

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 14 No. 18

PRESS

19th March 1934

CORRESPONDENCE

The XIII Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International

Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Kuusinen, Pieck and Pollitt

Comrade Bela Kun

The struggles of the Hungarian working class, especially its strike movements, have reached their highest point this year since 1925. There has been a constant strike wave since February of this year, showing a continuous upward line. It began with a strike movement in the less important branches of industry (leather goods workers, needle trades workers), which had for some time had an organised opposition under Communist leadership. The strike movement extended to the larger textile factories, it involved the three largest metal factories in Budapest, and finally developed into a general strike of the Budapest building workers, in which 10,000 building workers of all kinds participated. The special significance of these strike movements is that almost all of them were launched by the revolutionary trade union opposition and that the formation of this revolutionary trade union movement is the result of a change in the mass work of our Party and the trade unions.

That this turn in the trade union work has been carried out to an inadequate extent is seen by the fact that the trade union oppositions were not in a position to conduct right to the end the strike movements which they launched. Notwithstanding this, we must record the important fact that in some cases, e.g., the general bakers' strike in Budapest, the strikes were organised in such a way that the trade union opposition succeeded in capturing the leadership of the local group of the trade union and in this way succeeded in breaking the resistance of the trade union bureaucracy for some time.

The revival of the Party and mass work is also seen in the fact that the social democracy was pushed out of its positions in some important sections of the working class, e.g., in some important metal factories and partly also among the building workers.

Big shortcomings can still be seen in the field of the political work of the Party. Up to the present we have not yet been in a position to utilise unemployment, the crisis of Hungarian fascism and its consequences in town and country for the launching of mass actions. The condition of the Party, after it had been undermined by police provocations for a period of more than

three years, is responsible for the fact that the Party's activities are still more agitational than organisational. In our agitational work we can record a few not unimportant successes since the Twelfth Plenum. The illegal central organ of the Party has recently been appearing regularly in the country. There is also an illegal paper for functionaries, as well as the central organ of the Red Aid. Leaflets are issued in relatively large numbers and at a rapid rate during all strike movements.

From the point of view of fighting for legal possibilities and utilising them, the revolutionary trade union oppositions occupy first place. But the leading organisational role of the Party in these oppositional trade union movements is still very inadequate.

The Communist groups, local organisations in the villages (the number of which is so large that this year 800 to 1,000 peasants were arrested in one district alone on account of Communist agitation) are loosely or not at all connected with the Central Com-

CONTENTS

	Page
Speech of Comrade Bela Kun	453
Speech of Comrade Chemodanov (Y.C.I.)	458
Speech of Comrade Reimann (Czechoslovakia)	461
Speech of Comrade Gallacher (England)	463
Speech of Comrade Kreevels	464
Speech of Comrade Heckert (Germany)	466
Speech of Comrade Kristiansen (Norway)	469
Speech of Comrade Henrikovski (Poland)	470
Speech of Comrade Grosse (Y.C.I., Germany)	471
Speech of Comrade Capek (Czechoslovakia)	472
Speech of Comrade Losovsky (C. Fraction, R.L.L.U.)	474
Speech of Comrade Michal (Y.C.I., Czechoslovakia)	476
Speech of Comrade Stassova	477
Speech of Comrade Humbert-Droz (Switzerland)	478

mittee of the Party. It is one of the most important tasks of the Party to bring these numerous revolutionary organisations in the villages under its firm leadership.

The anti-fascist agitation of the Party, particularly after the events in Germany, attained particular breadth and popularity. There were no vacillations in our ranks in appraising the tactics of the Communist Party of Germany, and the Party leadership immediately replied in a legal pamphlet to the slanders of the social-democratic party of Hungary and the Second International directed against our Communist Party in Germany and energetically opposed the liquidationist conclusions drawn from the German events, both in the illegal as well as in the legal press.

Hitherto our struggle against Hungarian nationalist incitement as well as against the Trianon peace treaty and for the right to self-determination of the various persecuted and oppressed Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia has still been too weak to offset the nationalist demagogy of Hungarian fascism and the war preparations which it is carrying through under the slogan of the revision of the peace treaty. That is also the reason why the nationalist war incitement of the Goemboes government has not sufficiently been combated up to the present.

Our Czech comrades assisted us very ably when the Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia were deprived of the right to use their language, an action which the Hungarian social democrats have supported. Comrades from the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia boldly came out against their bourgeoisie in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. This common struggle of the C.P.Cz. and the C.P. of Hungary must become an important part of the struggle against the preparations for an imperialist war in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The Communist Parties of Rumania and Yugoslavia should also participate in this struggle.

But the successes which have been attained up to the present are not sufficient to permit us to speak of having completely overcome the crisis in the Party within the past few years. But one thing is already clear: almost all those who for years participated in the fractional struggles within our Party are to-day aware that it was just these fractional struggles which opened wide the door to the provocations of the police which had such a devastating effect upon our Party. The realisation of this fact is one of the most important guarantees that the unity of the Party is steered, that a firm Party leadership is being forged, that the Party cadres are being filled with sound young elements, that the wounds of the Party are being healed, and that the Party is rapidly marching forward with confident strides upon the broad path of mass work to the second invincible Soviet Republic of Hungary.

The complete unanimity even in the smallest questions of the revolutionary workers' movement at the present important historical turning point is a remarkable symptom of the unshakeable unity of the Communist International in contrast to the ideological and political disintegration of the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals. This complete unanimity is no less important in the question of the main tasks of the political moment, as it is determined by the draft thesis—in the question that we must prepare for the decisive struggles. The draft thesis says:—

"The chief slogan of the Communist International in this struggle is Soviet Power!"

The question arises: with this do we simply repeat our old tried slogan which we have propagated for years or do we put it forward in a new way, linked up with new obligations for all Communists in the struggle for the realisation of this slogan?

I think the latter is the case. But we now put forward this slogan as the slogan for widespread agitation, as an organising and stimulating slogan for political mass actions, for political strikes, which must form the introduction to these struggles for power. We put forward the slogan against the two forms of the bourgeois dictatorship—against fascism as well as against the bankrupt system of parliamentary democracy. We put forward this slogan as the slogan of a new, higher stage in the development of the crisis and the revolution, in which—as the draft thesis says—"a change can set in at any moment which will mean the conversion of the economic crisis into a revolutionary crisis."

This peculiarity in the estimation of the situation and the determination of the main task must be emphasised all the more as the social democracy, in order to demobilise the working class after Hitler's advent to power, incessantly proclaims that a new

epoch has set in—the period of the counter-revolution, the epoch of fascism.

A few Communists, such as Comrade Heinz Neumann and Remmele, as well as a few conciliators who do not want openly to acknowledge their views, and also Comrade Richard Schueller in Austria, have also allowed their hearts to drop into their boots. They are all, of course, for the Soviet Power, but they are of the opinion that the working class is defeated for years now, and must at present be on the defensive, and then, of course, there can be no question of a struggle for the Soviet Power. But such a recognition of the slogan of Soviet Power is synonymous with the recognition of the revolution in words and preventing revolutionary struggle in fact. We must remind such Communists of Lenin's words:—

"The Third Communist International has been founded precisely in order to deprive the 'socialists' of the possibility of discharging their duty to the revolution by simply acknowledging it in words."

Directly before the beginning of our Plenum, Mussolini declared the following in a speech to the national council of the corporations:—

"We have now reached the point where, if the government were to go to sleep for twenty-four hours, this interval would suffice to bring about a catastrophe. That is the crisis of the capitalist system in its universal significance." ("Arbeiter Zeitung," 16-11-38.)

In such a situation the Paris Conference of the Second International attempted to put the working class on the defensive! That means nothing less than altogether abandoning the struggle against capitalism and surrendering the working class to the class enemy.

The struggle for the Soviet Power—the main slogan of the present moment and the directives for the preparation of the working class for the decisive struggles for power—therefore arises out of a situation which the most faithful defenders of capitalism cannot characterise otherwise than the "crisis of the capitalist system in its universal significance."

Of course it does not follow from this that the dictatorship of the proletariat of necessity succeeds the overthrow of fascism.

We all agree with the thesis that fascism must be replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. But this is not to be proved theoretically, but, on the contrary, through practical mass struggles under the leadership of the Communist Party for the overthrow of fascism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Against the "theory" that only the dictatorship of the proletariat can "without fail" follow the overthrow of fascism—which in essence is a theory of passivity—we must specially emphasise that it depends upon us, upon the work of the Communist Parties, upon our influence on the masses, as to when the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie will be replaced by the rule of the working class in the given objective situation. Only our practical activity can supply the final proof.

The bankruptcy of the reformist tactic of the "lesser evil" has again been shown before wide masses of the workers by what has taken place in Germany. It is our task to make this proof the common property of still broader masses. The dissolution of the Second and of the Amsterdam Internationals has begun. The shattering of the hegemony of the social democratic parties has already set in in a number of countries (primarily Germany, Poland, Bulgaria). There are a number of signs which show that the shaking of the hegemony of reformism in the working class is commencing in a number of countries, in the first place in Greece and Rumania, but also in some of the most important political and industrial centres of other countries as, for instance, Paris.

Of course social democracy is not yet dead in these countries. Some comrades, who would like to take the whole thing too lightly, are of the opinion that the fascists have disposed of the social democracy in Germany, that the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals no longer exist. But the bourgeoisie will not take this duty off our shoulders. It will still require determined revolutionary enlightenment and organisational work, which does not shrink before any difficulties, and not least of all in the trade unions, before we will have annihilated the social democratic parties and uprooted their ideology among the majority of the working class. This is now seen in the fact that in some countries social democracy is still advancing. I have in mind such countries where the bourgeoisie, notwithstanding the intense economic crisis,

is still able to keep a small section of the labour aristocracy out of their colonial profits (England, Holland), out of the Versailles spoils (France), out of the supplies of war materials (Sweden, Czechoslovakia) and as a result of their special position in world economy (Switzerland, Norway) and to maintain the social basis of reformism.

However, these social democratic parties have also received considerable support as a result of the mistakes and omissions of our Parties, above all through the fact that after Hitler's advent to power they neglected immediately to utilise the international significance of the lessons to be drawn from the German events and in that way proceed to an attack against social democracy in their countries. This international significance of the lessons of the German events consists in the fact that they have revealed the role of social democracy as preparing the path for fascism in the clearest possible manner, and plainly proved to the masses that the parliamentary democratic republic is fertile soil for fascism.

In all countries the crisis has further considerably narrowed the social basis of reformism, of social fascism and is continuing to narrow it. In these countries it also depends upon us to push the social democracy back upon its contracted social basis, upon the labour aristocracy and certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie. Clear revolutionary principled tactics, free from opportunism and sectarianism, seems to be the first prerequisite for such a successful struggle.

The correctness of the revolutionary tactic of the Communist International has been confirmed by a series of events of historical significance. These are the following:—

(1) The heroic struggles of the C.P.G. under the Hitler dictatorship. These struggles show that only the Communist Party is capable of fighting against fascism. The conditions of the Party also proves that a Communist Party, once it has become a genuine mass Party, does not lose its mass character even under the conditions of the most brutal fascist terror.

(2) The development of Soviet China as the leader of the struggles for social and national liberation throughout China and as a factor of international politics. The example of Soviet China shows that the Soviets are the only organisations in which the struggle for liberation, not only of the proletariat, but of all the toilers, can be conducted to the end.

(3) The attitude of the Communist Party of Japan during the war of the Japanese imperialists, which shows that the Communists not only want to fight against imperialist war, but that they are also really capable of fighting against it in a genuine revolutionary and self-sacrificing manner.

(4) The most important is the new victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which has not only achieved recognition by powerful American imperialism, but also compelled the Second International not only to mask its deadly enmity before its members by means of a few platonic resolutions regarding the defence of the Soviet Union, but in many instances to acknowledge that the dictatorship of the proletariat has made the construction of socialism possible in the Soviet Union.

The contradiction between social democracy and Communism has not become slighter but, on the contrary, the abyss between us and them has become wider and deeper since the victory of fascism in Germany. The sentiments which Comrades Guttman and Reimann and also Comrade Richard Schueller express, behind which is hidden the attempt to revise the thesis about the social democracy as the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, these attempts to reconcile Communism with social democracy which are both "being persecuted by fascism," must be opposed by us with the following words of Comrade Stalin:—

"Principles may either triumph or fail, but they cannot be reconciled."

Either there is to be regulated capitalism according to the Roosevelt prescription, as the social democrats now programmatically demand in a number of countries, or the overthrow of capitalism by the Soviet Power.

In Germany there should either be the tactics, as Otto Bauer proposes: Learn and wait until fascism collapses of itself and then back to bankrupt parliamentary bourgeois democracy, or a day-to-day struggle against fascism, as is taking place under the leadership of the C.P.G. and, as is stated in the programme for the struggle for national and social liberation, "Not back to the Weimar democracy, but forward to Soviet Power"

Either the way is to be prepared for fascism in a reactionary

united front with the bourgeoisie, or the grave for capitalism is to be dug by the proletarian revolution. That is the dire necessity of history—for principles cannot be reconciled.

Hence there arises our attitude on the question of the united front in the period of preparing for the struggles for the Soviet Power.

When the Second International replied in its press to our letter of March, 1933, on the question of united action against fascism and the capitalist offensive, for the support of the German proletariat by stating that the Communist International had made a "belated turn" to the united front, then this coming from the deadly enemy of revolutionary unity, from the disrupter of the working class, cannot be characterised as anything else than one of its usual lies. If some Communists were of the opinion that with this letter the C.I. had changed its "old policy," then they spread social democratic conceptions in our ranks.

The tactic of the united front is a programmatic demand of the Communist International. As our programme states, it is, was and will be our tactic during the entire period of the struggles for power. We must and shall continue further to apply the tactic of the united front in the impending struggles for power and lead these struggles to victory. The triumph of fascism in Germany, however, showed the working class even better than the events of 1923 that the policy of a bloc with the social democracy, with Trotsky, Brandler, the leaders of the I.L.P., is not a united front policy for the revolution, but is the policy of a reactionary united front with the bourgeoisie, a social democratic policy.

But we must win over the oppositionally-minded social democratic workers by patient enlightenment work, firmly based on our principles, consolidate our influence upon them through the organisation of united front actions and draw them over to our side.

During the period of the struggles for power the united front tactic also remains the most important method for mobilising the masses. But it is an opportunist denial of the united front tactics if one does not recognise that it is intended to overcome the split of the working class, by showing the masses of the workers through enlightening them in the course of the struggle that there are only two fighting camps in the class struggle: one camp which defends the interests and the life of capitalism—the social democracy also belong here—and the camp which wants to overthrow capitalism, capitalist private property, under the leadership of the Communist Party.

We must remember our old illness. We have correct strategy, but often fail in working out our tactics. In other words: we often replace our tactics for a definite stage of the class struggle by the daily reiteration of our general, fundamental or strategical slogans. Our art must consist in working out concrete methods for each separate country on the basis of the chief international task—the struggle for Soviet Power. Still there are fundamental viewpoints for the preparation of this first step and also for further steps for the decisive struggles for power, which are valid for all Parties and the most important of which I want to emphasise here.

The role of the daily struggle as the first step in bringing the masses into new positions in the struggle for the Soviet Power, is by no means diminished. In this connection we must clearly recognise three dangers in carrying out the decisions regarding preparations for the decisive struggles.

First, the danger of throwing the organisation of the daily struggles overboard. Secondly, the danger of the point of view which considers that the daily struggles will automatically develop into political mass struggles. Thirdly, a sort of theory of stages, which is of the opinion that the struggles for power can only be developed if the masses will go through all stages, all forms of the class struggle, just like climbing up the steps of a ladder until you get to the highest stage of the struggle. Every Party leadership must foresee all these Right and "Left" opportunist dangers and ruthlessly fight against them so that it will not have to pay dearly for mistakes and neglect.

A sharp turn in mass work is necessary in view of the fact that the slogan of the struggle for Soviet Power has been put forward as the main task. We must work among the masses to a much greater extent than we have done heretofore and concentrate our entire activity among the masses upon the aim of uniting the struggle of the masses against capitalism in the most varied directions and steeling and strengthening the desire of the working class for power through every action, through our entire agitation.

We are confronted with the problem: Can the Communist

Parties fulfil the task set by the Plenum—mobilise the broad working and toiling masses and lead them into the struggles for power, in view of the present condition of the Communist press and mass literature? No, we cannot do that.

The lack of real, concrete and direct leadership of the press through the Party bodies, leadership in the sense of the conditions for admittance to the Communist International, is expressed not only in the very bad distribution but also in the contents of the Party press.

The chief shortcoming in our Party press primarily consists in the inability to agitate for the correct Bolshevik policy in a way which will be understood by the broad masses, stimulate them to action, raise their self-confidence and awaken their desire for power. What is mostly lacking in the leadership of the press by the Party bodies is the contact of the press with the masses from the factories, with the unemployed, and we almost entirely lack contact with the petty bourgeois sections in town and country. Our press is not a mass workers' press, let alone a revolutionary people's press.

We have two extreme types, in our daily press. The first type is especially personified in the legal German press. This press, and no less the "Rote Fahne," was, and still is, at present under conditions of illegality, written in such language and made up in such a way as if the editorial board had only intended it for the initiated. The "Rote Fahne" was, and is, unsuitable for winning over new masses of social democratic and unorganised workers. Almost everything was self-evident to it: the class treachery of social democracy and of the trade union leaders, as well as the imperialist character of the League of Nations, or the complete Bolshevik attitude of even the newest and simplest Party member.

The opposite type is, in the first place, personified in the French "l'Humanité" and partly also in the Czechoslovakian press. The Party line is very often lost here in the popular tone of the paper.

I should like to say something about the struggle of the French Party press against the social democracy.

It would obviously be quite wrong to maintain that our Communist Party press in France does not conduct a struggle against the social democratic press. It can be said without exaggeration that "l'Humanité" sometimes deals the social fascists pretty heavy blows in a way which is understandable to the proletarian readers.

But what is missing—and that is the most important thing—is a systematic and day-to-day struggle against the social fascist hack writers, against the so-called arguments and against the sophism of Blum and Company.

We have taken the opportunity of comparing "Populaire" with "l'Humanité" from November 17 to November 2 of this year in order to ascertain precisely how this Communist polemic, which ought to be understandable to the simplest worker, is being carried on.

(1) During this period the most vital question was that of the budget estimates of the government which, as is known, meant a serious robbery of the government and municipal employees. The socialist party pretended to be the defender of the small and middle officials and is ostensibly against every tax upon their salaries. But in reality it could not hide the fact that it built up its counter-proposal only so as to help the bourgeoisie out of its tight corner, to balance its budget and to link up the adoption of such a budget with the plan of large public works, etc. In doing so, it tried to make a big show of the alleged positive construction work of its social fascist municipalities.

"l'Humanité," however, contented itself by quite generally pointing out that the social fascists are the enemies of the government employees, without concretely going into the details of their financial proposal, without exposing their municipal policy, which is hostile to the workers and at the same time unmasking their manoeuvre with the 40-hour week.

(2) Another question which is deeply agitating the masses of the French workers is the question of the direct negotiations which French imperialism is now commencing with Hitler. Blum and Co. are carrying on a sharp attack against this in the interest of French imperialism, and make use of the opportunity by pretending to be friends of the Soviet Union. In this connection they emphatically referred to the decisions of the Executive Bureau of the Second International at its recent meeting in Zurich which completely endorsed their attitude. They polemised against some of the Right and radical papers that are in favour of negotiations with Hitler. Behind the scenes they are staging a new campaign of in-

citement against the Soviet Union and the Communist International: they attack the Soviet Union under the pretext that instead of relying upon real forces, namely, the social democratic parties, the Soviet Union is bargaining with the imperialist diplomats and is splitting the working class.

"l'Humanité" did not reveal before the social democratic workers the real reasons why Blum and Vievart now try to appear as friends of the Soviet Union, why they are against direct negotiations with Hitler. Not a word in "l'Humanité" about this, not a word about the fact that the Second International endorses the standpoint of French social democracy and that proves that it is in the service of French imperialism.

(3) "l'Humanité" also did not make use of the opportunity provided by the Spanish elections to show up to the French social democratic workers in a penetrating manner the experiences resulting from the participation in the government of the Spanish social fascists and it contented itself with a few sentences about the treachery of social democracy, which did not say anything, while Rosenfeld himself in the "Populaire" had painfully to acknowledge even on the eve of the Spanish elections that the coalition partnership would bury the Spanish social democracy.

(4) The split of the socialist party must of course now occupy the centre of attention in the day-to-day attacks which we must make against the social fascists. Among other things, it should also be a main task of "l'Humanité" to come forward as the champion against the neo-socialists and expose before the broad masses their platform which only differs from that of Blum and Paul Fauré by being a different deceptive manoeuvre, and in doing this naturally concentrating the fire against Leon Blum, Paul Fauré and Co. The editorial board of "l'Humanité," however, thought that it could carry through this task with a few witty comments which, of course, can be very amusing for the Communist reader, but cannot find their way to the heart and mind of the social democratic worker. We cannot learn from "l'Humanité" what is taking place in the various federations of the social democratic party, but "l'Humanité" ought to give this information in order to arm the socialist workers against the official Party leadership. It really cannot be maintained that "l'Humanité" comes forward as the organiser of the discontented socialist workers, which helps the social democratic masses that are becoming radicalised to leave the old rotten house of French social democracy and come over to the side of Communism. Convincing, friendly controversy with the social democratic workers who belong to the "Action Socialiste" group, is entirely lacking.

