: "Materialist Conception of History":

"Capitalism has gone through so many crises, has been able to adapt itself to so many new and frequently surprising and enormous demands, that from a purely economic viewpoint, it seems to have more vitality than half a century ago."

This is the length this "Marxist" has gone.

What does this "regulated", "confined" capitalism, this capitalist "planned economy" represent? It is something that finance capital desires and to which it aspires, but which it cannot achieve. The national economy of the Soviet Union works according to a Five-Year Plan — can anything similar be seen in the capitalist world?!

Wall Street dreams, for instance, of complete control and regulation of the world money market. But as we can now see, hardly have such dreams been conceived when harsh reality in the form of wild speculation on the Stock Exchange and a sharp international credit crisis, plays havoc with them. Can capitalist rivalry be completely eliminated, even in a few countries, through capitalist monopoly? Certainly not. Gigantic concentration of the means of production and centralisation of capitalism, truly vast schemes for the socialisation of labour, these are facts. But it is also a fact that capitalist monopoly can exist only in a general capitalist milieu, and this means: in the milieu of commodity production, of simultaneously existing competition and rivalry. Capitalist monopoly finds itself in constant and insoluble contradiction to its own general milieu, as clearly shown by Lenin, on the basis of the Marxist doctrine, in his "Imperialism". Engels in his notes to volume III. "Capital", when dealing with the increased efforts of the capitalists to bring about through cartels and trusts regulation of production and thereby of prices and profits, makes the following statement:

"It is self-evident that such experiments are possible only under relatively favourable economic weather conditions... even if production requires regulation, surely this is not the business of the capitalist class." (Free translation, Tr.)

This is the business of the working class, as even a superficial comparison — from this point of view — between the economic system of the Soviet Union and that of the capitalist countries will show.

Socialist Planned Economy.

The high degree of centralisation of industrial production, beside which free competition plays a very subordinate role; state monopoly of foreign trade; rational economy according to plan not only in industry and trade but also in agriculture, — all this, quite apart from the socialist character of this planned economy, only as an organisational form, means the possibility of enormous saving of productive forces, such as is not possible in any capitalist country. Even if we take into consideration only a single partial phenomenon of economic waste in the capitalist countries, losses through strikes, we can easily imagine what enormous savings the economic system of the Soviet Union implies, because the working class itself is the owner of the means of production. Moreover, we must bear in mind that even when capitalist monopoly succeeds in partially eliminating free competition, this happens in capitalist countries not so much in order to develop the social forces of production, but rather to impede this development.

The contrary is the case in the Soviet Union: it is precisely through the abolition of capitalist monopoly, through the establishment of the monopoly of the working class that the social forces of production have been set free. Even the interference with the normal international economic relations with the Soviet Union by the surrounding capitalist world is in many ways compensated by the upsurge of the emancipated, rationally conducted productive forces of the Soviet Union.

Even in the sphere where socialist planned economy is most difficult in the Soviet Union, namely in agriculture, the application of the present course of the C. P. S. U. means a gigantic step forward. I mean the course of collectivisation of agriculture (Soviet farms, collective enterprises, etc.). The collective enterprises alone which comprise at present in the

Soviet Union about 2½—3 million hectares, will comprise at the end of the Five-Year Plan about 25 million hectares, that is to say, ten times as much. This means consistent socialist management in the development of the national economy carried through with the support of the most important sections of the peasantry of the Soviet Union. This means introduction on a large scale of socialist reconstruction of peasant farming, and consolidation of the leading role of the working class on the basis of the development of the new forms of production implied in the alliance of the working class with the most important sections of the peasantry.

The carrying through of the Five-Year Plan "of gigantic work" which demands enormous efforts on the part of the working class, in order to overcome the resistance of the capitalist elements and to remedy the extreme backwardness of agriculture, guarantees a consolidation of the socialist sector in town and country at the expense of the capitalist elements in the national economy.

As I have spoken about the labour conditions of the proletariat of the capitalist countries in connection with capitalist rationalisation, I must also mention a few simple but very characteristic facts concerning the labour conditions of the workers of the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union, workers' wages rise every year. Moreover, 10% of the revenue of the enterprises go to the improvement of the conditions of the working class, which means that as the productivity of labour rises, the share of the workers in the profits rises in proportion. Then, there is social insurance to which the workers do not contribute anything; apart from wages they get all the benefits of social insurance; the social insurance fund amounts now to 1,100,000,000 roubles. In addition, workers have cultural and educational advantages. As to working hours, the 7-hour day is now being introduced in the Soviet Union. By October 1929, the 7-hour day will have been introduced in 20% of the industry. By the end of the Five-Year Plan, that is to say in five years, the 7-hour day is to be the rule in the whole industry of the country. Underground workers have already the 6-hour day; the same is also the case in occupations injurious to health.

All this explains the enthusiastic, creative "competition" of the human forces of production in the Soviet Union which have broken the chains of capitalist exploitation and slavery and are constructing their own socialist house. This enthusiastic competition enables the Soviet Union to out-distance by far the development rate of the most advanced capitalist countries. We have every reason to probe in all capitalist countries the main questions of the Soviet Union, as well as the questions of its economic development as our own questions and to explain to millions of workers the great process of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Instead of talking about the stabilisation of the capitalist world where stabilisation is seriously shaken, we have every reason to present a clear picture of the conditions of the only State in the world which is not only becoming stabilised, but is also constructing socialism.

The Imperialist Antagonism on a World-Scale.

I will go back to the capitalist world. It is certainly true that through the development of monopolist capitalism the regulating role of the free market is more and more restricted not only in the individual countries but to a certain extent also on an international scale. What is the consequence? Does a new general regulator take its place? The answer is in the negative. Capitalist rationalisation has, for instance, increased enormously Germany's capacity to produce and compete, but how and where to compete is a question which has not been solved for Germany. Can, perhaps, international concerns function in the role of a general regulator of capitalism? Certainly not. For instance, gigantic international raw material cartels have come into being, but they are the cause of continuous production crises in various countries in the respective production spheres. It seems that through them the crises are still more internationalised.

One can see of what enormous importance is the fact that the capitalist world, instead of having one centralisation centre,

has several such centres: the various big imperialist centres whose further development and consolidation is proceeding at an uneven rate. The more the function of the general regulator of the capitalist world economy is interfered with, the better opportunity have the various leading groups of the financial world to "regulate" at their own sweet will and in their own way. But they regulate against one another, each in the interest of its own surplus profit. This means: struggle without impediments.

In this struggle, investments of capital can be very well a means of poaching on other peoples' preserves. Not only in the colonies and "spheres of influence" of the opponent, but also in the opponent mother country, investments of capital are used as instruments of imperialist struggle. We had a typical example of this in Britain, I mean the General Electric Company. Here British and American capital came into collision, and it became evident that American capital had penetrated in order to act not only as a usurer, but also as a saboteur. Economic sabotage in the citadel of the opponent — why should not the finance oligarchy indulge in this? Or is this perhaps more reprehensible than espionage, bribing the press and such like methods of "competition" in which the high diplomats of imperialism indulge in all countries?! Struggle in all spheres, for outlets, for raw material sources, for spheres of export of capital not only for economic partial interests, but above all, for extension of one's own economic territory, and this of course at the expense of others, because the world is already partitioned. Struggle for supremacy and monopoly — such is in reality capitalist "planned economy".

To talk out of existence these contradictions of the capitalist world, and especially to deny the accentuation of these contradictions, is the business of the "scientific" apologists of finance capital such as Sombart and Kautsky. In this connection, their method is rather cunning. Sombart for instance, indulges in seemingly Marxist phraseology; he produces facts concerning the process of the socialisation of labour, he admits the parasitical character of modern capitalism, he does not prophesy eternal life to capitalism, but its gradual decay, perhaps in a hundred years time... Prof. Schulze-Gävernitz, on the other hand, has already taken fright. At the afore mentioned Zurich conference he said in reply to Sombart: perhaps revolution is possible because "the peace treaties have certainly accumulated stores of dynamite in Europe" and "the wheat of revolution will never flourish so well as in new wars". He is even afraid that it will not only be a revolution in Europe but a "world revolution which might even seriously jeopardise the position of the titan of Anglo-American capitalism". He says: "Europe would be then an Asiatic Peninsula of archaeological interest". One can see how panic stricken the poor man is, for he cannot find any other means to save the capitalist world than inoculation with Christian faith, namely a recipe of merely "archaeological interest".

The Law of the Collapse of Capitalism.

Why do I speak here about these apologists of capitalism? Because it is particularly important at the present juncture to give through our propaganda a clear picture of the accentuation of the contradictions of capitalism. This is the point on which we must concentrate our sharpest criticism. Of course not only criticism of Sombart, Kautsky, Hilferding and Co. Even our self-criticism must be wide awake in regard to this, to prevent us making even the least concession to a tendency which might land us in the belief in a gradual "decay" of capitalism. A warning example is the mistake made by such a great revolutionary as Comrade Rosa Luxemburg who, in her desire to construct a simple, purely economic law of the collapse of capitalism, was diverted into the wrong channel. I do not know if I am mistaken when I assume that "the tendency of the decreasing number of workers" brought forward by Comrade Varga (which he connects with the process of the final conversion of peasants into farmers and with the process of the industrialisation of the colonies) contains the germ of a new theory of the gradual decay of capitalism. The desire to find a consistent, unequivocal and terse economic motivation of the inevitable collapse of capitalism, is a perfectly

legitimate desire. In order to satisfy this desire in our propaganda, I advise the comrades firstly, to make an even more careful study of our programme than before and secondly, to study Marx more than before. Why should we want new laws re the collapse of capitalism, when Marx has formulated this matter consistently and clearly. I ask your indulgence in order to recall this Marxian law.

In the foreword to the "Critique of Political Economy" Marx brings forward the general law which applies to the capitalist as well as to the older modes of production:

"At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or — what is but a legal expression for the same thing — with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of Social revolution."

The collapse of capitalism is especially referred to in the well-known passage at the end of Volume I, "Capital".

"The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." ("Capital". Vol. I. p. 837.)

Can this more than 60 year old statement by Marx concern us now? Very much so! It fits exactly the present situation. Now is the time Marx has predicted. The monopoly of capital has become a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it". The centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour have reached the point "where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument". The development of the social forces of production is already out of harmony with the capitalist property relations.

The professional falsifiers of Marxism, such as Kautsky and Cunov, have falsified here too the Marxian dialectic just a little. Their interpretation is as if Marx had asserted that the end of capitalism will not come until a further development of the forces of production is utterly impossible. Cunov then makes the deduction: Consequently, capitalism has still a long lease of life. But Kautsky, who wants to appear more clever and even more "socialistic" than Marx, asserts: Marx was mistaken: "The end (of capitalism) will come sooner" (i. e. already during capitalism). Marx, however, has never prognosticated an absolute stagnation of the further development of the forces of production.

In his law, Marx does not take either the social forces of production or the capitalist property relations as static entities, but both of them in their destined, inevitable historical development. According to Marx, the development of the capitalist property relations is in the direction of monopoly, of an evergrowing centralisation of capital. This centralisation means "expropriation of many capitalists by few"; it leads to a constant reduction of the "number of magnates of capitalism" (not of workers, Comrade Varga, and also not necessarily of all capitalists, but of those magnates of capitalism) "who usurp and monopolise all the advantages of this transformation process" (of the socialisation of labour, the technical development of production, etc., K.). This fits admirably the present epoch of finance capital. Marx does not mean by this that capitalist monopoly develops in a manner to eliminate completely capitalist competition. He puts the matter exactly. "The monopoly of capital becomes" (it has already become K.) "a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it". Which mode of production? The capitalist. Thus, the monopoly of capital was to become a fetter upon the capitalist mode of production, does this tally? Certainly. This is expressed in a twofold manner: 1. The monopoly of capital acts as a fetter upon free competition and 2. as a fetter upon the free development of the forces

of production. As to the development of the forces of production, it is described by Marx as follows:

"Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour process, the conscious technical application of science (thus, there is not absolute prevention but rather absolute development of production technique, K.), the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all the means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime." ("Capital" Vol. I. p. 836).

How, according to Marx, does the conflict between the thus developing social forces of production and the simultaneously growing monopoly of capital, find a solution? Through the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat. The most important of the "social forces of production", human labour power, which, under capitalism, is the exploited wage proletariat, is educated by capitalism itself to be its grave digger:

There "grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation, etc. but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself." ("Capital", Vol. I., p. 836—837).

Through this working class the expropriators are expropriated, capitalist private ownership is abolished, the capitalist integument of the economic and entire social development is burst asunder. This is the law of Marx on the collapse of capitalism, already completely confirmed by the great revolution of the Russian proletariat. In the present epoch of imperialism, this law has set in throughout the imperialist world. Our task must be: to carry on a sharp ideological struggle against all attempts to revise these Marxian doctrines, to explain them to the mass of the workers not in an abstract fashion and not by merely repeating Marx' words, but by a concrete presentation of his law in the light of the present glaring contradictions of capitalism.

II. The Most Important Actual Antagonisms in International Politics.

The Soviet Union and the Capitalist World.

Parallel with the socialist development and consolidation of the Soviet Union, its international influence, the activity of the proletariat and support for the Soviet Union on the part of the toiling masses of the oppressed peoples, are increasing. All the more, however, is the predatory aggressiveness of imperialism against the Soviet Union increasing. Owing to the growing imperialist appetite of the capitalist environment of the Soviet Union and to the aspirations of this environment as a result of internal economic difficulties, to open up the biggest potential sales market, the differences between the capitalist states and the Soviet Union entered upon a new acute phase after the first years of the relative stabilisation of capitalism. Not only the hostile encirclement policy and finance blockade, but also direct war preparations against the Soviet Union are being relentlessly pursued.

The feverish armaments of the border states of the Soviet Union, the various military agreements between Poland and Rumania, the active leading participation of the French General Staff in the organisation and equipment of the Polish and Rumanian armies, Great Britain's machinations against the Soviet Union on Afghan territory (frontier raids of the White-Bukhara and Chinese gangs, the police raid on the Soviet Consulate in China, etc.), bear witness of this.

In the Anglo-French anti-Soviet bloc, the role of French imperialism as organiser of war against the Soviet Union has become very prominent lately. Through this war, French imperialism — by utilising its Eastern vassals, Poland, Czecho-

The Necessity of Leninist Concretisation.

In this connection, we must make our point of departure the concretisation of the Marxian doctrine which Lenin has given us. The main feature of Lenin's concretisation is the prominence he gives to the unevenness of development during imperialism, in various spheres, in town and country, in various countries and parts of the world. There is, on the one hand, accentuation of the economic and political struggle between the individual imperialist powers, and, as the world is divided among the imperialists, inevitability of imperialist wars for colonies and world hegemony. On the other hand, there is the special role of the peasant and national questions in the class struggles of the present epoch, as well as the important role of the colonial liberation struggles. But the greatest "concretisation" of the Marxian doctrines is the existence and role of the Soviet Union as the basis of the proletarian world revolution.

All that Leninism has contributed as concretisation of the Marxian doctrine, does not change the Marxian law in the least. On the contrary. All the glaring contradictions of imperialism in the present epoch have their root in the fundamental contradiction laid down in the Marxian law. For does not, for instance, the accentuation of the Anglo-American antagonism show that the monopoly of capital has become a fetter upon the capitalist mode of production? This fetter is felt now distinctly in both countries by the capitalists, as well as by the workers and the unemployed. The British capitalists seem to think that the American monopoly of capital is becoming a fetter upon the British capitalism, whereas the bourgeoisie of the United States thinks that it is the other way round. Hence, the struggle. Or let us take the development of the productive forces of India; is it not fettered through the monopoly of capital of the British imperialism? Is it not the same with the development of China through the British and Japanese monopoly etc.? This is certainly the case. The capitalist environment, on its part, is an impediment to the full development of the productive forces of the Soviet Union.

We must not even for a minute leave out of account what Lenin said: "This accentuation of differences constitutes the most powerful driving force of the historical transition epoch" — the epoch of imperialism. This was the view of the great revolutionary Marxist, and this has never been so true as in the present epoch of imperialism.

slovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania — would like to make a decisive step towards the subjugation of the whole European Continent to its direct or indirect domination.

The war policy of the capitalist states against the Soviet Union does not of course mean that they are united in the so-called Russian question. These are two different matters: there can be no complete unity among robbers, as Lenin has pointed out.

There is a MacDonald Government now in Britain; what will this mean in regard to the war policy against the Soviet Union: I think, only a step backward in order to make two steps forward. Even the British bourgeoisie was not quite united in its policy towards the Soviet Union. Chamberlain and Baldwin enforced the war policy as much as they could, but they were not very successful. MacDonald's mission is — to continue this policy in a roundabout way.

The Parties of the Second International are certainly more aggressive towards the Soviet Union than some capitalist circles. This is directly connected with their role of agency of the bourgeois counter-revolution in the labour movement. Their whole political existence is threatened by the revolutionisation process of the workers in the capitalist countries, on which process the socialist constructive work of the Soviet Union has a direct influence. The seemingly considerable difference between the "pacifist" policy of the Labour Government, and, for instance, the frankly social-fascist policy of the S. P. of Germany, is after all only a small temporary "transitional" difference. But more of this later on.

The International Position of the German Bourgeoisie.

