

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Questions of the Plenary Session of the E. C. of the C. I.

By D. Manuilski.

(Conclusion.)

III.

The Plenary Session of the E. C. of the C. I. will have to pay special attention to the question of the radicalisation of the masses, to the causes of this radicalisation, to its speed and to its forms, because the tasks of the C. I., particularly the tasks of the Communists upon the field of trade union work, can only be properly mapped out in connection with a correct answer to these questions.

The leftward swing of the working class is connected with the character of the Third Period. As is generally known, the economic basis of the reformist influence upon the working class was the "Rate of Super-Profit" obtained by the capitalist Great Powers either in the colonies or through the utilisation of their privileged monopolist positions. These super-profits enabled the bourgeoisie of countries like Great Britain, to favour the aristocracy of labour, to grant it to a certain extent a privileged position, to corrupt it with concessions which nourish reformist illusions within the ranks of the working class. This represented the roots of British reformism before the war.

Here one must seek for an explanation of the fact that the British working class movement which experienced the Chartist period, was during the course of decades so bound to the triumphal chariot of the bourgeoisie that it could not even boast of the liberal reformist Labour Party which now appears as the third party of the British bourgeoisie. The economic decline of Great Britain which was conditioned on the one hand by the loss of Great Britain's monopoly position on the world market and on the other hand by the decrease of its capital export, destroyed the privileged situation of the British aristocracy of labour, and with this commenced the leftward development of the working class in Great Britain.

The transfer of the main weight of the world economic system to the United States which commenced to show itself at the beginning of the 20th century, the tremendous profits of America during the world war, the increased export of American capital, and the possession of a type of economic organisation having its own raw material sources, and giving the United States an extremely favoured position as against other capitalist countries thus making it possible for the United States capitalist also to obtain "a super-profit rate" — all this caused the American aristocracy of labour, in the tow of their own capitalists, to take up the position occupied before the war by the "non-commissioned officer" of British capitalism.

The demoralisation and corruption of the upper section of the working class did not take place in Great Britain and America alone, but found there their clearest expression. In the other capitalist countries of Europe the bourgeoisie also worked, although not with such rich reserves as in Great Britain and America, to weaken the class-consciousness of the workers with measures upon the field of social legislation, insignificant partial concessions of an economic character and the use of the corruptest elements amongst the workers to fill small leading posts. In "normal" periods, capitalism succeeded in awakening the impression that the basis of reformism was extremely broad, that the situation of the workers would steadily improve, and that the working class would develop into socialism without crises and without revolution. It was upon this policy of corruption, that the international Social Democracy grew and strengthened. During the course of decades, it persuaded the workers that the achievements of the proletariat were due to the efforts of the Social Democracy.

The first breach in the influence of the aristocracy of labour upon the working class movement was made by the war with its terrible consequences for millions of working-class families. Impoverished and ruined Europe became the first arena of

revolutionary explosions. In connection with the general decay of the capitalist economic system, the radicalisation of the workers took on catastrophic forms for the bourgeoisie. It was no slow growth of the working class movement as we see it to-day, but a radicalisation of the masses which only occurs in periods of an immediately revolutionary situation. The speed of the radicalisation was so great that days counted as months and even years. Instead of slow processes, often invisible to the naked eye inside the Social Democratic Party, as to-day, at that time great masses of members split away. The class conflicts took on the form of open armed collisions.

In this period of the tremendous advance of the masses, the working class wrested from the bourgeoisie most important concessions which the capitalists of all countries and their servants, for instance Cassel, at present declare to be the cause of the disorganisation and instability of the capitalist economic system. This was the first serious blow directed against world reformism, but it was not the decisive blow. After the revolutionary wave had ebbed, the majority of the working class still remained under the influence of the Social Democracy. The task which was not concluded in the years 1918 to 1920, must now be fulfilled in the third period, under other and new conditions. This task of winning the majority of the working class, that is, its most decisive sections, for the Communist Party, will have to be carried out in the beginning under conditions which are not those of an immediately revolutionary situation such as existed in Germany in 1918 and 1919.