As far as the popularisation of the Soviet Union in the entire Communist press is concerned, we must state here that there are two types of mistakes:—

First, very little is in general being written about the Soviet Union. Our Communist press does not satisfy the requirements of the working class to learn from the experiences of the Soviet Union, the victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and facts from life in the Soviet Union. Most of the time the reader is unable to get a co-ordinated picture of the Soviet Union on the basis of concrete facts. The Soviet Union is written about more in a campaign manner, and even then without utilising the lessons of the class struggle in the Soviet Union, the experiences of Soviet democracy, and without sufficiently contrasting all this with the condition of the toilers in their own country.

The second mistake in the propaganda which is carried on in our press for the Soviet Union consists in the fact that the so-called "delicate" questions of the social democratic press and its agitation are not being replied to. These are questions which in reality are only "delicate" because our own editors do not understand them. These are questions as to why the Soviet Union is maintaining diplomatic relations with fascist countries, why the Red Army was not on the march after Hitler came to power, why we fight against the piece-work system in capitalist countries while we are working for it in the Soviet Union, the question of the differentiation of wage levels in the Soviet Union, etc.

The Communist press cannot fulfil the tasks which confront it if it does not daily popularise the great example of the mighty Soviet Union, if it does not teach the masses every day on the basis of these examples, how the possession of the State power in the hands of the working class basically alters the entire mode of existence of all the toilers.

The language used by the Communist press and in the mass literature is thesis language, and just the opposite of simple

language. In order to be able to fulfil our great tasks we must have a press which is a genuine mass press, a people's press, which the workers not only read but consider and defend as their own organ for which they also write. This must be a press which understands how to destroy the demagoguery of social fascism, nationalism, fascism and pacifism with strong arguments, convince the readers of the correctness of revolutionary tactics and which as a result of its contents and its language will find its way to the reader in the factories, the unemployed workers as well as all toiling sections of the population. The prerequisite for this is the struggle for a correct Bolshevik Party line in the press, which up to the present has not been carried through perfectly by any paper. The second thing is the reflection of all sides of the daily life of the toiling masses. That also applies to our mass literature. To give good arguments, to stir up people, to talk to the masses—that is the task of the periodical and non-periodical press in our agitation against fascism. That is the way to awaken the will to power among the broadest sections of the working class.

If we understand the change in the volume of our work that is necessary in preparing for the struggles for power among the masses, if we speak about extending our mass influence to millions, we must place the problem of work among the youth quite differently from what it has been heretofore.

The winning of the youth is not the special work of the Young Communist Leagues—it is the most important task of the entire Party and mass work. It is a question of showing that the post-war generation which grew up under the conditions of the war, the general crisis of capitalism, and in a number of countries the more or less open civil war, forms such an enormous part of the population and lives under such particular conditions that winning them over has become a vital question for the revolution.

The relation of the number of people between 15 to 30 years of age to the people from 30 to 60 years of age best shows the participation and the importance of the youth and the post-war generation in the various countries.

In France there are ten million people between the ages of 15 to 30 for every 15½ million between the ages of 30 and 60. The older generation predominate here by one third. The same thing applies to Great Britain and the U.S.A. In Italy, on the other hand, the older generation predominates to a much lesser extent. In Hungary and Japan they are about even, whereas in Poland the number of people between 15 and 30 years of age has already exceeded those between the ages of 30 and 60 by 200,000. In Germany there are 17 million people between the ages of 15 to 30 for every 22.5 million between 30 and 60 years of age. And finally I want to give the figures for the Soviet Union: In the European territories there are 24 million people between the ages of 15 and 30 for every 22 million between the ages of 30 and 60. **The young generation here is absolutely in the foreground.**

This generation of the war and the general crisis of capitalism grew up under entirely different social conditions than the pre-war generation. This generation did not participate in the war. This generation only knows the crisis, only knows moribund capitalism, its conditions of life have always been more miserable than the conditions known before the war. It would therefore be a denial of Marxism not to recognise that this generation represents another type in the working class and among the toilers than that of the pre-war generation. The bourgeoisie has very correctly recognised this. Before the war, the schools were primarily the chief places for the anti-social education of the youth. But now it is the compulsory organisations and the social organisations of the youth that have first place in this regard. The anti-Bolshevik, nationalist military training of the youth is being carried through in these places.

The organisations such as the Hitler Youth, Balilla, Giovanni Fascista, and others, are for the most part compulsory organisations in which a large mass of young people participate who are either hostile to the organisations or neutral to it. We must particularly emphasise this in order to eradicate the sectarian attitude towards these organisations which exists not only in the Young Communist Leagues but also in the Parties.

The best Communist Parties have already recognised the significance and importance of the youth problem for the revolution. In the Soviet Union the great successes in the training for socialist labour, for the defence of the socialist fatherland, have been achieved because the Party of the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, recognised the importance of the war and

post-war generation of the youth in good time and in its complete scope.

The C.P. of China owes its great success in large part to a similar recognition that this generation is of decisive importance and can furnish the most courageous and faithful fighters not only in the Red Army but in all sections of the front in the class struggle.

Training for war and against Bolshevism—that is the idea of the feverish educational, agitational and organisational work of the bourgeoisie (the fascist as well as the democratic bourgeoisie), among the broad sections of the post-war generations of the toilers, who are the chief victims of impoverishment in capitalist society and of past and future wars. According to bourgeois sources of information, there are 800,000 young people in Germany, who are without shelter and are tramps. Innumerable hundreds of thousands and millions of young people have no opportunity to work at a trade. The bourgeoisie is making considerable sections of the toiling youth into lumpen proletarians, so as to be able to make use of them against the revolution.

We must ask: what do these young people require? To make use of an expression which is widely used among the youth: they require a place in life, perspectives and outlook. They need the opportunity for vocational training, a place in the process of production, they require shelter, food and clothing. The problem of the 30 year old workers is the main care of the bourgeoisie in a number of countries. The 40 year old workers are being thrown out of the factories, but the workers under 30 are not being taken on. There is a similar picture as far as the offices and institutions are concerned. Apart from the real apparatus of force of the bourgeois state, we can see nothing but reductions everywhere. There is no perspective for improvement, no future. The chaos which is breaking out in the general crisis of capitalism and the whole social situation only leaves a gloomy picture for the youth. But that is by no means all. The entire literature of the youth and about the youth shows that never before has the meaning of life been pondered over as much as it is to-day. The statistics of the League of Nations show that over ten million suicides have taken place since the war—mostly young people.

What is there to live for? What is there to fight for?

That is at present no longer only the subject of the philosophising of a small decadent section and of a group of philosophers—these questions are vital problems for millions of young people in the epoch of moribund capitalism. The problem of an outlook on life has become a practical question for the post-war generation.

By using these facts as a starting point, we must deal with the problem of the post-war generation in our day to day work. There can be no struggles for power, let alone successful struggles, unless we have clearly answered these three problems: a place in life, the future, and an outlook for the youth. All these problems point beyond the boundaries of capitalism.

If we see young people supporting the fascist movement, we find that they primarily do so on account of anti-capitalist sentiments. If young people form the advance guard in the fighting formations of fascism, then they do so—with the exception of the sections of the lumpen proletariat—because they are convinced that fascism assures an improvement in their situation. If young people tolerate the domination of out and out social democratic and reformist trade union bureaucrats over their organisation, then they do so because they have a confused idea and the deceiving hope that the social democracy will somehow, some time, despite everything, offer them a future in socialism. If young people fall victims to the national socialist warmongers, then that occurs because in their despair they think that it is better to make a horrible end to everything rather than suffer horrors without end.

If masses of young people fall victims to religion, the myth about the nation, mysticisms in all its forms and sectarianism, then they do so because they hope to find in them the meaning of everything that seems so meaningless to them in capitalist society.

Leadership of the daily struggles of the youth, perspectives for an upsurge of the youth under the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet Power, and our Marxist-Leninist outlook, that is what we must give the post-war generation, all the young workers and toilers.

If for reasons of so-called "practical" policy, anyone should

happen to think that the problem of an outlook and giving this outlook to the youth is a secondary problem, indeed even an academic problem, he should note that the underestimation of the significance of the problems of an outlook for the youth, particularly at present, during the crisis of all bourgeois ideologies, is due to the lack of understanding of life.

We have the most advanced theory, the only theory that can explain life in its entirety to the youth. We have tangible socialism realised in the Soviet Union which has assured the youth a marked improvement in their situation, which cannot be shown anywhere else in the history of the world. The history of the struggles of the Communist International and its sections shows the youth the ardour of the revolution. The example given by Dimitrov and Luetjens inspires hundreds of thousands of young people with enthusiasm. In the Storm detachment groups in Germany the youth is thinking of Comrade Dimitrov with profound reverence and high esteem. In our ranks most of the leaders of the Parties have come from the young generation of the working class. The best elements of the revolutionary youth are in our Young Communist International—all the prerequisites are at hand in order to satisfy the needs of the young generation, to show them the path to a place in life, to progress and to life, the meaning of which they do not first have to seek by brooding.

Comrade Chemodanov (Y.C.I.)

The economic crisis which for many years has been raging in the capitalist countries weighs most heavily upon the growing generation of the toiling masses. In the millions strong army of unemployed youth occupy a very important place and the number of unemployed youths is counted by the millions. This army of unemployed young workers shows a tendency to grow further more rapidly than the army of unemployed adult workers.

Within the last year or two of the economic crisis the unemployed youth in almost all capitalist countries have been taken off unemployment benefit. It is necessary to see in all clarity that among the young toilers of the capitalist countries a section of youth is constantly growing who have never done any work. Not only the workers' children and the children of the toiling peasants, but also the sons and daughters of the petty-bourgeoisie, of the so-called middle classes, and the formerly materially secure intellectuals are more and more having the ground cut from under their feet. The labour of the youth is paid lower, and the conditions of apprenticeship take on an ever more brutal character.

If we add to this that the youth in the reformist trade unions is deprived of all rights and that its interests are not defended in any way, not to speak about the peasant youth, which is subjected to the most cruel exploitation by landlords and usurers, and that the youth in most countries has been robbed of almost all political rights, then we receive a clear picture of the sufferings of the toiling youth.

The broad masses of the youth are being more and more drawn into the class struggle. Communist influence, which is constantly spreading in the working class, becomes stronger and stronger among the youth. Thus we see that most of all in the strike struggles, in the revolutionary actions of the unemployed and peasantry, in the revolutionary struggles of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, in the struggle against fascism in Germany, Poland and other countries, in the struggle against new imperialist wars, the youth play a very important role. The political activity of the youth is growing, having as its basis dissatisfaction with conditions and the attempt to find a way out of its situation. However, this activity has not yet assumed a sufficiently political character from a class point of view. The youth is now confronted with questions of vital importance and is seeking a reply to these questions. Because it does not always find an answer in the Communist Party and the Y.C.I. it is easily led astray by pseudo-radical slogans and phrases and by the chauvinistic and nationalist demagoguery of the fascists.

Nevertheless the bourgeoisie, faced with the growth of Communist influence among the youth and the growth of political activity of the young toilers, is compelled to revise all its methods and means of ideologically enslaving the youth and to seek stronger means under the present conditions of preparation for a new round of revolutions and war. Together with the bourgeoisie

We cannot adopt our decisions about the preparation of the working class for the decisive struggles for the Soviet Power without at the same time recognising that it is one of our most important and special tasks to win over the youth and to reconstruct our entire mass work for the purpose of winning over the post-war generation. Arising from this acknowledgment, I consider it to be necessary that the decisions of the December Plenum of the Young Communist International, which took place last year, and which contain practical measures for winning over the youth, should be considered as decisions of the Communist International. Only when these decisions will be jointly carried out by the Parties and the Young Communist Leagues, only then shall we be able to commence seriously to realise our main task by winning over the youth to the struggle for the Soviet Power.

Comrades, at the Third World Congress Lenin gave us the slogan: "To the Masses." If we will win these masses for the support of the most decisive, boundlessly brave revolutionary actions against imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, against the bourgeoisie, against capitalism, we shall, as an invincible mass Party, realise the slogan which we inscribed upon our banner fifteen years ago as a small group during the founding of the Communist International—Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Soviet Power! (Great applause.)

this is also being done by the social democracy, the main social support of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie has succeeded in creating a whole network of youth organisations based upon the various needs, interests and aspirations of the youth.

These organisations created by the bourgeoisie arrange their work in such a way that in form they cater for the interests of the youth, but in essence their aim is to train the youth for complete subordination to capital.

In Great Britain the bourgeois youth organisations have a membership of over seven million, our Young Communist League in Britain has only seven hundred members. In Germany, for example, before Hitler came to power, out of seven million youths, five million were members of bourgeois organisations. In Japan, the youth organisations of the military-fascist type have a membership of about five million. The same is true of the United States, and particularly of France, where special attention is devoted to activities among young women in industry, because French imperialism perfectly realises the role of women in industry, and especially in the hinterland during the coming war.

Millions of young workers are in the reformist, Christian and similar trade unions. The fact that the young workers are members of these organisations does not mean that they are isolated from the class struggle. Regardless of their affiliation to the bourgeois or reformist organisations, the youth take active part in strike struggles and in the revolutionary actions of the unemployed and peasantry.

The bourgeoisie more and more resorts to forcing the youth to join its organisations. At present it is no longer the individual political parties who lead these organisations, but the state apparatus. Only recently this applied only to Yugoslavia, where all young people up to 21 years of age were compelled to become members of a semi-military organisation of the "Sokol" type; to Hungary, where a similar organisation ("Levente") exists, and to Poland, where there exists the mass organisation "Strelak." But now this is becoming characteristic of many other countries.

In Germany the bourgeoisie began a long time ago to introduce forced labour for the youth. This was done with the direct support of German social democracy even before Hitler came to power, when several hundreds of thousands of youth were sent to forced labour camps. At present this form of forced labour is characteristic not only for Germany, but for the United States, where already several hundred thousand young workers are involved, and characteristic also for Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria, Great Britain and a number of other countries. An especially rapid development of compulsory labour has taken place in Germany after the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. The fascists hope in 1934 to bring into this scheme all the unemployed youth, including the students. This means nothing less than that fascism is trying by means of terror and compulsion to

strengthen the influence of finance capital among the youth, to train the youth in the spirit of chauvinism and nationalism and to prepare new cadres for the coming wars.

The same thing in essence is being carried out by the bourgeoisie in other countries, although some of our comrades do not always see this and do not understand that it is by no means a rule that the chauvinist and nationalist education of the youth must go along the model of German fascism.

The German bourgeoisie draws the youth into the Hitler youth organisations without liquidating the Christian youth organisation, which is a mass movement, led, to be sure, by Hitlerites, but taking in certain groups of youth who are not willing to join open fascist organisations.

In Italy there exists an organisation, the Dopolavoro, with over two million youth members. This organisation has about 18,000 sections, of which 3,000 are industrial units and include numerous apparently most divergent youth organisations. In adapting this Italian model of the fascist organisation of the youth to German conditions, the national socialists consider as their main task the establishment of a network of different youth organisations under the leadership and control of the state.

The social-fascist leaders have already in previous years tried at the Paris Congress of the Y.S.I. (Young Socialist International) to lead the growing political activity of the youth into opportunistic channels. They talked a lot about the fascist danger, capitalism and socialism. Friedrich Adler and others placed before the members of the Y.S.I. the task of finding a "middle road" between reformism and Bolshevism, and declared likewise in the most shameless manner that there was no difference between fascist and proletarian dictatorship. Nevertheless, the development of the class struggle has frustrated the social-fascist manoeuvres. The German members of the S.A.J. (Socialist Youth Organisation) could find no "middle road" and seceded as an organisation from the social democratic party of Germany.

The trend towards unity with the Communist youth in the struggle against fascism and war, as was shown by the Paris International Youth Congress, and the increasing distrust in their old leaders, are becoming more and more characteristic of the sentiments of the youth under social-fascist influence.

We see how the social democracy is resorting more and more to sham revolutionary phraseology and to "Left" manoeuvres, in order to keep the youth under its influence. A special role is played here, and this must be emphasised, by the so-called "Left" socialist youth organisations who join hands with the Trotskyists, who are now getting active in capitalist countries, and speak about the necessity of struggling for the proletarian dictatorship, about the establishment of new revolutionary (to be more exact, Centrist) parties, etc.

In the case of the Y.C.I. sections, as in the case of the C.I. sections, the discrepancy between the growing political influence and its organisational consolidation is characteristic.

The struggle of many sections of the Y.C.I., as, for example, those of China, Germany, Poland, Japan, Bulgaria, and a number of other countries, are accompanied by unprecedented revolutionary heroism and loyalty to the cause of the working class. The sections of the Y.C.I. still remain, as before, much smaller in membership than the Parties in many countries, and their role in political and social life is not sufficiently great. The mass work of our sections is still, as before, looked upon as a difficult task to perform.

If we were to put the following question: what place is occupied by work among the youth in the system of Party mass activities? the reply would have to be that this work is insignificant and is not in accordance with the sharpening class struggle.

At a time when the bourgeoisie, supported by social democracy, is carefully following the process taking place among the youth and is conducting activities among all sections of the youth, by adapting the form of its work to the needs of the youth, in most cases among us this work is entrusted to the Y.C.L. organisations. Whenever the youth question is discussed in the Party organisations, this discussion is always limited to the activities of the Y.C.L.

The Central Committee of the British Communist Party discussed the "problem" of 700 Y.C.L.ers, but we do not know of any cases of the C.C. C.P.G.B. discussing the tasks of work among those seven million youths who are members of bourgeois and reformist organisations. After the Twelfth Plenum, a Plenum of the Central Committee of the Y.C.L. of France was held. This

Plenum characterised the processes taking place among the tolling youth of France as processes based upon pessimism, disillusionment, tendencies towards suicide, etc. The Central Committee of the French Y.C.L. did not notice the growing political activity among the youth, the increasing tendencies for unity in the struggle for economic and political rights, and adopted a resolution in which the main task of the Y.C.L. is defined, not as the struggle for political and economic demands of the youth, but as the task of obtaining maximum possibilities for recreation and amusement. The resolution emphasised that the Y.C.L. must change its "gloomy face" and reorganise its work with a view of holding more balls, dances and other forms of recreation.

In November last year, after the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., a Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. took place. This Plenum did not take up the narrow question of the work of the Y.C.L., but took up the tasks of the Party in its work among the youth. Comrade Bedacht, a member of the Political Bureau of the American Party, was the reporter on this question, and the Political Bureau submitted a draft resolution on this question to the Plenum. Both in the report and in the draft resolution (which we learned was never published), the statement is made that the American proletarian youth, not seeing its road to riches, is becoming disillusioned and this disillusionment is the source of fascism and is the basis for preparing the youth for imperialist war. Here, again, emphasis is laid on the development of cultural work among the youth, and the resolution points out that the defence of the economic interests of the youth is not the task of the youth itself, but the task of specially created bodies within the Red trade unions.

These examples of a distortion of the Comintern line in the struggle for the youth and the failure to understand this line are not isolated cases.

The Y.C.L. organisations were quick to respond to the call of the Paris Congress, and achieved considerable results in uniting the youth in connection with the Paris Congress. But what help did the Y.C.L. receive in this work from the Party organisations? In the leadership of the Belgian Party the impression prevailed that the convening of this Youth Congress for struggle against fascism and war will not call forth enthusiasm among the Belgian youth, which in essence meant the abandonment of any active participation in preparation for this Congress.

In the Scandinavian countries the leadership of the Party organisations manifested an underestimation of the growth of the anti-imperialist movement of the youth and the necessity to lead this movement.

Comrade Thorez, in addressing the Eleventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I., said:—

"At the present moment bold efforts must be made by all Parties to help the Y.C.L. This task demands the work of the whole Party. We wholeheartedly agree with Comrade Chemodanov's slogan: 'Not one Party nucleus without a Y.C.L. nucleus alongside.' We have already taken certain measures on this question."

Three years have passed since this declaration was made by Thorez, but what do we see? The already small number of Y.C.L. units has shrunk even more.

Only recently the secretary of the Party organisation in St. Denis, Comrade Lepre, who works together with Comrade Doriot, in reply to a proposal of the local Y.C.L. regarding the intensification of the work among the factory youth, stated that it is time to stop talking about factory work, and if the Y.C.L. hopes to achieve anything it must base its work upon the local (residential) organisations. This comrade was not exposed before the Party and the League for sabotaging the line of the Comintern in the struggle for the working-class youth, just as the opportunistic underestimation of work among the youth expressed by Comrade Doriot at a recent meeting of the Party active was not exposed. Was it only Lepre who came out in France against the establishment of Y.C.L. factory nuclei alongside every Party nucleus? We must give Comrade Lepre credit for coming out openly. But the discrepancy between the number of Party nuclei in the factories and Y.C.L. nuclei shows that in many Party organisations there are people who vote for the line of the E.C.C.I., but in practice sabotage the carrying out of this line.

It is not accidental that during this year we have not been able to penetrate into the mass bourgeois and reformist youth organisations, or reconstruct our mass political activities and intensify our work, especially in forced labour camps.

