

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 53

23rd August 1928

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

**SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

Fourteenth Session.

Moscow, July, 1928 (morning).

**Discussion on the Report of Comrade
Bukharin.**

Chairman: Comrade Zapotocky.

Comrade TSCHANG-BIO (China):

I will give a brief outline of the present situation in China. The occupation of Shantung and Manchuria by Japanese troops, the massacre of inhabitants and soldiers in the Tzinan district show that world imperialism is making a concerted attack on the Chinese Revolution. This imperialist attack is almost taking the form of an active open and armed intervention and a direct partition of China.

Japanese boldness in the question of armed intervention is due to the betrayal of the revolution by the national bourgeoisie and to a consensus of opinion between Great Britain and the United States. The Anglo-American bloc developed into a conflict between Great Britain and the United States. Moreover, a marked weakening in the positions of the United States in the Far East, compared with the period of the Washington Conference 1921 is noticeable. On the other hand, we witness full agreement in regard to the Chinese question between Great Britain and Japan.

Owing to the inadequate development of the worker's and peasant movement in the North of China it was impossible to hinder Japan in its predatory policy. At the same time, Great United states wants a so-called united government in China, so

Britain occupies almost a monopolist position in South China, although an open occupation has not yet taken place. Great Britain took General Li Ti-sing under its protection and strengthened thereby its positions in South China. The United States considers this as a slight and is dissatisfied with this state of affairs.

This intensifies and accentuates the conflicts between the imperialist powers. Great Britain and Japan pursue quite frankly a policy of partition of China, whereas, the United States keeps to the policy of the "open door". The substance of this policy of the United States is an attempt to divide, together with Japan and Great Britain, Chinese territory into equal parts, utilising for this purpose the so-called united Kuomintang Government — the Nanking government. However, for the realisation of their annexationist plans Great Britain has its main strong positions in the South, and Japan in the North. In this respect, the United States is comparatively weak. Great Britain and Japan are not likely to make concessions to the United States and to strengthen thereby its positions in China. Japan, as well as Great Britain does not want the establishment of a united national government in China. These imperialist powers would like to have in every sphere of influence a government which would be an obedient tool in the hands of the respective power. On the other hand, the

as to be able to carry out its predatory plans throughout China.

Is a stable **united national government** in China possible from the standpoint of the internal situation of the country? The Kuomintang has certainly strengthened its position after the occupation of **Peking** and **Tientsin**, but this has also accentuated the differences between the various groupings of generals in the Kuomintang. The former "common enemy" of these groupings, **Chang Tso-lin**, is no longer there.

At the Conference of the Kuomintang Generals in Peking one of the main questions was the reduction of the armed forces. In connection with this question, **Chiang Kai-shek** declared recently to the Nanking government that China has at present 2,200,000 regular troops exclusive of the Manchurian government; the yearly expenditure for war purposes is 720,000,000 Mexican dollars, whereas the entire national revenue of China amounts only to 400,000,000 dollars. Even if this whole sum were applied to war purposes, another 320,000,000 would have to be found. But according to the material at our disposal, the expenditure exceeds 720,000,000 whereas the national revenue does not come up to 400,000,000 dollars.

It is highly improbable that the various groupings of Kuomintang Generals who represent the interests of various antagonist groups will reduce the strength of the army. On the contrary, a series of facts show that these generals are contending now for the inclusion of **Chang Tso-Lin's** captured forces in their armies. This of course, will not reduce, but increase the strength of these armies.

This alone is enough to prove that the Kuomintang Generals will fight for the extension of their territory and their sources of revenue. This struggle is bound to develop from its present political form, into an armed struggle. As the Kuomintang Generals will want enormous means for the upkeep of their armies, increased exploitation of the masses of workers and peasants and also of the petty bourgeoisie is inevitable. Moreover, they will not be able to pay their soldiers for any length of time, because the latter have had no pay for the last 5 or 6 months. This situation has a revolutionising effect on workers, peasants and soldiers and also on a considerable section of the unpropertied poor population. This will no doubt deal a heavy blow to the Kuomintang regime.

Several conclusions can be drawn from all this: first of all the possibility of the creation of a united national government and the establishment of a so-called peace regime for the realisation of the imperialist plan of extended capitalist occupation under the leadership of the United States — but this is a very limited possibility. The United States does not feel the least inclined to give up China whose 400,000,000 inhabitants are an enormous object of exploitation, China being at the same time a magnificent source of raw material. Therefore the United States will be inevitably driven into accentuated conflict with Japan and Great Britain. This constitutes one of the biggest problems of the coming war. It is at the same time, the main problem in regard to the clash of interests between the imperialist states on the Pacific Coast.

As the position of the Kuomintang cannot be stabilised, there is yet another perspective — a perspective of feuds and internecine wars, the perspective of an increased burden of of taxation for the working masses.

The liberation of China from the Kuomintang and imperialism, the solution of the agrarian question can only be achieved through the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants. Therefore the objective possibilities of a "third" party creating illusions among the masses are very limited. Moreover, these illusions cannot last very long even among the backward sections of the population.

The only way out for the mass of the workers and peasants is determined and revolutionary struggle. Under these circumstances the proletariat and its vanguard, the **Communist Party of China**, being backed by the masses, can lead the workers' and peasants' insurrection to a victorious end.

The **peasant masses** are one of the main forces of the revolutionary movement. The agrarian revolution is the mainstay of the Chinese revolution even in its present stage. Although we

must extend the peasant movement the Chinese revolution will not develop into a purely peasant revolution. There has already been such a purely peasant revolution in Chinese history: — it worked itself out in the **Boxer and Taipan rising**. But after the revolution of 1911, cities become the determining factor in the revolutionary movement. In its present stage the Chinese revolution which is under the leadership of the proletariat is a revolution of workers and peasants for a through change in the agrarian domain, for the destruction of the relics of feudalism and the expulsion of imperialism from the country, for the national liberation and unification of China and the overthrow of the present Kuomintang regime, for the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in the form of Soviets.

The present struggle is not only a struggle against the Kuomintang, the landlords, gentry and bourgeoisie, but also a direct challenge to world imperialism. It will not only depend upon the organised forces of the revolutionary elements in China itself, but also on the support of our **Communist brother Parties**, especially in regard to prevention of attempts at intervention on the part of the imperialist powers.

We must draw attention to the imminence of a new revolutionary wave, and we must also point out that this time the class struggle will be wider and more acute.

Our Party has been guilty of serious opportunist and subsequently of putschist errors. But we must nevertheless declare that it is a fighting Party. It has gone through many serious and sanguinary struggles. There was a time when 3 million organised workers and about 10 million organised peasants were following it. Today it is suffering from brutal white terror and has lost over 26,000 members in the struggle; over 6,000 Communists are lingering in prison. But although illegal, it is a fighting mass party.

If the C. P. of China is to become a genuine Communist Party it must have an executive which will enable it to utilise every incident for the mobilisation and organisation of the workers and peasants. Not so long ago, our Party was guilty of so-called **Left errors**. No sooner were they remedied when **Right errors** cropped up which found their expression in slogans **demanding** the re-establishment of the mass movement through the Kuomintang, etc., as Comrade **Strakhov** mentioned in his speech. This slogan was a great mistake. If brought forward by Kuomintang followers it means that they want to re-establish the workers' and peasants' department in the Kuomintang apparatus. But if the masses bring forward this slogan it assumes an utterly different meaning. You know that the Kuomintang prohibited workers and peasant unions. All their achievements were destroyed by the Kuomintang. In this connection the masses bring forward the demand for the re-establishment of the mass movement — they demand the re-establishment of the former freedom and liberty and the positions they had gained. Formerly, when the Party was not paying sufficient attention to mass work, some comrades proposed participation in this mass struggle for the re-establishment of freedom and liberty in order to draw the masses into the struggle against the Kuomintang, to give it a new direction, in fact, to make it a struggle against the **Kuomintang**. When we ourselves bring forward the slogan it must be "**struggle of the Masses for freedom**".

As Comrade **Bukharin** rightly stated, the theoretical level of the C. P. of China is very low. The C. P. of China is a fighting party. Provided it secures a firm basis in industrial enterprises for the capture of the industrial proletariat with the help of the correct tactical line laid down by the Communist International, and provided it raises the theoretical level of its rank and file, it will be able to do justice to the tasks confronting it — the tasks of the Communist International and of the Chinese Revolution.

Comrade **ULBRICHT** (Germany):

The labour struggles of the last years have been good practice to the Communist Party of Germany. These struggles have revealed at the same time to the whole working class the fighting capacity of the Party. The last Session of the Executive and the Congress of the R. I. L. U. dealt with the most important labour struggles in Germany and came to the conclusion that

in many important struggles the will to fight of the workers was underestimated by some of our Party organisations. To make the Party fit to do justice to its revolutionary tasks in the present labour struggles, to mobilise big sections of workers in the enterprises, to carry out labour struggles even against the will of the reformist bureaucrats, such are the problems which were at the bottom of the controversies we heard here in the Plenum and also in the discussions held by the German Party. This is a question of the Communist Party not limiting itself to general agitation but carrying out mass mobilisation for the purpose of organising the revolutionary struggle. Therefore Comrade Ewert was wrong when he said that there are tendencies in the Communist Party towards a revival of old group standpoints which were overcome some time ago. Such a conception is tantamount to preventing the clarification of the present divergences of opinion. In the present situation, when we are at the beginning of a new advance in the revolutionary movement the main thing is to elaborate strategy and tactics which will enable the Party to develop among the masses a maximum of revolutionary fighting capacity.

In the execution of these tasks it has come to light that a group of comrades, adherents of the Right fraction, are systematically endeavouring to hinder the Party in the execution of these tasks and that there is also a current which goes by the name of "tolerants", a conciliatory current, which impedes the liquidation of this Right fraction work.

The discussion in the C. P. G. on the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress shows that the representatives of the Right group are overestimating the stabilisation of capitalism in Germany and are underestimating the contradictions of capitalism and the increasing fighting capacity of the workers. It is not a chance occurrence that in this connection an adherent of the Right declared in Breslau: "At the present juncture it is impossible to take up labour struggles in important industries against the will of the reformist bureaucrats."

We can also see by Comrade Ewert's arguments that he lays great stress on stabilisation phenomena. He declared that in Great Britain capitalism is "solid and strong". We do not underestimate the efforts of British capitalism to carry out rationalisation with the help of the trade union apparatus. We do not underestimate the defeat which the British workers suffered in the last great struggle. But the fact remains that chronic unemployment prevails in Great Britain, that the crisis in the British export industry continues and that the same applies to the crisis in the coal industry. Also in his estimate of social-democracy, Comrade Ewert exaggerates its strength and does not give enough prominence to the fact that owing to the present coalition policy and the fusion of the trade union apparatus with the capitalist economic and political apparatus, the clash of interests between the workers, including social democratic workers, and the upper social-democratic functionaries is becoming more intense and that favourable opportunities are created for the development and organisation of the labour opposition, the dissociation of big sections of workers from the Social Democrats. Comrade Ewert laid also very great emphasis on difficulties in the Soviet Union. On the negative sides of socialist construction in the Soviet Union more than sufficient emphasis has been laid in Germany. We must lay more emphasis than ever especially in Europe, on the positive sides of the progress of socialist construction in Soviet Russia. This is particularly necessary in view of the present anti-Soviets campaign of the reformists and social democrats. That Comrade Ewert is overestimating the stabilisation of capitalism and is under-estimating capitalist contradictions was noticeable in his arguments in regard to the Vienna "disturbances" which he considers of only local importance. We think that the Vienna "disturbances" to quote Comrade Ewert, were an insurrection of the Vienna proletariat and that the slogan of political workers councils should have been issued in that situation. We fully agree with the decisions made by the Executive concerning this question.

Divergence in the estimate of the present situation was also noticeable in the discussions on the German election result. It is characteristic that the same comrades who overestimate, in regard to the election result in Germany, the increased social-democratic poll do not lay enough emphasis on the qualitative success of the Communist Party. It is a fact that the C. P. G. in-

creased its poll above all in industrial districts, which means that it increased its influence among the most important sections of workers. However, friends of Comrade Ewert said in the Pol Bureau that the election result means a bourgeois victory. (hear, hear!). Later on this was withdrawn. Nevertheless such estimate is characteristic of these comrades' conceptions.

Comrade Ewert tried to disguise his divergent estimate of the present situation by declaring that "there is a considerable number of comrades who look upon the theses as a morass-perspective." We have not heard comrades express such an opinion in this hall; neither did any of the comrades in the German delegation give the least indication of such an attitude. I think that these insinuations of Comrade Ewert are contrary not only to the character of the theses but also to Comrade Bukharin's arguments.

Comrade Thälmann has already dealt with the efforts of the German trade union bureaucrats to convert the free trade unions into organs of the capitalist economic structure, and to develop them into auxiliary organs of the new German imperialism. To enforce this policy they endeavour, firstly, to disintegrate systematically the opposition, and secondly to remove the opposition from the unions or at least to relieve oppositional elements of their functions.

But what did the representatives of the Right fraction say in regard to struggle against these expulsions? One comrade declared that as long as we are not strong enough to prevent expulsions we ought not to show ourselves too much in our opposition colours by defending openly our revolutionary policy during labour struggles (hear, hear!). Our answer to this policy of the reformist bureaucrats must be — elaboration of the platform of a revolutionary trade union opposition in all trade union organisations. This is the only way to develop a labour opposition in the ranks of social-democracy. Not in the manner of the good people in the "Einheit", by making use of the Left social-democratic leaders, but only by working energetically for the capture of the workers in the S. P. G.

Just as in the question of struggle against the expulsion measures of the bureaucrats, we have also divergence of opinion in regard to the question of strike strategy.

In Berlin, workers engaged in the building trade have initiated, in spite of the resistance of the bureaucrats, an intermediate wage rate movement. Our comrades have issued the slogan: workers take a firm stand in the factories, demand that the bureaucrats should show their colours at factory meetings, that they should declare their attitude to the workers' demands. This united front tactic is the correct revolutionary tactic in labour struggles.

But an utterly different conception made its appearance in such an important movement as that of the Saxon metal workers. In this movement some of our comrades did not concentrate on united front tactic form below, but endeavoured to come to an agreement with social democratic trade union leaders.

We have a similar example in the Berlin metallurgical industry. When during the Berlin Metal Workers Movement the bureaucrats wanted to throttle the wage movement in the interest of the social democratic party committee, our comrades moved the following resolution at the decisive functionaries meeting:

"This Conference of the Metal Workers' Union of Germany rejects the decision as utterly inadequate because its effect would be a reduction in wage and piece work rates. The conference instructs the metal workers' trades council to take all the necessary measures for an immediate strike."

Considering that there was obviously determination to throttle the movement, the resolution should have condemned the policy of the bureaucrats in a concrete and unequivocal manner. We should have said what the workers in the factories must do to compel the bureaucrats to take up a definite attitude to these positive demands. If the struggle was utterly impossible in the then situation, we should have said clearly and unequivocally why the struggle is not possible in the present situation, so as to ensure that in future movements workers would enter into the struggle better prepared and capable of acting against the policy of the trade union bureaucrats.

In this connection it is rather significant that Comrade Ewert laid special stress on the role of the labour aristocracy. Comrade Ewert has misinterpreted Comrade Heckert's arguments. He said that the unorganised cannot carry on the struggle alone. This is not so. We have, on the contrary a state of affairs when better paid workers adopting a purely craft viewpoint, carry on the movement only for themselves, only for their craft interests and do not make an effort to link up the struggle of highly skilled groups of workers with that of the badly paid unskilled workers. Such are the weak points of the Berlin Metal Workers' Movement. These weak points should not be slurred over here, as Comrade Ewert has done.

I will deal now with the question of the inner Party course in the C. P. G. Comrade Ewert has said that the "majority runs the risk of developing a group ideology". This assertion reminds one of the call: "Stop thief". It is essential to set facts against these allusions of Comrade Ewert. After the Essen Party Congress some comrades endeavoured to improve on the lines laid down by the Congress. After the Essen Party Congress the Central Committee did its utmost to carry out the concentration of the forces of the Party and gave responsible posts to nearly all the comrades who belonged formerly to the Right group. However some of these comrades have tried systematically to use their position for the purpose of making their erroneous political standpoint the standpoint of the Communist Party. In plain German we call this fraction work. This fraction work of the Right group was more or less made use of by the group around Gerhardt for bolstering up their positions.

