

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 10 No. 35

31st July 1930

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

CONTENTS

Politics		
J. R. Campbell: The Growing Anglo-American Antagonisms	662	Hands Off the Soviet Union! Appeal of the Friends of Soviet Russia 672
The Labour Movement		Fight Against Fascism
Dario: The Revolutionary Strikes in Seville and Bilbao	664	Scandinavian-Finnish Anti-fascist Conference in Stockholm 673
Against Colonial Oppression		Fascism
V. Chattopadhyaya: Organising the Betrayal in India	665	Text of the Soviet Note to the Finnish Government 674
Solidarity with the Working Masses of India	666	Social Fascism
V. Ch.: British Imperialism and Egyptian Nationalism	667	Guido Zamis: A Social Fascist Attempt to Gag the Vienna "Rote Fahne" 674
China		In the R. I. L. U.
A. Ivin: From the Chinese Soviet Territory	668	A. Lozovsky: Ten Years of the Red International of Labour Unions 675
The Children's Movement		In the International
Ernst Bertram: The Second World Rally of the Workers' and Peasants Children in Berlin	669	From the Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. G. on the Report of Comrade Thälmann 677
In the Camp of our Enemies		XVI. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.
D. Richard: The Stockholm Congress of the Amsterdam Trade Union Bureaucracy	669	L. M. Kaganovitch: Organisational Report of the Central Committee 681
First of August: International Fighting Day		Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Stalin and Kaganovitch 683
Aquila: The Franco-Italian Tension	671	

The Mass Movement Against the Social Insurance Law in France.

By A. Simon (Paris).

The fight being conducted by the French working class against the "social insurance law", which has been aptly described by the Communist Party as a large-scale financial and political swindle, has been developing uninterruptedly since the first days of July and is assuming the character of a powerful mass movement. This movement is directed simultaneously against the employers, in order to enforce from them a wage increase, against the State, which is determined to force through this enslaving law at any price, and also against the social fascist leaders who openly declare themselves ready to "carry out this law loyally and correctly".

The revolutionary trade unions had delayed far too long their preparations for this fight, which was to be foreseen long ago; they frittered away their forces in discussions on the way the law would be applied and on the legal problem, whilst the workers demanded that they should show them the concrete forms of the fight against this law. The masses of workers in the factories had realised the actual meaning of the law more quickly and went over to the fight earlier than the majority of our functionaries. The deduction of the workers' contributions from the wages was for them the signal to give vent to their hatred against the monstrous exploitation of which they are the victims; and the immediate

motives of their challenge to the government are to be understood in connection with the whole political and economic situation

Already before the law came into force on the 1st of July, varied and numerous forms of resistance were employed: Collective refusal of the workers of whole factories and factory departments to sign the entry forms, public burning of the entry forms or their wholesale return to the Ministry of Labour. The method most commonly employed was to hand in to the factory management declarations of protest against any reduction of wages. The ferment in the workshops and factories was so general that we ourselves lagged behind in regard to agitation.

From the 1st of July demonstrations mostly assumed the form of factory meetings, at which delegates were elected who submitted to the employers the demands of the workers: passive resistance, lasting several hours, and strike movements. These last came more and more into the foreground. Between the 1st and 6th of July 61 movements participated in by 20 770 strikers were to be recorded. By the 12th of July the number of actions had increased to 183, participated in by about 50,000 strikers. At the time of the writing of this article there are over 60,000 workers on strike, whilst the

workers employed in the big factories in the Paris district are now first proceeding to take up this form of struggle.

The **Northern Industrial district** this time constituted the advance guard. 80 movements, for the greater part in the textile industry, and participated in by more than 30,000 workers, are to be recorded, and every day the strike movement is extending. The fact that the worst exploited portion of the French working class, that of the Northern district, this reformist stronghold, has begun to stir, is a further proof that we have succeeded after years of persistent work, in creating a breach in the one-time all-powerful influence of the reformists and of the social democracy. It was the members of a reformist union who first took up the fight in **Lille**; and everywhere in the North the united front between the revolutionary, the reformist and the christian and the unorganised workers is beginning to take shape.

In numerous districts, which had seemed to have fallen into the most hopeless passivity, a regular awakening is to be observed. And the movement has often commenced in the factories in which there existed not the least organisation. Whist many Party members have carried on unending discussions on the form of the fighting committees, the workers in numerous undertakings in which we have no firm organisational influence spontaneously formed their fighting organs by electing delegates in the factory departments.

The employers, the government and the reformist unions are extremely disturbed at this extension of the fight. The State is posting strong detachments of mobile guards in front of the factories and the pay offices. Many employers, such as Renault, to whom a postponement of the first wage deduction for the workers' contributions to the social insurance was granted, have at the first payment of wages after the 1st of July again refrained from making a deduction and are fixing the time for the first deduction at various dates in order to prevent common action. Others are granting trifling wage increases or declare that they themselves will for the time being pay the workers' contributions. In the North the union of the textile employers was ready to "concede" to the workers a "premium" equal to the amount of the workers' contributions to the social insurance on condition that the workers undertook to remain at the factory for a whole year.

The reformist trade union federation is doing everything in order to conceal the character of the fight; it is continually repeating that the movement is not directed against the law as such, but against the inadequate wages. It further declares, in agreement with the organs of the employers, as for instance "L'Usine", that "the workers must accept the wage deduction for the insurance contribution because their dignity and independence demand it". The reformist functionaries are actively carrying on strike-breaking.

The opportunists of the trade union opposition and renegades are openly joining the united front of all those who wish to save this law. They speak of future improvements of this law, which has brought the workers "certain advantages", i. e., they are for the acceptance of the law. One of their leaders, **Engler**, the secretary of the dockworker's union, broke the fighting will of thousands of dockworkers in Rouen by calling a "general strike" for which no preparations had been made and which immediately collapsed.

In general the workers have taken up the fight under our slogan: against every deduction from wages, for higher wages. But our fundamental weaknesses, the weak organisation in the workshops and our delay in approaching the masses have resulted in our not being able to lead the movement to an adequate extent and that we are not able to make plain to the strikers and other workers who are ready to fight, the political connections and the political importance of their fight. Thus it comes about that the workers are frequently satisfied when they are granted a wage increase which covers the amount of the wage deduction, whereby they give their approval to the insurance law as such. Our organisations are at present endeavouring to organise the workers for the following slogans: Wage increases, but no wage deductions of any kind. The mass movement which is at present developing and which will spread still further in the coming days, has at any rate consequences of great importance: 1. It irrefutably proves the general militant spirit of the mass of the workers; 2. it reveals the enormous possibilities of the creation of the united front from below, whilst we had actually given up this tactic for rallying the masses; 3. it expresses a decline in the influence of the social fascists and of the

reformists; 4. it has achieved wage increases and at the same time increases the efforts of the industrialists, who are feeling the effects of the economic crisis, to bring about a further reduction of the costs of production. These wage increases bring to nought the plans of the employers to meet the crisis.

Paris, July 28, 1930.

The political mass strike against the deduction from wages of the contributions for the Social Insurance has led to-day to fierce barricade fights in the main strike area in the north of France.

In **Rouen** yesterday about 6,000 workers held a strike demonstration. As the workers gathered in front of the Town Hall mounted police broke up the crowd. Several women and children were trampled on by the horses and some workers were wounded by blows from police sabres. The crowd was seized with tremendous indignation and attacked the police with showers of stones.

At Markus Square, where street excavations were being carried on at the time, the workers took possession of the trenches which were ready to hand and repelled the attacking police. At other places barricades of building materials and tree trunks were erected and heroically defended by the workers. The fighting lasted the whole day. In the evening the workers were still masters of the streets. During the night 30 workers were arrested, of whom 15 were released. Up to the present three seriously wounded policemen have been conveyed to the hospital. In addition, the police have a large number of slightly wounded.

In the whole of the strike area the local police prefects have prohibited all demonstrations.

In **Lille**, where the metal workers are on strike, the textile workers, the most important category of workers, have now proclaimed a general strike. There are now 70,000 workers on strike in Lille alone. The authorities are holding the military in readiness for street duty. A general cessation of work is expected.

The strike is spreading with tremendous rapidity in other industrial districts in the north of France. It is exceedingly significant that the political mass strike, which is being exclusively led by the Communist Party and the red trade unions, has been taken up by precisely those sections of the workers who have hitherto constituted the main support of the reformist trade union leaders.

Strike Spreads to the Eastern Departements.

Paris, July 30, 1930.

The strike struggle against the "Social Insurance Law", which is centred mainly in the industrial district of the north and the Paris industrial district, where over 100,000 workers are on strike, is spreading to the eastern departements. In St. Die, in Lorraine, 1,000 workers employed in the local textile mills, foundries and saw-mills have gone on strike. In the Aveyron Departement, the strike, which hitherto has been conducted in the first place by the glove-makers, is now spreading to other branches of the textile industry.

In the north it came to collisions between strikers and the police in Wazommies and Hellemmes, at which the police made several arrests; the strikers, however, released their arrested comrades. In Denain, near Valenciennes, a further 1,300 metal workers have downed tools.

POLITICS

The Growing Anglo-American Antagonisms.

By J. R. Campbell (London).

"We ask is there under capitalism any means of remedying the disproportion between the development of production and the accumulation of capital on one side and the division of colonies and spheres of influence by finance capital on the other side—other than by resort to arms."

(Lenin: "Imperialism").

The developing world economic crisis is daily intensifying the antagonism the two principal imperialist powers. Great Britain and the United States of America.

In spite of its economic decline Great Britain is still ruling over the richest empire the world has ever seen—over one-fourth of the surface of the globe. This division of the world once corresponded to the economic and political strength of Great Britain, to its economic supremacy, to its monopoly of sea power. It no longer does so. Great Britain has long been surpassed in economic strength by its young imperialist rival, the U.S.A., which is struggling for a re-division of the colonies and spheres of influence in accordance with its enhanced economic strength—a re-division to be effected at the expense of Great Britain.

Let us look at the relative productive power of both countries bearing in mind that the U.S.A. is practically self-supporting in relation to agricultural products and the greater part of its industrial war materials, while Great Britain is overwhelmingly dependent on overseas supplies.

	England 1924	U.S.A. 1925
(In thousand Pounds sterling)		
Iron and Steel	149,622	589,214
General Engineering	153,821	801,838
Motor & bicycles	84,669	949,152
Electrical engineering	69,938	308,000
Shipbuilding	51,225	35,436
Cotton	373,122	342,874
Woollen & Worsted	196,284	243,506
Boot & shoe Industries	35,384	185,077

The disparity is seen even more clearly if we take production in the heavy industries.

	England (in thousand metric tons)			U.S.A.		
	Coal	Pig iron	Steel	Coal	Pig iron	Steel
1913:	24,337	869	649	43,088	2,601	2,564
1928:	19,400	551	710	41,662	3,190	4,263

The tendency of production in both countries is equally clear. In Britain the tendency in the early post-war years to fall away from the pre-war level, then the arrest of the productive decline in a number of spheres of industry, the advance in 1929 almost to the pre-war level, only to be thrown back again by the world economic crisis. In U.S.A. a phenomenal increase of production over the pre-war level.

	British Index of production (1919 equals 100)	U.S.A. Index of production
1920	100.2	98
1921	67.5	79
1922	80.9	102
1923	88.7	119
1924	90.9	113
1925	87.1	126
1926	67.0	129
1927	96.2	

The growth of the United States in the sphere of foreign trade is seen by the growth of its manufactured exports.

	1913	1925	1927
(In million pounds)			
Great Britain	398.2	589.3	564
U.S.A.	159.2	356.6	412

The successful competition of the United States with Great Britain is particularly evident in the British colonies and in former spheres of British influence like South America.

In 1900, 84.9% of Canada's imports were obtained from Britain and the U.S.A.—Britain's portion being 25.7% and the U.S.A. portion 59.2%. In 1919, 83.9% of imports were obtained from Great Britain and the United States—but Britain's share fell to 15.3% and the share of the United States rose to 68.6%. In Australia the proportion of imports received from Great Britain has fallen from 59.7% in 1913 to 39% in the year 1928-29. The share of U.S.A. in Indian imports has increased from 2.5% in the year 1913 to 7% in the year 1928-29 while the share of Great Britain has fallen from 64 to 45% in the same period.

Of equal significance is the growth of American capital exports to countries which were formerly spheres for the

investment of British capital. Compare for example the proportion of new capital issues in Canada taken up before the war by Britain, the U.S.A. and by Canadian investors with the portion taken up today and one sees the tremendous change which has taken place.

	Taken out in Canada	Taken out in U.S.A.	Taken out in Great Britain
1910	17.00	1.50	81.50
1911	16.86	6.58	76.56
1912	13.82	11.35	74.83
1913	12.09	13.56	74.24
1926	50.20	47.95	1.85
1927	49.18	49.06	1.76
1928	48.50	47.96	3.54
1929	52.42	43.18	4.40

A similar picture is presented by South America one of the most important British spheres of investment. In 1912 the U.S.A. had 174 million dollars invested in South America and in 1928, 2,167 million dollars. According to the "Revista de Economia" (Argentina) the foreign investments in South America are as follows: Britain—\$ 4,103,000,000, the U.S.A.—\$ 2,167,000,000, other countries \$ 2,043,000,000. There also the U.S.A. is rapidly catching up and surpassing England.

But surely this does not mean war. Surely what is happening here is the slow but sure pressing back of England, and the emergence of the United States as the leading imperialist power. This view leaves out of account the fact that the retention and strengthening of its present positions is a matter of life and death for British imperialism and ignores the frantic efforts which British imperialism is making to rationalise its industry and to strengthen itself for struggle against the U.S.A. It ignores also the enormous importance which the markets of the Empire have for British imperialism. In 1913 the British colonies took 37.2% of the total British imports and in 1927, 46.2%. British imperialism cannot let those colonial markets and spheres of investment slip gradually out of its grasp. It will fight to protect them in every possible way.

On the other hand, the U.S.A. encountering the growing resistance of British imperialism; faced since the decline of its internal market with the need for a larger foreign market, and for increased sources of raw materials, cannot rely on the slow crushing out of Great Britain, but must expedite matters by force. Hence both the United States and Great Britain recognise the conflict as being inevitable and are carefully preparing for it.

The recent naval conference was no step on the road to disarmament but a manoeuvring for position in order to more effectively prepare war.

Both the U.S.A. jingoes and the British jingoes are accusing their respective Governments of having given away too much to the other side, an accusation, for which the Governments are duly grateful, as it enables them to maintain the pose of having made a "sacrifice for peace".

There can be no doubt, however, that the U.S.A. has for the moment been able to force considerable concessions from Great Britain. As Baldwin said in a speech in the House of Commons:

"The situation in this country (Great Britain) was very different from that of America and of almost every other country in the world. Great Britain was a country which had always been dependent on its naval power, and owed whatever influence it had in the councils of the world ultimately to its naval power. This country which had always built hitherto in reference to what it conceived to be its own needs, would in future have to build in terms of a very strictly down treaty." (Italics ours.)

It is clear that Great Britain has retreated, but only in order to regroup its forces, to rationalise its industry, to make new alliances and at a convenient opportunity to break through the limitations imposed by the treaty. Even at this moment it is not prepared to make any concessions with regard to the American doctrine of the freedom of the seas, with regard to the giving up of its naval bases or with regard to the right to arm merchantmen in time of war,—a right which gives Great Britain certain advantages in view of its powerful mercantile marine.

Naturally the U.S.A. attempts to utilise the difficulties of Great Britain in its colonies to its own advantage. The

American press deals sympathetically with the **Indian** struggle, exposes the British Government's attempt to pretend that it is on the way to advancing Indian self-government, and comes out sympathetically in favour of the demands of the Indian nationalist movement. The American social fascists, particularly the "Muste" group in the Socialist Party of America follow the example of their imperialists and sharply criticise the line which their dear Comrade MacDonald is following in India. The English imperialists display fierce resentment at any attempt on the part of the U.S.A. to interfere in the colonial affairs of the British Empire. Some time ago for example a number of American clergymen sent a letter to Ramsay MacDonald protesting against his attitude to the Indian nationalist movement led by the holy man Ghandi. The day after this protest appeared in the London "Times" a number of letters calling the attention of the clergymen to a number of cases of lynching which had taken place in the U.S.A. recently and suggesting that the U.S.A. was treating the Negroes much worse than British imperialism was treating the Indians. This is not likely to prevent American imperialism from continuing to express sympathy for the Indian bourgeois nationalists (such "sympathy" will help to sell American goods in India) nor even from attempting to establish relations with them in preparation for the general attack on British imperialism.