The foremost general tendency in the foreign policy of the German bourgeoisie is the sharpening of the anti-Soviet policy. But if one takes into consideration not only this side of the question, but the entire international situation of the German bourgeoisie, one can see that it finds itself at present in a very conflicting situation. A sign of this is the division of German Fascism in two camps: social-fascism and German nationalists; between whom an expedient political division of labour has taken place. The so-called "understanding policy" of the new German imperialism in regard to the Anglo-French bloc which was represented in the last years by the S. P. G., the Centre Party, and Stresemann, aims at a certain internal stabilisation of German capitalism, even at the price of recognising French hegemony on the European Continent. As compensation for loyal carrying out of the most important conditions of the Versailles Peace Treaty and support to the general reactionary European policy of the Anglo-French bloc, Germany can claim later on certain colonial mandates, etc. But as it is already perfectly clear that the hope of obtaining colonial mandates from the Entente rests on no foundation, the "fulfilment policy" alone cannot satisfy the German bourgeoisie. It is not content with the role of squeezing the enormous war contributions for two or three generations out of the German proletariat and of handing them over to the Entente; it is interested in union with Austria, in the rectification of the Eastern frontiers, and especially in obtaining the right to armaments. It is very interested in the conquest of the Russian markets, but only for itself and not for the benefit of Poland and France. It is not interested in further French and Polish expansion which would place Germany between hammer and anvil.

The conflicting situation of the new German imperialism was very evident also in the recent discussion of the reparations question in Paris.

The Reparations Question.

Ten years ago, when Müller signed the Versailles Agreement, the situation in the reparations question was not as complicated as it is now. The dictum then was: Germany must pay, it must pay a great deal, and if it does not pay, we will beat it as one beats somebody else's pig." And Germany was beaten, corridors were made in East Germany, whole regions were occupied in West Germany, and thus the country was surrounded by walls and besieged. But after a few years one could see that — as an old proverb says — no walls are so high that a donkey with a load of gold could not get over them (today a donkey with a load of gold is no longer a donkey). The dollar came from America, and Germany began to pay with dollars. This was the turning point. Ten years ago, when the saintly Wilson was in Versailles, he said to the Allies in the name of American capitalists: "I am for self-determination of all peoples, do as you please, but on the sole condition that you pay me back every dollar you owe; where you are to take this money from, does not worry me, and if, in this connection, you will show no respect for the self-determination of other peoples, I can look the other way, in order not to see anything." But the Dawes and Young method is quite different. America, said Lenin, robs the world in an "original" manner, i. e. for the time being, in a business-like manner. One can see that this applies also to the manner of the present solution of the reparations problem: abolition of the political commissars of the victorious powers in Germany, and their substitution by bank commissars; the contemplated evacuation of the Rhineland; the substitution of military occupation methods by the financial machinations of the new international reparations bank; fixation of the maximum amount of the war contribution; abolition of the transfer-protection, commercial mobilisation of the reparation debts of Germany.

What is the speculation of the four chief partners at the Paris gambling table? The pretensions of the French Government were nearest to the original Versailles standpoint: as many contributions from Germany as possible without opening the door even the least little bit for imperialist expansion by Germany. In regard to the maximum amount of the contri-

bution, the French government was compelled to make concessions, but in the agreeable form that French imperialism is to get a great deal of money in the next years (through the commercialisation of reparations), but naturally at the expense of the future and at the price of renouncing direct colonisation policy as far as Germany is concerned. This form is agreeable to the French imperialism because it cannot of course know what the world will be like in 37 or 58 years, and therefore every franc in the pocket is worth much more in the next years than the finest promises for the distant future. Thus, its consent rested on a very real calculation.

What was the speculation of the German "understanding" — politicians in Paris? They said: "Although we are incapable, of paying, as our experts can prove, we are prepared to pay even more than your experts think possible, provided you give us certain colonial mandates and such-like things. This was said (or hinted at) especially by the unofficial German representatives in Paris. This naive speculation, to be able to secure, through the goodwill of France and Britain, prospects of colonial expansion, has completely failed in Paris. Moreover, the British government wanted in Paris to tie Germany more securely to the Anglo-French bloc (of course, without itself losing any financial advantages), and eventually to separate Germany from the United States, especially by linking up the question of German reparations with the demand to reduce the inter-allied debts to the United States. But also this speculation failed to a great extent.

On its part, the American imperialism, represented in Paris by the Morgan Firm, showed its willingness to negotiate financially Germany's release from the clutches of the direct colonisation policy of France, but at the price of satisfactory economic and political provision: the prospect of gradually placing Germany under American financial control, of using it subsequently as a basis of American financial control also for various other parts of Europe, and in the future eventually even as a political counterpoise against British imperialism. It seems to me that this American speculation has been given a good chance through the Young-Plan. Without the participation of American capital, nothing could have been done. The Americans know that this Young-business requires capital, but as everyone knows, with the Americans finance technique is a high art, with a relatively small investment of capital they manage to secure a maximum of power and control.

The United States and Germany.

In fact, the attitude of American imperialism has undergone a considerable change in these ten years. The Monroe doctrine is all right, but it no longer satisfies American imperialism. The export of American capital is playing an important role. Once this mass export of capital from the United States has started, why should this capital be invested only in China or in the backward countries in general; surely, a highly developed industrial country such as Germany will do at least just as well in regard to working for the accumulation of American finance capital. As a vassal State under American control, Germany would certainly be made welcome... Lately, such speculations have sometimes been revealed by certain remarks in American financial circles; very characteristic was also the advice given recently in the bulletin of the New York National City Bank in regard to the solution of the German reparations question. Germany must work more and eat less.

According to the Young-Plan, Germany must pay, pay a great deal, but the export possibilities of the German capitalism have not been extended. This very important question has not even been dealt with in Paris. Can Germany pay or not? Keynes, in his last article, thinks that it cannot, Comrade Varga thinks that it can. We should therefore be cautious in our statements. What is going to happen in 37 or 58 years time, is a special question (we have our own views on this matter), but as to what will happen in the next few years, we can safely prophesy that enormous difficulties are in store in regard to the carrying through of the Young-Plan. As I have already said, the German bourgeoisie, on its part, is not prepared simply to rest content with the modest role of paying the yearly war contribution; it too is determined to go in for an imperialist policy. This policy implies that Germany must to a certain extent comply with the existing system of the imperialist world forces such as they are. But this system is full of great

antagonisms, and the position of the inadequately armed German bourgeoisie cannot be an easy one. The "understanding policy" in its present form will serve no purpose after the evacuation of the Rhineland. What then? I reckon with a growing American orientation of the German bourgeoisie. Does this mean immediate definite wheeling round to an anti-British or anti-French policy on the part of the German bourgeoisie? Certainly not. The position of the German bourgeoisie is precarious. This prevents it taking up an uncompromising attitude to this greatest antagonism between the imperialist big powers. In the small town where I went to school in my young days, there lived a merchant, no Croesus by any means according to modern ideas, but certainly the richest man in the said town; there were two parties in the town, and before every municipal election, when he was asked by his customers for which party he would vote, he said: "I am not rich enough to have political principles". Neither is the German bourgeoisie already rich enough to choose between Britain and America. But in any case, the law of dependence of bourgeois ideology on the golden chains, will assert itself. The relation between debtor and creditor is sounder than the relation between buyer and seller. According to the Young-Plan, American imperialism plays in regard to Germany the role of chief creditor, who is moreover always prepared to give new loans. From the standpoint of the German bourgeoisie and its imperialistic pretensions, the American orientation can appear, if not very much, at least a little more promising than the present practical capitulation policy before the Franco-Polish expansion.

In his last speech, Stresemann mentioned colonisation tendencies in the policy of American imperialism. This is correct, such tendencies exist. But considering that Stresemann did not discover in his former speeches such tendencies in the French imperialism which occupied the Rhineland, we can assume that in the next years he will be impelled to give fulsome praise to the growing dependence of German imperialism on American financial control, as being in the "national interest of Germany". Or, if he be not prepared to do so, the German bourgeoisie will be probably compelled to look for another Foreign Minister.

The "Solution" of the Imperialist Antagonisms.

Does the provisional attempt to solve the reparations question mean a "bridging over" of the imperialist differences, as Comrade Varga thinks in his amendment to our draft theses? It does not. Attempts to bridge over, is one thing, but the result of these attempts, is another. The Young-Commission itself has expressed its apprehensions as follows in its report:

"Should their (the participants') attitude show any signs of hostility or even distrust, or should it show a desire to bring about or continue one-sided economic discriminations, then a settlement which could be effected provided there be goodwill, would meet with difficulties sooner or later, so that the slow, painstaking and patient work of the reconstruction of Europe would experience a lasting setback. For without goodwill and mutual confidence all agreements and guarantees are worthless."

To reckon on "good will" in the existing imperialist contradictions, does not sound very hopeful. Or can one really imagine that the existing imperialist contradictions will not assert themselves in the international reparations bank? I think they will. I will not speak at this juncture about the prospect of an accentuation of the internal class differences in Germany, I will come to this later on. But firstly, there is no prospect whatever of getting rid of the Anglo-American contradiction through this solution of the reparations problem, we must rather expect a sharpening of the contradiction. Secondly, the Franco-German relations are bound to become more strained. Thirdly, we must reckon with the following prospect: enormous difficulties will arise in the carrying through of the Young-Plan, because the question of export markets for Germany has remained unsolved. Where is its solution to be found? In some African colonies for Germany? But this is ridiculous! They will look for this solution everywhere, but above all in the East, in the Soviet Union. No other country stands in such need of the markets of the Soviet Union as precisely Germany. The pressure of the capitalist world on the Soviet Union will increase. The old slogan "Germany

must pay" will be gradually converted into the new slogan "Russia must pay, Russia must buy, and if it does not want to, we will establish a blockade of the whole capitalist world against the Soviet Union". This will probably be the subject of the forthcoming conversation between MacDonald and Hoover, and the big speculators who will be sitting in the International Reparations Bank will certainly pursue the policy of increased pressure on the Soviet Union. Then, this anti-Soviet policy will be pursued with the direct participation of American imperialism, perhaps even under its leadership, and this means a big step in the direction of establishing the general capitalist united front against the Soviet Union.

Not only in the German reparations question is the old framework of the Versailles Peace Treaty becoming too narrow for the expansion of American imperialism, British, French and Japanese expansion can go on more or less comfortably on the basis of the Versailles Agreement. On the other hand, the expansion of the United States outside the American Continent can for the time being achieve only economic gains. Not only Europe is to be open to American financial expansion, not only freedom of all the seas, but open doors in all Continents, has become the slogan of American imperialism. The Monroe doctrine is all right, but not wide enough for this imperialism which has become so gigantically strong economically. Shut the doors of the American Continent, but open the doors of all other Continents!

The Anglo-American Antagonism.

The economic struggle between British and American capital is assuming ever-growing dimensions and sharper forms. In South America, we see a vivid example of this. Inevitably, the economic struggle is converted into political struggle. The competition in armaments is assuming a feverish character on both sides. Does this stage of mutual war preparations exclude the continuance of negotiations about "limitation of armaments", "maintenance of peace" and "outlawing war"? Certainly not. Negotiations concerning peace are a necessary component part of war preparations. We know this well from the history of the negotiations between Germany, Great Britain and France on the eve of the imperialist world war. The "success" of these negotiations was trumpeted everyday in the whole capitalist press, and some diplomats even thought that the prospects of the peaceful settlement had greatly improved just at the moment when, suddenly, the war broke out. Suddenness, surprise, belong to the launching of an imperialist world war just as much as the preceding pacifist negotiations. Such negotiations are necessary from various viewpoints. Firstly, in order to prepare the mass of one's own people for the event of war. Especially after the experience of the last imperialist war, which is still in the memory of the peoples of the capitalist countries, it is necessary to bring pacifist slogans into play on a large scale up to the very outbreak of war. This diplomatic game is also necessary for the wrestling-match for allies, and also for the purpose of postponing the outbreak of war till a suitable moment. The new imperialist world war will be a very risky affair. Just imagine it from the viewpoint of the British bourgeoisie. This war will be a trial of strength in which the whole destiny of the present British imperialism will be at stake. It is but natural that the British bourgeoisie cannot make up its mind to force on this war without trying to postpone it and to achieve its imperialist aims **without** it. Neither has American imperialism any particular reason for accelerating this war, because time works in its favour. The negotiations of the imperialist governments about maintenance of peace mean nothing but struggle for more favourable conditions for launching war, and in this sense, they belong to the necessary methods of war preparation.

MacDonald wants now to have a personal conversation with Hoover on the principles of peace! Well, this will affect very little the practical accentuation of the big objective contradictions. Not only such meaningless conversations, not only negotiations, but even solemn agreements are likely to be made. But one thing is certain: the competition in armaments will continue, the economic and political struggle will become sharper, the moment of the great collision is getting nearer.

The political atmosphere is becoming very strained throughout the world, through the differences between world imperialism and the Soviet Union, as well as through the Anglo-American

antagonism. In regard to the latter, an important regrouping of forces is going on. Canada and Australia are irresistibly drawn into the course of American imperialism. Italy must make up its mind, and shows more and more inclination for the American orientation. Japan must also make up its mind, and its leanings are towards the British camp. The effect of this contradiction is becoming more and more evident in the most important colonies of the British Empire. Moreover, American imperialism is very cleverly making the most of the possibility of operating for the time being — thanks to the objective situation — with methods and slogans other than those of the British and Japanese imperialism, in order to penetrate into the spheres of influence of others, for instance, with the help of the slogan "self-determination of nations", as shown recently in connection with the Kellogg Pact and the American *beau geste* in regard to Egypt, or with the help of the open door slogan in China. This is bound to have a certain amount of influence on the orientation of the national-reformist bourgeoisie in the colonial countries.

The Situation of China.

Resting on its economic power, the United States concentrates in China first and foremost on the conquest of important economic positions, on the financial and diplomatic subjugation of the central government, the hope to compensate itself in this manner for the absence of a territorial sphere of influence such as Great Britain and Japan possess in China, in order to adopt subsequently coercive methods. Part of the Chinese bourgeoisie harbour the illusion that it will succeed — by making use of the rivalry of the various imperialist powers, and especially now through the support of the United States — in achieving considerable successes with regard to the independent development of China. But in reality, the Chinese bourgeoisie cannot get anything but "rights" which serve at the given moment the purpose of the imperialist policy of this or that big power. For instance, what does the formal customs autonomy mean? You will remember how the Trotskyists exaggerated the importance of this question, making it almost appear as the decisive question of the Chinese Revolution. Well, the Nanking Government has now Customs autonomy, but the existing Custom tariff is nothing but a financial tariff which will increase a little the revenue of the government, but is not at all conducive to the development of the productive forces of the country. Certainly, a certain development of national capitalism is possible and probable in the near future in China, although accompanied at times by great difficulties. But the tendency connected with this, to develop the productive forces on independent national lines, is bound to meet always with the tendency of colonial subjugation on the part of world imperialism; and in these conflicts the Chinese national bourgeoisie is sure to betray time after time the interests of national independence.

This capitulation policy of the Chinese bourgeoisie is, on the one hand, connected with the association of its direct profiteering interests with the capital of the various groups of imperialist capitalists, and, on the other hand, with the enormous accentuation of class differences which took place already during the last revival of the workers' and peasants' movement, during the revolutionary events of 1927, which caused the Chinese bourgeoisie to go over into the counter-revolutionary camp. Moreover, the internal struggle of the various militarist cliques behind whose back the various imperialist governments are carrying on their machinations, has demonstrated how impossible for the Kuomintang government is the task of establishing the real unification of China. All the fundamental tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China are closely connected with the agrarian revolution and the destruction of the relics of feudalism. But this biggest of all the Chinese problems cannot be solved by the bourgeoisie. One can see even by the superficial press news that the Chinese village is an ocean which, once disturbed, can never be calm again; guerilla war goes on almost uninterruptedly in some place or other. The maturing of preconditions for another revival of the revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement in China proceeds on the basis of an accentuation of the agrarian crisis. All talk about the prospect of a quiet, "Kemalist" development in China is mere twaddle. Not a diminution, but an accentuation of the chief existing differences goes on in China. This will lead inevitably to another general

revolutionary crisis which will be of a wider and deeper character than ever before.

The Growth of the Indian Revolution.

An ever growing international importance attaches lately to the growing revolutionary movement in India, at the head of which is not the bourgeois opposition, but already the proletariat. Last year's mighty wave of economic strikes has developed this year in Bombay into a huge political strike movement. This was the revolutionary answer of the Bombay workers, firstly, to the general provocation of the British authorities, (incitement of Moslem workers against Hindus), secondly, to the shooting down of strikers and the attack of the government on the leaders of the so-called workers' and peasants' parties. The characteristic attitude of the Indian nationalist-reformists (Swarajists and others) finds expression not only in defence of employers' interests and their ruthless exploitation of the workers, but also in their treacherous capitulation policy practised already a long time by them in the national movement, and lately, in making common cause with the notorious Simon Commission and in the renunciation of the demand of complete independence for India at the last National Congress. At a time when in Egypt the "sovereignty" granted by Great Britain is demonstrated as British coercive regime pure and simple through the dissolution of parliament, the politicians of the Indian national bourgeoisie are begging of Great Britain a problematic constitution within the framework of "dominion autonomy" which cannot be worth anything as long as British authorities and troops remain in India.