Comrade Pieck, for example, in his report pointed out that the Y.C.L. is organising and successfully carrying out strikes in forced labour camps in Germany. This is correct. This fact will not be disputed by anyone, but we must openly state that the leadership of the German Communist Party has been very late in taking up this question of work among the youth in forced labour camps and that the underestimation of this work which was expressed by leading Y.C.L. functionaries at the December Plenum of the Y.C.I. did not meet with the necessary rebuke on the part of the Party leadership. However, we cannot say that the Party and Y.C.L. organisations in the U.S.A., Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Great Britain, where these forced labour camps will be rapidly developed within the next year, have as seriously taken up this work as the German Communist Party and the German Y.C.L. did.

We know, for example, that the leadership of the Italian Communist Party is seriously taking up the question of activities in bourgeois mass youth organisations, but there is lack of clarity on this question among the Italian comrades. This found expression first of all in the abstract slogan which was issued by the Party in its declaration that the "Dopolavoro" association (which is actually a fascist youth organisation) should be put under the control of the workers.

We know of cases where many Party and Y.C.L. organisations express their opportunism by being afraid to work among the masses and show their inability to organise mass work. All this is covered by statements that if the Y.C.L. goes to work inside the mass bourgeois organisations, then there is a danger that the members of the Y.C.L. themselves will be demoralised.

In speaking of these basic shortcomings in the Party mass work among the youth, we cannot help but point out that in the struggle for the economic interests of the working class conducted by the Communist Party and the Red trade unions, too little attention is paid to the interests of the young workers. The youth has been taking active part in strike struggles. Nevertheless a close examination of the economic demands advanced during recent strikes reveals first of all the fact that youth demands are very seldom advanced or are brought up only in a haphazard way, because the Party organisations do not advance them. Further, a careful examination of the propaganda and agitation of the Communist Party would reveal that very little attention is devoted to agitation work among the youth.

In emphasising the shortcomings of the Party mass work among the youth, I in no way wish to remove the political responsibility for this from the Communist youth organisations and from those of us who are active in the youth movement.

The Executive Committee of the Y.C.I. has repeatedly explained to many comrades that it is impermissible to put all the blame on the Parties and thus try to conceal their own political mistakes. Such explanations have been given in the course of our practical work. However, you must understand the difficulty confronting the Executive Committee of the Y.C.I. when, in the struggle against sectarian methods of work in Y.C.L. organisations, it comes face to face with opportunistic underestimation of work among the youth on the part of the Party organisations and a sectarian approach to this fundamental problem of class struggle.

Of course we cannot take off the political responsibility, for example, from our German Y.C.L. comrades for their not understanding the changed political situation and actually beginning organisationally and ideologically to strengthen the bankrupt socialist youth organisation by sending their comrades there and trying to establish an "opposition." They claimed that they were waiting for a chance to organise a split in this organisation, and stated with false pride that the only functioning young socialist organisations in Germany are those in which Y.C.L.ers are active. Of course, there is nothing wrong about our comrades working in the socialist youth organisation, but our task is not only to establish an opposition, but to win over to our side the working-class youth which is still under the influence of the social fascists. And that is the only reason for opposition work in the S.A.J.

Similarly, we cannot remove the political responsibility from the Y.C.L.ers in Czechoslovakia, who looked upon the establishment of the united front as an aim in itself, and in the course of the struggle for the united front they entirely concealed the face of the Y.C.L. The Czechoslovakian comrades completely abstained from any exposure of social fascism, and during the preparations

for the Paris Youth Congress they actually worked together with various reactionary organisations. It is precisely because of such facts that we must all the more sharply take up the question of Party leadership and control over the Y.C.L.

Comrade Stalin, in defining the tasks of the Y.C.L., emphasised that the most important and fundamental thing for the Y.C.L. is the education of the youth in the spirit of confidence in the Communist Party, because without such confidence it is impossible to educate the youth in the spirit of proletarian dictatorship, in the spirit of struggle for socialism. The Y.C.L. is not a Party organisation, but in essence it is a Communist revolutionary organisation.

The task of the Party organisations is continually to strengthen their leadership and proletarian influence in the Y.C.L. and to direct the everyday work and development of the Y.C.L. The successes of the Y.C.L. work are primarily the successes of the Communist Party.

It is precisely this correct approach to Party leadership in the Y.C.L. that made the Chinese Y.C.L. the shock brigade of the revolutionary movement in China, in the struggle against the bourgeoisie of its own country as well as against international imperialism. It is precisely the serious attention which the Party devoted to the work of the Y.C.L. in Poland that has made the Polish Y.C.L. one of the best sections of the Y.C.I., closely connected with the youth masses and actively helping the Party in its fight against fascism. It is precisely the extraordinary attention and help that the German Y.C.L. continuously received from Comrade Thaelmann and from the leadership of the German Party as a whole which liquidated the opportunist Remmele-Neumann group, which had succeeded in striking its roots in certain organisations of the German Y.C.L., thanks to the work of Mueller and others. This attention made it possible for the Y.C.L. to reorganise its work under conditions of open fascist dictatorship. However, the same is not true in regard to all Communist Parties and all Party organisations.

One of the basic methods of Party leadership of the Y.C.L. is the appointment of Party representatives to the Y.C.L. organisations and the strengthening of the Party membership within the Y.C.L. This method has been carried out only in the case of central and district organisations but not even in all districts. In the intermediate links of the organisations, and more so in the lower units, this directive on the appointment of Party representatives has not been carried out at all. The number of Y.C.L.ers who are at the same time members of the Communist Party, constitutes a very small percentage of the total Party membership. Of course we should not forget that members of the Y.C.L., particularly under conditions of illegality, while not being Party members, still carry on revolutionary activity. But it is also correct that we cannot look upon membership in the Party and membership in the Y.C.L. as one and the same thing. The recruiting of Y.C.L.ers into the Communist Party and through them effecting the leadership of the Party and organising Party influence in the Y.C.L. is one of the most important tasks confronting the Communist Parties.

For example, we should not approach the question of Party leadership in such a formal manner as has been the case in Switzerland. Here the Party leadership could not find a qualified candidate for the post of secretary of the Central Committee of the Y.C.L. within the Y.C.L. organisation itself and it appointed a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, who at the same time is secretary of the Basle Party organisation and editor of the Basle Party newspaper. This comrade works in Basle, whereas the Central Committee of the Young Communist League has its headquarters in Zurich.

We should not educate our membership as does the leadership of the French Communist Party. The French Y.C.L. has for many years been marking time and not making any headway. For a long time the leadership of the French Y.C.L. was in the hands of opportunists who had no contacts with the masses and no desire to fight for the line of the Comintern.

In consideration of the fact that the French Y.C.L., and especially its leadership, was going through a crisis in this matter, the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International placed before the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and also before the Central Committee of the Party, the question of the necessity of calling a special convention of the Y.C.L. The E.C.C.I. took up the matter and gave the Central Committee of the Party in France specific directions to organise

and develop in the Y.C.L. mass work in the light of Bolshevik self-criticism, in order to transform the methods and content of this mass work. The E.C.C.I. declared the question of calling a special convention of the Y.C.L. in France to be one of the first political tasks, through which the whole Party and mass work among the youth in France could be built up through the solidifying and strengthening of the Y.C.L.

How were these directives of the Comintern accepted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France? For a long time the Political Bureau of the Party put off the consideration of the directives about the calling of a special convention of the Y.C.L. from one session to another. And when they finally did get to it there began discussion along the line that the calling of the special convention was unnecessary, and that it would be done only as a matter of discipline.

This was a signal for the opportunists in the Y.C.L. and for those who had openly backed Charrière and against the calling of the special convention.

In July the Central Committee Plenum of the Y.C.L. of France was held. At this Plenum, in which Comrade Marty also took part, it was unanimously decided to convene the extraordinary Congress. In connection with that, the C.C. of the Y.C.L. of France prepared a special document, an open letter to all members of the Y.C.L. in which the tasks for the work of the Y.C.L. were explained in a politically correct manner.

Comrade Reimann (Czechoslovakia)

In his speech Comrade Gottwald correctly stated that the right opportunist views in our Party, which after the temporary victory of the Hitler dictatorship developed into direct capitulation before the class enemy, have formed an entire system which in practically all fundamental questions is contrary to the perspectives of the Communist International. That these tendencies were able to develop in our Party for such a long time without meeting with decisive resistance from the very beginning, is due to the fact that the tremendous danger of "Right" opportunism was not sufficiently clearly understood. The error of such underestimation of tendencies towards the "Right" was especially sharply expressed in the activity of the central agitprop committee of the Party which, under my leadership, did not understand how to develop from the very beginning an ideological struggle against the "Right" opportunist deviations of Comrade Guttman and a few other comrades, which has led to the development of rotten liberalism towards the expressions of the "Right" danger and to the strengthening of "Right" opportunism itself.

The reason why this struggle over principles was not waged with all possible intensity from the very beginning is essentially to be sought in the "Right" opportunist estimation of the situation, in an inadequate understanding of the historical significance of the perspectives of the Twelfth Plenum regarding the end of capitalist stabilisation. The fact that during the transition to a new cycle of revolutions and wars a strengthening of the forces of the counter-revolution also sets in temporarily, that the offensive of the fascist bourgeoisie and of social fascism is being increased right up to the most brutal form of physical annihilation of the revolutionary vanguard, that simultaneously the ideological pressure of the bourgeoisie, of social fascism, is also growing; this all caused weak and vacillating elements in our ranks to submit to this onslaught of the class enemy. A lack of understanding of this root of "Right" opportunism, the underestimation of its role in the present period, is at the same time the expression of the opportunist underestimation of the entire situation. In order to understand how it was that I did not succeed in developing the problem of the struggle against the views of Comrade Guttman with political sharpness from the very beginning, it is necessary that I should here also speak of the mistakes which I myself have made on some questions which Comrade Gottwald only touched upon.

These mistakes primarily refer to the underestimation of social democracy, especially in connection with the appeal of the Communist International in March for the formation of a proletarian united front. The incorrect understanding of this appeal which I also expressed in my entire position was approximately as follows:

The Party leadership had a number of copies made of this letter and sent them to all Party organisations. That was right.

But then how can one understand this, that Duclos and Raymond, who had actively helped in the liquidation of the weaknesses of the Y.C.L., who fought for its reorganisation in the spirit of the directives of the E.C.C.I., find only very weak support from the Party, while at the same time those who work against the line of the Comintern are handled by the Party leadership with liberal tolerance? We call on the French comrades themselves to answer these questions.

We are convinced that correct Party leadership and correct carrying out of Lenin's teachings on the role of the youth in the class war and the tasks of the Communist Parties in work among the youth will in a minimum time lead to overcoming the shortcomings in the mass work of the Communist Parties and youth organisations.

The extraordinary tenseness of the class struggle and the fact that we are approaching a new round of wars and revolutions places before us in all its sharpness the task of rallying the broad masses of youth for the struggle against fascism, against the preparation of new imperialist wars and counter-revolutionary attack against the U.S.S.R. We are going to fight for fulfilling this task under the leadership of the Communist International. (Prolonged applause)

At such a moment when the Communist International addresses itself to the social democratic leaders with such an appeal, it would be inexpedient prematurely and openly to attack social democracy with very sharp means. For tactical reasons it is now advisable to push criticism of social democracy somewhat into the background because the immediate, open attack, the immediate open disclosure of the counter-revolutionary policy of social democracy would make it more difficult for us to attract the social democratic workers to our side at the present time. From this opportunist view of the appeal of the Communist International, a whole chain of opportunist mistakes developed, the essence of which consisted in systematically covering up the role of social democracy. Instead of speaking of the counter-revolutionary policy of social democracy as a whole, we very often spoke only of the mistakes of the social democratic leaders. Criticism of social democracy as a whole was replaced by criticism of the leaders. In order to reveal this entirely erroneous tendency, I want to cite something from an article which I myself wrote on the German question at this time:—

"The more madly Hitler rages, the more rapidly will the social democratic workers recognise the mistakes which their leaders committed, the more rapidly will the democratic illusions which were an obstacle to revolutionary development disappear from their minds."

So we see that I here speak of the social democratic leaders and not of a counter-revolutionary policy. Further:—

"The Communist Party now has better possibilities than ever before to convince the social democratic workers of the necessity of unity and will all the more rapidly be able to overcome the influence of the social democratic leaders if these leaders continue their policy of sabotage in the struggle against fascism."

Thus we see that the question as to whether the social democrats will continue their counter-revolutionary policy is raised as a problem in this article and is not taken as a self-evident fact that the social democrats, even after Hitler's victory, could not carry on anything else but a counter-revolutionary policy.

These were actual mistakes in the whole appraisal of social democracy. The further development of these mistakes had to lead to a standpoint similar to that developed by all opportunist groups that have hitherto come out against the policy of the Comintern on the question of the social democracy.

These mistakes have further shown themselves in my speeches, among others, in connection with the attitude of Franzel, the social democrat. Shortly after the temporary victory of Hitler, Franzel

came out with an article in which he criticised the social democracy and its policy in the style of Otto Bauer. It stands to reason that this criticism was a "Left" social fascist swindling manoeuvre, the purpose of which was to deceive the workers with regard to the fact that the policy of the social democratic leaders in Czechoslovakia and the policy of the entire social democracy is the same counter-revolutionary policy.

How did I react to this swindling manoeuvre of Franzel? My reaction could be seen in an article in which I appraised Franzel's criticism of the social democratic party of Germany as a definite step forward by stating that Franzel of course does recognise the mistakes of social democracy but that he is not sufficiently consistent in his criticism of these mistakes. For if Franzel were consistent, then he would finally have to come to the same standpoint that we Communists have, namely, that the entire policy of social democracy is counter-revolutionary. Instead of showing up that here it was a question of a swindling manoeuvre of social democracy, a theory was set up that the "Left" social democratic leaders "criticised" the social democracy and the only thing is that they are not sufficiently consistent in their criticism. It is, of course, self-evident that such an estimation of "Left" social democracy is in entire contradiction to all the conceptions of the Communist International regarding the role of the "Left" social democracy. It must be stated very sharply and clearly that what I and a number of other comrades in Czechoslovakia have said and written regarding the problem of the "Left" social democracy, made it very much more difficult for the Party really to develop the struggle against the social democracy and to expose precisely the "Left" deceptive manoeuvres which have recently assumed very sharp forms. These great vacillations on the question of the estimation of social democracy have undoubtedly led to the fact that the struggle of the Party against the views of Comrade Guttman was weakened from the very beginning, and that the Party was not able really to conduct this struggle with energy from the very beginning. My responsibility in this question consists precisely in the fact that by participating in such mistakes I objectively supported Comrade Guttman's mistakes and hindered the development of the struggle.

All the fundamental elements of a whole "Right" opportunist system really exist in our Party. What does this consist of?

This consists of economism, and in connection with that the development of the theory of spontaneity and the undestimation of the leading role of the Party; obscuring the bourgeois class character of the social democratic policy; approaching the positions of petty bourgeois nationalism; the theory of an independent policy of the petty bourgeoisie. All these "Right" opportunist theories have been linked up in the Party with the falacious attitude on the most important central problem of the entire policy of the Communist International, the question of what happened in Germany.

I want to characterise here some of the essential features of this opportunist system. First, the question of the struggle for the Soviet Power, and the question of the leading role of the Party which is closely linked up with this. The main political slogan of the thesis of the Thirteenth Plenum is the struggle for Soviet power. This thesis emphasises the fact that only an ideologically united Communist Party which is linked up with the masses can solve the problems and the tasks of this struggle. The "Right" opportunism in our Party not only led to obscuring the leading role of our Party, but also at the same time led to obscuring the fundamental perspectives of the struggle for Soviet power. There are utterances in our Party press to the effect that the Communists are the only consistent democrats. Here it is not a question of an accidental deviation from the line but, on the contrary, it was the viewpoint of several comrades that the working class, especially the social democratic workers, cannot understand our revolutionary slogans. During the discussion of the Party document, in which the question of the proletarian dictatorship was raised, some comrades came forward with the proposal to replace the words "proletarian dictatorship" with the expression "proletarian democracy," as this terminology will be more understandable to the social democratic workers. Naturally, it was not a question here of intelligibility but a question of a tendency to cover up our fundamental slogan in the question of the Soviet power. Comrade Guttman proposed a special platform for winning over the oppositionally-minded social democratic workers in which the problem of the leading role of the

Communist Party for the proletarian dictatorship was to have been concealed.

It is quite clear what consequences the adoption of such a proposal would have had. It would have led to the fact that instead of splitting the social democratic workers away from their leaders, we ourselves would have undertaken the formation of a "Left" social democracy which was to keep back the workers from the revolutionary class struggle. But in my endeavours to polemise against this erroneous viewpoint, I myself made important, decisive mistakes. Along with other arguments which I stated, there was also the argument that the social democratic workers who are now coming close to Communism, cannot become Communists overnight. They need a certain process of development for this purpose. The first step in this process of development would be that the discontented social democratic workers would go over to the platform of the united front. The second step upon this road would be going over from the united front into the ranks of the Communist Party. In contrast to Guttman who placed the main emphasis upon the first step, drawing the social democratic workers into the united front, I declared that the decisive stage was the second step, the transference of the social democratic workers from the united front directly to the Communist Party.

The mistake here consists in the fact that these two processes, the social democratic workers going into the united front and their transference to the Communist Party, cannot be contrasted as two different stages. In the development of the proletarian united front, it is necessary correctly to raise the question of the revolutionary perspective and the question of breaking with the counter-revolutionary policy of the social democracy. The conception that the united front is a necessary stage of development in the process of winning over the social democratic workers, strengthened Guttman's viewpoint and he wanted to fix this transition stage in a special platform. In this way the tendency was strengthened not to win over the social democratic workers directly for the Communist Party but to rally them around the line of a "Left" social democratic mid-way platform.

The consideration that the social democratic masses of the workers still have a number of false views, in this way became the direct basis for avoiding the sharp placing of the problem by our Party with regard to the question of the struggle for the Soviet power which was systematically pushed into the background in our agitation among the social democratic workers.

I now come to the question of fascism. The thesis of the Thirteenth Plenum shows the character of fascism as the open dictatorship of the most reactionary chauvinist elements of finance-capital. Comrade Kuusinen has already mentioned here that in an article which appeared in the "Communist Review," our theoretical organ, which I edited, the fascist movement is represented as an independent movement of the petty bourgeoisie. It has quite clearly been shown at this Plenum that this theory is not only entirely wrong but that it actually of necessity strengthens all the conceptions of the "Left" social fascists, of the Trotskyites, the Brandlerites, etc., about the role of fascism. In this question it is also undoubtedly not a matter of a chance deviating from the path. The wrong estimation of the fascist movement in its entirety was an essential feature of right opportunism in the ranks of our Party. This was especially shown in dealing with the question of the character of the fascist movement in the German territories of Czechoslovakia. Comrade Guttman was of the opinion that on account of the national oppression in Czechoslovakia, the national revolutionary elements among the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie orientate themselves upon the Nazi movement because they regard it as the only party which conducts the struggle against national oppression. This attitude gave rise to the viewpoint that the national-socialist movement in Czechoslovakia is by no means an open fascist movement of the bourgeoisie, but that "national-revolutionary forces are dormant" within it. This mistake in the appraisal of fascism rests upon the wrong viewpoint that outside of the Communist Party, outside of the revolutionary working class movement, forces can be found which will lead a serious struggle for national liberation. This conception is equivalent to sacrificing proletarian internationalism and is capitulation to the nationalist, chauvinist tendencies of the petty-bourgeoisie. Only proletarian internationalism points the path to social and national liberation. Every other standpoint leads into the opportunist swamp of petty-

bourgeois nationalism. In this short speech I could only bring out part of the questions in which opportunist tendencies have developed within our Party. But I believe that even this short survey shows that it is here a question of an entire opportunist system. But I am convinced that our Party, which has grown in the struggle against deviations of all kinds, under the leadership of the Communist International, and which has already commenced within the past few months to combat these mistakes with determination,

under the leadership of the Central Committee, under the leadership of Comrade Gottwald, will within a short time be in a position to close its ranks still more firmly in the struggle against opportunism and successfully to solve the difficult problems which are confronting it in connection with the carrying out of the fascist dictatorship and the transition to illegality, bearing in mind the perspectives of the struggle for the revolutionary way out by winning over the majority of the working class.

Comrade Gallacher (England)

Comrade Piatnitsky dealt with some of our mistakes, and we are in agreement with this criticism, but we must say something more, especially in connection with the I.L.P. and the trade unions. It is true that even while the leaders of the I.L.P. were writing to the C.I. they were doing everything they could to break off the agreement with the C.P.

One group that has opposed association with the C.P. from the beginning, the group that quite openly worked for a return to the Labour Party, has as its leading national figures Paton, the national secretary, Campbell Stephen, and Buchanan, M.P. They are Scotsmen, with their base and influence in Glasgow.

But where does the break take place? In Glasgow? No. On the contrary, the agreement is more effectively carried out in Glasgow than elsewhere. The break took place in Lancashire. How, then, do we explain this difference?

In Glasgow, the leading role of the Party has been kept well to the front. In Lancashire, the Party is scarcely in evidence at all. This makes it easier for Sandham and Co. to break off the agreement in Lancashire. If the Party in Lancashire was out before the masses, leading them on all the important issues, then it would bring into this activity the best elements of the rank and file of the I.L.P., and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for Sandham to carry out this action.