With the advent of the world economic crisis both the U.S.A. and Great Britain prepare for a tremendous drive for the markets of the world. British imperialism is using the State to smash down the obstacles which stand in the way of the rationalisation of industry and the conquest of a greater share of the world market. So Lord D'Abernon goes to the Argentine and to South America generally in order to win markets for British imperialism at the expense of U.S.A. Thomas goes to Canada on a similar mission and the Canadian Government replied to the raising of the U.S.A. tariff by raising the Canadian tariff against U.S.A. while giving special preference to Great Britain. The U.S.A. is at the same time making great efforts to regroup its forces and launch a drive for the world market. Even before the coming of the world economic crisis British economists were calling attention to the fact that in the U.S.A. productive capacity was expanding much faster than the internal market and were predicting a big U.S.A. drive for the world market. They called attention to the fact that only a small part—some 8–10%—of the total American production was exported compared with 25–30% exported by Great Britain and that a difficult situation would arise for Great Britain when the U.S.A. was compelled in order to keep her industries going to export a greater quantity of products. That moment has now arrived and with it the sharpening of the antagonisms between the U.S.A. and Great Britain.

This growing antagonism does not preclude the possibility of a temporary agreement between the U.S.A. and Great Britain at the expense of the Soviet Union. The possibility of such an agreement was freely spoken of at the time of the London Naval Conference. On the other hand, recent fascist developments in Finland, (a country over which British imperialism has considerable influence) and Roumania (under French influence)—developments obviously directed against the Soviet Union—suggest the likelihood of a European bloc (including Great Britain) rather than an Anglo-American bloc as containing the prime danger of immediate intervention in the U.S.S.R. though once the struggle started the U.S.A. would also intervene.

One thing is certain, however, the development of the world economic crisis is greatly increasing the danger of war, war against the Soviet Union which is the principal danger and war between Britain and the U.S.A. The Communist Parties of Great Britain and the U.S.A. must make their 1st of August campaigns for the immediate demands of the working class, for unemployed maintenance or for higher unemployed maintenance, for the organisation of the workers' counter-offensive against the capitalist rationalisation drive, against wage cuts, for the seven hours day and linked up with the struggle for those immediate demands an exposure of the growing Anglo-American antagonisms and exposure of the war preparations against the Soviet Union and the mobilisation of the widest masses for struggle against the war danger. August 1st must be made a day of mighty mass demonstrations against the capitalist class which is cutting wages, starving the unemployed and preparing war.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Revolutionary Strikes in Seville and Bilbao.

By Dario.

Among the numerous strikes which have broken out in the whole of Spain and which confirm the perspective of the Communist Party regarding the radicalisation of the masses, two are marked by their special importance and leave no doubt as to the revolutionary period through which Spain is passing. The strikes in **Seville** and **Bilbao** heralded the rebellion of the workers and represent the undoubted commencement of the revolutionary upsurge of the proletarian masses against the armed forces of capitalism. During the fascist dictatorship of **Primo de Rivera** the Spanish working class passed through a period of defensive against the attack by the employers, who were supported in their actions by the Government, which by systematic persecution prevented all demonstrations of the proletariat in defence of its interests. But even while **Primo de Rivera** was still in power the proletariat went over from the defensive to the offensive. The workers did not confine themselves to coming forward in defence of their wages and working hours as they were before the coup d'etat, but began the fight for better working conditions and against the fascist policy. This fight has now developed into a great revolutionary offensive by the Spanish proletariat against the economic and political rule of capitalism and is being conducted by means of revolutionary mass strikes. This strike movement is assuming more and more the character of an insurrectionary movement against the fascist dictatorship of General **Berenguer**, against the monarchy and against the capitalist state generally.

Before all the strike in **Seville** assumed the form of a regular insurrection. Over one hundred thousand workers left work places and carried the fight into the streets. For three days the town was in the hands of the strikers — a fact which even the bourgeois press had to admit —, and the whole of the civil-guard of the town and all other armed forces of the bourgeoisie were unable to prevent the revolutionary action of the workers, who derailed the tramway-cars, erected barricades and drove back the police with volleys of stones. The struggle became so intense that even children took part in the street fighting, one being killed by a security guard. The masses endeavoured to storm the arsenals and also the editorial offices of the reactionary daily paper the "A.B.C.", but were driven back by the specially strong armed forces which were concentrated at these points. A fact which particularly serves to characterise the revolutionary situation prevailing during the strike in **Seville** is that the soldiers were not allowed to leave the barracks, and their sidearms were taken from them. In face of these revolutionary happenings — the most important since 1920 — the whole of Spain was aroused and such important big towns as **Malaga** and **Granada** came to the aid of the strikers.

The strike in **Bilbao** was another revolutionary action of the Spanish proletariat. It began as a fight for immediate economic demands, but soon acquired an outspokenly political character. It came to street fighting and serious collisions with the armed forces of the bourgeoisie.

The persecution of the proletariat in **Seville** and **Bilbao** developed into a campaign of annihilation against the best revolutionary elements of the Labour movement, above all of the communists, who in all these struggles stood at the head of the movement and led the workers in the revolutionary fight against fascism, against the monarchy and its social fascist and anarchist lackeys. In **Seville** thirty persons were arrested, a part of them being tried and sentenced in that town, while the remainder are to be tried by the "General Assembly of Public Order". In **Bilbao** the number of arrested runs into hundreds. Also in other towns numerous arrests have been carried out among the leaders of the revolutionary Labour movement. Needless to say, the whole fury of the persecution was directed in the first place against the Communists. Thus, for instance, in **Seville** and **Bilbao** the police were given instructions to shoot down in the street all known Communists.

The civil guard took the greatest pains to carry out this order. Thus one of our comrades was shot in the barracks in Bilbao, although it was given out that he had committed suicide.

All sections of the bourgeoisie, and also the social fascists and the anarchists, have joined in this annihilation-campaign against the Communists. In Bilbao the social fascists placed their party and trade union premises at the disposal of the civil guard as quarters, while in Seville they denounced the Communists as leaders of the movement. The anarcho-syndicalists, who were commissioned by a royal decree to lead the Trade Union Federation (C.N.T.), declared to the bourgeois press that "the revolutionary movement is to be attributed to the activity of agent-provocateurs". The bourgeoisie knows very well who are alluded to here; that by agent-provocateurs Communists are meant. In the bloody persecutions which set in after the strikes in Seville and Bilbao the social fascists and anarcho-syndicalists took over the shameful role of agents in the service of the murderers, who are paid by the bourgeoisie for choking the fight of the proletariat in blood. These facts show us once again how the united front of the bourgeoisie, the socialist fascists and the anarcho-syndicalists against the working class is developing.

But in spite of everything the outlook for the revolutionary struggle in Spain is more favourable than ever. The economic and political crisis, the bankruptcy of numerous undertakings, the rapid fall in the value of the peseta, the increasing unemployment etc. accelerate the revolutionary advance of the workers, all sections of whom are becoming radicalised. The endeavours of the fascist General Berenguer to create as broad a basis as possible for the dictatorship which has been ruling in Spain for seven years have proved in vain. In addition, there is the bad harvest and, as a result, the threatening unemployment of large numbers of landworkers in the winter, as the olive harvest has been simply disastrous. This will lead to a number of revolutionary movements on the part of the landworkers, the results of which it is impossible at present to foresee.

At the present moment the Communist Party of Spain and the Committee for re-establishing the Trade Union Federation (C.N.T.) is organising a hunger-march of the peasants and landworkers to the towns. Bourgeois rule in Spain is greatly shaken and the Communist Party of Spain will be its gravedigger.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Organising the Betrayal in India.

By V. Chattopadhyaya.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Simon Commission was almost unanimously boycotted by all political parties and organisations in India, and that the Report issued by the Commission, which deliberately ignores the mass revolt in progress during the last few months, has been unanimously condemned, there can be no doubt that the publication of the Simon Report in June and the announcement that the Round Table Conference has been fixed for October 20th have been highly profitable steps from the imperialist point of view. They have transferred political initiative into the hands of the Government and forced bourgeois politicians to concentrate all their energies on discussing the conditions of participation in the Round Table Conference. As for the Congress leaders, they are faced with two alternatives—either to carry on the struggle to its logical consequences, that is, to revolutionary action by the workers and peasants and to the complete expropriation of the landowning class, or to make a compromise with the Government for the protection of their own class interests. It is obvious that they must adopt the latter course. The Government, too, is anxious to come to a compromise, not only because of the heavy decline in British trade that is being caused by the general "lawlessness" and by the boycott movement, but because they have good reason to expect a further intensification of the mass revolutionary movement in the autumn. It is obvious that both the imperialists and the Indian capitalist and landowning

class feel that no arrangement regarding the future of India can be satisfactory unless Gandhi and the two Nehrus participate in the Conference. Accordingly, while the masses are carrying on an active guerilla warfare, and the Government is still bombing the frontier tribes and using police terror throughout India, negotiations have been indirectly begun between the Viceroy and the Congress leaders.

The arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru may be regarded as one of the moves in these negotiations. On June 19th, almost on the eve of his arrest, he made a speech in which he spoke about "continuing the Civil Disobedience movement until negotiations, if any, are complete". Commenting on this, Wilson, the well-informed editor of the "Indian Daily Mail", a Liberal organ of Indian textile capital, wrote: "The Pandit is an extremely clever man, who knows the meaning and use of words perfectly, and I attach great importance to the way in which he has phrased this sentence. I should not be at all surprised to learn that Motilal Nehru is prepared to accept a 'completion of negotiations' privately, and thus be able to justify, at an early date, the calling off of active lawlessness."

Eleven days after this conciliatory speech he was arrested, but the facts that he was allowed to address mass meetings just after his arrest and also when he was brought to the prison, and that he is receiving every comfort and privilege in "gaol", show that the Government in arresting him wished to enhance his prestige when he recommends the calling off of the movement.

But Motilal is not likely to accept any such plan unless and until it has had the sanction of Gandhi. From all sides, both in India and in England, the necessity of bringing Gandhi to London is being urged. In order to attain this end, the Viceroy has taken two steps. Finding that no Indian politician would accept the Simon Report as a basis for the Round Table Conference, the Viceroy made a statement in the Legislative Assembly on July 9th to the effect that the door was still open for negotiations and that the Conference would not be bound by the Simon Report which was to be only one of the documents that would be submitted for the "free" deliberation of the Conference. As soon as this statement had produced the desired effect on the moderate politicians, a "peace move" was skillfully engineered by the Viceroy. Two Indian politicians, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and M. Jayakar, applied to the Viceroy for "permission" to interview Gandhi and the two Nehrus in gaol, and, in the event of this permission being granted, to be allowed to speak to the imprisoned leaders privately "without there being any officer of the Government present at the interview". In their letter to Lord Irwin they ostentatiously add that they "are going on their own behalf and do not profess to represent either the Government or any party". The absurdity of these words will be understood when it is remembered that Sapru is a well-known agent of the British Government, and that his letter asking for permission was merely a camouflage to conceal the fact that he was acting under the orders of the Viceroy.

Sapru and Jayakar have already had a four hours' interview with Gandhi in Yerawada Gaol, and it is reported that Gandhi has given them a message in writing to the two Nehrus. The Viceroy's agents have left for Allahabad to interview the other two distinguished members of the Congress Trinity. It is not likely that these will accept the Government's proposal, unless the Viceroy undertakes to grant Gandhi's 11 points which in his (Gandhi's) opinion constitute the "substance of independence", but which incorporate mainly the demands of the capitalists and landowners.

In the meantime, the preparations for the Round Table Conference are proceeding, and His Majesty the King-Emperor has kindly offered St. James' Palace for this purpose. All the three British imperialist Parties are likely to be represented at the Conference, for the Labour Government is anxious that the Tories and Liberals should give their assent and approbation to the coming "reforms", in order that it may satisfy the maximum demands of British imperialism, while at the same time it will place before the Indian nationalists the excuse that its hands were tied by the "Die-Hards". The various Indian lackeys of imperialism are arriving in London.

batches. The Hon. Srinivasa Sastri, the only Indian "Privy Councillor", who was Britain's Agent in South Africa and is a member of the Whitley Commission on Labour, has already come with N. M. Joshi, his colleague on the Commission, and with Mrs. Annie Besant, the well-known Theosophist who has a long record as a Government agent and whose special function is to win over bourgeois nationalists for "home rule" within the Empire and to fight against every form of the revolutionary movement. Her latest move is significant. She has been a bitter opponent of the Lahore resolution of the Indian National Congress and been carrying on violent propaganda against the idea of independence. But she has now applied to the Working Committee of the Congress to be admitted as a member on the alleged ground that her place is with the Congress, but really because she wishes to appear at the negotiations as a member of the Congress.

Indian Labour is to be represented by one single man, **N. M. Joshi**, as a reward for his unswerving devotion to Amsterdam and the I.L.O. and for the services rendered in splitting the Indian trade union movement. In India, the reformist labour leaders, finding that the workers are becoming more and more militant and that they are not amenable to Labour reformism, have begun systematically to bring them under the political influence of the Indian National Congress, in order to give them an outlet for their political enthusiasm and to prevent them from joining the revolutionary worker's movement.

The extent to which the workers are being mobilised for the Congress programme is seen from the following facts: On July 1st 100,000 workers downed tools as a protest against Motilal's arrest, and 55 mills had to be closed down. A strike was also observed among the textile workers of Ahmedabad, the headquarters of Gandhism. According to the "Bombay Chronicle", the tramway workers came out as soon as they heard of the arrest of Motilal and went in procession through the principal streets of Bombay. The paper reports that the workers marched with Red Flags and with Congress Flags and shouted slogans showing the need of a united front between the Congress and the working class. At the end of the procession, a meeting was held and a resolution passed to the effect that the workers must take a more active part in helping the cause of the Congress. Propaganda in this sense is also being carried on systematically among the railway workers by reformist trade union officials, in order to divert the growing revolutionary movement of the transport workers into safer "national" channels. This is very clearly shown by the accounts of the political demonstration of workers in Bombay on June 9th, which was led by **Ruikar**, President of the G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union, who had recently betrayed the G.I.P. Railway strike. The procession, after parading through the main streets, was led to the Congress Office, where Ruikar called upon the workers "to give the fullest support to the Congress which stood for their rights and interests".

The direct subservience of labour leaders to the Government is shown by the report in the **Hindu** of Madras that the Collector of Madras, an important industrial centre in South India, sent for the President of the Madras Labour Union and asked him to see that the workers do not participate in the movement directed against "constituted authority". The President of the Union gave the Collector the assurance that "in view of the present exigencies he would act up to the instructions".

Similarly, the new Acting President of the Indian National Congress, **Vallabhai Patel**, is reported by the "Indian Daily Mail" of June 28th to have had a meeting with the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Police in Gujerat, as a result of which Patel consented to call off "active picketing" by students and peasants. The police expressed satisfaction with this arrangement. Previous to this agreement with the police, peasants and students had been actively picketing the liquor shops and the imperialist schools and colleges by lying down in front of them and preventing entrance or exit except over their bodies.

From what has been stated above it is clear that the betrayal of the movement of independence is being organised jointly by the Government and by the Congress and Labour reformist leaders. But there are clear signs that the masses will give their answer during the next few months.

Solidarity with the Working Masses of India.

The following message has been sent by the **All-China Federation of Labour** to the **All-Indian Trade Union Congress**.

E.C.