The real national-liberation movement of India was represented not by the last bourgeois-national congress but by the proletarian mass demonstration against this national congress. Apart from whether in the near future the hope of the Indian national bourgeoisie for favour and support on the part of American imperialism will strengthen a little its wobbling (in principle "non-violent") opposition to the British regime or not, — the mass movement in India against the British colonial rule will certainly grow in regard to size and fighting spirit. The growth of this movement depends on the growing contradiction between the forces of the independent economic development of India and the monopoly of the British finance capital. Closely connected with this contradiction are the crises which have arisen lately in various spheres of the native industry. In face of the inevitable development — though a very difficult, slow and uneven development — of the industrial productive forces of India (what Purcell so dreads), British imperialism, in its efforts to maintain its monopolist position, cannot pursue any other colonial policy than that of impeding and retarding the industrialisation of India and increased pressure against its independent development. This accentuates above all the Agrarian Crisis which constitutes in India the basis for the maturing of a general revolutionary crisis. The collapse of the backward system of agriculture, which is inseparable from the domination of feudal relics in agrarian relations, has been assuming in the last years the form of a chronic agrarian crisis which makes India dependent on the import of foreign foodstuffs and is leading to famine conditions among the millions of peasants exploited by imperialism, big landlords and usurers. The enormous masses of pauperised peasants, driven to despair, are at last showing signs of political awakening, are rallying around the struggling proletariat and are getting ready for revolutionary struggle against their oppressors, against the feudal and semi-feudal landlords, against usurers and imperialist authorities.

Against this standpoint, Comrade Roy suddenly raised his voice lately, — I do not know if I am still to call him comrade (interjections: He is no longer our comrade!), considering that he contributes to the press of the Brandlerite renegades. He is against us because we refused to have anything to do with a bloc policy with the national bourgeoisie. He would like to keep up an alliance between the labour movement and the national-reformist bourgeois parties of India. He cannot forgive us that we do not want to have an alliance with the "Independence Party" (his new name for the Swarajists) after these gentlemen had voted at the last National Congress against the slogan of independence. Roy praises the Swarajists as fighters against the anti-Communist law, but their merit is much more modest: they have caused in the Legislative Assembly the postponement of a law which concerns only the deportation of

foreign Communists. Quite apart from this law, the Communist movement in India is outlawed, exposed to brutal government persecution, which Roy does not mention. And have not the same Swarajists helped the government lately in the Legislative Assembly to pass the Anti-Trade Union Law. With these Swarajists, who cannot make up their mind if boycott is better than acceptance of high government posts from the British Government, we are to enter into alliance. We say, no thank you. Roy also accuses us that, because of our radicalism, certain leaders of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia in the "Independence League" have dissociated themselves from the revolutionary mass movement and have effected a rapprochement with the bourgeois capitulators. But he himself points out that in spite of this the petty bourgeois masses have remained revolutionary. Well, if we had really achieved what Roy asserts, namely, that the wobbling leaders of the petty bourgeoisie have gone into the camp of the big bourgeoisie while the masses have remained loyal to the revolution and are marching with us, this would not be such a bad result after all. We will shoulder this accusation in good conscience. But what Roy advocates, is arch-khvoostism. There is revolutionary ferment also among the petty bourgeois masses in India, even in a section of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, but these masses can be drawn into the anti-imperialist struggle only to the extent that they are freed from the influence of the national bourgeoisie, the Swarajists, etc. This is the only way of promoting their revolutionary development.

The weak points of our movement in India are not those which Roy gives. Our greatest weakness there is the fact that we are not yet firmly enough established as a Communist Party. A good many Indian Communists have worked in the ranks of the "Workers' and Peasants' Parties". We have advised them to endeavour to induce these Parties to reorganise themselves, to assume another organisational form, in keeping with the principles of Leninism. But not the two-class character of these parties was the worst thing, much worse was the fact that hardly any practical revolutionary work has been done yet among the peasantry. The objective situation in India is rapidly becoming more acute. There are unmistakable signs of the maturing of a revolutionary situation. For instance, we can see almost daily from the Bombay press news: spontaneous development of a mighty political mass movement, gigantic demonstrations and strikes owing to the arrest of the leaders of the movement, all of them signs of a rapidly growing revolutionary situation. A symptom of this is also the attitude of

our own Indian comrades. They are this year not the same by far what they were last year. What enormous vacillations and errors we witnessed last year among Indian Communists, and how different is their attitude now! We can see an enormous difference, and this growth is also a sign of the times. Of course, we witness the greatest ferment in Bombay, the movements in other places cannot be compared with it. But this does not mean that Bombay is an exception; it only means that the Bombay workers are marching at the head of the Indian revolutionary movement. Already the railwaymen's strike last year indicated the spreading of semi-revolutionary movements. Events since then have only confirmed the correctness of our prognosis at the VI. World Congress: the maturing of a big revolutionary crisis in India.

The recently arrested leaders of the Indian Workers' and Peasants' Parties and of the Bombay cotton operatives on strike who are now in the dock in Meerut are an important group of the best representatives of the Indian proletariat and peasantry. Their courageous behaviour at this trial shows that they are the representatives of a great revolutionary mass movement by which they are supported outside prison. The next few years will probably show that everyone of these defendants represents not only thousands and ten thousands but hundreds of thousands and perhaps even millions of revolutionaries. I propose to the Plenum to send fraternal greetings to the accused in the Meerut trial in India.

(This proposal was enthusiastically welcomed.)

The strategy of the class policy of the ruling bourgeoisie has naturally always aimed at an economic and political stabilisation and consolidation of its strong positions. But the new thing in the present period is — that owing to the external and internal weakening of the capitalist regime, the former methods of stabilisation are no longer effective and must be replaced by new methods. In the internal policy of the bourgeoisie this takes at present the form 1. of a sharper offensive against the standard of living of the working class and 2. of an ever growing fasciation of the bourgeois class rule. I have already spoken in the first part of my report on the growing pressure on the working class for the purpose of worsening its economic position; this includes not only intensification of labour and wage reductions, but partly also lengthening of the working day, worsening of social legislation, higher taxes, rising prices in regard to foodstuffs, clothes, etc., and higher rent.

III. The Accentuation of the Inner Class Antagonisms in the Capitalist Countries.

The Fasciation of the bourgeois class regime.

The Right deny that a general fasciation process of the bourgeois class regime is going on. They tell us that bourgeois democracy is in reality capitalist class dictatorship. We know perfectly well that bourgeois democracy means class regime. But experience has shown that bourgeois democracy, in its old forms, is not very much use to the ruling bourgeoisie in the present period. A change is going on in the bourgeois class regime, a transition from methods of parliamentarism to methods of a frankly terrorist coercive regime, to methods of civil war. These methods, which were certainly used also in the past, within the framework of bourgeois democracy, assume at present in the capitalist countries a dominating role in the State and the bourgeois class regime in general.

This course of the bourgeoisie is not yet complete everywhere; in some countries the process is longer than in others.

This process is going on not only in Italy, Poland, Finland, the Balkan States and similar countries, but everywhere in the capitalist world. Italian fascism has, of course, also peculiar national features. One can see that some of the main features of Italian fascism are asserting themselves more and more also in other capitalist countries. Of course it would be wrong to say that fascism reigns already everywhere, that the MacDonald regime is British fascism, etc. What asserted itself in Italy all at once, will take considerable time in other countries, and in a number of countries it will be probably

impossible to carry it through because the proletarian revolution will prevent it. Even in Germany, Fascism is not yet fully developed, and this applies to a greater extent to Great Britain. British Fascism finds expression at present partly in the British regime in the colonies, partly in the fascist organisations in Britain itself, and partly also in the beginning of fasciation of the Labour Party and the MacDonald Government. Fascism will no doubt make enormous strides in Britain in the next years, but just now the process is not complete, and let us hope that the British proletariat will put a stop to it. At present, this process is most rapid in Germany. What it looks like in reality, we can gather from the state of affairs in the States ruled by the Zörgiebls and Severings. One should compare this reality with Kautsky's description of the "modern democratic State" where "equality of defensive power" reigns (or, adds Kautsky, "equality of defencelessness", because it is obvious that the bourgeoisie which has at its disposal tanks, armoured cars, etc., does its utmost to make the proletariat defenceless). According to Kautsky's description, this State is going through a "change of function" which he compares with the transition from the state of a caterpillar to the state of a "butterfly", when "all is love and "gay fluttering from flower to flower" ... Can one imagine a more disgusting imposture than this Kautskyite flying of the bourgeois state into "socialism" which is, in reality, nothing but transition to Fascism.

Another question is, if Fasciation is to be estimated as strength or weakness of the bourgeois class rule. Comrade

Ewert and others imagine perhaps that they are crying out against a pessimist prognosis when they assert that bourgeois democracy is not replaced by a fascist regime. But in reality, the fascisation of the State regime is by no means a sign that the position of the bourgeoisie is being strengthened. We see the contrary by the map of the already fascisised parts of Europe; Italy, Finland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria and a few other countries, — can one assert that the power of the bourgeoisie is strongest and most firmly established in these countries? Stronger than in the United States, Scandinavia, Britain, France? Certainly not. One could rather set up the rule that the more uncertain the ruling class regime considers its own position, the more it endeavours to rest on a system of dictatorial methods of coercion. This has been frequently observed also in the past. In Russia, on the eve of the revolution, Tsarism seemed to be all-powerful, it had gathered so many bayonets around itself, but these bayonets no longer constituted a support to Tsarism. The fascisation of the bourgeois class rule brings us certainly face to face with a series of new tasks, and problems of tactic which we have to examine very carefully in order to develop our revolutionary methods in accordance with the situation. But it certainly does not mean consolidation of the position of the bourgeoisie. We can certainly see that modern war technique is placing heavy weapons into the hands of the bourgeoisie for struggle against the unarmed masses (heavy war machines, aircraft, the chemical weapon, etc.) But because this modern warfare is becoming more and more dependent on industry, it is also becoming more and more dependent on the industrial proletariat. The struggle for the so-called "reliable army" is going on in every country, but this problem has become for the bourgeoisie tantamount to another problem, absolutely insoluble as far as the bourgeoisie is concerned, namely, a "reliable" proletariat. Some imperialist military experts, such as Fuller and other, advocate, instead of million strong armies, small, highly qualified armies of professional soldiers strengthened by fascist reserve forces.

This is merely an imperialist utopia, a desperate attempt to escape from the blind alley into which the development of militarism has driven the bourgeoisie. It is impossible to carry on an imperialist war, firstly, without placing arms into the hands of the masses, without mobilising the whole people, and, secondly, without the closest co-operation of all important branches of industry, especially in war time. This is the main reason of the class struggle being concentrated at present in the enterprises. A constant struggle is going on between the bourgeoisie and the Communist Party for "reliable enterprises". The issue of the coming war and the issue of the coming civil war will be decided in the enterprises. (Hear, hear.)

Social-Fascism.

Along with the fascisation of the bourgeois class rule there goes on also the process of fascisation of the reformist trade union bureaucracy and of the parties of the II. International. Reformism and Social Democracy develop into social-fascism. One might think this description to be only a term of abuse. No, deeds characterise the real standpoint of a political party. One should not look into the mouth of the social democrats, but into their fists. At the first Congress of the II. International it was resolved to organise everywhere national demonstrations and manifestations on the First of May. To-day the German section of the II. International carries on armed police attacks against the May Day demonstrations of the German workers. The German Social-Democratic leaders have become police-socialists. The reformists are working everywhere in the different class struggle organisations of the bourgeoisie, in the organs of compulsory arbitration, in the "Central economic councils", and the like. Yesterday we could read in the press that in France the compulsory arbitration act was passed by parliament. I do not know, but I am firmly convinced that at least a section of the Social Democrats have voted for it (A voice: All of them!) This is what could be expected. They have voted also for the Boncour Law. They have voted for the exceptional laws against the revolutionary labour movement. They are taking an active part in the war preparations. They are rendering thousands of services, big and little, as the executioners for imperialism, as administrative authorities, both in France and in the colonies. Do not all

these practises constitute fascist actions? They do. But are the Social Democrats the same as the fascists? Not quite so; they are social-fascists. There is a difference. What is the difference?

The fascists are nationalists, imperialists, war-mongers, enemies of Socialism, enemies of democracy, stranglers of the independent labour movement, workers' assassins, and so on. The social-fascists are acting as a rule like the fascists, but they do their fascist work not with an open face, but behind a smoke-screen, as is done in war. This belongs to the nature of social-fascism: imperialist policy in the name of internationalism, capitalist policy in the name of socialism, abolition of the democratic rights of the toilers in the name of democracy, abolition of reforms in the name of reformism, assassination of workers in the name of labour politics, and so on. The pathos of "pure" fascism is expressed in the slogan of "the nation" and in the open incitement to imperialist expansion. The pathos of the social-fascists is expressed in the slogan of keeping up the State. "We have saved the State!" "Without us the State would have perished!" The simple fascists may also be connected with certain masses; for instance, this characterises to some extent the nature of Italian fascism. But the social-fascists are more connected with the proletarian mass movement, with the historically developed mass organisations of the workers which they are trying to use against the working class. The simple fascists pursue simple tactics, the tactics of fire and sword. Social-fascists must apply combined, more cautious and more elastic tactics; they must resort more to manoeuvres, to the backstairs methods of parliamentarism and to all the dodges of electioneering demagoguery, to pacifist phraseology in foreign politics, and so on. The aims of the fascists and the social-fascists are the same; the difference consists in the slogans, and partly also in the methods.

There is also a certain difference in that "pure" fascism does not employ any Left wing, while to social-fascism such a wing is absolutely necessary. And as soon as its "Left" becomes politically discredited, it must create a new Left wing. It is the special task of the Left wing of social-fascism to operate with pacifist, democratic and "socialist" slogans.

It is clear that the farther advanced the progress of social-fascism, the closer it gets to "pure" fascism. Yet this development is a lengthy process. In the social democracy of the different countries there are different stages of this process to be observed. British labourism can perhaps be described as social-fascism in the caterpillar stage, whereas the S. D. P. of Germany is already in the butterfly stage. At our last World Congress we spoke about the "germs" of social-fascist development in the II. International. Now these germs have already grown luxuriantly. In the course of further development it will be ever-more difficult for the social-fascists to obliterate the glaring contradiction between their words and their deeds. This will eventually cause social-fascism to lose its specific role. It is not difficult to unmask the simple kind of fascism. The simple fascist openly acknowledges his fascist faith. But the social-fascists, exposed as such, is like an exposed agent-provocateur; in this function he is of no further use to the bourgeoisie, he has to be either discharged or put in some different service. The unmasking of social-fascism is therefore a highly important task for us. When Wels spoke out openly at the Magdeburg Congress of the German Socialist Party in favour of the dictatorship, it seems to me that he was rather rash and imprudent in his speech. He should have previously consulted Kautsky whether dictatorship or democracy was the best suitable slogan for social-fascism. Since German fascism openly declares in favour of bourgeois dictatorship, since social-fascism openly shows itself up as fascism, it will no longer be difficult to win the majority of the working class in Germany for the proletarian revolution.

In view of the ever-growing crises, the bourgeoisie in Great Britain and in Germany is compelled to make use of the social-fascists for government purposes. In these countries it is very difficult for the bourgeoisie to maintain itself without the aid of the reformists and of "industrial peace", as well as to cover its war preparations by the cloak of pacifism. When Chamberlain or Baldwin speak of "securing peace", of the "democratic rights of the colonies", or of "labour policies", no worker has any faith in them. They have tried it to the best of their ability, but the result was that 8 million votes were polled by the

Labour Party. That is why it becomes necessary for the British bourgeoisie to resort to the services of the Labour Party.

The present function of the social democracy consists, firstly, in misleading and sidetracking the petty-bourgeois opposition to the imperialist policies of finance-capital, in overcoming its pacifist and democratic scruples; secondly, in overcoming the reformist labour opposition to capitalist rationalisation and other offensive measures of finance capital, and in recruiting direct supporters of fascisation of the State regime among certain privileged strata of the working class; thirdly, in curbing the process of radicalisation among the large masses of the workers by attempting to split the workers' front and to break up the Communist labour movement. Naturally, it is a different question to what extent the social democracy succeeds in carrying out these functions.

The Left Development of the Working Class.

As against the fascisation process of the social democracy there is the great process of the Left development of the working class.

What does this Left Development mean? It means the development of the large masses of the proletariat from the standpoint of reformist opposition to the revolutionary mass struggle. It is the great movement within the working class that characterises the present period.

How is this process going on? What does the course and the pace of this process depend upon? This is a highly important question for our practical policies. I might answer to this that the radicalisation process among the proletarian masses depends upon the revolutionising experiences gained by these masses during the present period. These are, above all: 1. Experiences as to the changes in the objective situation, i. e., in their own situation as well as in that of the bourgeoisie; 2. experiences as regards the social-fascist policies of the social democracy; 3. experiences of the working masses as regards the struggle and activity of the Communist Party.

The absolute worsening of the economic conditions of the working class which is going on under various forms yields valuable new experiences to the proletarian masses, which increase the proletarian class consciousness of the workers while shattering the reformist illusions. The mass unemployment, the general insecurity of the workers' existence (even in the United States where the existence of the working class used to be considered the most secure), these are among the most essential factors in this worsening of the conditions of the working class. There is also a large section of the skilled workers steadily losing their privileged position. You will recollect how even some Communists used to speak about a tremendously large labour aristocracy; this was quite true in the past, but it is a good deal less the case at the present time. The imperialist facilities for the corruption of certain elements of the working-class are becoming more circumscribed; the impoverishment, and consequently the resentment (as Marx puts it) is growing at an extraordinary pace.