In South Wales, as well as in all other parts of the country, there is more trade union work than ever before. But we are not bringing the Party into the trade union work. There is more trade union work, but not effective revolutionary trade union work, but the consequence is that the influence of Party comrades is continually increasing, as is evidenced by the positions they occupy—the vote for Arthur Horner is an outstanding example of the growing influence and the militancy of the masses.

But, in the face of this, the Party in the past period has actually declined in membership in South Wales.

In view of the tasks before the party, the fight against the new unemployment bill, against intervention and war and against fascism, the leading role of the Party—the revolutionary way out—must be hammered into the whole membership, and especially must we get the membership to understand the vital importance of work in the trade unions by correct revolutionary work in the trade unions.

The criticism made of the Party's failure to effectively expose the sabotaging manoeuvres of the leaders of the I.L.P., and the failure to popularise the letters of the C.I., especially the second letter, is correct. But here, again, care is necessary. The Derby Conference decided in favour of association with the C.I. The leaders of the I.L.P. endeavour to sabotage this decision. We should make a ruthless exposure of this and win the I.L.P. members for a struggle against the leadership.

The Derby Conference also decided on a break with the parliamentary traditions of the I.L.P. and for a new policy. It represented a break with the past traditions of the I.L.P.—a very confused break, but a break. Had we understood this, it would have given us an opportunity for a new drive into the I.L.P. and into those masses of workers who are under the influence of the I.L.P. We did not take advantage of this and we did not show to the members that the leadership would sabotage the attempt to break with parliamentarism, just as it would sabotage the attempt to get in touch with the C.I.

In each case these rank and file workers are trying to make a break with the leaders, trying to understand a revolutionary line, and in each case the leaders have sabotaged this.

Just a couple of words on the Y.C.L. and on the Y.C.I. I do not think the report we got to-night could be called an inspiring one. It stresses the weaknesses in the field, without bringing forward the efforts that are being made in the different Parties to develop the organisation. Of course, he says that in Britain we have had many discussions, but no practical work. I will tell the comrades one practical thing that we discussed. We discussed the question of "A Y.C.L. cell alongside every Party cell," as a task that could be carried out by the Party and the Y.C.L., and we abolished this slogan. To present this as the fighting slogan of the Y.C.L. is to play with the question. The fighting slogan of the Y.C.L. must be: "To the masses of the young workers."

When the Reichstag fire took place, and was followed by the letting loose of mass terror, our Party in Britain reacted very quickly. I can say here that the whole Party rallied immediately and took up the fight with greater energy than ever before on every front—support for the German Party, against fascism and war, against the national government and the social-fascist Labour party. In the discussions in the districts and at the Party centre it was clearly understood that the sharpening of the class struggle and the deepening of the crisis had forced the bourgeoisie to come together in this desperate attempt to hold back the proletarian revolution. It was clear to us all that the very desperateness of their measures, so far from solving anything, would immeasurably intensify the contradictions and hasten the process of the new period of wars and revolutions.

Nowhere in our Party was there any evidence of opposition to the Party and the C.I. line. Nowhere was there any pessimism expressed, as has been suggested about some of the sections and some of the other Parties. The Party as a whole is increasing its revolutionary understanding and revolutionary strength.

Comrade Kuusinen very correctly poses the question in his report when he deals with the rise of national socialism in Germany. He says there are two aspects: it hinders the revolution and, at the same time, accelerates it. But these are not separate and distinct processes. There is not a process of hindering and a process of acceleration, with the way in favour of the process of acceleration. The very process of hindering has the features that strengthen the process of acceleration.

But in many cases our comrades present the question of acceleration in such a way as to create the impression that the fascist coup has been a positive advantage to the revolutionary movement. I have seen tendencies myself of accepting the idea of spontaneity, fascist bankruptcy and automatic collapse, and the rising of the masses.

The social fascists, Trotskyists and other counter-revolutionaries very cunningly take up this incorrect presentation wherever they find it and use it to show that the Communists wanted and want the fascists to get power.

We must oppose this slander of the social democrats, these pace-makers of fascism, by explaining to the workers in the simplest and most effective way the two aspects of fascism—hindering and accelerating. I would like to have Comrade Kuusinen deal more in detail with this question in his concluding speech. (Applause.)

Comrade Kreevels

Comrades, it is now more in place than ever before to remember the resolution of the X Congress of the Bolshevik Party, written by Comrade Stalin and adopted at our Congress in 1924. In this resolution it is stated, *inter alia*—

"If private property and capital inevitably divide people, incite national hatred and increase national oppression, then collective property and labour just as inevitably bring people closer together, overcome national hatred and destroy national oppression. The existence of capitalism without national oppression is just as impossible as the existence of socialism without the liberation of oppressed nations, without national freedom. . . . Therefore the victory of the Soviets and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic condition for the destruction of national oppression, the establishment of national equality, the guarantee of the rights of national minorities."

Militant nationalism is a specific weapon of monopolist capital in the present peculiar circumstances of transition to a new cycle of wars and revolutions. Monopolist capital utilises the desperate ruin, produced by its rule, of the petty bourgeois sections of town and village in order to compel them to cling to "their" national capitalism. "National" capitalist autarchy for monopolist capital is nothing but a means of struggle for imperialist domination over the world. As for the petty bourgeois, he is not so much interested in world perspectives as in his lost job with good pay, his lost stores or workshops, his lost plot of land, his "good" master. But for this very reason, petty bourgeois nationalism and petty bourgeois desperation, owing to the historic laws of capitalism, is converted into a basis for the struggle of monopolist capital for dictatorship.

The leaders of the petty bourgeois sections have so far got rich by imperialist plunder, owing to the first imperialist war, and some of them made money also on inflation. They welcome the approach of a war situation, the prospect of war super profits and imperialist loot. The lower sections of the petty bourgeoisie are driven into the channel of the policy of monopolist capitalism not by reason but by prejudice. The leaders drag the rank and file behind them.

In Russia in 1918, the Mensheviks and S.R.'s organised the interventionist front under the slogan of "Struggle Against the Brest Peace Treaty and German Imperialism." The petty bourgeois rottenness of the position of the would-be "Left" Communists consisted precisely in the fact that they did not understand this, but in Russia at that time, in 1918, the split had gone too far for national speculation to make much capital out of it. Under the leadership of the Leninist Party, the working class succeeded in driving a wedge deeply enough between the bourgeoisie, with the leaders of the petty bourgeoisie, who support them, on the one hand, and the broad masses of workers and peasants. In order to be able to fight in a real Bolshevik manner against militant nationalism, we must put the task of struggle on the basis of the class struggle, on the basis of the concrete needs of this class struggle, the concrete conditions which we encounter everywhere.

We must state that militant nationalism is a weapon of struggle for a capitalist way out of the crisis to a new redivision of the world. Therefore, it is inseparable from colonial enslavement and the oppression of weak and dependent peoples.

It is inseparable from the fascist suppression of the national liberation struggles of dependent peoples who have been the victims of annexation. Even more than in 1914, a new imperialist war will result in the seizure not only of the backward countries but the re-division and annexation of industrially developed countries. In this sense, Hitler and Araki are the mentors of the whole bourgeois world.

Militant nationalism, at the present stage of the intensification and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, is distinguished by its clearly marked police character. We must give special emphasis to this side of the question. It is precisely on this side of the matter that we must intensify our struggle against chauvinism.

Every nationalism glorifies its own national advantages, the national advantages of its own fascist dictatorship, its own bourgeois dictatorship. This applies to all countries. France is the last trench of freedom. In England there is Baldwin-Mac-

Donald democracy, the only one of its like in the world. The same also applies with regard to German chauvinism.

Araki, the mouthpiece of Japanese imperialism, preaches an anti-Soviet Pan-Asiatism and is trying to ensure for himself the support of other imperialists. At the same time, he is trying to make Japan the decisive imperialist Power in the East at the expense of the other imperialists. The British die-hards are struggling against the danger of Bolshevism under the pretence of the defence and inviolability of the frontiers of their empire.

Through Shiva Rao, the British agent in India, Lansbury calls on the Indian youth to be quiet and to wait for the coming of a new Labour government. This is a purely pacifist "socialist" preparation for a counter-revolutionary struggle against the Soviet Union, because they have to reckon with the fact that if, for example, they have to send Indian sepoy into Middle Asia, these sepoy will compare the system which exists in our national Soviet Republics at present with the things which are done within the British Empire.

There is no doubt, comrades, that we have a number of favourable examples of the work of our Parties. The French Communist Party has skilfully linked up the question of the fascisation of the bourgeois regime in France with the brutal suppression of the revolutionary movement in Indo-China and with the events in Morocco. It did this very well. The American Communist Party put forward a correct slogan: "New Deal is Lynch Deal!" In the British "Daily Worker" there was a good cartoon—a British admiral crushing colonial slaves and saying to Hitler: "In practice we have applied this race theory for 100 years." This hits the mark and can be understood by every worker. We must undoubtedly mention the big successes, and I may say the exemplary successes of the C.P. Holland, which during the last two years has succeeded in developing its colonial work. The Japanese Party has given fine examples of struggle against nationalist frenzy and imperialist chauvinism. But, comrades, along with these favourable cases we may also mention unfavourable facts of this kind.

Comrade Gallacher, in an article in the "Daily Worker," on the question of the proposals which the social fascists of all countries were making regarding the boycott of goods from Germany, wrote:—

"The entire German press would use this (the joining of the U.S.S.R. to the anti-German boycott) for uniting the workers on the national front against the menace of Bolshevism and for a still greater terror against the revolutionary workers. Not war against Germany by carrying out the boycott, but war against fascism through the powerful forces of the German working class."

The struggle against fascism through the powerful forces of the German working class is a very good thing. And I ask you: What about the English workers? This article was written for English workers!

The chief thing has been forgotten. We know that in Denmark and Sweden the social democrats are in power, and they arrest and imprison the very sailors who refuse to unload steamers which fly the swastika, the fascist emblem. This is natural because all the noise which the Second International and the social fascists are making about this question was a link in a carefully thought-out plan of provocation, because it was connected with the fact that every social fascist party tried to help its bourgeoisie in spreading the popular slogan: "Buy British!" "Buy French!" "Buy Swedish!" etc.

The question of the boycott was not raised from the point of view of the international struggle of the working class, and the things which ought to have been said were not said.

Comrade Ferrat wrote an article in "l'Humanité." He is a good comrade and writes excellent articles, but what does he write about the boycott of Germany?

"The boycott of Germany by other European countries is a policy which rallies together the proletariat of two groups of countries around their own bourgeoisie, inciting chauvinist tendencies in both camps, making it inevitable to use other

means of struggle in the near future between these two imperialist groups. After the boycott there is no other means but war."

Well, comrades, is it only a question of chauvinist passions? The social fascists made no proposals to the Soviet Union and tried to serve their own bourgeoisie by means of the boycott. The latter is interested in the Soviet Union having as little as possible diplomatic relations in order to be able to squeeze higher profits out of the trade with the Soviet Union.

From what point of view should we have estimated this boycott? First of all as part of the policy of imperialism, as a component part of the economic struggle of the imperialists and of their attempts to mitigate their contradictions at the expense of the Soviet Union. It is precisely from this point of view that we should have approached the question.

Yes, if this boycott were not really a weapon of imperialist policy but a weapon of the working class struggle, a weapon of the revolutionary struggle, if it were based on a direct revolutionary situation in Germany itself, then the question of the boycott would be raised in a very different manner.

But at the present moment, in the present concrete conditions, it is a link in the policy of the imperialists against each other and in the policy of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R., and particularly the policy of the social fascists against Communist influence.

We must fight in such a manner that our enemies will abandon to shout every time the U.S.S.R. has achieved a diplomatic success, every time the peace policy of the socialist government is successful, that the U.S.S.R. has made a bargain with Hitler, that the U.S.S.R. is drawing near to Mussolini, etc.

The struggle against aggressive nationalism of the bourgeoisie must be concentrated on the following chief points:—

Chauvinism is not simply the hatred of mankind against which we must fight for humanitarian reasons. It is the militant reaction of capitalism. It drags peoples into a new imperialist slaughter and into the war against the U.S.S.R. in order to throw the burden of the bankruptcy of capitalism on to the shoulders of the oppressed and exploited, in order to compel the proletariat and the toilers in general to die for the sake of saving the super profits of capital, which cannot be secured without new plunder, in order that those who remain alive after the war, will be forced down almost to the level of colonial coolies.

I think that the polemic which is now being carried on by various groups of Conservatives and Liberals in England about what will happen to Lancashire in view of Japanese competition is very poorly and insufficiently utilised by our British comrades, though it gives excellent material for showing in the most practical way that the British workers who previously felt themselves to be aristocrats of labour are faced with the same fate as that of the Japanese workers, the Japanese coolies. They should be influenced by this idea every day and every hour, so as to give a real Bolshevik injection against imperialist nationalism. Either the hunt for slaves and the struggle for making fascism and parasitism a permanent state of affairs or the Soviet revolution—that is how to put the question.

The bourgeoisie have fastened the nation, i.e., the toilers and the exploited majority, to the chariot wheel of decaying capitalism. Hence the arguments: "War will give work!" and "Driving rivals to bankruptcy by war!"

The exposure of the background of the preparations for a new imperialist war, the exposure of those who profit by war, is very necessary for us at present. Not long ago the chairman of the British "Imperial Chemical Industries" went to China and Japan. You can read this in all the papers, except the Communist papers. However, arrangements are being made for gigantic supplies of poison gas, to the value of scores of millions, for the war against the U.S.S.R. and China.

You think that the British labourites are not making capital out of the struggle against armaments? They are. Lansbury said that "even bishops and some members of Parliament have shares in armament firms." And where will you find it written in a Communist paper or leaflet that when Lansbury talks about individual members of Parliament and bishops he is trying to conceal behind his elderly back the bourgeoisie as a class, which as a class wants to drag England into a world war.

The U.S.S.R. is the fatherland of the toilers of all countries! This slogan must be made concrete to suit the present conditions in various countries in direct contact with the struggle for the Soviet Revolution. The Soviet Union is the only country which pursues a constant and undeviating peace policy, and is an enemy of reaction, fascism and imperialism.

The U.S.S.R. is the embryo and foundation of the future unity of all nations in the world federation of Socialist Soviet Republics. It is the chief bulwark of the world proletariat and the colonial people. No international solidarity in connection with the struggle of two systems is possible without the recognition of the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the world proletariat. In all countries we must systematically and point by point place proletarian internationalism in opposition to the nationalism of monopolistic capital, which makes use of petty bourgeois nationalist illusions of despair: proletarian internationalism which in all countries fights for the Soviet revolution on the basis of a broadening and strengthening of the international revolutionary and proletarian unity.

Imperialism can only bring the nations closer together along the road of annexations and colonial exploitation, generally speaking, it is not even possible to imagine it without these. (Stalin—"Problems of Leninism.")

This A.B.C. of Marxism-Leninism, along with the explanation of how socialism in the Soviet Union draws the peoples nearer together and thereby gets rid of all the remaining economic and cultural inequalities, we must oppose to the imperialist nationalism of the social democracy, its pacifist phrases, its appeal to the League of Nations, etc.

"Against the war of the bankrupts of capitalism, for the transformation of this war into the Soviet Revolution which will make an end to capitalist rule along with military clashes between the nations and national slavery!" This basic thesis must be made an inseparable essential in our whole mass work. The attempt of social fascism to put the matter as though the possibility of a socialist revolution in this or that country depended on geographical factors, must be energetically refuted. The social democrats often base this thesis of theirs on the fact that the Soviet Union covers a sixth of the earth's land surface. But when Yudenich was six versts from Leningrad and Denikin had advanced to Tula, then the 'territorial basis' of the proletarian dictatorship served as an excuse for counter-revolutionary agitation of the Second International, with reference to the argument of the 'rapidly approaching collapse of Bolshevism.'

We must, above all, realise the things which Lenin said in his time against the Italian social democrats:—

"Revolutionaries and Communists must not deny the dangers and the difficulties of the struggle, in order to influence the masses to be firmer, to cleanse the Party from weak, hesitating and vacillating people, so as to permeate the whole movement with more enthusiasm, more internationalism, more readiness to sacrifice for the great aim—to accelerate the revolution in England, France and America, if these countries decide to blockade the proletarian Italian Soviet Republic."

The counter-revolutionary agent of the imperialist bourgeoisie, Trotsky, opposes the imperialist slogan of "The United States of Europe" to the unity of the proletariat for the defence of the Soviet bulwark of the proletarian revolution. He would like us to believe that the origin of the crisis is not only in the contradiction between the capitalistic form of ownership and the forces of production, but also is in another contradiction, that between the national territories as such and the forces of production. That is an argument for imperialist annexations and a fascist argument against the building of socialism in the Soviet Union. The exposure of such a swindle must proceed above all from the fact that only those State national forms and only those national boundaries which are created by the Soviet revolution exclude the possibility of suppression of a nationality, of legal inequalities and a nationalist provocation of the peoples against each other.

The slogan: "The enemy is in our own country" must permeate all the Communist mass work to counteract chauvinistic idiocy and nationalism. This can only be done when all the Communist Parties, each in their own country, and taking into account their national peculiarities, understand how to carry on the class struggle concretely and day by day, to expose this enemy, and to organise the masses for the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of capital. (Loud applause.)

Comrade Heckert (Germany)

There are still comrades who are surprised by the extraordinary capacity to manoeuvre which German fascism is still developing. But there are also comrades who are of the opinion that in view of the bankruptcy of some of the most important fascist manoeuvres, fascism has already reached the end of its capacity to manoeuvre. These views are extremely dangerous. The first conception which assumes that the capacity of fascism to manoeuvre is unlimited leads directly to capitulation; the other which assumes that fascism has already reached the limit of its ability to manoeuvre forms the basis for the theory that fascism will become bankrupt by itself, and leads to passivity. But capitulation and passivity lead to the same thing in the final analysis: to prolonging the rule of the fascist dictatorship.

The capacity of fascism to manoeuvre is of course limited and it finds a special barrier in the constantly intensifying crisis. One of the chief promises of the fascists was that they would give work and bread to all Germans. This promise brought the support of large numbers of workers, particularly unemployed workers. The fact that this promise was not fulfilled became the starting point for serious discontent among the masses of the fascist followers.

The provision of work to liquidate unemployment, which Hitler calls the "labour battle," was in the main built upon the following measures: 200,000 unemployed were sent to the farms as so-called agricultural assistants with the payment of a government subsidy to the peasants of 20-25 marks per person; 360,000 persons, mostly young people, Hitler sent into the labour service camps; but three million jobs were to have been gained by abolishing the so-called double-earning system.

Every one of these methods of providing work were camouflaged with special manoeuvres. Let us look at their effect. The sending of agricultural assistants, subsidised by the government, from the towns into the countryside made a big gap in the government funds, the peasants who were provided with these agricultural assistants were not satisfied, and the latter, who in many respects have become "carriers of disintegration and unrest" with regard to the Hitler system, were least of all satisfied. Hitler himself admitted this.

As far as the labour service camps are concerned, it was said that these would not only be a school for labour and for making young people physically capable, but a source of new value and to save young people from the despair into which they had been thrown as a result of their situation and their hopelessness of getting work. But soon Schacht, the president of the Reich Bank, raised a warning voice: There is no money for the labour service camps. The labour service camps have therefore not been extended as was expected. However, not only the lack of money but also the effects of the labour service upon the people in the camps made the fascists wonder whether they are a method which they can use for providing opportunities for work. The bad food and the frequent military drill led to revolts in hundreds of camps. Now the fascists themselves already write that in some districts the labour service camps have become real centres of pestilence which are infecting the entire district with ideas of rebellion. That is the reason why they are not now applying the energy that was previously intended for the extension of the labour service camps.

After the first two sources for providing work did not bring the results that the fascists expected, they all the more sharply pushed into the foreground the provision of work which was to result from the abolition of the system of double-earning. Unbridled demagoguery and the most brutal pressure were applied in order to achieve success in this field. Women were told that they must go back to the kitchen, the man must have such a high wage that he will be able to provide for his family. The wives and daughters of men who are employed were driven out of the factories.

The following is noteworthy: in the middle of November the statisticians of the national socialists announced that at that time 9.7 per cent. more women were employed in the factories than at the beginning of the year. That is no wonder. In the first place, the employers were not at all in agreement that the cheap labour

power of women which they made use of as a permanent means of depressing wages should be taken away from them and replaced by the costly labour of men. Their resistance was successful, as the above figures show. Secondly, German fascism is strenuously preparing for war and here it more than ever needs women in the factories.

But also in a general way the struggle against the system of double-earning brought forth the greatest discontent not only in the working class but especially among the petty-bourgeoisie whose daughters were thereby especially forced into unemployment. This general discontent compelled the fascists to change their demagoguery. On November 25 the Reich Minister of Labour and the Minister of National Economy suddenly issued a solemn decree stating:—

"The fight against the system of double-earning has brought forth the danger that the principle of efficiency will be pushed more into the background. The struggle against the system of double-earning is also unsocial in so far as it penalises the desire of a person or of a whole family to produce more, whereas double-earning which is linked up with capital income remains without consideration and has to remain so for reasons of capital formation. From this consideration of the system we see that the legal regulation of the extraordinary difficult and involved problem of double-earning would bring more harm than good. But instructions in an administrative way as to what is to be understood by unjustified double-earning also will not do. Hence, neither of these can be considered."

The big manoeuvre regarding the provision of work for three million people through abolishing the system of double-earning is entirely put out of existence by this new decision.