Dear comrades:

On behalf of the Chinese proletariat the All-China Federation of Labour extends its most cordial fraternal greetings to the brave Indian working masses, who are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with British imperialism, and declares that the revolutionary Chinese workers and peasants, who are fighting under the White Terror regime of the imperialistic powers and the Kuomintang for the creation of a Soviet China, will side with you against British imperialism, against the Indian bourgeoisie and landlords, and against the agents of British imperialism—Gandhi, Nehru, and company. We will do our best to support and defend the Indian Revolution. The Chinese working class is watching your gallant struggle with keen interest and profound sympathy, for your victory is also our victory and your defeat would be a defeat for the working class of the whole world.

The Indian Revolution has entered upon a period of high tide, and the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat for the leadership of the revolution is culminating in a decisive and grim battle. We do not doubt you are perfectly aware that the so-called "civil disobedience" movement sponsored by Gandhi, Nehru and other representatives of the Indian national bourgeoisie, is to sidetrack, retard, and finally crush the Indian Revolution. Already early in the course of the Indian Revolution these "gentlemen" of the All-India National Assembly have betrayed the Indian toiling masses and gone over to the camp of British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie and landlords. If the Indian proletariat fails to set up its militant leadership in the present sharp and bitter struggle the Indian Revolution will be sold out by these lackeys of the Indian national bourgeoisie.

Dear workers of India. You must realize that only a ruthless and tenacious fight on your part under the banner of the Communist International and the Red International of Labour Unions against the hypocritical phrases and demagogic gestures of the national bourgeoisie can bring the Indian Revolution to a successful conclusion. We venture to state that the exposure and combatting of the cheating propaganda of Gandhi, Nehru and their associates, together with the strengthening of the leadership of the Indian proletariat, is the immediate task of the Indian Revolution and of the revolutionary Indian labour movement.

At the same time we wish to avail ourselves of the opportunity to point out that even up to the present moment many henchmen of the bourgeoisie still remain in the ranks of the All-India Trade Union Congress. This is harmful and dangerous in the extreme. In order to guarantee the victory of the Indian Revolution and in order to strengthen the leadership of the Indian proletariat, it is imperatively necessary to drive these hirelings of British imperialism and of the Indian bourgeoisie out of the All-India Trade Union Congress, thus extending the organization and political influence of Red unionism.

In addition to utilizing the imperialist "Labour" government to suppress with armed forces the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries, British imperialism is also intensifying its reformist campaign in the Far East through the instrumentality of the Socialist & Labour International and the International Federation of Trade Unions. The proposal of Joshi and Bunji Suzuki at the recent session of the International Labour Office for the holding of a "Pan-Asiatic Labor Congress" is an unmistakable indication of the activity of the Second International and the Amsterdam International of Trade Unions. Our best reply to the Social Fascists is to fight shoulder to shoulder under the leadership of the Red International of Labour Unions and the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat against reformism and yellow unionism.

The bourgeoisie is our deadly enemy. The Indian Nationalist Party under the direction of Gandhi is just like the Kuomintang of China. Both are the tools of imperialism. We must not have the slightest illusion towards Gandhi. On the contrary, we must oppose him in order to guarantee the victory of the revolution.

Your sole reliable ally is the Indian peasantry, with whom you must create a united front so that you may be able to defeat British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie and their agents.

The tremendous revolutionary movement in India has brought to light the outrages and brutality of imperialist administration in the colonial countries. It has decisively exposed the fascist character of the so-called "Labour" Government and has unmasked the treacherous role of Gandhi, Nehru and their kind as representatives of the national bourgeoisie. It has accelerated the revolutionary development of the world-proletariat and the revolutionary anti-imperialist campaign in the colonies. The development of the Indian Revolution has imposed heavier tasks upon the Indian working class. We are confident that the brave Indian proletariat, in close alliance with the peasantry, will successfully fulfil its historic mission by fighting together hand-in-hand with the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the colonies against imperialism, the bourgeoisie and the landlords. In the very near future the red banner of the Soviet will fly over India and all over the world.

The broad masses of Chinese workers and peasants are fighting bravely under the militant leadership of the Chinese Communist Party for the creation of a Soviet China and have already succeeded in creating many Soviet districts in several provinces. A Soviet China will overthrow the regime of the Kuomintang and fulfil the great tasks of the Chinese Revolution. Dear Indian comrades. Let us fight together hand-in-hand with the international proletariat for a Soviet world.

Dear Indian workers. You are not isolated in your struggle against imperialism. You have on your side the world proletariat, the oppressed peoples and the fatherland of the world proletariat — the Soviet Union — all fighting together for the overthrow of imperialism and the completion of the world Socialist revolution.

Down with British imperialism and all the imperialist powers!

Down with the reformist swindles of the Indian national bourgeoisie!

Consolidate the front of Red unionism!

Long live the victorious Indian Revolution!

Long live Soviet India!

(Signed) The All-China Federation of Labour.

British Imperialism and Egyptian Nationalism.

By V. Ch.

MacDonald declared in the House of Commons on July 16th that the British Government would remain strictly neutral in the struggle between the Wafd and the Monarchy on the question of the change of the electoral law, and he forthwith emphasised that strict neutrality by ordering warships to proceed to Alexandria. There is nothing new in this action by the Labour Government, which is merely repeating what it did during its first term of office in 1924, when a similar deadlock arose between Zaghlul Pasha and British imperialism. In the middle of August 1924 troops of Malta were ordered to be in readiness to proceed to Egypt, the cruiser "Weymouth" and the sloop "Clematis" were sent to Port Sudan, and the Battleship "Marlborough" to Alexandria. Zaghlul and the Egyptian nationalists, representing the growing demands of native capitalism, committed the mistake of believing that they would have their claims satisfied by a British "Labour" Government, but after fruitless negotiations lasting 2 weeks between Zaghlul and MacDonald, it became quite clear to the former that the Labour Party was merely the protector of imperialist interests. And the Labour Government itself did not doubt whatsoever as to its real role as an agent of imperialism. Lord Parmoor declared on behalf of the Labour Government in the House of Lords in June 1924 that "there was no going back, at this stage, on the policy towards Egypt itself, which has been adopted for a considerable time and by successive Governments". And in his dispatch of October 7th, 1924, to the British High Commissioner in Egypt, MacDonald used the same imperialist language as his Tory predecessors had used, for he declared that the British Government had "concentrated heavy moral obligations by the creation of a

good system of administration", and that they "regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people" etc. etc.

Zaghlul's successor Nahas Pasha also came to the same MacDonald in 1930 in the same belief that he could come to terms this time, but found the Labour Government more imperialist than ever. But both the Wafd and the Labour Government are anxious to come to terms, and the anti-imperialist demonstrations of the one and the warships of the other are the instruments that are being used for the attainment of a compromise. The methods of the two to achieve this are interesting. The vassal King Fuad has always faithfully carried out the instructions of the British Government and in dissolving Parliament and appointing Sidky Pasha to rule dictatorially, as he did with Mahmoud Pasha in 1928, he hoped to force through the treaty on terms acceptable to British imperialism. But the Labour Government knows that no treaty is of any value that has not today the support of the Wafd leaders, and it therefore publicly recognises both the existing Cabinet as well as Nahas Pasha. This is proved by the instructions issued to Sir Percy Loraine, the British High Commissioner, to inform both Sidky Pasha, the Premier, and Nahas Pasha, the anti-Government leader, that they would both be held responsible for loss of European lives. The British Government would not dare to act in this manner in any other country, but it is playing a double game in Egypt, as the Wafdist leaders themselves are playing. British warships are sent to support the Egyptian Government in suppressing the "riots", i. e. the anti-imperialist movement, but recognition is given to the leader of the latter at the same time. And as for the Wafd leaders, they have launched a movement against the Government with the slogan of national independence, but important Wafd leaders belonging to the Senate and the Chamber, like Makram Ebeid, are participating in the Interparliamentary Union in London and carrying on unofficial negotiations with the MacDonald Government, while the Egyptian masses are stoning policemen and destroying Government buildings in Cairo and Alexandria.

And in the triangular contest that is taking place between British imperialism, the Egyptian feudal monarchy and Egyptian capitalism on the backs of the exploited and discontented peasants and workers, we find the paradoxical position that Sidky Pasha stands for Egyptian independence by telling MacDonald that British warships are not wanted and are against Egypt's sovereign rights, while Nahas Pasha, whose Party stands for independence, thanks the Labour Government for its neutrality!

The daily Press has published as detailed reports as could be obtained regarding the violence of the mass outbreaks, especially in Cairo and Alexandria. When it was made known that the Wafdist Senators and Deputies intended to force their way into the Parliament buildings on July 21st and hold a session in spite of the closing of Parliament by the King, the streets became the scene of mass demonstrations that were fired upon by the police and the troops, resulting in a very considerable number of persons being killed, wounded or arrested. But what did the leaders themselves do? They sent a petition to the King asking him to call an emergency meeting of Parliament on Saturday the 26th July, and they therefore abandoned the plan of forcing their way into Parliament House, and remained indoors all day! They had probably hoped that the mass demonstrations would force the King to act "constitutionally", especially as the leaders kept away, but King Fuad has declined to consider their petition which pointed out that the Cabinet "has resolved to undertake legislative work of the highest importance, notably a modification of the electoral law, . . . about which it has no right to legislate in the name of the nation".

While the King was advised by his Minister Sidky Pasha to refuse the Wafdist petition, Sidky Pasha has issued a bulletin in which it declares:

"I am glad to say that all parts of Egypt, from Alexandria to Aswan, have been quiet, with the exception of Cairo, Port Said and Suez, where there have been demonstrations composed of the lowest members of Society". In these contemptuous words, the Government refers to the historic events in Suez and Port Said, where the working masses were in possession of the towns for some time. In both places, the transport workers are well organised and have often taken active part in anti-imperialist conflicts, and notably in the First of May demonstrations. As was to be expected, they were fired upon by the troops and some deaths are reported.

But it is a significant fact that all the towns where conflicts and street fighting have taken place, like Cairo, Alexandria, Suez and Port Said, are centres where the masses are brought into daily direct contact with British imperialist domination, and where there are worker's unions that are becoming increasingly class-conscious and participating in the struggle against capitalist-imperialist exploitation.

The peasants have not yet begun to move, although it was reported that on July 21st the fellaheen in the environs of Cairo were planning a march upon the capital, which was prevented by the Government opening the sluices of the Nile. But the economic position in connection with the new cotton crop is expected to create a crisis, as the Government will not be in a position, as it has hitherto done, to bolster up cotton prices by heavy purchases, considering that it already has 2,500,000 kantars of cotton on its hands on which the Nalias Cabinet spent £ 13 Millions out of the Reserve Fund and which can only be sold at a considerable loss owing to the falling cotton prices on the world market. The discontent of the peasants is, therefore, bound to become acute in the autumn, and a revolutionary situation may arise that may give enormous strength to the anti-imperialist movement.

The Communist Party of Egypt has just issued a manifesto exposing the tactics of the Nationalist parties and calling upon the peasants and workers to unite and overthrow imperialism and capitalism.

Notwithstanding years of persecution the Communist Party has gained ground, and the objective situation in Egypt is very favourable to the development of the anti-imperialist movement under Communist leadership.

CHINA

From the Chinese Soviet Territory.

By A. Ivin.

In the past winter the 5th division of the 5th corps of the Chinese Red Army, which operated under the command of **Pen De Hual** in West Kiangsi, conducted partisan fights in the South-East of Hupeh.

Who would have thought, after seeing the modest division of 300 men equipped with only 240 rifles making their way forward through the desolate mountains of the frontier districts of Kiangsi and Hupeh, that in about six months this little group would grow into a force sufficient to create terror in the imperialist camp and, after the capture of Yochow, would call forth the impudent intervention of the English and American fleets.

But the wonderful achievements of the 5th division represent no exception: they are characteristic of many other divisions and troops which in a few months have developed into whole corps.

If one becomes acquainted with the history of the growth, with the revolutionary fighting capacity and the every-day life of the military divisions, which grew into eight corps, then one is acquainted, so to speak, with the history of the young heroic Red Army of China. It is now possible to become acquainted with this history, as a number of extremely interesting reports regarding it have been published in the Chinese Communist Press.

We shall not burden the reader by enumerating all the difficult names of localities, villages and districts in which the 5th division had to operate when it first commenced activities in Hupeh. This division, which numbered only a few soldiers and suffered from a great shortage of arms and munitions, was able at that time to avoid encounters with more or less larger bodies of regular troops. Its fighting activity was confined to disarming military and police troops.

Lightning-like manoeuvres, sudden appearances, night raids, by which the enemy was usually taken by surprise, resulted in the capture of some dozens of rifles, two or three cases of cartridges and a few dozen warm mantles.

"On that day we marched 140 Li (about 70 kilometres), reached the bank of the Yangtse, and during the night surrounded a part of the river police and the guards. Next morning, the enemy, in attempting to cross the

Yangtsee, lost 40 men. We captured 50 rifles, 2 Mauser pistols and took an American missionary prisoner."

Right from the beginning the division maintained close brotherly connection with the peasantry. Its popularity increased and also its strength, as it was daily reinforced by new bodies of partisans. It no longer avoided encounters with regular troops.

In the district of Yansin a frightful "purging" of the villages was undertaken. The regiment of Tan exercised bloody terror. The peasants of Yansin called on the red divisions for aid.

"After a few days preparations it came to an encounter 15 Li (7½ kilometer) from the chief town of the district. The enemy's losses were 50 killed and 20 wounded. We captured a 100 rifles and a machine gun. Not a single man on our side was wounded. It was one of the most successful battles waged by our division."

This success was in no small way due to the active support of the peasants of this district who had been driven to desperation by the "purging".

"The peasants took prisoner more than 40 landowners and gentry belonging to the "Committee for purging the villages" and killed them. All prominent persons of the district were seized with panic. The regiment of Tan cleared out as fast as it could and will never again venture to show itself in the South East of Hupeh."

There came representatives from the peasants of the neighbouring districts of Unin (Kiangsi) and requested reinforcements. The division thereupon proceeded to Kiangsi.

"We came to the little locality of Lutsiao. During the night we surrounded the barracks of the guard. Not a single one escaped. The commander was shot. Some of the guard were allowed to go. 40 rifles were captured.

The rumours, which frequently greatly exaggerate the power of the red division, spread far beyond the frontiers of Hupeh. In addition to numerous requests from the peasantry for aid, the red division is beginning to receive all kinds of offers and counsel, sometimes from very unexpected quarters. For example, a letter came from General Li, an old politician and militarist, who was twice military governor of the province of Kiangsi, and was commander of the Hunan troops. Later he was adviser to **Feng Yu Hsiang**. For a long time he intrigued in Nanking, was offended because somebody was promoted over his head, and retired for a time from "affairs of State". Now he has the impudence to offer his services as "strategist" to the Red Army. This old military fox realises that this army represents a new force.

The red division, which remained for some time in Unin, then returned to the district of Yansin and proceeded to Peisch, where two notorious militarists, Wu and Li, were conducting a fierce fight against the peasantry. Wu and Li, who had ample arms at their disposal and occupied the most important strategical points, had already repeatedly dispersed large but badly armed peasant troops. The scene changed, however, as soon as the red division arrived.

"The district of Yansin was very soon completely sovietised. The troops of the landowners of the South East of Hupeh took to their heels as soon as we arrived. It was difficult for us to capture any weapons."

It was decided to proceed to Taje.

"We approached the town during the night. The town garrison was commanded by Don In, an officer of the Sja division, famous for his military skill and prowess. More than ten times he sent all his forces to the attack, but in vain. The fierce fight lasted six hours. But finally we succeeded in entering the town . . .

The enemy's soldiers and officers changed their clothes and hid themselves in the town. One body of troops was driven into the lake and drowned. In the encounters the enemy lost more than 100 men. We took 80 prisoners and captured 120 rifles. More than 10,000 peasants took part with us in the fighting. They killed two commanders and many counter-revolutionaries and also captured 30 rifles."