I believe we should more than ever devote our attention to the struggle on questions of wages and working hours. We must place the question of the 7-hour day in the foreground. Owing to the strategy of surrender that is constantly pursued by the reformists, the workers are frequently confronted with a desperate situation. The question of "to fight or not to fight" becomes the question of "to be or not to be" for the worker. If the masses hesitate on this question, the Communists should not make the least concession to the surrender strategy of the reformists. The least concession would paralyse the radicalisation of the masses. We must encourage the masses to take clear decisions. Thus the masses will soon take up independent economic movements, without the reformist leaders, and partly in spite of them. The masses need and are looking for new leaders to organise and to guide their struggles. If the Communists begin to hesitate on the question of developing the economic mass strikes, or if they attempt to replace such a fight by a policy of revolutionary phraseology and semi-reformist practices, they are going to lose their hold upon the revolutionary movement. They are going to divert the Leftward movement of the masses from the path of revolutionisation to the path of reformism.

A further stage in these fights (these stages must not necessarily be conceived as chronological sequences) consists in that the constant action of the bourgeois State in alliance with the employers' associations, with the trusts, etc., imparts a political content to the economic struggle of the workers. The fascisation of the State authority and of the dominant bourgeoisie as a whole, beginning with the factories in which open imperialist war preparations are carried on, is a powerful factor in emancipating the masses from the spell of pacifist illusions. The social-fascist practices of the reformists furnish the necessary object lessons to the masses. The old mechanism for the maintenance of "social peace" (social insurance, etc.) is becoming more and more discarded. Nevertheless, certain new methods of corruption may be tried out here and there. In France, for instance, a suggestion was made by a certain bourgeois politician that shares of industrial enterprises be distributed among the trade unions — of course, not among the Unitary, but among the reformist trade unions — in order to get them interested in the profits of the business. (A voice: They are talking about this also in Germany!) This shows the efforts of the bourgeoisie to devise new methods for corrupting a section of the workers. This, however, does not yet constitute the distinguishing feature of the present period. The whole course of the bourgeois class domination is directed towards replacing more and more the old mechanism of the maintenance of "social-peace" by the methods of fascist terror.

The political effect of the reign of terror upon the working class is not so uniform as was the effect of the illusions. As a matter of fact, the problem of mass activity under the fascist regime should be studied more closely than hitherto; because we have to learn to organise the mass movement in such forms as would be able to survive the white terror, which would render it most difficult for the dominant regime to crush the mass movement, to deprive the masses of their leaders, to exterminate the revolutionary leadership, and so forth. On the one hand, terror as a system of government may render the masses passive to a certain extent. Even good revolutionary workers may for some length of time remain passive in the legal organisations, in the reformist trade unions, etc., under the pressure of the reign of terror; while the situation is not yet acutely revolutionary, they are not prepared to make such big sacrifices as they would be called upon to make when the final fight comes and which they will then be prepared to make. On the other hand, the reign of terror leads to a rise in the spirit of class hatred among the masses. But there is an important point to be noted in this connection. Every reaction may lead to the shattering of reformist illusions among the masses and to an increase of their class hatred. These are essential elements in the revolutionisation of the proletariat. Yet this does not explain everything that is new in the character of the present mass fights. The regime of terror can make the masses conscious of the necessity for the political fight, but this does not yet mean the starting of the fight itself. This does not yet explain the enthusiastic desire for political mass fights observed in connection with recent mass actions, even with those of an economic character. This desire for the political class struggle, this tendency towards stormy extension of the battleground, this aggressive spirit of the proletarian mass fights is the most important new trait to be observed. Not everywhere is this new trait clearly expressed, but it has been already quite clearly signalled by the actions which have taken place in Berlin, in the Ruhr, in Lodz, in Bombay.

The Shaking of the Relative Equilibrium.

What are the objective causes to this new character of the mass fights. I should like to draw a comparison with the war period. The bourgeois class terror was naturally strongest at the commencement of the war, when the front of all the imperialist powers was still strong. At that time, the radicalisation of the soldiers was an exceedingly difficult process. But as soon as the difficulties started at the front, as soon as the soldiers began to be aware of a weakening in the situation, a different spirit asserted itself both at the front and in the rear. The same is shown by examples from the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917, as well as by the German revolutionary events of 1918—19 and 1923. Similarly, such a semi-reformist, semi-revolutionary mass movement as the shop steward movement in England in 1919—1920 was obviously connected with the ob-

jective crisis experienced then by the ruling system of British imperialism. If the situation were to-day indeed as appraised by Humbert-Droz and other conciliators, if capitalist stabilisation were really getting stronger, then the present semi-revolutionary, militant character of the mass movements would be a puzzle.

The thesis of the German conciliators says: "Economic strengthening of the present basis of the relative stabilisation, and consequently of the political might of the bourgeoisie" (December Memorandum by Ewert and others). Even if they go on to "recognise" generally the existence of the capitalist contradictions, this is of no political significance, if there is really an economic strengthening of the basis of the political might of the bourgeoisie going on. But we know this to be utterly wrong. This is also in sharp contradiction to the line of the VI. World Congress. We know that owing to the intensification of the essential antagonisms during the present period, the relative stability gained by the capitalist world during the second post-war period is becoming more and more undermined. In my opinion, "relative equilibrium" is a more appropriate term than "stabilisation". Lenin spoke at the Third World Congress about a "relative, temporary equilibrium". The talk about "stabilisation" came into vogue in our political language only in connection with the stabilisation of the currency of the different countries. Of course, one may use also this term, if properly applied and correctly understood. For instance, if one speaks about "contradictions of stabilisation" this is rather a vague expression, and when German conciliators speak even of "structural changes inside of stabilisation", it is so sophisticated that I fail to grasp this mysterious stabilisation; it appears almost like a modern hotel "inside" of which everyone may accommodate himself as he sees fit.

According to the conception of Humbert-Droz and Ewert, the objective character of the present period is confused with the subjective stabilisation aims of the bourgeoisie in the different countries and with the pious wishes and illusions of the social democracy.

To be sure, the bourgeoisie may even now attain some partial successes here and there by stabilisation. Yet it is exactly the specific character of the present period that even these "achievements" of the bourgeoisie serve only to intensify objectively the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system, to set into motion ever-stronger counter-forces on a national and international scale, and thus to accelerate the tremendous clash. Certainly the relative, temporary equilibrium of the capitalist world is not yet liquidated. This will be accomplished only at the end of the process which is going on during the present period. But the dynamics of development in the present period are fundamentally different from those of the second post-war period.

The Character of the Present-day Mass Struggles.

It is highly characteristic that the present process of the shaking of the capitalist equilibrium has been better understood by the large proletarian masses than by some opportunistic Communists (like the conciliators). The masses have an instinctive feeling that the revolutionary struggle is now possible. There is now no longer any hesitation whether to fight or not to fight; there is not even the heavy consciousness that the fight is objectively unavoidable even if hopeless; there is rather an eagerness for the fight, for the political class struggle, for the political mass strike.

During a stabilisation period of capitalism the centre of gravity in the struggle of the masses — and this is a vast difference — lies in the immediate partial demands. The linking up of these partial demands with the strategical goal of the revolutionary movement during such a period is to the large masses more or less a matter of indifference, or a sub-conscious objective. This linking up of the ultimate revolutionary slogans with the immediate demands is chiefly of propagandist importance during such a period.

Also during the present period, the masses are struggling for their immediate everyday needs. This we should constantly keep in mind when framing our tactics. Nevertheless, the struggle is now no longer limited to these immediate partial

demands; there is now a distinct and strong tendency for the struggle to go beyond these limits. A fight is now waged even in such cases when the workers know that the immediate fulfilment of the demands cannot be attained; a fight is waged in order to show the power of the proletarian class, in order to avoid surrendering to the class enemy like abject slaves. **Force against force**, such is the sentiment among the large masses of the workers. Eventual partial defeats during this period no longer cause a mood of depression, and heavy defeats are borne even more easily than cases of surrender without a fight. (Hear, hear.) The masses are now raising more or less consciously the demand for **fortifying the fighting positions** in order to prepare for a new trial of strength against the class enemy.

This is the character of the **proletarian offensive** which is now more or less clearly revealed in some of the mass fights, as against the defensive character of the movement during the second post-war period. Whether the fight is based directly upon the slogan of higher wages, or upon resistance to wage reductions, is immaterial to the character of this movement. The approaching revolutionary upheaval is foreshadowed — I should say — by a certain red glow upon the horizon. This arouses the fighting spirit of the masses, the eagerness for political mass fights. This is connected also with the growing revolutionary attraction of the Soviet Union for the large masses of the proletariat in the capitalist countries. The Soviet Union is a living, grand, gigantic example that the Socialist revolution and the proletarian dictatorship are possible. Hence, the great interest now shown in the socialist construction efforts of the Russian proletariat.

The revolutionisation of the mass movement is a process which has just started, or has reached only the middle of its course; but it is bound to develop farther. The farther it develops, the more it will lead to the growing influence of the Communist Parties, if only the proper tactics will be applied by the Communist Party.

Against the Capitulationists and the Chvostism of the Rights and Conciliators.

The Rights are shouting about the alleged "sectarian" policies of the Communist International. One would think they had a patent for "winning the masses". Yet, they are left themselves without any masses. The masses stubbornly refuse to follow Frossard, Höglund, Brandler, and all the rest of the renegades. To be sure, we are aware of the fact that all the enemies of the revolutionary working class are resorting to all means to separate us from the masses of the proletariat, whether by discharging from the factory, by expelling from the reformist trade unions, by prohibiting our Communist press, by suppressing our organisations, or by driving our Parties into illegality. We should not put up with this without a struggle. We shall wage the keenest fight for the open existence of the Communist movement and of the revolutionary organisations. We shall certainly win the masses within and without the trade unions. But now? Shall we do it in the manner prescribed by the Rights? Oh no! This would never lead to winning the masses for the revolution, but rather to sidetracking the process of radicalisation into the channel of reformism.

Thalheimer does not like the Russian methods of winning the masses. He recites again his old song about "West European methods". According to him, the acme of practical wisdom lies in surrendering to the reformist trade union bureaucracy, and that at a moment when the large masses of the workers in the trade unions are already in rebellion against the rigid policy of trade union legalism enforced by the reformist bureaucrats. Objectively, the role of the Right wing Communists of the Brandler type at this moment is that of the Left wing of the Social-Democracy. Indeed, why should the Left wing of social democracy exist inside of the Social Democratic Party? It can exist just as well outside. The greater the failure of Levi & Co., the more they will be replaced by Brandler and Thalheimer.

It is characteristic of the present period that on our side, as well as on the side of the reformists, there are crystallising points which attract like powerful magnets the tendencies that are akin. The masses that are becoming radicalised are attracted by Communism, while at the same time the Social Democracy attracts from our movement everything that inclines

towards the Right, everything that belongs to the bourgeoisie. The present period is propitious for the unmasking of the Social Democracy. Yet social-fascism is screened by the Right renegades as well as by those opportunists who have remained in our ranks. Their method consists in pointing out to the masses the minor differences in order to conceal the fundamental and big differences between Communism and reformism.

The conciliators shout about an alleged liquidation of the tactics of the united front and about a renewed "offensive theory". This is nonsense. Only the opportunistic application of the united front tactics is to be liquidated. We are for the tactics of the offensive, but also for the tactics of the retreat, according to the circumstances. We resolutely reject any putschism, and we consider it essential for the Communist Parties to increase their ability for revolutionary manoeuvring. Yet we shall never consider it admissible to surrender to reformism. Especially during the present period we consider it the gravest danger when Communists lag behind the pace of the growing revolutionary movement of the masses. The conciliators are quoting Lenin to the effect that at the III. World Congress in 1921 he spoke against the "offensive theory". Yet what did Lenin say? Let me recall that he said that the application of the theory of the offensive in March 1921 in Germany had been wrong; but he added: "On the whole, the theory of the revolutionary attack is by no means wrong." This is what he said, and the conciliators will not succeed in turning Lenin into a tame semi-reformist.

It is quite clear that without winning the majority of the working class, the Communist Party of no country can carry the proletarian revolution to victory. Yet precisely for this reason, it should be the business of every Communist Party to realise the growth of the revolutionary movement of the workers during the present period, to march at the head of this movement, and to carry out practically the leading role of the Party. Only in this manner will the Communist Party be able to further and to accelerate the revolutionisation process of the working class.

Not always can we achieve immediate, appreciable and direct successes along this road. We had an example of this in the last general election in England. I was not at all surprised by the election results. Unquestionably, a number of tactical mistakes was committed by the C. P. G. B. during the general election, but the line of "class against class" announced by the IX. Plenum and the VI. World Congress was a correct line. Nevertheless, it did not lead to a direct and considerable poll in the election. Even many workers of Communist sympathies voted this time for the Labour Party. Was therefore our line a wrong one? Not at all. The slogan of "class against class" could not as yet get away the masses directly from the Labour Party, but it is already beginning to act as dynamite in the ranks of the Labour Party and of the trade unions. The spark has been kindled, and without this spark there can never be a flame.

These dialectics of history, naturally, cannot be conceived by the opportunists and by the stabilisation-Communists. Their policy of dragging at the tail, their vacillating passivity, their constant adaptation to the passing moment, this is the greatest danger which we have to avoid. He who would give up the leading role of the Communist Party during this period should not quote Leninism. He has nothing to do with Leninism, he is ballast to the movement in this period. When the German conciliators announced the battle on two fronts, they exposed themselves as Rights. As against them the C. P. G. put up a firm Bolshevik line and an iron Bolshevik Party unity.

At the Head of the Movement to the New Revolutionary Upsurge.

The pace of the proletarian radicalisation movement is not uniform in the different countries. This should be ascertained upon the basis of concrete circumstances in each country. The total situation in the different countries is not uniformly developing. The character of the present period is constantly changing — and what is essential — it changes in the direction of further maturing of a new revolutionary upsurge.

In this connection I should like to urge the importance of a correct attitude on the question of the war danger. On the one hand, we must combat every under-estimation of the war danger, which constitutes a highly dangerous mistake. On the other hand, it would also be a mistake to expect the revolutionary situation only through the door of war, or to limit ourselves to combating the foreign policy of the government. Precisely from the standpoint of the practical revolutionary struggle it is absolutely necessary that in each country we should consider the maturing of the objective (and subjective) postulates of the proletarian revolution in its concrete complexity, in the synthesis of the external and internal contradictions of capitalism which are constantly growing in intensity.

Sudden, unexpected changes in the situation are quite possible during the present period. No one knows at what moment the war may break out. In a situation when a dozen crazy generals in some neighbouring state of the Soviet Union may suddenly start the war in the assurance that this provocation would be followed by a number of other States, in such a situation it is wrong to prophesy a perspective of stability for a long time.

The fight against the war danger, for the defence of the Soviet Union, this is our central international task. Yet, as I did at the VIII. Plenum of the E. C. C. I., I should like to emphasise here that the best defence of the Soviet Union is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in one's own country.

To win the leading role for the Communist Party in the mass fights at the present period, to march at the head of the large masses of the proletariat which are becoming revolutionised, such is our general strategy of the present period. New proletarian strata which did not take part in our struggles before, are now joining the front: non-Party and unorganised workers, working youths, proletarian women, and agricultural labourers. In the villages of the capitalist countries there is going on within the peasantry an ever-increasing process of class differentiation, which we ought to bear in mind in our quest for fighting allies. It is equally correct to attract and support the awakening masses of the enslaved workers and peasants of the colonial countries.

If we think of the mass fights which have taken place during the short period since the VI. World Congress, we may truly say: the world army of the active class fighters is growing at a tremendously rapid pace. The miners in the Ruhr and in Scotland, the textile workers in Poland and in France, the barricade fighters of Berlin, the Bombay strikers and demonstrators, the plantation strikers in Colombia, the rebellious Negroes in the Congo, the striking agricultural labourers in Czechoslovakia and in Poland, the revolutionary trade unions and the peasant guerilla warriors in China, the rebellious tribes in Morocco, and hundreds of thousands of other fighting groups, — this is a gigantic active army! It shows how the revolutionary movement is growing throughout the world. If it goes on at this rate, all will be well. Yet the Communist International should and will bring together even greater masses of the millions for the fight against the world bourgeoisie and for the proletarian world revolution

Second Session.

3rd July, 1929 (afternoon).

The Communist International in the Struggle for the Majority of the Working Class.

Report of Comrade Manuilsky.

Introductory: The Main Political Questions of the Day.

I want to take as the central point of my report the question of the Communist Parties' capture of the leading role in the Labour movement, which means in the European labour movement the question of capturing the majority of the working class, the conditions under which the Communist Parties have to solve this task, the methods of its solution, the obstacles which are in the way of its successful solution.