The fascists carried through similarly subtle manoeuvres in the field of the trade unions. Immediately after the fascists' advent to power, the N.S.B.O., the national socialist factory organisations, were intended as the substitute for the trade unions. In a conference with Leipart, the chairman of the A.D.G.B., and with Grassmann and Eckert, Brueckner, the Reich Commissar, said: "The N.S.B.O. will take over the trade unions and you (the trade union leaders) must put up with this." The trade union leaders also wanted this. That is why they called upon their members to participate in the "day of labour." But the decisive sections of the working class kept aloof from the "day of labour." A decision was made quickly and the fascists occupied the trade union houses and declared the trade unions of the workers to be "incorporated." It seemed as if the fascists had captured the trade unions with this external act.

But this violent measure was not only necessary because Leipart and Co. could not surrender the trade unions in the way that Hitler had desired, but because the workers began to consider and to use their trade union organisations as centres for organising resistance against the fascists. This danger for the fascists arose even in their own N.S.B.O. That is why membership in the N.S.B.O. was stopped, many of the new members were removed, and the N.S.B.O. was deprived of its intended functions as a substitute for the trade unions.

In order to prevent the workers from meeting the attack upon their trade union organisation by launching resistance, the fascist leaders declared that the fact that the trade unions were taken over by the fascists did not alter anything in the trade union system. But soon it appeared that there could not be any talk of representing the interests of the workers. At the meetings the workers were only supposed to listen to announcements of decisions taken, without raising any objections. Great discontent arose on account of this, which was still further increased when so-called trustees of labour were installed to regulate the conditions of labour.

The workers began to rebel against this in their trade union meetings. They demanded the election of the leadership, raised demands, even came out on strike and often forced the functionaries of the N.S.B.O. to come out in favour of their demands or

to strike with them. It thus became clear to Hitler that even by "incorporating" the trade union organisations they could not be captured so quickly. Concentration camps were established for the functionaries of the N.S.B.O. who allowed themselves to be inveigled into strike actions by the workers. But striking was strictly forbidden as a disturbance of peace and order.

A decree by Dr. Ley, the leader of the so-called "labour front," who also has the trade unions under his control, declares that the concluding of new collective agreements is no longer the affair of the trade unions, but only the trustees of labour appointed by Hitler can decide this according to their own judgment. In very difficult cases the trustees of labour can abstain from making a decision, in which case it is left to the employers to decide. From an award of the national labour court in Frankfurt-on-Main at the end of November we learned further that the "incorporated" unions by no means succeed to the legal rights of the old unions.

But with this the attack against the trade union organisations is by no means ended, because the fascists have already issued a new proclamation which amounts to nothing but the forthcoming dissolution of the trade unions as a whole. As opposition in the fascised trade unions is continually growing and all the petty manoeuvres of the fascists cannot keep back the ferment among the masses, Dr. Ley published a decree which states:—

"In accordance with the desire of Adolf Hitler, our leader, the German Labour Front is not the place where the material problems of the daily life of the workers can be decided. Forms will shortly be created for the regulation of labour movements which will point out to the leader and the followers in an enterprise the standpoint which the national socialist point of view endorses. The high aim of the Labour Front is to educate all Germans who take part in production for the national socialist state and the national socialist idea."

Thus we see that everything that the trade unions were and everything that they were supposed to continue to be on the day the fascists came to power or as a result of their being incorporated by the fascists is extinguished. In future, everything is to take place through the trustees of labour, so far as these trustees do not leave it to the employers to decide. A measure against the N.S.B.O. was also taken at the same time. The employers are categorically called upon to join the N.S.B.O. along with their directors. Through membership in the N.S.B.O. the employer is to be constantly informed about everything which takes place in this organisation in his enterprise. The presence of the employer is intended to make the voicing of instigating ideas impossible from the very beginning.

Naturally the workers do not pass these measures by inattentively. They have their ideas about them. For this reason the slogan of the revolutionary trade unionists for the formation of illegal, independent class trade unions also struck deep roots among the masses. In order to somewhat cover up their reactionary measures, the fascists are coming out with such demagogic manoeuvres as the introduction of a definite time for notice and vacations estimated according to the length of service in the enterprise, which they extol before the workers as the greatest social achievement. They issue such demagogic slogans as: The place for the stop-watch is not the factory but the sport ground. Or they come out with demagoguery promising all the workers to raise their wages in the future. Thus Dr. Ley announced that in the spring a general increase of wages of 10 per cent. was to take place. Before that this leader of the Labour Front had already announced the introduction of weekly wages with the following words:—

"If the national collective agreement speaks of a minimum wage, then it stands to reason that it must also depart from wages by the hour and substitute them by weekly wages, as it is of course immaterial how much one receives per hour, as has been shown in practice, if one only works one or two hours a week."

These demagogic formulations are intended to make the workers believe that they have come to an end of their sacrifices, that in future they are not only to get a 10 per cent. increase in wages but also a stabilised weekly minimum wage. But it is quite clear that this swindle about the improvement of working conditions will come to nought. Talk about increases of wages in general is already being prohibited. These measures of the fascists against the trade union organisations and other associations in which the fighting power of the workers could be formed show

the great anxiety which the leaders of the national socialists feel about forthcoming developments. But if we shall act correctly, their preventive measures in their conduct against the trade unions will have precisely the opposite effect. The break-up of the last remnants of the German trade union movement, which is laden with a 70-year-old tradition, will bring wide sections of the workers closer to the formation of independent class fighting organisations. There thus arises a great opportunity for our revolutionary trade unionists which must be rapidly and ruthlessly made use of.

While the fascist organisations of power are to be still more monopolised and inwardly consolidated, the fascists are at the same time commencing to form a mass organisation called "After Work," which is to embrace all sections of the working class and of the toiling population as a whole, after the fashion of the Italian *Dopo Lavoro*, so as to give the fascists the opportunity to bring all the workers under the control of the fascist rulers, after work is over, after they have been under the control of their employers during work. On November 28 Dr. Ley announced the following:—

"The 'After Work' organisation is to take up people's spare time. Lack of occupation gives rise to foolish and idle thoughts, and finally even to criminal ideas. Dull, pointless ideas make people brood, give them the feeling of hopelessness, in a word the feeling of being absolutely superfluous. Nothing is more dangerous for the State than that. Borne out of these ideas, the family club is even of help to the government, as people know where they can go of an evening."

That's what it is, then. The organisation is intended to prevent the workers from still coming together to discuss their situation. The fascists who have to reckon with such great difficulties apply all their capacity for propaganda and even the brutality which is peculiar to them in order to make the new organisation into one that will embrace the masses. It would therefore be a great mistake to stand aside and wait to see where it goes, but, on the contrary, we must devote the greatest attention to this organisation from the very beginning.

The fascists' manoeuvres towards the working class are being supplemented by manoeuvres regarding those sections of the population upon the backs of which the fascists chiefly came to power, through the fault of the social democracy—the petty-bourgeoisie and the small peasants.

The social democracy is to blame for the fact that the fascists were able to catch masses of people with their impudent manoeuvres and that they were in a position to paralyse the resistance of other masses with their terrorist measures. The social-democratic leaders and the leaders of the reformist trade unions are indeed the originators of the ideas out of which Hitler's deceptive manoeuvres developed. Now when the social democrats have been defeated by the fascists, they still unflinchingly continue to play their role as the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie. They can, of course, no longer do this with the methods that they applied formerly, but have to do it with new manoeuvres adapted to the situation. After the collapse of German social democracy, Stampfer wrote the following sentence in a pamphlet entitled "Revolution Against Hitler":—

"The aim of the great liberation struggle against the fascist State cannot be to give the workers Bolshevik instead of fascist jails."

At a reception given by the Prague press Otto Wels made the following declaration:—

"A Bolshevik Germany must not arise if the present system collapses. That is why a democratic organisation must be prepared. A Bolshevik Germany would be an impossible thing. If there were to be several other Bolshevik States besides Germany, the life of the entire world would come to a standstill."

Thus we see that Stampfer and Wels apparently demand the struggle for the re-establishment of the old Weimar democracy.

In reality they are organising an increased continuation of the struggle against the Communists, for, according to them, Bolshevism is worse than fascism.

Otto Bauer, who readily plays himself up to be a "Left" social democrat, carries on his struggle along the same line as the Stampfers and the Wels. In the July number of the "Kampf" he berates the workers who are disgusted with this democracy and

who want to wage a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. We read:—

"No, at present the decision does not fall between democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but between democracy and the dictatorship of fascism."

And then he continues:—

"You can hear crowds of people muttering and mumbling: 'Why should we fight for the heights? We have already been up there once and we know that it was not so fine after all. And if we again take these heights this will not win the war.' What can one do with people who talk that way in the midst of battle? According to the army regulations of the Kaiser, they were shot down. And rightly so!"

So we see that this former officer of the Emperor is of the opinion that every social-democratic worker who is on the side of the Communist workers, every social-democratic worker whom social democracy has led into crisis and fascism, must be shot down as was prescribed in the Austrian army regulations. Otto Bauer writes this after the collapse of German social democracy and after the Second International had solemnly declared:—

"Thank God we not only have that (the German social democracy), but also still have Austrian social democracy."

At the last social-democratic party congress in France, Deat, the social democrat, dealt with the Hitler upheaval in Germany and the crisis of capitalism in general with the following words:—

"We are horrified to see that the regime (the capitalist regime) is approaching its end. We do not believe that the working class can play the role which Marx assigned to it; the consolidation of the capitalist nation breaks up internationalism. Hence socialism must be organised upon a national foundation with the help of the despairing middle classes by means of a strong State which again re-establishes the idea of authority."

That was a very open acknowledgment of social democracy going over to the camp of fascism. The entire Renaudel group (37 deputies) united with Deat. But a further 30 social-democratic deputies from Blum's fraction declared that they will not give up co-operating with the Renaudel group notwithstanding these programmatic declarations, i.e., half of the French social-democratic deputies want to work in Deat's way.

The efforts of the Second International to make the statements of Deat and Marquet harmless, so that the workers will not recognise the line towards which these allies of fascism are steering are most strikingly exposed by the statements of Mussolini and Hitler. "*Giornale d'Italia*" writes the following with regard to the attitude of the neo-fascists:—

"Attention! The revision of Marxism is continuing in Germany. Words in themselves have lost their value. M. Marquet in France has developed new ideas for the representatives of French imperialism, which does not mean that these are also new ideas for us. French socialism is at present becoming conscious of what the nation means, and then it will have nothing else to do but to disband itself."

And the national-socialist organs in Germany write the following in an article on the same question—I am quoting from the "*Frankfurter Zeitung*":—

"National socialism has made a real breach into the ideology of French socialism."

But it is the "Lefts" who are making the worst and most dangerous manoeuvres. It is their task to keep back the most revolutionised social-democratic workers from the path of a common fighting front with the Communists. They know that they can no longer defend the hated social-democratic betrayers and their policy before the workers. So that has to be sacrificed. Outwardly they must appear to be dissociating themselves from the bankrupt social-democratic past, and therefore audaciously come into the arena with the slogan: The reformist social democracy is dead, long live revolutionary social democracy! They are the inventors of the demagogic tactics of non-aggression pacts which are intended to make the Communists keep quiet about the policy of the social-democratic leaders which has led to fascism and which was to keep back the workers in every country and in every factory from immediately forming a united front with the Communist workers to defend their daily interests. These "Lefts"

link up their radically sounding demagogic phrases about the reformist social democracy which is dead and about revolutionary social democracy which is to live, with vulgar slanders and accusations against the Communist Parties. A particularly noteworthy type in this field is Fenner Brockway, the chairman of the I.L.P. This gentleman conducts a campaign against the Soviet Union and against the Communist International, but particularly against the Communist Party of Germany, which he accuses of being just as much to blame for the defeat of the German working class as Wels and Co. At the same time this type of social democrats from the "Left" camp try to minimise and excuse the treachery of social democracy to the interests of the working class.

Naturally, in such a society Trotsky, Brandler and Thalheimer should also not be missing, so they have already become collaborators of Fenner Brockway in the creation of this new "revolutionary" social democracy. In this connection it should also be mentioned that the Remmele-Neumann group with their entire argumentation also find themselves in the society of these saviours of the proletariat. The manoeuvres of these various social-democratic tendencies that I have mentioned pursue but one aim: to uphold and maintain the split of the working class and to prevent the unity of the working class for the overthrow of fascism. Social democracy in all its variations is continuing to play its rôle as the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie.

These new and often also successful manoeuvres of the fascists and social fascists clearly show us that we must become extremely elastic in our tactics in order to be able rapidly and resolutely to react to all these manoeuvres. We must learn how to penetrate into the gaps in the enemies' front much more rapidly than was the case heretofore and must expose all these manoeuvres before the masses much more ruthlessly than has been the case up till now.

The slogan of our central task is: To prevent the split of the working class, the establishment of the united front of the working class so as to bring about the overthrow of fascism, and win over the majority of the working class, and to fight for winning over the former social-democratic and trade union workers. But it is precisely the fulfilment of this task that necessitates that we should very precisely pursue the manoeuvres of the fascists and the social fascists, because only if we shall rapidly and correctly intervene shall we be able to draw the workers over to our side and thereby overcome the split in the working class. Every revolutionary must know that the path towards the annihilation of fascism, the path to the proletarian revolution and to its victory can only be the path that leads via the organisational and ideological abolition of the influence of social democracy.

After history has given us proof of the preparedness of the working class to struggle, of its unswerving loyalty to the Communist movement, which thousands upon thousands of German workers have shown, we are no longer confronted by the question whether the worker wants to fight, but, on the contrary, the question before us is whether all the leading elements in our movement are capable of directing the desire and the ability of the working class to struggle into correct channels. In contrast to such elements as Remmele and Neumann, who, corroded by their doubts, land in the camp of decaying social democracy, whilst tens of thousands of proletarians are conducting a heroic fight against Hitler fascism. I would like to call your attention to the letter of a simple worker from prison. He wrote to his mother: "My fight was honest, because I did not want to starve. I shall never regret, as regret is cowardice. No matter what the penalty will be, it will not be difficult for me. My conviction makes me strong." No one need have any doubt about workers who can speak that way when they are faced with the supreme court, and also need not doubt the capacity of the workers to find methods to fight against fascism. I have no doubt. This worker is the most outstanding witness of the fact that the revolutionary proletariat in Germany is daily carrying on its work, giving us the assurance that it is preparing the positions from which Hitler will be overthrown. (Applause.) In the leadership of our Party we must see to it that the workers who have the desire to follow us and who are prepared to stake everything in order to realise Lenin's way in their own countries also, come into the leadership—workers who are capable of utilising all the weaknesses of our enemy in order to attack the enemy and help to defeat him. (Applause.)

Comrade Kristiansen (Norway)

The development in Norway is characterised by a steady sharpening of the crisis of capitalism. Unemployment is increasing and wages are being reduced. In the rural districts the poor peasants and fishermen are groaning under the burdens of debts and interest payments. The number of distraints is growing.

In order to carry out this policy, the capitalist class is intensifying its reactionary course. New repressive and emergency legislation is being passed against the trade unions, the unemployed are being robbed of their political rights, and "legal" fascist civil war guards are being organised to crush the struggles of the workers. The entire process of fascising the bourgeois State apparatus is being carried out in the name of "democracy" and by parliamentary methods. At the same time a strong, openly fascist movement is growing, after the pattern of the fascist movement in Germany, with almost the same programme and the same social and national demagogy. Within the old bourgeois parties there is a rapid new orientation in the direction of open fascism, and at the present time steps are being taken to unite all fascist groups for the building of a big, modern, fascist mass party.

The Norwegian Labour Party, which is still formally outside the Second International, is moving fast to the Right, is in coalition with the capitalist liberal party and is supporting both directly and indirectly the advance of the reactionary forces and the fascists in Norway. At the present moment it is making preparations to take over the government, in order to save capitalism from the crisis by more direct and open methods. The Norwegian Labour Party is following the same path as German social democracy. It is paving the way for the open fascist dictatorship.

In Norway there is also a growing radicalisation among the working masses. Only thanks to the "Left" manoeuvres and "Left" phrases of the social democrats and the fact that the Communist Party has not yet succeeded in leading the working masses, this radicalisation has so far benefited the social democrats. If the Communist Party of Norway has not been able to develop into a mass Party and to take the leadership of the Norwegian workers who are becoming radicalised, the responsibility rests with the Party itself. Up till 1931 the influence of the Party steadily decreased. The Party was isolated from the masses because of the sectarian and "Left" opportunist policy of the former Party leadership. Towards the end of 1931 the Comintern stepped in. A change was made in the leadership of the Party, and, as a result of the fact that we followed the directives of the Comintern, we made a start in the direction of better mass work and achieved some good results. During the great lock-out of 1931, in a number of cases of unemployed action, during the politically important strike of the lumber workers in 1932, and during the widespread anti-war movement which was developed in connection with the Amsterdam Congress, and which drew 100,000 workers under the leadership of the Party, we succeeded to some extent, although not to a satisfactory degree, in breaking through the isolation in which we found ourselves. However, we went to a still more dangerous extreme, namely, Right opportunism.

The Right opportunist deviation of our Party's leadership is due primarily to the fact that we did not correctly understand the united front policy of the Comintern. We distorted it into the building of a bloc with the social-democratic and Tranmael Labour Party, and the result was that the demarcation between the social-fascist Norwegian Labour Party and the Communist Party was obliterated in the eyes of the masses.

Immediately following Hitler's seizure of power, a powerful united front movement arose among the Norwegian workers. The workers, who saw the seriousness of the fascist danger and were filled with bitterness and hatred against the German fascist bloodhounds and their supporters in Norway, demanded that a stop be put at once to the splitting up of the working class. The social-democratic workers demanded of their party committee and of the leadership of the Central Trade Union Council that they place no obstacles in the way of the militant unity of the Norwegian working class. When the Comintern issued its united front appeal in March, and the C.C. of our Party, in accordance with this

letter, applied to the Central Committee of the Norwegian Labour Party to take up the question of the building of a common front against reaction and fascism, this step of the Communists met with splendid response among broad circles of the Norwegian working class. In our letter to the Central Committee of the Norwegian Labour Party we put forward a programme of action. The Norwegian Labour Party answered our letter with the statement that it was ready to enter negotiations, provided our Party gave a clear and unequivocal pledge that the aim was organisational merging. It thus demanded that the Communist Party should be dissolved and be merged in the Norwegian Labour Party.

Instead of branding this hypocritical manoeuvre on the part of the N.A.P., we made the great opportunist error of entering into discussion with the class treacherous leaders of the N.A.P. And we did this in a way that was bound to distort the whole political line of the Comintern.

This discussion with the social-fascist leaders, which, objectively speaking, amounted to a discussion on the merging of the Communist Party with the social-democratic party, could only result in spreading confusion in the ranks of the working class. We looked upon the united front as the setting up of a temporary bloc with the social fascists. The Party followed the line of least resistance and thus landed in the swamp of opportunism. We in the Party leadership bear the main responsibility for this, because we did not understand how to apply the correct line of the Comintern. The opportunist attitude towards the united front tactics was the cause for our almost complete neglect of the organisation of the united front from below, and of the fact that we did not succeed in launching working-class action against the many forms of capitalist offensive, reaction, and growing fascism.

The Norwegian Labour Party has leaders who pose in their manoeuvres and words as being very radical, but at the same time are actually holding back and betraying the struggles of the workers, and are launching bitter attacks against the Communists and the revolutionary workers, against the Comintern and against the Soviet Union. Besides these "Left" leaders, there are also a number of others of less importance, who even go so far (in order to keep the workers with the social democrats) as to announce their direct collaboration with the leadership of our Party, both on a national and on a local scale. Also with regard to these people, the Party has had an opportunist stand. In actual fact, we built up a bloc with them, and even for some time allowed them to take the leadership of various actions. The Party was shoved into the background, and its face hidden from the masses, while these "Lefts" came forward before the working masses as revolutionary leaders, for whom even the Communists stood surety.

The fact that the Party leadership, in spite of repeated instructions from the Comintern, did not correct its errors, is due to our failure to recognise that we were following a wrong course. Only one member of the Polit-Bureau, Comrade Bentzen, put up open resistance to the intervention of the Comintern. On the other hand, there are a number of comrades in the Party leadership who wish to do everything within their power, with the support of the Comintern and the entire Party, to overcome their errors and deviations most speedily in order to bring the Party out of the swamp of opportunism.

A few words about the election returns. The results of the elections show that the marked process of radicalisation which has taken place in the ranks of the Norwegian working class, and which has been expressed during the past years in a number of great struggles, several of which were carried out under the leadership of the C.P.N., has not been utilised by our Party. Why? Because our Party did not succeed in organising and leading the struggles of the workers against the capitalist offensive and reaction, and because we failed to concentrate on the most important industrial districts in order to get the Party rooted in the enterprises and trade unions, and because we failed to realise that the united front policy means organising the masses for the struggle; we allowed this policy to be distorted into the opportunist action of building a bloc with the social democrats. This is the main reason for the extremely weak position of the Party.

The appraisal that the Polit-Bureau of our Party, and, still more, the central organ of our Party, gave of the political situa-

tion after the elections, brings out very clearly the hold which opportunism has in our Party.

With the help of the Comintern, our Party must immediately make a decisive change in the policy with regard to the Norwegian Labour Party.