The capture of the town of Taje, a rather important centre of the iron industry, had the effect of a bombshell in Wuhan. The 15th brigade was sent into the district as a punitive

expedition. The Reds withdrew from Taje in order to transfer operations to the Changsha—Hankow railway line.

"We proceeded in the direction of Hanning. On the way news reached us that the 15th brigade had mutinied. We immediately turned about in order to attack Taje. As we approached the city walls we fired signal shots. In reply we heard three shots. The mutinying soldiers rejoiced at our coming. All the soldiers who had not joined in the mutiny were taken prisoners. We captured 300 rifles, the peasants about 100. The district commander was shot. Soon afterwards we were joined by two other companies."

At the beginning of the present year the red troops operated in the territory in the neighbourhood of the Yochow—Wuhan railway line, and then in the Yetchen district. In South East Hupeh the Reds succeeded in closely connecting the political and military work in the districts of Tunchan, Shunian and Yetchen and other places. On the 26th of March the Reds unexpectedly attacked the Huan—Fu Kiao railway station (between Sjanin and Wuhan).

"The enemy believed that we would not decide to attack the town, i. e., that we possessed insignificant forces, and sent a battalion and a machine gun squad against us. We dispersed them in four hours. We also dispersed the second battalion and pursued it to Sjanin. The enemy, who was equipped with 8 machine guns and 8 bomb throwers opened a fierce fire against us. We had many untrained soldiers who were not skilled in night operations, and therefore had to retreat. The enemy greatly outnumbered us, nevertheless we captured more than 100 rifles and took five company commanders and more than 200 soldiers prisoners. Whilst the losses of the enemy were 100 killed, our losses were only 8 killed and 14 wounded."

In the course of six months the red troops fought more than 50 larger or smaller engagements. They have lost over 50 killed and 100 wounded. Of these 100 wounded the half recovered, the other half died in hospital.

At the end of March this year the 5th division was converted into the 8th corps numbering 2200 men. Everyone of these soldiers is equipped with a rifle. This number does not include the young recruits, who for the time being form the rearguard.

THE CHILDREN'S MOVEMENT

The Second World Rally of the Workers' and Peasants' Children in Berlin.

By Ernst Bertram.

The second world rally of the workers' and peasants children in Berlin was a **complete political success**. The ruling class had done everything in order to prevent this World Rally. The holding of the Rally in Halle was prohibited. In a relatively short time, however, the preparations for the Rally were made in Berlin. Here again the provocative and terrorist measures of the police set in. Visas were refused the Russian workers' children. In Saxony the government prohibited the participation of the Saxon workers' children. In spite of this they arrived in Berlin, these youngest fighters of the working class. Representatives came to the Rally from far-off Mongolia, from England, America, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Poland and other countries in order to demonstrate that the workers' children are in the fighting front of the whole working class. In Berlin the police measures were intensified against the World Rally. First of all it was forbidden to hold a demonstration with the foreign children, as the latter are not acquainted with the Berlin traffic and there could therefore easily arise a danger to public security. The leading girl of the Mongolian children delegation was arrested. The police indiscriminately arrested leading comrades and children at the various meetings. They did not even shrink from belabouring the children with their truncheon. In addition, all the demonstrations before the Labour Exchanges and factories were prohibited.

In spite of all these police measures, the second Children's Rally showed the great sympathy of the working class for the revolutionary children's movement. The participation of the Berlin working class was tremendous. Already the meetings of welcome were overcrowded. The opening of the 2. World Rally of the workers' and peasants' children was likewise largely attended by the Berlin workers. The culminating point however was reached at the demonstration in the Sports Palace. More than 20 000 people, of whom over 8000 were children, attended the meeting. The Hall was closed by the police on account of the overcrowding and thousands of workers could not obtain admission.

The Second World Congress of the workers' and peasants' children was attended by delegations from all countries and dealt in two days' work, in particular in the commissions, with the methods of conducting the struggle of the workers' children in all countries.

The Conference of the German children's leaders of the Young Communist League, of the C. P. of Germany and of the revolutionary mass organisations was of particular significance for the creation of a mass children's movement. In the report of Comrade **Becker**, supplemented by Comrade **Remmele**, the weaknesses of the revolutionary children's movement were revealed as well as the wrong working methods which are not adapted to the child's psychology, and the overlapping of different organisations. In order to establish a united revolutionary children's movement against the front of the bourgeois and social democratic children's organisations, all the revolutionary children's organisations, the children's groups and sections of the various organisations must be brought together, cartels are to be formed on a local and district basis in whose hands the political ideological leadership of children's work is to be placed. By this unification of the revolutionary children's work the preconditions will be created for applying various methods to enhance the activity, arouse the initiative and independence and satisfy all the requirements of the various strata and ages so as to make the proletarian children conscious of their class position and the necessity of the class struggle, and to educate them in the spirit of Socialism on the basis of the participation of the children in the class struggle. The Conference elected a provisional national committee which is instructed to work out directives and to prepare a new Conference of elected representatives from all organisations for the End of November.

In spite of the great political success, some shortcomings and weaknesses occurred in the preparation and carrying out of the Rally, as well as of the Congress. The attacks of the bourgeoisie were not adequately repulsed. Also in the programme of the Rally, which had to be changed several times owing to the bad weather, many shortcomings were revealed.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The Stockholm Congress of the Amsterdam Trade Union Bureaucracy.

By D. Richard (Stockholm).

The V. Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions was held from the 7th to 11th of July in Stockholm. It met at a time of severe world economic crisis and ever increasing unemployment, which already involves millions of workers. In the whole world the imperialist antagonisms among the capitalist countries are growing at an accelerated pace; the danger of new imperialist wars is constantly increasing.

The Amsterdam International, however, is not the competent body to deal with such urgent and vital questions. And, therefore, no mention was made of them at the Stockholm Congress. Nevertheless some of the big events which are stirring the outside world found a somewhat original expression at the Congress. We have in mind the anti-American and anti-English attacks by Jouhaux, which reflected the anti-American mood of the French bourgeoisie, and also the fight over the future seat of the International (Amsterdam or Berlin) between the Franco-Belgian and the German group (in the wider sense of the term) at the Congress.

In this way the Congress passed over the questions which are of vital importance to the working class in the present period, but at the same time adopted two programmes.

The economic programme is deserving of special interest. It has been adopted at a time when the capitalist world is shaken by a severe economic crisis. But no mention of this crisis was made either in the report, which was delivered by Eggert in place of Leipart who was absent owing to illness, nor in the programme. On the other hand, the report deals in great detail with the successes of capitalism.

"The restoration of world economy—declared Leipart—has made gratifying progress. The peaceful relations between the nations are growing stronger every year... It appears not improbable that the restoration of world economy is proceeding in other forms and other ways than we were used to in pre-war time. But, strange to say, the old economic form which we assumed was doomed to decline, is showing surprising vitality. It is developing unexpected forces."

In his praise of capitalism Leipart goes much farther than many bourgeois economists. The more far-sighted representatives of the bourgeois ideology note with concern the symptoms of crisis and decay, whilst the yellow Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy simply pass them over. In face of the intensification of the capitalist offensive, which is becoming more obvious every day, and the approaching class struggles they declare that "the fight against the working class appears to be declining more and more; the attempts to reduce wages are growing weaker, as the point of least resistance has changed".

The only regrettable thing which they observe is the monopolist policy of the trusts and cartels, which permits the capitalist to reap all the advantages of rationalisation and to keep up the prices of industrial products. The task of the Amsterdam International, therefore, consists in adopting measures which will "weaken" these "negative" aspects of monopolist capital. The people must control the capitalist trusts, Leipart solemnly announces, and demands control by the capitalist State and, of course, by the inevitable League of Nations over the monopolist organisations of capital. That is the entire economic "programme" of the Amsterdam International, which can be designated as an undisguised programme, to which the English Liberals and also the Italian fascists could subscribe.

The economic programme, however, touches two important questions. It demands the abolition of customs barriers, which have been set up owing to the protectionist policy of all capitalist countries. The adoption of a Free Trade Programme by the Stockholm Congress is of particular interest in view of the fact that at the same time there was published the report of a special Commission of the General Council of the English Trade Union Congress, which pronounces in favour of a protectionist policy. It is also worth mentioning in this connection that only a short time ago the German social democracy and the German free trade unions greatly helped in the introduction of tremendously high customs duties on agricultural products and partly on industrial products.

The Amsterdam leaders could not of course pass over in silence the **problem of capitalist rationalisation**. The results of capitalist rationalisation flatly refute all the former assertions made by the Amsterdam International, which promised the workers that rationalisation would lead to an improvement of their material situation. It is quite understandable that they cannot simply call upon the masses to support capitalist rationalisation. Therefore, we find in their economic programme a special chapter on the "Fight against the abuse (?) of rationalisation". The organised working class is of course (!) not against the process of development, the programme states. The International will, therefore, support the rationalisation measures. Needless to say, the programme contains no definite indication regarding the means with which this "fight against the abuse of rationalisation" is to be conducted, and still less does it think of comparing capitalist rationalisation with the socialist rationalisation in the Soviet Union.

At the Stockholm Congress there was also adopted the **social-political programme** of the Amsterdam International. Mertens, of Belgium, who delivered the report, proceeded to praise the "enormous" successes of the Amsterdam International in the post-war period in the sphere of social policy. His empty report concluded with the submission of a programme setting up the usual demands of a reformist

character regarding the questions of social insurance, protection of workers etc. But even this programme contains certain new features. Above all it emphatically abandons the old "doctrinaire" demand that the whole cost of social insurance be borne by the employer and the capitalist State. The programme quite openly advocates that the burden of social insurance, in accordance of the principle of "justice", be divided between the employer and the worker.

As a demagogic bait the demand for the 44-hour week is included in the programme. It is fairly obvious that the inclusion of this demand in the programme is due to the tremendous impression which the introduction of the seven-hour day and the five-day week in the Soviet Union has made upon the West European workers. What this demand is really worth is shown by the English Labour Government, which has not yet introduced the seven-hour day promised to the miners.

The question of disarmament also came up at the Congress. Jouhaux delivered one of his usual speeches, whereupon the Congress adopted one of the usual non-committal resolutions, declaring for "disarmament in general". Jouhaux concentrated attention upon the "control of the production of weapons"... by the private employers.

Contrary to the last Congress, this time there was no "Russian question". The Congress preferred to maintain complete silence regarding the Russian trade unions. The Executive Committee issued to the Congress a report containing a few words on the trade union movement in the Soviet Union, of which only the following compliments to the old leaders of the Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions deserve to be mentioned:

"For a short time it appeared as if the Russian Trade Union Council would return to a more reasonable attitude, and that it had learnt to understand the nature and the importance of the trade union movement outside of Russia. This was at a time when in Russia itself the so-called Right deviation made its appearance. But the leaders were not allowed to retain the leadership for long. Their standpoint that the economic development of Russia must not proceed at the cost of the working class, sufficed the pure communists in order to accuse them of treachery to the working class".

The social fascists of the Amsterdam International, after their manner, took advantage of the opportunist attitude of the old leaders of the Central Council of the Russian Trade Unions and assured them of their complete sympathy.

The "Russian question" was again referred to at the meeting of the Committee on the report delivered by George Hicks on the trade union movement in the countries "without democracy". It transpired that Jouhaux's attempt to get a passage directed against the Soviets inserted in this resolution did not meet with particular enthusiasm on the part of the English and the Poles and some representatives of other countries. Thus it came about that nothing was "decided" regarding the Soviet Union.

The Stockholm Congress of the I.F.T.U. shows once again with the greatest clearness that the time of reformism in the social democratic trade union movement is irrevocably past. Reformism has given place to social fascism. The completely capitalist programme and resolutions which were adopted by the Congress are fully in accordance with this change. The Stockholm Congress showed once again that the Amsterdam International and its affiliated trade unions are nothing else but supporters of capitalist policy in the ranks of the working class.

Notice!

Change of Address

The address of the International Press Correspondence and of the "Imprecorr." Telegraph Agency is now:

Lindenstrasse 71-72, III. Berlin SW 68.

The new telephone numbers are Dönhoff 2856 and 2867.

International Press Correspondence
"Imprecorr." Telegraph Agency.

1st August: International Fighting Day Against War**The Franco-Italian Tension.****By Aquila.**

In the last few months the Franco-Italian antagonisms have become so acute, the piling up of armaments on both sides has assumed such an extent and pace and the mutual threats of war such an open form that it would be superfluous to point especially to the danger of war which is threatening the European workers and peasants from this sector of the imperialist front.

Only six days after the conclusion of the famous London "Disarmament" Conference, the Italian Government launched with great ceremony four new cruisers — all four equipped with the latest achievements in warship construction — and a modern submarine. Three days afterwards, on April 30, the Italian Government published its naval programme for the financial year 1930/31, which provides for the construction of one ten-thousand ton cruiser, two five-thousand ton cruisers, four torpedo-boat destroyers and twenty-two submarines — in all 29 new warships with a total tonnage of over 43,000 tons. Ten days later, Mussolini started a tour of Central Italy and Milan, during which he delivered a whole number of threatening and bellicose speeches, which even surpassed all his former accomplishments in this direction.

In Florence he declared:

"There is nothing more insulting to the pride of the Italian people than the suspicion that our programme of naval armaments will not be realised. I declare here once again, that **this programme will be carried out ton for ton, that the keels of the 29 new units will be laid down . . .**

"Therefore we cannot allow ourselves to rest. That is forbidden not only by our inner tasks, but also by the **new and unprecedented signs of conflagration which are arising on all sides of the horizon.**

"On Sunday you will witness here an **imposing review of the army.** I have ordered this, for words are very fine, but rifles, machine-guns, warships, aircraft and guns are much finer. In the spectacle of the armed forces, on Sunday the whole world will see the determined and warlike countenance of fascist Italy. Powerfully armed fascist Italy will submit its simple alternative: Either valuable friendship or an inexorable hostility."

When Mussolini delivered these bellicose speeches he was of course aware that the French Government, having drawn milliards from its reserve funds for the purpose, is extending and strengthening at a feverish pace its network of fortifications on the Italian frontier and in Corsica, just as he was aware of the strikingly frequent visits in the last few months of numerous French Generals and responsible statesmen to the capitals of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria. And it was perfectly obvious that the mission of these generals and politicians consisted in the first place in making military and political preparations for war on the Soviet Union, but at the same time in improving the positions of French imperialism against its Italian rival.

The forced armaments of Italian imperialism are determined by the fact that — hampered in its development and expansion by a number of unfavourable factors of an economic and political nature, i. e., lack of important raw materials (coal, iron, cotton etc.), and the fact that the unification of Italy was not achieved until the sixties of last century — it entered the world arena at a time when not only were the richest colonial area already divided among the other imperialists, but also a close ring had already been drawn round Italy itself by its imperialist rivals.

The few colonies which Italy possesses (2 million square kilometres with one and a half millions inhabitants, while France possesses colonial territory to the extent of 12 million square kilometres with a population of 50 million) consist for the greater part of sandy wastes and desert, and even the narrow coastal districts are poor in raw materials. With a few exceptions the whole of the African and Asiatic coast of the Mediterranean is in the hands of French and English

imperialism: Morocco, Algiers, Tunis and Syria belong to the French, while Egypt and Palestine belong to the English.

Then there is the situation of the "mother" country itself. Among the big European imperialist countries Italy is the only exclusively Mediterranean country. Owing to its geographical situation (large mountains in the north, with only a few passes, and these difficult to cross), 80 per cent of Italy's traffic in goods with the outer world is carried on by means of the sea. The most important raw materials are conveyed to Italy almost exclusively by sea: 98 per cent of the coal imports, 98 per cent of the imports of mineral oil, 91 per cent of the raw materials for the textile industry, all the imports of corn (Italy covers about 20 to 25 per cent of its annual requirements of grain by imports) etc. More than nine-tenths of these imports pass through the Straits of Gibraltar, Suez and the Dardanelles! Also Italy's most important export-products have to be conveyed the same way. Nor is the situation more favourable from the military standpoint. France with Toulon, Corsica and Biserta, England with Malta, Greece with Corfu, and Yugoslavia with Cattaro and Sebnik encircle Italy with a close ring of powerful naval bases.