But this is not the only difference in the situation. The third period is also characterised by the fact that in connection with the growing contradictions of capitalism, the basis of reformism has been limited to the utmost. We have already seen, how narrow the basis of reformism is in the colonies. It is true, with the assistance of brutal repression, Kuomintang trade unions can be formed, as shown by the example of Tchiang Kai-shek, fascist trade unions as in Italy or individual trade union leaders corrupted like the dictator in Chili, Ibanez, does, but there is no economic basis for the growth of reformism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Upon colonial ground, Menshevism is a weak and parasitic growth which will never bear fruit. In the capitalist countries, of course, the situation is different. Here the bourgeoisie has not exhausted all its possibilities for the formation of an aristocracy of labour. In countries like America the economic basis for the corruption of the upper sections of the working class is still fairly intact. It is an undeniable fact, however, that the general tendency of the capitalist economic system is to limit this basis. The law of the falling tendency of the rate of profit plus the bitter struggle for markets, compelled the bourgeoisie to seek ways to cheapen the cost of production. It helps itself with the capitalist rationalisation whose whole weight rests upon the shoulders of the working class. However, the capitalist rationalisation lessens the share of variable capital and demands an increase of the share of constant capital. In other words, the capitalist rationalisation intensifies the contradictions which the bourgeoisie strives to solve by oppressing the proletarian masses.

The extremely intense competitive struggle will even compel countries like the United States to force down the living conditions of their workers to the level of the European workers. America, which entered the world arena of economic expansion later than the other countries, has to use its elbows energetically. Its export meets with customs barriers in Europe, the rationalisation of European industry and with successful "competition" in the sinking of wages, particularly in Great Britain. Its capital export in the form of the means of production, builds native industries in those countries in which it is invested. Under these circumstances the hegemony of America is not only inevitably connected with war, but also inevitably connected with the destruction of the privileged situation of the American aristocracy of labour.

It must also be remembered that the capitalist rationalisation has reached bounds where its further development is extremely difficult. The bourgeoisie has, however, one supplementary measure in reserve in order not to be crushed by the world competition: further attacks upon wages. All these processes are developing slowly and not suddenly. They fill up

the historic stage between two waves of the revolution. "Such perspectives" are not impossible in the third period as the consequences of inevitably sharpened forms of economic crisis and of wars, but possible and probable are also longer perspectives in connection with a reduction in the speed of the radicalisation of the working class.

Quite apart from the fact that the capitalist rationalisation causes the formation of a tremendous section of unemployed workers who represent particularly good ground for revolutionary agitation, it also produces structural alterations in the composition of the working class. It wipes out the dividing line between qualified and unqualified workers. It has been ascertained that in the Ford factories 45% of the workers receive only one day's training. The rationalisation shakes the foundations of the old aristocracy of the qualified workers and places them on a level with unqualified workers. Certainly it also results in the formation of a larger section of leading personnel, of "sergeants" of production. This circumstance will, of course, make it possible for the bourgeoisie to utilise this section as a counter-weight to the rest of the working masses. The general principle under the conditions of capitalist rationalisation, however, will be that the decisive sections of the working class must descend to a lower stage in the social scale. The old qualified workers will have to retire and make room for unqualified workers (youths, women) in production.

Between this new unorganised mass and the old trade union organised sections a barrier develops. The reformist trade union sections are educated in the traditions of the aristocracy of labour. Towards the new masses they play the role of a conservative factor. The unorganised sections enter production during the declining stage of capitalism. Under the circumstances of the rise of the working class movement, these sections are instinctively more revolutionary than the workers trained by the reformist bureaucracy in other methods of fighting, and organised in stable reformist trade unions. This fact makes clear the significance of the problem of the unorganised sections of the whole of the Red trade union movement. The experience of the recent strikes in the Ruhr district, in Lodz, and numerous strikes in France (Loire Department, Rouen) shows what general revolutionary material is often represented by those sections of the working class which are unorganised.

