

INTERNATIONAL



Vol. 12 No. 7

PRESS

18th Febr. 1932

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered post: International Press Correspondence, Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Berlin. Telephone: Dönhoff 2856 and 2867.

CONTENTS

Politics.		XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U.	
Hermann Remmele: The Presidential Election in Germany	117	V. Molotov: On the Second Five-Year Plan II.	123
The Labour Movement.		Resolution on the Reports of Comrades Molotov and Kuybyshev	130
R. Bishop: Economic Struggles in Great Britain	118	Industrial Development in the Soviet Union in 1931 and the Tasks for 1932 (Resolution Orjonnikidze)	133
The War in the Far East.		The Balkans.	
Clemens Dutt: The Role of the Nanking Government	119	Greetings from the Balkan Committee of the National Revolutionary Organisation to the Croat National Revolutionary Group	137
Chadi: The Chinese Toilers Organise the Defence	120	Proletarian Commemoration Days.	
A. Bosse: The American Campaign against the Chinese Revolution and the U.S.S.R.	120	The Red Army of Workers and Peasants	138
The World "Disarmament" Conference.		International Women's Day.	
G. Péri: After Fourteen Days of the Geneva Disarmament Conference	122	M. Bulle: Women Labour Renumeration	139

For Complete and General Disarmament!

Full Text of Speech Delivered by Comrade Litvinov at the Geneva World "Disarmament" Conference.

Our President and previous speakers have told us that this conference has no precedent, and no one will disagree with this. The conference is without precedent, not only on account of the number of states represented, but also—and principally—on account of the vast demands made upon it by humanity, and the enormous importance of its outcome, whatever this may be.

This conference meets as the result of long—we think too long—preliminary work. But this preliminary stage is now over. The present conference is face to face with the problem of disarmament, which demands a practical solution without further delays or temporising, without digression for the study of continually arising preliminary conditions.

The foundations of this conference were laid during the Great War, also an event without precedent, both as to scope and consequences. For the first time in history the peoples have been drawn in their millions into the battlefield; indeed, in some countries almost the whole male population was mobilised, and the correlation of class forces and social-political factors was very different from that in former wars.

In the very thick of the war the voice of protest against war made itself heard and the cry "war on war" was raised. The war itself could only be kept going, and millions of victims engulfed, by calling it "the last war".

And yet the whole history of international relations since this so-called "last war" has been marked by a steady and systematic increase in the armed forces of all states and by a colossal increase in the burden of militarism.

The creation of the League of Nations itself and the 8th article of its Covenant already referred to by several speakers, were nothing but a faint tribute to popular demands for the fulfilment of the promises given by their governments that the great war should indeed be the "last war", to the demands of the masses of the workers, grown more enlightened and beginning to take a direct part in political life. In the years ensuing on the war—years of universal impoverishment, of the healing of wounds, both on the part of the defeated and the victorious,—the popular clamour for the abolition of war increased, and cannot, in the opinion of the Soviet Delegation, be satisfied by the stabilisation or slight reduction of armaments or war budgets,—what is required is to find a way for putting an end to war.

The Soviet Government is not taking part in this conference on account of formal obligations, and not under any stimulus from outside. From the very first days of its existence it condemned war as an instrument of national policy, by deeds as well as by words, declared against all contributions and territorial annexations, and the oppression of any nation by any other, and proclaimed the principle of national self-determination. Ever since it has in its own policy pursued with strict consistency the line of peaceful and loyal co-operation with other states. Once war is excluded as an instrument of national policy the Soviet Government sees no need for maintaining armies and other armed forces and, on its first appearance at an international conference—at Genoa ten years ago—it proposed total general disarmament as the only

way of putting an end to war. It renewed this proposal as soon as it was invited to take part in the work of the Preparatory Commission for Disarmament. In making this proposal my government took into consideration the demands and claims of the peoples throughout the world as well as the spirit of its own people.

The Soviet Delegation urged at the Preparatory Commission the speediest possible realisation of its proposal. At the same time we pointed out the imminent danger of new wars and that the only means of averting this danger, under the economic system existing in most countries, would be total disarmament, and that no treaties, pacts, protocols or international organisations could create real security for all countries. Our point of view was disputed in the Commission. Our warnings as to the imminent possibility of new wars were ridiculed. We were accused of pessimism and of exaggerating the danger. We were told that it was "security" that was required and that this security could be achieved by a system of treaties, protocols and other international undertakings, suggested by the League of Nations, and that there was no hurry about disarmament.

Only a few years have passed since this controversy and what do we see now? The Disarmament Conference had to begin to the accompaniment of the distant rumbling of cannon and the explosions of bombs from the air. Two states, mutually bound by the League of Nations' Covenant, and the Paris Treaty of 1928, have been in a state of war, de facto if not de jure for 5 months. No war may as yet have been registered with a notary public, but vast territories in one of these countries have been occupied by the armed forces of the other, and battles in which all sorts of armaments are being employed and thousands are being killed and wounded, are being waged between the regular troops of both countries.

True all this is going on far away from Geneva, far away from Europe, but who is so optimistic as to assert in good faith that the military activities which have begun will be limited to two countries only or to one continent only? Who is so optimistic as to assure us confidently that the events in the Far East are not the beginning of a new war, which in extent, scope and—thanks to the latest technical inventions—horror, may eclipse the sinister fame of the last war? Continents are no longer economically and politically isolated. There are countries belonging to more than one continent. There are not many neighbours in Europe without serious territorial accounts to settle. The extent of disputed frontiers is greater now than it was before the war. Can we be sure that these differences will not be thrown into the melting pot, if a single one of the European states should be dragged into war? Granted that all this may not happen, that the fire in the Far East may be kept within local bounds, even then can we be sure that similar fires will not break out in other parts of the world? What is to prevent this? International organisations and pacts? But we have seen that they are incapable of either preventing or ending military activities in the Far East, with all the consequences of these activities.

Public opinion? It is still more impotent. And after all what is public opinion? Has it ever been unanimous anywhere, or served a single purpose? Public opinion, as expressed in the press or through public bodies, serves various interests, the multiple interests of various countries and of capitalist groups, of private enterprise and even of individuals in these countries. Have not the acts of violence going on under our very eyes in the Far East, their advocates and instigators in the press, even the press of countries not immediately concerned? Have we not read quite lately articles in both European and American papers, urging the necessity and efficacy of the extension of the war in the Far East and actually suggesting that war would be a way out of the crisis, of that very crisis the acuteness of which must be ascribed to the late war and its consequences?

Nor can the limitation of armaments be expected to prevent the arising of fresh wars. At the present moment all states are sufficiently supplied with armaments—and armaments sharp enough and destructive enough—to conduct a war, in comparison with which the Great War would appear mere child's play. The reduction of armaments is equally incapable of guaranteeing us against any war, especially if such reduction is not very radical and is not carried out with the conscious purpose of placing obstacles in the way of war.

The Soviet Delegation, basing its attitude upon the needs of the present moment, and the demands of the popular masses, those demands which necessitated all the preliminary

work of the Conference and which called the Conference itself into being, would sum up the problem before us in the words: "security against war". It is this that distinguishes our conception of security from the conception of other delegations, many of whom, when they speak of security mean the assuring of the utmost possible chances of victory to a state subjected to attack. The Soviet Delegation considers that we must endeavour to make war itself impossible since it is the people who suffer, both in the victorious and defeated countries, and moreover, as the last war has shown us, the people in all countries. The Soviet Delegation appraises from this standpoint all proposals made to the Preparatory Commission or to be made to this Conference, including the French proposals, which are worthy of more than a mere passing allusion. It is, indeed, as a mark of respect that I respond to the invitation of the French Delegation, to criticise and discuss its proposal.

First and foremost it must be stated that from the point of view of the reduction of armaments the French proposals scarcely bring us nearer to our aim, inasmuch as they are preliminary conditions requiring to be accepted before any sort of reduction of armaments is to be made on the part of France. The discussion of these conditions would actually convert this Conference into a preparatory conference for a future disarmament conference, requiring perhaps no less time than did the Preparatory Commission. It must be remembered that these proposals represent the further development and materialisation of what is known as the Geneva Protocol, which has been before the League of Nations for seven years, provoking wide controversy and so far unaccepted. We have no grounds to assume that the same protocol, pushed to its logical conclusion, will meet with greater unanimity than before. It would become a question of the creation of a new international organisation with considerable powers, and consequently of the creation of a new covenant, with regulations for the disposition of an international army, for the definition of aggression; a host of problems fruitlessly debated for ten years in the League of Nations, with the addition of new and still more complicated ones would spring up. Even now, as far as I know, there is no precise interpretation recognized by all members of the League, of the 16th and other articles of the Covenant, and the rules for their application passed in 1921. To spend time over these questions in the present acute state of political and economic international antagonisms would mean, as far as disarmament is concerned, to put the clock back years if not decades.

The French proposals, however, as I have already said, interest us most of all from the point of view of their capacity to create security against war, and I should like to dwell upon this question in somewhat more detail.

What then is the gist of the proposals of the French Delegation? It is proposed to create a new army, to consist of a certain number of military bomb-carriers, scattered over various countries or concentrated in a single place, and a certain number of troops reserved in various countries for special purposes. In other words, an army, of say a few hundred thousand men, is to be adequately equipped, for the purpose of joining the forces of a state recognized to have been the victim of attack. A state which intends to attack another will have in advance to reckon not only with the forces of its immediate enemy but also with those of an army so to speak allied to it. Does this imply that the aggressive party will inevitably refrain from attack? Have we not had experience enough of allies and allied armies, and have they ever been the slightest guarantee against war? Many a state in the past, when preparing for war, has had to reckon in advance that it would be up against more than one state, and this consideration has not invariably prevented it from carrying out its war-like intentions. Either it has provided itself with allies, or made its programme of armaments to outweigh all possible forces of the enemy side. All that an aggressive state would have to do then would be to take into consideration the forces of the international army also, in laying its plans.

Again, it is obvious that such an international army is not likely to be very big. We cannot assume that even those states which are adjacent to the theatre of war will be able or willing (except in very special cases) to send large forces to take part in a war not directly concerning them, especially when they themselves have accounts to settle with the state they are called upon to assist. Supposing then that a strong state, capable in time of war of

mustering an army running into millions, attacks a state many times weaker than itself! It is quite obvious that a few hundred thousand more soldiers on the side of the weaker state would not be a decisive factor, and therefore such an international army, far from preventing war, could not even always ensure the victory to the side attacked.

And this is not all. What guarantees would there be that such an international army would be put into operation, and that in good time, before the weaker party to a conflict was crushed? What guarantees would there be that the aggressor will really be found and that when he is found it will really be he? These questions are by no means idle, by no means theoretical, but have been suggested by well known facts of international life very present in the minds of us all. Supposing an armed conflict is going on somewhere, whether it has the official stamp of war or not. First of all it must be established who is the aggressor and who the victim, and whether there has been an infringement of international treaties and undertakings binding upon both parties? In most cases this is by no means a complicated matter. The unsophisticated man in the street would have little difficulty in giving an answer to these questions and no doubt his answer would be the right one. But when it is international organisations and individual governments who have to give the answer they are not always ready with it, and are reduced to issuing appeals, exhortations and threats simultaneously to both sides. I merely use this supposition for the sake of argument. But now I would ask—should such a conflict arise in the future what guarantees would there be that the existing or some new international organisation, at whose disposal the international army would be, would be able or desirous to establish which is the guilty side? After all, it can hardly bombard both sides simultaneously, so as to make sure of hitting the aggressor! What, I ask, are the guarantees that a new international organisation, or the existing one with increased actual power, will really be able or willing to use such power for the defence of the weaker, for the protection of the attacked against the attacker.

National egoism has been mentioned here as an obstacle to international action. Apparently this egoism shows itself not only in the decisions of individual governments, but finds its way into the proposals and decisions of the representatives of these governments at international organisations, paralysing their action or giving it an undesirable turn. If such cases have occurred in the past what is to prevent them from occurring again? More, what are the guarantees that, since this egoism admittedly exists, an international army would not be exploited in the interests of some state which has won for itself a leading position in the international organisation through separate alliances, ententes and agreements? There is not a word about the prohibition of such alliances in the French proposals.

I shall be told that the stronger and more actual the means of pressure at the disposal of an international organisation, the more resolutely will it act. I venture to doubt this. If states represented in such an organisation, either from fear of upsetting their relations with the aggressor, or from other egoistic nationalist considerations, cannot always agree to the use of even feeble means of pressure for the aversion and ending of conflicts, how much more are they likely to hesitate before applying such powerful weapon as the dispatch of their own armies. This being so, is it to be expected that states will be sufficiently imbued with the necessary confidence in an international organisation and in its impartiality, to entrust their security to it, and place their own national troops at its disposal?

The question of an international army arose and was discussed, if I am not mistaken, 13 years ago, when the Covenant of the League of Nations was being drawn up, and it was then decided in the negative. And at that time there was much more faith in international organisations than now. As for international differences and national egoism, surely these have not been diminished during the last 13 years! A glance over events in the sphere of international economic relations will suffice to convince us of this.

I pass over the question of the extent to which the Soviet Union could be expected to confide its security and a part of its own armies to an international organisation consisting largely of states openly hostile to it, even to the extent of refusing to maintain normal relations with it. The workers and peasants of the Soviet Union are more likely to see in

an international army created in such conditions, a threat to their country.

I feel bound, therefore, to state frankly that as far as security against war, and, therefore, security of states, are concerned the French proposals arouse grave doubts in our minds. The Soviet Delegation is thereby only strengthened in its conviction that the only infallible way to the solution of the problem of the organisation of peace, the problem of the averting of war, the problem of assuring security to all nations, is the way recommended by it, the way of **general and total disarmament**.

It would, however, be wrong to infer from what I have said that the Soviet Delegation denies the importance and efficacy of all other ways of consolidating peace short of total disarmament. The Soviet Government has shown its readiness for international cooperation by taking part in a series of international congresses and organisations and by the proposals which it brought before them.

Nor do we underrate the importance of **international treaties** and undertakings for peace. My government adhered to the 1928 Paris Treaty at the time and even put it into force with neighbouring states earlier than was done by the Treaty's own initiators. My government itself makes a practice of concluding mutual **non-aggression pacts** which it considers infinitely more significant than multi-lateral or general treaties. It has always proposed non-aggression pacts to all states. These pacts are a kind of acid test for making other states display their spirit, whether peaceful or the reverse. When a pact proposed by us to a state is immediately accepted and put into force, a certain stability in the relations between the two states may be affirmed. When such a proposal is not immediately accepted but considered for years, and even after the first letter of the signature has been appended to it a period of meditation ensues, and the completion of the signature is postponed, there is naturally less feeling of confidence. But still more serious doubts of a peaceful spirit arise with regard to states which categorically reject proposals for the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression, either on some excuse or other, or without giving any excuse. It is then obviously impossible to deny the importance of international pacts as a means of discovering the peaceful or hostile attitude of another state. In addition it must be admitted that the conclusion of a non-aggression pact increases the guilt of the aggressor in cases of disturbance of the peace. Such pacts cannot, however, be considered an actual guarantee against war. Total and general disarmament is the only effective guarantee against war and its devastating effects.

The Soviet Delegation submitted to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference a **draft convention for total disarmament**, to be realised in the course of four years. This was four years ago, and it will hardly be denied that if our proposal had been accepted at the time, the events in the Far East would not have occurred, there would have been no threats of a new world war, and the economic crisis now being almost universally experienced, would undoubtedly have been less acute.

The idea of total universal disarmament is distinguished from all other plans by its simplicity and by the ease with which it could be carried out and with which its realisation could be controlled. A plan for total disarmament would eliminate all those difficult and thorny questions which made the work of the Preparatory Commission so long drawn-out, condemned to sterility the innumerable international conferences of the last few years held in various capitals on the question of disarmament, and gave rise to those gloomy forecasts with which this Conference has been met. Identical security and equality of conditions for all countries could only be arrived at by means of total disarmament. As regards control

"Rote Fahne" Suppressed for Fourteen Days.

Berlin, 15th February 1932.

The "Rote Fahne", the central organ of the Communist Party of Germany in Berlin, was suppressed to-day by the Police President, the social democrat Grzesinski. The suppression took place allegedly because the newspaper published an appeal of the revolutionary trade union movement against the new attack on the social insurance benefits. Both communist daily newspapers in Berlin, the morning "Rote Fahne" and the evening "Nachrichten" are now suppressed. The "Rote Fahne" will appear again on the 1st March.

it is sufficiently obvious that it would be much easier to find a state out when making tanks, cannon, machine-guns, bombing planes, in spite of an international undertaking, than if it were only increasing its output of these weapons above the percentage internationally established. It would be easier to find a state out when training its population in the use of machine-guns and bomb-throwing, in the face of international prohibition, than if it were merely increasing its army above the percentage laid down.

I must, however, once again emphasise the fact that the Soviet Delegation has by no means come here merely to put before you yet another time its proposal for total and general disarmament, or to declare that we are determined to have all or nothing, complete disarmament or none at all. We have no illusions whatsoever as to the fate in store for our proposition. Our Delegation, ladies and gentlemen, is ready to discuss with you any proposals tending to reduce armaments, and the further such reduction goes, the more readily will the Soviet Delegation take part in the work of the Conference. Considering the draft convention drawn up by the Preparatory Commission altogether inadequate, the Soviet Delegation will advocate here its own **draft for the reduction of armaments**, which, however, it regards merely as the first step towards total disarmament.

I would remind the Conference that the Soviet Delegation was the first to propose, in its second draft convention put before the Preparatory Commission, the complete destruction of the most aggressive types of armaments, including:

1. tanks and super-heavy long-range artillery;
2. ships of upwards of 10,000 tons displacement;
3. naval artillery of over 12 inch. calibre;
4. aircraft carriers;
5. military dirigibles;
6. heavy bombing planes, all stock of air bombs and any other means of destruction for use from airplanes;
7. all means and apparatus for chemical, incendiary and bacteriological warfare.

The Soviet Delegation proposed the complete prohibition of air bombing, and not only beyond the limits of a definite area. It also proposed not merely to refrain from chemical warfare but actually from preparing for it in time of peace.

All these proposals remain in full force for the present Conference.

The Soviet Delegation will recommend the progressive proportional method as the most impartial and equitable method for the reduction of armaments, allowing for facilities and exceptions in favour of weaker countries, in danger of aggression. It will warmly support any proposals approaching or outstripping its own. It will support the equal rights of all participants in the Conference, and equal security for all states.

The country I represent is in a less favourable position as regards security than other countries. Only 14 years ago, it was the object of armed attack on all its frontiers, of blockade and of political and economic boycott. For 14 years it has been the object of indescribable slander and hostile campaigns. Even now many states, including one of the strongest naval powers, do not conceal their hostility to it, even to the extent of refusing to establish normal peaceful relations, and many states maintaining normal relations with it have refused to conclude or confirm pacts of non-aggression. The present events in the Far East, which have evoked universal alarm, cannot but cause special anxiety in the Soviet Union, owing to its geographical nearness to the theatre of these events, where huge armies are operating, and where anti-Soviet Russian emigrés are mobilising their forces. Despite all this I am empowered to declare here the readiness of the Soviet Union to disarm to the same extent and at the same rate to which the other powers, first and foremost those actually at its borders may agree.

Here I feel bound to express once more that no measures for the reduction of armaments can meet the pressing needs of the present times.

The political and economic differences existing between various states have become considerably intensified since the Great War and owing to the crisis, are inevitably and rapidly leading to a new armed conflict between nations. This conflict, owing to modern improvements in the weapons of destruction, threatens humanity with incredible disasters, unprecedented devastation. The impending menace of war is causing universal alarm and arousing universal suspicion.

This alarm and suspicion, together with the burden of taxation imposed upon the people for the maintenance by states of huge armed forces are nourishing and intensifying the present economic crisis, which is felt in all its weight first and foremost by the working classes. In these circumstances the task of the hour is not the repetition of any attempt to achieve the reduction of armaments or war budgets, the realisation of which is bound to come up against tremendous obstacles, but the actual prevention of war, through the creation of effective security against war. This task can only be carried out by means of total and general disarmament.

The Soviet Delegation will move a resolution to this effect, convinced as it is that there would be no external obstacle to the carrying out of general disarmament if the governments here represented show their readiness for it.

The sole aim of the Soviet Government is the building up of socialism on the territory of the Soviet Union, and in the face of the successful accomplishment of the first Five-Year Plan, of colossal achievements in every sphere of economic life, it seems to the Soviet Delegation that what has been obvious from the beginning must by now be as clear as daylight to all and sundry—namely that the Soviet Union requires, neither the increase of territory, nor interference in the affairs of other nations, to achieve its aim, and could therefore do without army, navy, military aviation and all other forms of armed forces. It does, however, require the assurance that there will be no attempts against Soviet territory either and that other states will not interfere in its internal affairs and that its peaceful economic construction will not be tampered with from without. It will only feel this assurance if other states also agree to give up their armed forces.

Now, when the whole world is going through an unprecedented economic crisis, which is shaking the edifice of the capitalist system to its foundations, the masses of the people suffering from unemployment to an extent hitherto unknown, from universal wage reductions, threatened by still further economic upheavals, the full burden of which the ruling classes readily shift on to their shoulders, must be relieved as far as possible from the threat of the catastrophe of war, which the course of the economic crisis is making more and more imminent. Security against war must be created. This security can never be achieved by roundabout ways, but only by the direct way of total general disarmament.

This is no communist slogan. **The Soviet Delegation knows that the triumph of socialist principles, removing the causes giving rise to armed conflicts, is the only absolute guarantee of peace.** So long, however, as these principles prevail only in one sixth of the world, there is only one means of organising security against war, and that is **total and general disarmament.** One proof of its practicability is the fact that it is proposed by a state with a population of over 160 million. This idea is by no means utopian in itself; but it can be made utopian by its rejection by the other states represented here.

