

The next speaker was **Comrade Poganni**, he expressed the opinion that Comrade Trotsky's report contained some contradictions and omissions. On page 4 of his theses, Comrade Trotsky says that the main reason why the bourgeoisie are maintaining their positions is that an industrial boom arose a few months after the conclusion of the war. On page 14 however he says "the proletariat which in the present crisis has suffered defeat will make a new offensive under better conditions". Thus, the theses asserts that the European proletariat were unable to conquer political power because of the economic boom which developed after the war. And then, the theses states that the workers failed to capture political power owing to the economic crisis. Comrade Trotsky quoted an example from the history of the Russian labour movement from which it was evident that the proletariat which had suffered a defeat in 1905, rallied again when the industrial boom arrived. "I could also quote examples from the history of the Hungarian Labour Movement" said Com. Poganni, "where the proletariat was defeated by the white terror, but did the Hungarian proletariat rally during the economic boom? No! on the contrary we see that it is during the present period of economic crisis in Hungary, that the proletarian movement is becoming stronger, but this example is not valid for the present moment. The Russian proletariat suffered defeat in 1905, the Hungarian proletariat in 1919, but the European proletariat has not been defeated, it is not true that the European proletarian organisations have been destroyed. On the contrary we see that during the period of industrial boom the workers organisations of the whole of Europe, have grown, have become stronger and have united in fighting divisions. We see further that during economic crises the proletariat by no means loses heart. On the contrary it was owing to the commencing industrial crisis that the workers of France, Germany and Tcheco-Slovakia, rose and formed Communist parties. It was not accident that the strong communist parties were for-

med not in the period of industrial boom, but in the period of economic crisis. I think that the theses are based on a future war, and not on the present economic crisis. I think that this crisis will not bring about social peace, because the bourgeoisie will adopt all measures in order to defeat the proletariat. The proletariat will not surrender because at the present moment the revolutionary movement in all countries is guided by the communist parties, which calculating the situation will lead the proletariat into battle. For that reason it seems to me that it was necessary to deal more widely and deeply in the theses with the question of civil war. We must assert that force plays the same at the present moment as it played during the so-called period of accumulation of capital i. e. that force in the period of the collapse of capital plays the same role as it did in the period of its accumulation. I must raise the question as to what the economic crisis will bring to the proletariat in the immediate future and what situation will be created as the result of it by the communists parties. I do not think that it is necessary to be a prophet for the crisis itself indicates what this will be. As evidence of this I will quote only the most important facts: the miners strike in England, and the March rising in Germany are nothing else than resistance to the attempt of the bourgeoisie to reduce wages. In this connection the bourgeoisie directed all the force at its command against the proletariat. As a consequence the Communist Party in Germany went more to the Left, became more revolutionary, and in the ranks of the Independants, a so called new left wing has been formed. As a consequence of the miners strike in England more favourable conditions have been created for the revolution and for a mass communist party. We mainly assert that the same phenomena reveal themselves both at the beginning and at the end of capitalism. Both at the birth and the decline of capitalism we witness robbery and theft.

I think, Comrades, that in examining the present world economic crisis we must take three characteristic features into consideration, 1) the economic offensive of the bourgeoisie along the whole front, 2) the resistance of the proletariat to this offensive which must inevitably lead to a political struggle, and 3) the increasing application by the bourgeoisie of the forces of the State, reorganised during the period of the boom, against the proletariat. From this it is clear that a period of civil war must arrive in all countries. For that reason it seems to me that we must speak here not of world war, or of booms, but on the contrary, our "leit motiv" of our thesis should be civil war and crisis. I propose therefore to insert the following amendment to the point I mentioned on page 14.

"Owing to the crisis which arose, the proletariat was compelled to take up a defensive position. Here the proletariat will be compelled to conduct a defensive battle, this struggle naturally will lead to a political struggle against which the bourgeoisie will to an increasing extent apply the power of the State. The economic crisis represents a period of intense proletarian struggle — of civil war. If the proletariat will not conduct this defensive struggle with the necessary offensive enthusiasm, the bourgeoisie will reduce the standard of living to that which existed in the period previous to the trade union movement".