At the same time the fact that the employers are quite able to replace qualified workers by new and unqualified workers and that a great economic reserve army exists, increases the difficulties of the economic struggles of the proletariat. The employer can permit political considerations to play a role in choosing his workers. This possibility is being utilised on a large scale by Fascism in Italy, Poland, Germany, France, Austria and other countries. This is one of the factors of "factory fascism", a certain strengthening of fascist influence in the factories (the supporters of Jaworowski in Poland, the attempts in Austria) despite the general radicalisation of the working class. The radicalisation of the masses does not exclude the possibility of the formation of little fascist groups in the factories by means of sharp measures of oppression. This fact causes many workers to draw incorrect conclusions and makes them tend to doubt the existence of the process of radicalisation altogether. Here is the key to the recognition of why the reorganisation of our Communist Parties upon the basis of factory groups is so difficult. Communists are hunted out of the factories. The bourgeoisie makes the factory the main arena of its class struggle.

The radicalisation of the working class is also increased by the changes in the respective significance of individual branches of industry. The unequal development of capitalism is shown not only in the altered relation of forces of the national sections of the world economic system (Great Britain, America) but also in the role of the individual industries. Certain branches of industry are gradually declining (world crisis of the coal mining industry, developing crisis of the textile industry) whilst other industries which not long ago played an insignificant rôle in the balance of world economy, are now developing rapidly (the chemical industry, the electrical industry, the automobile industry, the production of artificial silk). The regrouping of the productive forces and the territorial economic centres also results in a regrouping of the working class. It is a source of the extremely unstable situation of the working masses.

IV.

In what forms does the radicalisation of the international working class take place? Does this process develop in all capitalist countries in the same fashion? ~~Certainly not.~~ The tempo of the radicalisation of the working masses in the various countries depends upon the totality of the existing economic and political conditions. In the colonies the radicalisation of the working masses is influenced by imperialist oppression and feudal relations which revolutionise the peasantry and therefore create at a definite stage an atmosphere of sympathy with the struggle of the proletariat.

In India, for instance, where at the present time the radicalisation of the masses is proceeding especially quickly, the connection of modern capitalist methods of rationalisation with methods of exploitation taken from the period of the primitive accumulation of capital, is of decisive importance. Considered metaphorically, the modern moving band system together with the rags of the Indian worker produce in the last resort such heroic movements as the strike of the Bombay textile workers which has now lasted for months. In the countries of South America where the radicalisation of the masses develops parallel with the development and existence of an immediately revolutionary situation in a number of these countries, where the civil war already has its traditions, the tempo of radicalisation is determined by the inter-relation of three various socio-political phenomena: the remnants of slavery with all its terrible forms of exploitation, feudal relations and modern capitalist methods of exploitation upon the basis of capitalist rationalisation.

In the capitalist countries of Europe the speed of working class radicalisation is also varied. It does not develop in a straight line. In countries like Germany and France the masses are coming under the influence of the Communist Party. The situation in Great Britain, however, is different. The Sixth World Congress pointed out that the radicalisation was taking place in two parallel processes: increasing influence of the Communists but also the numerical and external growth of the influence of the Social Democracy. The parallel nature of these two processes is temporary and results from the twofold character of the "stabilisation" of capitalism.

The preponderance of the elements of the decline of capitalist economy over the elements of stabilisation in the third period will inevitably lead to a regrouping of the relation of forces inside the working class in favour of the Communist Parties. In the consciousness of the working masses, these processes will develop as crises of the confidence in the Social Democracy. We have seen a crisis amongst the German workers, who previously followed the Social Democrats. Such crises are also making themselves evident in other countries. The Social Democratic and reformist apparatus can put the brake upon this process of decline for a time, but the decline is already very definite.

The Social Democracy was the party which had the majority of the workers under its influence in a number of countries. At the last elections the Labour Party in Great Britain received over 8 million votes (over a third and less than a half of the total poll). At various stages of its development, the Social Democracy formed governments. It deceives the working masses with the legend that its victory is an expression of the power of the proletariat even within the framework of capitalist society. It describes the coalition policy as the way to Socialism.