We hope that the responsible representatives of states here present will treat the idea expressed by the Soviet Delegation with the seriousness which the problem of assuring to all nations real security against war, real peace, deserves.

Workers in the Capitalist Countries Support Litvinov.

Moscow, February 16, 1932.

The Moscow press reports that Comrade Litvinov has received numerous messages of greeting by post and telegraph from numerous workers' organisations and also from various individual persons in reply to his speech at the "disarmament" conference. Thus, for example, the following message was sent by a huge meeting of **Czechoslovakian women held in Kladno:**

"The toiling women of Czechoslovakia are following with the greatest attention your consistent championship of Peace and Disarmament and your fight against those who are openly or secretly preparing the horrors of a new war. Whilst speaking in the name of your Government you speak at the same time in the name of many millions of working class mothers and sisters throughout the world. The toiling women of all nations approve your fight for peace and disarmament."

A French worker writes from Toulouse: "You have given clear and manly expression to the plain and proper proposals of your Government. I therefore greet in your person the worthy representative of your Government."

POLITICS

The Presidential Election in Germany.

By Hermann Remmele (Berlin).

Up to four weeks before the Presidential Election in Germany (the election is to take place on 13th of March), the "people" did not know whom the German bourgeoisie would present as the "leader of the nation". Up to that time there was only **one** certain candidate—the candidate of the German working class, **the representative of the Communist Party, Comrade Thälmann**. Complete confusion still reigns in the camp of the German bourgeoisie. For weeks the bourgeois press has been pronouncing its oracles; whether Field-Marshal Hindenburg would or would not agree to stand as candidate again—until he has now, in a solemn declaration, pronounced his readiness to make this sacrifice—whether the Kyffhäuser Bund (the head organisation of the ex-servicemen's and military associations), and the Stahlhelm (fascist defence organisation) will support their honorary President Hindenburg or not, whether the Harzburger front under the leadership of Hugenberg and Hitler will put forward their own candidate, and for weeks the German public has witnessed the spectacle of the "hostile" brothers in the camp of the bourgeoisie being unable to come to an agreement.

Nothing shows more clearly the development of bourgeois society in Germany from democracy to fascism than the approaching Presidential election. Seven years ago, Fritz Ebert left Germany the "freest democracy in the world", as it was described by the whole of the II. International. At that time the various bourgeois wings came forward with clearly demarcated fronts. At the first ballot at that time the monarchist-nationalist front put forward as their candidate the German nationalist **Jarres**; the democratic Centre put forward **Marx** and the Republican Left put forward the social democrat **Otto Braun**. At the second ballot the monarchist wing gave their support to **Hindenburg**, whilst the social democracy withdrew their candidate—in spite of the fact that he polled four times more votes than the candidate of the Centre—and voted for **Marx**. At the second ballot **Hindenburg** was elected President of the Republic as representative of the monarchist nationalist wing against the bourgeois Centre and against the workers candidate **Thälmann**.

The same Hindenburg who seven years ago was the representative of the extreme monarchist nationalist wing gathered round **Hugenberg, Hitler and Seldte**, is today the chosen candidate of his erstwhile "opponents" of the Centre and of the social democracy. What has changed in the meantime is the political life and consciousness of bourgeois society itself: the coming together of the "hostile" fronts in the bourgeois camp in a united bloc for the fight against the common enemy—Bolshevism.

Brüning's appeal to the various parties to proclaim Hindenburg as Reichs-President without fresh elections was at once accepted by the social democrats, whilst, on the other hand, the actual Hindenburg wing refused to agree to this procedure, unless at the same time the Centre Reichs-government was replaced by a government of the pronounced **Right**, a "national" government. As a result of this demand, the common national united front from Hitler to Wels collapsed. Thus, against the will of the monarchist wing, **Hitler's** candidature became necessary. But only as a sham candidate. For the arrangers of Hitler's candidature have already made it plain that their candidate will only be put forward at the first ballot, whilst in return for further concessions to their original demands they are ready, at the second ballot, to set up the united front from Hitler to Wels.

The co-operation of the extreme fascist wing round **Hitler** and **Hugenberg** with the **Brüning-Severing** wing is so palpably obvious to the whole world that there is nothing to conceal. In Germany, no political questions are decided by the Brüning-Groener government or by the Prussian Braun-Severing government without the nationalist wing of Hugenberg and Hitler being "consulted" or having a decisive say in the matter. In this connection the Reichswehr Group of Groener and Schleicher play the role of co-adjutors of the extreme nationalist tendency. It is from this political constellation that there arises the demand by the Hugenberg-Hitler wing

that Groener shall be given the office of Reichs Chancellor and that several Ministries shall be given to representatives of the extreme nationalist wing.

Meanwhile, all the big towns and industrial centres are being covered by a close network of barracks of the fascist storm detachments. The murder columns of fascism are continually organising punitive expeditions against working class quarters, where, under the protection and with the support of the police, they undertake raids and attacks upon the revolutionary proletariat. In this atmosphere of murder there is, as is to be expected, a growing protest and will to resistance on the part of millions of workers and also of those who hitherto have been in the camp of the social democracy and of the Reichsbanner. In this atmosphere of active revolutionary struggle of the workers against fascism, the social fascists set up the so-called "Iron front against fascism", with which they are attempting, by claiming to fight against fascism, to prevent the workers from going over to the revolutionary camp. This "Iron front" is at the same time to be a means with which the social fascists intend to carry out the Hindenburg election and also the Prussian elections which are due to take place in May.

In actual fact, however, collaboration in the fascist united front of Hitler with Groener, and Groener with Severing, Hugenberg with Brüning and Brüning with Otto Braun, finds below, in the fight against the working class, its reflection in the attitude of the police troops led by social democrats, towards the armed storm detachments of the Hitler fascists. For example, after the fascist bands, with the support of the police, broke up and prevented a number of Communist meetings in Berlin, the social democratic police President **Grzesinsky** threatened to prohibit all Communist meetings in the future. Here there is clearly shown how the fascist united front of the national fascists with the social fascists wishes to destroy the last political rights of the working class.

In spite of the cowardly and treacherous attacks of the Nazi bands on the working class, in spite of the social-fascist police terror, and in spite of the savage sentences passed by capitalist class justice, with the open approval of the social fascists, against workers who have defended themselves against fascist murderers, fascism in Germany is encountering the steadily growing and firmly organised resistance of the German proletariat. Throughout the whole of Germany the red united front is being welded ever more firmly, and red unity committees, led by Communists, are being formed against the offensive of the fascist hirelings in the service of finance capital.

In the gathering of the broad proletarian masses in the revolutionary united front in the fight against the Brüning-Severing dictatorship, in the fight against Hitler fascism, in the fight against all enemies and betrayers of the German proletariat, the million masses of the German working class are rallying to give their votes to the representative of the Communist Party, **Comrade Thälmann**. The deceitful manoeuvres of the social fascists, whose "iron front", already a few days after its birth, proved to be a sickly abortion, are proving of no avail in face of the growing power of the revolutionary united front against fascism. At thousands of membership meetings of the social democratic party, indignant protests by social democratic workers are being raised against the support of Hindenburg's candidature by the party leaders. In workshops and factories, at the Labour Exchanges, and even at hundreds of meetings convened by the social democratic party, the workers adopt decisions and proclaim in resolutions that they will never accept Field Marshal Hindenburg, the pacemaker of fascism as their candidate, but recognise **Comrade Thälmann** as their candidate. Thus the candidate of the Communist Party is becoming the real rallying centre of the **intensified fight of class against class**.

In no political campaign or action in the past has the clear open class character of the fight been so plainly revealed as at the present Presidential election. Never was the alliance of all political tendencies of fascism so clearly evident in Germany. The outstanding **characteristic feature** of the present election campaign is that the class differences, the class antagonisms are more apparent and more marked than was the case in any political struggle in the past. The Presidential election thereby becomes for the revolutionary proletariat of Germany the starting point for rallying all the revolutionary forces under the leadership of the Communist Party, for the victory of the working class against the fascist united front.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Economic Struggles in Britain.

By R. Bishop (London).

The issues confronting the British working-class to-day are bigger and more urgent than at any time in its history. The direct offensive against wages and hours is being felt in every industry, whilst coupled with it, the tariff cum rationalisation drive means a lowering of the standard of life, a worsening of industrial conditions and ever increasing unemployment.

2½ million workers in the most important industries have either recently suffered wage-cuts and worsened conditions or are facing demands of this character.

The Means Test has made itself felt in the home of practically every worker—employed as well as unemployed. The unemployed figure rose by 218,000 in the month of January despite the fact that during that period 130,000 workless deprived of benefit under the Means Test and the Anomalies Act have ceased to sign on at the Labour Exchange, and consequently are not considered officially as "unemployed".

What are the demands with which the workers are confronted? **The London Underground and bus workers** are being asked to accept a cut of 2½ per cent. in all earnings, with an extra 2½ per cent. on all earnings in excess of 40/- weekly. **The building workers** are having a cut of ¼d an hour demanded of them. This cut is based upon a sliding scale. **The woollen workers** are facing a demand for an increased working week and lower wages. In parts of Yorkshire they are on strike against it. **The cotton weavers** are fighting against the extension of the more-loom per weaver system and also against an attempt to extend hours from 48 to 55½ per week accompanied by a cut in piece rates. **The dockers, lightermen etc.** were faced on January 4 with a wage-cut of 10d per day, reduced piece-rates, reduced overtime rates and worsened conditions generally. The lightermen of the Port of London have been on strike ever since against these conditions. In the beginning they were supported by a considerable section of dockers, but the militants in the docks proved too weak to be able to resist successfully the efforts of the reformist leadership of the Transport and General Workers Union to get them back.

The seamen have just had their pay cut by 30 per month in some cases and 10/- per week in others, with the virtual abolition of certain privileges such as the payment of rail fares from the port of debarkation to their home towns. **The tramwaymen** throughout the country are being asked for wage-cuts similar to those demanded from the London busmen. In addition the maximum daily duty is to be increased, the guaranteed week to be abolished and pay for overtime, night work etc. decreased. **Boot and shoe operatives** are faced with a general demand for a 10 per cent. wage cut. **The railwaymen** face demands of unknown dimensions from the companies next month when the National Wages Board meets. Already the trade union officials are paving the way for further cuts by talk of the "bad position" of the railways and assuring the Directors that the workers "will be reasonable". Sections of the **steel-workers**, in Cumberland particularly, are fighting against an attempt to lengthen the working day to 10 hours and against rationalisation measures which threaten to increase the already terrific amount of unemployment in the industry.

In a number of **clothing** factories, wage demands are being put forward by the employers. The laundry employers who cut wages by 7½ per cent. in January propose a further cut in March, whilst up and down the country, in various light industries, the employers are imposing various methods of more onerous working, chief of which is the **Bedaux system**, against which the Leicestershire hosiery workers struck for nine weeks, before eventual betrayal by the union bureaucrats, on a promise of "modifications" being made by the employers.

With all these attacks on the standards of the workers, one thing stands out clearly—despite the heroic struggles being put up by various sections the ranks of the workers are disorganised and the resistance is purely sectional. The responsibility for this lies alone on the shoulders of the Trade Union leadership—it is a direct outcome of their policy of class collaboration, of their efforts to assist the capitalist class to

find a way out of the crisis at the expense of the working class.

Nevertheless, despite every effort of the Trade Union colossus being used to prevent a struggle, the workers have taken every opportunity vouchsafed them to re-iterate their will to fight. For instance when the officials of the Transport and General Workers Union signed an agreement on behalf of their members agreeing to the employers' demands, the only waterside union to be balloted, the Lightermen, showed a big majority for strike action, despite the advice of their officials. When, after weeks of struggle, the officials fixed another ballot, and again recommended acceptance, the result was an even bigger majority for continuing the strike than there originally was for starting it. When at last the union officials, compelled by mass pressure, took a ballot of the Burnley cotton weavers, the majority for strike action was nine to one.

When, a week previously, another **Burnley cotton mill** was out against longer hours and lower wages, the strikers ignored the advice of their officials and energetically mass picketed, and won the strike. So in the strike of the mills in the Batley and Dewsbury section of the woollen industry. Here a strike reluctantly assented to by the officials was carried from mill to mill, by mass pickets and processions of the workers taken in the teeth of the repeated pleas of the officials to be "law-abiding".

In the fight against the infamous Bedaux system in **Leicestershire**, it was the workers, mostly young girls, who forced the hands of the officials, who in the first place had recommended the system being given a trial. Only when the girls at one of the mills took the law into their own hands did the Union come in and take over the leadership of the strike so that they could eventually betray it. In **Birmingham**, the workers at the Lucas Lamps Works, about 10,000 of them, followed the lead of the Minority Movement and were methodically preparing for strike action by building up their own effective rank and file organisation to fight Bedaux, whilst the trade union officials were wringing their hands in desperation at the turn events were taking. Here a tremendous victory was won. When the employers realised that the workers meant business, that there was no chance of them submitting to the blandishments of either bosses or bureaucrats, they capitulated, and scrapped Bedaux at considerable cost to themselves. The militancy shown demonstrates the potentialities of the mass fight once a sufficiently strong united front organisation to lead the resistance is developed.

Despite the disorganising effect of the whole trade union leadership and machinery being concentrated on securing the acceptance of wage-cuts and worsened conditions, the workers have fought back magnificently all the time. In 1927 there were 308 trade disputes involving 108,000 workers and 1,170,000 lost working days; in 1928 the figures were 302 disputes, 124,000 workers and 1,390,000 lost days; in 1929 there were 431 disputes, 533,000 workers involved and 8,290,000 lost days; in 1930, 422 disputes, 307,000 workers and 4,400,000 lost days; in 1931, 419 disputes, 490,000 workers and 6,980,000 lost days.

These figures mean that practically every section of the workers has been involved in struggle against some manifestation of the boss offensive. Each section has been isolated from every other section, in every instance the whole efforts of the bureaucracy once they have been unable to avoid a strike were exerted to settle it on the best terms possible—for the employers. Nevertheless the workers have fought every inch of the way.

But now the employers' offensive is being reinforced, is being developed on an extended front covering practically every industry and using every weapon—direct wage-cuts, higher prices, rationalisation, speed-up methods etc. Last year the workers suffered direct wage-cuts of £400,000 per week; the employers aim at taking many times that sum this year, directly and indirectly.

The **Labour Party** is running a campaign to win a million new members; the T.U.C. in conjunction with the Labour Party, is campaigning for a great increase in membership. But this activity does not mean a better chance of a united resistance being put up, but a worse one. It is not merely that the Reformist political and trade union machine has not helped the workers to struggle, it is that it has been used deliberately for strike-breaking purposes. The whole force of the Transport and General Workers Union was used to keep the dockers at work when their conditions were attacked. The railway unions now are paving the way for betrayal in March. The unions catering

for the bus and tram men are urging the shouldering of the "sacrifice" demanded by the employers on the grounds that it is only a little one—and will only be temporary in its operation.

It is regrettable but true that in this situation the revolutionary movement in Great Britain has not been able to win the leadership of these workers, dissatisfied as they are, from the reformists. In many cases much support has been won, in some cases such as the Lightermen's strike, the gains since the dispute started have been phenomenal and it may be truly said, as the employers ruefully admit, that it was the influence of the Communists who made the magnificent second ballot possible, when everyone, employers and trade union bureaucrats, believed that the men would decide to go back to work, and when they, in actual fact, so decisively registered their determination to continue until victory was won.

The great weakness is still lack of contact inside the undertakings. When the lightermen first came out, the C.P. and the M.M. had no touch with them at all. Even among the dockers, the contacts were so weak that it was not possible to effectively marshal the resistance to Bevin and his fellow-bureaucrats, and consolidate it in the form of strike action alongside of the lightermen. At the Lucas factory, Birmingham, where for a long period an organisation had been built up inside, success rewarded the efforts of the militants.

The Communist Party and the Minority Movement are concentrating every effort now on building up effective organisations inside the most important undertakings, and of strengthening the positions inside the reformist trade unions, the more effectively to combat the bureaucracy's efforts at betrayal of the struggle. The unemployed movement also is concentrating on winning the support of, and building up a united front with, the employed workers, who more than at any previous time are being forced to realise their identity of interest with the workless by means of the ruthless operation of the Means Test, which places the burden of keeping unemployed relatives upon men and women, themselves in receipt of but a miserable pittance.

The fighting spirit of the British workers at the present time is beyond question, despite the disorganisation and sectionalism that exists. It is the job of the revolutionary movement to organise that fighting spirit for successful struggle, for which the workers are ready and eager, once they clearly see and understand the way.

THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST

The Role of the Nanking Government.

By Clemens Dutt (London).

The war operations in China and in Manchuria, which are not yet officially admitted to constitute a war, continue with unabated intensity. Japan has landed over 20,000 additional troops in Shanghai to add to the 5,000 already operating there and it has also concentrated at this point some 27 warships. It has six warships before Hankow and four more are expected, while other forces are stationed before the other big cities. All the imperialist Powers are concentrating warships, troops and munitions in Shanghai. Even Fascist Italy has despatched an extra couple of gunboats. The American Fleet is particularly in evidence. These forces are concentrating in Shanghai on the threadbare pretence of being necessary for the safety of the International Settlement, but their commanders have been given full powers to take such action as the situation may seem to them to require and the conclusion is inevitable that they represent the advance-guard of the flock of imperialist vultures which will descend upon the body of China as soon as the opportunity offers and partition has been decided on. In the meantime, the fight for Chapei continues. Wusung has been bombarded and re-bombarded. Chinese aeroplanes have been successfully engaged in countering the Japanese air forces. The Chinese troops and irregular forces have still prevented the capture of Chapei, which is being reduced to a pile of ruins. Thousands of casualties occur daily.

Yet there is no war, nor has there been any declaration of war on either side. Such, apparently, is the achievement of the League of Nations. A war is not a war unless it is officially recognised as such by the League of Nations, and the latter sees no necessity to do so in this case. Nor is it possible for

either side to issue an official declaration of war for that would automatically constitute evidence of being the aggressor party. Thus, if the League of Nations has not been able to abolish war, it can perhaps claim that it has been able to secure the abolition of the declaration of war!

Japanese imperialism bases its refusal to regard its operations as constituting a war on the grounds that there is at present no responsible government in China. The English, French and American press is being filled with statements to a similar effect. It will be remembered that a similar unanimity of opinion served as an excuse for invasion during the period of the war of intervention against Soviet Russia. In the present case, however, the Nanking Government was previously recognised by all the Powers and proved indeed an obedient tool in their hands. In fact, nothing has done more to expose the character of the Nanking Government and the Kuomintang and to arouse the violent indignation of the Chinese masses against it than its role in relation to foreign imperialism. If, at the present time, these Powers are disposed to regard the Nanking Government as non-existent it can only be because the latter has gone so far in compliance with their dictates that it is even ready to destroy its own existence and leave the field clear, if necessary, for the foreign forces to undertake a direct attack for themselves against Soviet China and the Chinese people.

The role of the Nanking Government in regard to Manchuria was the direct prelude to the present position. It refused to take any measures to oppose the plunder expedition of Japan. It played its servile part as a tool of foreign imperialism in the role allotted to it in the farce staged by the League of Nations. The mass demonstrations against the Kuomintang (and the Central Political Council of the Kuomintang holds, of course, the real power in the Nanking Government whether its members are ministers or not) forced a reconstruction of the Government. The statement issued by Mrs. Sun Yat-sen last December, in which she branded the Kuomintang as a counter-revolutionary and treacherous body of self-seeking militarists and politicians, had a considerable effect throughout the country. Chiang Kai-shek resigned and the "Left" Kuomintang leaders who had established their own dictatorship at Canton were drawn into the Cabinet in order to deceive the masses. But the reconstruction of the Government was only a façade. **The new government took over the heritage of the old including as their chief task the war against Soviet China and the massacre of the militant workers and peasants.**

They took over also the hopeless economic position resulting from the Kuomintang's counter-revolutionary militarist adventures. Sun Fo, the new President, on coming into office, declared:

"I have been left a legacy which is unprecedented. Not only is there not a single cent in the treasury of the Government, but my predecessors have mortgaged whatever available income there is for the next four or five years in advance."

For a long time past the expenditure of the Nanking Government has been more than three times its income. Every few months a new loan was floated, usually amounting to seventy or eighty million Dollars. During the last four years more than Dollars 1,100,000,000 of short term bonds and treasury notes have been issued. Nearly Dollars 200,000,000 are required for interest and Sinking Fund on these alone. **Sun Fo pointed out that the Kuomintang Government had mortgaged, among other things, the Russian Boxer Indemnity Fund to the Central Bank for the next three years to come although it had been agreed that it was to be used only for educational purposes.** The Kuomintang had boasted that it would develop national industry. Actually it has handed over Chinese industry wholesale into the hands of foreign imperialism. The match monopoly was given to Kreuger. The coal industry was given to foreign companies. Chinese aviation is in foreign capitalist hands. Still the new Minister of Industry, Chen Kung-po hastened to declare that in order to develop Chinese industry foreign capital must be welcomed.

Thus, when Sun Fo took office, the Government was forced to declare that bankruptcy was staring the nation in the face. Under such conditions, what was their solution for the crisis? Did they propose the cessation of the ruinous attacks against the workers and peasants? On the contrary, they proposed to continue the shedding of blood and the squandering of treasure in order to carry on war against the Chinese masses and to maintain in power the feudal warlords' and bureaucracy while at the same time declaring that any resistance to foreign

imperialism was an impossibility. As Sun Fo declared in the statement referred to above, "the time is as yet far away when we can effectively withstand foreign invasion" and he found as the only way out that **"the people, I am afraid, must make great sacrifices at this moment of national crisis"**.