All the conditions for a revolutionary advance of the Norwegian working class are at hand. The great sharpening of the capitalist crisis, the increasing capitalist offensive, and the growth of fascism—and, of no less importance, the events in Germany, have hastened the process of radicalisation in the Norwegian

working class. The militancy is increasing more and more—the Communist Party alone can bring it into action.

With the help of the Comintern, the "Left" opportunist sectarian policy of the Party was changed in 1931. We succeeded in making definite progress. But we did not succeed in developing our Party into a revolutionary mass Party. "Left" opportunism was replaced by the still more dangerous Right opportunism. With the help of the Comintern and with the most intensive activity of the whole Party, we hope to overcome our errors within a short time and set out on revolutionary mass work.

Comrade Henrikovski (Poland)

Comrades, the great intensification of the outer and inner contradictions of capitalism, demanded a thorough transformation of the mass work of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union movement. We must state that in view of this tense situation, the tempo at which the mass basis of social democracy is being destroyed is absolutely inadequate. The organisational growth of the Communist Parties and of the revolutionary organisations does not correspond to the present tension in the relations of the class forces.

The influence of the events in Germany, particularly the capitulation of social democracy and the reformist trade unions, was very great upon the membership of the Second and Amsterdam International. A great deal of revolutionary ferment arose in the ranks of social democracy in all countries and also in Poland in the ranks of the reformist trade union organisations. The confidence in the leaders, in the Second and Amsterdam Internationals was shaken to a serious extent. The urgent political problems were discussed in all mass organisations in a lively manner. The question of democracy and dictatorship again very sharply confronted the wide masses of the members in all reformist mass organisations. The answer of the Communist International of March 7 to the resolution of the Second International of February 19 created favourable conditions for raising the question as to which path they should pursue among the masses of the members of the social-democratic parties and the trade unions—the path of Wels and Leipart with the bourgeoisie, or, with the Communist Party, the path that was shown in the Open Letter of the Communist International.

Our Party correctly understood the step of the Communist International and of our Central Committee on the question of the united front. We did not have any vacillations and difficulties within the Party to any considerable extent. But still the utilisation of this step of the Communist International among the broad masses of the social-democratic members was not sufficient because our ranks were not sufficiently orientated to the new situation, were not sufficiently *politically* orientated in order to reply to the numerous and manifold manoeuvres of social democracy, to frustrate these manoeuvres and in this way to convince the broadest masses of the proletariat in the struggle that the path which the Communist Party shows is for them the only correct and possible way out of the present crisis.

In order to be able to answer the question why our growth does not accord with the objective possibilities, it would be of great importance to examine how the various parties and the revolutionary oppositions, in the reformist trade union organisations have responded to this new transformation of the reformist leaders.

Our answer to the Brussels decisions of the Amsterdam International was very weak. The leaders of the Amsterdam International have set up a number of slogans in Brussels which were replied to by us only in the very limited way. That primarily applies to the slogans and manoeuvres of the "left-wing" which attempted to conceal the bankruptcy of the Amsterdam International and the capitulation of the Leiparts and to divert the ferment of the masses into a nationalistic channel against Hitler Germany.

The great accentuation of the class contradictions and antagonisms in the most important capitalist countries has compelled the leaders of the reformist trade unions to put forward sham radical slogans. In Poland we had a widespread strike movement, there were also beginnings of such a movement in France, in England, and large struggles are taking place in

America. The new "radical" slogans of the "left" leaders are first of all intended for the purpose of blocking the path of the masses into the revolutionary camp and, secondly, to keep back the masses from concrete daily struggles. The Polish leaders of the reformist trade unions came forward with the following slogans in Poland: "Workers' and Peasants' Republic, overthrow of capitalism, there is no use for fighting for partial demands at present." That was said by Zulavski and Szezer Kovski, the two leading personalities of the reformist trade unions in Poland.

Recently they have again revived their old swindle:—general strike—but against partial strikes.

In this situation when the social fascist leaders are so shrewdly and cunningly manoeuvring, we did not succeed in sufficiently exposing these fraudulent manoeuvres inside the reformist trade unions and in isolating these leaders from the reformist masses of the membership, to a larger extent. I think that this is an international phenomenon.

We conducted large struggles in the course of last year. Everyone who knows the work of our Party and of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement of Poland knows that we have learnt a great deal from these struggles. The revolutionary strike strategy, the formulation of our slogans, the form of the preparation and the organisation of the struggle, as well as the carrying out of the struggle, have already become the common property of large masses of revolutionary workers. We already have examples which show that revolutionary workers can also correctly prepare and carry through revolutionary strike struggles even when they have no close contact with Party bodies on a central and district scale.

But the greatest weakness of our large strikes consists in the fact that we have not yet succeeded to a sufficient extent in deepening the political consciousness of the workers in these struggles, to make them the starting point for large political class struggles and in this way most closely to link up the economic strikes with the political strikes.

The general strike of the textile workers in Lodz furnishes a striking example to show that the weak political aspect of the struggle made it considerably more difficult for the striking workers to go over to the side of the revolutionary movement. The *universal* general strike in Lodz was in the first place a solidarity strike in favour of the fighting textile workers. But to a very limited extent it was also directed against the fascist State power, against the police, who had wounded many workers and killed Wojciechowska, the young textile woman worker, during the strike meetings which involved as many as 20,000 workers.

Only in this way can we explain the circumstance that after the big strike in Lodz our Party organisation and the revolutionary trade union opposition increased but slowly. This growth by no means corresponds to the size and the international importance of the struggle in Lodz. At the last plenum of our Central Committee we stated that the turn in our work in the reformist trade unions must consist in eliminating the following main weaknesses and defects, which in my opinion, are international phenomena:

We must determinedly fight against underestimating the work in the reformist trade unions, which prevails in the Party to-day. It would be wrong to understand the matter in such a way that only backward workers who do not want to struggle join the reformist trade unions. The most recent events in Poland show precisely the contrary. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of workers have been set in motion through the large strikes. The Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union movement could not offer them the necessary framework of organisation, as

a result of illegality, of the terrible persecutions of fascism, and also because of their weaknesses and defects. The workers who have become activated during the struggle in part joined the reformist trade union organisations. Of course they still have many prejudices, but they are radicalised elements and this opens up great perspectives for our work among these workers.

In the first place, it is a question of the correct application of the united front policy among the members of the reformist mass organisations. Only for this reason were we successful in Lodz in further developing the general strike against the will of the social fascist leaders, after they had already betrayed the struggle, because we understood how to expose these leaders in their own trade union organisations, how to isolate them from their own members, how to mobilise the reformist workers under our slogans and to lead them into the struggle.

It is a question of having the revolutionary workers raise good and correct demands at the proper time and of gathering the signatures of the members in favour of these demands, raise demands about the immediate calling of membership meetings. (Interruption—Comrade Losovsky: Not only demands but we ourselves must call them.) Quite right, and in this way we must set the members of the reformist organisations into motion. Every conflict in the factory must be made use of by our comrades for the purpose of carrying out the necessary conferences with these members, electing commissions, etc. This method provides us with a very favourable basis for more firmly organisationally rallying the broad masses who sympathise with us and our work.

The weak organisational positions of the revolutionary trade union movement among the farm labourers forms a great danger for the entire revolutionary movement. The great revolutionary upsurge, which we are at the present time experiencing in the countryside of Poland, demands a strengthening of the hegemony of the proletariat in the class struggles of the poor peasantry. This is very difficult without the agricultural workers, without creating strong positions among these workers, the danger arises that the radicalised peasantry can get under the command of the kulaks and the fascists.

The reorganisation which the present situation demands from the revolutionary trade union movement can only be carried through if our organisations, our comrades will throw off the former routine and use new forms of struggle, new forms of organisation suited to the new conditions. I believe that the inventive spirit of our German comrades in their illegal work can also give some hints to such an old illegal Communist Party as our Party is.

We have two types of fascist trade unions, mainly in the State industries, especially in the armament factories. One type of these trade unions are the trade unions that rest upon "voluntariness"; that means, where the workers are being driven into the trade unions on account of the terror of the police, the employers, spies, etc., but where membership in the fascist trade unions is formally not compulsory. The second type—these are the fascist trade unions whose existence rests upon fascist compulsion. That usually takes place in the following way: A small meeting is called by the fascists which is surrounded by the police. At this meeting

a decision is adopted in the name of all the workers to the effect that all the workers belong to the fascist State organisation.

In both cases we fight against the fascist trade unions, against the workers joining these organisations. In the first stage, when a fascist union springs up, we must exert all our energy to frustrate the existence of this union. But if the fascist union is already a fact then it is our duty to come out against the individual revolutionary workers leaving this union, form R.T.U.O. groups under various names and carry on diligent work for winning over the masses of the members. Where there is a possibility of winning over the lower links of the fascist trade unions, the R.T.U.O. must apply all its energy for the realisation of this task. Where membership in the fascist trade unions is virtually compulsory (where the membership dues are being deducted by the administration), the R.T.U.O. must organise and lead the struggle against this compulsion and against the deduction of the membership dues by the administration. It is the duty of the R.T.U.O. to wage a struggle inside these trade unions against compulsory membership, against the deduction of dues by the administration and for the formation of revolutionary unions. The R.T.U.O. must fight against the appointment of fascist factory delegates by the fascist leadership to the committees of the sections and departments and also in the local committees.

Have we got opportunities of working in these trade unions? There are tremendous difficulties. But still there are opportunities. The difficulties are the following: The workers in the armament industry are selected in a special manner. They are chosen with the help of the police, the "Defensive" (secret police), and the spies inside the factory. The fascists in this way try to get together workers who would be immune to the influence of the revolutionary movement. In the early period, during the first few weeks the fascists can succeed in this. But already after a few months, when conflicts commence in the factories, we get the first points for beginning oppositional work not only in the factory but also within the fascist trade union organisations.

One of the main hindrances in the building up of factory groups of the R.T.U.O. is the fact that in almost all large centres of workers the large majority of the members of the factory nuclei do not belong to the R.T.U.O. groups, that when the R.T.U.O. members go over into the Party it very often means that these comrades also leave their former trade union work. In general, the Party nuclei limit their help for the R.T.U.O. groups to sending their representatives into them, without drawing all their members into active work. The result of such a situation is the extraordinary political weakness of the factory groups of the R.T.U.O. All the work lies on the shoulders of the young, non-Party, inexperienced comrades. A radical elimination of this bad routine in the work of the Polish R.T.U.O. must become the work of the immediate future.

I summarise: We must reconstruct our mass work, our trade union work at the most rapid possible rate. The development of events in all countries, but particularly in Poland, the fact that the revolutionary crisis is directly approaching, demands that the Party and the revolutionary trade union movement should exert all their energy. The more rapidly we will do this, the surer will be our victory. (Applause.)

Comrade Grosse (Y.C.L. Germany)

Fascism tries to make use of the broad masses of the youth for carrying out its militarist adventures as well as for the plundering offensive upon the standard of living of the toiling population and the civil war against the proletariat. For this purpose it makes use of all the methods of terror, of technique, propaganda and slander. A special institution was created within the confines of the State apparatus—the so-called Reich Youth leadership. Broad fascist youth organisations were formed and by means of "unification" of all the former bourgeois youth leagues they tried to draw them into the system of State fascist training. The poisoning of the youth begins on the day of their entrance into the schools. The unexampled terror against the revolutionary young workers and the Young Communist League is in the foreground. It is being linked up with very cunning demagogic manoeuvres. In order to alienate the working-class youth from the class struggle they preach "Volksgemeinschaft" (community of interests of all the people) in still stronger tones than they do for the adults. With its slight experiences in the class struggle, the youth more

easily falls a victim to the counter-revolutionary manoeuvres of the Nazis. Fascism very cleverly makes use of the ideals, the romanticism, the urge for action and the readiness of the youth to sacrifice itself. Ostensibly, true "Volksgemeinschaft" is to be demonstrated by the fact that in various places joint comradely evenings of factory youth and students have been held. In their agitation the Nazis endeavour to distort the question of the classes with the deceitful counter-posing of the generations. They say: "You young people will come into a great inheritance; the present-day difficulties are to be attributed only to the old leaders in economy."

Alongside of the swindle about "Volksgemeinschaft," anti-capitalist phraseology at present still plays a big role with the Hitler Youth. It is precisely the anti-capitalist demagoguery in conjunction with strong pressure of the foremen in the factories that leads to a considerable growth of the fascist youth organisations. The N.S.J.B. (Youth section of the fascist N.S.B.O. in the factories) are now being disbanded and being transferred into the Hitler

Youth which is built up on a territorial basis. That is a very significant thing. The reason for disbanding this organisation is that in many cases the N.S.J.B. had become a rallying ground for discontented elements in the factories. The N.S.J.B. had to be disbanded in a number of factories precisely for this reason, even before the ban. Just two examples of this:

At a meeting of the N.S.B.O. in a printing plant, a young S.A. member declared that it is now time to carry through the demands of the Hitler Youth. The person in charge of the N.S.B.O. refused to have any discussion on the question. Thereupon a young S.A. member wanted to form a youth cell. He went to the District Bureau of the N.S.B.O., but there his request was refused with the following remark: "That is not possible in your factory; there are too many Communists there." The second example: in another factory the young workers also declared that they are absolutely for Hitler and in order to prove this they now want to carry through Hitler's demands in the factory. They set up two demands for the time being: paid vacations and the prohibition to discharge the apprentices who have completed their training. The N.S.B.O. declared that they were crazy. Thereupon they proposed to send a delegation to the district leadership and also to Hitler. Naturally, the district leadership did not have anything to do with them, nor did they get to see Hitler. Our nucleus cleverly made use of this and was able to carry through a good action against military sport in the factory jointly with the Nazis, social-democratic and unorganised young workers. In both cases—and in many others—the members of the N.S.J.B. were drawn into the movement. These are the real reasons for disbanding the N.S.J.B. Transferring them into the Hitler Youth is intended to divert attention from factory problems by means of militarisation, hikes, saluting the flag, the organisation of clubs, youth homes, social evenings, etc. It is therefore precisely in the factory that it is our task all the more to draw the supporters of the Nazis in all the militant actions of the workers and of the working youth.

I want to reveal a few more of these social deceptive manoeuvres of the fascists: (1) The Siemens Company is sending 16 apprentices to a technical college for the first time this year. (2) The medical examination of the members of the Hitler Youth in the factory is supposed to be extended to all apprentices free of charge. (3) A Social Service department was created in the Reich Youth Leadership with four sub-departments as follows: (a) Care of the youth; (b) social hygiene; (c) youth rights; (d) labour rights. That gives the youth the impression that the government are concerned with their needs. But at the same time this social demagogy is less costly and more dangerous than their manoeuvres in the factory.

We conduct a determined struggle and mobilise the working youth against all these machinations of fascism, especially against the militarisation of the toiling youth. We have still more to increase our struggle against the fascist youth movement and thereby not only expose the demagogy of the Nazis, but at the same time, also organise the struggle. We show the youth that Hitler's promises are a fraud, that nothing is being carried through. But we do not show how they have to fight and we do

not sufficiently organise this struggle. It was only very belatedly that we raised the demand for entrance in the R.T.U.O. and for the formation of independent class trade unions. At present we already have a number of results.

We must be clear that for winning over the majority of the working youth, hundreds of thousands of young people must be freed from the influence of the Nazis. Large masses of anti-fascist young people, which we must by no means leave to the fascist leaders, are in the mass organisations which comprise no less than five and a half million youth. We must root ourselves deeply into these organisations and draw the proletarian elements over into the class front.

Now with regard to the problem of our struggle against social fascism and for winning over the social-democratic youth. In the period before January 30 we attempted to draw the oppositional comrades in the Y.S.L. together into groups with the aim of later bringing them over to the Y.C.L.G. In this we also had some success. But after January 30 we made the crude mistake of not altering this tactic. Instead of immediately developing a wide-spread offensive for the Y.S.L. members who now saw that they were betrayed by their leaders, immediately drawing them into our League and conducting an annihilating campaign against the social fascist organisation, we stuck to the old tactics. The question was placed in a politically correct manner only after a great delay. We have corrected this mistake, especially with the great help and support of our Party and of the Y.C.I. And to-day we can already point to a number of successes. Cases of comrades leaving the camp of the Y.S.L. and coming over to us are very numerous.

In the struggle for the masses of the youth who are still influenced by social democracy, our task must be constantly to expose all the manoeuvres of social democracy, to draw the individual social-democratic members into our actions in the factories and the labour service camps, to carry on persistent, serious and systematic enlightenment work with them regarding the role of social democracy before Hitler's advent to power and at the present time, to draw the Y.S.L. members into the committee movement against the imperialist war and fascism, to enrol the youth that is still influenced by social democracy into the independent class trade unions and to bring about the complete liquidation of the Y.S.L. and the influence of social fascism upon the working youth.

Under the leadership of the Party and of the Y.C.I., we shall fulfil our tasks. There are no sentiments of doubt in the League and almost no traitors despite the worst possible tortures. The fact that our young comrades are helping to organise the new revolutionary upsurge, that they understand that the breathing spell of capitalism can only be a short one, is also shown by the utterance of a 17-year-old young comrade from Berlin who replied to the proposal of the State prosecutor for a sentence of 12 years in the penitentiary by the following: "You cannot frighten me. I shall be out very quickly because the revolution is coming faster than you imagine!" (Applause.)

Comrade Capek (Czechoslovakia)

One of the most important aims which the bourgeoisie of Czechoslovakia has set itself during the carrying out of the fascist dictatorship is the destruction of the Communist Party. In view of the present situation in Czechoslovakia, we must be prepared at any moment for the dissolution of the Party. Formally we are still legal but practically we are already illegal. The entire Communist Party press has been suppressed. Meetings and demonstrations are banned. Legal agitation and propaganda of any kind is being made impossible. Most of the revolutionary mass organisations, such as the Red Aid, the Workers' International Relief, Friends of the Soviet Union, League of Proletarian Free-Thinkers and also the Young Communist League have already been disbanded some time ago and have now to continue their work illegally. The Red Trade Unions are threatened by dissolution and the appointment of government commissars. Several hundred comrades are already imprisoned and within a few months they may number thousands. Under these circumstances it would be criminal if the

Party did not most energetically and with the greatest possible speed reorganise its ranks and prepare itself for working under illegal conditions. In transforming the Party for underground work, we have had very sharply to combat two wrong viewpoints. Some comrades were of the opinion that illegality means to make ourselves entirely invisible to the masses, to isolate ourselves, which practically means to abandon any sort of mass work. Other comrades represented the viewpoint that there is still time to prepare ourselves for illegality, that with us in Czechoslovakia things will not become as bad as in Germany.

Both these tendencies have a common cause, namely, shrinking from mass work under the more difficult conditions of the fascist dictatorship. It is the duty of the Party to wage a most intense struggle against these erroneous viewpoints against all shrinking back from difficulties and from the terror of the enemy. The Party must fully make use of and defend all legal possibilities, no matter how small, for mass work, for agitation and propaganda.

In this connection, by "legal" we do not mean what the police allow us but what they cannot prevent. In Czechoslovakia we have a number of legal possibilities which we can utilise, first of all the trade unions, then the factory committees and factory councils, the committees of action of the unemployed, the tribunes of the town council sessions, the various unity committees and the mass organisations of all kinds in which Communists work in Czechoslovakia. We must constantly create for ourselves new platforms from which we can speak to the masses.

Our Party membership is now gradually learning to combine illegal with legal methods of work. It must be borne in mind that the C.P.Cz. has up to the present had no experience whatever in illegal work. The Party was legal since its foundation and has strong legalistic traditions which now have to be overcome. During the past few weeks we have already been able to collect a number of experiences. In this connection we also endeavour to take over all the great and valuable experiences of other illegal parties, especially the Communist Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Poland, but, of course, not in a stereotyped manner.

The struggle for the defence of the Party and its legal existence has up to the present been very weak. During the past few months and weeks there have been a number of protest strikes in the factories in defence of our Party. There were a number of political demonstrations and a still larger number of factory meetings and hundreds of public meetings which protested against the dissolution of the Party and against the attacks upon it. But all that is still not yet enough for effective defence of the Party. In this problem we have to fight against a wrong tendency. There were comrades particularly in our lower Party organisations who represented the standpoint that if the Party is banned they will then carry on a fight, they will then carry through political strikes in the factories, and then we should go out upon the streets. We have to make it clear to these comrades that it will not do to wait until the Party is disbanded but that it is necessary to defend the Party now.

That the Czechoslovakian workers also love and defend their Party is shown by an example from a place in Slovakia where 400 workers, engaged on relief work, went on strike for half a day to defend the Communist Party and, besides that, gave up a day's wages out of their miserable pay for the fighting fund of the Party. (Applause.)

What is the situation in our Party organisation? We can say that the largest part of the members have shown themselves to be absolutely equal to the situation and are firmly and determinedly with the Party. This is proof that our Party is inwardly firm and sound. Only a small part of the membership, who were passive even before, are intimidated by the blows of the class enemy, are shrinking back and dropping into complete passivity. Cases of members becoming renegades have heretofore only occurred in isolated instances, and these have been only petty bourgeois hangers-on.

The struggle against opportunism has been carried on hitherto more or less only at the top. Only within the past few weeks did this struggle penetrate to all the Party nuclei. The struggle against opportunism is of the greatest significance precisely now when the Party is regrouping its ranks for work under illegal conditions.