I will give you facts:

The June Plenum of the Party was made use of to improve on the Essen decision in regard to the Left S. P. G.

When Brandler's programme of action was discussed these comrades were against saying in the end part: "If comrades use the programme of action as a group platform they must be fought".

It is a fact that in connection with the Berlin District Party Congress an attempt was made to remove certain comrades from the small district Executive so as to strengthen the influence of the conciliatory current in the Berlin Executive.

An attempt was made by enlarging the Polit Secretariat of the C. C. to give the majority there to comrades who belonged to the Gerhardt-Ewert group.

It was proposed that Comrade Walcher should be at the head of the trade union department and also that other comrades of the same tendency should be given leading functions.

Before the last meeting of the Executive these comrades declared that the main danger is the Left danger. This means that the Right which had the majority in the trade union department was sabotaging with all the means at its disposal the execution of the decisions of the Communist Party in its Central Committee, and was carrying on openly a struggle against it.

In the candidates question these comrades tried to get into Parliament not only Brandler and Thalheimer but a number of other comrades in order to change in this manner the correlation of force in the functionaries cadre.

It is a fact that the comrades of the Gerhardt group are endeavouring above all to utilise the Berlin trade union apparatus in order to induce Berlin Party members to associate themselves with this conciliatory current. The most important Berlin trade union fraction is still under the leadership of an opponent of the R. I. L. U. decisions. These comrades are also strongly represented in other fraction executives. Not enough new functionaries are drawn into the work.

It is a fact that in the discussion on the R. I. L. U. Congress these comrades endeavoured to disguise more or less the differences with the Right group.

The facts I have just given show that Comrade Ewert's assertion that the Pol Bureau wants to brand certain comrades is absolutely false. The Right as well as comrades belonging to the "conciliatory" current have branded themselves by their own actions. They cannot erase the mark unless they show by deeds that they are willing to carry out the decisions of the VI. World

Congress shoulder to shoulder with the majority of the Pol Bureau.

Comrades, with your permission, I will say a few more words concerning Comrade Ewert's arguments concerning the proposals of the Russian delegation. The Russian delegation has declared that the main danger is the Right danger and that it is also necessary to fight the conciliatory current. It is also said in the amendments that it is necessary to draw the best forces of the Party into the work and to take resolutely the course of consolidating the Party.

In regard to this Comrade Thälmann said clearly: we agree, the Right danger is the main danger. But the followers of the conciliatory current who are utilising, more or less, this Right for themselves and are in turn utilised by the Right, preventing thereby the Party from fighting the Right as it should be fought, must also be combated by ideological means as well as by organisational measures. Comrade Thälmann said clearly: If the comrades around Ewert associate themselves unreservedly with the proposals of the Russian delegation it will be possible to overcome the differences in the Party without much difficulty. What is Comrade Ewert's answer? He says: "Even the majority of an Executive can degenerate into a group" (interjection by Thälmann: This was what Trotzky said). Comrade Thälmann's interjection is correct, this is what Trotzky said. This reminds us of the Trotskyist conception of organisation. It is true, that Comrade Ewert toned down subsequently his arguments by declaring that it is possible to overcome divergencies of opinion, "provided there is on all sides a real desire to do so". Comrade Thälmann stated clearly that this desire exists in the C. C. and in the Delegation. Comrade Ewert's answer to this is: Yes, but there is the danger that the majority which is now willing to overcome divergencies of opinion "will degenerate". This is a terrible insult to the Party majority. Comrade Ewert shows his willingness to overcome divergencies of opinion in a peculiar manner. This is consent with reservation, i. e. if Comrade Ewert thinks it expedient in a certain situation to bring forward a different policy he will say: "I am not bound by discipline because the majority is on the road to degeneration". This was also said by Trotzky about the big majority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Comrade Ewert must make up his mind either to pursue the path proposed by the Russian Pol Bureau which is identical with the views of the German delegation and Pol Bureau, or he must realise that if he does not pursue this path, if he does not carry out the decisions in a disciplined manner shoulder to shoulder with the comrades of the C. C., he can become a rallying centre for elements who hold views which deviate from those of the Party. Comrade Ewert must realise this consequence. This is the meaning of the warning which was given comrade Ewert also in the German delegation.

We say that it is necessary to give an impetus to self-criticism in our Party organisations including the lower organisations. This, together with a correct utilisation of the experiences of the Party, will result in a correct political orientation. Moreover, on the strength of self-criticism the lower organisations will begin to elect Executives capable of creating organisational guarantees for the execution of the decisions of the VI. World Congress in a disciplined manner by the whole Party. We believe that the decisions of the VI. World Congress will become the basis for the development of maximum unity and activity in the Party.

Comrade LOMINADZE (C. P. S. U.):

The central point at present is the approach of the war danger, or it is better to say not merely the approach but, so to say, already the beginning of the war, if we take the war which is now being fought in China. The division of China, which has been begun, testifies to this in an irrefutable manner. But, comrades, one must not, on the ground that the danger of war is extraordinarily close and that it has become a real menace of the present day, under-estimate the positive possibilities given us by the growth of the inner contradictions in the individual capitalist countries. This would be a big mistake and it seems to me that the Theses in no case give cause for such an orientation. On the basis of such an analysis of the present period, the Theses lay down the general line of the Communist International for the period immediately before us. This general

line conditions the following tasks: struggle against the approaching war danger, defence of the Soviet Union, defence of the Chinese Revolution and the colonial movement, and last, but not least, the preparation of the proletariat — in connection with the augmenting crisis of capitalism — for an intensified struggle to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the orientation and this is the line of the Theses proposed to the VI. World Congress. If one looks upon the speeches of some comrades from this point of view, then it appears to me to be quite beyond doubt that the declarations of agreement with the Theses do not always correspond to a real agreement with the Theses on the part of the various comrades. It seems to me that Comrade Ewert, who tried to defend the Theses proposed by our Delegation to the VI. World Congress, in reality deviated from the line of the Theses, and from the orientation given in the Theses. Comrade Ewert developed the idea here that the victory of the Communist Parties, and the victory of the proletarian revolution, is not possible all at one time. This is a matter that requires no proof and on this occasion nobody will begin to quarrel with Comrade Ewert. But Comrade Ewert cited this indisputed truth in order to prove that the Vienna uprising was an exception to the general rule and that in a country other than Austria, which is a state with only one large town — Vienna, the recurrence of such an uprising would be impossible. More than once a sentence slipped out of Comrade Ewert, to the effect that revolutionary struggles could not take place in the present period. It seems to me that such an appraisal of the Vienna uprising as an exception which could not be repeated in other countries, is not correct and that it most sharply contradicts the whole orientation of the Theses. The Vienna uprising was revolutionary explosion, and had it had the preconditions of a powerful Communist Party and its connection with the masses, it would have become the starting point of the proletarian revolution in Austria. Are such explosions possible in other countries? They are absolutely possible. From the point of view of the orientation given in the Theses the Vienna uprising is a phenomenon entirely according to law, one which proceeds inevitably from the sharpening crisis of capitalism.

A still greater mistake which Comrade Ewert has made is his appraisal of the great British strike. Comrade Ewert declared literally that if the British strike — at first the General Strike and then the miners' struggle — disclosed the forces of the British working class, on the other side it showed the might and solidity of bourgeois stabilisation in England. This conclusion decisively contradicts not only what is stated in the Theses, but likewise all the appraisals ever given by the Comintern with regard to the British General strike. The Comintern has constantly emphasised the gigantic revolutionary significance of the strike struggles of 1926 in Great Britain, and has at all times pointed out that the events of the year 1926 were the expression of the extreme insecurity and unsteadiness of the stabilisation of British capitalism.

It appears to me, furthermore, that Comrade Ewert erroneously estimates the extent and the character of the Leftward turn of the masses of workers in Europe. Comrade Ewert said that one must not compare the votes that were cast for our Communist Party in the elections with a leaden weight, but that neither must one consider the votes cast for the Social Democracy as empty straw. Of course, one must not make such a comparison. It seems to me, however, that it would be a big mistake to proceed like Comrade Ewert does, when he identifies absolutely the specific gravity of votes cast for the Communist Party of Germany with the votes cast for the Social Democracy. Comrade Ewert declared that while every ballot cast for our Party is a lead weight thrown upon our side of the scales, every ballot cast for the Social Democracy is also a lead weight, but it is one thrown upon the scales of the bourgeoisie. This comparison is wrong, and it shows quite obviously how erroneously Comrade Ewert conceives of the character of the process of Leftward development of the working class in Europe and particularly in Germany. In the elections the Communist Party of Germany came forward with a revolutionary slogan. It raised the demand for the proletarian dictatorship, for the workers' and peasants' government, which is a synonym for the proletarian dictatorship. The Communist Party did not promise the workers any sort of betterments through its work in Parliament, but on the contrary the sharpening of the struggle.

In the elections the Communist Party called upon the proletariat for a greater exertion of its powers for the revolutionary struggle. The Social Democracy on the other hand came forward with a positive reformist programme. The Social Democracy made excellent use of these Social Democratic illusions about peaceful development, with which the German working class is still imbued to a very great degree. It is, therefore, absolutely wrong if one now identifies the votes cast for the Party of revolutionary struggle, according to specific gravity, with the votes cast for the reformist party which wrote upon its banner the programme of peaceable organic construction.

Comrade Ewert identified himself with the proposal to include a special point in the Theses on the tempo and character of economic development in the U.S.S.R., which was made here by a number of delegations, but he proposed to broaden these proposals in such a way as to say that the Communist International shall assure a better information service concerning the difficulties that stand in the way of the industrialisation of the Soviet Union.

Our Party and the Comintern are doing everything possible on their part, and perhaps more than is necessary sometimes, to reveal before the whole world the difficulties that stand in the way of our construction. I do not altogether understand what this proposal aims at. A reproach to the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. from this side is absolutely out of place.

Finally as to the inner Party question which Comrade Ewert touched upon.

Comrade Ewert puts the whole question as if he had differences with the majority of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany over the question of applying organisational measures against the Right group, against the Right tendency in the Party. I really must say that if one talks of the shortcomings in the leadership of the Communist Party of Germany, its shortcomings do not consist in an excessive resort to organisational measures against the Right comrades, against those who openly depart from the Leninist line of the Comintern and who openly violate Party discipline, but that its shortcomings consist in making far too little application of these organisational measures. (Applause.)

It seems to me that there cannot be even the slightest doubt of this in the minds of a single delegate to this Congress who heard the speech of Comrade Lozovsky (yesterday), in which he pilloried all the dealings of the leaders of local organisations, of prominent Party functionaries — dealings which directly tend towards a defence of the Amsterdam International.

It seems to me that it would be absolutely wrong for anyone to try to separate entirely the political line from the organisational measures. One must clearly and soberly look the truth in the eye as it is. If the Party carries out a definite political line, and if a group or a fraction organises itself inside the Party and sets itself the task of forcing the Party to give up this political line — then one cannot always confine oneself solely to corrective measures. Against a Right group, against a Right fraction, and consequently against organised measures to which a Right opposition resorts, there will become inevitable in one case or another the application by the Party leadership also of organisational measures of a Party disciplinary nature.

Now as to the claim of Comrade Ewert that the majority of the Communist Party of Germany is to a certain extent on the road to degeneration into a special group; here Comrade Ewert, if he makes such accusations, should at least have based them upon some sort of valid proofs.

In the present case, is not the raising of such a reproach against the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany merely a camouflage of the fact, on the part of Comrade Ewert, that a group character is far rather borne by the activity of those comrades who have grouped themselves around Comrade Ewert on various questions of inner Party life? It seems to me that this is the way the things stand and not the other way.

And, finally, if Comrade Ewert accepts the motion of the C. P. S. U. delegation in which a characterisation is given of the inner Party relations of the Communist Party of Germany, he must accept it without any reservations whatever. Those re-

servations which Comrade Ewert made here may furnish the occasion for further differences of opinion, for further struggle against the leadership of the C. C. of the Party, and the Congress must see to it that the motions of our delegation on the question of the inner Party situation in the Communist Party of Germany are accepted without any reservations whatever.

In my opinion, Comrade Pepper obscured, to an even greater degree than Comrade Ewert, the meaning of the leftward process of the working class in Europe. The Theses say: "The general process of the march to the Left of the masses of workers in European countries advances further." But Comrade Pepper declared in his speech: "We cannot say even about Germany, about France and Great Britain, that there is in process a general leftward march of the working class." Pepper added to this sentence the following: "The decisive mass, viz. the majority of the European working class, does not yet give expression to the Leftward trend." First of all the decisive mass of the working class is not yet its arithmetical majority. Secondly, no one has ever said that the Leftward march of the decisive mass of the proletariat has already been concluded. Finally, the growth of sympathy for the Soviet Union, the Vienna uprising, the wave of demonstrations on the occasion of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti — all this is the most convincing expression of the circumstance that the general process of the Leftward march of the decisive masses of Europe has begun and that it is proceeding. In his speech, Comrade Pepper further stated: "The growth of the base of reformism and of the American Federation of Labour, and the consolidation of civil peace, is an inevitable consequence of the increasing strengthening of the world hegemony of the United States of America." Will the growth in the world hegemony of the United States go hand in hand with a consolidation of civil peace — this is still a more than disputed problem. It appears to me that Comrade Pepper is not right when he presents the perspective of the development of class antagonisms in America in this manner. In my opinion the contrary is correct.

Comrade Pepper states that the further leftward march of the proletariat is being checked because in the ranks of the American bourgeoisie there are no great differences; it is absolutely impermissible to look upon this whole story as a brake, as a barrier to the process of leftward march of the American working class. All that Comrade Pepper has said in this connection is nothing else than the expression of that circumstance that in America the political power of the bourgeoisie confronts the American proletariat in the most concentrated, in the most naked form, where class stands out most clear-cut against class, and that this circumstance must become a guarantee and a factor for the intensification of the process of leftward march in the ranks of the American working class, and not a factor alleviating it as Comrade Pepper believes. Comrade Pepper has turned things upside down in respect to the perspective of the development of the American labour movement. I have no time to enter in detail upon this economic analysis, if I may so call it, which Comrade Pepper gave when he appraised the perspectives of the development of American capitalism. I will say only the following: if this section of the speech of Comrade Pepper, which is an advertisement for the power of American imperialism, were published in the American press one might consider it to be the speech of any of the candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties — it makes no difference which — at an election meeting. (Applause.)

In an article by Comrade Pepper published in the American periodical, "The Communist", there is expressed with greatest clarity that dark perspective which Comrade Pepper draws with respect to the development of the labour movement in America. Polemising against Comrade Lozovsky, the article by Comrade Pepper declares that the carrying out of the task of organising the unorganised and forming new trade unions in America finds the following obstacles in its path: 1. We are hindered by the circumstance that capitalism in America is still very strong and that it continues to move on an upward curve. 2. We are hindered by the circumstance that the American working class as a whole is in a privileged position. 3. We are hindered by the fact that in America there is the broadest and most powerful strata of labour aristocracy. 4. We are hindered by the fact that the proletariat in the decisive branches of industry and gigantic enterprises consists of workers born outside of America and who speak various languages. 5. We are

hindered by the fact that a most powerful government of finance capital has consolidated itself, which subjugates the working class by means of troops, police and courts, and which is endeavouring to smash all labour organisations. 6. We are hindered by the fact that the organised employers on a national scale are conducting a campaign against the right of the non-trade union workers to strike, and also for the formation of company unions. 7. We are hindered by the fact that the most important sections of the workers in the steel, coal and textile industries are compelled to live in company towns where the employers own practically everything — the land, the houses, the roads, the schools, and the stores, where the capitalists hold State power directly in their own hands and where a whole system of their own police and their factory espionage has been established. 8. We are hindered by the trustification of American industry from top to bottom, we must not forget that in Europe the trade unions of the unskilled workers were formed in a period prior to trustification, viz., at a time when it was still easier to organise these workers. 9. We are hindered by the circumstance that the Communist Party of America is still weak.

In general, everything is hindering us, the capitalists are hindering us by exploiting the workers, the existence of capitalism itself hinders us, and of perspectives there are none at all. (Applause.)

It seems to me that in America we have all the premises to make our Communist Party, which at the present time is a sect — this must be stated openly — into a powerful force. There are more favourable premises for the growth of the Communist Party in America than in a number of other countries. They are the gigantic social antagonisms which arise in an ever-expanded reproduction in connection with capitalist development, and which Comrade Pepper has forgotten.