The advance of French imperialism in the Balkans, which bars Italy's expansionist efforts in this direction, and also the expansionist tendencies of Italian imperialism in North Africa, which likewise immediately encounter the obstinate resistance of French imperialism, inevitably lead to Italian imperialism being compelled to adopt an ever more openly hostile attitude to its French rival. On the other hand, French imperialism makes use of every opportunity in order to tighten as much as possible the noose round the neck of its Italian rival. At the London Conference this antagonism was sharply revealed. French imperialism wished to use this opportunity in order to place a limit to Italian imperialism by a naval agreement sanctioning French preponderance at sea, which limits French imperialism is determined Italy shall not overstep. The acceptance of these limits by Italian imperialism would, however, have been tantamount to an abandonment of all claims to the position of a big imperialist power, to a renunciation of a "place in the Sun". The Italian delegation therefore demanded **naval parity** with France; and Mussolini declared that this demand was not put forward as a basis of negotiations, but as a demand from which Italy could not recede one step, as naval parity is for Italy (that is Italian imperialism) "a question of life and death".

The question of naval parity was, therefore, only the condensed formula of the sharpening imperialist antagonisms, the chief basis of which lies in the Mediterranean, but which extend to almost every sphere of present-day European politics: to the Balkans, where the antagonistic interests between Italian imperialism and Yugoslavia — this faithful vassal of French imperialism — touch a whole number of questions (Macedonia, Albania, Dalmatia, Croatia etc.); to Rumania, where the fight for predominance is now being waged in the form of a rivalry over the person of the new king; to the Little Entente, against whom Italy is at present trying to play off Hungary, Poland and Austria, etc. At the same time the raising of the naval question enormously intensifies all these antagonisms. Italy's new programme of naval construction, Mussolini's fire-eating speeches, the feverish armaments by France on the Italian frontier and in Corsica, the journeys of French politicians to the capitals of the Balkan countries and the countries of the Little Entente, the visit of the Italian Foreign Minister to Pilsudski, Horthy and Schober — all these are the first visible expressions of the further aggravation of the antagonisms and the growing tension between the two imperialisms.

The danger of war, which as a result of this intensification of Franco-Italian imperialist antagonisms threatens not only the French and Italian but also the whole of the European working class and peasantry, calls for the maximum strengthening of the fight of the workers and peasants against imperialist war. It is necessary on August 1st to give a powerful expression to this anti-militarist fighting spirit of the masses.

The First of August and Czechoslovakia.

By K. Gottwald.

Prague, 22nd July 1930.

Like the majority of the capitalist States, Czechoslovakia too is passing through an economic crisis. The question of markets is becoming more and more urgent for the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie. The balance of foreign trade shows a great decline in the turnover: from 19,100 million Czechish crowns for the first six months of 1929, to 16,600 million Czechish crowns for the first six months of 1930, i. e. about 2,500 million Czechish crowns. Exports fell by 800 million crowns and imports by 1700 million crowns. Czechoslovakia is being ousted from the Hungarian, Austrian, Yugoslavian and Rumanian markets, partly by German competition, partly by the extension of the national industries in these Danubian countries. Concurrently with the shrinkage of the markets, the imperialist expansion of Czechish capitalism is growing and is leading to an enhanced participation of Czechoslovakian imperialism in the preparations for a new war: on the one hand on the side of France against Hungary, the exponent of Italian policy, on the other hand as partner in the united front of all capitalist States against the Soviet Union. In connection with the anti-Soviet campaign of the Pope and of the II. International, the Czechish press quite openly advocated the necessity of a war on the Soviet Union. The same necessity is urged in the discussions on the economic crisis and unemployment. It openly and cynically admits that the capitalist world can recover only by means of a military defeat of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.

The Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie, however, is not content with merely talking about war; it is preparing for it economically, politically and militarily. In spite of the general economic crisis, the armament industry is working at full capacity. While on the one hand, whole factories are being closed down, on the other hand new big fertiliser factories are being constructed in Falkenau, in Stechvitz near Prague and on the Waag in Slovakia. In spite of the budget difficulties, the expenditure for military purposes is being increased; over 300 millions have been paid out of the treasury to a big bank having connections with the Skoda works and the French armament concern, and will finance the armament industry of Czechoslovakia.

The Skoda works have floated a new investment loan amounting to 800 million Czechish crowns. All these transactions are actively participated in by France, the great imperialist protector of Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovakian military school is now visiting Rumania in order to "study the glorious battlefields". The national Ministry of War has concluded secret agreements with the nationalist and fascist sports organisations for the purpose of mobilising these organisations in the event of the mobilisation of the army. The draft of a law on compulsory preliminary military training of the youth as well as the draft of a Czechoslovakian "Lex Boncour" is being discussed at interministerial deliberations. It is therefore not to be wondered at that there is much talk in Czechoslovakia about the danger of war. The broad masses of the working people are more and more realising that the Communist Party is perfectly right in calling for the struggle against the new imperialist war.

In Czechoslovakia there are today over 300,000 unemployed and at least twice that number of workers on short time. Unemployment is increasing daily. With the exception of the war industry there is not a single branch of industry in which wholesale dismissals are not the order of the day. The overwhelming majority of the unemployed, at least 90 per cent, do not receive any benefit. In the factories rationalisation and speeding up are rampant; the working day is being lengthened and wages reduced. On the other hand, prices are increasing. In this way the Czechoslovakian capitalists have succeeded, during the last six months, in lowering the standard of living of the toiling population by at least 20 per cent.

The political offensive against the workers, police terror and fascism are likewise increasing. The notorious law for the Defence of the Republic is being applied with unheard-of severity. The majority of the leading Communist Party functionaries have been sentenced to several months imprisonment. Every strike struggle is de facto declared unlawful by the

social fascists and the bourgeois State power. The Party organs in Carpatho-Ukraine are being suppressed for six months, and all the German Party organs and the majority of the Czechish Party organs are threatened with a new prohibition. Demonstrations, meetings, conferences etc. are continually being prohibited and dispersed. The revolutionary movement of Czechoslovakia is in a state of semi-illegality. The Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie is following with great sympathy the raging of the fascists in Finland, and voices are heard demanding that this example be followed.

It is in this situation that the Communist Party is preparing for anti-War Day on the 1st of August. The objective preconditions for this action are favourable. The strike struggles are increasing. The demonstrations and meetings of the Communist Party are attended by greater masses and reveal a more enthusiastic character than hitherto. It is to be expected that 1st of August in Czechoslovakia will far surpass the action of first of August last year and even that of 6th of March.

The Party has set itself the task of preparing for 1st of August before all in the factories and mass organisations on the basis of the united front from below. In the course of July more than 200 factory meetings, 200 meetings of the unemployed and over 500 meetings of the mass organisations are to take place. At these meetings delegates to the district Conferences of the working people are to be elected. Some of these Conferences were already held on the 20th and 27th July. At these conferences committees of action will be elected for the organisation of the demonstrations on 1st of August. At the same time these conferences will elect delegates to visit the Soviet Union and confirm the delegates to the V. R. I. L. U. Congress. In addition, hundreds of meetings will be held in the villages with the assistance of factory workers in order to win the broad masses of peasants for the anti-war day. On the 1st of August demonstrations will be held in all the important towns of the country.

Simultaneously with the increased preparations for August 1st, there is an increased terror exercised by the social fascists and the Police. The conference of working people was dispersed by the police, the preparatory meetings suppressed. House searches on the premises of the Party on the part of the police are becoming more and more frequent, and one can reckon that shortly before the 1st of August the police will attempt to arrest the majority of the active Party functionaries in the most important centres.

In spite of this enhanced terror, the Party is unswervingly continuing its preparations for the 1st of August, thereby winning the increasing sympathy of the working people. Without closing our eyes to the weaknesses of the preparations, which are still to be observed, we can say, that the action of 1st of August will be a further step on the way to the consolidation of the Communist Party.

Hands off the Soviet Union!

Appeal of the F.O.S.R. for August 1st.

August 1st marks the sixteenth anniversary of the great world war, which for four years devastated Europe and drenched it in blood. Sixteen years after the "war to end war": after the conflict that was to bring "freedom and democracy" to the nations and give "self-determination" to the subject peoples, the world stands on the brink of a new and greater conflagration.

In every country of the world outside the Soviet Union, there is an economic crisis which daily widens in extent and deepens in intensity. Unemployment spreads like a plague, wages fall, huge industrial conflicts take place, and the standard of living of the workers is reduced. The connection between the economic crisis and the desire of the imperialists for war becomes increasingly clear. It embitters the rivalries of the imperialists, Great Britain and America, France and Italia, etc., whilst at the same time it increases their common hatred of the Soviet Union and compels them to work feverishly for the destruction of the new order of Socialism that the Soviet workers and peasants are successfully building up.

The propagandist campaign preliminary to the armed attack on the Soviet Union has been well prepared. For months past, under the hypocritical cloak of religion, freedom,

ed
of

justice, the most shameful campaign of slander and calumny has been conducted against the U.S.S.R. in which the Pope and the Christian Churches have played a leading part. For the purposes of this campaign no lie has been too ludicrous, no slanders too outrageous to be circulated, repeated and used in every unscrupulous way to prejudice the Soviet Union in the eyes of the workers of the West.

On the military and economic front the ranks against the Soviet Union have been equally systematically prepared. One by one the border States have been drawn into the iron ring around the Soviet Union. The fascist coup in Finland and the proclamation of ex-Prince Carol as King of Rumania, mark the consolidation of the north-western and south-eastern sectors of the anti-Soviet bloc. To crush the Indian revolutionary movement and to concentrate large military forces on the northwest Indian frontier is an essential feature of the preparations of British imperialism for the offensive against the U.S.S.R.

Against each attack of world imperialism the Soviet Union must at all costs be saved. The achievements already accomplished by the Russian workers and peasants in the economic and cultural reorganisation of their country are a guide and an inspiration to the workers of all the world.

Under Tsarism illiteracy and cultural backwardness was the common lot of three-fourths of the Russian people. Under the rule of the Soviets a complete transformation has been accomplished. The number of children of school age attending school increased from 47.4 per cent in 1913 to 88.6 per cent in 1928. The number receiving intermediate education has advanced by 54 per cent as compared with the years immediately preceding the war. The percentage of illiterates has been reduced to 45 per cent for the whole of Russia, and to less than 20 per cent for the urban districts. With the completion of the Five Year Plan illiteracy will, to all intents and purposes, have disappeared. In the domain of books the Soviet Union has not only caught up but has outstripped the most advanced countries of the West. More than two and a half times the number of books were published in the Soviet Union in 1929 than were issued in 1913. In 1927 nearly three times as many books were issued in Soviet Russia as were published in the United States. In every branch of literature there is a wonderful and unprecedented growth, which yet fails to cope with the educational demands of the free and enlightened Russian people.

In the economic and social sphere the same amazing progress is recorded. The ravages of the world war have not only been overcome, but the pre-war level of industrial production left far behind. The output of manufacturing industry shows a phenomenal increase as compared with 1913: coal, 40.5 per cent; oil, 47.3; cotton cloth, 82; agricultural machinery, 175.8. The production of steel in 1928-9 was 10.6 per cent in advance of 1913.

Every improvement in the economic situation in the Soviet Union means progressively less hours of labour, more time for leisure, recreation and cultural activities for the workers and peasants to enjoy. In the thirteenth year of the revolution wages have reached 133 per cent of 1913. The five-day week has been established, and the seven hour day is being introduced into all industries. Social benefits are enjoyed free of charge by the workers — insurance against sickness, old age and unemployment, annual holidays varying from two to four weeks, recreational and cultural facilities — to an extent unknown in other countries. The best hospitals, convalescent homes, sanatoria and medical services are at the free disposal of the workers. Sanitary conditions have improved and, together with a better health service and a higher standard of living, have brought about a consequent decrease in mortality, both infant and adult. The scientist and thinker hold premier rank in the counsels of the nation; the arts and sciences have reached a high point of development, and new and scientific institutions are being created. Superstition, once rampant amongst the Russian masses and due to ignorance and illiteracy, is practically swept away. With the completion of the Five Year Plan Soviet Russia, under the rule of the workers and peasants, will be the wealthiest and happiest, the most powerful, free and enlightened country in the world.

It is against these tremendous achievements of the Soviet Union that the war preparations of the world imperialists are

directed. In the last desperate attempt to buttress the crumbling edifice of capitalism, the imperialists look with greedy eyes on the Soviet Union. A successful war against the Soviet Union, and the exploitation of the vast territory and resources under its control, is the only way out from the dilemma in which world imperialism is now placed. All the plans are prepared. Every week marks the forging of a new link in the chain, and brings nearer the day when the plunge will be made.

The success of the imperialists would not only destroy the vast achievements already accomplished in the building of Socialism in the Soviet State. It would consolidate the forces of fascism and be a great and lasting defeat for the revolutionary workers all over the world.

Only the mass action of the workers of western Europe and America can prevent this attack. On August 1st they will demonstrate everywhere in opposition to imperialism and war and in defence of the Soviet Union. The International Committee of the Friends of the Soviet Union calls upon all friends of Soviet Russia to join in these demonstrations of international solidarity and in defence of the Soviet Union, the first proletarian State. Hands off the Soviet Union!

The International Committee of the FOSR.

FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

Scandinavian-Finnish Anti-Fascist Conference in Stockholm.

Stockholm, July 27, 1930.

On the initiative of the Stockholm Anti-Fascist Committees, the National Committee of the Workers International Relief in Sweden, and of the Central Committee of the Friends of the Soviet Union the Scandinavian-Finnish labour organisations have been invited to an anti-fascist conference to be held in Stockholm on August 10. The appeal calling for participation in the conference states:

"The advance of fascism in White Finland is an alarm-signal for all Scandinavian workers. In White Finland this fascist terror is directed against all revolutionary elements among the workers and small peasants, and in the first place against the Communists. It is intended thereby to break the resisting powers of the workers, to cast the burden of the economic crisis on to their shoulders and to prepare the way in White Finland for the carrying out of its warlike intentions against the Soviet Union, in order to annex Soviet Karelien, which is the dearest wish of the "Great Finns".

"The Scandinavian workers must be on guard and rally for the counter-attack, for the advance of fascism in White Finland also affects them. It is the duty of the workers of Scandinavia to display their complete solidarity with their Finnish class-brothers and to launch a great protest-movement against Finnish fascism and its Scandinavian helpers. There is to be seen already today a great activity among fascist circles in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, which will undoubtedly increase still further. The "liberty-loving" Ekman government has carried out the Finnish orders and expelled Comrade Salo from Sweden.

"It is therefore the duty of all workers to take part in the work of rallying and organising a broad united front against fascism, not only in Finland but in all the Scandinavian countries. Only thus will the workers and peasants succeed in calling a halt and repelling the organisers of fascist terror."

The Conference-Agenda contains two points:

1. The fight against fascism in the Scandinavian countries, before all in White Finland.
2. The imperialist war-danger and the role of Scandinavia and Finland in the Anti-Soviet Front.

The Anti-Fascist Conference in Stockholm on August 10 will without doubt be an extremely important gathering at which representatives of the revolutionary workers and small peasants and also of all anti-fascist elements will work out the directives for the anti-fascist fight in Scandinavia, against the war-preparations of the imperialists and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

FASCISM

Text of the Soviet Note to the Finnish Government.

Helsingfors, 20th July 1930.

The text of the Note handed on behalf of the Soviet government by the Soviet ambassador in Helsingfors, comrade **Maitskij** to the Finnish Foreign Minister **Prokop**, is as follows:

"Recently the Soviet frontier guards observed that Finnish citizens were being systematically and compulsorily driven over the Soviet-Finnish frontier into Soviet territory without the permission of the Soviet authorities.

"There is the case of the Finnish citizen **Isaak Heikka**, the chairman of the Finnish trade union federation. He was arrested by the Finnish police on the 17th June at the station **Julivieska**. On the morning of the 18th June he was carried forcibly over the frontier into Soviet territory through the woods in the **Repola-Tuuliwaara** district.