Through this struggle we will first of all create the fullest clarity among our membership on all political questions, we will train the membership for Bolshevik vigilance against all opportunist deviations and convince the members that the greatest benefit for the Party in underground work lies in a correct Party line. Secondly, through this struggle against opportunism on a wide scale, we shall cleanse the Party of all incorrigibly opportunist, rotten elements who, if we were to drag them with us into illegality, could do us the greatest harm. We want to convince our comrades that no fascist dictatorship will be able to do away with the Communist Party if the Party itself does not allow itself to be inwardly corroded by opportunism.

What preparations are the Party making with all possible haste for work under conditions of illegality? We place main stress upon turning the Party towards the factory. The largest part of our factory nuclei is already illegal. Where this has not been so the Party nuclei are being transferred to an illegal basis. Up to the present 12½ per cent. of our Party membership was organised in factory nuclei. To raise this percentage now and to transfer half

or more than half of the members into factory nuclei is one of our most important present problems. We tell all the members: He who refuses to work in a factory nucleus can no longer be a member of the Communist Party.

A second measure which we are now putting through is the division of the factory nuclei into department nuclei and the division of the local groups and the street nuclei into smaller self-reliant organisations. In this dividing up of the various nuclei, the consideration of the capacity for action of the diminished organisations, must be decisive. In Czechoslovakia we have also made the mistake of having groups of five. The division of the organisations into groups of five was carried through in an entirely schematic manner and resulted in organisations which were formerly quite active becoming passive through this reorganisation. We are convinced of the incorrectness of these groups of five and are now correcting this very rapidly along the line of forming small self-reliant nuclei that are capable of action.

A third measure was the carrying out of our work with a certain amount of decentralisation. We further devote great attention to instructing the nuclei through the district and section committees. Systematic guidance of the nuclei is absolutely necessary. A certain amount of progress can already be recorded in this field. By the development of a planned system of instructors from top to bottom, instead of stereotyped circular letters, we hope to improve the work of the Communist Party and to increase the capacity of the Party for action. On the whole, we are now endeavouring to overcome everything of a stereotyped nature in the organisational work of the Party, but in doing so we are holding firmly to the fundamental Bolshevik principles of organisation.

The transition into illegality also makes it necessary to assure ourselves of our leading forces. The forming and training of new cadres is a very serious problem for our Party. It is our duty, now when we are going over into illegality, to cleanse our ranks from all spies and provocateurs and all suspicious elements in general. We can say that the Party has comparatively quickly learned how to publish and distribute an illegal press after the suppression of our entire legal press. A large number of illegal papers and hundreds of illegal leaflets have already appeared. We can state with satisfaction that the illegal papers which our lower organisations get out are well written. But we must do a great deal to raise their political level.

A decisive problem for the Party is how it can secure contact with the masses under the conditions of illegal work. Therefore it is now of the greatest importance that the Party should immediately mobilise all forces for the development of Communist fractions in the trade unions. The creation of fractions in the reformist trade unions is also very necessary now in connection with the great amount of discontent among the workers organised in the reformist trade unions.

Then it is a question of forming fractions in the other mass organisations and in the committees of action of the unemployed. We are now also proceeding to form so-called circles of sympathisers. These circles are to be formed around our Party organisations, the factory nuclei and street nuclei. Every Party member is to have contact with a non-Party and social democratic worker and these circles of sympathisers are to be a reservoir from which the Party will get new forces and new members.

In former years we had a strongly-organised unemployed movement in Czechoslovakia. Two years ago we had about 1,400 committees of action of the unemployed; the Party and the Red Trade Unions, with the help of these committees of action, had influence over several hundred thousand unemployed. But in 1932 the unemployed movement already began to decline and this year it is extraordinarily weak. This decline is mainly to be explained by the fact that we did not understand how to give the necessary political content to the unemployed movement. Its main activity was directed toward fighting for material successes. We must now absolutely make up for this, raise the unemployed movement to a political level and place the question clearly that only the dictatorship of the proletariat gives the unemployed work and bread, that only the Soviet Power can really help the unemployed. At the same time we must continue to fight for food cards and for every penny's worth of relief. If we now place the question before the unemployed in such a way, then we are convinced that we shall win over the great mass army of the unemployed as a fighting battalion for the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. (Applause.)

Comrade Losovsky (Communist Fraction, R.I.L.U.)

The destruction of the German trade unions and of German social democracy not only caused serious organisational and financial damage to the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, but was a tremendous moral and political blow to them. If we limit ourselves to the trade union field, we have the following picture: The membership of the Amsterdam International, which was about thirteen million at the end of 1932, suddenly dropped to eight million after the destruction of the A.D.G.B. A similar amputation occurred in the case of all the international industrial organisations under the direct political influence of the Amsterdam International. Immediately after the capitulation of the German trade union bureaucrats the leaders of the Amsterdam International, under the pressure of the indignation of the masses, began to make critical remarks about their German colleagues. Then the second period set in, when the Amsterdamites went over from condemnation of the Germans to expressions of sympathy with them, and to amnesty and justification of their politics and tactics.

This change of tactics of the Amsterdam people is due to the fact that the bankruptcy of the German trade union bureaucracy means the moral and political bankruptcy of the reformist trade union bureaucrats of other countries. Having begun with a criticism of the capitulation policy of the German reformists, but seeing that the indignation of the masses was being directed against the reformist policy in general, the trade union leaders made a sharp turn and began to seek for extenuating circumstances and to prove that the leaders of the German trade unions could not have acted differently.

But facts remain facts. The Amsterdam International was at once reduced by 39 per cent., and instead of being a European organisation, as was the case formerly, became for the most part a federation of trade union members of the countries of the Entente, carrying out the Entente line without adulteration under the banner of struggle against fascism. This is clear from the slogan of boycott of German goods, which is aimed at promoting the sale of goods of their own countries on the world market. This is evident also from the attitude of the Amsterdam International to the Austrian problem. The Amsterdam International appointed a special commission to assist the Austrian trade unions. But this assistance follows the line laid down by the French general staff and does not go beyond these directives.

The international reformist trade union movement has already received a crushing blow, because the example of Germany brought out into bold relief the difference in worth and relative stability between the big reformist mass trade unions and the small Red trade unions and revolutionary opposition. Everyone knows that the main blow of German fascism was directed against the Communist Party and the trade union opposition.

The bankruptcy of the German trade unions was bound to give rise to a tremendous wave of indignation among the masses of reformist workers in all countries, who are stubbornly asking their leaders what became of the great trade unions in Germany. The leaders are manoeuvring, trying to shift the blame on to the Communists, but this is much more difficult than it used to be, because even the bourgeois world press must admit that the Communist Party and the R.T.U.O. are carrying on a heroic struggle against fascism, while the social-democratic leaders, both at home and abroad, are endeavouring to shift the responsibility for their bankruptcy on to the shoulders of the German working class.

The rapid fasciation of the capitalist governments naturally confronts us with added difficulties, but the bitterness of class antagonisms and the complete bankruptcy of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals offer us tremendous new possibilities. The main enemy of the revolution within the working class has grown weaker, but has not disappeared, even in Germany, where the social democrats are attempting to revive their organisations and keep the workers back from a united front with us in order again to sidetrack the energy of the masses into the channel of "democratic socialism." But the situation has changed and the manoeuvring possibilities of the international social democrats have been considerably restricted, thus offering new possibilities for the Comintern and the R.I.L.U., not only in the capitalist countries, but also in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The rank and file social-democratic worker is now more receptive to our words and our proposals, and more ready than formerly to join us in struggle. The main task facing the international

Communist movement is the preparation of the working class for struggle for a Soviet government. All other tasks must be subordinated to this central task.

Of all the conditions necessary for a direct struggle for power in countries where the elements of a revolutionary crisis are rapidly maturing, we still lack the support of the majority of the working class. Consequently the outstanding problem is to-day the struggle to win over the majority of the working class. Experience teaches us that we must seize upon the elementary demands of the workers and develop a struggle of the workers and the unemployed for their vital demands (questions of wages, social insurance, relief, etc.).

Since the time of the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have conducted a number of important economic and political struggles. This has already been brought up by the delegates from France, the United States, England, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Balkan countries, etc. They have all given positive and negative examples and have all taken up in a very serious manner the weaknesses and errors of the Party and trade union organisations in the conducting of these struggles. If we ask ourselves what feature is common to all this self-criticism, we find that the characteristic feature of all the positive and negative examples brought up here involves three factors:

- (1) Insufficient consistent, systematic and persistent preparation of these struggles.
- (2) Failure to utilise and build up even those movements which have arisen and developed under our direct leadership.
- (3) The wave-like character of our activity, i.e., after the tensing manifested during struggles and actions we observe a slackening of energy and activity.

I will give only two examples. The Citroen strike was the outstanding feature in the labour movement of France during the past year. But we not only failed to extend our positions as a result of this strike, but actually lost ground. Another example. After a long struggle Comrade Arthur Horner was elected an official of the South Wales Miners' Federation, obtaining 10,000 votes as against 7,000 votes polled by the reformist candidate. This is a great victory. But what next? In the Executive Committee of the S.W.M.F. we have one Communist and two sympathisers. What are they doing? How are they carrying on their work? What platform have they got? What distinguishes them from the non-Communists and non-sympathisers? Neither the Party press nor the trade union press says a word about this. We have a definite position, but we do not make use of it, although we won this position so that we could make use of it and extend our influence.

Thousands of times we have decided that the sole purpose of the united front is struggle against capitalism, but we find tens and hundreds of cases in which the united front is formed merely for joint discussion. Thousands of times we have declared that the united front in no sense means any glossing over of our views, but the speakers up to now have brought up dozens of cases in which we have been swamped in the united front, fearing to show our faces before the enemies, and have folded our hands and kept silent about the crimes of the reformists. A thousand times we have declared that the united front must be utilised for strengthening and building up our positions by recruiting members for the Red trade unions and by building up, strengthening and extending opposition movements in the reformist and other trade unions, by organising factory sections, etc. But the speakers here have given a tremendous number of examples which show that in cases when a united front has been built up at our initiative we not only failed to become stronger as a result of it, but were actually weaker. In other words, when we have followed an incorrect line the united front works against us. Why? Because frequently the united front was interpreted as an agreement from top, as a mutual truce, and not a uniting of rank and file forces for struggle against the reformist bureaucrats. We have passed thousands of decisions declaring that the united front must serve to develop the initiative of the rank and file, bringing forward new active elements from among the masses, and that the united front must be used to draw social-democratic and non-Party workers into active struggle. But experience has shown that in many cases the united front has not brought such results, and that, at best, we and the

social democrats remain in our old positions. Why, then, have we not formed a united front? What does it bring us? Why is it that the correct decisions of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. and of the overwhelming majority of the leading organs of our Party and of our trade unions reach our lowest units in distorted form? Why is it that in some cases we find even a fear of the united front? Because the leading organs of our Party and our revolutionary trade unions and trade union oppositions consider the question settled when they publish their theses and resolutions. But the question is only beginning when the theses or resolutions are published. It is necessary not only to print a resolution, but to explain the methods and forms of building up a united front in all rank and file organisations, to rally all members of the lower units, to mobilise all fractions from top to bottom, to work out a plan of action and make it applicable to every enterprise, every district, every industry, and to assign concrete tasks to every trade union member, especially every Communist.

The united front must be brought about first of all in the enterprises. We must take the initiative in formulating the immediate demands of the workers. We must organise an exchange of opinions on questions affecting the workers of the given department, of the given enterprise, and an exchange of opinions on more general questions of policy, discussing policy in relation not only to fascism, but also democratic governments. We must work for the election of all kinds of commissions—for the defence of wages, for the investigation of the situation of the workers, and the working women, and for the study of labour conditions; we must work for the election of delegates, for the putting forward of demands, etc. We must see that the most influential workers, social-democratic or non-party workers, are elected to these delegations, and must discuss all questions with them and create a spirit of comradeship and internal discipline, so that the social-democratic worker cannot refuse to carry out the decisions in which he has collaborated. We must prepare protest movements, demonstrations, strikes, etc., drawing into all leading organs social-democratic and non-party workers and workers belonging to fascist organisations. Activity in the enterprises must be the starting point for our influence among the masses.

We must apply the united front also in the reformist, Catholic and other trade unions. We, as members of the given organisation must work and take upon ourselves the initiative, and gather together the members of the trade union who are employed in the given enterprise to discuss the specific questions affecting the workers of the department, enterprise or category in question. We must put forward revolutionary workers and supporters of the revolutionary trade union movement for official posts, as dues collectors, etc., and work to capture every elected post in the enterprises and in the trade unions. But it is not enough to capture elective posts. We must utilise these posts to distribute our literature and uphold our views and our tactics. We must struggle against capitulation to the reformist bureaucrats. We must organise all forms of protest action, including strikes, through trade union members and functionaries sympathetic to us, continually driving the movement ahead against the employers and against the social fascists. Our work in the reformist trade unions must follow the line of criticism of the reformist trade union bodies for their treachery and strike-breaking activities. But this criticism must be based on concrete facts. The main thing is to organise our forces and build up a solid trade union opposition with a definite programme and rigid internal discipline, and not waste what we have already gained. The establishment of trade union groups in the enterprises and the uniting of all lower oppositional trade unions for struggle on behalf of our programme—this is the only way to strengthen our ideological influence. If we follow this line, our work in the reformist trade unions is bound to show definite and positive results.

With boldness, persistence and serious work among the masses, very good results can be achieved. It is sufficient to bring up the example of Denmark, where we succeeded in winning the stokers' union over to the revolutionary trade union movement. How can we hold our own in the reformist trade unions when we have the trade union bureaucrats against us? How can we hold our own if the entire government apparatus is backing the trade union bureaucrats against us? If we fight tenaciously for trade union democracy and if we work from day to day to expose and combat appointments from above, the bureaucratic attitude towards the interest of the workers, manipulations behind the scenes, and strike-breaking, and if our every step is linked up with the masses,

instead of being the isolated action of a few bold and intrepid persons, it will be more and more difficult to expel revolutionary workers from the unions.

We must carry on work for united front also in the fascist trade unions. Here, above all, the entire work must be concentrated in the enterprises among the masses, and the workers must be mobilised against compulsory membership, against the payment of membership dues to the fascist trade unions. All agitation and propaganda among the working masses must be carried on under the slogan: "Where do the pennies of the workers go?" If the fascists themselves arrange meetings we must participate in these meetings by asking questions, making interjections, and coming forward ourselves in order to expose the treacherous character of the fascist functionaries and to introduce our resolutions at their meetings. Every time that fascist functionaries go to the employers we must lead the masses to give expression to their discontent, and we must put forward the idea of the necessity of electing specially authorised commissions for conducting the negotiations with the employers regarding labour conditions, and we must continually spur the masses on to struggle against fascism.

On the basis of the concrete example of the fascist trade unions in Poland I wish to point out here how our work should be developed. I wish to show what we Communists must do in enterprises where there are trade unions adhering to the fascist trade union organisation. Our cell and our illegal trade union group must carry on a struggle to prevent the workers from joining the fascist trade union. If, however, all the workers are actually forced to join the trade union, we, of course, must join, too, combating individual withdrawals from the trade union which merely result in dismissal from the enterprise. As members of the fascist trade union, we must carry on systematic work to unite the workers, exposing the fascist trade union leaders, the lack of democracy in the trade union, etc., and spurring the workers on to struggle against the fascist system as a whole.

In the matter of strengthening and developing our work in the armament factories we are literally going ahead at a snail's pace. We should now concentrate our efforts first of all on the factories producing armaments, machine guns and tanks, and in shipyards, as well as factories producing cannons, gunpowder and chemicals for war purposes, and finally on transportation.

Sea transportation is bound to play a tremendously important role in time of war. What have our Comintern and R.I.L.U. sections done to organise the seamen and harbour workers? Very little. And this in spite of the fact that at the present time we have very great possibilities in this field. The strongest federation in the Amsterdam International was the international federation of transport workers, headed by the noted demagogue, Pimpen. The crushing of the German trade union movement led not only to a decline in the membership of this federation, but to its financial bankruptcy. The federation even suspended the publication of its official organ, although, according to its own words, it still has almost a million and a half members. On the other hand, in connection with the special strike-breaking policy of the international federation of transport workers and the recent struggles of the seamen in the Baltic and other European countries, the hatred against this federation is growing among the masses. It would seem that this offers us every basis for rallying the discontented workers and organising them and forming groups and helping the seamen's international in its work. But this has not been the case. The international of seamen and harbour workers, which has developed fairly widespread activity since the time of the Hamburg unity congress, has not met with the necessary support in the most important countries. What has the British Communist Party done to develop work among the seamen? Nothing. What has the American Communist Party done in this field? Very little. What has the French Communist Party done, and the C.G.T.U.? Still less. Nevertheless, war is drawing nearer and nearer. Just think for a moment: if we took up this work seriously in England, in the United States, in France and in Japan, what tremendous importance it would have for the future development of the world labour movement and of our struggle against war. Of course, we must not be led to believe that by working among the seamen we can deal a crushing blow to war. This would be an exaggeration, but this is the section of the proletariat which can do more than any other section of the proletariat in the field of struggle against war, because the merchant seamen are most closely linked up with the sailors in the navy.

And, finally, it must not be forgotten that over a hundred

thousand sailors pass annually through the harbours of the Soviet Union. They attend our clubs, read our literature, hear our lectures, go to the Soviet cinemas, become acquainted with our socialist construction, etc. How are our Parties and our R.I.L.U. sections making use of these vast and continual "workers' excursions"? These workers go back with the impressions they have gained, but have no one to get in touch with, as is the case, for example, in England. How are the Parties utilising this great mass of seamen? Are they establishing contacts with those who come back from the Soviet Union and attempting to make use of them to develop and extend the work among the seamen, and not only among the seamen and harbour workers, but also among broad sections of workers in other branches of industry? I do not know of any such facts. An end must be made once and for all to such a state of affairs in which this sphere of our work is entirely neglected.

What are the conclusions to be drawn from an analysis of our work since the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.?

(1) At every Plenum and congress we again and again point out our weaknesses and defects, and yet year after year we observe a repetition of a portion of our earlier mistakes, while at the same time new ones are added.

(2) The influence of the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. has undoubtedly increased, but this growing influence has been very poorly consolidated—for example, in the U.S.A., in Japan, in France, etc.

(3) We find an unequal development in the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. But there is one common feature characterising all our sections, and that is the practice of lagging behind events. This practice is less pronounced in some countries (China, Germany and Poland), and more pronounced in other countries (France, England and U.S.A.). But it is the characteristic feature of the present state of our movement.

(4) The responsibility for this, we must frankly admit, rests not only with the sections, but with the leadership of the R.I.L.U. We have by no means done all that could have been done, and we lost time in the struggle against the Amsterdam International immediately after the destruction of the German trade unions, and this loss of time unquestionably damaged the international revolutionary trade union movement.

(5) All the efforts of the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. must be directed speedily to overcoming this backwardness at all costs, and all the energy of the R.I.L.U. must be concentrated in this direction, otherwise events may take us by surprise. We must keep in mind that, although the manoeuvring possibilities of the social democrats have already been restricted, they are nevertheless manoeuvring very skilfully.

(6) We must undermine and definitely put an end to the influence of the social democrats. We must teach the working

masses to fight after the manner of the Soviet Union, and we must keep in mind that events are developing with tremendous rapidity and that if we lag behind this rapid development of class contradictions we will only be playing into the hands of the enemies of the proletariat. This is why the slogan of all our Comintern and R.I.L.U. sections must be: "No more lagging behind!" We must exert all possible pressure in order to raise the Comintern and R.I.L.U. sections up to the necessary level.

(7) The number of the illegal sections of the R.I.L.U. is growing, and, owing to the sharpening of the class struggle, it is likely that sections of the R.I.L.U. which are still on a legal basis will be driven underground. The Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions must carry on an intense struggle for the legal and open existence of the revolutionary trade union movement, at the same time adopting a number of measures for the event of the movement being forced underground.

(8) The more tense the class struggle becomes the greater watchfulness is required of the Party in the struggle against deviations from the general line of the Comintern. The more bitter the struggle, the more watchful the Party must be of the leadership of the trade unions, where vacillations are inevitable owing to their composition, as Lenin warned us. If the Party does not exercise continual control over this leadership and build up its Communist fractions, the revolutionary trade unions may not only fall behind themselves, but hold back with them important sections of the workers. A strong and systematic leadership of the trade union fractions is a prerequisite for utilising the trade unions as a weapon for the destruction of the capitalist system.

(9) Without the Communist Parties it is impossible for us to build up a revolutionary mass movement. It is impossible for the Communist Parties to put forward the question of power in concrete terms without basing its support on the revolutionary trade union mass movement. Consequently, the question of the really revolutionary and mass character of the sections of the R.I.L.U. now acquires exceptionally great significance. The masses expect of us both leadership and initiative. They know that the Bolsheviks are not just talkers, but are people of revolutionary action. Of course the difficulties are tremendous, for the enemy is still strong, but there are no difficulties which Bolsheviks cannot overcome. Communism is invincible. It smashes through all barriers and breaks down all obstacles. The Communist Parties embody all the power, all the energy and all the revolutionary fire of our great class and of the future labouring generations. The Communist Party must not keep its face covered, but must go forward with its head high, for we Communists do not and must not conceal our aims, but must fight for the tasks set us by the Comintern—and we will win. (Applause.)