In this connection I should like to emphasise also the circumstances that, in my opinion, it is necessary to apply in America also those tactics which were proposed for Great Britain and France at the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Comrade Pepper recently published an article in "The Communist International" in which he comes to the conclusion that the tactics recommended by the E. C. C. I. for France and England cannot be carried out in America.

What basically impelled the Comintern to shift the course of the British and French Communist Parties toward the left consists in that reformism is developing turbulently toward the Right, that the Social Democracy is becoming integrated with the State apparatus; it consists in that raging struggle which reformism is waging against the Communist movement. All this is unquestionably present in America in its ripest form and therefore a fact which Cannon described, that the Communists in New York voted for the candidate of the Socialist Party who was supported by the Republican Party and the American Federation of Labour, is just as impermissible from the standpoint of the American Party as from the standpoint of the French. Such facts must no longer occur in the American Communist movement. The attempt of Comrade Pepper, however, to justify this fact by saying that the situation is different in America is a pernicious policy, an utterly wrong and rotten attempt.

In America there are all the premises for the application of the change undertaken by the Comintern in England and in France, and it is necessary that this turn shall be taken as quickly as possible. The position which Comrade Pepper takes on this question must be rejected, and although I am not particularly well acquainted with the factional struggle inside the American Party, it appears to me that if the majority of the C. E. C. advocates all the views of Comrade Pepper then the Opposition is right in many things.

I should like to make a few remarks on the Chinese question. In the Theses on the Canton uprising we find the following:

"The Congress considers the attempt to look upon the Canton uprising as a putsch, to be absolutely wrong. The Canton uprising, which was a heroic rear-guard battle of the Chinese proletariat in the period of the Chinese revolution which lies behind us, remains, despite the grave mistakes of the leadership, the banner of the new, Soviet stage of the revolution."

This section in the Theses, if it is elevated to the rank of a decision of the VI. World Congress, is of greatest principle significance. This is not only a worthy reply to the calumnies from the Trotskyist opposition which announced, in complete agreement with the Social Democracy, that the Canton uprising was a putsch organised by the Comintern, or an adventure organised by the Comintern, but this section also puts an end, once for all to any vacillations in our own midst on the question of our appraisal of the Canton uprising. How far these waverings go can be seen from an article published by a certain Comrade Reuberg in one of the recent issues of the "Communist International". The whole super-smartness of this article consists in the profound conclusion that good uprisings are those which succeed, while bad uprisings are those which fail. He says that the greatest mistakes of the Communists in Canton was the organising of the uprising itself. Reuberg declares that: "the military and organisational-technical mistakes made by leaders of the uprising were unquestionably also of considerable influence on the results of the Canton struggle, but nevertheless, as compared with objective causes, they had but subordinate and not decisive importance". Here Comrade Reuberg says everything except the word "putch". I must say that one might with equal success brand as a putch any uprisings that fails of success, particularly the December uprising of 1905, the Hamburg uprising of 1923, the Estonian uprising of 1924 — and one might do so here in an even greater degree, from this Reubergist point of view, than in the case of the Canton uprising. When I read the article of Comrade Reuberg I came to the conclusion that Reuberg was a pseudonym for Pepper (laughter) since the whole argumentation of Reuberg corresponds to the arguments which Comrade Pepper brought forward at the time against the Canton uprising.

Why have I again mentioned Pepper here? Because not long ago Comrade Pepper had the courage — to express it mildly — to declare in the American "Communist" that the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. had completely adopted his position on the Chinese question.

Comrades, surely everyone knows that with respect to the Canton uprising Comrade Pepper had the opinion that up until the Canton uprising he was against the Canton uprising, that during the Canton uprising itself he was against the uprising, and that after the Canton uprising he was also against the Canton uprising. (Applause.) Therefore all the arguments which he brought forward against the uprising are basically and in form the same arguments as brought forward by Comrade Reuberg. Now, to be sure, it has developed that Comrade Reuberg is not Comrade Pepper but another comrade. This changes nothing in the case. Comrade Pepper considered it a merit that even before the action of the Canton workers he had warned the leaders of the C. P. of China and had pointed out the inevitable fatal consequences of the Canton uprising. Comrades, again I shall draw no complete analogy, and shall in no case designate Comrade Pepper as a Menshevik, but I must recall that the Russian Menshevik in 1905—06 took a position against the December uprising for the same reasons, that they considered it premature, and they likewise considered it to their credit to have been against the premature uprising.

I shall offer a small citation in this connection. Lenin wrote:

"Plechanov jokingly compared himself to a roman army chieftain who had his son executed because he had begun a fight prematurely, but if I had been the "son" in the moment of decisive struggle, when "the forces of the revolution already exceeded the forces of the government, without hesitating a second, I would have shot (or in Roman style, stabbed) "Mr Papa" who issued the slogan for a horse trade with the reaction, and would have left it for the future to decide whether my action in murdering a traitor was his execution or a crime against the respect for rank."

The appraisal of the Canton uprising given by Comrades Reuberg and Pepper has nothing in common with the appraisal given in the Theses.

In order not to arouse the impression that I want to cover up my own mistakes in the Chinese question by pouncing upon the mistakes made by others at the same time, I must openly declare that, prior to the 9th Plenum I made a serious mistake, which I want to mention. My mistake consisted in that I did

not look upon the Canton uprising as a rear-guard action, did not consider it to be the concluding engagement which wound up a whole period of the revolution, but that I held it to be the beginning of a new upsurge of the Chinese revolution. Events have disproved this position, events have shown that the Canton uprising was the last link in a whole chain of revolutionary struggles which had mounted particularly high in the middle of 1927, and slowly declining, had ended with a last mighty flare-up in the Canton uprising. After the Canton uprising the depression set in.

My mistakes consisted in that, proceeding from a false estimate of the situation, I continued after the Canton uprising to hold that the course for an immediate armed uprising was just as necessary as before the Canton uprising.

Now it is perfectly clear that this line was not tenable after the Canton uprising. The 9th Plenum, and subsequently the Theses proposed to the VI. World Congress, put this question absolutely correctly; that the slogan for the armed uprising can now be formulated only as a propagandist slogan and only in those districts where there is a spontaneous peasant movement, that the Communists must put themselves at the head of these peasant uprisings, in order to consolidate and strengthen themselves there. On the whole, however, the slogan of the armed uprising is for the present only a propagandist slogan for the Communist Party of China. But if anybody were to say that because the period of depression had set in at the end of 1927, already earlier than Canton, he is against the Canton uprising, this would be an impermissible distortion of the line of the Comintern on this question. As long as there was the slightest hope that the revolutionary upsurge would continue unabated, it was necessary to act in the way that the Chinese comrades acted in December of last year.

I consider it very necessary to enter briefly upon what Comrade Varga has stated here. Comrade Varga has declared that at the present time tremendous structural changes have taken place in the system of world capitalism, which are expressed in the change in the character of unemployment. Comrade Varga looks upon the unemployment of today as a structural unemployment. According to the opinion of Comrade Varga, for all large industrial countries a new law of development has been set in force, under which the amount of variable capital, and consequently also the number of workers, declines absolutely in the face of a simultaneous increase in constant capital.

Comrade Varga does not limit himself to the statement of a single fact, but he draws general conclusions from it. These general conclusions decisively contradict the whole teachings of Marx. Comrade Varga himself does not hide the fact that in respect to the laws established by Marx, his thesis is something new. I will read only one section from "Capital" in which Marx says the opposite of what Comrade Varga has maintained:

"Just as simple reproduction incessantly reproduces also the capitalist relationship itself — the capitalists on the one side and the wage workers on the other, so expanded reproduction, or expanded accumulation, reproduces capitalist relations on an expanded basin: more capitalists or more big capitalists on the one pole, more wage workers on the other pole."

Marx concludes this paragraph as follows:

"Thereby the accumulation of capital is the multiplication of the proletariat."

Comrade Varga on the other hand, maintains the opposite, that at present the accumulation of capital is accompanied not by an increase but by an absolute decrease in the working class.

I must remark that this theory is not a particularly new theory. This theory was once put forth by Tugan-Baranowsky. Comrade Bukharin gave an excellent reply to Tugan-Baranowsky in his pamphlet against Rosa Luxemburg.

Comrade Varga bases his conclusions on two whole tables. One of these tables, taken from the American periodical, "Commercial Year Book", points out that in the years 1919—25 the number of workers declined by 7% whereas the mass of total

production in industry, railway transport and agriculture, increased by 20%.

Comrades, first of all the data in this table has not been exactly checked up. The table furthermore only offers data on agriculture, mining, other industries and railway transports. But what has happened to automobile transport? If one takes the railways in an investigation of the decline in the ratio of variable capital, then one should also include automobile transport because there we have a considerable increase in the number of workers. What has happened to building, where we likewise have a large increase in the number of workers employed? It is not permissible to make conclusions on the basis of a questionable table which revises the whole teaching of Marx. In passing I should also remark that in his analysis of the data in these tables, Comrade Varga confuses two points, the technical composition of capital and its value composition. These two things must not be mixed up, however. With respect to Great Britain, the figures which Comrade Varga offered, that from 1923 to 1928 there has been an absolute reduction in the number of workers, has been refuted, e. g., by Comrade Spector. In addition we see in England a stagnation on the field of the production of means of production, but not an increase of constant capital, and unemployment there is growing on the basis of the depression. According to the figures cited by Comrade Varga, unemployment in America in 1924 was considerably smaller than at present, and today it is not the technical transformation but the depression, not the gigantic increase in constant capital but the slackening tempo of the development of productive forces in America, that has caused the unemployment.

In reality things are as follows, that a technical revolution always has called forth and still calls forth a reduction in the number of workers in the individual enterprises, in the individual branches of industry. The steady absorption and expulsion of workers by industry leads to a rapid growth in the reserve army but the whole process of accumulation is accompanied by an absolute increase in the working class. What we see to-day is an accelerated increase in the reserve labour army, which however, does not suspend the law that capitalism reproduces an ever greater and greater number of workers on each level of its development. Everything that now occurs in respect to unemployment may very well be included within the limits of the laws of development recorded by Marx. Capitalism develops and declines under the same laws that Marx laid down, and we do not have to think out any new laws.

In conclusion, I consider it necessary to enter upon one more question. I believe that the sharpening of the struggle against the Right danger inside the Communist movement which is now undertaken by the Communist International, naturally in no sense means a weakening of our irreconcilable attitude to the Trotskyist opposition. Momentarily, however, the acute phase of the struggle against Trotskyism belongs in the realm of the past, while the Right danger crowds forward strongly from all the pores of the individual Communist Parties. We see it in the American Party, in the German Party, in the Scandinavian Parties, in the French Party, etc. The circumstance that the Congress has seen this danger in time and that it is offering the requisite resistance, is the guarantee for the frictionless overcoming also of this deviation in the ranks of the Communist International. (Strong applause.)

Comrade LOVESTONE (America):

Comrades: I believe the American Party owes an explanation to the Congress for the impermissible performance of some comrades of the delegation that has come here. Allow me to assure you comrades that I do not intend to air the inner questions in detail as has been done. I merely propose to analyse the economic situation prevailing in the United States, not only from an American angle but particularly insofar as it involves the present status of international capitalism.

The comrades in the opposition of the Workers (Communist) Party are confusing the immediate economic situation with the fundamental trend of economic development of American imperialism. We reject any schematic concept as utterly un-Leninist.

The American Party's opposition say that they accept the main line of Comrade Bukharin's theses but they have seven reservations; one, they want an elaboration of some sections; second, an emphasis on other sections; third, they say that the rate of decline in the growth of production is already clear. Then they say that the rate of increase of exports is already declining. Fourth, our Opposition demands a "new emphasis" on America. Fifth, according to our Opposition the thesis of Comrade Bukharin fails to show clearly the interdependence of the class struggle within the imperialist countries and the contradictions between the capitalist countries. Sixth "it is necessary that the Congress should work out a more concrete perspective for America", said Comrade Foster. Seventh, all in all, our Opposition, in accepting the theses of Comrade Bukharin, say that they want "a new word" on America. Otherwise our self-styled Left wing which the Comintern has repeatedly criticised for its Right errors, accepts the theses of Comrade Bukharin.

Comrade Bukharin says that American imperialism is still on the ascent; that the very prowess of American imperialism is the basis of rationalisation in Europe. The Central Executive Committee maintains that American imperialism is still on the ascendant. Our comrades of the Opposition charge that we advertise American imperialism because we recognise as an objective, though objectionable fact, the existing prowess of American imperialism. For instance, the other day in our July 4th demonstration, when our comrades were arrested for anti-imperialist acts, we were "salesmen" of Wall Street. And look at this piece of advertising that has been put into the theses of Comrade Bukharin — advertising American imperialism — in the language of our Opposition:

"The general social and economic basis of this fact is the slow rate of development of the crisis of capitalism in the course of which one of its principle component parts is on the upgrade while others are undergoing a process of relatively slow decline. This includes the growing consolidation of the positions of the United States as the world exploiter, creditor and usurer (the 'prosperity' of the United States . . .)"

Now, what does the Opposition say? I quote from their documents as follows:

"An analysis of the degree of ripeness of these contradictions will show that American capitalism is about to reach the apex of its growth."

This is taken from the Bittelman-Foster thesis. Secondly, "The present economic depression must inevitably become the forerunner of a deep going crisis". Third, before the Presidium of the Comintern, Comrade Dunne declared:

"Furthermore, our Party and in this all of us are involved, but of course most of the responsibility rests on the majority of the C. E. C. — have underestimated the rapidity of the development of the class struggle in America, underestimated the tempo both of the decline of American national economy and the will and the desire of the masses to struggle."

A few words about the present economic situation in the United States. Yes, there is an acute depression in the United States today. Basic features of this depression are shown in mass unemployment, arising first of all from the depression itself and secondly from the tremendous rationalisation process which is producing an army of virtually permanently "disemployed" workers. Secondly: — the mass production which has been the very boast and pride of the development of American imperialism is bringing on sharp contradictions in its course. Thirdly: the credit situation — with America as the leading world creditor, is in a crisis, because of the terrific plethora of capital. There are also crises in different industries. But these crises are not elements of decay, elements of decline, but on the other hand are symptoms of growth of rationalisation in these industries. For examples, I mention coal, oil, textiles.

Are there contradictions in American imperialism? I refer you to the fact that at the February Plenum of our Central Committee the thesis presented to the Central Committee and voted for by the Opposition pointed out very sharply a number of contradictions in American imperialism. Merely to enumerate these are: 1. The large excess productive capacities as indicated

in the "overdevelopment" of certain industries. 2. The deepening fundamentally critical condition of agriculture. 3. The superabundance of credit. 4. Intensive installment buying which really should be called over-buying or over-selling, To a large extent American prosperity is based on installment buying. This mortgage on the future purchasing power of the workers and farmers which may for a time defer an economic depression, will become an aggravating force of an economic crisis, once it sets in. 5. Derangement of certain basic industries. This is due for the time to insufficient rationalisation and being appendage industries, like coal to steel and rails, and like coal and oil being more subject to distributing conditions of the world market than other industries. 6. The rapid development of great international cartels in Europe indicates a growing capacity of other imperialist powers not only to challenge but also to undermine the supremacy of American imperialism. 7. American imperialism is dependent on other imperialist powers for certain basic raw materials, as rubber, nitrates, oil, tin, nickel, etc. 8. The increasing export of capital creates for American imperialism a problem in the final repayment of commodities.

We have elaborated and emphasised the contradictions developing in American imperialism and the opportunities for work for our Party growing out of the conditions arising from these very contradictions. Are there already visible elements of decay? Yes! And we have pointed out very emphatically such elements of decay in American imperialism as the development of a rentier class, the narrowing domestic market hitherto largely the very base of American prosperity.

But we must not overlook its certain strength and special reserve powers.

However, when we look at this reserve power we do not become pessimistic. We say that in this very aggression of American imperialism we find the basis for the increased militarisation as well as the certainty of America being involved in the coming imperialist war. In appraising the role of American imperialism we must not overestimate the strength of American capitalism. There are forces gnawing at its very vitals despite the outward substantial signs of prosperity. Above all, we must keep in mind the fact that international capitalism is now in its last stage — the decadent stage of imperialism.

Comrades, our Opposition sees only either the contradictions or strength. They cannot see, at the same time, that the very strength of American imperialism brings about contradictions and hence increasing opportunities for our Party's working.

Now I want to examine some of the criticisms made of Comrade Bukharin's theses by our Opposition.