This line of policy, "sacrifice" for the masses, non-resistance to foreign imperialism and war against the militant Chinese workers and peasants has been faithfully carried out by the Kuomintang Government. Thus, when the bombardment of Chapei and the warfare of the Japanese troops began, the government absolutely refused to take any part in the organisation of resistance. Sun Fo and Eugene Chen resigned from the Cabinet, while the majority of the Government retired from Nanking to Loyang. The two former leaders are said to have remained in Shanghai but they have probably taken safe refuge in the International Settlement. The Government in Loyang has not only refused to support in any way the Chinese forces that are defending Chapei but it has threatened to take strong measures against any military commanders who refuse to obey its injunctions. Instead it is noteworthy and characteristic that it has been occupied with the working out of a new plan for an offensive against the Chinese Soviets. The Government in Loyang bases its refusal to defend Shanghai on the plea of possible danger to the International Settlement!

It is clear that the Chinese resistance to aggression in Shanghai comes neither from the leadership at Loyang nor from the retired "Left" Ministers in Shanghai, but has been organised independently by army units and the mass of the population itself. The kernel of the military defence is the **19th Canton Army** which has issued a proclamation denouncing the Kuomintang Government, calling upon the Chinese population to take part in the struggle against the Japanese and **ending with an appeal to the workers and peasants to organise Soviets.**

The Chinese bourgeoisie has revealed itself as the accomplice of imperialism in the massacre of the Chinese people. The defence of Shanghai can only be undertaken by the workers themselves in conjunction with the rank and file of the Army and the support of the Chinese Soviets. The Commune has not yet been established in Shanghai, but the Kuomintang leaders of the Chinese bourgeoisie will be only too glad of an opportunity to surrender the Chinese toiling masses to the massacre of the foreign invaders. **Unless the revolutionary workers throughout the world take energetic steps in support of their Chinese brothers, the new Japanese forces will compel the withdrawal of the Canton Army from Chapei and the working population will be delivered up to the most terrible butchery.**

The Chinese Toilers are Organising the Defence.

By Chadi.

Shanghai, February 16th, 1932.

The attitude of the various social strata of China to the Japanese robber-war in the Yangtse valley is in accordance with the experiences in the national emancipation struggles in the era of imperialism: if the nation is in danger, it is the toiling strata who fight for national freedom and independence. The attitude of **Chiang-Kai-shek**, the hangman of the Chinese people, in face of the Japanese robber-campaign is the attitude of a national traitor. The Shanghai bankers and merchants send one deputation after the other to the diplomatic representatives of America, England and France in order to be able to secure the withdrawal of the Chinese forces, the 19th Chinese army, under reasonable conditions. But the 19th army has not by a long way remained the same as what it was when the Japanese began their attack on Shanghai. It is reported from all sides that the Chinese workers, coolies, artisans and small traders are voluntarily flocking into the army. A new army, known as the 21st army, has been formed from those working people from Manchuria and North China who have been driven from their native homes by the monstrous persecutions and terrible atrocities of Japanese imperialism, as well as from soldiers whose regiments were defeated by the Japanese military in North China and Manchuria.

A whole number of social organisations, auxiliary organisations for the troops are rendering effective aid to the soldiers who are defending the Chinese people from the horrible deeds

of the Japanese. The most important of these organisations is the "People's Anti-Japanese Union", to which belong all working sections of the Chinese population. In this Union the Communists play a leading role and the worker elements have the hegemony in their hands. This "People's Anti-Japanese Union" is working in close collaboration with the strike committees and with the Communist Party of China.

It is not by chance that the Japanese war Ministry, in its latest declaration, in which it emphasises the "redoubled activity of the Communists in the Yangtse valley", threatens to launch a campaign against the Chinese Red Army which, it is alleged, at the commencement of its march on **Hankow**, has already occupied **Nanchang**, the capital of the province of **Kiangsi**. This declaration means an obvious attempt to strengthen the united front of the imperialists against the Chinese people and especially against the Chinese Soviets.

The Communist Party of China has summoned the workers of Shanghai to a general strike against the Japanese occupation of Shanghai. The slogans of the Party, of which the following are the most important: **"People, arm yourselves! Working masses, defend Shanghai and the revolutionary movement against Japanese imperialism and against the Kuomintang! Revolutionary soldiers, unite with the people!"**, are being promulgated with great courage. Delegates from nearly all the striking and locked-out factories are taking part in the strike committee for the whole of Shanghai. District strike committees have also been formed, pickets are being organised according to districts, and the agitation work among the masses is being strengthened in order to organise armed forces. The foreign imperialist representatives, together with the Japanese, are organising attacks on the striking workers, coolies etc. Among the forces which are called upon to maintain "internal order" is a "Russian regiment" which is being organised by white guardists and which has presented the municipal council of the International Settlement with a Russian Tsarist flag.

A leaflet on the solidarity actions of the European and American proletariat has been distributed among the Chinese soldiers and striking workers. The foreign police have arrested a number of persons for distributing this leaflet. Resistance is still being organised. This fight will undoubtedly be strengthened by the fact that the Chinese working masses, in spite of the conspiracy of silence of the Shanghai imperialist press, already know that in Europe and America the number of those workers is increasing more and more who wish to prove by actions that **the cause of the Chinese working masses is our cause, their enemy is our enemy, and their resistance to the Japanese and international imperialists is our resistance to the offensive of capital!**

American Campaign Against the Chinese Revolution and the U.S.S.R.

By A. Bosse (New York).

The United States has mobilised its entire fleet, scores of warships and troop transports in the Pacific, has sent its whole Asiatic squadron to Chinese waters. The greatest military mobilisation it has ever undertaken in "peace-time" is now under way in a threefold manoeuvre: to attack the Soviet Union, to smash the Chinese Soviets, and to wrest mastery over China from Japan. At the same time that it supports the Japanese seizure of part of the Chinese Eastern Railway and of Harbin and its attack upon Inner Mongolia, that it fills the Yangtse River with its warships to attempt to stop the advancing Chinese Red Army, it shows Japan its naval force ready for war.

"At the beginning of February, 65 warships plus 25 transports, 300 airplanes, etc. sailed from its San Pedro base with food supplies on board sufficient to last a **whole year**. They were fully loaded with fuel, despite the fact that further huge supplies are stored at Peal Harbor, Hawaii, 7 days journey from Shanghai. 45 more ships of the Atlantic fleet are preparing to participate in March. At the same time the Asiatic fleet, stationed at **Manila**, was ordered by Hoover to Chinese waters (primarily Shanghai and the Yangtse ports). The Yangtse patrol is a regular branch maintained by the U.S. Navy, its commander, Admiral Williams, being the cutthroat who in 1927 slaughtered thousands of Chinese workers at Socony (Standard Oil) Hill in Nanking. His fleet of 7 gunboats

was reinforced then by the Asiatic fleet of 23 cruisers, submarines, destroyers, gunboats, etc., which were ordered from the Philippines by the State Department to protect American lives and property at Shanghai "and other exposed points on the Yangtse and elsewhere in China." (N. Y. Post Feb. 1.) It is interesting to watch how the U.S. and the other imperialist powers keep step with Japan's progress: when the attack was centered on Shanghai they mobilised there. As soon as Japan started up the Yangtse, they followed to make sure she did not grab any of the loot they were after.

The American Consul at Shanghai, Cunningham admitted frankly that the warships were intended to crush the activities of the students and workers, who had called a general strike: "With the arrival of additional vessels we shall be able to clean out the snipers and control the refugees, Communist students and labour unionists within the settlement." (Daily Worker, Feb. 2.) Admiral Pratt, Chief of Naval Operations, as frankly indicated 4 days earlier how the entire fleet would be used: "Our forces will go in and take whatever steps are necessary to protect our people... (against) **Mob Rule**". (N. Y. Times.)

The N. Y. World-Telegram (Feb. 1) states just what the imperialists are after: if and when they smash the Chinese Red Army, Britain will take the Yangtse Valley, France Yunnan, Kwangsi and Hainan and Japan Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, Shantung, and Fukien. Uncle Sam will take the "open door" (which Japan is now trying to close in his face), since American trade with China has prospered most from this policy. We would say, however, that the U.S. will take its share (in the Shanghai-Yangtse area) as definitely as if it annexed it.

This division corresponds generally to economic interests. The U.S., Britain, and France together have investments of only \$43 million in Manchuria, as against over \$1½ billion for Japan. France wants territory near what she now has. The U.S. does the lion's share of the business with Shanghai (\$120 million in 1930 or more than Britain and Japan together) and its business through Shanghai is much greater (\$200 million). American investments there total only \$130 million, though a sum equally great is included in missionary property, utilities, Chinese securities, etc. Of 2,000 firms in Shanghai 900 are Japanese, 350 British, 240 American, 125 French and the rest of other countries and Chinese.

With Japan threatening to grab control of this rich market, a Washington dispatch from the N. Y. Times states that "the U.S. and Great Britain are answering the Japanese challenge to their rights in the International Settlement" by sending troops and warships "in the determination to give the fullest protection possible to these rights and to their nationals." (Feb. 1.)

The reason for the haste of the imperialists just now is that with the bankruptcy of the Kuomintang as a force to check the spread of the Chinese Soviets, Japan stepped in to clean them out and take control **directly**, and the other powers followed suit. An equally important purpose is to break the boycott that followed on the seizure of Manchuria, and is throttling Japanese trade. Chinese soldiers as well as workers and students even in Shanghai were becoming too revolutionary for imperialist comfort. The World-Telegram admits that Chinese troops in Chapei "attempted to desert and join the ranks of the labour unions and the volunteer 'dare to die' corps." (Jan. 28.)

The United States is perfectly willing to take Japan's gold, and to sell her war supplies to give her rope to hang herself with in a war with the U.S.S.R. and China. From Dec. 13 to the end of January Japan shipped to the U.S.A. \$44½ million of gold, and since August \$194 million (\$144 million of this in Nov. and Dec.—when the war in Manchuria was on). These heavy purchases by Japan had reduced her stock of gold from \$425 million on Dec. 13, when she abandoned the gold standard, to \$266 million on Jan. 30. China shipped to the U.S. during the latter half of last year \$8 million in gold, as compared with \$13,000 in the same period of 1930. Japanese bonds in New York reflected this drain, as well as the economic crisis and the prospect of war danger, and at the end of January dropped again, some even to 36 cents on the dollar. In these six months she bought in U.S. 1,069,000 bales of cotton, as compared with 490,000 in the same period of 1930; despite the crisis in the textile industry she now has over a year's supply of cotton on hand. During the present season Japan took 950,000 bales, with 600,000 more to be shipped—admittedly for making munitions.

The American press began to talk openly of war business restoring prosperity; Brisbane in the N. Y. American wrote that war "might actually do what all our wise men have been unable to do, start a boom". Congress used the likelihood of war to stop the slight reduction in army appropriations that the economy drive had forced upon it, and the advocates of a big navy began a renewed campaign for large-scale naval construction.

In its campaign against the Soviet Union the American press played up prominently charges that Soviet employees of the Chinese Eastern Railway were damaging it to hold back Gen. Tamon's drive on Harbin. Elsewhere in their stories they admitted that it was the Chinese railway guards under Ting Chao who had done it, but in the headlines and introductions they stressed only of war threats against the U.S.S.R. When the Japanese seized the Harbin-Changchun branch the press gloated over the prospect of Soviet interference, not knowing that the U.S.S.R. could reject their provocation as determinedly as it had done throughout the entire Manchurian adventure, the Vanek episode, etc. The U.S. and Japan are doing their utmost to unleash the White Guard generals, Semenov, Kusmin, Petukkov, Sichev. The Mongol princes, and others for an attack upon the Soviet Union or its representatives in Manchuria.

In the main the U.S. has been working with Japan against China and the U.S.S.R. though imperialist antagonisms are always present and may erupt into war at any moment. An analysis of American-Japanese-League relations during recent months evidences this. When Consul Cunningham reported to Washington protesting against the Japanese use of the International Settlement at Shanghai as a base for the attack upon the Chinese, the State Department told him to mind his own business; they advised him to refer the protest to the consular body and went on to "urge the utmost forbearance, and that every effort be made to remove any friction between America and other defence forces, including the Japanese" (Times Jan. 29).

The U.S.A. government is trying to hide from the public the nearness of a new world war, at the same time that it prepares feverishly for it. It is carefully putting into the record protests against all of Japan's "unfriendly" acts, for use when the proper time comes. Relations between the two countries have been strained on a number of occasions since the Manchurian-Shanghai invasion began, and while the efforts of the U.S.A. are to get Japan to attack the U.S.S.R. and Chinese Soviets, it is ready for a break. When the Pacific fleet was sent to Honolulu Admiral Pratt answered a question as to whether it would go further west by saying, "not under any existing conditions", implying that changed conditions were likely to occur at any moment.

In one of his protests to Japan Stimson plainly gave Japan to understand that Shanghai was not Manchuria, and to show he meant business he published the secret correspondence between them. Morgan's N. Y. Post spoke of the occupation of Shanghai as a "new and extremely grave departure in foreign policy toward China". It even went so far, in discussing a Japanese-American war, as to say that "the reasons for cooperating with Russia as a means of setting bounds to Japan's ambitions will become almost inescapable". (Jan. 30.) It published a story, obviously inspired from Washington, of the possibility of recognition of the U.S.S.R., though the absurdity of the latter joining in an imperialist war against Japan is obvious.

The **social fascists** in the U.S. are already displaying their chauvinism in this crisis. The weekly organ of the S.P., the New Leader, does not have a word of news or editorial comment on the invasion of China in its issue of Jan. 30, but its spokesman, Norman Thomas, argues against "pulling Europe's chestnuts out of the Eastern fire". Another prominent socialist, Heyward Brown, writing in the World Telegram, urges that America's duty is "to sit tight" and do nothing, arguing that Japan "has been kidnaped by its military machine". (Jan. 30.)

The liberal Scripps-Howard press, controlling a score of papers and the United Press, speaks of outlawing Japan for her madness, but reassures its readers with the illusion that the "unity of the neutral nations has been re-established". (Feb. 1.)

American missionaries from the Soviet districts of China admit that the workers and peasants are "giving a hearty welcome to the returning Communists... they enjoyed greater liberty and a greater degree of prosperity under the Reds than

under Nanking." (Times, Jan. 31.) The day before, the Post recorded the fact that "the national quarter of Shanghai, before the Japanese occupation, was a hotbed of Communism". The general strike called in Shanghai by the C.P.Ch.—even under Japanese domination—is further evidence of this.

Under these conditions of unexampled revolutionary fervor and heroism, the proletariat of the world must rally militantly to the support of the Chinese revolution, must rally as it did to defend Soviet Russia in the intervention of 1918-21. It has been too quiescent until now, satisfying itself too much with slogans and resolutions. The C.P.U.S.A. is urging the formation of **united front committees** against intervention, and of anti-war committees; the adoption of resolutions of protest in the shops, workers organisations, etc. demanding the withdrawal of American warships from China, hands off the Chinese masses, defence of the Soviet Union. In the U.S. the nation-wide demonstrations against hunger and unemployment, scheduled for Feb. 4, are being turned into demonstrations of protest and mobilisation against the war of annihilation of the Chinese Revolution, against the threatened intervention in the Soviet Union. They must act on the slogan of turning the coming imperialist slaughter into a civil war.

*

Anti-War Demonstration in New York.

New York, 15, February 1932.

A mass meeting of 4,000 workers took place here yesterday against the attack launched by Japanese imperialism on the Chinese people and against the threat to the Soviet Union. A unanimously adopted resolution called for the election of anti-war committees. The meeting was organised by the Friends of the Soviet Union.

THE WORLD "DISARMAMENT" CONFERENCE

After Fourteen Days of the Geneva "Disarmament" Conference.

By Gabriel Péri.

Geneva, February 14, 1932.

The debates which began on February 9th at the Disarmament Conference are to be continued for a further ten days. Then a much fiercer discussion will arise in the General Commission. This organ is, in a certain sense, the political commission of the Disarmament Conference. Its importance is so great that the French delegation made every effort to get Benes or Politis elected as chairman of this Commission. France's intention has been only half realised. Henderson will act as Chairman of the General Commission, just as he now been appointed his deputy.

Let us endeavour to give a survey of the fourteen days' debate. In view of the danger of finding herself isolated, France could not content herself in Geneva with repeating her demand for security. The whole case of Tardieu, the French Minister, consisted in declaring that the League of Nations is not powerful enough, that in the course of years the League of Nations' Pact has lost its power and that it is necessary to give it new force.

Tardieu was not mistaken when he declared at Geneva that his plan would be approved by the whole "public opinion of France". It is a fact that the proposals made by Tardieu at Geneva on February 5th received the general support of all bourgeois fractions, including the socialist party. It is also true to say that these proposals are completely in accord with the general political line, especially the anti-Bolshevist line, pursued by French imperialism during the past 13 years.

What sort of reception did the representatives of the vanquished powers give to this project, which means the perpetuation of the Versailles system? The debate which arose proved beyond doubt the sharpness of the antagonisms which split the capitalist world; but it likewise showed that France is continuing to derive great advantage from her temporary increase of power. In face of Tardieu's attack, the rival Powers beat a retreat. Those who criticised the French project did so only in a concealed manner. Brüning's speech was a model example in this respect, a model example of evasion and

capitulation. He made only a passing allusion to the scheme. Only one and a half line of his whole proclamation was devoted to the draft convention, of which he only deplored its weaknesses. His kowtowing was quite in accordance with the desires of the French government.

One could say the same thing with regard to the speech of Count Apponyi, the Hungarian delegate. The 80-year old Count has less to say now about a revision of the Peace Treaties. So great was his anxiety not to rouse the dissatisfaction of the French money-lenders, that he declared himself ready to accept the text of the Draft of the Preparatory Committee as a basis for discussion.

In this concert, however, a voice was raised which was somewhat more clearly opposed to the French Draft. The Italian delegate Grandi spoke against the French demands by stressing that the conclusion of numerous security and arbitration treaties has not in the least resulted in a slowing down of the armament race, but on the contrary is accelerating it; he also protested against the system of military predominance and demanded that the armed forces be brought down to the level of the weakest countries.

The attitude which the Anglo-Saxon States adopted between these two groups of Powers is to be attributed in the first place to the profoundly shaken position of the British Empire, and in the second place to the Anglo-American rivalry.

Sir John Simon and Mr. Gibson have—not without some reservations—declared in favour of the Draft Convention. Nevertheless, they both oppose the French thesis on security; what they said regarding the French draft, hardly conceals their aversion to it. Against France they declare for the abolition of submarines. In addition to this the British delegate advocated the fixing of a maximum of armaments, and the American representative advocated the reduction of the figures contained in the London Naval Agreement, a reduction which would enable the United States to realise at less cost naval equality with Great Britain.

These are the various positions adopted by the representatives of the big imperialist Powers. Litvinov was quite right when he declared that the security of which they are all thinking, consists mainly in military supremacy in the event of war. To this endeavour the delegate of Soviet Russia opposed the slogan which accords with the deepest desires of the mass of the people: security against imperialist war!

Revolutionary Seamen's International Appeals against War.

Berlin, 13th February 1932.

The International Union of Seamen and Dockers has issued an appeal to the water transport workers of the world in connection with the imperialist war in the Far East. The appeal points out that imperialist Japan has occupied Manchuria with the support of imperialist France and has bombarded Shanghai, Nanking and Harbin from the land and from the air. The occupation of Harbin was a blow against the Soviet Union. The League of Nations supported Japan's drive and the League was supported by the Second International and the social democrats in all countries.

The appeal points out that the shipowners have declared openly that a new war would be desirable in view of the increased demand for shipping and the rise of prices. That thousands of seamen would meet their deaths was unimportant, the vessels were insured.

The war in the Far East was an alarm signal for the water transport workers. A new imperialist war was threatened. The appeal then calls on the water transport workers all over the world to fight against imperialist war and declares that the best way to do so is to increase their fight against their own imperialist employers.

The new war threatened not only to divide up China and crush the Soviet districts, but also to attack the **Soviet Union**. Arms and ammunition for the fighting area were being loaded feverishly in the harbours of the imperialist countries. The appeal then calls for the election of control commissions in all harbours, for the organisation of protest demonstrations and for the prevention of troop and munition transports. The dockers are called upon to refuse to load arms and ammunition. Down with imperialist war! Down with Japanese imperialism! Hands off the Soviet Union.

The XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U.**On the Second Five-Year Plan.**

By V. Molotov.

Full Text of the Report Delivered at the XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U.

(Continued.)

Now with regard to the question of the State. The question of the State is not specially discussed in our theses. This is natural. While raising the problem of the liquidation of classes in our second Five-Year Plan, we cannot, and must not, by any means raise the question of the superfluousness, or of the withering away of the State. On the contrary, in the present stage it will still be necessary to strengthen the proletarian State and increase its power.

This arises from the tasks which still confront us of liquidating the capitalist elements, thwarting counter-revolutionary machinations of the bourgeois elements against the power of the working class, and from the tremendous organisational and educational tasks in respect of the mass of working peasants who are undergoing a transformation onto a new basis, and of the whole mass of toilers in town and country.

It is hardly necessary to say that in view of the existence of the external capitalist environment, any weakening of the proletarian State would be opportunism of the worst sort. In view of the increasing accentuation of the antagonisms between the country that is building up socialism and the capitalist world, only one conclusion can be drawn, namely, the necessity for an all round strengthening of the proletarian State, to increase its strength not only in regard to the inner class enemy, but also in regard to the hostile class forces of imperialism.