To-day the decisive moment has come when, upon the basis of post-war experience, the international working class raises the question: What advantages has the working class had from the fact that in various countries the Social Democracy was the party of the majority of the working class? The July insurrection in Vienna which broke out against the will of the strongest Social Democracy, signalled the beginning of a revision by the masses, of their attitude towards the Social Democracy. The insurrection showed that in the ranks of the Social Democracy there are broad sections of the workers who vote for the Social Democracy and who perhaps honestly believe that the Communists are sectarians but who are nevertheless prepared to apply methods of the revolutionary class struggle only recommended by Communists. In numerous countries we

are about to see the decision of the historical struggle with the Social Democracy for the broad masses of the working class (in France, in Czechoslovakia, and even in Poland, the country of the white terror). This question faces, above all, the Communist Party of Germany which is nearer to its practical solution than any other section of the Communist International.

The winning of the decisive sections of the working class is today no longer an abstract problem. It is not a matter of the future, it is an acute political task and unless it is solved, it is useless to speak of the approach of an immediately revolutionary situation. Hundreds of thousands of workers voted for the C. P. of Germany during the recent shop councils elections not only because they had convinced themselves of the development of the Social Democracy into an active agent of capitalism, not only because they had convinced themselves that the Social Democracy misused the will of the majority of the working class, but also because they recognised that their own forces had grown and that only the Communist Party was capable of leading the proletariat against capitalism.

Our Party can only win the broad masses of the working class through great class struggles. These struggles will become the decisive method for the winning of the majority of the working class by the Communist Parties. The example of Jilek in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, who believed that one could win the majority of the working class with methods and measures differing little from those of the reformists, and who thought that the influence of the Communist Party could be saved up like small change for a time of need, and that great class struggles must be avoided up to the last moment, showed all sections of the C. I. the necessity of activating their policy.

Only an active revolutionary policy can win the confidence of the broad masses of the toilers for the Communist Party. We shall not lose courage because of the fact that during the recent British elections the Communists only received 50,000 votes. These 50,000 workers who voted against the Labour Party in a country where every vote given for the C. P. was described as increasing Baldwin's chances, where the working masses believed that by giving their votes for the Labour Party, they would overthrow the government which had throttled the general strike, crushed the miners and passed the anti-trade union bill, in such a country these 50,000 workers represent the forces of a future great Communist Party. To-morrow, after they have seen MacDonald and Thomas at work, the British workers, like the German workers who have learned from the policy of Mueller and Zoergiebel, will also find their way to the only proletarian party which stands for the revolution and for Communism.

We know that the formation of a Government of the Labour Party by MacDonald can temporarily nourish democratic and pacifist illusions. Some people are already speaking of the possibility of a repetition of the "pacifist era" of 1925, a decline of the fascist tendencies, a lessening in the danger of war, etc. However, it must be said loudly and clearly that any second edition of the "pacifist era" of 1925 on a more or less international scale is quite impossible. The intensification of the class struggle upon an international scale will effectually prevent this. The government of MacDonald will be an episode of short duration. The inevitable differentiation in the conglomerate block into which the Labour Party has developed, the development to the right of all the companions of the noble Lords, etc. at present in the Labour Party, including the "leaders" of the workers, and the development of the workers themselves to the left in a situation of intensified class conflicts, will cause the fall of this government in the none too distant future. It will be more right-wing and more reactionary than the first MacDonald government both with regard to home affairs and with regard to foreign and colonial affairs.

Governments of such a type cannot postpone either the historic dates of wars or of revolutionary movements, they cannot create either a political or economic stability for the regime which produced them. They are themselves the result of the instability of the whole existing political and economic system. Such governments are destined to carry out those tasks which under the given concrete circumstances are beyond the power of the ruling classes to perform. The bourgeoisie will strive with the assistance of MacDonald to lull the work-

ing class not only of Great Britain but of the other capitalist countries into a false sense of security, possibly by recognising the Soviet Union, by coming to some agreement with America in the question of naval armaments and by a number of alterations in the anti-trade union law. The government of MacDonald is a government of war and reaction, and war is being prepared under the mask of pacifist and democratic phrases with means and methods "acceptable" to the working class.