The vitality of American imperialism is not to be measured by mere figures of the value of commodities produced in certain years, but by the whole system of rationalisation, particularly by the productivity status of the individual productive unit, that is, by the productivity per man per hour.

The number of persons engaged in industry for the product of one hundred men in 1914 is as follows:

Year	Number of Men
1919	102.2
1921	99.6
1923	80.5
1925	71.0
1927	64.0 (approximately)

Up to 1919 employment and productivity had increased simultaneously. Now the trend indicates continued increase in productivity but, particularly in the last three years, a marked decrease in the number of men employed in the manufacturing industries. The average worker's productivity in the manufacturing industries increased about 45% in 1927 above 1914.

The second point. Comrade Bittelman says that there is a decline in the rate of increase of exports. It is silly to compare the present years with the war years, as Comrade Bittelman has done. First of all, the war and immediate post-war years are an unusual period. Secondly we must examine the values in terms of pre-war dollars and not stop at mere superficial dollar value. In order to have correctness in this respect, we should

not take the years of 1919—21 for they are not the proper base to take. The United States is not living in a vacuum. We must look at it in relation to other imperialist powers. The question is: is the United States still beating in the world market all other imperialist powers? We say, yes. It is this that indicates the present strength and prowess of American Imperialism. On this basis American exports are still expanding despite Bittelman's figures.

But why does Comrade Bittelman leave out the question of the trend in the export of capital which is the very key to the present international situation? These facts show that American imperialism is still on the upgrade. We herewith produce the following table:

American Export of Capital.

Year	Amount
1923	414,000,000 (Dollars)
1924	878,000,000 "
1925	1,031,000,000 "
1926	1,135,000,000 "
1927	1,377,000,000 "

These figures are exclusive of refunding loans and are the net amount of additional new capital exported within these years.

For the first six months of 1928 America has exported 1,053,164,000 dollars. This compares with 794,277,000 dollars in the first half of 1927. It is a fact that American capitalism is investing in foreign securities and in domestic securities for export and at home, a thousand dollar per business second.

Now Comrade Bittelman's main argument to prove his fallacious theory of the decline of American imperialism is that the percentage of national income received by the workers is decreasing. Comrade Bittelman cites this in order to show the increasing misery of the American workers. He forgets that though it is absolutely true that the rate of exploitation of the American workers is increasing, this fact in itself does not mean that their condition is getting worse. A smaller share of a bigger national income is bigger than a larger share of a smaller national income. To prove our point we herewith indicate the constant rate of increase in the growth of the national income of the United States:

Year	Amount of Income
1921	62,736,000,000 (Dollars)
1922	65,567,000,000 "
1923	76,769,000,000 "
1924	79,365,000,000 "
1925	86,461,000,000 "
1926	89,682,000,000 "

Here we have an increase of 28,000,000,000 dollars in seven years — a pretty rapid decline!

Comrade Varga is correct when he states that the American standard of living is not going down. The fact of the matter is that the real income has been increasing 7% every year. What the Opposition confuses is real wages with the rate of exploitation.

Now from this fallacious income analysis Comrade Bittelman comes to his most "damaging" conclusion against the theses proposed by Bukharin. He says: "The theses do not bring out sufficiently the dependence between the outer and inner conflicts of imperialism". Comrade Bittelman wants to create the impression that Bukharin's theses tried to explain the conflict among the imperialist powers without a class basis, without linking them up with the relations of the classes in the various countries.

It goes without saying that this is a ridiculous charge which, if it were true, would challenge the whole Marxian basis of the theses proposed by Comrade Bukharin in behalf of the Russian Delegation.

A few words about the role of American imperialism. The Central Committee declares that the growing aggressiveness of American imperialism today is based on its growing strength. This is the special feature of the present world situation. Our Opposition says that the growing aggressiveness is based — on "The diminishing reserve power of American imperialism". This is false and is a wrong "elaboration" of the theses. The Opposition cannot see that the growth and aggressiveness of American Imperialism can go together. Here is where they get their criticism of the Party in certain fields. They believe so firmly in their false conclusions that American imperialism is about to decline, that they charge that the C. E. C. policies towards Anglo-American and Japanese-American conflicts are based on a supposed notion attributed to the C. E. C. of America being the tail to British and Japanese imperialism on China.

Let us examine some facts. I read from the estimate of the Anglo-American relations made by one of the "theoreticians" of our Opposition. Comrade Dunne in estimating the Anglo-American relations has declared:

"If American imperialism really desires peace for herself and the imperialist world, (we consider in this article only the inner imperialist conflicts and not the general struggle of imperialism against the Soviet Union) the requisite procedure seems quite simple. It would be sufficient for immediate purposes for the two most powerful imperialist nations — America and Great Britain — to sign a Treaty against war and agree to move jointly against any other imperialist nation or nations, which disturbed the peace. The combination of forces would be too powerful for any possible grouping of capitalist nations to challenge."

The Central Committee rejects this opportunist non-Leninist estimate of the Anglo-American conflict, and maintains that the Anglo-American conflict has displaced the Anglo-German conflict of pre-war days.

Now let us see about the Japanese question. Our Central Committee maintains that the Japanese American imperialist conflicts are developing and are bound to sharpen. But particularly because of the strong persistent anti-Japanese propaganda of American imperialism and the propaganda of Wall Street that the United States is a friend of China — it is necessary for us to expose this propaganda by making clear the concrete, aggressive role of American imperialism. American imperialism is today temporarily giving Japan, to a certain extent, some freedom because of the greater common danger of a revolutionary China. Do we deny the sources of conflict between Japanese and American imperialism? We do not deny any of this. What we do deny is that it is our work to hide the role of American imperialism in this connection as an active co-operator with Japan in crushing China. The basic line of the policy of the Party must be founded not on the differences among the imperialist powers, but on the concrete role of the so-called Home Government, the United States Government, which oppresses the American workers.

Is there a radicalisation process going on in the United States? The Central Committee says: yes. The volume of radicalisation today is greater than at any time since the Lafollette movement was at its height. We say, furthermore, it is increasing, but if it were of a national and deep-going character there would be some mass political expression of it. There would be many economic struggles of the workers. There would be a wave of strikes. But Green, Woll and the reactionary trade union fakers and the capitalist politicians still have the overwhelming majority of the working class following their policy.

The error of the Opposition on the question of radicalisation is that they maintain that radicalisation in the United States today is already national and involves the bulk of the working class. This is due to the fact that they think radicalisation can come only when capitalism goes down and that American imperialism is already going down. They fail to see that the developing strength of American imperialism itself develops contradictions which are a source of radicalisation.

Briefly about unemployment: America with its mass unemployment and with its consequent developing unrest affords increasing opportunities for our Party. Our Party has responded well.

Much has been said here by our Opposition about the fight against the Right danger. The American Party has consistently fought the Right danger for a number of years. Our Opposition is making a caricature of the fight against the Right danger.

Comrades, I want to give you a brief survey of the development of our Party. — In the first stage we made errors mainly of an ultra-Left character. For instance, Comrade Cannon now parading here as one of the Left, had a shortcut method of fighting the ultra-Lefts by proposing to expel 5000 workers from our Party. We fortunately rejected that method.

In the second period of our Party our orientation was largely a Right Wing orientation, that was in 1924 and 1925 with Lore-Forster-Bittelman constituting the heart and head of our then Party leadership. Let us briefly look at the line of our Central Committee at that time.

1. Labor banking, which everyone denounces today, was officially endorsed in the Labour Herald, edited by Foster, the official organ of the Trade Union Educational League.

2. The convention in which the Foster-Bittelman-Lore-Cannon group were the majority, was greeted by Lore in the "Volkszeitung", his paper, as the victory of a majority for Trotskyism. And when we tried to repudiate this, we were defeated in all our efforts.

3. The convention sent a request to the Comintern that the E. C. C. I. decision to reorganise the Party on the basis of shop nuclei should not be applied to America.

4. Our efforts to secure a repudiation of Trotskyism as soon as it raised its head, were defeated. It was not until instructions came from the Party representative in Moscow at the Fifth Congress that Trotskyism was first renounced by the then majority of our Central Committee led by Foster and Lore.

5. The whole of the trade union work was then based upon the skilled workers, the labour aristocracy. The sole attention was paid to the amalgamation of the existing trade unions. All our efforts to push the organisation of the unorganised (1923) Convention) were rejected.

6. Lore, who was then the real ideological leader of the Foster majority, has since been expelled. At the Fifth Congress, special instructions were given to our Party to have the then majority of Foster break with the Lore forces, now outside the Party and unite with the followers of Ruthenberg.

7. The C. I. further declared at its Fifth World Congress that:

"The comrades gathered around Comrade Cannon have made a number of declarations which have shown that in their efforts to secure influence on the petty-bourgeoisie they have failed to maintain the Communist position."

8. What was the policy of these self-styled Left Wingers of today on the Negro work at that time? I read from a speech delivered at the Third Profintern Congress by Comrade Dunne of the Opposition.

"That the black workers are not organised is not to be explained by race antagonism but by the fact that the American workers in general are not organised. In those branches of industry in which Negroes work, they are accepted in the trade unions as members on a basis of equality. If we are against dual unions in general, we cannot be for dual Negro unions. Race prejudice exists, it is true, but the best means of struggle against it will be the acceptance of white and black workers in one organisation, and not the mobilisation of the Negroes on one side of the barrier and the whites on the other."

"If comrade Losovsky insists upon the organisation of separate Negro unions in America, then we invite him to come to America and try to occupy himself with this question for at least a year. I am convinced that at the next Congress he would demand the head of that comrade who might propose such a solution of the Negro problem."

Our Central Committee has put forth a totally different policy, without Comrade Losovsky's assistance on this question.

Then let us come to the present period of our Party beginning with the close of 1925.

We now see the beginning of the development towards a Bolshevik Party, with the present Central Committee leading the Party.

1. We reorganised the Party on a Bolshevik basis of shop nuclei.

2. We raised the ideological level of the Party.

3. We have driven the Party into mass work. Today 47% of our members are in the trade unions, as against only 32% when we took over the Party leadership.

4. We began the campaign to organise the unorganised. When we raised it concretely on the Passaic question, the organisation of the unorganised textile workers and famous Passaic strike, the Opposition resisted it and branded it as dual unionism. (December 1925 C. E. C. Plenum.)

5. We have made considerable headway in the unification of the Party, ideologically as well as organisationally.

6. We have here laid the beginning of mass work amongst the Negroes.

7. We have conducted the fight against opportunism, continuing the fight against Lore, and the fight against the ideologically damaging effects of American imperialism on the working class and even on certain sections of our Party — the present Opposition.

Comrade Swabeck, one of the leaders of the Opposition, declared there was pessimism in the Party because the Russian Revolution is no longer a source of inspiration to the American workers.

This comrade saw a conflict between the ideals of the proletarian revolution in Russia and the objectives of the Party in active participation in the everyday struggles of the working class. We rejected this theory vigorously as an example of the most dangerous opportunism.

And when Comrade Foster developed the theory that the trade union bureaucracy is invincible, and that the savings of the workers in America have "dynamic possibilities", we rejected it as another evidence of the dangerous effects of the strength of imperialism on the ideology of our Party.

Our Party is engaged primarily in the work of organising the unorganised. The Trade Union Educational League has been so organised as to provide place for the unorganised workers in its structure. In mining, textile, needle trades, boot and shoe, and rubber, we are engaged in organising new unions. In textile, mining and the needle trades, we already have new unions organised. The Party is in the centre of every strike in the country. The Passaic strike and many others, the Sacco and Vanzetti movement, the fight against the American imperialist war in Nicaragua, the struggle against the oppression of the colonial masses — in all these our Party has been the leader. Today our Party has the complete hegemony over the Left Wing.

Comrade Cannon spoke here critically about our election campaign. I can only refer to an article of his in the "Daily Worker" (June 5th, 1928) before he came to Moscow, in which he wrote the highest praise of our election campaign.

With reference to the Negro work, we have made many errors, but we have made a definite beginning in this work.

In the organisation work, our Party apparatus is centralised. We have brought in more than 1,000 new members in the mining campaign: we have more than 15,000 members in the Party today, with an average monthly increase of 600 members for 1928. We now have 28 factory nuclei papers with a circulation of over 60,000.

Are we fighting the right danger? No one can charge the Central Committee with being guilty of over-caution and conservatism in leading the Party work. The Central Committee has provided for the immediate expulsion of any Party member who refuses to violate an injunction. In the fight against the injunction, particularly in the coal strike, many scores of our members have been jailed. The same has occurred in the national picketing and street demonstrations in which our Party has participated vigorously and which have very often been led by our Party.

Only the other day our Central Committee was compelled to repudiate a proposal by one of the Opposition leaders in America,

Comrade Swabeck, to refuse to build a new union in the textile industry because the reactionary United Textile Workers — the blackest type of reactionary union we have — has issued a statement that it wants to organise the unorganised. We have been fighting against the Right danger in Minnesota, where supporters of the Opposition said that the discipline of the Labour Party is as high as the discipline of the Communist Party, and where these comrades insisted on supporting the bourgeois politician, Shipstead, for the U. S. Senate.

In the anti-imperialist work, we fought the pacifist errors of Comrade Gomez, an Opposition delegate.

In the mining campaign, we have fought the Right errors committed in the anthracite by the Opposition spokesman, Papcun.

And in the question of the progressives, it was the Central Committee which saw to it that where we made unity with the progressives, we did not give them the leadership.

Our Central Committee very properly sharpened its position towards the Socialist Party. Much has been made here of the so-called opportunist attitude of our Party towards the Socialist Party.

The Minutes of our Political Committee December 14th, 1927, show that this outrageous opportunistic crime (of sending under special circumstances for special confidential purposes some very reliable comrades into the Socialist Party) charged against the majority of the C. E. C. if it is at all to be considered an error, was participated in wholeheartedly by our Opposition leaders in an even more aggressive and aggravating manner than that proposed by the majority.

Much noise has been made by our Oppositionists here in reference to the Panken matter as another opportunistic crime of the Central Committee. Not only did the supporters of the Opposition in the New York District Executive Committee unanimously vote for the policy in the Panken election, but in the Polcom meeting of October 27th, 1927, Comrade Foster made a motion which was typical of the worst of opportunistic errors our Party has committed in its relations to the Socialist Party. The motion thus proposed by Foster was rejected. It reads as follows:

"That the policy of the New York D. E. C. in giving qualified support to Panken (the S. P. candidate for judge) was incorrect. The Party should have approached the S. P. with general proposals for the establishment of a united front labour ticket in the New York elections, based on a minimum programme."

The C. E. C. of our Party has been charged with opportunism by the Opposition because of the wrong step it took in sending an open letter to the SP.

It is clear from the minutes of Polcom, 7th Nov., 25th Nov. and 7th December 1927 that though the Central Committees as a whole was responsible for this mistake, yet the Opposition did more than its share in having the Party commit this error. The Party has repeatedly pointed out the anti-proletarian and pro-capitalist policies of the S. P.

On April 9th, before we received the last letter from the Presidium of the Comintern, we find the following motion in the Polcom:

Motion by Lovestone:

"That the Party issue a statement not addressed to the S. P. but an official statement to the workers on the S. P. convention."

In the May Plenum Resolution, our Party elaborated in detail its sharpened policy against the S. P. Comrade Bittelman has said here that he and the Opposition as whole admit and correct their errors. What he should have said was that the entire Opposition repeats its errors.

Up to the May Plenum the differences in the Party were not brought up in any sharp way. The differences that existed were chiefly between Comrade Bittelman on the one hand on the trade union question, and the majority of the Central Committee, inclusive of Foster, on the other hand. A similar relationship occurred on the proposal of Comrade Bittelman on political strikes in our every day agitation.

On the very day before the last Plenum was opened, all comrades were agreed that no political resolution was required for the session. Comrade Cannon and Bittelman even made motions to this effect. These motions were unanimously agreed to. Obviously until very recently the present Opposition in our Party did not see any Right menace.

I want to say a few words on Comrade Losovsky. He says we rejected the Profintern resolution. He says we have made a united front with the Right wing of the German Party in opposition to the Profintern. Comrade Losovsky's imagination is working overtime.