The best treatment of this question, as of all other main tasks in the building up of socialism in our country, is such a fundamental document as Lenin's "State and Revolution". Together with the appropriate literary documents by Marx and Engels, we have here a key to the understanding of the fundamental questions of socialist construction, especially in regard to the second Five-Year Plan.

Lenin thoroughly discusses the first lower stage of the communist society (Socialism), on which we have already entered, but which will not by a long way be ended in the second Five year period. The characteristic peculiarity of this phase, the phase of socialism, is that remnants of the bourgeois society still remain in the shape of so-called „bourgeois rights“.

Lenin says the following in "The State and Revolution".

"Equal right, (says Marx) we indeed have here; but it is still a 'bourgeois right', which, like every right, presupposes inequality. Every 'right' is an application of the same measure to different people who, as a matter of fact, are not similar and are not equal one to another; and therefore, 'equal right' is really a violation of equality, and an injustice. In effect, every man having done as much social labour as every other, receives an equal share of the social products (with the above-mentioned deductions). Notwithstanding this, different people are not equal to one another. One is strong, another is weak; one is married, the other is not. One has more children, another has less, and so on.

"With equal labour, (Marx concludes) and therefore with an equal share in the public stock of articles of consumption, one will, in reality, receive more than another, will find himself richer, and so on. To avoid all this, 'rights,' instead of being equal, should be unequal."

"The first phase of Communism, therefore, still cannot produce justice and equality; differences, and unjust differences, in wealth will still exist, but the exploitation of man by man will have become impossible, because it will be impossible to seize as private property the means of production, the factories, machines, land,

and so on. While tearing to tatters Lassalle's small bourgeois, confused phrase about "equality" and "justice" in general, Marx at the same time shows the line of development of communist society, which is forced at first to destroy only the "injustice" that the means of production are in the hands of private individuals. It is not capable of destroying at once the further injustice which is constituted by the distribution of the articles of consumption according to "work performed" (and not according to need)."

And Lenin further points out that even after the abolition of the capitalist elements and classes generally, the State can wither away only gradually in the course of a long period.

"The State withers away in so far as there are no longer any capitalists or any classes, and therefore there can no longer be any oppression of class (emphasised in the original).

The State, however, has not yet quite disappeared, for there still remains the protection of bourgeois law which actually sanctions inequality. For the complete withering away of the State, complete Communism is necessary."

In discussing the role of the State after the proletarian revolution, Lenin refers to the declaration of Engels' that the Commune was not a State in the actual sense of the word. Lenin also says that the proletarian State is a semi-State, i. e. that it differs fundamentally from the bourgeois State with its rule of the minority (the exploiters) over the great majority (the exploited). The proletarian State, on its part, is the organisation of the rule of the working class and the development of proletarian democracy, i. e., of the increasingly active participation of the working masses of the town and the village in the whole work of socialist construction.

In the words of Marx and Lenin which I have quoted there is emphasised the existence of an inequality in society even after the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie.

The first task of the socialist revolution is the abolition of the possibility of exploitation of man by man, i. e., the abolition of private property in the means of production; but there exists an inequality in society long after, as equal standards are applied to different people who are unequal to one another and are not living under quite the same conditions. This inequality will not be abolished at once by a long way. And it cannot be abolished so long as there exists the necessity of applying so-called "bourgeois right", which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption "according to work performed" and not according to needs. The State is still under the "the protection of bourgeois law", which justifies actual inequality.

The fundamental distinction between the workers' State and the bourgeois State, however, is that "right", under the dictatorship of the proletariat, protects the interests of the toiling majority and aims at the suppression of the elements hostile to the proletariat. Therefore, the working class and the whole of the toiling masses are, in the present stage, confronted with the task of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, strengthening the power of the proletarian State. Only on this condition is the complete liquidation of the capitalist elements and of classes in general and therewith the establishment of the classless socialist society, possible, in the process of which the State will gradually wither away.

I come now to the question of the mutual relations between the town and the village, as envisaged in the perspectives of the second Five-Year Plan.

First of all I will quote what Engels says on this subject in his "Housing Question". He states:

"On the other hand, it is perfectly utopian when people like Proudhon wish to overturn the present society and retain the peasant as such. Only a distribution of the population as evenly as possible over the whole country, only a close connection of industrial with agricultural production, together with the extension of the means of communications which would be thereby rendered necessary—assuming at the same time the abolition of the capitalist system of production—is capable of wresting the rural population from its isolation and brutalisation in which it has vegetated practically without change for thousands of years."

The appropriate conclusion from the foregoing is also drawn in our theses. It is pointed out in the theses that the fulfilment of the tasks of the second Five-Year Plan means the creation of the prerequisites "for the complete abolition of the contradiction between town and village."

It is important, however, to say a few words here regarding the question of the ways of abolishing this contradiction. This will depend, on the one hand, upon the town, upon industry and the like. On the other hand, it will depend upon the village, which is being transformed upon the new collective farming basis (in the present stage in the form of the *artel*).

It is particularly necessary to consider on what lines the socialist transformation of agriculture is taking place. As you know, this transformation is taking place on the basis of collectivisation. You are also aware that the collective farms represent a variety of the co-operatives, in fact the highest forms of the co-operatives, their **socialist** type of production.

The distinction between the collective farms and the State socialist undertakings is of tremendous political and practical importance. The co-operative basis of the collective farm in its *artel* form, the voluntariness of participation in it, and in addition the setting up of the highest technical basis of collective farming with State support and under State leadership, facilitate to the highest degree the going over of the peasant masses (via a number of stages of development of the collective farms themselves) to Socialism. This follows from Lenin's world-known co-operative plan.

The VI. Soviet Congress in the year 1931 emphasised the difference between collective farms and Soviet farms. It specially declared that the Soviet farms are State undertakings, of which the State alone is the owner. It declared at the same time that the owners of the collective farms are the collective peasants. The difference is obvious. This difference was emphasised by the Party in order to obviate any false mixing of Soviet farms with collective farms and vice versa, which, as is known, has happened in a number of cases. This decision made sufficiently plain the co-operative character of the collective farms and the peculiarity of the path of the peasantry to Socialism.

The peculiarity of the paths to Socialism trodden by the working class and the peasantry is obvious. Owing to the special conditions of its class position, the working class marches at the head of the peasantry through the highest forms of socialist economy at the present stage. The peculiarity of the position of the peasantry in the past leads to the special character of its path to a classless socialist society—for instance in the number of additional stages of transition and longer periods of transition through which it passes. Both the workers and the collective peasants are builders of Socialism. Both the workers and the peasants in their mass will be converted during the second Five-Year Plan into more active and conscious builders of the classless socialist society. The peculiarity of the paths of their socialist development not only does not render difficult the final victory of Socialism—in which finally all differences between workers and peasants will completely disappear—but it alone can secure this final victory.

The building up of Socialism, however, means the continuation in the near future, and sometimes even a considerable sharpening, of the class struggle on certain fronts in various forms. This applies to the town, where the capitalist elements have fundamentally already been liquidated; it applies with even greater force to the village, where the liquidation of the capitalist elements has not been completed.

Everything that I have said in regard to the political character of the second Five-Year Plan is inseparably connected with the task of **improving the material conditions** of the masses of workers and peasants.

The liquidation of parasitic class elements and the growth of our national economy, the accumulation of which is more

and more placed at the disposal of the toilers, should ensure that the second Five-Year Plan will see a far speedier rise in both the material and the cultural standards of the mass of the people. The directives of the second Five-Year Plan call attention to these tasks.

It is the task of the second Five-Year Plan to increase at least two to three times the supply of the most important manufactured and food products to the population. Such a grandiose task, realised in the course of a period of five years, would not only exceed the powers of any bourgeois State, it would also have exceeded our powers in the first five-year period. It is only now, on the basis of the successful realisation of the first Five-Year Plan, and thanks to the circumstance that in the year 1932 we are approaching the successful completion of the first Five-Year Plan, that we can and must put the question of a further and, moreover, decisive improvement of the standard of living of the working population in the second Five-Year Plan.

Comrade Stalin's statement that the working masses want to live better and must live better—that they must be able to satisfy all their growing demands, is a statement which fully corresponds to the needs of the moment. The Party must guarantee the successful solution of the task of increasing at least two to threefold the standard of living of the workers and of the toiling population in the village in the next five-year period.

It is particularly important to improve the housing conditions and the communal services. The directives do not contain exact instructions regarding this. But it follows from the whole political character of the theses. The improvement of the housing and communal services, which has already begun, must become the starting point for an essential improvement of the housing and living conditions, particularly of the working class.

Not only that. The question of decidedly improving the material and living conditions of the working population of the towns is now being placed by the Party on the order of the day. It is a task of the possibility of achieving not inconsiderable successes in this respect. These tasks must be realised on a larger scale in the second five years.

Our resources in this respect are not exhausted by a long way; they are growing from day to day. The decision on the organising of a People's Commissariat for light industry and the contemplated reorganising of the food Commissariat into a Commissariat of the food industry corresponds to the tasks of the increased mobilisation of the inner resources in order to satisfy the growing material and cultural requirements of the masses.

The question of increasing the goods circulation, of developing Soviet trade and above all increasing retail trade, is of special and immediate importance at the present moment, and not only for this year. Without the development of shops and stores—after private speculation-trade has declined and is continually declining—it is impossible to satisfy the growing requirements of the working and peasant masses. At the beginning of the N.E.P., Lenin said that the most important slogan of the Party is the slogan "learn to trade". The realisation of this slogan was of tremendous importance at the time for improving the national economy, for consolidating the proletarian leadership of the village and for improving the supplies to the population. But also now, under new conditions and with a new content, this slogan is of immediate importance.

At the commencement of the N.E.P., the basis for the development of trade was not only our socialist industry but also the individual peasant, and partly the kulak, sector of the village. The development of trade under those circumstances led at the same time to a certain regeneration of the capitalist elements. For the Communists it emphasised the necessity of carrying out the slogan "learn to trade" in order to beat the capitalist elements also in this field. This task was, as a whole, carried out.

Since then the situation has thoroughly changed. Under the present conditions, the basis of the development of trade is before all the rapidly growing socialist industry and the socialist forms, the collective farms and Soviet farms, which already predominate in the rural districts.

This means that the basis for developing Soviet goods circulation has been considerably strengthened, that consequently better conditions exist for a further consolidation of the proletarian leadership of the village, and that we have increased possibilities of improving the supplies of

industrial products and foodstuffs to the masses. It must be particularly emphasised that solely on the basis of the development of foreign trade, and before all the development of retail trade, is it possible to abolish the rationing of food and articles of consumption, which we had to introduce for the time being, in spite of the disadvantages of this measure (abuse, bureaucratism etc.). We shall more rapidly create the preconditions for abolishing rationing the more actively we work already now at improving and developing Soviet trade and before all the network of retail trade.

Whilst in the second Five-Year-Plan we make it our task rapidly to improve the well-being of the working and peasant masses, we must at the same time reject such conceptions as "Socialism is production for consumption". The one-sidedness and incorrectness of such a phrase is obvious. Essentially, this mistake is similar to the principle enunciated by Lassalle and criticised by Marx, namely: "the right of the worker to the full product of his labour". In actual fact this principle is unrealisable and obviously false, as the workers never denied nor will deny the necessity of setting aside a part of the product of their labour for the general needs of the State, for the creation of reserves etc. This narrow consumers' attitude to Socialism does not correspond to the interests of the workers' State and the theory of Leninism. The greatest satisfaction of the needs of the masses is inseparably connected with the abolition of the parasitic class elements. Attempts to separate questions of consumption from the raising of production and the carrying out of the policy of industrialisation—that is to say, from increasing, in the first place, heavy industry and developing the production of the means of production—leads to mistaken conclusions. We have laid down in the theses the necessary linking up of the fundamental political tasks with the tasks of rapidly improving the well-being of the working and peasant masses.

In the passage I have already quoted from the resolution characterising the fundamental political tasks of the second Five-Year Plan, it is also said that we are confronted with the task of **overcoming the remnants of capitalism in economy and in the minds of the people**. In connection therewith we shall encounter questions such as: How will it be with the remnants of capitalism in the minds of the people on 1st January 1938? (Laughter.)

It is clear that in this respect schematism and a scholastic approach to the matter can only do harm. It suffices meanwhile to deal with the fundamental question in this sphere—the question of the distinction between manual and mental labour, in order to understand the real character of the theses.

As you know, our theses do not say anything about the abolition, during the second Five-Year Plan, of the distinction between manual and mental labour. This is done quite deliberately, in spite of the fact that the press is already making attempts to raise this question in connection with the second Five-Year Plan. The Central Committee is of the opinion that to put this question in the theses would be both premature and inexpedient, as the abolition of the distinction between manual and mental labour is a very lengthy process and not one that will be achieved in one or two Five-Year periods.

The October Revolution has already done a good deal to begin the undermining of this distinction. Liquidation of illiteracy is one of the fundamental measures in this direction. The fact that not only lower but also higher education is accessible to every worker and every toiler of the village, and the exceedingly rapid growth of the technical and scientific cadres in our country show that we are creating the material and cultural conditions for the struggle to abolish the distinction between mental and manual labour. But we consider it premature and not in accordance with the objective prerequisites to include already in the second Five-Year Plan the task of abolishing the distinction between mental and manual labour.

On the other hand, the realisation of such tasks as the complete liquidation of the capitalist elements and classes in general, as well as the rapid improvement of the well-being of the workers, cannot but be connected with the task of overcoming the remnants of capitalism not only in economy but also in the consciousness of the people. Of course, these remnants will not by a long way be liquidated in the course of the second Five-Year Plan. Nevertheless, in the second Five-Year Plan, the fight to overcome the relics of capitalism,

not only in the economy but also in the minds of the people, must be developed on the whole front in accordance with the fundamental political tasks of the Party.

Finally, with regard to our **Party and the fight against opportunism**.

Our Party, our working class, are leading the toilers of the Soviet Union from victory to victory. Our Party is increasing numerically every year, and is also increasing its connections not only with the working class but also with the working masses in the village: our Party is growing in regard to the experiences acquired by it in socialist construction and the whole of the revolutionary proletarian struggle; our Party is growing ideologically and being steeled in the fight against every anti-Leninist distortion and deviation, in the fight for the Leninist general line. All these are the most important preconditions for the successful leadership of socialist construction.

In the period of the second Five-Year Plan, in the period of the final liquidation of the capitalist elements and of classes generally, our Party will be confronted with the most complicated tasks: the fight for the carrying out of the Leninist line, for the exposure and necessary combating of opportunist vacillations of every kind.

The abolition of the capitalist elements is connected with the intensification of the class struggle in a number of spheres. The influence of the bourgeoisie is showing itself and will show itself not only on the collective farms but also in the works and factories. The class enemy has his agents, and will have them for a long time, on various sectors of socialist construction and in the Party itself. The fact that with us there is no unemployment while it means that the workers are assured of work, it also means that hostile class elements are penetrating into our factories and our institutions; that they will make ever fresh attempts to frustrate Bolshevik work with their counter-revolutionary attacks, by sabotage, by cultural disintegration work of individual groups of collective peasants and the like.

The strengthening and the growth of the State apparatus, both in connection with the growth of industry and especially in connection with the socialist forms in the village, results in our organs being rapidly filled not only with working elements devoted to the cause of Socialism, but also that there is a certain new influx of bourgeois elements, including openly hostile elements into these organs.

Ever fresh millions of toilers are joining in the work of socialist construction, who inevitably bring with them petty-bourgeois traditions which are bound to make themselves felt again and again on this or that sector of Party work. Finally, considerable new cadres are coming into the Party which are far from being steeled from the Bolshevik point of view and must inevitably, to a certain extent, succumb to the pressure of hostile class influences.

From all this it follows that the struggle against opportunism as an expression of bourgeois influence over the proletariat and the toilers must be in the centre of the Party's attention. Insofar as the main task is finally to liquidate the capitalist elements, the Right danger remains also in the future the chief opportunist danger for our Party.

The history of the fight of the Party against the Right opportunists has sufficiently shown that the Right opportunist elements are the most dangerous weapon of the class enemy in the period of the developing struggle to liquidate the capitalist elements. From this we must draw our conclusions for the second Five-Year Plan. It will be our main task to fight against the Right opportunists who are endeavouring to retard the Bolshevik pace of development and to hamper the Party in liquidating the capitalist elements.

This does not mean that the tasks of the fight against opportunism can be limited to the fight against the Right danger. Proceeding from the experiences of the fight of the Party against Opportunism in the past, we can say with certainty that moments may arise when the blows of the Party must be directed principally against the "distortions", against the "Lefts". Such a setting of the task in the fight against opportunism on two fronts follows directly from the policy of the Party, whereby the increased fight against the Right opportunists as the chief danger in the given stage is dictated by the whole course of events.

These are the political preconditions of the fight in the second Five-Year Plan, of the fight for the construction of Socialism (Loud applause).

III. Technical Reconstruction and Bolshevist Tempo.

I now come to the questions of economic construction in the second Five-Year Plan.

Already at the beginning of the first Five-Year Plan we went over from the period of restoration to the period of reconstruction, to the period of the general technical transformation of our national economy. In varying degrees, in various spheres of economy we are already able to record certain achievements in this respect.

As you are aware, a number of important branches of industry have been successfully transformed technically in the last few years. You are also aware that new big industrial construction and the equipment of the factories already built with the latest technique have made good progress in the first Five-Year Plan.

We know very well that in agriculture a real technical revolution has already commenced. But it is only at the beginning, not more.

What is most important is, that we already possess our own industrial basis for the Bolshevist development of the reconstruction of our economy. On the basis of the advance already made by heavy industry, we can set these tasks and, according to the fundamental interests of Socialism, make them our chief tasks in the second Five-Year Plan.

The theses proceed from this standpoint in determining the economic character of the second Five-Year Plan. The theses state regarding this:

"The fundamental and decisive economic task of the second Five-Year Plan is the completion of the reconstruction of the whole national economy and the creation of the most modern technical basis for all branches of national economy."

And further:

"The leading role in completing the technical reconstruction falls to Soviet machine-construction."

"The most important element in the technical reconstruction of national economy consists in the creation of a modern energy basis, grounded on the broadest electrification of industry and transport and on the general permeation of agriculture with electric energy."

This must be the attitude to economic construction in the second Five-Year Plan.

One can add a few words regarding the extent of the economic tasks in the second Five-Year Plan. The extent of these tasks can best be seen by the amount of capital investments proposed. As these to a great extent have not yet been determined and we have at our disposal only the provisional proposals, we can only speak very approximately of the scale of economic construction in the second Five-Year Plan. These very provisional proposals regarding capital investments in the second Five-Year Plan give us the figure of 140 to 150 thousand million roubles.

Compared with the first five-Year Plan this marks a tremendous increase, an increase of approximately 2½ times. It is quite possible that these proposals will be exceeded in actual practice.

A few words regarding the leading element of technical reconstruction in the second Five-Year Plan.

In the before-quoted formulation of the theses it is expressly pointed out that the leading role in this sphere falls to Soviet machine-building.

It is also known that some comrades are not satisfied with this formulation and consider it necessary to emphasise that **only** electrification as such should be regarded as the main basis of technical reconstruction of national economy. In reality this is a one-sided and narrow interpretation of the Leninist treatment of the question of the role of electrification in our country. As an attempt is made here to cite Lenin, it is necessary that I go into this matter somewhat.

In order to understand how Lenin regarded the task of the technical reconstruction of our economy and the role of electrification it is best to study the matter in order really to understand how Lenin put this question.

In this connection I give two quotations from Leninist documents:

In the first place I quote what Lenin said in his theses at the third Congress of the Comintern in 1921, entitled: *The material basis of Socialism and the Plan for the electrification of Russia.*

"This sole material basis of Socialism can be only the big machine industry which is capable also of reorganising agriculture. We cannot, however, be content with such a general thesis. It must be concretised. The big machine industry corresponding to the level of modern technique and capable of reorganising agriculture, is the electrification of the whole country."

As you see, according to Lenin, the only material basis of Socialism is the big machine industry, which is inseparably bound up with the electrification of the whole country, not however electrification alone, in the narrow sense of the word.

I quote what Lenin said in his article, "Better Little but Good", where he particularly clearly expresses the idea of technical reconstruction in our country.

"If we retain the leadership of the peasantry in the hands of the working class, then there arises for us the possibility, at the cost of very great frugality in the economy of our State, that even the smallest saving will accrue to the advantage of our big machine industry, for the development of electrification, of water power, of turf production, the completion of Volkovstroy etc.

Here and here alone lies our hope. Only then shall we be in a position to change from one horse to another—to use a metaphor—namely, from the peasant's horse, the poor use of the mujik, to the horse which the proletariat is seeking and must seek—the horse of big machine industry, of electrification, of Volkovstroy."

According to Lenin, reconstruction consisted in changing "from the peasant's horse, from the feeble horse of the mujik, to the horse of saving" etc., "to the horse of the big machine industry, electrification, Volkovstroy etc." Here there is again emphasised the inseparability of big machine industry and electrification in realising the technical reconstruction of the national economy. Lenin again and again emphasises the importance of the big machine industry and at the same time of electrification, water power, turf etc.

In this way there follows from the Leninist conception the formulation of the theses of the leading role of Soviet machine building industry and electrification as the most important element of technical reconstruction.

The State electrification Plan was only a first draft of the technical reconstruction of our economy. The task of technical reconstruction as laid down in the directives on the second Five-Year Plan determined with greater concreteness than formerly the role of the Soviet machine building industry, and in particular the importance of the modern power base on the foundation of the broadest electrification. In this sense the theses are based entirely on the appropriate Leninist statements; they are at the same time a further concretisation of the before-mentioned thesis applied to the period of the second Five-Year Plan.