The longer such a government exists, the more thoroughly it will expose itself. The speed at which the British workers will free themselves from their illusions, will depend to a great extent upon the energy and capacity of the Communist Party of Great Britain. The small British C. P. will have the possibility of making a great step forward on its way to becoming a mass party and winning the leadership of the radicalising British working class movement.

In a number of countries our sections are still small. However, the support of those masses who are fighting all over the world with our revolutionary methods, often without having heard a word about Lenin's lesson makes us strong. The Communist International is already a power which can and must influence the relation of class forces in favour of the proletariat by the organisation and preparation of great class struggles.

To-day, when the capitalist world is inevitably driving towards new wars, the Communist Parties must throw the whole weight of their influence into the scales. This is the significance of the International Red Anti-War Day on the 1st of August. By international demonstrations on this day the proletariat must show the bourgeoisie that a repetition of the 4th August is no longer possible and that by provoking war the bourgeoisie prepares civil war against itself. We know the difficulties with which a simultaneous action of the working class against war will meet. The bourgeoisie will mobilise all its forces to prevent it. The Communists, however, would fail in their elementary duty if under the present circumstances, when the horizon is already lit up by the bloody lightning of coming wars, they did not call to the working masses: "Force the bourgeoisie now, immediately, before it is too late, to take your increased strength into account!"

We must also approach the question of our trade union tactics from the point of view of our most important task, the winning of the decisive sections of the working class. We remain the supporters of the unity of the trade union movement, but we do not fear any threats of disruption. We know that if the Communists were about to win the most important positions in the trade unions, the reformist bureaucracy would not hesitate to disrupt the unions. (A proof for this was the disruption of the Basle Trades Council.)

One cannot imagine a struggle of the Communists to win the majority in the trade unions taking place under idyllic conditions in which the cunning and treacherous reformist bureaucracy would permit the left-wing opposition to overwhelm them upon the basis of the statutes and of inner trade union democracy. Our struggle with the Social Democracy will end in civil war. Those who hope to intimidate the Communists with threats of disruption (Walcher, Enderle, etc.) show in the trade union question that they expect a peaceful development into the revolution.

The Communists must, however, oppose the formation of parallel organisations out of small groups of workers expelled by the reformist bureaucracy. Such parallel organisations would only fulfil the wishes of the reformist bureaucracy. Such conservative organisations cannot possibly decide our struggle against the reformists for the majority of the working class. The decision will have to be given by organisations upon a different scale. These tendencies, however, are dangerous because they might cause our small sections, having an insignificant radius of influence, to develop along the line of least resistance. The greatest damage would be done if small Communist Parties, as for instance the Austrian or the Belgian parties, in order to appear arch-left, and under the pretext that such expelled workers must be organised, commenced a policy of founding parallel trade union organisations. This would be absolute opportunism, and would represent a capi-

tulation before the difficulties. This path is full of dangers for communists for other reasons also.

If the principle is correct that we are approaching an intensification of the class struggle everywhere, then it is obvious that the bourgeoisie will strive to place the Red Trade Unions upon the same basis as the Communist Parties with regard to their open existence. (See Roumania.) The Communists would be poor strategists if, in the period of the preparation for decisive struggles, they cut off their path in the open trade union arena. Here the question of the speed of the radicalisation of the working class is decisive. Or in one situation can we overstep the existing trade union and that is, when the radicalisation of the masses takes such energetic forms that the overwhelming majority of the organised workers follow the opposition. The situation, however, not yet so mature that the majority could drive the reformist bureaucracy which is supported in its struggle against communist influence by the apparatus of the bourgeois State. If that were the case now, then we would be in a period immediately before the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, in a period which would speedily develop into civil war.