The question of capturing the leadership in the Labour movement is now the fundamental question from which we must proceed in defining all other tasks of the Communist Parties, the substance of the whole future development of the Sections of the Comintern which have to solve the most important problem of the third period, the problem of bringing the masses of the working class closer to the vanguard and of widening the vanguard for the victorious struggle for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The Communists of Europe and America have to cope with this task under conditions different from those under which the Russian Bolsheviks had to work prior to the October Revolution of 1917. In these countries capitalism is stronger, the bourgeoisie is better organised, the corruption and demoralisation of the top stratum of the labour aristocracy is such the like of which did not exist in tsarist Russia; the working class is better organised in all possible yellow organisations (social-democratic parties, reformist unions, Christian organisations, the American Federation of Labour, etc.), than was the case in Russia. And

"the better the proletariat of an advanced capitalist country is organised, the greater thoroughness is demanded from us by history in our preparations for the revolution and the more thoroughly we must capture the majority of the organised workers." (Lenin — Report at the III. Congress, 5. 7. 1921, on the tactics of the C. P. S. U.)

We are not yet confronted with an immediate revolutionary situation when the revolutionary Party of the proletariat must tackle not only the question of capturing the majority of the working class, but also the problem of spreading its influence among the most backward sections of all toilers and exploited elements in general. But we are already in such a phase of development of the international Communist movement when, in a number of countries where the Communist Parties are strong, we must take up the question of winning over the majority of the working class as a concrete problem of the present political moment. We are now putting this question in a somewhat different form from that at the time of the III. Congress of the International when its solution was extended over many years of the "stabilisation" period. We have since then experienced great class conflicts such as the General Strike in Great Britain, the Chinese Revolution, the July insurrection of the Viennese proletariat, the May Day events in Berlin, which have considerably shortened the historical period in which this task has to be solved. The period has been shortened by the accentuation of the class struggle, which has made a clear division of the class forces; it has been shortened by the poverty of the proletarian masses as a result of capitalist rationalisation, which intensifies the process of radicalisation of the working class; it has been shortened by the "test" which the working class is now making of the Social Democratic and "labour" governments of Germany and Great Britain, it has been shortened by the inexorable imminence of war, by the ripening of colonial revolutions, particularly in India, and in general, by all contradictions of "organised" capitalism.

But in undertaking the task of capturing the leadership in the Labour movement, we meet with a great variety of conditions under which it has to be solved. The conditions are different in Germany from those in Great Britain, for example, and they are quite different when it comes to the small Austrian Party. There can be no simplicity and no general formula in the solution of this task. In some countries we are as yet but a potential force, a force of to-morrow. In other countries, as for instance in Latin America, where the political situation changes with extraordinary rapidity, and where frequently a direct revolutionary situation develops very quickly, the influence of the young and politically inexperienced Communist Parties on the broad non-proletarian masses of toilers grows at times much more rapidly than on the working class. In such colonial countries as India where the Communist Parties are still in the process of birth, millions of people are already using our methods of class violence in their struggle although they do not consider themselves Bolshevik Communists. The approach to the solution of this task depends on the whole context of the economic, political and historical conditions of development of the Labour movement of the given country, on the degree of its revolutionary maturity, but first and foremost on the level of development of the Communist movement.

We raise this task as a pressingly urgent task of the day because we are not a small sect in the Labour movement of the world. The Comintern is not merely a spectre of Communism haunting Europe, it is a real force preparing, organising and leading the class proletarian conflicts in a number of countries to-day. Its foremost Section, the C. P. S. U., is a Party of the victorious proletarian revolution which has been engaged in the course of ten years in the building up of Socialism over one sixth of the globe. The Communists have already become Mass Parties in such countries as Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia, and in the country of white terror, Poland; they are Parties whose followers can be counted in the thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands and millions. This success serves as an example which stimulates the energy of the backward Sections of the Communist International. We are going to solve this task in the present phase of the Labour movement in class conflicts which gain in vigour and scope, which in conditions of the rising wave of the Labour movement become the chief method of capturing the majority of the working class, not through the use of sectarian methods and simple methods of agitation and propaganda. We reorganise our ranks from the viewpoint of this main task. The most active and militant elements of our movement, who are capable of giving expression to the changes taking place in the working class through the internal policy of the Party, are now gaining the upper hand. Commensurate with this, the less active sections within the Parties are relegated to a secondary position. The Party Executives are reorganised and altered along the same lines. There is to be observed a process of cleansing of the Party membership of all that is putrid and inactive, of all that weighs down upon them as ballast, and retards the progress of the Parties. What the Right wingers call "crises" in the Comintern, is but the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties, which is a necessary preliminary condition for the successful fulfilment of the task of capturing the leadership in the Labour movement. This, if it may be so put, is but a passing into a "higher class", in the course of which all that is undesirable, unsuitable and backward, is swept away from the Communist movement.

After the preliminary remarks concerning the formulation of the question, I now come to the substance of the matter.

I. The Task of Capturing the Majority.

1. Can the Communist Parties Organise the Majority of the Working Class Under Capitalism?

What does it mean to gain a leading role in the Labour movement? Does that mean that the Communists must capture the majority of the working class? In Europe where there is a strong Social Democracy and strong reformist unions, this is unquestionably so. But does that mean that the Communists must **organise** the majority of the working class? No, comrades. It is merely a question of **direct influence** of the Communist Parties on the majority of the working class through their transmission belts, — the trade unions, factory committees, strike committees, all kinds of committees, all kinds of committees of action organised in the factories, etc. The Communist Party which would wait until it would organise the majority of the working class before claiming to have a leading role in the Labour movement, would be a bad Party. We are not only a Party of the majority of the working class, but the only Party of the **whole working class**, which staunchly defends its immediate interest, as well as the final aims on an international and historical scale. The Social Democrats are now not merely the Party which like pre-war revisionism has given up the final aims of the movement, but a Party which is now entering the service of capitalism against the immediate interests of the working class. The numerically small Communist Party which would be overcome by the numerical strength of the Social Democratic votes and would give up the struggle for leadership in the Labour movement to-day, would show that it does not believe that it **alone is the only workers' party**. Under capitalism the Communists will not and cannot be the "organised" majority of the working class.

"In the capitalist epoch when the workers are subjected to constant exploitation and cannot develop their human abilities, the most characteristic feature of the workers political parties is that they can embrace only a minority of their class. A political Party can unite only a minority of its class, just as the truly conscious workers in any capitalist society constitute only a minority of all workers. That is why we must realise that **only the conscious minority can lead the broad masses of workers and keep them on its side.**" (Lenin, Speech at the II Congress, July 23, 1920).

The proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. has shown that even after the victory of the proletariat, the problem of embracing the majority of the working class by the Communist Party is a problem to be solved in the course of a long period. But does that mean that in order to lead the Labour movement, the Communist Parties must have at their disposal a formal majority of the working class expressed in the ballot (parliamentary, municipal, trade union, factory committee elections, etc.)? We emphatically reject the fetishist attitude of the Right opportunist elements on the question of capturing the majority of the working class. These people measure the correlation of forces between the Communists and the social democrats in the movement by means of statistics which are not much different from the scales used by the social democrats based on the experience of bourgeois democracy. Can we, for example, consider the "majority" received by the German Social Democrats in the recent Reichstag elections, the Social Democrats who are a ruling party which operates in alliance with the employers, which disposes of financial support, full freedom of agitation, a vast number of social democratic State officials, as a majority which truly expresses the correlation of forces between the social democrats and the anti-governmental Communist Party in the Labour movement of Germany? Three and a half million votes cast for the Communist Party of Germany, a Party which the capitalists drive out of the factories, the adherents of which are shot down by the Zoergiebel, the press of which is persecuted and gagged, are of an entirely different relative strength than ten million votes cast for the social democrats. Only one who is absolutely drunk with parliamentarism can think that two different magnitudes can be weighed on the same scales just as the honest shopkeeper does with his wares. We reject this formal criterion because there can never be a full and free expression of the

will of the working class in a system which is politically corrupt to the core, built from top to bottom on deception, on monstrous pressure on the labouring masses, such as capitalist democracy is. We have other criterions in determining the degree of the capture of the majority, namely, the leadership of the Communist Parties in the mass conflicts of the proletariat. A Communist Party may formally have no majority, but at the same time it may lead all the most important actions of the working class. If, for example, our Communist Party of Germany, which has had such a splendid victory at the recent factory council elections, which succeeded in bringing out in the streets about 200,000 workers on May Day in spite of the prohibition of Zoergiebel and the reformist unions, had been able to reply to the May Day shootings by a similar political mass strike, if it had been able under certain conditions to stop the work in most of the mills and factories of Germany, then, although it has no formal majority, it would nevertheless be a Party which has already captured the majority of the working class.

With this formulation of the question, we sweep aside also the legalist idea of capturing the majority of the working class. The Right opportunist elements conceive the capture of the majority of the working class exclusively within the framework of the legal Parties, in a peaceful, almost idyllic, way on the basis of "labour democracy". Our struggle for the majority of the working class will be accompanied by bloody conflicts not only with the bourgeoisie, but also with the social democracy. This struggle is now entering this fierce and sharp phase in the countries where we have already directly approached the task of capturing the majority of the proletariat from the social democrats. The bourgeoisie and social fascism will try to make our mass Parties outlaw organisations. This prospect frightens the Right opportunists. In their imagination an illegal Party means to be **torn away from the masses**. However, a small illegal Party with a few thousand most progressive revolutionaries loyal to the cause of the working class, working in conditions of raging white terror, penetrating the factories persistently and with skill, in the course of growing revolutionary sentiment of the working class, can have as much influence on the masses as a huge mass Party which works in the open. Years of heroic struggle of such an illegal Party under the most difficult conditions raise its prestige among the masses and as years go by the confidence in that Party becomes traditional. A model of such a Party is the Communist Party of Poland. While the experience of the Communist Party of Germany, which has most approached the task of capturing the majority of the working class when compared with the other open mass Parties, is of tremendous significance for all countries in which the Communist movement is working openly or semi-legally, the experience of the Communist Party of Poland is of decisive importance for all illegal Communist Parties which operate in conditions of white terror. Only that Party will be able to approach in a real Bolshevistic manner the problem of capturing the majority of the working class which will combine the open forms of the movement with illegal forms, which will be able quickly to re-arrange its ranks in accordance with the conditions of underground work. Woe to those Parties which could be adapted only to conditions of legal existence. Such Parties would in time of war be absolutely disarmed in the face of the class enemy. To discard these Social Democratic survivals is a preliminary condition of a successful solution of the task of capturing the majority of the working class.

2. Lenin's Formulation of the Question of Capturing the Majority.

Lenin's formulation of the question of capturing the majority of the working class pre-determines the position of the Communists on the question of capturing the majority of all toilers and all exploited elements in general.

"The proletariat cannot be victorious," wrote Lenin, "without winning over the majority of the population to its side. But to restrict or condition this capture by the receipt of a majority in time of elections under bourgeois

domination is hopeless stupidity or simple mockery of the workers. In order to capture the majority of the population the proletariat must first overthrow the bourgeoisie and take power into its hands. Secondly, it must set up a Soviet Government, smash into smithereens the old state apparatus, whereby it immediately undermines the domination, prestige and influence of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois compromisers among the majority of the non-proletarian labouring masses. Thirdly, it must kill the influence of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois compromisers among the majority of the non-proletarian labouring masses by means of revolutionary realisation of their economic needs at the expense of the exploiters." (Lenin, "Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", December 16, 1919.)

Lenin's position on these fundamental questions, summed up, is therefore:

1. In order that the revolutionary Party of the proletariat may be able to overthrow the bourgeoisie, destroy the old state apparatus, create a new Soviet Government, it must win over the majority of the working class.

2. The proletariat can overthrow the bourgeoisie before having won over the majority of the non-proletarian labouring masses because its strength in any capitalist country is much greater than its numerical strength in relation to the entire population. This multiplied strength is a result of the fact that the proletariat dominates economically over the centres and nerves of the entire capitalist system; that the town is in the historical conditions of the present epoch not equal to the village, and inevitably leads the rural areas behind it, that the concentration, organisation and discipline of the proletariat increases its relative strength when compared with the scattered petty-bourgeois individualism of the intermediary strata, that the proletariat economically and politically represents the interests of the vast majority of the labouring sections under capitalism.

3. The proletariat, after overthrowing the bourgeoisie, must utilise its State power as an instrument whereby it may win over the overwhelming majority of the non-proletarian labouring masses, as an instrument of winning these masses away from the bourgeoisie and from the petty-bourgeois parties.

But Lenin's formulation of the question of capturing the majority of the working class by no means signifies that we must worship the spontaneity of the movement. Leninism differs on the question of mass movements from the position of Rosa Luxemburg, who did not understand the organising role of the Party in the mass movement precisely on the question of doing homage to spontaneity. Leninism does not put off the capture of the majority of the working class to the "great days" immediately before the revolutionary situation. The closer we approach the task of capturing the majority of working class, the better we organise and prepare the revolution. This is of particular importance for the Communist Parties of Western Europe where the elements of revolutionary spontaneity is largely paralysed in the Labour movement by the existence of strong Social Democratic Parties. Therein lies the main difference between the European type of the Labour movement and the Labour movement which existed in Russia prior to the October Revolution. In this country the spontaneous revolutionary elements played a much greater role than in the movement of the West European proletariat, the leaders of which have been systematically corrupted in the course of decades of parliamentary democracy, freedom of reformist labour organisations, etc. History demands from us more thorough preparation for the revolution in the West than in Russia of old, also because the world bourgeoisie has made excellent use of the lessons of the defeat of the Russian bourgeoisie and landlords in October 1917. It is now better prepared for the emergency of a civil war than it was in 1917. It has now at its disposal

powerful fascist detachments almost everywhere. It has reorganised in the name of "disarmament" its armies on a class principle for the purpose of civil war. It has perfected its entire coercive machinery. In modern capitalist countries it does not suffice to capture two or three centres as is the case in Russia to guarantee the success of the revolution. There are tens of such centres in them. Finally, the nature of the available class forces in the West is now different from what it was on the eve of the October Revolution of 1917. The class lines are cruder than they were here. The revolutionary and counter-revolutionary camps stand more clearly arrayed against each other. The role of the intermediary strata wavering between the revolution and the counter-revolution is much smaller than it was in Russia in 1917. The proletariat is larger and stronger in these countries, but it is also more isolated. The camp followers and sympathisers of the intermediary classes comprise here a very thin layer. Class differentiation in the rural areas is more profound. The nature of the present economic battles shows that the proletariat has in each economic conflict to fight against the holy triple alliance of the capitalist State, the employers, and the reformist bureaucracy. Owing to the far gone fusion of the employers' organisation with the State, the growth and strengthening of the tendencies of State capitalism, the merging of the capitalist State and employers' organisations with the Social Democrats and the reformist trade union bureaucracy, each action of the proletariat has a tendency of becoming a general conflict with the entire capitalist system. Each action of the proletariat meets with the resistance of a united front of all forces of capitalist reaction. The struggle of the proletariat in the present epoch is more difficult than it was prior to the war in 1914-18. In such Fascist countries as Italy and Yugoslavia, an economic strike is tantamount to declaring the "final conflict". The class antagonisms in these countries have reached a degree unknown in the past; but they are still in the process of accumulation, to be poured out with the break up of the capitalist system which will pull fascism and social democracy into the abyss, in such stormy forms which will render the civil war in the U.S.S.R. pale in comparison.

All these conditions raise before the Communist Parties of all countries the task of better organised preparation of revolution than was the case with the Russian Bolsheviks of the past. But in order better to organise the Communist Parties for the revolution, means to enter the revolutionary decisive struggles with a broader organised base than was done by the Bolsheviks in 1917. If we do not tackle the direct task of embracing the majority of the working class organised in the Communist Parties, it does not by any means follow that we cannot organise most of its decisive sections in the non-Party organisations under the influence of the Communist Party (trade unions, committees of action, strike committees, factory committees, etc.).

Lenin said that "to have predominant forces at the decisive moment and at the decisive point, this 'law' of military success is also a law of political success, especially in the fierce and seething class war known as revolution".

To create such striking fists among the decisive sections of the working class, means to establish organised positions first of all among the metal workers, miners, transport workers, chemical workers, electricians and munition workers. It further means to establish organisational centres in the most important industrial arteries of the country, in the large centres in which the proletarian victory will be of utmost importance for the success of the revolution. Thirdly, it means to capture the dominant positions in the most important strategical points of the enemy — the post, telegraph, telephone, the docks, railway junctions, etc.

Finally, in the enterprises it is necessary to win over first of all those groups of workers without whose participation in the productive process the enterprises cannot normally function.