Here I must emphasise the necessity of going over from details in the formulation of this or that, in general indisputable, thesis to the real estimation of the content of the tasks of reconstruction. The more so as in the struggle over formulations some comrades neglect the main thing: the real content of the question.

With all their brevity the theses give the possibility of forming a relatively concrete picture, not only of the general extent, but also of the relations of the fundamental elements of economic construction in the second Five-Year Plan.

In this connection I refer in the first place to the figures quoted in the theses regarding the growth of the most important branches of industry.

It is easily seen that in the second Five-Year Plan the most rapid tempo is prescribed for electrification. In the course of the second Five-Year Plan the production of electrical power is to be increased sixfold. This follows from what is said in the theses on the role of the modern power base. In regard to increased tempo, the second place is occupied by the machine-building industry. Machine construction is to increase not less than three to three and a half times. In regard to the most important fuels—oil and coal—there is envisaged an increase of 2½ to 3 times. Finally, the production of articles of every day use is estimated to increase at least two to threefold.

The figures quoted regarding the increase of the most important branches of industry best show the importance and the perspectives of development of these branches of economy in the second Five-Year Plan.

I will now deal with the different branches of economy.

1. The **modern power base** and above all electrification. In the first place, how has the State electrification plan been carried out up to the present time?

According to the State electrification Plan, the output of the central power stations was to have amounted to 1,750,000 kilowatts. The figures show that up to the commencement of this year the output of the central power stations in the Soviet Union amounted to 1,719,000 kilowatts. Thus the State electrification plan was fulfilled already in the third year of the Five-Year Plan. It must be further pointed out that the plan for the erection of electric power works must this year secure a hundred per cent. increase in the output capacity of the central power stations.

What tempo of electrification is envisaged in the second Five-Year Plan?

From what I have said it is to be seen that the output of electric power will be increased by about sixfold, i. e., from 17,000 million kilowatt hours at the end of the first Five-Year Plan to 100,000 million kilowatt hours at the end of the second Five-Year Plan. This is an extraordinarily rapid pace of development, which can be seen when one makes a comparison with the tempo in other States.

Already in the past year we reached the level of **Great Britain** in the year 1924 in regard to the production of electric power. In Great Britain, however, the production of electric power has increased in the five years from 1924 to 1929 from 10,900 million, to 16,300 million kilowatt hours. And with us? The answer to this question depends upon us, as with the carrying out of the programme for 1932 the Soviet Union will increase the production of electric power from 10,600 kilowatt hours in the previous year to 17,000 million kilowatt hours. That is to say, we shall achieve in one year more than Great Britain did in the course of five years during the period of the world crisis.

Let us make a comparison with the **United States**, where the production of electric power is particularly great.

Already in the year 1911/12 the United States was on a somewhat higher level in regard to the production of electric energy than we are at the beginning of 1932. In the five years following, up to 1915/16, the production of electric power in the United States increased to 17,000 million kilowatt hours. But America has also made further rapid headway. In the year 1929, the production of electric power in the United States reached 91,000 million kilowatt hours. That was its highest point, after which, as a result of the crisis, a certain decline set in. You know, however, that we have set ourselves the task of reaching 100,000 million kilowatt hours at the end of the Five-Year Plan. That is to say, in regard to the quantity of electric power, we shall advance to the ranks of the leading countries of technique.

As you see, things are not at all bad with us in regard to the pace of growth of electrification in the second Five-Year Plan. We must only carry out what we propose.

But as a result of the planned management of our economy, we have great advantages not only in regard to the pace of electrification, but also in regard to the utilisation of our power works. Consequently, in spite of our technical backwardness, the coefficient of the utilisation of the power works in the Soviet Union is considerably higher than the corresponding figures of other countries. Thus with us, in the year 1928/29, the power works were utilised on an average 38 per cent., whilst in other countries the utilisation was much less; in the United States 34 per cent., in Germany 26 per cent., in Great Britain 21 per cent., in France 18 per cent.

On the other hand, we have to record great deficiencies in this sphere. This is already to be seen from the fact that in spite of the higher percentage of utilisation of the power stations with us, much more fuel is consumed in the production of a kilowatt hour of current than in other countries.

The estimates of the Five-Year Plan in regard to oil and coal are already known.

Here also we have adopted a tremendous pace. If we carry out the tasks in this respect, we shall greatly consolidate our power base.

It is clear, however, that the realisation of the prescribed tasks, the tasks in regard to creating a modern power base for the tremendously increasing socialist production in the Soviet

Union, depends in the first place upon the development of our machine building industry, that it rests immediately on Soviet machine construction and particularly on electro-technique.

2. Machine building and Metal.

In addition to the proposal for a general increase in the pace of the machine building industry, which as you know is already contained in the theses, we have in the future to perform a great work for discovering the possibilities and tasks confronting the various branches of machine construction. This is not only the business of the People's Commissariat for the heavy industry, but also of all economic organisations whose work is connected with the transformation of the technical basis.

Our machine building is already able to record a tremendous pace of development.

Capital investments in the machine building industry have increased nearly tenfold in the last five years. In the same five years the gross production increased more than 2½-fold. As you know, the whole Five-Year Plan of the machine building industry has been carried out in three years. It is likewise generally known that particularly in regard to the construction of agricultural machinery the Five-Year Plan was surpassed in three years.

Is there any proof needed that the rate of growth of the machine industry proposed in the second Five-Year Plan, amounting to 3 to 3½-fold, represents the minimum; that the machine-building industry must strive to surpass this programme?

The theses envisage an increase in the production of pig iron to not less than 22 million tons by the end of the second Five-Year Plan, while at the same time securing for the machine building industry the necessary production of high quality steel.

How is one to estimate the proposals for such a growth of our smelting industry? Let us make here a comparison with other countries.

In Great Britain there has been only an inconsiderable increase in the production of pig iron in the last decade. In the period preceding the world war, the production of pig iron (taking the average annual production in the five-year period from 1911/1915) amounted to nearly 10 million tons. In the last ten years, however, the production of pig iron in Great Britain amounted to about 6 million tons a year, which is a considerable decline.

In **Germany** the production of pig iron increased very rapidly at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century. As is known, Germany rapidly became a technically leading capitalist country. What was the pace of development of the production of pig iron in Germany before the war? In the last five years of the 19th century the production of pig iron increased by 2,800,000 tons, in the first five years of the 20th century by 3,500,000 tons, and in the third five years by 2,900,000 tons. That was the pace of development of the smelting industry in Germany before the war, when there was an all-round rapid advance of industry.

Finally, let us take the pace of development of the smelting industry in the **United States**. Here the production of pig iron increased in the last five years of the 19th century by 3,400,000 tons; in the first five years of the 20th century by 6,900,000 tons; in the second five years by 5,900,000 tons; in the third five years by 3,500,000 tons. Only in the five years of the world war (from 1915/20) the production of pig iron in the United States increased by 9,600,000 tons, whilst in the five years following it retrogressed considerably. Thus, if we take the pre-war period, the maximum increase of the output of pig iron in the United States in five years amounted to 6,900,000 tons. One must admit that this represents an extraordinarily rapid growth of the iron-smelting industry.

A comparison between the development of the iron-smelting industry of Great Britain, Germany and the United States and the growth of the output of pig iron proposed in the second Five-Year Plan justifies us in being proud of the tremendous advantages of our socialist economy. The programme of 22 million tons of pig iron in the second Five-Year Plan means, that in five years we must increase the production of pig iron by at least 12 million tons. In no other country has there been such a rapid growth of the iron smelting industry, for this growth exceeds the powers of the capitalist countries. Only the Soviet Union, with its socialist economy, can set itself such a gigantic task.

At the same time, attention must be called to the big deficiencies in the work of our iron smelting industry, by abolishing which it is possible already now greatly to increase the output of pig iron, iron and steel.

This is shown before all by the figures of the average utilisation of our furnaces compared with the capitalist countries. The productivity of our furnaces is one and a half time less than the productivity of the furnaces in the United States and Germany.

The shortcomings of our smelting industry are also shown by the low productivity of labour. The amount of pig iron smelted per year per worker amounts in the United States to 1300 tons, in Germany to 620 tons and in the best works of the Soviet Union to 300 tons. The renewal of the machine equipment of the smelting works and the better organisation of work in these undertakings can and must bring about a thorough improvement in the shortest possible time.

It must be remarked that it is impermissible for metal to be wasted as it is in our machine building works. This is shown by the investigations made by the Central Control Commission of the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, which recorded that the average percentage of waste metal amounts in Germany to 23 per cent. and with us to 56 per cent.

The programme of the second Five-Year Plan in regard to pig iron production means a tremendous growth. In the main, it corresponds to the existing demands for metal and the requirements of the various branches of industry. It is our very first task to carry out at all costs the programme of pig iron production. For this purpose the smelting industry itself (iron and non-ferrous smelting industry) must be supplied with the requisite best machines and the appropriate leading technical basis.

3. In regard to **transport, post and telegraph**. Up to recent transport was one of the most backward sections in regard to technical reconstruction.

The rapid improvement of railway transport, which is so necessary to us, depends not only upon reconstruction but also upon the decided improvement of its present utilisation. In this respect railway transport is not yet up to the required level.

Nevertheless, railway and also water transport are confronted with new reconstruction tasks.

The theses propose an extension of the railway lines in the second Five-Year Plan to 25 to 30 thousand kilometres. This is a tremendous increase in new railway construction compared with the first Five-Year Plan. This is of first-class importance to all branches of our national economy. It must not be forgotten that transport is one of the leading branches of our national economy. The fresh railway construction enables us to exploit the vast mineral resources in the new regions and to increase the utilisation of the inner resources of the main centres of industry.

The chief thing in regard to the reconstruction of railway transport at present is the rapid introduction of more efficient locomotives and of waggons with a greater loading capacity, as well as to develop automatic couplings and automatic signals, automatic brakes and Diesel locomotives.

In addition, in the second Five-Year Plan our automobile transport begins for the first time to adopt a Bolshevik pace of development. This is already shown by the fact that by the end of the Five-Year Plan the annual production of the automobile industry will amount to not less than three to four thousand cars. At the same time, this must not in any case lead to a neglect of the horse and horse transport. Such a neglect must be decidedly combated as harmful overweening pride.

Our air transport is now being placed on a firm basis. It is clear that in our vast country aviation transport has extraordinary prospects in front of it.

The post and telegraph service, and in particular the wireless service, must also be placed on a new basis in the second Five-Year Plan. It is necessary to overcome in the shortest possible time our extreme backwardness in regard to the post and telegraph service, as this is one of the essential preconditions for the growth of socialist construction.

In order decidedly to improve the whole transport service and the post and telegraph service, we need a very rapid growth and transformation of the transport-machine construction, as well as of the electric industry and in particular of the radio industry.

4. In regard to **agriculture**. The main question of agriculture in the second Five-Year Plan must be the question of the harvest yield.

In the last few years we have made almost no progress in this respect. It is true there is a certain growth of the harvest yield, but it is very insignificant. Now, when we are rapidly increasing the employment of machines, tractors, mowing and threshing machines etc. and when chemical fertilisers are also being employed to an increasing extent in agriculture, we must raise the question of increasing the harvest yield to the central question of the workers in agriculture. It is time to adopt a Bolshevik tempo in increasing the harvest yield of our collective and Soviet farms.

The time has also come when we must tackle in a Bolshevik manner the solution of the question of the fight against drought. It must not be forgotten that the drought in the year 1931, which visited a number of regions in the East, caused a loss to our national economy of several hundred million poods of grain. We must in the second Five-Year Plan conduct a regular fight against drought.

The development of our technical plants is of special importance in regard to the proposed tremendous increase of the light industry and the food industry. It is impossible to improve the material well-being of the working population two to threefold without decidedly increasing the cotton, sugar beet and flax harvest etc.

In this connection it is necessary to call attention to the great role of the chemical industry, without the rapid development of which we shall not be able to secure the necessary harvest yield of the technical plants. Meanwhile, we are still very much behindhand in regard to the pace of promoting the chemical industry. An end must be put to this at all costs in the second Five-Year Plan, and we must put the question of developing the main branches of the chemical industry.

We have in the last few years achieved considerable successes in regard to the growth of socialist cattle-breeding.

Whilst our Soviet grain farms were the model of the gigantic pace of promoting agriculture, the Soviet cattle-breeding farms have likewise in a short time become powerful and great organisations. But in regard to productivity, both our Soviet grain farms and also the Soviet cattle-breeding farms are on a very low level. In the second Five-Year Plan, the task of developing cattle-breeding on the Soviet farms and collective farms acquires particularly great importance as one of the most important preconditions for improving the supplies to the broad masses.

The tractors will form the technical basis for transforming agriculture also in the second five years. It suffices to say that the tractor factories already built and those in course of construction will at the end of the Five-Year Plan supply agriculture with at least 170,000 tractors a year.

In the second Five-Year Plan there arises once again the question of electrification as an instrument for the technical reconstruction of agriculture. The theses point to the necessity of gradually applying electrification in agriculture. With regard to the extent of this task in the second Five-Year Plan, it is still difficult to judge at present. One can only assume that of the 100,000 million kilowatt hours electric power which we shall have at the end of the second Five-Year Plan, some thousand million will be immediately consumed by agriculture. In addition to tractors, this chief element of the technical reconstruction of agriculture, the role of electrification in agriculture will increase more and more in the second five years.

In accordance with the new tasks in the sphere of the technical reconstruction of agriculture, the question of mastering technique here acquires extraordinary importance. It should be remarked, by the way, that the matter is by no means confined to the task of learning to use tractors and combines, or learning to employ electric power in land cultivation and cattle breeding. The requirement of technique in agriculture must at all costs include the appropriation of the achievements of agronomy and zootechny. We must decidedly make an end to our backwardness in the sphere of agronomy and zootechny.

The completion of the technical reconstruction of our national economy, the gigantic development of our machine building and of our whole industry and the extraordinary development in regard to the tempo of electrification, place tremendous demands on the **technical cadres**.

We cannot realise the task of complete reconstruction of all branches of our national economy in the second Five-Year Plan unless the whole new army of technicians, engineers,

agronomists, and scientific workers of the various specialities really acquire a **knowledge of technique**, not to speak of the acquirement of technique by the cadres, numbering many thousands, of the qualified workers required by us. If the question of technical cadres became so acute in the first Five-Year Plan, this question acquires still greater importance in connection with the completion of the technical reconstruction of our national economy.

Also in the question of the technical cadres we have made some "revisions" in the Five-Year Plan originally decided.

In the last few years we were compelled to undertake a really thorough reformation of our technical training. We have already achieved a good deal here in regard to quantity. With regard to the scientific-technical qualification of our cadres, in the majority of cases we have to record a not very high, and in fact even only a very low level.

Therefore, the slogan proclaimed by Comrade Stalin: "the Bolsheviki must master technique" is the most important slogan of the Party. This slogan must become in fact the slogan of the second Five-Year Plan, of the Five-Year Plan of completion of the technical reconstruction of national economy. If we do not achieve decisive results in regard to mastering the up-to-date technique of the world by our Bolshevik cadres, we shall not fulfil the main tasks of the second Five-Year Plan. Here, too, the Bolsheviki must proceed at the head and lead the masses of engineers and technicians with them.

Under the conditions in which we are completing the technical reconstruction of all branches of our national economy, the mastery of technique calls for the most rapid training of many thousands of qualified workers, the promotion of new cadres of organisers of socialist economy from the ranks of the workers and of the working peasants who are devoted to the cause of Socialism; further, a comprehensive extension of appropriate scientific institutes and authorities, in order to propagate the scientific-technical questions in our country and, in connection therewith, a Bolshevik degree of work in regard to the practical realisation of an all-round education of the people and also in regard to developing the technical education of the masses.

The carrying out of technical reconstruction renders necessary the appropriate utilisation of specialists of the bourgeois type. This question also is of particular importance to us.

Lenin said, when emphasising the importance of the work in drawing up the plans of electrification of our country:

"We consider it a success that we have drawn in dozens and hundreds of engineers and representatives of science who are permeated with bourgeois views, and allotted to them the task of reorganising the whole economy, industry and agriculture, awakened their interest in this work, and received manifold material from them."

The present situation differs in many respects from the period in which the plan of the Goelro was worked out. Nevertheless, the question of drawing in specialists of the bourgeois type, old specialists into our work, has not lost anything of its importance.

Nay more, in a number of cases the work of the foreign specialists is of tremendous importance. In order to acquire foreign technique, which at present we utilise to a relatively slight extent, we are not seldom compelled to avail ourselves of the services of foreign specialists. We can only be thankful to those among them who conscientiously fulfil the obligations undertaken by them and actively work in organising our new factories. The duty of the Communists consists in skillfully utilising these specialists, in organising the necessary control, and in connection therewith, increasingly mastering the essentials of the work. Lenin spoke very plainly regarding these duties of the Communists:

"The Communist who does not show his capacity for mastering and modestly controlling the work of the specialists by penetrating into the nature of the work and studying its details, such a Communist often only causes harm. There are many such Communists with us. I would exchange dozens of them for one who conscientiously studies his work and knows the bourgeois specialist."

Lenin here most sharply attacks those Communists who do not fulfil their direct obligations in regard to supervising the work of the specialists, and in connection therewith, their obligations in regard to the independent acquirement of technique and the knowledge of the essentials of their work. This remark by Lenin is of first-class importance to us at the present time.

It only remains for me to emphasise the task of our scientific institutions in connection with the main problems of the second Five-Year Plan. We are justified in demanding from the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad and the Communist Academy in Moscow, from the scientific research institutes and technical institutes, as well as from the publishing houses and technical periodicals, for the purpose of realising the great task confronting the country of technically reconstructing our national economy, the fulfilment of a general directive: **technique and science in the service of the second Five-Year Plan!**

Of course, the purely theoretical work in the sphere of science and technique must also be developed. But there can be no doubt that a real approach of the work of our scientific and technical collaborators to the practical work of socialist construction will help the cause of science in the Soviet Union and promote its development.

In conclusion, I come to the question of the **criteria** by which we must measure our economic successes.

Not so very long ago the chief criterion of our economic work was, as you know, the pre-war level. At that time we compared the progress of this or that branch of economy with the situation before the war. But it is not due to chance that more and more rarely we make use of this criterion. We have made far too much progress in order to consider our pre-war level as a suitable standard for judging our economic work.

We are now making more and more frequent use of other criteria.

Thus we are comparing the directives of the second Five-Year Plan with those of the first Five-Year Plan. We speak of increasing the production of electric power, developing our machine industry etc. in relation to the level attained in the last year of the first Five-Year Plan. These are now our fundamental socialist criteria.

But this is not the only criterion of our economic successes. For us the international criterion, the comparison of the development of the different branches of our economy with the corresponding statistical data of the capitalist States is also of great importance. Also in the future we shall not be able to dispense with comparisons of this sort.

We can call to mind Lenin's slogan "Overtake and outstrip the technically and economically advanced capitalist countries". We are still far from the realisation of this slogan. But in this respect we are making considerable steps forwards in the second Five-Year Plan.

The theses state that at the conclusion of the second Five-Year Plan, the Soviet Union must occupy first place in Europe in regard to technique. It cannot be denied that this is setting a very high aim, and this criterion possesses for us exceedingly great importance.

We are not setting ourselves the task, during the second Five-Year Plan, of overtaking and outstripping the most advanced capitalist countries as a whole in regard to technique and economics. The theses, however, state that in a number of branches of economy we can and must overtake and outstrip the advanced capitalist countries in regard to technical economics. It is clear that here, too, the employment of international criteria is of great political and tremendous practical importance.

Of course, it is not seldom difficult and sometimes even impossible to draw a comparison between the Soviet Union and the other countries, if only because the appropriate data from abroad are lacking, for, as you know, in the capitalist countries there is lacking such a control of national economy as exists with us. Nevertheless, in a number of cases we can and shall continue to make use of the international criterion, the comparison of the Soviet Union with the technically and economically advanced capitalist countries. The Leninist application of this criterion, i. e., its application in the sense of the struggle for the realisation of the slogan "overtake and outstrip", has hitherto possessed and will continue to possess the greatest political importance.

On the other hand, it must be remembered whither the Trotskyist attitude to this question has led. The Trotskyist attitude to this question, fostered by unbelief in the possibility of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, here also has quite another, anti-Bolshevist sense. Let us take, for instance, what Trotsky said at the VII. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in December 1926:

"The rate of development is a decisive factor, for we are not alone in the world; the isolated socialist State

exists at present only in the imagination of journalists and the authors of resolutions. In reality, our Socialist State is always—directly or indirectly—**under a relative control** of the world market. Therein lie the roots of the matter. The pace of development is not arbitrary. It is prescribed for us by the whole world development, because world economy, in the last resort, **controls** each of its parts, even when this part is under the rule of the proletarian dictatorship and is building up socialist economy.” (Emphasised by me, M. V. Molotov.)

Thus we see that Trotzky, already at that time, declared that our Soviet economy is under the control of the world market. In the Trotzkyist manner of putting the question the fundamental difference and the antagonism between Soviet economy and the economy of the capitalist countries was already at that time obliterated in a Menshevist manner.

In his book: “Socialism or Capitalism” Trotzky wrote in 1925:

“The more we are drawn into the system of international division of labour, the more directly and immediately the elements of our inner economy, such as price and quality of goods, are dependent upon the corresponding elements of the world market.”

Here Trotzky even goes so far as to say that the prices of our commodities “are dependent upon the corresponding elements of the world market”, which apparently can only mean that with crises in the capitalist countries the prices in the Soviet Union must fall, and vice versa. It suffices to point to this argument in order to show its absurdity, especially under the present conditions.