The Communists who to-day remain in the reformist trade unions, must increase their activity tremendously, must fight ruthlessly against all the tendencies of trade-union legalism, and, when the circumstances demand it, violate the formal limits of the trade union statutes, always remembering that the highest test of their activity is the interests of the proletarian revolution. Only by such an active revolutionary policy will the Communists be able to consolidate their influence in the trade unions and not run the risk of lagging behind the growing strike wave. The extending strike struggle of the proletariat is creating all the preliminary conditions for the conquest of the majority in the trade unions by the communists. In past years the situation for the fulfilment of this task was never so favourable as it is now, and this favourable situation will guarantee that the Communist Party will fulfil this task in the Third Period.

V.

Let us now deal with the tasks of the C. I. These tasks result from the aim which has been set, i. e. the winning of the decisive sections of the working class and the winning of the sympathy and support of the broadest masses of the toilers. We must approach the carrying out of these tasks in a different manner to that of the period of the Third Congress of the C. I. The old forms of the application of the united-front tactics, the form of "Open Letters" to the leaders of large and small organisations, have become antiquated. People like the Italian conciliator Serra and the German right-wingers, who would drag us back to the period of the Third Congress, fail to understand the elementary truth that the forms for the application of the united-front tactics worked out by the Third and Fourth Congresses of the C. I. applied to the period of the decline of the revolutionary wave of 1918/19. To-day the forms must be determined by the rise of the international working class movement. That is the fundamental difference in the situation.

The contention that the Social Democracy did not alter its character after the 4th August 1914, that no more negative evolution of the Social Democracy commenced after the rôle of Noske-Scheidemann in the years 1918/19, idealises the Social Democracy which is at present allied with the trusts. On the 4th August the Social Democracy declared itself in favour of the war and supported it actively. It had had no part in the preparation of the war prior to the 4th August however. To-day on the other hand the Social Democracy of the trusts, at the epoch of "economic democracy", is an active agent in the preparation of war. The Social Democracy of Noske and Scheidemann suppressed the revolt of the workers and sailors in blood no less brutally than Zörgiebel shot down unarmed workers. The Social Democracy of Noske and Scheidemann, however, did not dare to abolish the eight-hour day and the social legislation, and to oppose with cynicism the most moderate economic demands of the proletariat.

The Social Democracy of heavy industry in the Ruhr district is already risking it. Despite a number of deficiencies in their carrying out, the shop council elections in Germany can be excellent examples of the new forms of the united-

front tactics. They refuted the slanders of the right-wingers concerning the alleged abandonment of the united-front tactics by the C. I., and showed how great masses of the proletariat can be drawn into this front under the influence of the Communist Parties with correct revolutionary tactics and the exposure of all opportunist prevarications.

The first task of our sections is to learn the lessons of the C. P. of Germany and to extend and deepen these forms of the application of the united-front tactics. We must take into account the concrete experience which other Communist Parties have made in this connection. The experience of the French comrades is particularly instructive. A few days before the 1st May they held two general conferences in the Paris district of the metal workers and the woodworkers in order to organise the May-Day demonstration. The result was that on the 1st May 80% of the metal workers and 100% of the woodworkers went on strike. This form of the mobilisation of the masses must be urgently recommended to all Communist Parties for the preparation of the demonstrations on the 1st August. If the Communist Parties seriously wish to make the Anti-War Day a tremendous success, then they must cover the whole country with a network of August committees elected in the factories.

The solution of our most important task, the successful struggle for the masses, determines our attitude towards the right-wingers and the conciliators. We fight against these groups because they hinder us in the performance of our task. They opened their campaign against the C. I. with the slogan: "Long live the United-Front Tactics for the Winning of the Masses!", and ended as little sectarian groups cut off from the main stream of the international working class movement (Brandler, Hais, Jilek). They are in the way of the Communist Parties and hinder their work by expressing the tendencies to passivity, legalism and backwardness in certain sections of the working class which have not yet flung off the apathy of the stabilisation period, in political platforms.