II. Under what Conditions is the Struggle for the Majority of the Working Class Waged?

1. The Existence of a Proletarian State.

I am now going over to the question of the conditions under which the Communist Parties fight for the majority of the working class. The first thing to be observed is the fact that we are undertaking the capture of the majority of the working class in the capitalist countries when we have a proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. based on the majority of the toilers. This is a decisive factor. The proletarian dictatorship in one country is not only an instrument for the capture of the majority of non-proletarian labouring masses of that country for the proletariat, but also a mighty instrument in the hands of the Communist Parties of the countries where capitalism still dominates in the capture of the majority of the working class. Secondly, the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. greatly multiplies the specific gravity of our organised Communist "minorities" in the capitalist countries. The type of the pseudo Communist who speaks of the "demoralisation" of the Comintern and manipulates for this purpose the statistics concerning the membership of such Communist Parties as the Austrian, Swiss and similar organisations, is now quite common. The Italian conciliator Serra, in a note submitted to the Central Committee of the Italian Party, went so far as to express such a monstrous stupidity that at the present time our Sections are weaker than they were in 1919—1921. It follows that the Spartacists of Germany were stronger than the Communist Party of that country at the present time. It is futile to argue with such a philistine. The mathematics of these people in measuring the revolutionary forces is mathematics not of a politician, but of a petty-bourgeois who is frightened by the "strength" of the social democracy. These people do not understand that a few hundred members of the Communist Party of Austria are not simply a few hundred, but a plus to the majority of toilers of the U. S. S. R. organised in a proletarian State. By virtue of this fact, these few hundreds are of different importance from say a couple of dozens of Serras who base themselves on a few hundred Brandlerites in Europe. Those who ignore this decisive fact in measuring the correlation of forces between the Communist "minorities" and the Social Democratic "majorities" are simple fools who can count only on their fingers. Secondly, the existence of a proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. greatly facilitates the struggle of the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries for the majority of the working class. Thirdly, and finally, the existence of an organised proletarian State is a factor which accentuates the struggle between the Communist Parties and the Social Democrats for leadership in the Labour movement. This struggle will proceed not only in the form of internal class wars, but also in the form of war against the U. S. S. R., provoked and supported by international social democracy. Such parties as the P. P. S. or the Social Democratic party of Germany whose aggressiveness in relation to the U. S. S. R. already goes much further than the aggressiveness of the "businessmen" of the bourgeois camp, will in such a war save not only capitalism, but first and foremost their own existence which is bound up with the preservation of capitalism.

2. The Transformation of Social Democracy into Social Fascism.

We must have a clear account of the fact that the greater the influence of the Communist Parties will be, the closer they will approach the problem of capturing the majority of the working class, the more quickly will social democracy become the most aggressive war party in relation to the U. S. S. R. The struggle of the moribund Second International for the preservation of the last vestiges of its influence on the masses against the Communist International, will be finally settled in the arena of war of the capitalist states against the State of the proletarian dictatorship. It is not merely within the bounds of possibility that the bourgeoisie will wage this war through "labour" and Social Democratic Governments, but this perspective is most probable in view of the growing economic difficulties of the bourgeoisie. And whereas the Communist Parties will in their struggle for the majority of the working class rely on the support of the first proletarian dictatorship in the world, the Second International will not only be an instrument of the capitalist States, but will make them its instrument of struggle

against the development of Communism throughout the world. Social democracy will take ever-greater initiative from the bourgeoisie in the suppression of the working class. It will become the more savage, it will be the more rapidly fascised, the more its influence on the working masses will decline. Its social basis will not alter, it will base itself ever-more on the strata which but yesterday comprised the army of fascism. The "capture" of these strata will be proclaimed by it as its greatest victory, a triumph of the invincible power of attraction of the ideas of "democratic socialism". This process of transformation of social democracy into social fascism has already begun right before our eyes. The Right opportunists and conciliators who still repeat their arguments that the Social Democrats have after the betrayal of August 4th remained what they were before and who deny the process of their fascisation fail to see this as if they were blind.

I have before me as an instance a document submitted by the German conciliators to the last Congress of the C. P. G. In that document its authors maintain that the shooting down of the workers organised by the Social Democrats on May Day in Berlin does not by any means indicate that there is a process of fascisation of social democracy, that it is the "usual" repressive measures of the capitalist State.

They say that "to qualify all repressive measures of the bourgeois State in relation to the proletariat as fascism, and all participation of the social democrats in these repressive measures as social fascism, means not to reason as Marxists."

From this kind of logic it follows that if the Italian fascists force castor oil down the throat of a half-choked Communist, this is "abnormal" repression which is beyond the ordinary repressive measures of the bourgeois State. But if Zörgiebel and his party shoot through the instrumentality of the bourgeois police at the workers' quarters for the simple reason that Communists happen to live there, "to qualify" this as social fascism means "not to reason as Marxists". Can you imagine a more vulgar, insipid reasoning devoid not only of a grain of Marxism, but in general even of a shadow of an analysis of fascism? It does not even occur to these people, who have in fact embraced the social democrats, that fascism is "not any kind of repressive measures", but a centralisation of the Government machinery of coercion of the proletarian masses developed to a monstrous degree commensurate with the degree of centralisation of capital and the monopolist character of capitalism. Cavegnac shot tens of thousands of workers during the July uprising of the proletariat of Paris in 1848 and Zörgiebel shot a few dozen, and wounded a few hundred people, nevertheless the counter-revolutionary General Cavegnac served bourgeois democracy and Zörgiebel is the servant of fascism and a social fascist. Zörgiebel, in contra-distinction to the counter-revolutionary General Cavegnac, is a social fascist because an entire historical period of transformation of capitalism into monopoly capitalism, into capitalism of the epoch of powerful trusts, consortiums, a period of transformation of social democracy from the tail of bourgeois democracy to a tail of centralised trustified capital, lies between them. Social Democracy constitutes a party of social fascism not only because it does not stop at shooting down more workers than Cavegnac at a moment of proletarian rebellion, but because with its hands, centralised trustified capital is seeking to abolish firstly the institutions of bourgeois democracy — Parliamentarism, the system of political parties, etc., secondly, it is already doing away with the gains achieved by the working class in the period of bourgeois democracy — with the help of the noose of compulsory arbitration it throttles the workers' strikes, with the co-operation of the social democrats it dissolves revolutionary unions, etc. It is ridiculous, for instance, to speak of fascism only in the countries which are going through their bourgeois democratic revolution. In China we have the most brutal and most ruthless bourgeois counter-revolution, but that is not fascism. This does not mean that Chang-Kai-shek, in implanting Kuomintang unions does not make extensive use of the experience of Mussolini and Zörgiebel. In such countries, if the world proletariat will not take measures to liquidate in good time its fascism through the proletarian revolution, the growing over of the bourgeois

counter-revolution into fascism in a situation of contemporary fascisation of the advanced capitalist countries would proceed at a most rapid rate in which decades will be measured by years. International social democracy and the trade union reformist bureaucracy march along the path of most rapid transformation into social fascism because, being fused with the central State apparatus of class violence against the proletarian masses, they become an organic part of that apparatus, aiding thereby in the greatest concentration of the pressure exerted on the working masses.

Our pseudo-Marxists do not understand that when the "Vorwärts", for example, writes about the "authority of the State which stands above the classes", it not merely employs fascist terminology, but considers that as the programme of social fascism calling for the further centralisation of the functions of the machinery of class oppression. They also fail to understand that when the reformist trade union democracy expel scores of revolutionary workers from the unions, that is not merely an expression of ordinary forms of struggle of various tendencies in the Labour movement, not a "usual repressive measure" of the reformist bureaucracy, but a constituent part of the entire system of centralised violence of the fascised State apparatus of the bourgeoisie. What social democracy calls the "capture of power" by democratic means, i. e. the placing of the social democrats into office and their utilisation by the bourgeoisie as a party through the capitalist State apparatus, referring to that as a social democratic conquest of the capitalist State, is nothing but the social fascisation of the social democracy which undertakes to perform the functions of the trustified bourgeoisie in the capitalist State.

Wels' threat at the Magdeburg Congress of the Party about the "dictatorship of the social democracy" indicates that social democracy has already matured for the proclamation of an open bourgeois dictatorship, that it represents a party of most naked violence over the proletariat, disrobed of all parliamentary cloaks. From democracy with inverted commas to dictatorship without inverted commas, without reservations and adornment — such is the path of social fascism. This means that the struggle of the Communist Parties for the majority of the working class will proceed not only with the parallel existence of a proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., but also under an open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie materialised through the instrumentality of Social Fascism in a number of capitalist countries. The concern and perseverance of the social democrats in the struggle for self-preservation will be equal to the power of resistance of capitalism to the revolutionary movement. From this it follows that although the power of resistance of social democracy increases, the task of the Communist Parties of exposing the social fascist nature of contemporary social democracy is being facilitated. The ascendance to power of the largest parties of the Second International in the form of Müller's coalition government in Germany, and MacDonald's Government in Great Britain, may play the part of a turning point in hastening the process of revolutionisation of the working class not only of those countries, but of the whole world. We have seen in the post-war period a number of similar experiments of the bourgeoisie which put the social democrats into office at moments of internal and external difficulties, but these experiments of the "labour" and the social-democratic governments, were made in entirely different circumstances. The working masses had not been driven into such a movement by capitalist rationalisation at that time as it is now. War was not knocking at the door as persistently as now. The activity of the proletarian masses was not growing as systematically as at the present time. They were further away from the point of desperation than now. The bourgeoisie and the social-democrats had more reserves at their disposal for manoeuvring. All this created a basis for more durable and lasting democratic illusions among the masses than to-day. The millions of workers are now passing through a political school of their own experience such as we could not provide for them in the course of years of our oral and written agitation. They see ever-more clearly that the political mission of these governments is to take the working class into their iron clutches, to secure the bourgeois rear in case of war — in Germany, on the basis of Young's new reparation scheme, a system of double exploitation of the German proletariat is to be introduced, in Great Britain capitalist rationalisation is to be enforced and the colonies suppressed. A series of great economic battles is already maturing

in Great Britain, and in these battles the true role of the MacDonald Government will be revealed.

The reformist simpletons of all countries may whimper as much as they like about the fact that the Communist Party of Great Britain which intends to capture the majority of the working class has polled only 50,000 votes, but to-morrow, tens and hundreds of thousands of workers who, owing to the class hatred of the Baldwin Government, the government which throttled the general strike, which passed the Trade Union Act, have voted to-day for the treacherous party of MacDonald, will rally to the 50,000 advanced workers of London and the South of Scotland. To-morrow these proletarians will realise that only the class against class policy of the Communist Party, the policy which does not run after cheap effects or parliamentary positions, was the only correct and honest policy helping to free the working masses of their pacifist and democratic illusions and pointing to the proletariat the only correct way to victory. The small British Party which fought "against the stream" of old traditions of political corruption and hypocritical deception of the MacDonald politics, will be at the head of the Labour movement, which will result in its transformation into a mass party of the British working class. The British comrades who are situated at one of the most responsible posts of the international Communist movement must not reject the idea of capturing the majority of the working class, they must not delay the solution of this task for the political day of tomorrow, but must proceed to-day, despite the elemental forces, with the transformation of the Communist Party of Great Britain into a mass Party of the proletariat, remembering that not always are such conditions given for the solution of this task as those existing to-day in that country.

We say to the British comrades: In your struggle against the Labour-Party, against illusions and prejudices of the British working class, the Communist International is with you. It will be able to rebuff all defeatist moods concerning the role of the C. P. G. B. on the basis of the outcome of the recent elections. We are not going to reproach you for mustering only 50,000 votes in a few constituencies under the most difficult conditions. We know the genuine Bolshevist value of these votes as compared with the eight million votes polled by the Labour Party as well as you do. If we are going to criticise our British comrades it will be for another reason. We are going to criticise you not for your class against class tactics, but because you have not employed these tactics with sufficient energy and firmness, because your whole Party was for a long time wavering before it adopted these tactics. Many of you have accepted them out of your loyalty to discipline and not because you were convinced of their correctness. You yourselves have paid tribute to the prejudices of the masses. You entered the struggle not with the enthusiasm which sweeps aside all obstacles in the way. The Party was unable to extend and deepen the class against class tactics, converting them into a new line of the Party in all spheres of Party activity, in the relationships of the Party with the broad masses of workers all along the front. Finally, how does it come about that at the last Congress all comrades who fought in the Party for the new line were removed from their responsible posts? Perhaps our continental narrow mindedness is to blame, but none of the comrades of the Comintern can understand the peculiarities of this queer policy of the British comrades. Further, how are we to explain the fact that while activating its policy by means of the class against class line the British Party did practically nothing in preparation for the August 1st demonstration? The Plenum will have to submit to severe criticism the mistakes of the leaders of the British Party so as to help them to transform it into a mass Party of the British working class.

3. The Radicalisation of the Working Class and the Level of Communist Development in the Various Countries.

The British problem brings us down to the third condition which influences the formulation and solution of the question of the capture of the majority of the working class, namely, the question of the level reached by the Communist movement. We do not put the principal task in a purely mechanical way, approaching all sections of the Communist International with the same scale. We take into account the various levels of the Communist movement, putting concretely the methods of solution of that task in the various countries. But at the same time, we must seek out the fundamental and decisive element

in this intricate complex of the Communist Parties of various levels, various strength, various experience, various influence, and link up our main position with that. This decisive and fundamental element in the present state of the international revolutionary movement is firstly, the incontestible **growth of Communism in the main capitalist countries of Central Europe** — Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland; secondly, the clearly expressed process of Revolutionisation of the working class in all capitalist countries, including such important capitalist countries as the United States and Great Britain; thirdly, the revolutionary processes in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, in India, and partly in China and the Latin-American countries. A new element in this general picture of the present state of affairs in the revolutionary movement is the fact that the growing revolutionary movement in the colonies does not proceed within circumstances of the international isolation, but parallel with a rising wave of a new revolutionary upheaval of the Labour movement in the metropolis. This "intertwining" of the revolutionary colonial movement with the growing activity of the international proletariat has a revolutionising effect both on the toiling masses of the colonies, as well as on the proletariat of the metropolis. It also creates the pre-requisites necessary for a bolder tackling of the question of the capture of the majority of the working class. In accordance with these three main features of the present state of affairs in the international revolutionary movement, we also differentiate our main task. The capture of the majority of the working class we consider to be a **burning task of the political moment of to-day** confronting the mass Communist Parties of Europe — first and foremost the C. P. of Germany which has a more profound Marxian and Leninist foundation than any other section of the Communist International in the capitalist countries. Its experience in civil war, the experience of such mass organisations as the Red Front Fighters, its numerous crises which purged it from opportunist elements of the Right and the "Left", render it an advanced Communist Party to which all other Sections of the Communist International must look up in the matter of capturing the masses; then comes the **Communist Party of France**, which has made considerable progress in the Bolshevisation of its ranks at the last Congress, a Party which shows an example of the most skilful and splendid organisation of a mass campaign from which all other Sections of the Comintern must learn, but which greatly lags behind in the organisational consolidation of the results of this campaign; then comes the **Communist Party of Czechoslovakia**, a mass workers' Party, with its recent "crisis" which has only taken the first step in raising the fighting skill of the Party and liquidating the heavy heritage of social democratic survivals which weighed down upon it; finally there is the **Communist Party of Poland**, the illegal skilful work of which must be recognised as an example for all illegal Parties, but the factional struggles of which, not without alien influences, become one of the main obstacles in the path of capturing the overwhelming majority of the working class of Poland by that Party.

For the second category of countries, i. e. the rest of Europe and the United States, we advance as an immediate task the **line of organising broad mass parties**. This refers first of all to the **Communist Party of Great Britain and the United States**. The creation of broad mass Parties in those countries is a **burning task of the Comintern**. The small Communist Parties existing in those countries are not commensurate with the enormous role which these countries play in world affairs, especially the United States. The radical solution of the American problem which occupied in the course of many years all Congresses of the Comintern and Plenums of the E. C. C. I. the step of the Comintern at the recent Convention of the American Party, is no accident. The unprincipled factional struggle accompanied by the transplantation of the morals of the American stock exchange brokers into the Party, accompanied by a crude unprincipled speculation on the differences in the C. P. S. U. which degenerated into a football match of mutual accusation of Right and ultra-Left deviations, a struggle which was in reality an expression of the worst type of opportunist sectarianism — this struggle conflicted so much with the requirements of the growing radicalisation of the mass Labour movement of America, that the Comintern had to take energetic steps in order to put an end to the unbearable situation in that Party. The liquidation of that state of affairs was a necessary preliminary condition for the transformation of the Communist Party of the United States into a **broad mass Party of the working class**. We had to put a stop

to **Pepper's** theory of "exceptionalism" which reflected on the one hand the influence of the Monroe Doctrine, and on the other, the imperialist philosophy of the American bourgeoisie, and actually served as a justification of the inactivity of the Party in the struggle for the masses. We diverted the attention of the Party from the factional struggle to the growing mass strikes, to the inexorably developing industrial crisis in the United States which will widen the objective pre-requisites of the mass Party of America. This mass Party in the United States will be the consequence of the contraction of the economic basis of reformism, of the inevitable attack of the American bourgeoisie forced to wage a fierce struggle for markets, on the standard of living of the workers. Finally, we turned the Party's attention to the new unions which are called upon to play the role of the backbone of the mass Party of America and to enrich the experience of the Communist movement of Europe in the sphere of trade union activity and in the struggle for revolutionary trade unions.