Comrade Michal (Y.C.L. Czechoslovakia)

There is a strong process of radicalisation going on among the youth who are still under the influence of the social fascists and reformists, the chief characteristic features of which are as follows: Firstly, this process is directed not only against the social-fascist leaders, but also, and with increasing aggressiveness, against the whole treacherous policy of social fascism in general. Secondly, it embraces a larger part of the youth under social-fascist influence than formerly. Thirdly, individual members of the socialist youth and even whole organisations are to an increasing extent drawing the final conclusions and severing organisational connections with the social fascists.

What are the most important causes of this process? Firstly, the ideological bankruptcy of the Second International. Secondly, the fight of the Communist Parties and of the Young Communist Leagues against social fascism. One must emphasise in this connection that the two united front appeals of the E.C. of the Y.C.I. have played a great role in developing and influencing this process. Thirdly, the Soviet Union and its gigantic successes in the fight for socialism are an extraordinarily big political factor in

radicalising the youth who are under the influence of social fascism and reformism.

The young socialist international, as a part of the Second International, has suffered the same ideological bankruptcy as the latter. The Y.S.I. and its sections are unreservedly carrying out the nationalist, counter-revolutionary anti-working-class policy of their parties. As, however, there is taking place a profounder process of radicalisation among the socialist youth than among the adults, the youth leaders are resorting to the utmost extent to methods of "Left" demagogy in order to retain and strengthen their influence.

The real attitude of the socialist youth leagues to the question of the fight against imperialist war is shown by the fact that members of the socialist youth, or even the whole organisations, are expelled for participating in the youth anti-war movement and its committees; it is further shown by the fact that the socialist youth leagues forbid their organisations and members generally to take part in the world movement of the youth against imperialist war and fascism. The socialist labour youth not only supports

the introduction in every country of labour service—that is to say, the militarisation and fascisation of the youth, but is one of its initiators. The secretary of the socialist labour youth international, Vorrink, is a member in Holland of the State Commission for the introduction of labour service, and is mobilising the youth for the labour service. In Czechoslovakia, in Sweden, etc., the socialist youth represents labour service as "the way back into life." That is the policy of the socialist labour youth in all countries with regard to the question of war.

Among the youth who are under social-fascist influence there is revealed an ever-greater desire for the real united front. The Y.C.I. has issued two united front proposals to the socialist youth. Shortly afterwards the executive bureau of the socialist youth international met in Amsterdam. The question of the united front was on the agenda. But how was it dealt with? A decision was adopted "not to do anything at present regarding this question, but to leave it to the individual leagues." All our youth sections have, on the basis of the united front appeals of the Y.C.I., addressed concrete united front proposals to the socialist youth. And the reply? Categorical rejection, prohibition of the organisations of the socialist youth and their members from taking part in the united front with the Communists. They are for the counter-revolutionary united front with the bourgeoisie, i.e., against the revolutionary unity of the workers and the toiling youth. One of the leaders of the socialist Young Guard of Belgium wrote in an article: United front—No, Common struggle—Yes. But in what shall this common struggle consist? In actions, perhaps? No, in propaganda, for if a united front of action should be set up, then the Communists might get the upper hand of us. This is the attitude of one of the most "Left" leaders of the socialist youth on the question of the united front.

The results of our struggle against social fascism and reformism among the youth are in no way commensurate with the process of radicalisation, and lag behind it. This is due, firstly, to the insufficient work of our sections of the Y.C.I. and the grave opportunist mistakes of a Right and "Left" character in this sphere; secondly, to the very outspoken "Left" demagoguery of the socialist youth leagues in a number of countries, as well as to the increased activity of counter-revolutionary Trotskyists among the youth and the insufficient struggle which our youth leagues are waging

against both these tendencies. In Germany our league, instead of making use of the bankruptcy and the collapse of the S.P. of Germany and the socialist youth leagues and going over to the offensive against them, organised the opposition among the youth in the old manner, and even permitted a number of serious Right opportunist mistakes. There prevailed in the league, right up to the C.C., the opinion that the social democracy is no longer the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie within the working class. In France the opportunist leadership of the league has committed a number of serious mistakes. Instead of organising the united front from below, negotiations were conducted with the leaders of the socialist youth and the Poujists. The fundamental difference between the Y.C.L. and the S.Y.L. was blurred over. In Austria, instead of boldly initiating an ideological offensive against the social fascists, and especially against the "Lefts," and thus drawing the radicalised youth who are under their influence into the revolutionary united front, into the Y.C.L., and the revolutionary mass organisations, our league has created a "Left" youth opposition within the socialist party of Austria, with a platform of its own. By this policy our Young Communists in Austria have prepared the way for a centrist youth organisation.

It is thanks to the fight of the E.C. of the Y.C.I. against these mistakes that we are able to-day to make the first positive advance in this field in connection with the preparations for the World Youth Congress. The mistakes are not yet liquidated. A correct Bolshevik vigilance and an irreconcilable fight on two fronts are necessary in this question. It has become evident that the sections of the Y.C.I. have up to now not been able to make use of the profound radicalisation process which is going on among the youth under the influence of the social fascists. In addition to the causes already mentioned, this is also to be attributed to the fact that the Communist Parties have not paid sufficient attention to the youth leagues. It is the task of the Communist Parties and not only of the Y.C.L. closely to connect their day to day fight against social fascism with the question of the winning of the young workers in order to wrest them from the influence of the social fascist parties, trade unions, and other social-fascist organisations, and to bring them into the revolutionary front and thereby convert our Young Communist Leagues into real mass organisations. (Applause.)

Comrade Stassova

The membership of the I.R.A. at the time of its first world congress, which was held shortly following the Twelfth Plenum, was 13,778,605. Of these more than ten million were individual members, while over three million were in collective memberships. The membership was divided into 70 sections, 25 of them legal, 7 illegal and 38 semi-legal. By the time of the Thirteenth Plenum this proportion has undergone a marked change: we now have only 22 legal sections, while already we have 39 illegal sections. Instead of 7 illegal sections, we have 39. The number of semi-legal sections has been reduced from 38 to 10. We have, moreover, one new section, on the Island of Timod, and there are also groups, though not yet real sections, in Iceland, Trinidad and British Guiana. We have made very good and close contacts with the Negro world. Our Congress was attended by representatives from the whole Negro world, including a representative from the Island of Trinidad, sent by the social-democratic trade unions there having a membership of 30,000. Moreover, we could claim at our congress, groups and organisations situated in all parts of the world. Furthermore, most of our sections were already on the way to becoming mass organisations. The preparations for the congress were characterised by mass work and struggle against war preparations.

In spite of its illegal status, our German section lives and works and struggles, and is carrying out its tasks in a manner worthy of a revolutionary organisation. We have contacts with nearly all districts, and in spite of the fact that the organisation is beheaded by Hitler from time to time, new forces always come to the fore and carry on the work. Immediately after the prohibition in Germany, we launched a widespread campaign to form

relief committees throughout the world to help the German section, the German working class. We conducted campaigns in a number of countries such as Holland, Switzerland, France, Denmark, Poland, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Spain, England, Italy, U.S.A., in all the countries of Latin America, Madagascar, Syria, Canada, China, etc. Furthermore, we carried out a Relief Week. This was set for June in the European countries and for July in the non-European countries. We used this week for collecting funds. In France, 300,000 francs were collected, in Switzerland 11,600 Swiss francs, in the U.S.A. 2,070 dollars, in England 600 pounds, in Belgium 15,000 francs, in Holland 2,500 gulden, in Denmark 2,500 kronen, in Czechoslovakia 90,000 kronen, in Austria up to the prohibition on May 20, 3,000 shillings, in Greece 20,000 drachmas. Here I wish to bring out one fact which will undoubtedly interest the whole Executive Committee of the Comintern: the political prisoners in the Sironos (Athens) protested against terrorism in Germany and sent 400 drachmas, the prisoners in the Larissa prison sent 100 drachmas, while the collective group of political prisoners in the Orenes prison in Thessaly expressed its protest and sent 300 drachmas. (Applause.) The revolutionised soldiers of the 32nd infantry regiment on the Island of Mytilen announced their protest and sent 186 drachmas, while the soldiers of the 16th infantry regiment from Verja (Macedonia) sent 30 drachmas.

Not only have we carried on work among the great masses of the working class, but we have also turned to the intellectuals. We attempted to obtain counsel for the trial in Germany. Moreover we organised international delegations. In August delegations met in Amsterdam from the U.S.A., England and Holland in

order to obtain permission to send a delegation to Germany to study conditions in the German prisons. The permission was refused by the German government, which also refused the application of the labour delegations which had been formed in a number of countries to protest against fascism and white terror in Germany.

For months we have been carrying on an increasingly extensive campaign in Latin America, in spite of bitter persecution and illegal conditions. This campaign of the Red Aid has been carried on in Cuba, Mexico, Panama, Brazil, Argentina, Chile and throughout Central and South America: Our campaign has taken the form of distribution of mass leaflets, boycotting German ships, demonstrations, strikes against the swastika flag, demonstrations in front of German consulates and embassies, collection of funds, the holding of street meetings, the distribution of literature in the German language for 500,000 Germans living in Sao Paolo, and the drawing in of other working-class organisations and intellectuals—all under the leadership of the I.R.A.

In Madagascar a widespread campaign was conducted in spite of very great difficulties. In South Africa also we have made great progress. And finally, the Executive Committee of the I.R.A. has issued a number of pamphlets in German against Hitler fascism.

It must be emphasised that the Party, as well as our own organisations, have not recognised to a sufficient degree that this movement which has now been launched in all countries, must be looked upon as an expression of the united front. This error has made it possible for the social democrats to start an attack against the Red Aid all along the front. It is calling the Matteotti Fund back to life.

Whom has the Matteotti Fund helped up to now? We know this very well from the trial against the Mensheviks in the Soviet Union in 1930. At that time the Mensheviks declared that they had received 200,000 marks from the social democrats of Germany. This was refuted by Vandervelde and Dan, who declared that the money did not come from the social-democratic party but from the Matteotti Fund. This was the first public appearance of the Matteotti Fund. As you can see from this, the Matteotti Fund is being used for the struggle against the Soviet Union.

There have been a number of cases of expulsion of workers from the social-democratic party for support of our Red Aid. And not only individual workers, but whole organisations have been expelled from the trade unions and from the social-democratic party on these grounds. This makes the struggle of our Party on behalf of the Red Aid and against the Matteotti Fund at the same time a struggle to win over the social-democratic workers for the revolutionary united front.

The number of victims of the white terror for the eight years since 1925 up to to-day is 5,544,321. During the eight months of this year, according to the very incomplete figures which we have been able to get from the bourgeois press, there have been 227,896 arrests. The number of those tortured and wounded while under arrest is 159,132; 46,543 have been killed and 346 have been sentenced to death; 10,651 have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment or fined.

Comrade Humbert-Droz (Switzerland)

I take the floor because some leading comrades of the Comintern have asked me to inform the Executive of my attitude to the events in Germany and to what extent I share responsibility for the situation obtaining in Geneva and in the C.P. of Switzerland.

On the same day when the report of Hitler's seizure of power was published I wrote a leading article for the "Drapeau Rouge." After having pointed to the responsibility of the social democracy for the seizure of power by fascism, my chief concern was to prevent a pessimistic and defeatist interpretation of the German events gaining ground among our readers and in the ranks of our Party, and in particular to see that no superficial and light-minded comparison should be made with the Italian situation. I endeavoured in the article to show the difference existing be-

According to the figures appearing in the "China Forum," issued in Shanghai, the number of victims of the white terror in China for the years 1927-32 is one million, not counting the thousands killed in the Japanese attack on Chapei and those left dead on the battle-field in the six campaigns of the Kuomintang against the Chinese Soviet territory. In the first six months of this year alone, there were in Kuomintang China, according to incomplete estimations, 42,694 killed, 31,000 wounded, 11,333 arrested and 3,000 house-raids. I give these figures in order to make clear to the Plenum of the E.C.C.I. the importance of the fact that in 1931 the Executive Committee of the I.R.A. adopted a resolution to make December 12, the anniversary of the Canton Commune, the second "International Red Aid Day."

From Japan we have had news of the arrest of 1,700 trade union members. On October 29 the monster trial was opened against 500 members of the Japanese Communist Party, in which four revolutionaries were sentenced to life imprisonment and another 477 were sentenced to frightfully long prison terms. In Tokyo 4,000 persons were arrested in two days. Every month there are no less than 1,000 arrests in Japan. In 1933, 300 revolutionists were murdered in Japan, and 170 were wounded.

In Bulgaria in September, 1933, 183 soldiers and sailors were sentenced for their struggle against war—34 were sentenced to death, while the others were sentenced to a total of 770 years' imprisonment and fines amounting to 31,690 dollars. In France most of the political prisoners are soldiers and sailors.

In Greece at the present time, hundreds of soldiers and sailors are serving their terms in the notorious prison on the Island of Kolpak.

And what is the attitude of the social democrats to the soldiers and sailors who mutiny and want to struggle for their freedom? In Parliament, one of the Dutch social-democratic leaders, Wibaut, declared:—

"I have no intention of upholding the mutineers of the 'Zeven Provincien.' What occurred there is something which cannot be tolerated."

And Albarda, chairman of the social-fascist parliamentary fraction, said: "Not a single government can tolerate mutinies." The executive council of the trade union of sailors, soldiers and marine workers, which is completely under the influence of the social fascists, also took a stand against the uprising and expressly stated to the government that it condemned this action and called upon its members to be loyal to the government.

Comrades, these are facts which we again bring to the attention of the whole proletarian world. Comrade Knorin called to mind the Sacco and Vanzetti case and said that the reaction to events in Germany is not the same as what it was at that time. Is this a mere chance? No, comrades. Only because the parties underestimate the political role of the R.A. and because of the fact that we do not get any good forces for our work, is it possible to have so little attention paid to such a great cause as the struggle against fascism. I am not here to ask for favours. I put forward the demand that we, as an organisation with millions of members, have a right to demand of the Communist Parties, that they give us good forces so that we can achieve our final aim: the world revolution, which will open the doors of the prisons. (Applause.)

tween Mussolini's seizure of power in Italy and Hitler's taking over the reins of the Government in Germany.

I stated at numerous meetings that it is necessary to support the illegal and heroic struggle of the C.P. of Germany, its fierce struggle against fascism, which is the only correct and effective policy. I conducted this struggle not only against the social fascists but also against their agents, the Trotskyists, Brandlerists, the renegades of all shades. I combated the assertions and views of these renegades regarding the defeat of the German proletariat, the bankruptcy of the Communist International and of the Communist Party of Germany, and defended the line of the C.P. of Germany and of the Communist International.

This activity, of which numerous copies of the "Drapeau

Rouge" and thousands of Swiss workers can bear witness, cannot emanate from a person who is filled with defeatism, and who, it is alleged, asserted that "everything has come to an end, that nothing can be done," an assertion which one of the speakers from this tribune, on the basis of wrong information, credited me with having made.

In connection with the international events since the beginning of this year, however, I committed an opportunist error in another sphere, e.g., in my interpretation of the appeal of the Communist International, in which the sections of the C.I. are called upon to launch a united front of action.

At a session of our Political Bureau I maintained that this appeal marked an important turn and a change in the policy of the Communist International in regard to united front tactics that the C.I. had returned to the tactics of the united front from above and below.

I recognise that this appraisal of the policy of the International meant a grave relapse into the opportunist mistakes which I had committed in the year 1928 and last year.

In Geneva we have a situation which may be repeated in other sections of the Comintern, and where, in a typical form, there exists the danger of a wrong policy and of illusions evoked in our ranks by the "Lefts" of the Second International.

The figures of the election returns reveal a catastrophic situation: 220 to 230 Communist votes as against 17,000 to 19,000 social-democratic votes. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to assume that the situation in Geneva, and also the influence of the Communist Party, could be judged on the basis of these election figures. In almost all the sections of the Communist International the number of our voters exceeds by far the number of the leaders of our press and the number of participants in our demonstrations. In Geneva this proportion is reversed. In the trade unions of Geneva our Party occupies the strongest position it has in the reformist unions in general. Our comrades are frequently supported in the revolutionary trade union opposition work by active members of the social-democratic party, who at elections vote for Nicole. On the other hand, hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of social-democratic workers attend the meetings and demonstrations of the Communist Party and of the revolutionary mass organisations.

Our great mistake last year was that we believed that Nicole was drawing nearer to Communism and was developing towards our Party. But Nicole applied his "Left" demagogy in order to erect a barrier between the Communist Party and the socialist workers who are coming nearer to Communism.

Under the pressure of the socialist workers who were in favour of the united front, Nicole agreed to set up the united front with the Communist Party for May 1, and thereby violated the discipline of the social-democratic party of Switzerland. This was a manoeuvre on the part of Nicole in order to make the workers under his influence believe that he was going to break with the socialist party and would in time join the Communist Party.

(Losovsky: He turned your heads.)

This is the reason why he went to Amsterdam and also of his attitude towards the Soviet Union. He makes use of the great influence and the prestige enjoyed by the Soviet Union among the Geneva workers in order to keep these workers within the ranks of the counter-revolutionary Second International.

The influence of our Party on the socialist workers was also the reason why Nicole, in November, 1932, called upon the workers of Geneva to come out in an anti-fascist counter-demonstration, which led to the well-known bloody collisions. The socialist party knew that the Communist Party would call upon the masses to come out

in a counter-demonstration, as it had already done twice previously; by calling upon the workers to demonstrate, Nicole wanted to prevent the workers of Switzerland joining the Communist Party. The leaders of the social-democratic party also called a demonstration in order to appease the masses and to keep them away from the square where the fascists were assembled. In view of this demagogy of Nicole, it is not surprising that thousands of Geneva workers consider Nicole to be a revolutionary. Our work in regard to destroying this illusion existing among the working class was insufficient. However, thanks to this peculiar situation, our Party has succeeded during the past year—this time not only against the Right social-democratic leaders but also against Nicole—in mobilising the working class for the general strike and the big demonstrations which took place on the occasion of the funeral of our Comrade Fuerst and in the course of which the Geneva troops mutinied.

During the great demonstrations on November 9 our comrades prevented Nicole from dragging the workers behind him to the other bank of the Rhine. They also succeeded, as soon as the troops began to fire and Nicole had fled, in rallying the workers together into a demonstration and in putting forward the slogan of the general strike. Our comrades, however, waited until the strike was carried out spontaneously in response to our slogan or until the socialist party and the reformist trade unions had seized the initiative and organised the strike. In this respect our comrades of the Geneva Committee made a mistake; after having demonstrated in the streets under the slogan: long live the general strike, instead of organising the strike themselves, they went to Nicole in order to enquire what was his attitude to an eventual general strike. Nicole replied that he was opposed to the general strike, as this was a matter for the trade unions. Our comrades did not seize the initiative for organising the general strike; they issued an appeal for the general strike, but did not give a definite fighting slogan.

You will now ask: how is it possible that a year later the Communist Party polled 220 votes, whilst Nicole received 19,000 votes? It is certain that Nicole's demagogy is one of the reasons for this fact.

(Losovsky: And, before all, your policy towards Nicole!)

As a result of Nicole's demagogy, we have still further popularised certain demagogic slogans of Nicole in the course of this year, when he declared, for instance, that the Second International is the last bulwark of capitalism, by which we strengthened the illusions in regard to Nicole's policy not only among the socialist workers but also among the members of our Party. It was just as harmful when "l'Humanite," which is widely read in Geneva, after the Amsterdam Congress, designated Nicole a true revolutionary.

Only after Nicole's capitulation to social democracy and his miserable attitude before the court did we succeed in overcoming these illusions. The main reason of our defeat in Geneva is opportunism, which is corroding our Party, the illusions regarding the role of the "Left" social democracy, as well as the role of Nicole.

I must admit that the policy which I pursued in Geneva before the Twelfth Plenum, and which was expressed in my platform of last year, helped to strengthen the illusions in the ranks of our Party and of the working class, illusions which we, to a very inadequate extent, tried to overcome in the course of the last year.

Even after the treachery of Nicole there are still in our Party a great number of comrades who regard the socialist party of Geneva as a party of class struggle. This was expressed immediately after the elections in the discussion opened in our paper.

I have already admitted that I bear the main responsibility

for this situation of our Geneva organisation—both as a result of my policy before the Twelfth Plenum as well as a result of the inadequate struggle conducted during the last year in the "Drapeau Rouge," where I omitted to clear up the situation and to help the comrades to rid themselves of their illusions and their wrong policy. I am responsible not only for Geneva but for the situation in our Swiss Party.

Whilst our Party Central Committee endeavoured to continue the struggle against opportunism in Basle and Geneva, to renew our cadres by a number of measures in order to ensure the correct political line of our Party, I have not—this must be admitted—supported our Party in this struggle, neither in the paper of French Switzerland nor in the whole organisation of the Party. I remained in

a state of passivity, which certainly encouraged resistance to and hampered the activity of the leadership.

Now, when I am voting for the resolutions submitted to the Thirteenth Plenum, I realise that this vote means particularly for me, who have committed many opportunist mistakes, a pledge to support our Central Committee to the utmost in its struggle for the carrying out of the decisions of the Thirteenth Plenum.

Interjection: You declared the same thing at the Twelfth Plenum, but you have not carried it out. What does that mean?

Humbert-Droz: I have carried out something, but not everything.

Interjection: Whatever it has been, it was not a struggle against opportunism.