Trotzky wrote in the same book:

“But with a rapid growth of exports and imports the situation radically changes. We become an integral part, even if a highly peculiar part, of the world market. This means, however, that all its general factors, no matter how much they may change, must be reflected, in one way or another, in our national economy. The course of economy is expressed most clearly in how the

market purchases and how it sells. We appear upon the world market both as purchaser and seller. Thereby we come economically **to this or that degree** under the influence of the ebb and flow in trade and industry of the world market.”

Further:

“Our independence of yesterday on the vacillations of the world market is disappearing. All the fundamental processes of our economy not only come into contact with the corresponding processes, but **to this or that degree** are subjected to the laws which determine the capitalist development, including also the changes in the business situation.”

Thus Trotzky already then developed the idea that we are dependent upon the effects of the laws of capitalist development and its fluctuations: he developed the idea that the Soviet Union is dependent upon the ebb and flow of the world market. In spite of the slippery and down-right fraudulent formulation the Menshevist tendency of Trotzky's writings was already perfectly clear. His endeavours to conceal the fundamental antagonism between capitalist world economy and the socialist economy of the Soviet Union are also evident from these arguments. As regards the profound prophecies of Trotzky as to the dependency of our economy on the ebb and flow of the capitalist world economy, this sounds particularly ridiculous now, at the moment of the most profound crisis in the capitalist countries and at the time when the economy of the Soviet Union is making rapid progress.

The political meaning of the Trotzkyist attitude consists here also, of course, in petty-bourgeois capitulation to imperialism, in a philistine unbelief in the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, as a result of which our cause is allegedly hopeless. Therein consists the political basis of Trotzkyism.

Let him go his way. He can occupy himself with his own affairs. We shall attend to our affairs and believe without vacillation in the victory of our cause, in the victory of Socialism. (To be concluded.)

The Directives of the C.P.S.U. for the Setting up of the Second Five-Year Plan of National Economy of the Soviet Union.

Resolution on the Reports of Comrades Molotov and Kuybyshev at the XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U.

I. On the Results of the First Five-Year Plan.

1. The results of the struggle for the carrying out of the Five-Year Plan in four years are expressed in the victorious construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union. The basis of these achievements of Socialism is the policy of industrialisation, the advance of heavy industry, the development of the output of the means of production. In the past period our heavy industry has been placed on a firm basis, as a result of which we have been able to set up our own basis for completing the transformation of our whole national economy, i. e., the basis of socialist large scale machine-building industry. In the last year or two new factories have been erected, among them being works which already surpass the level of European technique in various branches of industry. At the same time, the light industry has greatly developed and the rate of development of the food industry far exceeded the proposals of the Five-Year Plan.

2. A radical change has taken place in agriculture, which is expressed in the final turn of the masses of poor and middle peasants of the village toward Socialism. The socialist forms (collective and Soviet farms) have obtained a dominating position in agriculture. The Soviet Union has

been converted from a country of small and dwarf farms into a country of the largest agricultural undertakings in the world, on the basis of collectivisation, the development of the Soviet farms and the large-scale application of machine-technique. This victory of Socialism, which has solved the most important and most difficult problem of the revolution, is of world-historical importance.

3. The most important result of socialist construction on the basis of the first Five-Year Plan is the final extirpation of the roots of capitalism in the village, which is a precondition to the complete liquidation of the capitalist elements and the complete abolition of classes. The completion of the basis of Socialism in the Soviet Union means that the Leninist question: “Who will be victor?” has been completely and irrevocably solved in town and country in favour of Socialism.

4. Thanks to the realisation of the Bolshevik tempo of socialist construction and thanks to the liquidation of the parasitic classes, which has been carried out on the whole, we have already in the first five years liquidated the basis and sources of the exploitation of man by man, the people's income

is growing at a rate quite unattainable by the capitalist countries, unemployment and pauperism have been abolished, the "scissors" and the contradiction between town and country are being done away with, the standard of living and the cultural level of the workers and the toiling peasants are rising from year to year, mortality is declining and the population of the Soviet Union rapidly growing.

5. All these achievements are the result of the colossal growth of the revolutionary activity of broad masses of the working class and of the toiling peasantry, the result of the tremendous upsurge of socialist competition and the shock-brigade movement, and finally, the result of the Leninist policy of our Party, which has consistently conducted the attack on all fronts against the capitalist elements.

6. The Party achieved these results in the struggle

II. The Main Tasks of the Second Five-Year Plan.

The successes in the realisation of the first Five-Year Plan have created the basis for the further and still more powerful development of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

The XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U. is of the opinion that the vast natural resources of the country, the Bolshevik tempo of socialist construction, the increasing activity of the broad masses of the workers and collective peasants and the correct line of the Party will fully secure such a development of the productive forces of socialist economy in the second five years, as a result of which the capitalist elements in the Soviet Union will be finally liquidated. The Conference is of the opinion that the fundamental political task of the second Five-Year Plan is the final liquidation of the capitalist elements and of classes in general, the complete removal of the causes which produce class differences and exploitation, the overcoming of the remnants of capitalism in economy and in the minds of the people, the conversion of the whole of the working population of the country into conscious and active builders of the classless socialist society.

On the basis of the liquidation of the parasitic class elements and the general increase of the national income, over which the workers have complete disposal, a considerably more rapid increase in the well-being of the working and peasant masses and at the same time a decisive improvement of the whole housing and communal services is to be achieved. The Conference is of the opinion that the supplies to the population of articles of necessity, including foodstuffs, must by the end of the second Five-Year period be increased at least two to threefold compared with the end of the first five years.

1. The fulfilment of these tasks is possible solely on the basis of the broadest technical transformation of national economy: industry, transport and agriculture.

At the commencement of the first Five-Year Plan the Soviet Union had practically concluded the reconstruction period, and in the last few years proceeded to the reconstruction of a number of key industries, in particular of the smelting industry, engineering, the coal mining industry, not to speak of the reconstruction of the naphtha industry which had already been carried out. A special place in the broadly developing reconstruction is occupied by agriculture, which is being rapidly transformed on a new technical basis.

The successes achieved in this sphere in the first Five-Year Plan are, however, only the commencement of the realisation of the technical reconstruction of national economy. Meanwhile, with the present inadequate and, moreover, obsolete and worn out machine equipment of industry and transport, not to speak of agriculture, the Bolshevik tempo of socialist construction which is necessary for the realisation of the fundamental tasks of the Five-Year Plan, cannot be secured unless a technical reconstruction is carried out in all branches of the national economy, and unless the latter is provided with a new machine technique.

The XVII. Conference of the C.P.S.U. is therefore of the opinion that the **fundamental and decisive economic task of the second Five-Year Plan is to transform the whole national economy and to create the most modern technical basis for all branches of national economy.**

The leading role in completing the technical reconstruction falls to Soviet machine-construction. The Conference is of the opinion that the output of the engineering industry must by the end of the Five-Year Plan be increased at least three to three and a half, compared with 1932, so that all requirements of the reconstruction of industry, transport, traf-

against the bourgeois theory of Trotskyism regarding the impossibility of the construction of Socialism in one country and of the inevitability of the restoration of capitalism—of Trotskyism, which has become the advance-guard of bourgeois counter-revolution.

7. The Party has achieved these successes in the fight against Right opportunism, whose line consists not only in undermining the policy of socialist advance but also in direct capitulation to the kulaks and the bourgeois elements.

The creation of the prerequisites for the realisation of the first Five-Year Plan in four years the crushing of the class enemy and the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union is secured only in the decisive fight against both Left and Right opportunism and against conciliation towards the same, and for the general line of our Party.

fic, agriculture, commerce etc. can be satisfied by perfect and most modern machines, produced by ourselves.

The most important element in the technical reconstruction of national economy consists in the creation of a modern energy basis, grounded on the broadest electrification of industry and transport and on the general permeation of agriculture with electric energy, utilising for this purpose the tremendous water power, stores of coal, the chief and minor coalfields, local deposits of fuel (turf etc.). The Party Conference is of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to increase the production of electric energy in the year 1937 to at least 100,000 million kilowatt hours compared with 17,000 million kilowatt hours in the year 1932. The output of coal must be increased to at least 250 million tons compared with 90 million tons in the year 1932, and the output of naphtha must be increased to 2½ to 3 times the present output.

The XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U. is of the opinion that in regard to the most important branches of the national economy, the following tasks must be set up in the second Five-Year Plan:

a) In the **iron smelting industry**, at least 22 million tons of crude iron must be smelted in the year 1937, in addition to securing for the machine-building industry the necessary production of good quality steel, for which purpose the complete technical reconstruction of the iron smelting industry, with the erection of new works, introduction of new, highly efficient machines, careful preparation of raw material, electrification of labour processes and the utilisation of by-products are necessary.

b) In the **non-ferrous smelting industry**, in the course of the Five-Year Plan, the smelting of copper, lead, spelter, aluminium and rare metals is to be carried out on a scale necessary to satisfy completely the requirements of the country.

c) In the **chemical industry** the lagging behind the tempo of the development of national economy as a whole is to be liquidated. Special attention is to be directed to the chief branches of chemistry and especially to the production of chemical fertilisers, which necessitates the re-equipment of factories and the all-round promotion of the construction of such factories.

d) In **railway transport** a fundamental reconstruction is to be carried out, involving the promotion of the building of new railway tracks amounting at least to 25,000 to 30,000 kilometres in length. Some dozen new bridges over the main waterways are to be built; powerful locomotives, waggons with a big loading capacity, electrification of a number of lines, automatic couplings, automatic signals and oil-driven locomotives must be introduced on a broad scale. The development of railway transport has to guarantee the accelerated progress of economy in a number of regions and national Republics whose requirements have by no means received sufficient attention in the past.

In **water transport** the reconstruction of the lake and river fleet will be carried out; new waterways are to be opened up, the existing ones improved, and the construction of well-equipped harbours on lakes and rivers carried out.

The construction of **streets and highways** and **automobilisation** is to be secured at a more rapid pace than the other branches of transport.

Transport on the waterways is to be developed in all the chief directions as one of the most important means of

communication between the remote districts and the industrial centres.

Broadcasting in particular is to undergo a great development.

e) In the **light industry** and in the food industry production is to be extended and a threefold increase in the standard of consumption of the population per head is to be secured by setting up a big machine-industry and considerably developing the agricultural raw material basis. Here we proceed from the necessity of greatly developing light industry and the food industry in the new districts, especially in the districts producing agricultural raw materials.

In the timber industry, which is acquiring extraordinary importance, we have to secure the necessary rate of growth and the introduction of mechanisation.

f) With regard to small trade and industry the production co-operatives must considerably increase the production of articles required by the masses and also increase the development of those branches of trade which supply socialist industry and agriculture; this must be achieved on the basis of the organisation of the whole of small trade and industry in co-operatives.

g) In **agriculture** we must achieve the completion of socialist reconstruction; the machine and tractor stations must embrace all collective farms and complete in the main the mechanisation of agricultural production. The tasks of consolidating the collective farms organisationally and economically and of socialistically retraining the masses of collective peasants must occupy our chief attention also in the second Five-Year Plan.

The Soviet farms have the task to increase their production in all spheres, both in regard to technical plants and also in the sphere of cattle breeding, to consolidate their role as models of socialist organisation of production and of the employment of highly developed machine technique and all the achievements of modern agronomy and zoological technique in agriculture.

In the sphere of cattle breeding we must in the second Five Year period achieve such an increase in the number of cattle and such a growth in the production for the market, corresponding to the solution of the cattle breeding problem in the Soviet Union, as the Party has achieved in the first Five-Year Plan in regard to the grain problem.

With regard to cotton and flax, we have at least to double the gross production and to triple the production of sugar beets. All these measures in the spheres of agriculture demand a further and still more rapid promotion of grain cultivation, so that by the end of the second five years the grain production will amount to at least 1,300 million double centners. Therefore, it must be made the central task of the second Five-Year Plan to raise the yielding capacity of the collective and Soviet farms, and Bolshevistically to solve the problem of droughts.

2. The fulfilment of the task of the complete technical transformation of national economy is indissolubly connected with the acquisition of technique by our economic cadres, the creation of broad new cadres of technical intelligentsia out of the workers and peasants, and the definite raising of the cultural level of the whole mass of the working population.

The quantitative growth of the technical cadres in the Soviet Union must in no circumstances reduce the importance of the scientific qualification of these cadres, which lies in the fact that they have to acquire all the important achievements of international science and technique. The solution of the problem of the technical cadres is the most important element in the Bolshevik fulfilment of the tasks of the cultural revolution and the successful construction of Socialism. The all-round acceleration of the complete abolition of illiteracy, the rapid improvement of the whole technical education and the increased material support of the scientific development of the Soviet Union by the State, — these are the most important tasks as part of the general tasks of building up Socialism in our country.

3. The development of the goods' turnover is of outstanding importance in securing the Bolshevik pace of development of the whole of national economy and better satisfying the requirements of the broad masses in town and country as regards articles of daily necessity. The development of the goods' circulation—before all of retail trade—and the introduction of the principle of business accountancy in the whole of economic work, is the most important stimulus for bringing

to the front the tremendous inner reserves in our economy which have not been fully utilised by a long way, which promote an acceleration of the growth of socialist accumulation and thereby the consolidation of the material basis of the whole of socialist construction. Only by developing the circulation of goods is it possible to secure the further rapid improvement of the supplies to the workers and the toiling population of the village with industrial goods and agricultural products, and for this purpose it is necessary in turn to develop in every way the network of shops and stores, besides carrying out the necessary technical transformation of the same. Only on this basis is it possible to prepare for the abolition of rationing and to replace the centralised distributive system by a broadly developed Soviet trade.

In addition, the Party Conference emphasises the anti-Bolshevist character of the "Left" phrases of the transition to the "exchange of products" and the "gradual elimination of money" already in this stage of the construction of Socialism. The Party Conference, on the other hand, emphasises that the bourgeois-N.E.P. distortion of the principle of business accountancy—which is expressed in the wasting of the provisions of the people and of the State and, as a result, in the frustration of the economic plans laid down—is incompatible with the policy of the Party and the interests of the working class.

* * *

The working class will be able to secure the new achievements of Socialism only in the fight against the remnants of capitalism, by ruthlessly defeating the resistance of the declining capitalist elements, by overcoming the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois prejudices among the toilers and by carrying on persistent work for socialist re-education.

This means that for a time an aggravation of the class struggle in its different phases, especially in certain regions and in various spheres of socialist construction is unavoidable. As a result, the continued existence and in some cases even an increase of the bourgeois influence on various strata and groups of the working population will at the same time be unavoidable as will also, for a long time, the penetration of alien class influences into the ranks of the workers, in fact even into the Party. As a result the Party has the task of consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and developing still further the fight against opportunism, especially against the Right deviation as the greatest danger in the present stage.

The complete collectivisation of agriculture, the development of the big State agricultural undertakings and the equipment of the Soviet and collective farms with up-to-date technical means and machines, which converts agricultural work into a variety of industrial work and brings about a considerable consolidation of transport and goods turnover between industry and agriculture, are the prerequisites for the complete abolition of the contradiction between town and country.

The rapid development of socialist economy in the period of the second Five-Year Plan necessitates the overcoming in the national districts and Republics of economic and cultural backwardness inherited from the Tsarist, colonial-capitalist regime.

In the second Five-Year Plan the Soviet Union will advance to the first place in Europe in regard to technique. The work initiated by the first Five-Year Plan to convert the Soviet Union from a country importing machines and equipment into a country independently producing machines and equipment, will be completed and will "secure the Soviet Union its economic independence, thereby safeguarding the Soviet Union from becoming an appendage of capitalist world economy". (14th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

All this creates for the Soviet Union the possibility, already in the second five years, technically and economically to catch up to the most advanced capitalist countries in many branches of economy.

The deep crisis in the capitalist countries is the best proof of the approaching doom of the capitalist world. The achievements of Socialism in the Soviet Union are the best proof of the superiority of the socialist system as compared with the capitalist system.

In the capitalist countries—catastrophic decline of production, wholesale dismissals and closing down of factories and works, unheard-of destruction of productive forces. In the Soviet Union—uninterrupted, enormous increase in production, broad development of the construction of

factories, giant works, collieries, electric-power stations, a rate of development of the productive forces unattainable by capitalism.

In the capitalist countries—frightful unemployment of millions and an extraordinary impoverishment of the masses in the rural districts. In the Soviet Union—complete liquidation of unemployment and abolition of misery, seven-hour working day in the factories and works, uninterrupted increase in the well-being of the toiling masses in town and country.

All this renders the Soviet Union still more a centre of attraction for the workers of all countries and the oppressed of the whole world. The revolutionising importance of the Soviet Union is growing. The Soviet Union is becoming stronger as the basis of world Socialism.

The XVII. Party Conference of the C.P.S.U. expresses the firm conviction that the main tasks of the second Five-Year Plan will be not only fulfilled but even surpassed; that accordingly the real concrete economic leadership and the decisive

fight against bureaucratism by all organisations of the working class is secured; that the toilers of the Soviet Union will secure the increase in the productivity of labour necessary for the fulfilment of the tasks of the second Five Year Plan; that the ranks of the participants in socialist competition and in the shock-brigade movement will grow from day to day.

The Conference is firmly convinced that the working class and the masses of collective farmers will find in the Party, in the Young Communist League, in the trade unions and Soviet organisations Bolshevik organisers and leaders for the victorious struggle for the realisation of the second Five-Year Plan.

The Conference considers it necessary, immediately to develop the work of the Party, Soviet, economic, co-operative, trade union and youth organisations in the interest of the most rapid working out of the second Five-Year Plan in order that this will be submitted to the ordinary Party Conference for confirmation.

Industrial Development in the Soviet Union in 1931 and the Tasks for 1932.

Resolution on the Report of Comrade Orjonnikidze.

I. The Results in 1931.

The XVII. Party Conference records with pleasure that on the basis of the political and economic achievements in the previous years soviet industry was able to conclude the year 1931 with new successes.

The production of socialist industry as a whole in 1931 amounted to a total value of 27 milliard roubles, representing an increase of 21 percent as compared with 1930. The production of those branches of industry subject to the planned economics of the Supreme Economic Council amounted to a total value of 21.8 milliard roubles, representing an increase of 20.5 percent as compared with 1930. The share of the heavy industries amounted to 11.8 milliard roubles, representing an increase of 28 percent as compared with 1930. No capitalist State has ever experienced such phenomenal development even in the heyday of capitalism.

In the year 1931 a number of branches of industry completed and even exceeded the Five-Year Plans which had been drawn up for them, thus fulfilling their tasks within two years and six months or three years respectively. Amongst the industries in question were the petroleum industry, the electro-technical industry, the engineering industry, the packing industry and the production of cakes and pastry.

The results obtained in 1931 offer a satisfactory basis for the completion of the Five-Year Plan in four years.

At the same time the year 1931 saw the continuation and intensification in all capitalist countries of what is the biggest crisis in the history of capitalism. In 1931 this crisis resulted in a further tremendous limitation of capitalist production and in an almost complete standstill of the building industry.

The number of unemployed workers in Europe and America already exceeds twenty-five millions. Wages have been greatly reduced. A process of absolute impoverishment is going on which affects millions and millions of working people. In the Soviet Union on the other hand unemployment has been completely abolished and the total number of industrial workers, including building workers, increased in 1931 by 2 millions. Further, in 1931 the wages of the workers in the Soviet Union increased by 16 percent as compared with 1930.

The superiority of a socialist system of economics over the capitalist system has been proved up to the hilt.

Together with the general development of industry as a whole in the Soviet Union in 1931 there was a considerable qualitative improvement within the individual industries. Thanks to the efforts of the party, economic organisations, the labour unions, the shock brigades, the best engineers and technicians, and in general thanks to the efforts of the working class as a whole great success was obtained in the mastery of technique and the opening up of new branches of industry.

The mastery of the technique of modern production in the Stalingrad tractor works, in the "Red Putilov" works, the opening up of the Charkov tractor works, the reconstruction of the engineering industry as a whole, the opening up and rapid development of the works producing reapers and threshers, the opening up of automobile works in Moscow and Nizhni-Novgorod, and many other successes, mean that a powerful basis of industrial production has been created for the further technical development of the equipment of the soviet economic system, including agriculture.

In 1931 the manufacture of powerful machines and modern equipment for the electrical industry, for the production of petrol, for the mining industry and for the foundry industry was begun for the first time. A beginning was also made with the production of high-quality steel. For the first time oxoacetyline and electrical welding was carried out on a large scale. Excellent development was also obtained in the production of phosphates, nitrogen, artificial fertilisers and artificial fibres.

In accordance with the policy of socialist industrialisation further big investments were made in 1931 for the building of new industrial undertakings. In those branches of industry under the control of the Supreme Economic Council a total of 7 milliard roubles was invested in 1931, or more than the total similarly invested during the previous two years and six months. Further, a total of 3.5 milliard roubles was invested as working capital, or as much as had been similarly invested during the previous two years and six months.