Of decisive importance in the revolutionary movement are, of course, the Communist Parties of the principal capitalist countries. Not Austria, Switzerland or Denmark will have the last say in the process of the world revolution. But we most emphatically reject **Otto Bauer's** theory that the pressure of international capital brought to bear on these small countries renders their independent revolutionary initiative impossible, and that these countries will be merely "attached" to the victorious revolutions in the principal capitalist countries. It is by no means out of the question that the revolutionary outburst may begin in the weakest links of the chain of capitalist States. The policy of mass Parties in these small countries holds therefore good for them, the more so since the realisation of this policy is being facilitated now by the successes of Communism in the **main capitalist countries**. One of these small Parties had to be dealt with more closely (we have in mind the **Communist Party of Austria**), so that by its example we may be better able to discover the ailments not only of that Party alone. We should warn from the very outset against a lightminded attitude in relation to our small Austrian Party. The Austrian comrades need not think that the E. C. C. I. follows the course of least resistance in criticising its Parties. We choose the Austrian Party as a type of Communist Party which has become stagnant although the conditions are comparatively favourable for the winning of the masses away from the social democrats. The Communist Party of Austria, as well as the C. P. G., was born in the fire of revolution. The economic basis of reformism is narrower in Austria than in Germany, or, more exactly, it is entirely absent. **Otto Bauer's** reformism is the reformism of beggars on the doorsteps of the world. The material conditions of the Austrian working class are unbearable. Notwithstanding the strength of Social Democracy, Fascism is on the offensive all along the line. Under these conditions following the insurrection of the Viennese proletariat of July 15, 1927, which took place in spite of and against the will of the social-democrats, our Party could not take a decisive step forward towards becoming a mass Party. What is the reason of this? We are not going to enumerate all the objective causes of which our Austrian comrades have told us. There is no doubt that the difficulties for the development of a mass Party in Austria are great, but there are not only the objective difficulties, there is something else besides. First of all we think that on the example of Austria the thesis of the Comintern saying that the Left social-democrats constitute the worst and most dangerous type of social-fascism within the Labour movement, has found splendid confirmation. If the proletariat of Austria is now so disarmed in facing the fascists, if its conquests during the revolution of 1918 have been gradually taken away from it, if it has no mass revolutionary Party now in 1929, a Party capable of directing its class struggles, it is certain that **Austro-Marxism**, which by the use of Left phrases impressed the Austrian workers with the idea that the Social Democracy is of a different quality from that of the Social Democracy of Noske and Scheidemann in Germany, is to blame for that. This lesson concerning the "Left" Austrian Social Democracy must be remembered by all Sections of the Comintern.

But if the Communist Party of Austria could not expose the traitorous role of **Otto Bauer's** Party after July 15, if it could not, by means of doing so, convince the social-democratic workers who are fighting against Fascism in spite of their party, side by side with the Communist workers, this is not the fault of **Otto Bauer** but of the Communist Party. It

is hard to imagine that the social-democratic workers who fought in Graz and Steiermark while still in the ranks of Social Democracy, **employing our methods of class violence**, are so far away from the Communist Party that they can by no means be reached by its agitation. In this we find a confirmation of the second thesis of the Comintern advanced against the opportunists, namely, that in order to undermine the influence of Social Democracy, it is necessary to start a ruthless attack upon it; however, our Austrian Party held on too long to its defensive tactics. It, as well as the other small sections, did not believe in its own forces. It regarded its role in relation to Social Democracy just as Social Democracy regards the role of Austria in relation to the big capitalist countries. Austro-Marxism found its expression in our own ranks. Some Austrian comrades believed that it is impossible to break through the social-democratic front, that the role of our Party is still the role of a simple agitator and propagandist, that owing to its weakness it can have no influence whatever on the masses and on their struggles. Without overcoming these sentiments, which are alien to genuine Bolshevik activity, we will never build up a mass Party in Austria. More than anywhere else we need here the type of aggressive Bolshevism able to surmount difficulties, heedless of traditions, capable of "going to the people" in the purest sense of that word. We must revise all methods of our work, revolutionise them, sweeping aside the social-democratic habits which are still firmly rooted.

"That is what Communists, followers of the III. International all over the world, are here for, they are here in order to remake the old socialist, trade union, syndicalist and parliamentary work into new Communist work all along the line and in all spheres of life. The Communists of Western Europe and America must learn to create a new unusual non-opportunistic, non-careerist parliamentarism; their Parties must learn to issue slogans, they must see to it that real proletarians, with the assistance of the unorganised and stupefied poor peasantry circulate and distribute leaflets, visit the homes of workers, the huts of agricultural labourers and peasants of the remotest corners (in Europe fortunately there is much less remoteness than here, and in Great Britain there is very little altogether), go to the public houses frequented by the people, make their way into the societies of the people, their casual meetings, speak to the people not as highbrows (and not like parliamentarians), do not run after 'positions' in Parliament, but rouse everywhere the minds of the masses and attracting them... etc." (Certain Conclusions — written April 27, 1920).

That is what the greatest revolutionary taught all Communist Parties, and specially such a Party as the Communist

Party of Austria, in order to become mass Parties of the working class.

Finally, as to the third category of countries, the **colonial and semi-colonial lands**, especially India, and the countries of Latin America, here it is necessary to point out the characteristic feature, that the **maturing** of the immediate revolutionary situation proceeds much more rapidly than the formation and colonisation of the Communist Parties of the working class. Secondly, it has to be pointed out that in some countries of this type the mass revolutionary movement which is not much differentiated from a class viewpoint, has the tendency of creating "dual class" Parties, creating at times populist illusions even among the Communists. Thirdly, the absence of any kind of Social democratic influence in these countries creates for the young Communist Parties extensive possibilities for **direct leadership** not only of the movement of the working class but of the national revolutionary movement of all labouring and exploited elements in general. Here the element of revolutionary spontaneity plays a tremendous role. Here even a numerically small Communist Party can leave in the rear the mass European Parties as far as influence on the broad masses is concerned. The way of solution of our central task lies here, therefore, chiefly through the creation of **sound bolshevik parties** with strong ideological and organisational barriers against "Kuomintang" and "semi-Kuomintang" elements and the **greatest strengthening of the already existing Communist Parties.**

In taking up this task concretely in the various important countries of this type, we should say that for India, to which 50 per cent. of the attention of the Comintern must now be paid, this means the creation of an independent Communist Party, the only Party of the working class fighting for the interests of the proletariat during the bourgeois democratic national revolution and capable of leading the toilers of India, with the support of the international proletariat, in the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship when that revolution inevitably grows over into a Socialist revolution.

For the countries of Latin America this means that the young Communist Parties must resolutely break with the ideological traditions of petty-bourgeois radicalism which follows in the wake will the "terribly Left" anarchism, expel from their organisations all liberal and semi-liberal elements, build Parties on the social basis of the working class, influence and attract the peasantry through organisations which are influenced by them, ideologically strengthen their ranks on the basis of Marxism and Leninism, on the experience of the C. P. S. U. and the Communist Parties of Europe. Only the existence of hardened Bolshevik Parties will fructify the revolutionary movement of the toilers of these countries and keep it from degeneration into the 101 "military revolutions" of the Mexican type.

III. The Methods of Capturing the Majority.

1. Leadership in the Masses Struggles.

The third question we have to consider is the question of the methods of capturing the majority of the working class. We have almost everywhere captured the proletarian vanguard and created Communist Parties in all capitalist countries. This is the first step towards the capturing of the majority of the working class. Without the ideological capturing of this vanguard we would not have been in a position seriously to speak of capturing the broad masses. When small Communist groups set out to capture the vanguard their main weapon was propaganda and agitation. Now, when we are becoming a serious factor, this is not enough. The masses must learn on their own political experience acquired in the class wars organised and led by the Communist Parties.

"As long as it was a question (and as long as it is still a question) of winning over for Communism the vanguard of the proletariat, **propaganda was put forward** as the central point. Even circles which suffered from all defects of sectarianism are useful here and give favourable results. When it is a question of practical mass action, a question of arraying — if it may be so put — armies of millions, a question of arraying all class forces of a given society for the final conflict, propagandist methods alone

and the mere repetition of the "pure" doctrines of Communism cannot carry us far. In this case we have to count not up to one thousand as a propagandist essentially counts, as is done by a member of a small group which does not lead the masses, it is necessary to count in millions and tens of millions. In this case we have to ask ourselves the question not only whether we have convinced the vanguard of the revolutionary class but also whether the active forces of all classes, absolutely all classes of the given society without exception, have been so arrayed as to be ready for the final conflicts." (Some Conclusions — April 27, 1920).

The Communists do not yet count in the present phase of the international labour movement in tens of millions because they have not yet squarely approached the final conflict; but they must begin today to learn to count in millions in accordance with the nature and the extent of the imminent class conflicts. One cannot begin counting in millions all at once. The Communist Parties have to learn to do so in the bitter science of struggle. The small British Party has learned this lesson, but not enough, in the General Strike, the Communist Party of Germany has learned it in the Ruhr and in the factory committee elections; the Communist Party of Poland has learned

it during the general strike in Lodz; all Communist Parties have learned it in the numerous strikes all over the world which have been witnessed this year. This counting of millions presupposes further the ability of the Party to influence the millions of unorganised workers, who constitute in the capitalist countries of Europe more than two-thirds of the proletariat, over the heads of the reformist unions and the social-democrats. It is also connected with a deeper penetration of the trade unions and the creation of a wide ramification of factory organisations (strike committees, committees of action, etc.) which are the strongholds of Communist influence. It requires from the Communist Parties to turn the entire Party front towards the side of capturing the factories from below, the reorganisation even of the formally "legal" Parties on an illegal basis in view of the terrorism employed by the employers in the factories.

The Communists will never learn to count in millions unless they will deeply convince the masses that they alone can guide their struggles. And this they will be able to accomplish if they will stand at the most dangerous posts, if they will absorb the first shocks, if in spite of the terror of the police and the employers, and in spite of the reformist repressions, they will be the first ones to dash into the class struggle, infecting by their example the waverers and carrying along the mass of the unorganised. Communists of the Hais type who during the textile strike in Czechoslovakia were the first ones to break it and to go back to work, Communist strike-breakers kill the influence of the Party and must be swept out from the ranks of the Communist movement with an iron broom. The masses will never trust the Communist Party if people speak in its name who, as in a number of strikes in France, drag at the tail of the unorganised workers. Can the masses trust, for example, some of the leaders of the Swedish organisation of Stockholm who called off the May Day demonstration on account of the bad weather. The working masses must be convinced in action that the Communist Party is not a saving box for the accumulation of influence and a bankbook in which is deposited its revolutionary energy saved for the moment of the "final conflicts". If they are now turning away from the social-democrats who, in the course of many years of the post-war period represented parties of the majority of the working class, this is so because they have realised that these parties of trustified capital have systematically transformed their power into impotence, forcing them now to grind their teeth from anger after betrayal of the revolutions in Central Europe and after ten years of "democracy". The leftward drift of the working masses will proceed the more quickly, the more the Communist Parties will display their ability to materialise the power of the masses and to force the bourgeoisie to reckon with their influence on the masses. Only through the medium of stupendous class conflicts can the Communist Parties undertake the capture of the majority of the working class. These conflicts are and will be fought in the most difficult circumstances. Each serious battle will confront the proletariat with the entire front of capitalist reaction, the breaking through of which would signify the beginning of a revolutionary crisis in a number of countries. And inasmuch as the forces of the proletariat are not yet ripe for a direct struggle for power, inasmuch as there is no immediate revolutionary situation, these struggles will frequently end in an apparent draw. This will give the least tenacious elements cause to clamour about their futility, to accuse the Communist Parties of being "strike mad", of squandering like an extravagant master the accumulated funds of proletarian confidence. Already now all putrid and decadent elements are carrying on a shameless campaign in connection with the anti-war demonstrations of the international proletariat on August 1st proclaiming that to be a "putsch". We have seen such liquidatory tendencies in the textile strike in Czechoslovakia and a much more glaring example in relation to the May Day events in Berlin.

The heroic May Day demonstration of the proletariat of Berlin, the greatest demonstration ever since 1923, is regarded by the political eunuchs exclusively as a result of Zörgiebel's provocation, as an act which resulted in a "divorcement of the Party from the masses". This treacherous slander concerning one of the most outstanding demonstrations of the German proletariat of recent years cannot be read without a feeling of profound disgust. The significance of class conflicts in the capturing of the majority of the working class was splendidly demonstrated precisely in the action of the proletariat of Berlin.

Who was the greatest loser in the Berlin events? The Party of Zörgiebel. The behaviour of its Chief of Police and his murderous gangs called forth almost universal indignation not only of the workers of Germany. Only the Brandlerite simpletons cannot see what the social-democrats have paid and will pay for the bloody May Day in Berlin. And this will be paid for not only by German social-fascism but by the whole II. International. The victory of the French comrades in the municipal elections was largely a result of the Berlin events. Who gained as a party in influence on the masses, who gained the greater confidence of the masses in their leadership, who has gained in prestige? There is no doubt that it is the Communist Party of Germany. The international significance of the Berlin events lies in the fact that they marked a rebuff to capitalism and its social-democratic agency not only in Germany but on an international scale. If German Social Democracy, which does the bidding of trustified capital, had come out of this clash the victor, if it had succeeded in depriving the German proletariat of its May Day, if the Communist Party of Germany had retreated in face of the prohibition of the demonstration by Zörgiebel and the reformist bureaucracy and had taken the advice of the Right renegades and restricted itself to the holding of trade union meetings, there can be no doubt that that victory of the German bourgeoisie, just as the "victory" of the Baldwin Government which suppressed the general strike, would have served as a signal to the international bourgeoisie to start the offensive on the working class along the whole front. The events in Berlin ended neither in the formation of Soviets of workers' deputies nor in the overthrow of Müller's government, nevertheless they marked a victory of the working class in the sense that the attack of the watchdogs of international capitalism, German Social Democracy, was given a setback and that they had to capitulate on the question of street demonstrations in face of the resistance of hundreds of thousands of workers. The Berlin events increased the self-confidence of the working class not only in Germany but also in the other countries. Can one think that the struggle waged by the C. P. G. in connection with the outlawing of the Red Front Fighters League will leave no trace in the minds of the workers of other countries who were also faced with an attempt of the bourgeoisie to deprive them of their open and half-open organisations, wherever they still exist? On the experience of Germany the workers of the other countries who are now preparing for their August 1st demonstrations will learn how to mobilise the proletarian ranks and how to defend every inch of their conquered positions. Those who speak under the present conditions of a "defeat of the proletariat" merely mitigate the difficulty of the position of Zörgiebel's Party, and save Social Democracy, which has discredited itself by the bloody suppression of the May Day demonstration, and smell for a mile with the odour of the decay of opportunist decomposition.

The significance of such partial battles as the textile strike of Czechoslovakia, the lock-out in the Ruhr, and especially the events of Berlin, consist in the fact that they bring to the surface the opportunist rash, that they test all groups and tendencies of the Party in action and help the broad masses of the proletariat to recognise and distinguish the genuine revolutionaries from the political capitulators and liquidators.

2. The Mass Political Strike.

The Berlin events have placed on the order of the day the question of the mass political strike as a most important weapon in the struggle of the proletariat in the present phase of the labour movement. Economics and politics are now more intertwined than ever before. The working class feels that in every one of its more or less big economic conflicts. As much as the reformists endeavour to convince the workers of the necessity of localising their economic conflicts, and as much as they drive revolutionary "politics" out through the door, it comes back through the window. The workers learn by their own experience of the dastardly treacherous "policy" of the reformists, which is the same as the policy of the capitalists. A life and death struggle is developing between the Communists and the social democrats who act in the role of the employers for the masses in the factories. The capitalist wants to be the sole master in "his" factory. He establishes the dictatorship of his class in the framework of the bourgeois class State, beginning with the basic nucleus — the factory.

It is in the factory also that the social democrats speak at the same time of "economic democracy". After each economic conflict, and frequently without a conflict, the factories are cleansed of the revolutionary workers who are betrayed by the reformist sleuths. After the May Day events about 7,000 workers were dismissed in Berlin factories. The bourgeoisie and the reformists want to cut the Communist Parties away from the factories and to convert them into parties of the unemployed. The revolutionary workers cannot permit themselves to be slaughtered. Under these conditions solidarity strikes are inevitable and their role will increase to the extent that the class struggle will sharpen in the factories. But solidarity strikes are acts which open the door for revolutionary politics.

The role of the mass political strike increases at the present time also because in conditions when there is no immediate revolutionary situation the proletariat must dispose of a weapon which would enable it to carry over the present economic strikes into higher forms of struggle. If the insurrection is the highest form of class struggle, the mass political strike is a prelude to it. The mass political strike as a weapon of class struggle corresponds to the situation in which the Communists are beginning to learn to count in millions but in which they cannot yet count in tens of millions, when the movement already shows tendencies to go beyond its economic form but has not yet reached the stage of an armed uprising. Here of course, it would be dangerous to fall into schematics; the dialectics of the class struggle are more complicated than all rational schemes. In the present, the third, period we will see a co-ordination of all forms of struggle: economic strikes, demonstrations, political mass strikes, uprisings, in the various sectors of the international front. The Berlin events marked a turning point in the sense that they signalled a growing over of the economic struggle into a political struggle, but they do not exclude the possibility of varied forms of class struggle of the proletariat in the future. This variation of forms corresponds to the degree of the class consciousness of the various sections of the proletariat. The task of the Communist Parties will be to use all forms of the class struggle in their fight for the majority of the working class, make no fetish of any of them, but unceasingly try to lead each movement to a higher phase.

In this connection the significance of partial demands increases. They are the starting point from which we must "jump" in the matter capturing the basic masses of the working class. This is not because we cherish any illusions to the effect that there is a wider base now under the present conditions for the realisation of these partial demands than there was before. On the contrary, the bourgeoisie is now fighting against any more or less serious partial demands as it has never fought before. In the Ruhr lock-out, it lost twice as much in a week as it would have cost to meet the demands of the workers for higher wages in the course of a year. By this frenzied stubbornness it objectively revolutionises the partial demands of the proletariat. A victory of the working class on the basis of partial demands at the present time is a breach in the capitalist front, a breach in the entire capitalist system. By this our task of leading the masses from partial demands to the fundamental issues of the class struggle and the question of the proletarian dictatorship is made easier.