These tendencies are more widespread than the right-wing and conciliators' groups, and inside the Communist Parties they are more extensive than these groups. Occasionally they appear, externally, in very radical forms. When for instance the Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany appealed to the Berlin workers for a mass strike as a protest against the May-Day events, voices were heard demanding: "Give us arms, then we can talk about protest demonstrations!" In the overwhelming majority of cases however, these tendencies in the Communist Parties expressed themselves as open opportunist errors (the proposal of the C. C. of the C. P. of Switzerland for the formation of an electoral block with the Social Democracy immediately after the VI. World Congress, the incorrect estimation of the rôle of the Polish Socialist Party by some comrades who even stand upon the line of the VI. World Congress etc.).

The struggle against the right-wing deviation and against the conciliatory attitude towards it, and the merciless exposure of opportunist partial errors even amongst the supporters of the line of the C. I., means to overcome the passivity and indifference in certain sections of the workers. Only by exposing right-wing opportunism and the conciliatory attitude towards it, will we be able to fight successfully against the "left-wing" Social Democracy, which is the most dangerous and damaging kind of reformism and which saves the party of Noske and Zörgiebel with pseudo-radical phrases. Without first of all disposing of the right-wingers and conciliators as political tendencies, the Communist Parties cannot prepare their ranks for the great decisive struggles and cannot move forward swiftly. The only way to dispose of these tendencies, however, is by a broad application of the united-front tactics from below embracing not only the organised, but also the unorganised workers.

The question of the revolutionary united front is of the greatest practical importance for the joint struggle of the proletariat and the peasantry in numerous countries. There are countries where the civil war continues almost without interruption, where history is an uninterrupted chain of such wars. These are the countries of South America. In a number of these countries, for instance in Ecuador and Columbia, one can speak of an immediately revolutionary situation. Here the question

of the united-front tactics is the question of the leadership of the struggle of the peasant masses by the proletariat. The Brandlerist errors express themselves here in a diminution of the leading rôle of the working class. Therefore in these countries the Communists must above all abandon the idea of a permanent workers and peasants block which represents nothing else but the slogan of workers and peasants parties rejected by the Sixth World Congress.

The formation and strengthening of independent proletarian parties is the best way of ensuring that the tactics of the united front will not develop into the hegemony of a few petty-bourgeois politicians who appropriate the right to represent broad masses of the peasantry, and that the civil war developing on the basis of a broad workers and peasants front, does not degenerate into the 101st Mexican generals revolution. The altered situation in the colonies makes the formation of Communist Parties in all colonial countries a particularly important and acute question. Our experience has shown that only such Parties can fructify the national-revolutionary movements upon a class basis. This question is most acute in India where up to the present there has been no independent Communist Party. The struggle for the winning of the masses of the workers who are already in movement cannot be taken up without some point around which the pioneers of the struggle for the social revolution can rally.

The question of the reduction of the disproportion between the political influence of the Communist Parties and their organisational strength, must also be approached from the standpoint of our decisive task, the struggle for the leadership of the working class movement. This disproportion is not only the result of objective conditions, the "stabilisation period", the persecutions and repression, it is also the result of the insufficient ideological content of the life of our Party organisations. The fluctuation in the membership of the Parties, shows that our organisations and our factory groups are unable to utilise the revolutionary enthusiasm of new sections of the workers coming to the Communist Parties. The enlivenment and renewal of the activity of the factory groups, the organisation of the factory groups in such a fashion that they are able to react to the demands of the broadest non-Party masses, and the permanent winning of each new worker member for the Party, means to dispose of half this "disproportion" immediately.

We must abolish the purely formal attitude to our tasks, the self-satisfaction, the hard and fast bureaucracy of some of our groups, the practice of stewing in their own juice etc., and must educate them to energetic initiative and activity. In the "stabilisation period" a membership was formed, particularly in the smaller Parties, reminiscent of an exclusive caste which patiently waited for better days to dawn and fatalistically declared that it was impossible to run their heads through brick walls (Spain, Austria etc.). These memberships are slothful and without backbone, infected with the spirit of pusillanimity. With such fossilised troops we shall be able neither to win the decisive sections of the working class nor win the leading rôle in the working class movement.