What are the facts regarding the so-called rejection of the Profintern resolution? First of all, Comrade Foster presented the resolution on trade union work at the May C. E. C. Plenum which we voted for. Secondly, Comrade Johnstone presented an ultra-factional document as the report of the Profintern Congress Delegation which we rejected and which not even Comrade Losovsky would have us accept. Thirdly, we carried a motion endorsing the Profintern resolution. Fourthly, the charge made by Comrade Losovsky yesterday that the cable to the Trade Union Educational League Conference, the Left Wing Conference, caused discontent in the Central Committee, is unfounded. Although Comrade Foster put his opposition to the contents of this wire — yet we published it and long before we received this advice for the organisation of the unorganised we adopted the following motion:

Political Committee, November 2nd. 1927:

"The T. U. E. L. in order to establish working relations with the unorganised masses, shall build up a special connection with the workers' clubs, shop committees and other groups in the organised plants and cities. Into all groups and leading committees of the T. U. E. L. there shall be included representative elements from the unorganised plants and in the respective industries and localities."

As to the ridiculous charge of Losovsky that we have made unity with the Right Wing in the German Party, Comrade Losovsky — "people who live in glass houses should throw no stones". Is your criticism of the German Right Wing correct? We endorse it 100%. Why do you make these charges without quoting us as you quoted your case against the Germans?

Was there no criticism of the Profintern resolution by us? Of course there was! By whom. Especially by Comrade Foster about whom you are so silent — in the May Plenum Trade Union resolution. Foster criticised it also in an 18-page letter to Comrade Losovsky. In July Comrade Foster wrote an article against the criticism made by Comrade Losovsky against us.

Comrade Losovsky, without the slightest basis of fact, has been attacking our Party in a most shameful manner and charging it with not doing any work in organising the unorganised. Our Party has done considerable work in this field, despite the slanderous campaign of Comrade Losovsky.

I myself have some disagreements with certain features of the Profintern resolution. In this matter I also want to register a sharp disagreement with Comrade Pepper, who said he agrees with this resolution of the Profintern 99%. I stand by a tion in the labour movement in the Profintern resolution is no accident. Comrade Losovsky has yet to discover America.

The comrades might ask, why is it that Comrade Losovsky is so bitter and prejudiced against our Party? The answer is the following: For years we have conducted a vigorous fight against him to compel him to revise the programme of the T. U. E. L. (the American Left Wing) which provided for a long time the exclusion from its ranks of any worker who did not accept first of all the proletarian dictatorship.

When we consider the effort it took from us to defeat Comrade Losovsky on this point, there comes forcefully to our attention the fact that Comrade Losovsky has no right whatsoever to talk of another comrade as a "muddler of two continents". The weakness of the Profintern is the leadership of Comrade Losovsky, who has been making a muddle of nearly everything he has touched.

At the IX Plenum Comrade Losovsky introduced a resolution on the American trade union question in which there was

not a single word about the need for Communists working within the existing A. F. of L. unions. The American delegation to the IX Plenum introduced a counter-resolution in which it laid the greatest emphasis on the organisation of the unorganised, but at the same time said that it is necessary to continue and increase the work of the Communists in the A. F. of L. Comrade Losovsky fought against this amendment bitterly, but was overwhelmingly defeated — in fact, even Comrade Foster refused to vote for the position of Comrade Losovsky on the policy to be followed by our Party in the mining campaign.

Obviously, Comrade Losovsky acts in a factional, prejudiced manner against our C. E. C. I am of the opinion that Comrade Losovsky has for some time functioned as one of the primary forces instigating factionalism.

In recent months the Party has done much work in organising the unorganised. Several thousands of our Party members have been expelled from the trade unions. Our Party has developed a vigorous energetic strike leadership policy. What we need is advice and criticism, and not vilification from Comrade Losovsky.

Comrades, I want to say that despite the very sharp criticism made by... (Interruption the Chairman announcing the end of Comrade Lovestone's time. One minute granted to finish).

The Congress should not misjudge the situation. Our Party will not be thrown into a faction fight despite the vigorous efforts of our Opposition to camouflage, develop poisonous smoke screens and to stampede our membership into a suicidal faction war. Our Party has fought the Right danger. We have made a proposal here for a special amendment to the theses proposed by Comrade Bukharin on behalf of the Russian Delegation, to instruct the American C. E. C. to continue and intensify its fight against the Right danger.

The Party needs peace. We are in the midst of big campaigns — the mining campaign, the election campaign and the campaign to organise the unorganised in a number of industries. There is a possibility of peace because despite all the errors, all the hesitation, all the slowness of our Opposition, they are more and more coming closer to the correct line of the Comintern, to the policy followed by the C. E. C. Therefore we insist that the Opposition should dissolve its bloc (Foster-Cannon). We request that the C. I. should reject the unfounded charge of Right Wing levelled against the C. E. C. We insist that the C. I. should once and for all put an end to the factional Opposition to the C. E. C. The American Party realises the gravity of the situation. We are prepared to do everything in our power to maintain the unity of our Party and to carry on the tasks such as are confronting us in developing our work amongst the Negroes, fighting against imperialist war on Nicaragua, organisation of the unorganised. With the help of the Comintern and under the leadership of the Comintern, we will move forward to a united mass Communist Party in America.

Comrade BRAND (Poland):

The liquidation of the inner-Party crisis in Poland demands an answer to two questions: Firstly, are there actually big ideological divergencies of opinion and secondly, is the policy of the C. C. which the minority attacks, correct? The answer of Comrade Bukharin's draft theses is: the policy is correct, the Party has achieved considerable success, divergencies of opinion are insignificant. The majority of the Polish delegation agrees with this. It declares that it had to carry out this correct policy in the struggle against the opportunist errors of the minority. It thinks that these errors can be remedied provided there be harmonious co-operation. The majority expressed itself for harmonious co-operation at the IV Party Congress and voted for the minority candidates to the C. C. The minority has adopted a different standpoint. Comrade Lensky declared yesterday that the activity of the C. C. has been a series of mistakes which had their origin in a Right deviation. He declared that Comrade Brand's pamphlet published by the C. C. "translates the views of Fascist writers into Marxist language". And then he said, out of consideration for the atmosphere of the Congress, that he too considers the divergence of opinion insignificant. It is

really inadmissible to bandy irresponsible accusations in this manner. By such methods the minority poisons Party life.

I do not want to dwell on the disruptive activity of the minority and wish merely to point out that at the IV. Party Congress it did not vote for the majority candidates to the C. C. and that immediately after the Congress it resumed fractional attacks on the C. C. The minority has been guilty of a number of serious opportunist mistakes. In connection with election tactic, it proposed the application of united front tactic from above in regard to the social-Fascist P. P. S. All the minority members present here voted in the C. C. for this proposal.

In connection with the war question, the minority comrades brought forward theses in which a "decrease of the war danger" is mentioned. This, at a time when feverish war preparations are being made in Poland.

The same comrades defended not so long ago the thesis that the Communist Party must bring under its leadership the entire White Russian countryside, which means including the big peasantry.

The explanation of the representatives of the Warsaw Party Executive for Pilsudski's election success in Warsaw was: that Fascism and Social Democracy asserts: that stabilisation is in the interests of the workers and is not carried out at their expense.

Finally, the Executive of the Y. C. L. in Warsaw (an adherent of the minority) issued last May, during the metal workers' strike, the slogan: "control over production", a decidedly opportunist slogan in the then situation, which the Comintern had rejected. All these errors are of an opportunist character, but in spite of them we do not consider the minority incapable of remedying them. We want harmonious co-operation with it provided there be genuine Bolshevik discipline and genuine subordination of the minority to the decisions of the majority.

Just a few words about my pamphlet which, according to Comrade Lensky, is supposed to represent fascist ideas. Among other things he asserts that I deny the bellicose attitude of the Polish industrialists. The Polish industrialists are the prop and pillar of Polish Fascism. If they do not want war, I would like to know who does. Certainly not the workers and peasants. How is it possible for the Central Committee to give prominence, on the one hand, to struggle against war and defence of the Soviet Union and to publish on the other hand, a pamphlet denying the bellicose attitude of the Polish bourgeoisie. Lensky wanted to prove too much and therefore he has not proved anything. He wants to saddle me with something which is "utter nonsense". But there is a real contradiction behind this "utter nonsense". What are the causes which drive the Polish bourgeoisie to war against the Soviet Union? The minority is inclined to say that these causes are purely economic, namely, a question of markets for the coal and iron of the Upper Silesian industry. Thereby they dissociate war against the Soviet Union from the epoch of social revolution on an international scale. From a component part of the big historical struggle between Socialism and capitalism they transform it into a question of markets for the manufactured and other produce of the Upper Silesian industry. We say: the bourgeoisie and the industrialists in particular want war, but they do not only want it for the sake of Markets, they are driven to it by all the political, economic and especially social contradictions of the Polish situation, just as Great Britain is compelled to make war on Soviet Russia not for the export of its goods to Soviet Russia, but because of the contradictions and especially the big social contradictions between imperialism and the construction of Socialism. Otherwise it would be impossible to understand why Pilsudski marched on Kiev in 1920 when Upper Silesia did not belong to Poland and Polish industry was down in the dumps. The insoluble agrarian question, the question of nationalities, the accentuated mass struggles of the proletariat and workers in general, plus the geographical proximity of the Soviet Union are so serious to the Polish bourgeoisie that it cannot maintain its rule for any length of time as long as its neighbour, the Soviet Union, is proceeding with the work of Socialist construction. The question of the causes of war, is not an academic question. The causes of war determine the character of future wars. Is the next war to be an ordinary imperialist war or an extraordinary war, a class war of the bourgeoisie against the dictatorship of the proletariat? It will be first and foremost a class war against

proletarian dictatorship. This is the most important thing to be told by us to the Polish workers. We must on no account give prominence only to the market interests of the bourgeoisie, as demanded by Lensky; by doing so we would only disguise the true character of the war.

Comrades, we are in favour of self-criticism. We have exercised self-criticism and have admitted our mistakes, for instance, the mistakes made by us in the Ukrainian question prior to the IV. Party Congress. But Comrade Lensky's interpretation of self-criticism is a mockery of Bolshevik self-criticism, it is disintegration of the Party, a struggle against the Party. We want the Congress to help us to put an end to this Party strife, and to do so politically and not mechanically. This means: rallying the Party on the basis of a correct policy, defence of this correct policy against all Right and ultra-Left deviations, enforcement of iron Bolshevik discipline against fractional attacks. Then the C. P. of Poland will be able to achieve still greater successes, it will become an invincible bulwark against imperialism and will lead the proletariat to victory over Fascism.

Comrade ERCOLI (Italy):

Comrades, I declare on behalf of the Italian Delegation that we agree with the general line laid down in the theses and explained in Comrade Bukharin's report. But while agreeing with this line we wish to draw attention to several points which have a bearing either on general questions or on some details in the present situation.

We were pleased to see that in Bukharin's theses and report, as well as in most of the discussion speeches an effort was made to depart completely from the purely verbal method of describing the objective situation which consists in confirming the existence of stabilisation and adding to the term "stabilisation" various adjectives, thinking that everything can be solved by a proper graduation of adjectives. We must adopt the method of careful and thorough analysis of elements which are either favourable or unfavourable to us.

There are in the present situation elements not at all favourable to us. We are of the opinion that these elements, too, must be considered and thoroughly analysed. Comrades, this is not a question of optimism or pessimism. Acknowledgement of the necessity of a critical analysis of all the elements of the situation should not cause dissension among the diverse currents. Here the question is that we must carry out a very definite behest of Lenin, the last word uttered by him on this platform at the IV. World Congress. "Today the most important thing for us Russians and foreigners alike, is: that we must study and learn". These are words which must be fully applied by us in all the domains of our activity.

I declare that the errors committed by the C. I. as a whole and by Individual Parties have their root in our failure to analyse objective situations. That is why events take us somewhat by surprise, that we always arrive a little too late.

You remember the discussion we had at congresses and plenums of the C. I. with the extreme Left current which accused the Leninist tactic of being an "unprincipled situations tactic". It was Bordiga who made this accusation. We have done everything to eliminate this conception from our ranks. But through lack of thorough analysis of situations we might fall into a kind of "unprincipled situationism". How could we, for instance, call otherwise a tendency which could consist in determining our tactic solely on the basis of formal, verbal, external preoccupations, such as the preoccupation of the more or less "to the Left" or "to the Right?" "Left" and "Right" is a terminology which has acquired citizen's rights because it serves to indicate in the labour movement two fundamental deviations from the path which leads to its revolutionary aims. But these terms "Right" and "Left" have no proper meaning unless we apply them to a definite situation, to newly arising tasks and to necessities which are a result of the existing situation.

Comrades, I think that the main result of all the work done in regard to analysing the objective international situation since the Third World Congress consists in the fact that we have arrived consciously at the truth that the decadence of the capitalist regime cannot be represented by a steadily declining curve, on the contrary, we must visualise this decadence as a process

resulting from the intensification and accentuation of internal contradictions, the consequence being that the general line takes a zig-zag form. It is this truth which enables us to appreciate at its right value the fact of a certain capitalist elan, which, however, does not change the general character of the present period which we must still consider the period of the decline of the capitalist regime.

If we begin to look into the fundamental causes of the contradictions, the development of which constitutes the crisis of the capitalist regime, we must admit that the main causes are the development of productive forces and the fact that this development takes place in an uneven manner. The merit of the theses which we are discussing consists in having emphasised and correctly appreciated this fact. The problem of markets on which we concentrated our attention at the VIII. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive, is also very important, but its importance is not evident unless we consider the problem of the development of the forces of production, and with the fact that the process of this development is uneven.

Let us take Italy as an example. In the last two years this country has gone and is still going through a serious economic crisis. The main cause of this economic crisis is that at a certain moment a development of productive forces took place in Italy which destroyed the traditional framework of Italian economy. Naturally this process was determined by the historical development of the capitalist regime in Italy and its internal structure. The internal weakness of Italian capitalism, lack of equilibrium which has always existed between the different branches of production and which was always overcome by bringing pressure to bear upon the masses and finally the repercussions in Italy of the booms and slumps in other countries — all this combined has helped to accentuate the crisis by intensifying and accentuating its manifestations.

But if we consider the present situation, we must admit that the development of the economic crisis seems to have come to a standstill. There has been an attenuation of the most serious symptoms of the crisis. This has been attained by certain measures adopted by the Italian bourgeoisie. The most important of these measures are: 1. Help by foreign capitalists, 2. strong economic and political pressure on the workers; 3. the fact that Fascism has created, even in the bourgeoisie, a greater consciousness of its general interests which enables the state to intervene in the economic life with measures which cannot radically solve the problems and overcome the crisis, but can only postpone it. It is in the general interest of the bourgeoisie to postpone the solution of problems in order to retard the development of events and to concentrate its forces on setting a limit to the development of the labour movement and the proletarian revolution which is an inevitable consequence of the intensification of the internal contradictions of the Italian capitalist regime.

Consequently, one could say that at present the position of Italian capitalism is outwardly a defensive position; but in reality this defensive position is a cloak for preparation for ruthless struggle which is already developing, a struggle for the conquest of new positions on the internal as well as on the international market.

What applies to Italy, could also be applied, with certain reservations, to a number of other countries. We witness the collapse of internal equilibrium in every country, a collapse which is expressed mainly by greater pressure on the mass of the working population, an accentuation of the agrarian crisis and an accentuated class differentiation in town and country. This is a general fact. That is why our delegation demands that the agrarian question be brought forward on a general basis and be thoroughly examined here not as a question concerning the activity of one branch of our apparatus, but as a question of thorough study of the consequences and forms of internal contradictions in the capitalist regime and of the tasks which confront the proletariat and our Parties. Personally I must say that I am not satisfied with the speech made here yesterday on this question by Comrade Dombal. This speech, which was a mass of general phrases, cannot help to solve the problem — we have come to the conclusion that much remains to be done by us in this domain.

On the other hand, the pressure exercised by the development of the forces of production causes the transformation of

the pacifist methods of struggle between the various imperialisms into non-pacifist methods. Lenin included in the pacifist methods the erection of tariff walls. At present we witness the application on a large scale of another so-called pacifist method: establishment of big international cartels. But the main thing is that we are living in an epoch when pacifist methods are substituted by non-pacifist. The wars which took place in the colonies, the war carried on for the strangulation of the Chinese revolution bear witness of this. Comrades, that is why when we study the international situation we feel that it is fraught with unforeseen elements, that the fundamental prospect is that of war, and that it imposes important tasks on us.

Comrades, I think that at this Congress we must insist on the necessity of considering the perspective of war as the fundamental perspective. Some of our Parties have not yet grasped the meaning of this perspective. War is talked about and agitation is carried on against war, but the impression exists that this agitation is necessary more in loyalty to written down theses than owing to the conviction that war is inevitable.