There is the case of the Finnish member of the Reichstag **Yucho Perala** from **Teuva**. On the morning of the 19th June he was driven into Soviet territory in the same way as the Finnish citizen **Heikka**.

The worker **Aarne Hiltunen** from **Kuopio** was dragged to the frontier on the 17th June and driven into Soviet territory only half clothed.

On the 21st June the Finnish citizens **Josif Korhonen**, **Matwei Ronkonen** and **Thomas Humonen** were also driven over the Soviet frontier. According to their evidence they were escorted to the frontier by 10 armed members of the Finnish Sharpshooters Corps under the leadership of an officer named **Suomis**. The members of the Corps themselves went over the Soviet frontier onto Soviet territory, afterwards returning..

On the 22nd June two deputies of the Finnish Reichstag, the worker **August Maenlya** from **Kokkola**, and the peasant **Kalle Kuhyala** from **Sievi** were also driven across the Soviet frontier.

The Finnish Reichstag's deputies **Emil Tabel** from **Kali** and **Arvo Lechto** from **Helsingfors** who is also the secretary of the Leather and Rubber Workers Union of Finland were driven across the Soviet frontier near **Uchta**.

On the 24th June the two deputies of the Finnish Reichstag **Karl Kichana** and **Yucho Millumaki** both of **Kokkola** were also driven across the Soviet frontier. The latter was arrested in **Kokkola** by a certain **Kalyako** and a policeman named **Oixuso**. At the frontier an officer of the Finnish Sharpshooters Corps informed the Finnish frontier guards of his intended action and afterwards he changed into civilian clothing and accompanied the two over the Soviet frontier.

On the 25th June **Armas Hiltunen** and **Hugo Richard Petikainen** were driven over the Soviet frontier. On the same day **Taipe Olly Raagelsalm** was also driven over the Soviet frontier.

On the 26th June the Finnish Reichstag's deputy **Karl Mirelain** and **Yuri Makela** were driven over the Soviet Frontier.

The cases enumerated above do not represent a complete list of those Finnish citizens who have recently been driven over the frontier into Soviet territory against their will. However, the cases mentioned above are sufficient proof of the fact that recently the deportation of Finnish citizens disliked by certain organisations and the authorities in Finland has become a system. The information in the possession of the Soviet government leaves no doubt that these forcible deportations over the Soviet frontier without the permission of the Soviet authorities have been carried out not only with the toleration, but the direct support of the Finnish authorities and the Finnish Sharpshooters Corps.

The facts mentioned above are not unknown to the Finnish government. Reports concerning the forcible transport of leaders of the Finnish working class movement over the frontier into the Soviet Union have appeared again and again in the Finnish press.

The Soviet government places the fact on record that the Soviet frontier has been systematically violated by Finland

and that armed detachments have actually crossed the Soviet frontier and entered into Soviet territory, thus committing a breach of international law and violating the comity of nations. The Soviet government hereby protests energetically against such happenings.

The Soviet government expects from the Finnish government that it will take effective measures to prevent such violation of the Soviet frontier in the future, and that it will not permit the forcible deportation of Finnish citizens over the Soviet frontier.

The Soviet government expects from the Finnish government that it will take effective measures to inquire into the cases mentioned above and into all cases where the Soviet frontier has been violated, that it will call to account all persons and in particular Finnish officials, guilty of such violations of the Soviet frontier, and that it will give the Soviet government detailed explanations in this matter."

SOCIAL FASCISM

A Social Fascist Attempt to Gag the Vienna "Rote Fahne".

By Guido Zamis (Vienna).

The Vienna "**Rote Fahne**", the organ of the Communist Party of Austria, has of late considerably increased its influence among the working class. In spite of persecution, in spite of constant confiscations, the Communist workers, by persistent and arduous circulation-campaigns, have succeeded in winning **2000 new subscribers** in the last few months and at the same time greatly increasing the street sales. Thus, for instance, in the industrial district of **Traisen** the number of readers of the "**Rote Fahne**" already exceeds that of the social-democratic and bourgeois papers.

These facts serve to explain why the social fascist trade union bureaucracy are now resorting to such measures against the "**Rote Fahne**".

The printers are at present engaged in a conflict over the new collective agreement. The "**Arbeiterzeitung**" (chief organ of social democracy) characterised the attitude of the employers as follows:

"The reason why an agreement has not been arrived at in the printing trade is to be found in the efforts of the employers to check any further advance by the working class and, as far as possible, to do away altogether with the achievements of the working class."

The provocative attitude of the employers in the printing industry forms a part of the general offensive of capital against the Austrian working class. In this the employers of course enjoy the friendly support of the social democratic trade union secretaries. The above-quoted article of the "**Arbeiterzeitung**" states that that part of the demands of the employers which corresponds with the "necessities of the industry" will be discussed. Thus preparations are already being made for an understanding at the cost of the workers.

The revolutionary trade union opposition pointed this out to the workers in several articles in the "**Rote Fahne**". They put forward the following fighting demands: seven-hour day, 20 per cent. wage increase, collective agreement to be concluded for a term of one year subject to a month's notice by either party.

The trade union bureaucracy has replied to these attacks on its treacherous tactics by exerting pressure on the workers in the printing works (a capitalist undertaking) where the "**Rote Fahne**" is printed in order to get them to refuse in future to print articles directed against the tactics of the reformists.

In order the better to prepare for this action and to be able to justify it before the rank of file of the printers, a somewhat similar action was taken against the "**Heimat**", a small fascist weekly paper. Here, however, it was a case of an advertisement for intellectuals who were required to learn to work linotype machines in order to serve as wage-cutters.

Thus the blow was delivered against the "**Rote Fahne**". On the 23rd July a shop stewards' Conference of the Vienna printers was held, at which inciting speeches against the

Communists, the "Rote Fahne" and the revolutionary trade union opposition were delivered. On the evening of the same day the printers engaged in setting the "Rote Fahne" actually refused to set an article on the wage conflicts in the printing trade, which was signed by a member of the trade union.

Thus the social fascist trade union bureaucracy have imposed a preliminary censorship on the "Rote Fahne". This is an important extension of the fascist press law introduced by the Schöber government.

The importance of this social fascist action is enormous. Today it is a case of the bureaucracy of the printers' union; tomorrow it can be the bureaucracy of the building workers' union which places itself under the protection of the social democratic type-setters, following which it will be forbidden to print any attacks whatever on social democracy.

The "Rote Fahne" and the revolutionary opposition of the printing workers organised a protest meeting on the 24th of July, which was very successful, in spite of the fact that the trade union bureaucrats did all they could to prevent the printing of the leaflet announcing the meeting. The leaflet nevertheless appeared.

The fight is not yet over. But one thing is already fairly clear: The action of the social fascists will not achieve its purpose; it will not succeed in checking the growth of the circulation and influence of the "Rote Fahne". It has, however, given the Austrian working class a very plain object lesson in what social fascism really is.

THE WHITE TERROR

The Prison-Hells of Yugoslavia.

A Letter from the Mitrovitzka Prison. — Hunger Strike in the Pozarevatz Prison.

A political prisoner confined in the Mitrovitzka prison in Yugoslavia, has succeeded in smuggling a letter abroad in which he describes the terrible situation of the political prisoners. The letter is as follows:

"I will endeavour to write you a few lines describing our situation here. There are 120 of us Communists here, but we have no privileges whatever; we are treated just like ordinary criminals. In a room measuring 32 metres long and 7 metres wide 70 prisoners are quartered, half of them political prisoners. At first many comrades were frightfully beaten, among others comrade Petrovitch, and many were subjected to disciplinary punishment for their Communist conviction. Comrade Hebrang, for example, was placed in irons because he said, they could murder us but they could not destroy our ideas. We have to work ten hours a day in dirty and unsanitary workshops, although many of us are not used to this work. The food we get here is indescribably bad. Old potatoes, beans and, three times a week, stinking and rotten meat—that is our menu. In addition we receive one and a half pounds of maize bread. The cost of maintenance of a prisoner is reckoned at 4.50 dinars (about fourpence!) a day. We are allowed to have a visit only once a month, and this only lasts ten minutes. We likewise can write only one letter a month, and this only to our nearest relations. The visits and the letters are so strictly censored that it is impossible to inform the outer world regarding our real situation.

We learn nothing of what is going on outside, for we do not get any newspapers and are completely cut off from the world. We are completely in the power of a few warders, who can neither read nor write, and who can report us at any time, following which we receive from the governor of the prison, without his having investigated the matter, the severest disciplinary punishments.

We cannot obtain any Marxist or political book. The whole regime has the sole aim of completely crushing us physically and mentally. We will not capitulate to the terror; we have fought and will continue to fight, but we need the help of you outside. You must write in the papers describing our situation and start a campaign so that we shall be treated as political prisoners.

*

Since the 10th of July all the political prisoners in the "Zabela" penitentiary in Pozarevatz have gone on hunger-strike. They have resorted to this extreme measure as a protest against the ill-treatment of a few comrades and against the withdrawal of the most elementary rights of political prisoners which are even guaranteed by the law.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

Ten Years of the Red International of Labour Unions.

By A. Losovsky.

When in the middle of the year 1920, in the fire of intervention and blockade, the foundations of the Red International of Labour Unions were laid, even among the communists some voices of doubt were to be heard. It was argued, there is still a trade union international which unites 23 million workers; would it not be better not to create our own world organisation of trade unions, in order not to lay ourselves open to the accusation of splitting the workers. But the Comintern and our Party dismissed these objections, which were based on the fear that "something bad might happen", and determinedly pursued the course, through the medium of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, of founding and forming an international revolutionary trade union centre.

The negotiations for the founding of this body commenced upon the initiative of the Comintern already in June 1920. The first negotiations were participated in by the "left" representatives of the English Trades Union Congress, Robert Williams and A. Purcell, who immediately after their departure from the Soviet Union forgot the pledges and promises given by them. After long discussions with the representatives of the Italian Confederation of Labour, D'Aragona, Colombina and others, and with representatives of the Spanish Confederation of Labour, the anarchist Pestanha, an agreement was arrived at on the founding of a provisional International Council of Trade Unions.

The main question in dispute in this period was the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the mutual relations of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. We should not have succeeded at that time in founding the provisional International Council if the Comintern had not intervened and brought pressure to bear on the Italian Socialist Party and if, on the other hand, Lenin had not interested himself in this question and advised that we must in the first place found the Centre, and the exact formulation of the platform of the new international could be undertaken later.

At its inception the R.I.L.U. united only a few organisations (R.S.F.S.R., Italy, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria). During the whole of its ten years existence the R.I.L.U. has fought for the masses, in uninterrupted ideological-political fight against reformism and against the Right and "Left" deviations from the communist policy in the trade unions. In this fight the R.I.L.U. has grown and become the world organisation of the revolutionary trade union movement.

At the time of the founding of the R.I.L.U. the yellow Amsterdam International had more than 23 million members. Now, at their Stockholm Congress, at which the social fascist bureaucrats come forward as open representatives of their governments, they number only 13 million.

In these ten years the R.I.L.U. has developed from an international Propaganda Committee embracing only a few European countries, into a world organisation uniting the revolutionary trade unions and the revolutionary minorities of 55 countries.

The way of the R.I.L.U. is the way of unrelenting fight in every factory, in every work place, not only against capital but also against its agents among the working class. In these years the R.I.L.U. has grown far beyond the frontiers of Europe and, step by step, won the trade unions of new countries where the Labour movement has arisen only in the last few years. At the present time the R.I.L.U. has against the trade unions, minorities or groups in all important parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, North and South America to the not

Australia, while four-fifths of the organisations affiliated to the Amsterdam International are European organisations. The young Labour movement of the colonial and semi-colonial countries turned right from the beginning to the Comintern and to the R.I.L.U., for both organisations have arisen as a result of the victory of the October Revolution and of the militant internationalist initiative of the C.P.S.U.

What has filled the life and work of the R.I.L.U. in the past ten years? What has inspired the work of the supporters of the R.I.L.U. in all parts of the world? The whole work of the sections of the R.I.L.U. and of the R.I.L.U. itself has consisted in the carrying out of communist policy in the trade union movement, in winning the masses for the Communist Party and the Comintern, in spreading the influence of communist ideas to ever fresh sections of the workers. That was the meaning of the founding of the R.I.L.U.; and this work the R.I.L.U. has carried on during the whole ten years of its existence.

On its path of development the R.I.L.U. has encountered great difficulties, not only from the side of organised reformism, the employers' organisations and of the bourgeois state, but also from the side of those immature, backward elements of the Labour movement who were drawn into the R.I.L.U. during the period of the revolutionary wave and afterwards began to turn away from it, and as a justification propounded all sorts of theories regarding the "independence" of the trade unions, "unity under all circumstances", that the trade unions, as super-party organisations, should be based on the policy of compromise between reformism and Communism, etc.

While in the first period the chief danger was the remnants of anarcho-syndicalism, in the next period — to the extent to which the reformist trade unions became auxiliary organs of the bourgeois state and of the employers' organisations — the Right danger became the chief danger, for it sought to convert the united front with the masses into a united front with the leaders; the united front for the fight against the capitalists into a pact of non-aggression between reformists; the united front of the class struggle into the united front of reconciliation with reformism.

The Right danger became particularly conspicuous after the 9th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the IV. R.I.L.U. Congress (March, 1928). At that time the Comintern mobilised all its organisations for the fight against this danger — the advance of the Rights and the Conciliators in the Comintern and in the R.I.L.U. was repelled.

The Rights in the R.I.L.U. reckoned very much on the former right-opportunist leadership of the Central Council of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, some leaders of which, at the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U., formed a united front with the Rights in the C. P. of Germany. But the trade union movement of the Soviet Union did not prove a favourable environment for the growth of right-opportunist tendencies. The right-opportunist leadership was removed from the Soviet trade unions, which meant at the same time a severe blow to all right groupings in the Comintern and in the R.I.L.U.

The decision of the 9th E.C.C.I. Plenum and of the IV. R.I.L.U. Congress has now no longer any open opponent in the R.I.L.U. There are Right tendencies; there is also sabotage of the line of the R.I.L.U. and of the Comintern (this was to be seen in the factory council elections in Germany); but these opportunistic tendencies are subjected to a sharp fire from all sections of the Comintern and of the R.I.L.U. Does this, perchance, mean that the Right deviation is already defeated, that it has already disappeared? No, it still exists, and in many countries even in an organised form (France). It is a great danger, for the essence of the Right deviation is reconciliation with the social democracy under the plea that the social democratic party is also a workers' party and that the social democrats are "misguided brothers".

In the course of the fight waged by the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. for the line of "Class against Class", for the independent leadership of economic struggles, in the fight against the least attempt to find a middle path between Communism and reformism, "Left" sectarian tendencies made their appearance in the R.I.L.U., involving the danger of a rearrangement from the masses. The essence of this "Left" in them consists in lumping together the social fascist leaders with the workers who follow them; in not knowing how to separate the Soviet from not wishing to work — in the reformist trade

unions for the realisation of the united front from below; it consists in employing methods of command and of setting up "Left" slogans (permanent general strike, armed strike, and such like) which merely remain on paper.

Before the R.I.L.U. there now stands the question of the fight on two fronts, the question of the fight for the correct communist policy in the trade union movement, against Right opportunism as the chief danger, and against "Left" sectarianism.

The R.I.L.U. would not have arisen, nor would it have been able to acquire any considerable influence over the masses if it had not received constant ideological, political and organisational aid from the Communist International. This leading role of the Comintern has found expression during the whole of the ten years existence of the R.I.L.U., not only on the occasion of working out the main line of the international revolutionary trade union movement, but also in the practical carrying out of this line. The R.I.L.U. emphasises the leading role of the Comintern not only in its decisions, but this leading role is realised in actual practice in the fights against the enemies of the working class.