The problem of the backbone of our Parties is at present the most important task. In numerous strikes (in the Ruhr district, in France, etc., quite apart from the strike in the Czech textile industry) it was shown that our old membership was far behind the non-Party masses with regard to its political level, its spirit and its fighting capacity.

The greatest possible attention of the Communist Parties must be directed towards selecting the best elements in the old membership and then extending them with fresh forces won in the process of the class struggle. We need a new type of Party official in the factories, a type free all petty-bourgeois prejudices and from all the old methods of Social Democratic agitation and propaganda, a type which does not let itself be misled by the false consideration that "under the conditions which exist in our country", the "Russian" methods are not always advisable. Into the factories! Every factory a fortress of the Communists! This is the fighting slogan of the day. The lessons learned by the C. P. of Germany from the May-Day events, when it succeeded in leading 200,000 workers to demonstrate on the streets despite the prohibition, but, in consequence of our weakness in the factories, was unable to

organise a sufficiently powerful mass strike after demonstrators had been shot down, these lessons must be taken to heart by all the sections of the C. I.

In numerous countries our parties are more like circles of professional politicians, more like political clubs, than organisations of Communists from the factories. They lead a life isolated from the factories. This must all be altered radically. The decisive verdict upon the worth of a Party member, his devotion, activity and capacity, as a Party official, must not be his oratorical capacities, or his readiness to discuss political subjects with good friends, but the verdict must be decided from the point of view of how many new members he has won for the Party in his factory, what mass work he has performed in the factory in order to increase the confidence of the workers in the Party. In a number of illegal Parties a type of "communist for personal use" has arisen, a type which appeals to conspirative considerations in order to do no work of any kind. Such Communists are at the cross-roads of their final breach with the Party. In Austria there are Party members who play a leading rôle in the Party and who have never been victimised in the factories. One cannot say that this is the best proof of their activity.

Apart from the work in the factories the Communist Parties must carry on an active policy towards the unemployed workers. The work among these workers must be closely connected with the general movement of the working class. The conferences and congresses of the unemployed in Germany and the British unemployed march upon London must be studied and applied on an enlarged and international scale. Such a movement of the unemployed could be given an international character by organising a march of the unemployed workers upon the 1st August in various countries in connection with the Anti-War Day.

The line of our struggle for the leading rôle in the world movement of the working class must find its expression upon the field of inner-Party politics in the liquidation of the fractional groups which formed themselves inside the Communist Parties during the "stabilisation period" in the life of the C. I. The unity of the Communist Parties, their bolshevist amalgamation as the expression of their united will to struggle as the advance guard of the working class, is one of the greatest achievements of the C. I. The C. I. is not a mechanical linking up of "autonomous" national sections, it is an united communist world party.

In the past the existence of groups of such a nature was inevitably conditioned by the bolshevisation process of the Communist Parties. The fight of the left-wing groups against the Social Democratic remnants in the Parties played a great and positive rôle. In a number of Parties however, the fractional groupings remained rigid even after this process was essentially at an end. The split-up nature of the communist movement promoted their maintenance. Under the circumstances in which the overwhelming majority of the Party has become the arena of a struggle against opportunist deviations, the fractional groups have become a reactionary factor hindering the development of the Communist Parties.

Fractionalism degenerated into an unprincipled struggle of groups (America). Occasionally the fractional groups reflected the split-up nature of the State (Balkans) or the semi-feudalist conditions of a struggle between individual provinces (Spain, Barcelona against Madrid). Upon the whole they have become a hindrance to the conquest of the world, they conserve a deleterious bureaucracy and prevent, as in Poland for instance, any self-criticism of the errors of the Party. Individual groups bound by fractional discipline conceal the errors of their own fraction and exaggerate the errors of the other groups. The Communist Parties can only grow by honest bolshevist self-criticism of their own mistakes.

We have not dealt especially with the tasks set by the Sixth World Congress which still remain in force (struggle against war, against the consequences of the capitalist rationalisation etc.). The most important duty of all sections of the C. I. is not to find new tasks at every Plenary Session, but to work persistently for the carrying out of those tasks which have not yet been performed.