The year 1931 was thus a year of tremendous progress in the opening up of new industrial undertakings. This work consisted on the one hand of a speeding up of building activities and on the other hand in the completion of a series of powerful building projects begun in the previous year. In 1931 and in the first month of 1932 the following large-scale works were opened up: the automobile works in Nizhni-Novgorod, the tractor works in Kharkov, the automobile works in Moscow, the first series of works in the Urals for the production of heavy industrial machinery, the works in Saratov for the production of combined reapers and threshers, the Ural copper works, the opening up of the apatite deposits in the Hibin mountains, the piping works, and cracking works, including a cracking works built on new lines according to the plans of the soviet engineers Shuchov and Kapelyushnikov. Big undertakings about to be opened are: the first series of the Magnitogorsk works, the works in Kuznetsk, the first series of works in Beresniki, the chemical works on the Neva and in Vosskresensk, a big ball-bearings works, and factories for the manufacture of lathes and tools in Moscow and in Nizhni-Novgorod. In 1931 79 coal mines with a total annual production of 28 million tons, and power stations with a total annual capacity of one million kilowatts have been

opened up. The annual capacity of these power stations is almost as large as the annual capacity of the power stations opened up during the two previous years. The power stations opened up in 1931 include the Suyevo, Shterovka, Kuznetsk, Magnitogorsk and Beresniki works. Further, great progress was made with the construction of the Dnieperstroï works, which is undoubtedly of world importance. The progress made during 1931 was so satisfactory that the works will be opened up in the summer of 1932 or ahead of time.

The opening up of these large-scale undertakings and the supply of new and tremendous quantities of power by the electrical works mean fundamental changes in the technical basis of the soviet economic system and create new possibilities for further rapid development.

The rapid development of foundry building operations in Magnitogorsk and Kuznetsk, and the development of the chemical and coking works attached to them, the development of the coal mining basis in Kuznetsk, the building of the Urals works for the manufacture of heavy machinery and the building of the Siberian works for the manufacture of mining equipment, lays the basis for a **new powerful coal-mining and foundry industry in the shape of the Ural-Kuznetsk industrial combination** as planned by the XVI. Party Congress.

Side by side with the building of powerful new industrial undertakings and with the development of the productive capacity of the existing works, soviet industry is also creating new masses of highly-qualified workers and technical forces on an unparalleled scale. In 1931 the industries under the control of the Supreme Economic Council were training 1.8 million students. During 1931 21,000 young engineers and technicians completed their studies. In 1932 the number will be 38,000, and in 1933 85,000. In 1931 51,000 workers completed their training at the factory schools. In 1932 the number will be 350,000. These new masses of qualified forces, whose numbers are rapidly increasing and who have been trained in the struggle to master modern industrial technique, represent the most important element for the further development of socialist industry.

The year 1931 was also of great importance with regard to the development of the network of scientific institutions (from the Academy of Sciences to the individual institutes of the various branches of industry) with a view to satisfying the demands of the work of socialist construction on the scientific field and adapting these institutions to modern industry. The scientific industrial institutes (the institutes and their branches in the industrial centres) increased in number from 141 to 205. The number of scientific workers engaged in industry increased from 6,000 to 12,500 and at the same time the percentage of industrial workers drawn into this activity increased considerably. This scientific industrial work produced a series of very fine results on the technical field, for instance in the production of cast-iron, special high-quality steel, light metals, aerodynamics, plastic materials, new building materials, combined agricultural machines, new forms of raw material and a series of new or perfected technological processes.

The year 1931 also saw the beginning of the reorganisation of labour and industry as a whole on the basis of the principles laid down by Comrade Stalin. The carrying out of these principles represents a necessary preliminary condition for continued industrial success under new conditions: the reorganisation of the wage system, the abolition of levelling, the establishment of personal responsibility, the struggle against labour fluctuation, the organisation of the supply of labour power for the growing needs of industry, the continued improvement of the social and housing conditions of the workers, the maintenance and consolidation of the principle of economic working, the decentralisation of the great economic organisations in order to strengthen their vital connections with the factories, the development of a more practical leadership of the work of the factories, the continuation and development of the work for the training of proletarian technicians, and an alteration of the general attitude to the engineers and technicians of the old school, including greater attention to their needs and more attention to their welfare, resulting in closer co-operation with them and in an increase of their initiative.

The third and decisive year of the Five-Year Plan has thus achieved successes which represent the creation of a new and powerful technical basis for the reconstruction of heavy industry. The problem of the basic capital of socialist industry must be regarded as solved. This will make possible

a further tremendous development in the heavy industries and also the development of the light and food industries. The development of the production of agricultural machinery, the building of new power stations and the organisation of a powerful chemical industry will provide a new technical basis for the further development and mechanisation of agriculture.

The XVII. Party Conference records that the policy of socialist industrialisation proclaimed by the XIV. Party Congress and confirmed and developed by the XV. and XVI. Party Congresses for the building of the basis of a socialist economic system and the economic independence of the Soviet Union has been carried out with tremendous success. This success was made possible by the unswerving carrying out of the general line of the Party under the leadership of its leninist Central Committee and by the crushing of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and the Right-opportunists.

II.

The Chief Weaknesses of Industry.

Despite all the great achievements already enumerated, the 1931 plan was not carried out completely both with regard to quality and quantity.

The chief reasons for this were:

1. The transport deficiencies in the first quarter of 1931 which hampered the speedy development of industry;
2. The deficiencies in industry itself, and in particular deficiencies in the organisation of labour power (above all the lack of personal responsibility), levelling tendencies in the wage system, deficiencies in the plan work in the factories, and in the technical leadership of the industrial work. These deficiencies prevented the complete carrying out of the plan with regard to the productivity of labour and the costs of production;
3. The bureaucracy in the work of the leading economic organisations and the lack of practical touch with the factories; a lack of practical leadership on the part of the economic organisations;
4. The insufficient application of the principle of economic management;
5. The insufficient control of the actual carrying out of the tasks set.

The Conference is of the opinion that the main forces of the Party and of the working class must now be concentrated on securing the abolition of these deficiencies in order to secure the complete carrying out of the 1932 plan and in order to utilise to a greater extent than was the case in 1931 the great possibilities offered to industry by a socialist economic system.

III.

The 1932 Plan and its Chief Tasks.

The total value of production for 1932 is set at 37.5 milliard roubles. The costs of production are to be reduced by 7 percent. The industrial working class (including those workers engaged in the building industry) must be increased by 1,200,000 persons. Wages in industry as a whole must increase by 11 percent and wages in the building industry by 5.6 percent. The productivity of labour is to be increased by 22 percent.

Capital investments—which depend directly on the quantity and quality of production—in industry as a whole will total, together with the recent supplementary estimates, 12 milliard roubles. 9.2 milliard roubles will be invested in the heavy industries.

The main task of the economic programme for 1932 as a whole is the carrying out of the production and building programme in the iron foundry industry, the mining industry and the engineering industry.

1. In this connection the first and **basic task** of the industrial plan is to overcome under all circumstances the leeway in the **iron foundry industry**, to increase the production of pig-iron in 1932 to a total of 9 million tons, to increase the production of steel to 9.5 million tons, the production of rolled-iron to 6.7 million tons, the production of special high-quality steel to 676,000 tons. The production of high-quality steel is of special importance in connection with the powerful development of the automobile and tractor industries and other branches of the engineering industry.

The production and building programme in the foundry industry can only be carried out if all productive possibilities are utilised, including raw material supplies, the energy and

knowledge of the workers, the services of the technical and economic experts, etc.

The Party Conference stresses in particular that one of the most important technical tasks of the foundry industry in 1932 is to supply the blast furnaces with the necessary raw materials. The carrying out of this task is directly dependent on the coking and iron-ore industries. The coal-mining and coking industries must secure an improvement in the quality of the supplies delivered to the iron foundries in 1932. Every superfluous percentage of slack and sulphur in the coal and coke causes a deterioration in the work of the blast furnaces, burdens the railways unnecessarily and means great losses for the economic system as a whole.

In particular the conference draws attention to the fact that an improvement in the activity of the fire-brick industry is necessary. In 1932 the fire-brick industry must not only carry out its programme to the full, but must also attain a quality level which is not inferior to the quality of the imported fire-bricks. This refers both to the special brick-fields and to the corresponding departments of the foundries.

The conference also draws the attention of all railway workers to the necessity of extreme care and exactness with regard to the transport of supplies for the foundry industry both with regard to the main supplies of raw materials (ore, coke, and flux), and to the supplies of supplementary material (magnesite, fire-bricks and raw materials for the fire-brick factories). In 1932 the work of the railways must guarantee such a reserve of ore and coke that uninterrupted production can be guaranteed in the foundry industry. In particular, the Krivoi Rog Basin must be freed of the tremendous congestion of ore supplies in the shortest possible space of time and these supplies must be delivered to the foundries.

2. The **second important** task which must be performed if the industrial plan for 1932 is to be carried out successfully is the **increase of the production of coal to 90 million tons** and the **production of 13.4 million tons of coke**. This programme must be carried out as follows:

a) All mining areas must concentrate on developing from a partial mechanisation of production to the combined mechanisation of all processes; hand labour must be replaced by mechanical processes first of all in the heavier kinds of work, coal cutting, the loading of the moving belt, the supporting of the shafts, etc.;

b) The speeding up of the work of developing the pits by the application of mechanical means and new technical processes;

c) The securing of a decisive advance in the quality of the coal produced; and

d) The securing of a decided improvement in the housing, cultural and other living conditions of the miners, the formation of permanent cadres, and the abolition of seasonal work on this basis.

In order to secure a reduction in the demand for fuel which has to be transported over long distances, the conference recommends the Council of People's Commissars and in particular the People's Commissariat for the Heavy Industries, and also the local Party organisations to pay particular attention to the development of local fuel resources, for instance, the development of the coal supplies in the neighbourhood of Moscow, in Cheremchovo, in the Far East and in Fergana, further the soft coal resources in Ukraine and in the Urals, the coal resources in Borovitchi, the local resources of peat, slate, etc.

The rapid increase of the automobile and tractor park in the Soviet Union demands a corresponding development of the production and refining of **oils**, the continued development of the petroleum industry, the adoption of deep-level borings, an increase of prospecting work and above all the complete carrying out of the 1932 programme.

3. The **third important task** of the industrial plan is the further development of the **engineering industry** in order that the carrying out of the capital investment provided for by the economic plan can be done with soviet machinery, whereby the programme for the production of locomotives and other railway rolling stock, and the production of mechanical equipment for the foundry and coal-mining industries must be considered as one of the shock tasks.

With this end in view it is necessary to speed up the work for the completion and opening up of the Ural and Kramatorskaya factories for the manufacture of heavy machinery, the Siberian works for the manufacture of mining

equipment, the Lugansk locomotive works, and the Nizhni-Tagil rolling stock works.

The successful progress of the industrialisation of the Soviet Union, the transformation of agriculture, the growth of the towns and the formation of new industrial centres, and the rise of the material and cultural level of the working masses all put new and ever increasing demands on the development of the various branches of the soviet economic system which serve agriculture, the towns and the cultural and material needs of the working masses. Therefore the People's Commissariat for Heavy Industry must pay particular attention in 1932 to the development of those branches of the engineering industry which serve agriculture in all its forms, the light industries, the timber and paper industries, the food industries, municipal construction, and the building of undertakings serving the material and cultural needs of the working masses.

One of the most important tasks of 1932 must be the introduction of new technological methods in all branches of the engineering industry with a view to securing the greatest possible utilisation of the existing machinery, the reduction of the amount of material needed per unit of production, and the increase of the quality of production.

With a view to economising in the use of metal, construction must be revised in order to secure a reduction of weight. Superfluous supplies of material must be reduced, waste must be reduced in the moulding and forging departments, rivetting must be replaced as far as possible by welding, the number of rejected pieces must be reduced, waste products must be utilised to a greater extent, in short, everything must be done to secure a greater volume of production with the metals placed at the disposal of the engineering industry.

In order to secure the uninterrupted supply of the engineering industry with metal, special attention must be paid to securing the maximum utilisation and development of the **foundry departments** of the engineering works. With regard to the supply of fire-bricks these smaller foundry works must be treated in exactly the same fashion as the big foundries.

In order to secure the complete carrying out of the chief tasks of the economic plan for 1932, and in particular the task of speeding up development in the leading branches of heavy industry, the supply of energy must be extended still further. The electrical building programme for 1932 provides for new high level production in the big power stations, totalling 1.5 million kilowatt or the amount provided for in the total Goelro programme (Lenin's electrification plan). The main feature of the electrical plan for 1932 is the big increase of the power supplied by the hydro-electric stations and the big development of the thermic energy centres (about 0.5 million kilowatt from the hydro-electric stations and the building of 16 thermic energy centres with a total capacity of 800,000 kilowatt, of which 300,000 kilowatt will be attained in 1932). This programme must be carried out under all circumstances.

In this way the carrying out of the building programme in 1932 must produce a new and important impetus in the supply of electrical energy. The carrying out of this task raises in particular the question of the rapid development of a powerful electro-technical industry, the production of turbines and boilers, the production of other accessories and machinery for the equipment of complete aggregate works.

With regard to the **non-ferrous foundry industry and the chemical industry** upon which the completion of the tasks of a number of branches of industry are dependent, the conference draws the attention of the Party organisations, the workers, economists, engineers and technicians to the necessity of opening up the undertakings as quickly as possible which are now being built, and of mastering the technique of production as quickly as possible both in the undertakings already working and in those about to open up. The continued development of the non-ferrous foundry industry and of the chemical industry on a broad scale demands an all-round development of the corresponding branches of the engineering industry, and in particular the production of the special machinery and accessories which have previously been imported from abroad.

One of the most important tasks of the economic plan for 1932 is the securing of a great increase in the production of the manufacturing and food industries, far greater than was the case in 1931, the utilisation of all possibilities of securing raw materials, the development of the production of new forms of raw material, the rational utilisation of the raw materials and the improvement of the quality of production.

It is necessary to speed up the building of new meat factories, packing factories, sugar refineries, large-scale bakeries, etc. The building of textile combinations in Central Asia and Western Siberia must be completed and opened up according to plan. This will greatly further the work of reconstructing the technical basis of the food industry and of the manufacturing industries.

IV.

The Rational Organisation of Production.

The rational organisation of production is one of the most important preliminary conditions for the carrying out of the economic plan. The carrying out of the task set by the Party of securing an increase of industrial production of 36 percent, and to invest 12 milliard roubles, including 9.2 milliard roubles in the heavy industries, demands a great concentration of the strength of the Party, the working class, the engineers, technicians and economic organisations.

The greatest possible attention must be paid to the workings of the industrial undertakings already in operation and to the rational organisation of production in these undertakings, because the carrying out of the production programme of these undertakings is the absolutely necessary precondition for the successful continuation of the capital investment work. In 1932 hundreds of new or fundamentally reconstructed industrial undertakings will open up. These undertakings will be provided with the last word in technical equipment and will possess machinery of tremendous productive capacity. One of the most important organisational tasks in industry in 1932 is to attain the quickest possible mastery of the total capacity of these undertakings, to select the technical forces and the workers for these undertakings correctly and to distribute them correctly at the necessary points, to secure the correct organisation of the work of these undertakings as a whole, of every machine and of each department, and to secure the increase of the productivity of labour power both in the new and in the reconstructed undertakings.

The XVII. Party Conference considers the following measures necessary:

a) To make an end once and for all to the lack of personal responsibility. At every machine, at every point of production, a permanent responsibility for the working of the equipment etc., must be established. Further, the lack of responsibility with regard to repairs, waste material and the transference of processes from one department to the other and from one bench to the other must cease;

b) To make an end with all levelling tendencies in the wage system as these tendencies eliminate the line separating good from bad work;

c) To make technical standardisation the basis of the organisation of labour power and the inner-factory planning. The responsibility for technical standardisation must be borne by the directors, the technical directors, the departmental managers and the technicians;

d) To stress the importance of the role of the foremen and brigade instructors as the direct organisers of the labour process and as a result to supply them with the best possible material conditions for their work and to invest them with the necessary authority in their department and in the undertaking as a whole;

e) To pay the greatest possible attention to the welfare of the engineers and technicians both of the old and the new schools. To give engineers and technicians prominent and responsible jobs and to spur on their initiative in the opening up of new branches of production, in the investigation and introduction of new measures of industrial rationalisation with a view to economising in material, to improving the quality of production, to improving the organisation of production, etc.;

f) To consolidate the principle of economic working and the principle of strictly carrying out agreements made;

g) To see to it that the leaders of production are really closely bound up with their undertakings and provide practical leadership in every factory and department. To establish an exact control of the carrying out of the tasks set. To see to it that the leaders of production really master the technical, economic and financial side of their works.

The XVII. Party Conference approves of the decision of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. for the formation of a People's Commissariat for the Manufacturing Industries, of

a People's Commissariat for the Timber Trade and Forestry, and for the reorganisation of the Supreme Economic Council into the People's Commissariat for Heavy Industry.

V.

The Improvement of the Investment Work.

The conference is of the opinion that the following measures are necessary in order to secure the carrying out of the capital investment programme for 1932 and the opening up of the greatest possible number of new factories this year:

a) The concentration of material, financial and human resources on the most important building operations which can be opened up entirely or in part in 1932;

b) The abolition of the seasonal character of building operations and the organisation of permanent building operations throughout the year, whereby the experience of the big building organisations and of the growing cadres of permanent building workers in 1931 must be thoroughly utilised;

c) The preparation of the foundations, of the supplementary undertakings, and the careful working out of the plan for building activities as a whole;

d) The greatest possible application of mechanical means to building operations and the greatest possible utilisation of the mechanical equipment at the disposal of the building industry;

e) The all-round application and development of local supplies of building materials;

f) The rapid continuation of the work for the substitution of metals in building operations by timber and ferro-concrete;

g) The wider application of standardised building on the basis of those types which have shown themselves to be good;

h) The thorough introduction everywhere in the building industry of payment according to results and an intensification of the struggle against fluctuation.

In order to obtain the maximum productive capacity of new undertakings as quickly as possible after their opening up it is of first-rate importance, as shown by the experiences of 1931, that the preparations for opening up should be careful and thorough. To this end it is necessary:

a) To train the engineering and technical forces, the brigade instructors, and the workers for the new undertaking in good time;

b) To prepare the adjacent branches of production and the necessary supplies of raw material in good time;

c) To open up the individual departments whilst the other departments are still being fitted up without waiting for the final completion of the whole undertaking.

Special attention must be paid in 1932 to housing construction and to buildings for cultural and social requirements of the workers employed by the new undertakings, whereby local building materials must be used as far as possible and standard houses erected.

VI.

The Mechanisation of the Labour Process and the Improvement of the Quality of Production.

The XVII. Party Conference draws the attention of all Party and industrial organisations to the necessity of speeding up the application of mechanical means to all lengthy and heavy labour processes both in industrial production and in the building industry. This is particularly important in the mining industry, ore mining, lumbering, the foundry industry and transport, particularly loading and unloading.

The broadest possible application of mechanical means is necessary both for the carrying out of the production and building plans which demand the transport of tremendous loads of material and commodities, and for the replacement of human labour power in the heavy and dangerous labour processes.

The conference considers it necessary that the 1932 plan should provide for an increased supply of mechanical means, particularly by with regard to railway and motor transport, for the industries mentioned.

The rapid increase of the productivity of labour power must be made the basis of the whole further development of industry. This is quite possible by the introduction of new machinery and appliances. The very urgent necessity for the utilisation of all the internal resources of industry and of all hitherto hidden possibilities this year on the basis of technical reconstruction demands special attention to the question of quality. This attention must be paid both to economic questions (the costs of production, the productivity

of labour power, etc.) and to the technical questions (maximum utilisation of the capacity of the given machinery and equipment, maximum utilisation of the blast furnaces, the highest possible speed in technological processes, etc.) which form their material basis.

The absolutely necessary conditions for the improvement of the quality of production and the growth of inner-industrial accumulation are: the rationalisation and standardisation of production, the greatest possible economy in the issue of material, and in particular of material which is scarce, for instance, metals, the greatest possible utilisation of fuel per productive unit, the greatest possible application of auto-acetylene and electro-welding, the quickest and complete mastery of new technological processes, a rigorous campaign against all forms of waste and loss, and in particular the maintenance of good quality production in the foundry industry beginning with the quality of the ore used and ending with the finished product. These tasks make necessary a further development of the work for the mastery of technique on the basis of a closer co-operation between the economic scientific institutes and industry, and in particular on the basis of **the rapid development of the works and factory laboratories**, whereby special attention must be paid to this question in all new building projects. The work of the scientific institutes must not be permitted to remain within the walls of the laboratories, but it must establish the closest possible connection with the work in the factories and industrial undertakings. The work of the scientific industrial institutes must be concentrated in particular on the main tasks set by the economic plan for 1932. The attention of the technicians and economists must be concentrated in particular on the tasks presented by the technical leadership of their undertakings. The tasks set by the economic plan for 1932 can only be carried out if all these conditions are fulfilled.

VII.

The Problem of Trained Forces and Technical Propaganda.

The bolshevik rate of development being maintained in the technical reconstruction of the soviet economic system demands a tremendous increase in the supply of qualified labour power and in the technical forces for industry. This unparalleled rate of development and the consequent necessity for broad sections of the workers (including great masses of totally inexperienced workers), engineers and technicians to master new technological processes, make it necessary to **develop technical propaganda amongst the masses** as widely as possible, quite apart from the systematic work for training new technical and skilled forces for industry. The conference is compelled to point out that up to the present the economic organisations and the labour unions have not paid sufficient attention to this side of the problem. The conference considers it necessary that the 1932 economic plan shall include a scheme for widespread technical propaganda, and in particular the translation and publication of guides and technical explanatory literature for all branches of industry as a necessary material basis for this campaign.

The training of technical and skilled forces both numerically and qualitatively in accordance with the tremendous development of socialist industry is one of the most important preliminary conditions for the carrying out of the 1932 economic plan. This refers both to the normally skilled and to the highly-qualified technical forces, and also to these persons engaged in scientific industrial work, whereby special attention must be paid to the training of skilled forces for technical standardisation. It is necessary to secure an increased qualification for these trained forces and to improve the quality of the whole system of training. The highest engineering and technical forces in the Soviet Union must be up to the highest level of modern international industrial and scientific technique, whereby they must thoroughly master the special conditions of soviet production. The theoretical training given in the Technical High Schools must be accompanied by practical experience in the factories. In general, promotion to important administrative positions must be made dependent on a previous practical experience in the factory itself.