The R.I.L.U. unites a great number of various organisations: to it there belong trade union federations as well as minorities, illegal and semi-legal trade unions. But the variety of the forms is no hindrance to the unity of the political line, to the unity of the tactics which are determined in the international revolutionary trade union movement by the role of the Comintern as leader.

From the historical standpoint ten years is but a short time. But for the organisation this time is quite sufficient in order to show in actual fact what it really represents. The R.I.L.U. has shown in practice that it is a world organisation, in spite of the many weaknesses and shortcomings which have existed in its work and which will form the subject of discussion at the V. R.I.L.U. Congress.

The most important of these faults are: the lagging behind the mass movement, and the disproportion between political influence and the organisational consolidation of this influence. But in spite of these faults, in spite of the many failings, in spite of the fact that in a number of countries the followers of the R.I.L.U. have not yet learnt how economic struggles must be conducted, have not yet drawn their conclusions from the collective decisions adopted by the R.I.L.U. Congresses — in spite of all this the R.I.L.U. has accomplished a great work in uniting, rallying and ideologically welding together the forces of the international revolutionary trade union movement.

Lenin foresaw this role when in 1921, in his message of greeting to the first Congress of the R.I.L.U. he wrote:

"It is hard to find words to express the full political importance of the international congress of trade unions. The winning of the members of the trade unions for the idea of Communism is proceeding steadily forward in all countries, in all the world; not evenly, not regularly, but unevenly, overcoming a thousand hindrances, but nevertheless marching steadily forward. The international congress of trade unions accelerates this movement. Communism is gaining the victory in the trade unions. No power in the world will be able to stay the collapse of capitalism and the victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie."

The ten years existence of the R.I.L.U. confirms the correctness of this prediction made by Lenin. The development of the revolutionary trade union movement is proceeding not regularly nor evenly; it is overcoming thousands of difficulties; but it is marching steadily forward, that is the chief thing. Therefore, the proletariat of the Soviet Union, engaged in the task of building up Socialism in the land of the proletarian dictatorship, in sending its greetings to all revolutionary workers fighting in the ranks of the R.I.L.U., expresses the firm conviction that, in the approaching hard political and economic struggles in the capitalist and colonial countries, the R.I.L.U. and its sections will know how to lead the masses under the flag of the Comintern in the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the victory of Communism in the whole world.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

From the Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. G., on the Report of Comrade Thälmann.

We publish below the IV. (inner-Party) section of the resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Germany which bears the title: "Successes and Shortcomings of our Work and our Tasks".

The increasing radicalisation process of the toiling masses and of the working class resulted in a big increase of sympathy for the revolutionary class struggle and a visible new orientation of broad sections of workers in the great success of the revolutionary 1st of May demonstrations, which in all big towns and in the industrial centres surpassed by far the demonstrations of the social democrats and of the reformist trade unions. The Youth Day in Leipzig showed, compared with the previous Youth Days, that the Young Communist League of Germany had succeeded for the first time, in some districts in mobilising the young workers beyond the limits of the League. The Rally of the Red Sport Opposition in Erfurt was proof of the advance of the revolutionary movement in the workers' sport movement. The mass demonstration on the anniversary of the prohibition of the Red Front Fighters' League showed the palpable growth of the revolutionary defence idea within the working class. The visible progress of the Red Trade Union Opposition and the more active participation of the workers in the factories in the meetings against the employers' offensive, the animation of the unemployed movement, the consolidation of the red class front of the factory workers and unemployed, the lively response to the decisions of the Pol-Bureau regarding the struggle against fascism and the active acceptance of the Party's slogan to establish red factory defence groups, likewise confirm the correctness of the general line of the Party.

At the same time however a number of serious shortcomings, mistakes, weaknesses and resistance to the Party line must be recorded the most ruthless and energetic combating of which are necessary in the interest of the Party and of the revolutionary class struggle. Up to now the mobilisation and the organisation of the resistance to the starvation offensive of the bourgeoisie and to the wage-cutting offensive of the employers have sharply revealed, just as the factory elections, both the strong as well as the weak sides of our mass work. Everywhere where the Party and the R. T. U. O. determinedly and decidedly prepared the workers and mobilised them for resistance against the wage cutting offensive, it was possible to launch broad mass struggles (Mansfeld) and partly to oppose the offensive of the employers who are in alliance with the capitalist State Power and the treacherous trade union bureaucracy (Ruhr district, Lower Rhine). Everywhere where the Party line was distorted by opportunism — and in particular by opportunism in practice which is the main danger, but also by Left sectarianism, there was an abandonment of the mass struggle, which enabled the bourgeoisie, supported by national and social fascists, to realise their robber plans. The chief shortcomings and weaknesses, the errors and resistance were indicated by the following:

a) Neglect of revolutionary fraction work of the R. T. U. O., that means abandonment of the struggle against the social fascist policy in the trade unions, which in many cases means abandonment of the ideological and organisational work in the trade unions altogether. In most of the trade unions we notice an obvious neglect, sometimes even an open renouncement of ideological propaganda among the trade-union organised workers for the revolutionary class struggle. This mistake in our Party work and in the work of the R. T. U. O. facilitates the social fascist trade union bureaucrats in betraying the working class. Such a neglect of trade union work was revealed particularly in the almost complete failure of the R. T. U. O. to prepare and to influence the federation congresses of a number of important trade unions which have taken place this year.

The inadequate mobilisation of the working masses against the wage-cut offensive of the employers, the far-reaching

possibility of the reformist and christian trade union bureaucrats to sabotage the wage struggles and actively to support the bourgeoisie in its starvation offensive were the result of the lack of revolutionary fraction work on the part of the R. T. U. O. in the trade unions. It is one of the most important tasks confronting the Party to undertake the complete and comprehensive mobilisation of the Party for the removal and overcoming of these shortcomings and weaknesses of the Party. The neglect of work on the inner-trade union front by the adherents of the R. T. U. O. arises from the underestimation of the role played by the trade unions in spite of their treacherous leaders. These leaders can still, without encountering great resistance in the trade unions, take it upon themselves to fix wage and working conditions for millions of workers and conclude tariff agreements without even consulting the working men and women in the factories themselves. This monopoly of the trade unions must be broken by the R. T. U. O. making the conclusion of tariff agreements dependent upon the will and the approval of the organised and unorganised workers themselves. The factory workers whose wage and working conditions are laid down in the tariff agreements, have to decide on these conditions and on their acceptance or rejection by their leaders of the German General Federation of Trade Unions and of the Christian trade unions.

b) In the opportunist attitude extending into the ranks of our Party and of the R. T. U. O., paying homage to the lying social fascist ideology according to which "wage and labour struggles cannot be conducted in this period of crisis", as well as in the passive waiting for the wage cutting measures of the employers. This defeatist ideology resulted in a considerable retardation of the defensive and counter offensive of the proletariat. Simultaneously it was revealed that the process of radicalisation and the readiness of the workers to fight was much more advanced in the non-Party masses than in some backward sections of our Party membership, of our Party cadres and even of the R. T. U. O. The lack of faith in the fighting power and the fighting will of the proletariat is in the present period of the crisis of the capitalist system one of the most fatal mistakes and must be energetically combated.

c) The indubitable adherence of the million masses of the unemployed, the recognition of our slogans in the struggle for the interests of the unemployed, the active solidarity of the unemployed (even under the threat of loss of unemployment benefit) with the striking workers (Mansfeld, North West), the successful repulse of the reinforced attempts of the social fascists and fascists to penetrate the unemployed movement, are proof of the fact that the policy of the Party and of the R. T. U. O. in this sphere is correct and that the work among the masses of the unemployed is active and successful.

The Party and the R. T. U. O. have, however, not yet succeeded in organising and linking up the factory and trade union work of the Party and of the R. T. U. O. in the common interests of the factory workers and of the unemployed, as is necessary in order to launch the broadest mass actions.

The R. T. U. O. and the Party can organise and carry out the defence and the counter-offensive of the proletariat against the advance of the united front of the exploiters, the State and the treacherous trade union bureaucracy only consolidating and extending the united front of all workers, no matter whether they are organised or unorganised, non-Party or social democratic, christian or Hirsch-Duncker. This enhanced method of our united front policy requires an intensification of our fundamental policy against all class enemies.

d) After the factory council elections there were in some districts some good beginnings at realising the decisions of the C. C. and of the R. T. U. O. in regard to **gathering together and training the factory councils**. But precisely in connection with the struggles over wages and working conditions it was revealed that in this sphere very little has been done — in some districts nothing at all. The decisions of the Pol-Bureau in this respect must again be brought to mind.

The same applies to the establishment, the extension and the renewal, which is necessary in every movement, of the revolutionary functionary system in the factories.

The inadequate mobilisation of the workers against the starvation offensive of the capitalists is mainly due to the insufficient political activity of the factory nuclei to the net

sufficiently energetic mobilisation of the workers against dismissals and short time work, wage cuts etc., to the lack of connection between the nuclei and the red factory councils and the inadequately developed self-initiative of the red factory councils. In the first place the factory nucleus of the Party is responsible for the shortcomings, faults and weaknesses of the red factory councils and the work of the revolutionary shop stewards, and the development of the resistance and of the fighting will of the workers depends to a great extent upon the initiative, activity and the control of work in the factory nucleus.

e) The struggle of the Party against fascism and the capitalist State apparatus by the bourgeois parties and the social fascists as well as the struggle against the growing fascist movement was not sufficiently regarded as a central task of the Party and work in this sphere was completely neglected in some districts. The Central Committee makes it incumbent upon the whole Party to remedy this shortcoming in the shortest possible time. The resolution of the Pol-Bureau of July 4th, 1930, on the political and defensive mass struggle against fascism lays down the tasks in this respect. The greatest importance must be attached to the ideological fight against fascist ideology and the demagogic phrase-mongering of the national socialists. In the factories and at the labour exchanges the broadest basis for struggle and counter measures against fascist terror (terror in the streets, in meetings, black-legs of the national socialist party) must be created. The formation of red factory defence groups on the basis of the united front from below, with the inclusion of the organised and unorganised, non-party, social democratic and christian workers and the unemployed from the Labour Exchanges, is one of the most important tasks as prerequisite for the broadest mass mobilisation and mass advance of the working class against the fascist danger. The energetic and offensive struggle against fascism must not lead to the struggle against social fascism and against the social fascist trade union bureaucracy being neglected or restricted, but we must apply the various forms of our ideological-political and organisational methods to win away the proletarian followers from fascism and social fascism. New methods of agitation, based upon facts and good material, must be applied in the localities and districts.

f) In the fulfilment of important tasks and in the carrying out of important actions of the Party (elections in Saxony, struggle against fascism, repulse of and offensive against the starvation offensive etc.) there were revealed palpable symptoms of a lack of self-confidence, lack of a real revolutionary and offensive elan, and instead, passive attitude to the terrorist measures of the State power and the enemy front.

g) The tasks set by the C.C. to the Party districts and local branches are not brought to the members with sufficient initiative and persistence and in some cases do not get farther than the upper and middle apparatus of functionaries in the districts. The whole Party membership and the transmissions to the mass of the proletariat (mass organisations, R.T.U.O., fractions in the trade unions, and other organisations etc.) react but badly, sometimes not at all to the problems and tasks set by the C.C. In this connection there was revealed a considerable lack of leading self-initiative and setting of tasks on the part of the district and branch committees. This failing is particularly obvious in the work of the factory nuclei, the red factory councils and in the factory work general.

h) The contents and the extent of the tasks set by the district committees and the Party press, the language of the Party and of the Party press in no way correspond to the critical economic and political situation in Germany and the revolutionary shattering of the capitalist system connected with it, nor to the general radicalisation process and the revolutionary upsurge of the working class. Before all there is lacking the revolutionary consciousness of strength and revolutionary optimism which are the preconditions for drawing the radicalised masses into the revolutionary class front! In the economic and political fights is lacking a thorough utilisation of the facts of the gigantic socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which should be presented in a manner rendering them understandable by every worker and toiler and clearly showing the way out of the capitalist crisis. There is also lacking the daily agitation and propaganda, in a manner understandable by the masses, for the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only escape from

the general crisis of capitalism. In removing these failures the Party organs must not make the mistake replacing revolutionary language and enthusiasm by hollow boasting language, phrases and petty-bourgeois pathos, as these have nothing to do with the real revolutionary language of the masses.

One of the greatest shortcomings is the weak organisational connection of the Party organs with the radicalised working masses. This applies before all to the daily petty work in the factories, in the trade unions, among the unemployed and in the work of the R.T.U.O. Considerable deviations from the general line of the Party (underestimation of the role of the Party, rejection or non-carrying out of the united front tactic, neglect of the organisational tasks, retreat before reformism, anti-trade union moods, self-satisfied sectarian seclusion etc.), in particular in the trade union work and in the close connection of the unemployed with the factory workers are due to this weak organisational work. The extension, the securing and the systematic control of adequate organisational work in the district committees and local branches is one of the most important tasks confronting the Party.

i) In the sphere of the development of new Party cadres and the attraction of unused labour forces to the functions of the Party, progress has been made in a number of districts. This was before all the case in the struggle against the Right liquidators, against opportunism in practice and on the occasion of the campaign of the Party for the factory council elections, the organisation of the R.T.U.O. and on other occasions. But the process of the development of new Party cadres is much too slow. Most of the Party organisations have not yet understood, particularly in the present economic struggles and in connection with the radicalisation process of the proletariat, how to draw the most active forces of the working class into the decisive old and new functions of the Party. This slow development of the Party cadres is one of the main reasons why, in the present struggles of the proletariat, the Party cadre of functionaries and of the Party organisations lag behind the development and the radicalisation process of the working class and why sometimes a considerable loss of time is to be noticed. The district committees are in duty bound to combat this shortcoming in the organisations and to see to its immediate removal.

The educational work of the Party stands in close connection with the training and extension of the Party cadres, which must be carried out under all circumstances. Whilst in this sphere good work can be recorded on a central scale, the educational work in the districts, and still more in the local branches and nuclei, is at a complete standstill. The revolutionary education work of the Communists must be mass work for Socialism, and the task must consist not merely in training some functionaries or specialists, but a broad strata of revolutionary functionaries must be trained for the whole mass work of the Party, of the R.T.U.O. and of the mass organisations within and without the Party among the proletarian masses.

j) One of the weakest points in our whole revolutionary work is real Bolshevik self-criticism, which must be exercised much more than hitherto openly in the press and in meetings, in the factory papers and in the oppositional trade union press, as a stimulus to the self-initiative of the masses for the removal of the existing weaknesses and shortcomings, thereby making the Party political problems the affair of the whole proletariat, the great revolutionary significance of which is not sufficiently realised in the Party. The Polbureau of the Central Committee has quite correctly recorded, in the resolution on the results of the factory council elections, the inadequate development of self-criticism. The Polbureau of the Comintern, in the "Resolution on the factory council elections in Germany", likewise criticised the fact that in the German Party in many districts self-criticism is not at all developed (district committees, Party press), and in the remaining districts only very weakly. These shortcomings of self-criticism were in particular revealed in the carrying out of the factory council elections, where the district committees, and still more the daily newspapers, frequently did not at all adopt a self-critical attitude to the mistakes, failures or even defeats. The R.T.U.O. and the red factory councils must, before the whole of the workers, in the factory papers etc. and in particular there where defeats occurred (such as

in Berlin in the tramcar, omnibus and underground depots, Leuna works, Opel, Bochum Union, Siemens A. G.), expose the faulty activity of the red factory councils in all publicity and conduct the strongest ideological struggle against opportunism, which is the main cause of the defeat. This applies still more to the mobilisation of the workers for struggles over wages and working conditions, to the work of the R. T. U. O. and the trade union fractions in the reformist trade unions, to the mobilisation of the working masses against fascism and the fascist organisations. The Party has not yet grasped the effect of revolutionary self-criticism, which is one of the strongest weapons of the Communist Party.