But what is today the exact value of the war perspective? In the past we were wont to say that there are various forms of contradictions which cause dissensions throughout the world. On the one hand, antagonism between individual imperialist powers, and on the other hand the fundamental antagonism between the imperialist powers and the Soviet Union, between the capitalist and the socialist world. And we have always thought — or at least it is always at the back of our mind — that the development of the former (that is to say antagonism between the imperialist powers) constituted to a certain extent, if not an obstacle, at least a factor which retarded the development of the antagonism between the imperialist states and the S. U. I think that this conception does not hold good any longer. It does no longer correspond with reality.

To demonstrate this point, I will refer to comrade Kostrsheva's remark that too much stress is laid in the theses on the importance of Germany in Europe and in the world, and that one should not forget Great Britain. Certainly, comrades, when we consider the present European situation, we must admit that the predominating fact is the political hegemony of Great Britain. Therefore we must take into consideration the fundamental antagonism between European and American capitalism. If we visualise an eventual collision between these two groups and if we ask ourselves which of these countries could be at the head of the forces of European capitalism in such a collision, we must say that it will be Great Britain. But such a conception, the only basis of which is the present "political" situation, is false. We must see things as they develop.

The political hegemony of Great Britain does no longer correspond with its economic hegemony, whereas the political position of Germany does not correspond with its development and economic importance. One must admit that all the antagonisms which exist between the various capitalist states in Europe and throughout the world are to a great extent dominated by the fact that a struggle for European hegemony is going on between Germany and Great Britain. This struggle cannot be settled except by struggle against the Soviet Union. If we examine the position and organisation of Great Britain and Germany we must come to the conclusion that to solve the problem of securing hegemony in Europe, both these big capitalist countries must follow the path of war against the Soviet Union.

Comrades, are war perspectives to relegate to a back seat the perspectives of the development of the class struggle in the big capitalist countries of Western Europe? It would be a serious mistake to imagine this. The two matters are closely connected, above all because the development of the forces of production is one of the objective conditions of the growth of war danger and because this development takes place on the basis of a capitalist accumulation, the fundamental element of which is accentuation of economic and political pressure on the working class. Secondly, from the subjective viewpoint, the economic and political pressure brought to bear on the working class is an integral part of imperialist war preparations.

In reality, the first skirmishes in the war against the Soviet Union are already taking place throughout the world. They take the form of accentuated and intensified class struggle in all domains. The first combatants, the first victims of the war

against the Soviet Union are the comrades who are prosecuted, imprisoned and killed in the countries of white terror. We cannot emphasise enough the close connection which exists between the development of the overt struggle of the capitalist States against the U. S. S. R. and the struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat in all countries.

To us the necessity of developing better this part of the Theses is connected with the necessity of bringing up once more very clearly the question of Fascism. Evidently considerable progress was made in this domain in the C. I. In 1921, 1922 and even in 1923 fascism was always spoken of as a special form of the development of capitalism against the working class, in a definite period and under definite circumstances. At present the problem is: that the reactionary transformation of the political institutions of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state is on par with the intensification of the objective contradictions of the capitalist world.

Fascism is the most consistent and complete form of reaction. **But fascism does not represent reaction as a whole.** There are forms of reaction which differ from Fascism without being less important. For instance, when it became evident in 1924 that the ruling classes in France were compelled by the then situation to effect a reactionary transformation of all the political institutions of France, certain comrades in the French Party issued the slogan: "Fascism has come". This was an erroneous slogan. Today we see this quite clearly. Reaction has come in France but it exists in a form which has nothing in common with Fascism. Instead of witnessing in France the development of a fascist movement, we have witnessed there a dislocation of the political groups of the bourgeoisie and the Left petty bourgeoisie and their absorption in a reactionary bloc. Instead of assuming the mask of fascism, reaction assumed the mask of **Left parliamentary groups.**

We think that some of the errors of the C. P. F. in this domain originated in the fact that it did not properly understand the forms which the reactionary political transformation was to take in France. Generally speaking, fascism is a form of reaction which can only develop under special conditions, mainly when the big industrial bourgeoisie is weak, when it is obliged to have recourse to special forms of coercion and political oppression in regard to the masses in order to maintain and consolidate its regime. Moreover, reaction cannot take the form of fascism unless there is a possibility of developing a reactionary "Mass" movement, by taking advantage of the re-shuffling of certain strata of the middle and petty rural and urban bourgeoisie.

Of course, the fact that we consider fascism the typical form of capitalist reaction under the historic conditions of certain countries, has its very important political and strategical consequences. The chief of these consequences consists in the fact that the establishment of fascism and the complete reactionary transformation of bourgeois society do not open the prospect of a **second democratic-bourgeois revolution**; the proletarian revolution is mature, we are going through the period of preparation of a proletarian and not of a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

We think that it is quite correct to point out the ideological connection between fascism and social democracy. In some cases there is even organic connection; generally speaking, social democracy uses in certain cases and under certain circumstances frankly fascist methods. But also in this domain one must beware of excessive generalisations because there are serious differences. Fascism, as a mass movement, is a movement of the petty and middle bourgeoisie dominated by the big bourgeoisie and the agrarians; moreover, it has no basis in a traditional organisation of the working class. On the other hand, social democracy is a movement with a labour and petty bourgeois basis: it derives its force mainly from an organisation which is recognised by enormous sections of the workers as the traditional organisation of their class.

If we proceed now to the examination of the subjective elements of the situation we must come to the general conclusion that there is still disproportion between the objective and subjective factors of the revolutionary situation.

We can see that this disproportion is on the decrease because a manifest radicalisation of the mass of workers is taking place in all the big capitalist countries.

To us the most important thing is to ascertain exactly the specific character of the process of radicalisation among the masses, of the reshuffling which the workers are accomplishing just now, — we must ascertain what positions they are abandoning and in what direction the reshuffling takes place.

There are sections of workers whose radicalisation takes the form of leaving bourgeois parties, of getting away from bourgeois influence. Others again dissociate themselves from Social Democracy. But there are also sections of workers which, having got away from bourgeois influence, come under the influence of the social democrats. It is a complicated process which we must watch carefully. What we notice among the masses is — that they are more active, more inclined to resist the political and economic offensive of the bourgeoisie. This resistance takes the form of **partial struggles** against capitalist oppression and exploitation, of growing sympathy for Communism and the Soviet Union. I declare that in all these domains there is not a single position which can be definitely occupied and maintained by the masses without active and continuous intervention by our Party.

It is above all the **reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie** which isolates us from the masses.

Secondly, important structural changes are also taking place within the working class. On the one hand, these changes result in bringing certain strata of workers nearer to us because they do away with a certain labour aristocracy, increase differentiation among a certain intermediate section of the working masses etc. But on the other hand, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that these structural changes imply also the birth of a new aristocracy which forms the basis of social democracy.

Comrades, just because we notice that these objective bases of social democratic influence within the working class constitute an obstacle to the complete radicalisation of the masses, **we make it incumbent on the Communist Parties to struggle against Social Democracy more energetically than ever before.** For the same reason we enjoin our Parties to struggle also more energetically than ever before against **Right dangers** in our own ranks.

The causes of these Right errors originate, on the one hand, in a certain nervousness of some of our Parties and among some comrades when they see themselves face to face with the bloc of hostile forces arranged against us: the reactionary State, the reformist trade unions, their support of this State and even their integration in the reactionary apparatus of the State, their anti-Communist policy etc. I think that this is the origin of the Right deviations which manifested themselves in illegal Parties, for instance those in the Balkans.

On the other hand, the source of the Right errors is the view that social democracy has still a revolutionary role to play. This is the source of Right errors committed by the **French Party.**

Finally, the most dangerous tendency is that which would like to prescribe for our Parties a policy approximating to that of the social democrats. This is the characteristic feature of the Right danger in the **German Party**, a danger against which, in our opinion, the German Communist Party must struggle with the utmost energy.

But even if we all agree on the necessity of more energetic struggle against social democracy, we must decide by what methods and in what form the struggle is to be carried on. Let us take for instance, the domain of ideological struggle: The errors committed by us in this domain are self-evident. Social democratic ideology has still a strong hold on hundred of thousands of workers. We must wage a battle royal against social democracy in the ideological domain, and not only in theses and resolutions but before the masses. Are we doing this to the extent that we should? Certainly not. But if we consider general theoretical questions we must acknowledge that we are still in the positions occupied by Lenin and Bolshevism in the war and post-war period. We have not made the necessary progress in the struggle against social democracy and its new platform.

The decisions of the VII. Plenum which made it incumbent on our Parties to place themselves at the head of the partial struggles of the workers against the consequences of rationalisation, have not been applied as consistently and completely as the situation required. That is one of the reasons why the social democrats still hold many positions which we could have captured.

I would like now to draw the balance of our activity in the period between the V. and VI. World Congress. We notice that there are many positive elements in this balance: Our growing influence, a certain ideological and organisational consolidation of our Parties; but there are also many negative elements which must be exposed. Among these negative elements we must mention particularly our partial defeat in China, serious Right errors in almost all the Parties, lack of solidarity in regard to the British miners during the lock-out, and also a whole series of organisational and ideological weaknesses.

We welcome the fact that in Comrade Bukharin's report these defects have been dealt with, perhaps for the first time in the life of the C. I., in a very thorough manner and that the necessity of overcoming them has been made very clear to the C. I. But the fact that the Executive of the C. I. is launching for the first time the slogan "self-criticism", shows that the C. I. itself is not in a very comfortable position. Defects in the activity of the Executive of the C. I. manifested themselves in all domains, political as well as organisational. Just one example: everyone is agreed now to struggle ruthlessly against Right deviations and errors. But how much resistance we had to overcome when we tried to put right the policy of the French Communist Party which was a mass of deviations and Right errors! The episode of the Senatorial Elections in the Seine Department and of the Menshevik theory of "circumstantial agreements" were not enough. It needed the scandal of submission to bourgeois law and order, for the C. I. to perceive that serious steps were necessary to rectify the policy of the C. P. F.

In regard to our Party, the Italian Delegation makes the formal request that the part of the Theses which deals with our successes and non successes be drawn up more critically, that our errors and their detrimental consequences should be frankly pointed out. We are making this request because we think that a careful examination of our experiences in regard to illegality can be useful to all our Parties. We are marching towards war, which means towards illegality. But what does, preparing for illegality, mean? Is it only a question of forming a new department in our apparatus for underground activity? No, because this is the least important part of our task in this domain. The chief part consists in dealing with the problem of illegality on a political and organisational basis, that is to say, instructing our Parties how to adapt themselves to all conditions, impressing them with the necessity of grasping the situation as soon as it arises and not when it has already passed, and of adapting their methods of work to the new situation. This problem also implies ability on the part of our Parties to retreat when the situation demands it, in order to be able to give subsequently an impetus to their revolutionary work.

A series of other defects has also been pointed out: bureaucratisation, failure in regard to recruiting, lack of a revolutionary fighting force etc. All these defects have been indicated but no one has indicated in what manner we are to remedy them.

To remedy all these weak points, we must work mainly in three directions: 1. more political activity within our Parties; 2. more internal democracy in our Parties and the International; 3. a clear exposé of the problem of establishing effective executives in the Parties and the C. I.

There is much talk of the low ideological standard of our movement. But comrades, how can we talk about raising this standard if we do not encourage our Parties to discuss more freely all the problems of the Communist movement, if we do not conduct these discussions in contact with the working class.

How can we struggle against "bureaucratisation", how can we recruit new elements and put more life into our nuclei? Such are the problems which have been occupying the attention of our Org. Department for several years. On the strength of its experience, it has drawn up certain general rules, but we must admit that the results of its work have not been satisfactory.

I declare that all these problems which are nothing but different aspects of the problem of the internal life of the Parties, must be solved on the basis of broader internal democracy.

I think that we must pay more attention to this problem of central committees. If we compare the position of the central committees of our Parties at the time of the IV. Congress with their present position, we see that hardly any of them have shown much power of resistance during this period, with one exception perhaps, the central committee of the Italian Party. It appears before the VI. Congress in the same form as at the V. Congress, and during this period it carried on a struggle against Right and ultra-Left deviations and put and to them. At the same time it has succeeded in maintaining its homogeneity, in keeping and rallying around itself all the forces which the Party needs in its struggle.

In the last two years we had also to take organisational measures occasionally. Whenever this was necessary we did so. But all these organisational measures and the entire internal struggle in the centre and at the base of the Party took place always in the form of an open struggle around some particular policy. If there is anything in the experience and internal life of our Party in the period between the V. and VI. Congress which should be brought forward for the benefit of the other Parties, it is the fact that the process of the formation of the central committee of the Party must be based on a definite policy and must develop on the basis of open political struggle.

Concretely, our Delegation can express its view of the problem of the central committees of the French and German Parties as follows: In regard to France, we think that the time has come to raise openly and solve the problem of the creation of a united and homogeneous central committee capable of leading the Party without hesitation on the lines laid down by the C. I. In regard to Germany, we agree with the statement that at present the greatest danger to the German Party is the Right danger and that the Central Committee of the German Party must concentrate its whole strength on the struggle against Right deviations and relics of social democratic ideology in its ranks. As to the diverse currents which exist in the Political Bureau of the Party, we think that the differences which exist there are differences which can exist normally in the Central Committee of a Party without necessarily causing fractional and group struggles. If on the strength of these divergences in the German Party it came to a group struggle or else to the adoption of organisational measures on the part of the majority of the Political Bureau against the minority, this would be a very dangerous state of affairs because it would be tantamount to a shrinking of the basis of the Central Committee; moreover it might also narrow down the political life of the Party and its internal democracy. The task confronting the German comrades consists in working on uniform political lines, in explaining these political lines to the whole Party and in achieving on the basis of these lines unity among all the leading forces which the Party stand in need of.

Comrades, what shall be the keynote of the VI. Congress of the Communist International? We are agreed that the keynote of the VI. World Congress should be **struggle against the war danger and ruthless struggle against social democracy and the Right danger in Europe.** But on the strength of the experience communicated to this Congress by various speakers, we will also have to make criticism, including **self criticism**, the keynote of the Congress. We want more study, a greater capacity to analyse situations, to recognise errors and to put them right. These are faculties which cannot be considered of secondary importance at the present juncture. Acquisition of these faculties is the problem confronting the Communist International, its Executive and all its Sections. It is a problem which we must absolutely solve if we want to be successful in the struggle for the emancipation of the workers and the revolutionary cause.

COMRADE BENNETT (Great Britain):

I believe the assumption of the American comrades was that the problems which interest them, are the most important problems with which the Comintern is faced. I personally see only one justification for such an assumption, and that is, that we all agree that the rivalry between Great Britain and the U.S.A. is the most important factor in the relations between the different imperialist powers. But just because we consider this to be the pivot of international relations, I believe that this Congress is in duty bound to try and make an analysis of the relations of forces within these two countries. I will begin with Great Britain.

The general suggestions of the British Delegation concerning Comrade Bukharin's theses were formulated by Comrade Murphy.

We want to make it very clear, that not only the British delegates assembled here, but all the leading comrades of the British Party do not agree with Comrade Varga with regard to the achievements and prospects of capitalist rationalisation in Great Britain. It is our opinion that the facts repudiate all the theories about the new era in Great Britain, about the second industrial revolution. But still, there is one field, in which Americanisation shows some relative success, that is in the labour movement itself. It is significant that, while Mond is not able to find followers among the capitalists for his schemes to rationalise British industry, he finds followers among the leaders of the British Labour and Trade Union movement for the Americanisation of the Labour movement in Great Britain.

First let us take the international sphere. Everyone knows that the so-called Empire Labour Conferences are to some degree the reflection of the same policy as that of the Pan-American Labour Conferences. These conferences do not confine themselves to mere demonstrations in the honour of the British Empire. Take, for example, the work of the labour imperialists in India, which deserves our deepest attention. In a recent polemic between Saklatvala and Joshi, the following assertion was made:

"Certain British Labour experts have made a definite report that if the Right Wing officials of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain are allowed to take in hand the Indian situation, they will soon put an end to dangerous revolutionary activities in India, and make the country safe for British imperialism."

That such report was really made can be shown by the activities of Purcell and Hallsworth in India. The agreement reached between the leaders of the British Trades Union Congress and the leaders of the Indian Trades Union Congress is of very great importance indeed. I will remind you only of two decisions of that secret agreement of February 26th of this year. First:

"Resolved that hereafter the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress should directly represent the A.I.T.U.C. in Great Britain as its agents. The same Council resolved to express its gratitude to the Welfare Workers League of India for the work it has done on behalf of the All Indian Trades Union Congress."