The conference recommends special attention to the development of the broadest possible public interest in scientific and technical problems beginning with the active workers in the factories (shock brigade members, worker

inventors and rationalisers, etc.) and ending with the scientific-technical associations. Only the development of such broad general interest together with the growth of socialist competition, the exchange of experiences, etc., can speed up the growth of the trained forces at the disposal of socialist industry on a mass scale. The task before us is the technical training of broad masses of the working class and the training of engineers and technicians who are really capable of responsible leadership on the basis of the most modern technical achievements.

The economic plan for 1932 demands the mobilisation of all the forces at the disposal of the Party and the working class and the further development of socialist competition and of the shock brigade movement as the most important lever for the carrying out of the plan.

The chief slogans of the counter-plan, of the shock brigade movement and the socialist competition in every factory in 1932 must be: **the greatest possible utilisation of all productive possibilities on the basis of the given supplies of material and with the greatest possible economy, the completest possible mobilisation of all forces and the best possible practical leadership, increased production and improved quality!**

The XVII. Party Conference expresses its firm conviction that the working class, the engineers, the economists and the technicians will follow the leadership of the Leninist Party under the leadership of its Central Committee and fulfil the great plan for 1932 and thus carry out the first Five-Year Plan in four years.

THE BALKANS

Greetings from the Balkan Committee of the National Revolutionary Organisations to the Croat National Revolutionary Group.

The Committee of the National Revolutionary Organisations of the Balkans sends warm brotherly greetings to the Croat National Revolutionary Group, which with its book: "The Way to the Emancipation of the Croat People" has decisively taken up the fight against the military-fascist dictatorship in Yugoslavia and all its confederates. The Croat National Revolutionary Group comes before the Croatian masses with its programme of ruthless and unrelenting fight for the emancipation of the Croat people. It ruthlessly exposes all attempts of the national opportunists and national fascists to deceive the Croatian masses and to hold them back from the consistent mass fight under the pretext that the League of Nations will emancipate the Croats, that Italy of Mussolini, Hungary of Horthy will afford the Croatian masses "support". The national revolutionary Croatian group calls upon the Croat masses to rely on their own strength, not to be misled, not to rely upon this or that imperialist Power, and not to seek their allies among the fascist bands of Michailov nor among the jailers of the Italian and Hungarian masses. The Croat national revolutionary group shows the masses who are their true friends, their disinterested and devoted allies, namely, the Macedonians, the Albanians in Kossovo, the Slovenians, Montenegrins and the other non-Servian nations, who like them are oppressed, tormented and plundered by the big Servian dictatorship, the working people of Servia itself, the oppressed nations of the whole of the Balkans, the enslaved colonial peoples, the international revolutionary proletariat and peasantry and their organisations, as well as the masses in the Soviet Union, the only country where there is no national oppression, the bulwark of the revolution of all oppressed.

The Committee of the national revolutionary organisations of the Balkans emphatically and indignantly repels the dirty attack made by the Pavleic-Percec people, who attempted in their paper the "Gric" to represent the brochure "The Way to the Emancipation of the Croatian people" as a "product of the agents of Belgrade under the Communist flag". The Pavleic people who are conscious agents of Italian fascism and of Horthy-Hungary, these same people who have fraternised with the Michailov band which terrorised the Macedonian masses—the same Pavleic people who deli-

berately wish to hand over the Croatian people to the worst reaction and slavery, are attempting by dirty slanders to confuse the Croatian masses and to stir up a pogrom mood against the courageous Croat fighters for freedom. They will not succeed in this attempt. The Croatian masses are sufficiently familiar with the hideous features of the fascists; they know who Mussolini, Horthy, Michailov, Pavleic and the other fascist heroes are.

The Committee of the National Revolutionary Organisations of the Balkans calls upon the broad masses of the Croatian people, to rally more closely round the Croat National Revolutionary Group, to launch the mass struggle in alliance with the proletariat and the other nationally oppressed masses in Yugoslavia and in the Balkans, and declares to them its complete solidarity in their fight for emancipation.

Up with the flag of the Croat national revolutionary emancipation struggle! Down with the big Servian dictatorship! Down with the national fascists, the allies of the enemies of the Croat struggle for independence! Down with the dirty slanderers!

Long live the Balkan Federation of free Republics of the Balkan people!

**Committee of the National Revolutionary Organisations
of the Balkans.**

February, 1932.

PROLETARIAN COMMEMORATION DAYS

The Red Army of Workers and Peasants.

The Red Army of Workers and Peasants was founded on the 23rd February 1918 and can thus look back on a history of fourteen years of activity in the cause of the proletarian revolution. The Red Army was forged in the fire of civil war and steered in the struggle against the counter-revolutionary white-guardist Generals and their followers and the troops of the various imperialist countries which tried to throttle the new born Soviet State which arose as a result of the October Revolution. The Red Army developed from the detachments of Red Guards formed by the revolutionary workers in St. Petersburg, Moscow and the other industrial areas, and from the irregular guerilla detachments in the rural areas. In February 1918 a Decree of the Soviet government formed the Red Army from these detachments.

The young Red Army was faced with tremendous military tasks. The white armies and the troops of the Entente pressed forward on all sides. The Polish troops occupied West White-Russia, the white armies held Ukraina, Siberia and the Far East supported by the Czechoslovakian Legion. Bessarabia was occupied by Rumanian troops and German and French troops were advancing from the West and the South. For four years the Red Army, poorly clothed and poorly equipped, fought against better clothed and better equipped troops, and was victorious. Gradually the Red Army pressed back its enemies. In the summer of 1918 the white troops suffered a smashing defeat on the Don and in Caucasia. A powerful British army was held in check in Archangel by weak Red Army detachments until reinforcements were available and the British were then compelled to evacuate the district. In the Urals and in Siberia the white troops were annihilated. At the beginning of 1919 a Red Army of 400,000 men faced white armies totalling 750,000 men. However, despite the numerical and technical superiority of the enemy the Red Army won victory after victory. But in the summer of 1919 the heart of revolutionary Russia, Moscow, was again threatened, this time by the troops of General Denikin. The first red cavalry army under the leadership of General Budionny was then formed and Denikin was decisively defeated. In the winter of 1919/20 the same fate befell Koltchak and Yudenitch. The Polish troops were driven helter-skelter out of Ukraina and pursued up to the gates of Warsaw. Lack of munition and other supplies brought the red drive to a halt and compelled the Soviet power to conclude a treaty of peace. The last armed conflicts took place in 1922 in the farthest corners of the great workers and peasants State against the remnants of the white guardist bands. And then came the demobilisation. The Red Army, which had swollen during the

course of the civil war to a strength of four million men, was reduced to a standing army of 500,000.

The chief task of the Red Army is the defence of the Soviet power and the defence of the socialist constructive work. The fundamental difference between the Red Army and the armies of the capitalist countries is very obvious. The armies of capitalism defend the system of capitalist exploitation and wage warfare in order to conquer new lands and enslave new peoples. The Red Army is the army of peace. The Soviet power does not organise wars; it conducts an unswerving policy of peace up to the uttermost limits. On innumerable occasions the imperialists have attempted to provoke the Soviet power into war. Soviet Ambassadors have been deliberately assassinated with this end in view, illegal raids have been made on the Soviet Embassies or trade missions in London, Berlin and Peking. These provocations have not yet ended. One of them is at present developing in Manchuria where the basis for an attack on the Soviet Union is being laid. In view of these facts it is the duty of the Red Army to be prepared for all eventualities. Every member of the Red Army is prepared to repulse the attacks of the imperialists at a moment's notice and this is the spirit which prevails throughout the Red Army.

The General Military Service Law in the Soviet Union places every able-bodied male citizen between the ages of 21 and 40 inclusive at the disposal of the government in case of need, but only workers, poor peasants and the employees of Soviet institutions have the right to bear arms. The other citizens are relieved from the necessity of military service by the payment of a special military tax, and in case of need they can be organised in special labour detachments. The officers corps of the Red Army now consists of a greater percentage of workers, poor peasants and a small percentage of former so-called brain-workers. Off duty there exists a spirit of friendliness and equality between officers and men.

A special characteristic of the Red Army is the work which is performed in it for the political enlightenment of its members. Each member of the Red Army is educated to independent thought and action. There is a special political administration in the Red Army. The higher commanders are for the most part members of the Communist Party, where this is not the case, the commander in question is given a political commissar to control his actions. Political training occupies an important place in the work of the Red Army. Big and modern libraries are to be found in all barracks. Political and educational meetings, amusements and film performances take place in the barracks. Every barracks has its wall-newspaper which is edited by the men and contributed to by them. These wall-newspapers contain criticisms of the officers where necessary and practical proposals for improvements on all fields. All military units have their Communist Party and Young Communist League groups. These groups are the standard bearers of the political work in the army whose aim it is to imbue every member of the Red Army with the firm conviction that the Red Army is the sharp weapon of the Workers and Peasants State and the armed forces of the world revolution.

The imperialist countries threaten the Soviet Union. The Red Army must therefore be constantly on the alert and steadily increase its fighting power. This is not merely a question for the higher command as it is in capitalist armies. In the Red Army the men themselves are organised in shock groups and in socialist competition with each other to increase their military knowledge and technical capacities. The capacity of the Red Army to deliver smashing blows with tremendous speed and efficiency was demonstrated in 1929 when Chinese Generals and white-guardist bands threatened the Far Eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union.

The revolutionary workers in the capitalist countries can support the Red Army most effectively by organising their own struggle in the factories, in the labour exchanges and in the rural districts, by fighting against the capitalist militarisation of the youth, by fighting against the compulsory labour schemes, by exposing as far as possible the secret military preparations of the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union, and by organising the revolutionary united front under the leadership of the Communist Parties and the Young Communist Leagues in all countries. The international proletariat must celebrate the fourteenth anniversary of the foundation of the Red Workers and Peasants Army of the Soviet Union in this spirit and in an intensified struggle for the overthrow of capitalism all over the world and the establishment of the workers and peasants power.

International Women's Day**Woman Labour Remuneration.**

By M. Bulle.

Not in a single capitalist country does equal pay for equal work regardless of sex exist. In all branches of industry, women workers are paid much less than men for the same work, including piece rates. In the capitalist countries wage rates are still fixed according to sex. The wage rate is either divided into two parts, with separate remuneration for man and woman labour, or a definite percentage is taken off the men's wages for women. For instance, in **Germany**, the following average weekly wage for men and women workers existed in December, 1930.

	Men's Wages	Women's Wages	
Chemical Industry	55.75 mark	26.40 mark	per week
Manufacture of Explosives	44.05 "	26.97 "	" " "
Artificial Silk	41.63 "	25.05 "	" " "
Metal Industry	53.61—39.19	25.58 "	" " "

Textile Industry:
(For September, 1930)

Spinners	39.14 mark	24.73 mark	per week
Weavers	40.94 "	29.57 "	" " "
Assistant Workers	31.80 "	22.06 "	" " "

In the chemical industry in Germany women are paid 55.1 per cent. of the men's wage, in the cardboard boxes industry 64 per cent. Towards the end of 1930, 5.3 per cent. of the men, and 34.1 per cent. of the women received a weekly wage of less than 18 marks.

There are similar conditions in the other capitalist countries. For instance, in **Austria**, the following wage rates were adopted for piece work in the Wienerberger Brick Works; for men 61 groschen, for women 42 groschen, for youths up to 17 years 35 groschen, for girls up to 18 years 27 groschen. Thus, women workers were paid 68 per cent. of the men's wage, and girls 78 per cent. of young male workers wages, while doing the same work.

In **Great Britain**, women's workers wages constitute on an average about 52 per cent. of the men's wages. For instance, in the cotton industry men are paid from 35 to 40 shillings a week and women from 25 to 28 shillings a week. The Lancashire Weavers Union is the only union that has succeeded in establishing equal pay for equal work regardless of sex. In all the other textile unions there is a difference between men's and women's pay. Not only day rates, but even piece rates are lower for women than for men. For instance, in Huddersfield, men cloth weavers were paid 30.8 shillings per piece, and women 26.5 shillings; men wool operative 28.5 shillings per piece and women 24.5 shillings.

In **France**, women workers in the metal industry are paid 60 to 70 per cent. of the men's wage, in the leather industry 65 to 70 per cent. and in the food industry 70 to 75 per cent.

In **Czechoslovakia**, women workers are paid 50 to 60 per cent. of the men's wage, in **Poland**, on an average 60 to 65 per cent.

In Eastern Countries—China, Japan, India, Indo-China and others—women workers are still paid from 1/3 to 1/2 of the men's wage.

In recent years, in connection with the economic crisis and general capitalist offensive against the standard of living of the working class, the difference between men's and women's wages is once more growing. Thus, for instance, in the textile industry in Germany women workers were paid in 1913-14 71 per cent. of the men's wage, in 1924-27 74 per cent., in 1929-30 70 per cent. On the lower Rhine men's wages were reduced by 5 per cent. in October 1931, women's wages by 25 per cent., and young workers wages by 35 per cent. In France the wages of men textile workers in Aive were reduced in April 1931 by 6 per cent., and those of the women workers by 8 per cent. In the **United States** men textile workers were paid in 1929 26 dollars a week, and women textile workers 18 dollars a week, and in 1930 the men's wage was 23 dollars and the

women's wage 14 dollars. Between January and December 1930 the weekly wage of men and women workers was reduced as follows (in dollars):

	January 1930		December 1930	
	Men's Wage	Women's Wage	Men's Wage	Women's Wage
Metal Industry	32.11	17.75	28.82	15.71
Chemical Industry	33.74	17.72	32.26	17.16
Paper Industry	29.45	16.02	25.94	13.28
Fur, Leather & Rubber Industry	28.53	16.76	24.87	14.95
Textile Industry	24.10	15.19	22.77	13.86

The employers' usual explanation of lower remuneration for woman labour is—that it is of lower quality, and therefore less valuable than man labour. This radically incorrect assertion is upheld by the social fascist trade union bureaucrats who furnish the anti-Marxist theoretical basis for the exploitation of woman labour. They assert that women workers cannot give their labour fully to the factory, and are therefore a less productive labour power, considering that they have household duties to perform.

When fixing men's wages, it was always taken into consideration that men must keep not only themselves but also their families; in regard to women workers, it was generally assumed that they only work for "pocket money". Life itself has shown the falseness of these assertions, millions of women workers are ruthlessly exploited in factories and works, application of woman labour is indissolubly connected with the development of large-scale capitalist economy. However, the Social Democratic trade unions stick to their Conservative point of view regarding women's "vocation"—to be housewives.

This is what is said on this subject in the resolution of the October session of the International Trade Union Committee of Women workers of the Amsterdam International in 1930:

"The trade Union movement is trying to obtain conditions of life and labour that will allow persons belonging to the working class to establish and maintain a family without married women being compelled by dire necessity to add to the earnings of their husbands through their own labour. The trade unions consider such conditions of life and labour essential for the proper development of the members of the family, and for the promotion of a happy family life."

Thus, Social Democrats openly defend women's "Right" to be housewives. **Lenin** at one time wrote:

"Women continue to be Domestic Slaves, despite laws for their emancipation, for Household Drudgery keeps them down and prevents their development, tying them to kitchen and nursery, wasting their labour in appallingly unproductive work that works on their nerves and hampers their mental development."

The Amsterdammers propose to women to devote themselves to housework "for the promotion of a happy family life". But they hypocritically add in the resolution: "But trade unions must refuse to have anything to do with struggle against married women's right to be wage earners, on the plea that this frequently destroys family life." The Social Democrats who are clever agents of the capitalists, by dividing the proletariat according to sex, by setting woman labour against man labour, and single women's labour against married women's, are trying to bring confusion and dissension into the ranks of the proletariat, disorganise the offensive of the working class, and divert women workers from the struggle against the employers and the capitalist state.

The different attitude of the capitalist society and state to the education and bringing up of boys and girls, to their training for professional activity created at one time

inequality between men and women in the labour market, because women did not have the necessary training and, physically, were frequently weaker than men. However, if these circumstances played a certain role in the first period of the development of capitalism, in the subsequent period when technique rapidly developed, new machines were introduced, including lately the conveyer system, when rationalisation set in, the arguments regarding the lower value of woman labour have lost all meaning. The inconsistency of these arguments is vividly illustrated by the difference in the piece rates for man and woman labour, **women workers being paid considerably less than men for the same quantity and quality of work.**

Women workers' low wages, which for an enormous number of women are lower than the minimum of existence, and under-feeding—the result of this state of affairs—wear out the women workers' organism, are the cause of sickness and mortality, and lower the general standard of living of the working class. The question of women workers wages is a general question of the revolutionary Labour movement, the demand of equal pay for equal work is one of the main demands of the Communist Party and the Red Trade Unions.

Only in one country in the world—the Soviet Union—women employed in industry and peasant women in the collective farms have become full fledged members of the large family of workers. In the Soviet Union women workers do not only get equal pay for equal work, for all the measures of the Soviet power—the establishment of a broad network of children's institutions, the organisation of public feeding, of social and cultural services—aim at freeing women in the factories and collective farms from household drudgery that “degrades and hampers mental development” (Lenin). In the U.S.S.R., women workers and collectivised peasant women take an active part in the administration of the State, in leadership over Party, economic and trade union work. Class consciousness and Labour enthusiasm are strongly developed among the emancipated women workers and collectivised peasant women of the U.S.S.R.; in 1931 the percentage of women workers participating in Socialist competition and shock brigade work was higher than men's. Through the example set in the U.S.S.R. where Labour has become “a matter of honour, glory, prowess and heroism” (Stalin), the working women of all countries are becoming convinced that full emancipation of women and woman labour is possible only through the overthrow of the capitalist order.

Women's Work in the Red Clothing Worker's Union in England.

By S. Lipson.

The **United Clothing Workers Union** was formed out of a struggle that involved 750 women employed at the firm of **Rego of London**, in October 1929. These women who had never been in a union before, fought a splendid battle for 13 weeks against the employers and reformist leaders of the Tailors and Garment Workers Union. Despite the fact that the officials of that union did in no way support the strike, the women fought on until they won under the leadership of the Clothing Workers Minority Movement Group, with the help of the Communist Party.

After the strike the leaders of the T. & G. W. started to expell from the union our most active members and leaders of the strike. The members then realised that the T. & G. W. was no longer an organisation for the workers, but rather an organisation for the employers, and that the time had arrived when they should organise themselves under a real workers leadership. They had seen by then that the **Minority Movement and Communist Party** was their friend and leader, and it was under the leadership of these comrades that the U. C. W. U. was formed.

Although the clothing industry employs 85 per cent women workers, it was not until the red union was formed that the question of **equal pay for equal work** was discussed, and it was finally agreed to embody this demand in the programme for clothing workers. It is now a good and very

popular slogan amongst the women in the clothing industry. For the first time in the history of the clothing workers a committee for work among women was formed. Our main task is outside the largest factories in London. Also very good social work was done. This social work has helped the clothing union to get in contact with many workers. The women's committee of the union has helped to develop women from the factory who have since held leading positions in the union and some joined the Communist Party.

The work has not always been easy. It was necessary in many cases to fight against the idea that recruiting women in the union was only the work of the women. The women's committee always demanded that the work among women be embodied in the general work of the union, and that **special women's demands** should be fought for by the union as a whole. A few months ago we were told by the leadership of the union that the women's committee was too small, that we should at least have hundred women on the committee by now. This would result in forming a separate women's section and a separation of women's work from the general work, a splitting of the union into sections on the basis of sex, therefore, the working women fought this idea of forming women's sections most energetically.

Experience has taught us that as long as the working class is split into women and men, there will always be something to split hairs about among the workers, always bringing about this division of the proletariat according to sex, to divert the workers and working women from the class struggle. A united front of working men and women against the common enemy, the employers and their lackeys, is our task.

PRESS REVIEWS

“Soviet Russia Today”, February, 1932.

By A. Bosse.

The American section of the Friends of the Soviet Union has begun the publication of a monthly magazine of the first issue of which 15,000 copies were printed and sold. The American Workers' Delegation to the 14th Anniversary Celebration last November promised the Soviet workers that by the 15th anniversary the magazine the F.S.U. were preparing to publish would have a circulation of 100,000, becoming a mighty voice in the mobilisation of the American workers, farmers and intelligentsia for the defence of the Workers' and Peasants' Fatherland. The reception accorded the first issue favours the realisation of this goal, and the F.S.U. proceeding on this basis, are preparing to print 25,000 already of the second issue.

With the danger of war against the Soviet Union more imminent than at any other time since the international intervention of 1918-22—the American press talks frankly of a Japanese attack upon North Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, and Siberia in the spring, and the American and European imperialists and their Balkan and Baltic tools prepare feverishly for it—the workers of the United States must be organised by an immediate and militant mobilisation. The new magazine can be one of the most potent factors in this campaign.

The issue opens with a tribute to Lenin by Max Bedacht, of the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A., and a declaration of the purpose of the magazine and the aims of the F.S.U. It also contains a review by Karl Radek of General Graves' book, “America's Siberian Adventure”; a statement by the Workers' Delegation on their impressions of the U.S.S.R.; letters from the Leningrad “Red Putilov” plant to the steel workers in the U.S. and from the Gorlovka coal miners to the Kentucky miners; a comparison of workers' conditions in the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. by A. A. Heller; an account of a visit to a Red Army Camp, by M. Epstein; etc.

The magazine is fully illustrated and constitutes a good beginning; it will help to increase the interest of the American workers in the Soviet Union and promote the building up of a powerful F.O.S.U.