3. The United Front Tactics.

The united front tactics become of utmost importance. It is possible on the basis of the united front tactics to mobilise the masses around Party demands. But the united front tactic is neither a coalition with the socialdemocrats at the top nor a policy of compromise with their officials below. It is a direct appeal of the Communist Party to the mass of workers, to the social-democratic and non-party workers, to the organised and the unorganised. The united front tactic of the workers would be the easiest thing in the world if it were to consist of the formation of more or less "cordial" agreements of the Communist Parties with the other lower organisations in the factories for the purpose of common action. The united front tactic means a most irreconcilable struggle against the reformist and social-democratic organisations for the masses in the factories. We do not idolise the social-democratic lower officials in the factories (members of factory committees and delegates, etc.). If these people have mustered sufficient determination to break with the party of betrayal of the working class after all this bloody experience of the Noskes and Zörgiebels, after the years

of coalition policy, after the war programmes of the social-democrats, etc. they cannot very easily be distinguished from the staff of social-democratic officials who are the agents of capitalism and pursue a policy in the interests of capital. The task of the Communist Party is to press these elements to the wall in face of the working masses of the factories, to give them no chance to spread illusions to the effect that they, being connected with the rank and file, are of a different quality from their leaders, that they are capable of fighting honestly in the interests of the workers, etc. We must isolate them, advancing, commensurate with the degree of our influence, the demand on behalf of the entire mass of workers that the social-democratic workers should leave their party. In this connection we must launch a recruiting campaign for our Party in the factories after each action based on the united front tactic. At the same time we must pay special attention to the masses of proletarian women who are to an ever larger extent being drawn into industry as a result of capitalist rationalisation and who have displayed in some cases more aggressiveness than the men. The same is true of the young workers, who in some countries play the role of skirmishers in the strikes, demonstrations, and clashes with the police.

The results of each united front action must be organisationally consolidated. We must not be satisfied with the successes of one spontaneous action or another of the workers in which our Party succeeded in influencing the broad masses of workers and believed that the given factory or group of factories has already been captured. We are not "knights of an hour" who exert their influence only now and then in time of great class conflicts. We are the Party of the working class which constantly seeks to exert and strengthen its influence on the masses. We must in accordance with the concrete conditions in each given country find such organisational forms which will allow the Communists to retain the masses within the limits of these forms without letting them fall asunder until the next action. On the experience of our mistakes of the past we must remember three principal tenets in the application of the united front tactic. These are:

1. Do not minimise the role of the Communist Party in pursuing united front tactic but fight for its leadership in each mass action.
2. Do not diminish or abandon the hegemony of the proletariat in establishing a united front with the broad masses of exploited and labouring elements, particularly the peasantry.
3. Never fail to criticise the half-heartedness and waverings of your allies remembering that only in this manner will you be able to drive them along the path of determined struggle and to weld the ranks of your own party in a revolutionary spirit.

We have already accumulated certain experience in the correct application of the united front tactics. In Germany we have had the experience of strike committees created below in the factories during the Ruhr lock-out; we have also had there the experience of drawing the unorganised masses into a united front with the Communist workers in the factory committee elections. In France we have witnessed the convocation of conferences of factory workers in preparation for the May Day demonstrations as a result of which 80 per cent. of the metal workers and 100 per cent. of the carpenters of Paris struck on the 1st of May. This experience of the united front, in spite of all whimpering of the Right wing liquidators, has shown what a powerful instrument the united front tactic is in capturing the masses provided it is applied in a correct Bolshevik manner. The assimilation of this experience, the widening and deepening of these forms of application of the united front tactic, is a most vital duty of all Sections of the Comintern.

In undertaking the capture of the majority of the working class, the Communist Parties must consider the question of their cadres. We need now cadres who by their initiative, stamina and ability would correspond to the task of capturing the majority of the working class. Our present cadres are cadres of a period when our Parties were in the minority. These cadres have become too much attached, especially in the countries where the Communist Parties are very small, to the position of being in the minority. They regard anyone who wants to put an end to their inertia as being out of his wits. Year in and year out the same people come together and register the same meagre successes in the matter of capturing the masses. Very often they resemble a narrow caste, patiently waiting for better days, when the masses will turn their ears to the Party. In

Spain they have even developed a whole "theory" according to which the Communist Party is not advised to "disclose" its underground cadres through participation in the current struggles of the working class because the real calling of these underground cadres is that of revolution. On the other hand our cadres are weighed down with social-democratic survivals. These cadres usually unanimously vote for resolutions against the opportunists while at the same time committing big opportunist

mistakes in their work. Where will we get the forces to add to and displace some of our cadres? These forces will be given us by the upward trend of the labour movement. In the process of the class struggle, fresh forces will come to the fore. These struggles will also test the suitability of our cadres, they will help to select the Bolshevik material capable of coping with the task.

IV. Against Opportunism.

1. The Rights in the Service of Social Democracy.

What interferes, apart from objective difficulties, with the capturing of the masses? The deviations from the Bolshevik line which threaten either with a divorcement of the vanguard from the basic mass of the working class, or its conversion into an appendage of the mass movement. As an example let us take such a Party as that of China. Both of these deviations came to the fore in the course of its development. We have witnessed in China what is known as "vanguardism", the skipping of all phases of development of the revolutionary movement and threatening to tear us away from the broad masses of the proletariat, to convert our Party into a vanguard without an army. Now we are confronted in China with the reverse danger — the danger of the liquidators. Sentiment is growing among some sections of the Party in favour of withdrawing from the illegal organisation, participation in which is connected with great sacrifice. These groups want to concentrate the Party's work exclusively in open organisations, especially in the yellow trade unions. They seek so to change the Party's policy as to convert the C. P. into an appendage of the Kuomintang. On the agrarian question they stand for the Party's orientation on the whole of the peasantry, including the rich peasants. The Executive of the Chinese Party has waged a most energetic struggle against this sort of deviations so as not to be swept off its feet in the matter of capturing the masses.

Not so long ago the most serious danger to the international Communist movement was the first deviation. Now, since the Sulz organisation in Germany, which was a Trotskyist stronghold, has gone over directly to the Social Democrats, skipping all necessary phases in the development of renegades, since Trotsky has become a pensioner of the European bourgeoisie and its chief informer on Soviet affairs, and the "ultra-Left" Neuraths are in the same camp with Hais, Trotskyism has so discredited itself in the eyes of the workers, it has so exposed itself, that it can no longer be taken seriously. All working class and revolutionary elements that were temporarily misled, owing to their revolutionary impatience into the swamp of Trotskyism have returned to the ranks of the Parties. The greatest danger of the present time is outright opportunism which does not use the mask of "Left" phraseology. Opportunism is a smoke screen which prevents the workers from finding their way into the Communist Party. Opportunism interferes with the work of the Communist Parties in capturing the majority of the working class firstly by the fact that it seeks to weaken their criticism of the social democrats, the chief obstacle in the way of capturing the masses by the Communist Parties. There is not a single fundamental question of our movement in which the opportunists would agree with the Communist Parties. They are on all questions closer to the Social Democrats than to the Communist Parties. On the question of war, which is a central issue, such people as Crozet of France, together with the social democrats, obscure the contradictions of capitalism which make war inevitable, praise the international intertwining of interests of finance capital as a factor which retards war and creates "harmony" of capitalist interests. This position is closer to Hilferding's theory of "organised capitalism" than to the views of the Communist Parties. The propaganda of such views prevents the workers from seeing the war danger, diminishes their vigilance in the interests of the bourgeoisie and the war party — the Social Democracy. It disseminates pacifist illusions which still find most favourable soil even in some of our Parties, as the experience of the Swedish Party, which recently introduced a "disarmament" project in parliament, let alone the masses of non-Party workers. On the question of stabilisation of capitalism, opportunism (Humbert Droz, Ewert) underestimates

the contradictions of capitalism arising on the basis of "stabilisation", exaggerates the technical and industrial successes, coming near to the evaluation of capitalism given by the social democrats. By this it is trying to scare the workers with the power of capitalism in the interests of the bourgeoisie and the social democrats, to create the impression that capitalism is invincible and to keep the workers from the revolutionary struggle. On the question of the Soviet Union, opportunism exaggerates the difficulties of socialist construction, helps the social democrats in discrediting this construction, and thereby retards the process of transition of the workers to the side of Communism and the revolution. Its slogan of "control over industry" when there is no immediate revolutionary situation is merely a reflexion of the social democratic slogan of "economic democracy". It thus spins a thread of identity in the views of the Communist Parties and the social democrats and obscures in the eyes of the workers the irreconcilable struggle of the Communist Parties against the parties of working class betrayal.

In its attitude to the unorganised opportunism is closer to Kautsky, who is just as much afraid of mass action as were the Russian liberals in their "Viekh", and who wrote as early as in 1911 in his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg that "If such masses begin to act they must necessarily display ignorance and insolvency", that "mass action is not always progressive", that the mass of unorganised "can only destroy". ("Die Action der Masse.")

Adopting the snobbish attitude of the labour aristocracy in relation to the unorganised, the opportunists support the social democratic prejudice that the mass of organised workers in the reformist organisations are more class conscious than the unorganised workers drawn into the class movement. This idea is also advanced in order to mitigate the struggle of the revolutionary workers against the reformist bureaucracy. Hence, they advocate loyalty in relation to the reformist bureaucracy, downright sabotage in the organisation of strike committees from below, strike-breaking aid to reformism in the struggle against our strike strategy, espionage in our ranks in favour of reformism, supply of material to the latter for the struggle against the Communists, etc. in the sphere of our strike strategy. The opportunists do not expose the social democrats, they are trying to "expose" the Party in the ranks of which they have recently been. Their loathsome role in the notorious Wittorf affair, their attempt to sell out the Communist Party at the time of the armoured cruiser campaign, will forever stand as a classical example of how the Brandlerites help in every way the social democrats at the moments of acutest struggle between them and the Communist Party.

But the role of opportunism is nowhere as clear as on the question of social democracy's growing over into social fascism. Since the May Day events it is clear to an infant in what direction social democracy is developing. And this growing into social fascism is the most vulnerable spot of social democracy. It is here that it will receive its death wound. On this question the workers whose support it still has will desert it. And it is here that opportunism comes to its assistance, assuring the workers who are beginning to break away from the social democrats that "Social Democracy's growing over into social-fascism is an 'ultra-Left' legend".

2. Serra, the Zarathustra of Conciliation.

What place is occupied by conciliation in the system of opportunist views? Does it fundamentally differ from Right wing liquidation. The conciliators were always more close to the liquidators than to the line of the Comintern. In the system of opportunism it always played the same role as the "Left"

social democrats in relation to the Right social democrats. It shielded the liquidators, it recognised them as a lawful current in the Party, it endeavoured to prevent the Party's struggle against the liquidators. Since the expulsion of the latter from the Party, the functional rôle of the former has changed. It has itself become the centre of gravity of all Right wingers still left in the Party, the mouthpiece of opportunist tendencies, the limits of which are wider than the political groups of opportunism. In accordance with this its development towards the liquidators has also made headway. All members of the Plenum have probably received among all other material Comrade Serra's statement which I have already cited. I will merely repeat a few extracts from it to show how far the conciliators have gone towards the liquidators pure and simple. Thus about the Ruhr lockout, Serra says:

"The letter of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. to the C. C. of the C. P. G. maintains that in the struggle against the social democrats and against the Catholic Party in the Ruhr, the C. P. G. scored a great victory. Rarely have similar light-minded assertions been made under the flag of self-criticism... In the Ruhr, the workers were beaten without a struggle."

On the question of the unorganised, he says:

"On the whole, the masses organised in the trade unions (including the mass belonging to the reformist unions which have not split) are on a higher level of development. The joining of a union is the first step along the path of growing class consciousness. Demagogic romanticism concerning the "unorganised" drives us back to childhood, neither Right nor Left, but plain childhood without any deviations."

On the methods of work in the reformist unions he says that the letter of the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. G. "nourishes anti-trade union sentiments in speaking of an independent mobilisation of the unorganised workers and stating that under capitalism it is impossible to organise the majority of the working class in the trade unions".

On the radicalisation of the working class we read:

"The British miners' strike, the Viennese insurrection, the Sacco and Vanzetti demonstrations in Paris did not have the anticipated effects. The working class is beginning to react more aggressively to the capitalist offensive which has been going on in the course of several years. But these manifestations of a sharper class struggle have not yet assumed the nature of a radicalisation of the working class. The economic movements which are now beginning almost everywhere are primarily of a defensive character (author's emphasis)... the correlation of forces is no more favourable for us today than it was in 1921."

On the slogan of "Control over industry", he says:

"The struggle between us and the social democrats will develop chiefly in the form of a struggle between the ideas and practice of class collaboration on the basis of economic democracy and the ideas and practice of class revolutionary control over industry... The two slogans — "factory committees" and "control over industry" are inseparable. It would be a crude error to leave the trenches of control over industry to the social-bourgeois forces of economic democracy."

On the policy of the C. P. S. U. he writes:

"After the crisis which began in 1923... the leitmotiv of all documents of the Party is to the effect that the N. E. P. must be extended to the rural areas (author's emphasis). This need of extending N. E. P. found expression in two main conclusions: 1. The necessity of a general enhancement of agriculture and 2. necessity of fighting against the kulak, not through the medium of administrative means, but through economic measures. In my opinion the C. P. S. U. was not sufficiently firm in the enforcement of this policy... According to the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U., the principal task was not to eradicate the greatest poverty prevailing in the villages but to liquidate the 'capitalist elements'... This is a mistake. I think that the XV. Congress abandoned too soon the decisions of the XIV. Congress."

On the danger of the kulak, Serra says:

"There is as yet no seriously scientific definition of the kulak... Calculating the real value of the rouble, one must say that the income of most of the Russian Kulaks is not

greater than the income of our middle peasant... The kulak must be given a chance to produce... We can destroy the kulak when the output of grain will be sufficient for consumption... In order to increase the amount of grain, no tractors and no chemical fertilisers are necessary... What is necessary is that the peasant should receive for his grain a price which would not be too low as compared with its value."

Thus spake Serra, the Zarathustra of conciliation. It will be superfluous to show here that this harmonious system of Serra's views is a ponderously worked out system of opportunism advocated by the German "Against the Stream" group in all its details. Serra has ventured to say what his Russian fellow thinkers dare not utter. We do not doubt that the Italian comrades, and particularly Comrade Ercoli, hold in unison with the Plenum that the public defence of such views is incompatible with affiliation with the Comintern and that the Communist Party of Italy will be able politically to weld its ranks better than it has done till now in a relentless and consistent struggle against such views which demoralise the workers and disarm them in face of the social democracy. At the same time it would not be without interest for the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. to find out the position on this kind of views taken by Comrade Wieser of Switzerland, who unfortunately has not arrived, since in one of his documents addressed, to the Comintern, he defended, if not the entire system, then at least some of these views. In opening a discussion with Comrade Wieser at the Plenum, the E. C. C. I. will help us in disclosing another type of opportunism, perhaps the most widespread opportunism, which prefers to sit in "ambush" and be mute. This opportunism "loyally" votes for all resolutions; in "normal" times it does not dispute with the Party; it does not counterpose a line of its own to that of the Party; it adapts itself to any prevailing course of the Party, does not "hold out", but reveals itself at moments of sharp class conflicts. This is one of the most dangerous species of opportunism because it cannot be caught, it coils up like a snake when it comes to a turn, slips out of the hands when it is caught red-handed. In the course of many years we have had this type of opportunism greatly widespread in Czechoslovakia represented in the Jilek Group, the true nature of which was discovered when the VI. World Congress decided to make a turn. We must clearly take into account the fact that the closer we approach the task of capturing the majority of the working class, the more dangerous will this species of opportunism become. The "swamp" in the Party which is always with the majority was always considerable, but it will be still greater when the Communist Party will be closer to the capture of the majority of the working class. A most irreconcilable struggle against all forms of opportunism is therefore an elementary condition for the solution of the task of capturing the majority of the working class.

"Without a most serious and all-round preparation of the revolutionary elements of the proletariat for the expulsion and suppression of opportunism, the idea of the proletarian dictatorship is absurd." (Lenin, The Constituent Assembly Elections.)

We will not eradicate the roots of social democracy from among the workers unless we liquidate its influence in our own ranks.

The bourgeoisie and social democracy cannot be successfully fought without fighting the social democratic agency in the labour movement. The elements of inactivity in the latter cannot be overcome unless the groups which stand for this inactivity in their political platforms are overcome. Secessions of insignificant groups such as we have witnessed last year in Germany and Czechoslovakia not only cleanse the ranks of the Comintern of decaying opportunist elements, but also serve as the best sign of the maturity of the two largest parties, the development of which has rendered impossible the further maintenance of such elements in the ranks of the organised Communist movement. We have lost the petty bourgeois slag in order to win the enormous and as yet untouched gold deposits to be found in the midst of the working class. The Comintern's course is to capture the deepest layers of the working class as a task made possible and necessary by the present surge in the Labour movement. The X. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. will give this fundamental course to all Sections. The business of the Sections is to work out this task in concrete forms and to carry it into operation.