The meaning of this resolution is very simple. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress is the agency of imperialism, while the Indian Workers' Welfare League is an organisation fighting against imperialism.

The second decision is that the British General Council should send its organisers to help the "poor" Indian trade union workers. In the report presented to the labour movement by Purcell and Hallsworth, on page 43, we read:

"Our view is that we must take the mighty step of linking up the British and Indian Trade Union movements for the purpose of positive and sustained organising work."

In the meantime, the Independent Labour Party, is sending its "adviser" to the "poor" South African workers to help them in the work of their union, which is headed by Kadalie, who, with the support of Amsterdam, is openly fighting the Communists and Left wingers.

I want to say just a word here about South Africa. Comrade Bunting said that during the last six years they have received nothing but circulars from the Comintern. This is not true. There was a very good resolution sent last year, which was prepared with the help of Comrade Laguma, a resolution which contained a new political and tactical line concerning the work among the natives. It is true, that Comrade Bunting is against this resolution. It is also true, that the majority of the Central Committee is with him. But this does not mean that the resolution is a bad one. Notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the Central Committee was opposed to this new resolution, and that it has been only partially applied, it is a fact that it has already given good results.

Now let us come, comrades, to the situation inside Great Britain itself. Only children will believe that the institution created by the so-called Mond Conference is only a voluntary conciliation board. The real meaning of the decisions taken by the Mond Conference is to supplement the Trade Union Act, which is directed against certain kinds of strikes — political strikes, sympathetic strikes, strikes of solidarity — with a special arrangement which is aimed at killing the strike as a weapon of the working class.

Of course, one may say that their activities in India on the one hand, and the Mond conferences, on the other, show that the Americanisation policy of the labour leaders in Great Britain has achieved some success. Those same leaders who organised the defeat of the General Strike and miners' fight, were sufficiently well equipped to exploit the depression which followed the defeat they organised.

It must be admitted that the Communist Party was not sufficiently well prepared to make the necessary changes, to adapt itself to the new situation, and to fight the reformists with sufficient sagacity during the period which followed the miners' defeat. That is why, comrades, we consider the new tactic, adopted by the IX. Plenum, as marking a new epoch, and as a necessary weapon in our fight against the reformists. But, honestly speaking, we must say that it is still premature to talk about the application of this new tactic. I will give a few reasons why this is so:

1. In order to apply this new tactic it was necessary to have a new orientation of the whole Party. This was not an easy thing, which could have been done in an hour or in a day.
2. The resolution itself has created some confusion in connection with questions of more or less secondary importance; namely, whether or not to drop the slogan of affiliation to the Labour Party, and on the question of the political levy.
3. The resolution made no provision for the numerous by-elections, which will become more frequent the nearer we get to the general election. This is an important question, because, if during the 30, 35 or 40 by-elections we act in an inconsistent manner, it will be impossible to act correctly when the general election comes.

Notwithstanding all these facts, I say that in Great Britain we can now see the end of the depression, and the beginning of the awakening of the workers, when we will be in a much stronger position to apply correctly and successfully our new tactical line.

Unfortunately, I must say here that in the first stages our policy regarding the Cook-Maxton affair was not very successful. The greatest error the Party committed was that, instead of helping the movement by criticising Maxton, Hicks and the others, we thought we were helping the movement by directing Cook and Maxton. This was a serious mistake. But notwithstanding this, it is a fact that the Party as such, from the top to the bottom, have accepted and are trying to apply the new tactical line.

Now, comrades, as to India. I want to emphasise in the first place that, immediately after the secret agreement was signed by Purcell and Hallsworth, we witnessed in India a great movement, directed not only against British imperialism, and the Indian bourgeoisie, but also against the reformists. Though the Americanisation of the British Labour movement has given some apparent results for the reformists, it would be a big mistake to over-estimate the progress they have made. At the same time, it would be also a mistake to underestimate the

great possibilities we have both within the movement in Great Britain, and in the colonies. Mondism has made wider the gulf between the masses and the bureaucracy; while labour imperialism has drawn together the British Communists and the workers of India.

Now I will come to the U. S. A. When Comrade Foster and others come to us and say, it is absolutely essential to sharpen our fight against the Right wing tendencies, we are all prepared to say we fully agree. When Comrade Foster says that there is a certain radicalisation of the masses, which opens up new possibilities for the organisation of the unorganised workers, again we say: we fully agree. When Foster comes and says that the economic position of the U. S. A. is critical, well, here we say that Comrade Foster is not fully correct; because the present depression is in no way the fore-runner of America's economic decline. But even in this respect, there is something correct in what he says — that in the present stage there are great possibilities for a real class struggle.

If you take the whole picture presented by the United States, you will see that there is very fertile soil there for Communist work in every direction. But notwithstanding the fact that we agree with many suggestions made by Comrade Foster, when he transforms his proposals into a platform, the platform of his fraction, then we say, here we part. There is a decision of the Comintern, that the continuation of the factional fight in the American Party means the degeneration of the inner Party fight into a fight of cliques. The very moment the fight is transformed into a factional fight, it is no longer a fight against Right wing tendencies, but becomes a fight against the Party and its achievements. (Applause.)

On the other hand, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am afraid that when the comrades of the majority make so many reserves concerning the radicalisation of the masses, concerning the economic situation of the U. S. A.; that when they describe the situation in such a way as to hypnotise the workers into accepting conditions as they are, so that it is difficult even to imagine a powerful movement in the U. S. A. — then they are rendering a bad service to the movement. The conditions in the U. S. A. are undergoing a radical change. The changes that have taken place are of such importance that it is impossible not to face them and to draw the necessary political and tactical conclusions. But political and tactical conclusions should be made in such a way as to consolidate the Party on a platform directed as sharply as possible not only against right wing deviations, but also against any attempt to revive factionalism. The main task under the present circumstances is consolidation. Many mistakes to which reference has been made were mistakes not only of one group, but of the whole Party. Take the Panken case, the famous open letter to the Socialist Party, the work among the Negroes. This work was neglected by both the minority and the majority of the Party. We must make a radical change in our work among the Negroes. A new resolution has been drawn up lately on this question, but even this resolution misses the main point. You cannot begin any work among the Negroes in the American Party unless you fight and defeat white chauvinism in the American Party itself. (Applause.)

Are there differences between the two groups in the American Party? I think so. Many of these differences have deep roots, but these differences do not warrant the existence of fractions. I am convinced that the American Party must change its line. But one thing is clear to us, and that is this. The Party will make no headway unless it accepts the idea of liquidating the two factions and working together as a consolidated organisation.

Comrade MIKOLOS (Ukrainian S. S. R.):

In our Parties we have broken with the legacy of Social Democracy and the breach is growing deeper and more intense. In this respect the agrarian and the national question assume particular importance. In this domain Social Democratic relics are still strong in our Parties, and the theses do the right thing when in paragraph 42 they emphasise the most important defects of the work of our Parties, inadequate work among the peasantry and the oppressed national minorities. The theses

also point out in this connection that the Czechoslovak Party is not paying enough attention to the question of nationalities. Moreover, the crisis through which the Czechoslovak C. P. is going owing to the failure of the "Red Day" requires all our attention and a careful study of many matters in the Czechoslovak C. P., including its work among national minorities. In regard to the Memorandum of the Ukrainian C. P. (b) the Comintern had already an opportunity to examine the character of the work of the Czechoslovak C. P. in Trans Carpathian Ukraine and to issue directions for further work.

I am also of the opinion that what we have heard from the American Negro comrades at this Congress, shows, that the American C. P. does not pay sufficient attention to the Negro question. The Communist International probably knows from documents which have been published about the incident in the Communist Party of West Ukraine. At first the majority of the C. C. supported the nationalist deviation which made its appearance in the Communist Party of Soviet Ukraine subsequently it adopted a downright nationalist policy and finally left the ranks of the Comintern, it is now supporting Pilsudski's fascist regime.

One cannot help saying that under Pilsudski's Fascist regime Poland is becoming more and more an instrument of world imperialism to be used against the Soviet Union. In Poland are concentrated the main forces to whom so much attention is paid by the British, French and other imperialists who intend to strike from here a blow against the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The rallying ground, the gate through which the future imperialist attack on the Soviet Union will be made is the territory of West Ukraine, and Soviet Ukraine will be the first victim of this attack. Soviet Ukraine has been already several times the rallying ground of world imperialism for an attack on the heart of the Red Republic — Moscow. To secure this military road is of the utmost importance to the Fascist Pilsudski Government. There are at present over 300,000 West Ukrainians in the Polish Army divisions. The Fascist government cannot throw them against the Soviet Union and Soviet Ukraine unless it succeeds in deceiving and befooling the West Ukrainian masses. The dirty work of slander and insinuation against Soviet Ukraine is done at present by the democratic parties of West Ukraine, first and foremost by the U. N. D. A. (Ukrainian National Democratic Association). The entire national bourgeoisie and the kulak sections of the peasantry have come to an agreement with the Fascist Government concerning preparations for an attack on Soviet Ukraine. However, it will be impossible to deceive the masses, the working class, the poor and middle peasantry unless the treacherous work of deceiving them and estranging them from Soviet Ukraine were undertaken by the treacherous elements and groups who worked formerly under Communist colours. Objectively this was also the role of the former leading majority of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of West Ukraine. This is not merely treachery on the part of individual groups, we have to do here with something which might play a decisive role in the march of world imperialism against the Soviet Union through Poland, through West Ukraine. We can see that the healthy Communist movement, the working class of West Ukraine have already overcome the consequences of this treachery. I can tell you that the recent Congress of the C. P. of West Ukraine was able to declare that the organisation which adheres to the Comintern has been fully re-established. It was also able to say that only two to three small groups are loyal to the treacherous banner of the Vassilkov group which has come to a regular agreement with Fascism.

The question which confronted us, the C. P. (b) of West Ukraine and the C. P. of Poland, and which we have also placed before the Comintern is the question of the origin and causes of this treachery. Comrade Lenski makes the erroneous attitude of the majority of the Polish Central Committee responsible for the situation in West Ukraine.

But comrades of the Polish minority, has not the Comintern already investigated your attitude to the West Ukrainian question? The Comintern has already dealt with this question. Last year, during the sessions of the E. C. C. I., two conceptions and explanations of the reasons and sources of the treachery of the former leaders of the C. P. of Ukraine were brought forward: one by the minority of the Polish Party

and the other by the delegation of the Ukrainian C. P. (b) and the majority of the C. C. of the C. P. of Poland. We have said that we must look for the reasons of the treachery in the change which has taken place in regard to class relations in Poland after Pilsudski's coup d'état in May, 1926; the consolidation of the entire Polish bourgeoisie including all nationalities: Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish, which caused a reshuffling of classes in West Ukraine, has also affected some vacillating elements in the C. P. The reasons of the treachery was the change in the external, objective, social conditions and class relations in Poland, and, under the new conditions this has also led to the secession of certain elements in the C. P. of West Ukraine. This explanation was accepted by the Comintern in August 1926, was subsequently confirmed once more in December 1927 and was subsequently confirmed once more in January 1928, already after the treachery of Vassilkov and his group.

But what was the explanation given by the representatives of the minority of the Polish Party? They said that the treachery of the Vassilkov group was not the result of the change which had taken place in objective social and political conditions, but that this change merely expressed the treacherous nationalist character inherent at all times in the former Executive of the C. C. of the West Ukrainian Party. Your explanation, Comrades of the Polish minority, was not accepted by the Comintern. How can you come onto this platform now and make charges against the majority of the Polish C. C. on account of an explanation accepted by the Comintern. Can you not see that by doing this you are actually disputing a thrice-confirmed decision of the Comintern. Instead of an objective explanation by bringing forward serious social and political reasons the Polish minority brings forward subjective explanations and insinuates that the entire former activity of the Communist Party of West Ukraine was tainted with nationalism.

On the whole the "organic theory" plays a very big role in the minority of the Polish C. C. Take for instance our internal conditions in the Polish Party. What is the explanation of the present struggle? The former Right deviations of the majority? There were of course such deviations. But did not also the minority have Left and even ultra-Left deviations? Comrade Lensky spoke of Comrade Varsky's Trotskyist errors in 1923 from which he had already dissociated himself at that time. Why are you so one-sided? Why do you not for instance, mention the mistakes of your then companion Domsky who, in 1920, when the Soviet Army, after frustrating Pilsudski's advance on Kiev, reached the walls of Warsaw in its desire to liberate Poland, protested against this and declared it to be "Red imperialism" on the part of Moscow? At that time Comrade Lensky did not dissociate himself from Domsky. Why indeed do you not speak here of your old sins? It is only gradually that people acquire Leninist views and by their mistakes learn to lead. No need to dish up again Varsky's and Lensky's old errors. There is nothing to choose between them. During the Pilsudski coup d'état in May the mistakes were surely not all on one side. In May 1926, during the coup d'état, errors were committed by the majority as well as the minority of the Polish C. C. When the Comintern had to deal last year with these divergencies it was after all compelled to insist on a unanimous adoption of the resolution by the Polish Party Congress. This settled the political divergencies within the Polish C. C. Lensky declared that he fully agrees with the resolution proposed by the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. which says that there are no fundamental political divergencies between the majority and the minority. All divergencies were settled except one: Comrade Lensky's theory of the organic incapacity of comrades Varsky's and Kostrecheva's group to take up a Leninist standpoint. On this theory, this divergence on a matter of principle, he built up his fraction and carried on the struggle for a whole year.

How is it possible to take up again and again the struggle against negative divergencies of opinion?

With this only exception there is positively nothing, everything else are trifles, unimportant questions. If Comrade Lensky imagines that on the basis of this theory of the organic incapacity of the C. P. of West Ukraine, of Varsky, etc., he can occupy Leninist positions, can establish his fraction in the Party, I would like to ask him if he is organically capable of ever renouncing his organic theories?

Comrades, not everything is of course normal in the Polish Party; for instance the dissolution of the Warsaw Committee, of the Bureau of the Y. C. L., etc. But when I see the leader of the Polish minority ascending the platform and declaring that infringement of Party discipline is inadmissible, in the C. C., I declare — and I have followed his arguments very attentively — that Comrade Lensky has made a big discovery which upsets the entire Leninist science of organisation. He made the discovery and admitted that it is an inadmissible breach of Party discipline for the C. C. not to subordinate itself to its departments! But what kind of struggle is it when representatives of the Minority who are also represented in the departments of the C. C. do not submit to the latter? In such a case, the weapon of discipline must be directed against the departments. Comrade Lensky criticised the decision of the Presidium concerning the Warsaw committee, and wanted to make use of this in his interest and against the majority, etc.; but one must admit — he conveniently forgets this — that under present conditions the Comintern cannot have anything to do with parity. Although divergencies on matters of principle no longer exist after the Party Congress, Lensky's theory of organic incapacity remains in force and must be done away with. I am convinced that after the discussion of the Polish question the Comintern will settle the matter definitely at this Congress, will eliminate these inadmissible methods and strife and will help the Polish Party to consolidate itself, to create a strongly welded united C. C., which will do its duty in this very important sector of the anti-imperialist front and will lead the Polish proletariat in the struggle against the imperialist attack on the Soviet power and for the establishment of Socialism. (Applause.)

Comrade REIMANN (Czechoslovakia):

The failure of the "Red Day" has led to a discussion in the ranks of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The main subject of the discussion is: if it is possible for a Party which has suffered such a defeat, which is unable to take up in a decisive moment the struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie, to have a fully correct policy or not. When answering this question, one must admit that the defeat suffered by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on Red Day shows that there is in this Party the serious danger of Right opportunist deviations, and that the Party has not been working on clear Bolshevik lines. The C. C. of the Party has arrived at the following conclusion: although the "Red Day" defeat is connected with the general defects and errors of the Party, these defects and errors do not fully explain the defeat. Comrade Jilek enumerated in his speech the mistakes committed during the "Red Day" action. But the real question is if these mistakes justified such a defeat of our Party. If the question is put in this manner, one can only come to the conclusion that the "Red Day" defeat is due to the whole policy of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. I have here material by which it can be shown how questions are dealt with in the Party now after the "Red Day". We have Party organs which are already prepared to say that the "Red Day" was not a defeat. The "Slovak" declares that there were on that day one hundred thousand workers in the streets of Prague. This shows an inclination to slur over the defeat of the Party, to refuse to draw the right conclusions from it. Another tendency has made its appearance in the central organ of the Party. "Rude Pravo" makes the following statement:

"In a Bolshevik Party all actions are decided and carried out on a broad basis. Collective decision and broad collective execution is our aim. If the Executive of the Party commits errors these errors are also committed by the proletarian rank and file of the Party."

Here is a tendency to place the consequences of the defeat on the shoulders of the proletarian rank and file instead of blaming the Executive of the Party for them. It should be very definitely stated that not the rank and file but the Executive of the Party is to blame for the incidents which we witness in Czechoslovakia.

Comrades, to show here the "solidity" of the basis of the policy of the Party, one has only to point to the economic analysis which Comrade Jilek gave in his report. Comrade Jilek said that there is a boom in Czechoslovakia. This is an indisputable fact, but the mere confirmation of a boom is not

sufficient as an analysis of economic tendencies of development. And when the national conference of the Party which was held a few weeks ago, limits its analyses also to the mere confirmation of the existence of a boom, we must say that this is more than insufficient.

We witness in Czechoslovakia the same capitalist phenomena as in the rest of the world. They are: monopolisation, trustification, rationalisation. But all these phenomena take place in a country which is relatively very small. In regard to markets, enormously increased production is a much greater problem in Czechoslovakia than in a big imperialist state. This leads of course, on the one hand, to Czechoslovakia's increased dependence on the big imperialist states whereas on the other hand it leads inevitably to the accentuation of the war danger in Czechoslovakia.

It is correctly pointed out in Comrade Bukharin's Theses that the Czechoslovakian Party has still very strong legalist tendencies, that, on the one hand, it does not know how to prepare for illegality, and that on the other hand, it has been unable to struggle with the necessary energy for the extension of its legal rights.

Legalism is one of the biggest obstacles to the further development of the Party. I maintain that the Party has not recognised this danger sufficiently.

I want to deal now with the position of the Party in regard to the trade union question.

All the other Parties know that the Red Trade Union Movement has no sound basis in Czechoslovakia. It was built up there in the form of an association, and owing to the organisation of this association no encouragement is given to the initiative of the rank and file. This is evident in all the struggles which have been conducted by the Trade Unions. In these struggles, a united front is, as a rule, established from above, between the leaders of the Red and the reformist trade unions. The masses are not mobilised for the struggle simply because the defective organisational basis of the Red Trade Union Movement has hitherto prevented such a mobilisation and permeation of the masses.

Moreover, the Red Trade Unions have adopted a false opportunist course which unfits them also ideologically for the execution of mass work.

Comrades, when did the Party notice this danger and draw the attention of the masses to it? When we were already in the midst of serious wage struggles in Czechoslovakia, when under the impression of this opportunist attitude of the Executive of the Red Trade Unions, a whole series of struggles had already ended in failure, or at least not very favourably for the Party. Now that the VI. Congress of the R.I.L.U. has solved the question of the Red Trade Unions and has declared that we must aim in Czechoslovakia at the establishment of industrial unions, we see, as Comrade Losovsky pointed out yesterday, that this transformation is proceeding very slowly.

If one analyses all these mistakes of the Czechoslovak Party one realises that there is a serious **Right danger** in the Party, that the course adopted by the Party is full of serious oppositional deviations and that for this reason it is essential for the Congress to issue very clear directions.

The main struggle in Czechoslovakia must be directed against opportunist Right deviations which are already making their appearance in the Executive of the Party.

Comrades, I declare that the addendum to the Theses on Czechoslovakia proposed by the Russian Delegation which declares that opportunist inertia is making its appearance in the Executive of the Party, is absolutely correct.

Comrades, I can also say that the rank and file of the Czechoslovak Party understand the situation and demand that the Party should adopt a different course. A few days ago a functionaries' meeting in Prague demanded that the Party should change its course. I can also tell you that in the Reichenberg region several functionaries' conferences have demanded the same and have also insisted on changes in the Party Executive. This shows that rank and file members have matured since the discussion held in our Party four years ago.

Because the rank and file of the Party have developed ideologically, I am convinced that the Party will be able to understand better this new controversy and that with the help of the proletarian rank and file it will be able to make progress with the work of Bolshevisation.

Comrade TITTEL (Germany):

The contradiction between the general swing to the left of the workers and the growth of reformism is the **decisive problem** with which Comrade Bukharin dealt in his Theses and speech. It is the question of reformism.

The German Social Democratic Party is not only the **biggest reformist Party in the world**, it is also the Party most consistent and far-reaching in its reformism which it pursues together with the bourgeoisie. It is one of the most important props and pillars of the II. International. In Germany this Party has still the majority of the working class behind it. This consolidates and guarantees the domination of trust capital. Bourgeois democracy is in Germany the means by which trusts dominate the State. But owing to the influence of the Social Democrats the majority of the German working class is still under the spell of this democracy. The concentration of capital, the power of the employers' associations narrows down more and more the field of purely industrial struggles. The trade union bureaucrats restrict to such an extent the industrial struggles of the workers that the basis of capitalist domination is not affected, that these struggles serve rather as a regulator of capitalist exploitation. The Communist Party must destroy this influence of the reformists on the masses. Only insofar as we succeed in weakening the Social Democrats already at the present juncture, will we be able to destroy the Social Democratic Party in serious and acutely revolutionary situations. By its policy the Social Democratic Party still keeps alive among large sections of German workers the illusion that it is possible to give the capitalist German republic a democratic and social character. It has succeeded in making the masses accept, the permeation of the State apparatus with Social Democratic officials as a beginning of the reform of the bourgeois State apparatus. It has succeeded in utilising the present activity of the trade union bureaucrats and the conciliation courts of the State for the creation of economic-democratic illusions. In these fundamental questions the so-called **Left Social Democratic** leaders differ in no way from the official policy of the Social-Democratic Central Committee. The policy of the "Left" Social-Democratic leaders aims at making the discontented masses serve reformism by using radical phraseology. In my tactical attitude towards the Left Social Democrats I have been guilty in the past of many errors in regard to the utilisation of the differences between the interests of the masses and the pseudo-radical policy of the "Left" leaders, in the utilisation of differences in the reformist camp.

Comrades, these differences between masses and leaders is the basis for a successful united front policy of the Party: the stronger the pressure of the workers on the "Left" leaders, the more radical these "Left" leaders will be in their phraseology; but the more complicated will also be the tactical attitude of us Communists. Where are the masses today? Comrade Thälmann said in his report that most of the nine million Social Democratic votes were petty bourgeois votes. (Interjection by Comrade Thälmann: This is false, I did not say this.) If we peruse the Manifesto of our Party published three weeks after the Reichstag elections, we will come across the following expression: "Uniformity of the struggle of these twelve millions" who give their votes to the Communist and Social Democratic Parties. Thus we see that a divergent estimate of the elections exists. But if we want to capture the masses who are still with the reformists, we must have first and foremost a perfectly clear analysis of the social and political composition of the adherents of reformism.

Although the Social Democratic Party is still, according to its social composition, a Party in which large sections of workers are organised, it is according to its political substance and character a petty bourgeois and even an imperialist party. Owing to the attitude of the Social Democrats and above all owing to the policy of the "Left" leaders, it is incumbent

on us to criticise this Party from the Communist standpoint and to get away the masses from its influence. Above all, in the every-day struggles we must show the Social Democratic workers and followers the glaring difference between the policy of their leaders and their own interests, and must endeavour to mobilise these masses for our own immediate and ultimate aims. Centrist, the "Left" S. P. G., is the strongest barrier between the masses and Communism.

The general, tactical and fundamental problem of our attitude to centrism was solved long ago and was clearly formulated and practically developed in the past. (Interjection: Only you failed to notice it.) Our policy as Spartacus Bund, our attitude to the Independent Socialist Party in Halle, our attitude during the war to the Kautsky and Haase elements, and last but not least, the fundamental policy of the Bolshevik Party in Russia in regard to Trotskyism are a proof of this (Interjection: What about the Leipzig Party Congress!) The centrist leaders impede by their radical phraseology the clarification process among the masses who are veering towards Communism. They indulge in a pseudo-opposition within the limits of reformism. It is incumbent on us to accelerate the process of radicalisation within Social Democratic ranks by a correct every-day policy, so as to win these workers for Communism.

Thus, we must not adopt the ideological platform of the centrists but must at all times ruthlessly criticise the "Left" S. P. G. from our Communist standpoint. It is only by beating the "Left" S. P. G., by overcoming centrism that we will capture the masses.

The question of the capture of the masses has been before every Congress of the Comintern. The means, the revolutionary method for the capture of the masses is the tactic of the **united front**. We must show to the masses that we are successful representatives of their immediate demands in all spheres, be they wage questions, social-political, municipal or cultural questions. This united front tactic cannot be successful unless we carry on the right kind of work in trade unions, co-operatives and all mass organisations where our comrades must demonstrate that they are able to produce in all conflicts the best practical results for the masses through the utilisation of all and sundry circumstances. Such successes bring the masses nearer to us and enable us to organise them for the revolutionary struggle.

In regard to the illusions which the reformists of both tendencies try to foster among the workers, we must make perfectly clear to the latter our idea concerning the necessity of struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the workers' and peasants' government. We must show to the masses that proletarian dictatorship, which is the real democracy of the workers, can only be accomplished through the destruction of the bourgeois State apparatus. This fundamental propaganda must not be disassociated from current politics. It must be evolved from the concrete conditions of the existing situation.

Comrades, after the big election success the Executive of our Party collapsed. There is uncertainty and vacillation in the Executive. The generally speaking correct policy of the Party laid down at the **Essen Party Congress** and through the directions of the Comintern was not always correctly applied by the Executive. A very glaring example of this is the fact that it was only three weeks after the elections that our Executive issued a fighting programme to the Party and all class-conscious workers, that it brought forward acceptable every-day demands for their struggle without combining them, however, with satisfactory revolutionary propaganda. Unfortunately, this manifesto was not utilised, was not made the occasion for a broad campaign for the capture of the masses. The Executive was paralysed after the elections. This was at a time when S. P. G. was performing a series of remarkably clever manoeuvres. At such a time the Party stood helpless in the face of this, because of total lack of political leadership.

This helplessness and lack of leadership was also reflected in the central organ of the Party, the "**Rote Fahne**", and in the entire provincial press almost without exception. (Interjection: How dreadful!) This lack of leadership in the Executive is the main source of opportunist deviations.

There has been vacillation and lack of leadership in the Executive in connection with all questions. We had a big industrial struggle among the foundry workers in the Ruhr. There,

too, the Party failed completely. Instead of proper mass mobilisation and proper revolutionary propaganda which would have paved the way to a political accentuation of this conflict, the same old scheme of extension and co-ordination of wage struggles was repeated ad nauseam on every occasion. What is the effect of this? The elections in the metal workers' union showed that reformist influence is increasing.

These phenomena cannot be only ascribed to lack of necessary political directions and stimuli on the part of the C. C., they are rather due to the fact that a real united front would collapse at the very outset owing to the present **trade union policy of the Party**. The initiative of the Party from below is paralysed by the excessive bureaucratisation and mechanisation of Party work, and by scorning any initiative from below. Comrades are afraid to take the initiative in questions which are not purely local, they are afraid to express their own views for fear of being snubbed or persecuted by the Party bureaucrats.

Thus it happens frequently that nothing is done in very decisive situations, that no lead is given to Party members and that they are thus condemned to inactivity. The reason of this paralysation of the activity of the Party is the **new inner Party course** adopted by the C. C. on the strength of the agreements made after the IX. Plenum between the German and Russian Delegations. Since the IX. Plenum the Party has adopted a course based on trade union tactics the application of which — to judge by the latest results — will lead to the isolation of the Party. This course is tantamount to abandoning the policy of the united front initiated by the "Open Letter" and the Essen Party Congress: capture of the trade unions and inner-Party concentration on this basis.

The opportunist perils are certainly very serious, but I must disagree with something in Comrade Losovsky's speech. He quoted the minutes of the District Executive of Greater Thuringia. We discussed there the Congress of the R. I. L. U. The formula "the Amsterdammers are the tool of capitalism" and "they are strikebreaking organisations" played an important role in the discussion. I did not oppose this formula as Comrade Losovsky asserts; on the contrary, I laid stress on it.

To prove this I will quote from the minutes of this session of the District Executive. Among other things I said:

"In the international Theses on our tasks the Amsterdammers are designated as 'tools of capitalism'. Objectively this is so. But in our work it is not only a question of saying the right thing but rather a question of how the right thing is said."

Well, I said that it is "correct", and I cannot understand how Comrade Losovsky can prove here the opposite. We must prevent the widening of the gulf between us and the industrial proletariat. We must rather endeavour to create a gulf between the mass of the workers and us on the side, and the reformist trade union leaders on the other side, so that when it comes to disruptive actions on the part of trade union leaders — and there is every sign of this — the masses be on our side.

The slogan "**Control Over Production**" was brought forward at the III. World Congress and the VII. Enlarged Plenum. If it is to be designated now as an opportunist slogan, I will submit to this decision. I would like to deal now with the inner Party course. Comrade Thälmann has said that the main danger in Germany is the Right group which is getting very near to betraying the Party. Comrade Losovsky has said that "Right comrades are bound to the Party only by a very thin thread". (Interjection by Thälmann: I did not say this. I protest against an assertion which was not made by me.) If this is said here how will it reverberate in Germany? I would like to point out that the expression of such views in the Party must lead to serious complications. To show you how far things have gone I would like to give you just one example. When the elections of delegates to the VI. World Congress took place in my district, a member of the C. C. came forward and said: "The question is: for the Comintern or against it." (Interjection by Ulbricht: But this is perfectly correct.) This means: "Who votes for Comrade Tittel is against the Comintern!" Comrade Ulbricht has just emphasised this, I want you to draw the inference.

I admit that in some questions I have been guilty of errors in my ten years of successful revolutionary activity: opportunist and also Left errors. In as far as I did not correct them on my own initiative, the Party did this by convincing me. Now I am being fought because in a few tactical questions I hold divergent views. Nevertheless, I have always carried out loyally the policy of the Essen Party Congress, and this will be always my attitude in regard to decisions. The main thing is, however, that in our Party every practical suggestion, especially if it comes from the so-called "Right" is treated as opportunism, without being given a trial. This paralyses the intellectual life of the Party and is one of the reasons of fluctuation and inadequate recruiting.

I do not ask for toleration to deviations from Party decisions. But the present Executive does not tolerate freedom of opinion when comrades are trying to find the best way out of the present complicated situation. This is a great danger. The opportunist danger is the main danger. This must on no account be minimised. Reconciliation with opportunism and reformism, tolerance for reformism, is out of the question. This would be tantamount to giving up the Party. There can be no compromise in this question!

I say this because for years — nay for decades, this has been my standpoint in the struggle of the working class. We of the Spartacus Bund struggled before and after the war against reformism, and those who assert today that we want to smuggle reformism into the Communist Party are speaking the untruth, are insulting comrades whose past proves the contrary.

Sloppiness in the Executive which paralyses the working capacity of the Party must be done away with by reinforcing the Executive through stimulation and initiative from below. It is only thus that the Executive will be able to react radically to all questions as they arise. But this requires the application

of self-criticism and inner Party democracy in accordance with the Manifesto of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and the speeches and articles of Comrade Stalin.

Concentration of all healthy elements in the Party, co-ordination and fusion in the Party of young and old cadres must be established by joint study and clarification of all questions connected with the German labour movement.

A clarification process must take place. This clarification which must lead to the application of past experiences through the whole Party membership will establish ideological unity in the Party and will lead to the abolition of all groups and cliques, to a real concentration of all our forces which must not be established mechanically but politically. This clarification will also enable us to fight successfully opportunist errors.

The war policy of Germany drives us into a situation which will be very serious. With the help of the reformists the bourgeoisie will use terrorist methods against us. This will be the great test: we will go through it for the second time. In the war danger which is becoming more acute the Soviet Union has only the support of the Communist Parties. To reinforce them, to make their Executives homogeneous, to create within the Parties such premises as will enable them to do their duty in a decisive situation, such is the task of the VI. World Congress.

Therefore, the Party must be united ideologically, it must have a strong and united Executive, and must exercise ruthless self-criticism from above and also from below. Our slogans must be: concentration on the lines of the Essen Party Congress and continuation of this concentration! Establishment of real concentration on the basis of the decisions of the VI. World Congress.

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.