This shortcoming is particularly to be seen in the Party press, the editors of which do not pay any heed to this task. In particular there is revealed in this connection the inadequate connection of the district committees and the editors of the Party press with the factory nuclei, and the almost complete lack of a well-developed workers correspondents movement, extending far beyond the Party membership, which constitutes a decisive factor in the sphere of open self-criticism. The district committees and the editors of the Party press are bound to remove this shortcoming as quickly as possible.

k) Our membership roll and the number of subscribers are in glaring contradiction to the radicalisation process and the permanent growth of our influence among the workers. Therein are revealed strong tendencies to sectarian seclusion and self-satisfaction on the part of numerous middle and lower Party organs and Party organisations. The great fluctuation in members and subscribers is also due to this neglectful treatment of the question. Our organisational basis is in part too weakly consolidated, so that the newly won members soon fall away owing to the inadequate organisational hold. Still greater is the evil — quite inadmissible for a revolutionary Party — that in many nuclei and local branches newly won members are not sufficiently trained or not sufficiently (sometimes not at all) drawn into Party work, and hence are not considered as equal and valuable collaborators and class fighters.

From this weak development of our membership and the number of our subscribers there result most of the shortcomings, weaknesses and mistakes of our Party, as in the narrow Party basis lies the cause of the yielding to the social fascist ideology, the pessimistic attitude and defeatist tendencies, and in particular the reason of the opportunist and also sectarian vacillations. The Party organisations must devote chief attention to removing and overcoming these great weaknesses of the Party.

l) Extremely feebly developed is the work among the employees and civil servants. The embitterment of the employees and civil servants caused by the dismissals, by the worsening of the conditions of work and pay, by the "emergency sacrifice" and the head tax, as well by the political disenfranchisement (prohibition of membership of the C. P. of Germany) renders it much more possible than hitherto to develop agitation among these strata (Public meetings, increase of our influence upon the organisations of employees and civil servants, delegate conferences of civil servants and employees, connection of the struggles of the workers with those of the civil servants and employees).

m) The middle class (artisans, shop-keepers, traders, free professions etc.) which is greatly affected by the starvation, taxation and suppression offensive of the bourgeoisie, is proceeding to a determined political regrouping and new orientation. The Party has up to now not succeeded in winning over the million masses of these victims of monopoly capitalism, of the Young exploitation and of the crisis for the struggle against robber-finance capital to the side of the revolutionary fighting proletariat. For this reason these million masses of the middle class are for the greater part falling victims to the nationalist and social demagoguery of fascism. The Party is in duty bound to gather under the proletarian hegemony these masses of toilers, whose vital interests are closely connected with the successes and defeats of the revolutionary class struggle. The outcome of the decisive struggles of the proletariat will be also determined by the successful fulfilment of this task.

n) Equally necessary as the winning of the city middle class for active participation (or at least its neutralisation) in the great encounters between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie

is work among the small and middle peasantry. The Young slavery and the capitalist crisis are threatening the toiling peasantry no less than the suffering middle class. In addition, the intensification of the agrarian crisis is a particular burden on the toiling peasants. If fascism, and in particular the Stahlhelm, have succeeded in gaining a prominent influence upon the village, this is mainly due to the great neglect of our rural propaganda and work among the peasants. The district committees and the local branches are in duty bound, in connection with the economic struggles, with the mobilisation of the masses for the 1st of August, and on all other occasions, to win the toiling peasantry for an alliance with the proletariat against capitalist plundering. The agricultural working men and women, who are driven ever deeper into social misery, must be won by special methods of propaganda and organisation. Our work and propaganda among them must be different from that among the poor strata of peasants.

o) In regard to the mobilisation and drawing in of the working women into the revolutionary class front, the Party line has undoubtedly to record a number of successes. The active participation of women in the strike movement in Mansfeld, the participation of working women in the revolutionary factory and trade union work prove that we are making headway in this sphere. But this fact does not find expression in the permeation of our functionary cadres by working women and in drawing working women into the leading positions of the Party. In this respect there still exists in the Party a strong petty-bourgeois tendency, in that the view is held that women are not able to cope with important political work as effectively as men. Such tendencies are unworthy of the Communist Party and must be energetically combated and overcome.

p) Also in the sphere of winning the young workers for the red class front and their organisation in the Y. C. L. of Germany, and also in the mobilisation of the young workers both for their participation in the struggles of the adult, as well as for independent struggles of the youths, such as youth strikes etc. the Y. C. L. G. has considerable successes to record. This also applies to the increase of membership of the League and the attraction of new strata of young workers in some districts. But the work of the Y. C. L. as a whole and in the majority of districts is still unsatisfactory and is not in keeping with the great radicalisation process observable in particular among the young workers. Before all, the inadequate factory and trade union work of the Y. C. L. G. is characterised by "Left" isolation from the decisive strata of the young proletarians. Also, judging by the fact that we have succeeded in attracting broad strata of workers' sport movement, in which the young workers are particularly prominent, the growth of the Y. C. L. lags far behind the favourable objective conditions. In many districts and local branches of the League there are strikingly revealed the faults and failings in regard to the sectarian seclusion of the League, which were strongly condemned by the Plenum and Presidium of the Y. C. I. and which the Y. C. L. has up to now not been able to remove.

The greatest weakness of the youth work lies in the fact of the strong decline in the work among the children, one can even say the complete failure of the League to organise the young pioneers and the complete failure of the Party to support the League in this serious and important task.

Whilst the C. C. of the Party has established satisfactory relations of collaboration by means of closer connection with the League leadership, the district committees, the committees of the local branches and of the nuclei lag far behind in the solution of this task. The Party organisations restrict themselves in most cases to a mere formal mutual delegation, without placing the problems and tasks of the League as official Party work into the centre of the deliberations and decisions of the district committees, the committees of the local branches and nuclei. Such a formal treatment of the League questions on the part of the Party is inadmissible and must be replaced by greater initiative in setting up the tasks within the Party organisations.

The Main Tasks of the Party.

The above mentioned weaknesses in Party work render it necessary in connection with the measures necessary to overcome them that the Party exert the greatest efforts in order

to solve the following main tasks of Party work in the present situation:

1. Clear elaboration of the role of the Party as the **only anti-fascist Party** and leader of the masses which alone is capable of showing the revolutionary way out of the capitalist crisis. Broadest mobilisation of the masses for the anti-war demonstration on August 1st.

2. Intensification of our **struggle against fascism and social fascism** by strengthening our ideological work for separating the **proletarian adherents** from these parties and winning them for the revolutionary class front. Intensified organisational anchoring of our policy on all mass fronts.

3. Strongest offensive and **extra-Parliamentary mass struggle of all toilers** against the starvation, customs, and tax offensive and the reactionary repressive measures of the capitalist State apparatus (national and provincial governments and other State organs).

4. Energetic and systematic preparation, launching and leadership of **economic struggles**; firm alliance of the factory workers with the workless; higher development of the tasks of the R. T. U. O. as the independent leadership of the masses within and without the trade unions. Energetic preparation of the setting of the problems and tasks of the V. Congress of the R. I. L. U.

5. Determined turn and development of our mass work among the **working women and young workers**; increased attention to and improved work for the children's movement.

6. Special methods for winning the employees and lower civil servants. Emphatic strengthening of our political work among the city middle strata, the toiling **peasants** and in particular special work for winning the **agricultural workers**.

7. Systematic recruiting and winning of **new members of Party and readers of our press**, renewal and improvement of our Party cadres, stronger attraction of new proletarian elements, raising of the level of political work and systematic extension of the **factory nuclei**, improvement of the control work of all other Party organs. Greater development of political life in the whole of the Party and in the R. T. U. O. Greater collective work in all Party organs and promotion of inner-Party democracy.

Second Plenary Session of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 24th July 1930.

The second plenary Session of the Moscow committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has just ended. Commenting on the work of the session the "**Pravda**" points out that it dealt with a series of important questions in connection with the carrying out in the Moscow district of the decisions of the XVI. congress of the party. The plan of work for the district for the next two months was confirmed and various decisions taken with regard to the carrying out of the building programme of the Moscow district, the harvest campaign, the autumn sowings, the grain purchase campaign and the re-organisation of the district.

A great part of the industry of the Soviet Union is within the territory of the Moscow district and the building programme is very great. A series of great engineering undertakings are in course of building and they will prove a great incentive to socialism when they are completed. Further, the decisions of the XVI. Congress concerning the development of the manufacturing industries, the extension of the area under cotton and maize, the forced development of vegetable productions etc., are all of great importance for the Moscow district.

The plenary session declared that the building plan must be carried through under all circumstances despite its wide-scale nature. The carrying out of the programme would mean a great advance for socialism and any delay would affect the whole industrial programme. However, the industrial and financial tasks should not therefore be neglected. At the same time the quality of production, and the real wages of the workers should be raised and the costs of production reduced.

The session also paid particular attention to the agricultural question and to the scheme for developing the Moscow district and all other districts which are not agriculturally self-supporting into centres for the production of vegetables and of flax and for cattle-breeding.

The session called for a continuation of the struggle on two fronts against left-wing sectarianism, and in particular against right-wing opportunism as the chief danger, including bureaucracy. Above all rigorous bolshevist self-criticism was necessary.

Greetings from the E. C. C. I. to Comrade Stutchka.

On the Occasion of his 65th Birthday.

Moscow, July 27. 1930.

The E. C. C. I. has sent the following greetings to Comrade Stutchka:

"On the occasion of your 65th birthday the E. C. C. I. sends you its warmest greetings as leader and veteran of the Latvian Labour movement, as one of Lenin's fellow-fighters and as one of the most prominent creators and leaders of the Communist Party of Latvia.

Your services to the Latvian proletariat, to whom you gave the translation of "Capital" in the Latvian language, are of the greatest merit. Your labours in the sphere of jurisprudence and science of State form a valuable part of Marxist-Leninist world literature.

For about four decades you have stood uninterruptedly in the front ranks of the fight for the emancipation of the working class under the illustrious banner of the Party of the Bolsheviks. You present a magnificent example of bolshevist steadfastness of principle and of devotion to the cause of the international proletarian revolution.

The E. C. C. I. expresses the warmest wish that you may still for many years to come fight and work in the ranks of the famous cohorts of the bolsheviks.

*

Comrade Stutchka received messages of greeting and telegrams from numerous organisations in the Soviet Union, including the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., the editorial staff of the "Pravda", the Society of Old Bolsheviks etc.

*

Comrade Stutchka's Career.

Comrade Stutchka was born in 1865 in Latvia and was of peasant extraction. He attended the University of Petersburg, and from 1888 to 1897 was editor of the newspaper "Dienas Lapa" in Riga, which was the rallying point for all marxist and revolutionary elements in Latvia. In 1897 the newspaper was prohibited and comrade Stutchka was arrested. In 1899 he was condemned to 5 years banishment in Siberia. Afterwards he worked in the Vitesk organisation of the Social Democratic Party and was a delegate at all the congresses of the Lettish party. In 1906 he was again at work in Riga where he sought to combat the influence of the mensheviks and the anarchists. A year afterwards he returned to Petersburg, where he worked on the party press writing in particular on the nationality and agricultural problems. Stutchka translated "Das Kapital" into Lettish.

After the February revolution he was a member of the Bolshevik fraction in the Petrograd Soviet, and following the November revolution he became People's Commissar for Justice. In 1919 he was chairman of the Latvian Council of People's Commissars and remained at his post until the revolution was overthrown, when he succeeded in escaping to Soviet Russia. Comrade Stutchka is at present the president of the Supreme Court of the R. S. F. S. R.

XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Organisational Report of the Central Committee.

By L. M. Kaganovitch.

Text of Speech Delivered at the XVI. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

(Conclusion.)

d) Self-Criticism as Weapon in the Struggle against Bureaucracy and the Violation of Inner Party Democracy.

The development of self-criticism played an important part in the purging of our ranks from all rotten, bureaucratic, and disruptive elements. The period under report is characterised especially by the powerful wave of the development of self-criticism. Self-criticism has been directed in particular against the elements of disintegration and bureaucracy. Self-criticism has been employed against the faults of practical work, against opportunism and revisionism in the ranks of the Party. There is no other Party in the world which allows itself such a decided and public criticism of its own shortcomings, as our Party has done and continues to do. I may say that here our press has played an important historical rôle. It has not merely referred to faults apparent in any case. Our press has been a leading factor in revealing the shortcomings and deficiencies of our practical work. Whenever such deficiencies have been exposed, the C.C. has taught the masses of the Party and the non-partisans, has taught the cadres, to fight relentlessly against the elements of disruption and bureaucracy, and has called upon the masses to take part in the systematic and determined struggle for the furtherance of self-criticism from below.

The C.C. has carried its appeal for self-criticism consistently into every department of life. In the appeal we read:

"We will put an end to the practice of regarding membership of the Party as an extenuating circumstance in the case of punishable offences, and will carry out Lenin's old thesis on stricter measures against Party members, declaring it to be a crime against the Party to hide the guilt of any Party member, however high his position in the Party may be."

This referred to a number of high functionaries, and to a number of large organisations.

The self-criticism developing from below, under the leadership of the Party, has greatly contributed to enabling the whole apparatus of the proletarian dictatorship to adapt itself to carrying out the work and tasks of the reconstruction period.

The preliminary results of self-criticism already suffice to show that an extensive process of purging and purification has been performed in many organisations, a process calculated to advance not only the Party, but at the same time the economic, Soviet, and social work in town and country.

Self-criticism has increased the activity of the masses in their struggle against the class enemy to a gigantic extent. The data issued by the People's Commissariat for the Worker's and Peasants' inspection show that more than 50,000 persons have already been sifted out of the State apparatus.

It would however be a grave error for us to be satisfied with the positive results which we are able to record. Above all, we must admit a lagging behind in the realisation of the suggestions made by the workers, and of their practical proposals. This is one of the weakest spots in the development of self-criticism. In some of the works and factories we sometimes see our self-criticism running without load. The workers criticise, but the realisation of their suggestions and ideas is very inadequate. The practical carrying out of the suggestions and proposals of the working and Party masses—this is at the present moment of paramount importance in order to ensure further success in the development of self-criticism. The C.C. has not fought only against the openly festering spots, but has at the same time carried on energetic work against those elements causing these sores to form.

During the period of this report, a number of people were removed from their posts by the Central Committee and the local organisations. In various organisations about 1000 persons were dismissed for bureaucracy, for suppressing self-criticism, for violating inner Party democracy, for inadmissible attitude towards the masses, etc. A large number of persons gave up Party

work, as they were not able to cope with the new tasks. When we speak of such conditions as have occurred in Smolensk, in Astrachan, in Artemov, very often only the crassest facts of disruption and decay are referred to. The C.C., after making a thorough analysis of the causes of the these occurrences, has however drawn the attention of the Party organisations to the fact that these sores and eruption are already to be regarded as consequences, and that their causes lie mainly in the separation from the masses, in the suppression of self-criticism, in the low cultural level of the leading cadres, in the application of violence by alien elements, in the weak participation of the workers, in nepotism, etc.

And apart from these crass consequences, comrades, apart from these sores, this disruption, and these deficiencies in work, we find these same faults to a greater or lesser degree, in this or that form, in some of our other Party organisations, and these are not by any means bad organisations, but such as work very well on the whole, as is so often said.

Hence it is our task to expose these faults as speedily as possible, before they lead to decay, that we may nip them in the bud. On no account must we permit the self-satisfaction so often observed to take root amongst us. In the course of our daily work we must fight against every fault existing in the ranks of our Party organisations. That everything is quiet is no proof that everything is in order. We have a number of organisations in which seats of decay have been able to form because the leaders made up their minds to have no disagreements, but to make smooth working possible. It is of course very desirable that we all live in peace, but this attitude has resulted in suppression and nepotism. This nepotism has at times assumed forms violating inner Party democracy, and representing the Right deviation in actual practice. Let us take the Orjol affair for instance, where the worker members of the bureau of the town committee of the Party were arrested on the instigation of the secretary of the district committee, Drobenin: accusations were made against them, and they were arrested, solely because they criticised the district committee of the Party. What did the C.C. and the C.C.C. do in this case? The C.C. and the C.C.C. not only expelled the secretary of the district committee, Drobenin; the C.C. dissolved at the same time the bureau of the district committee, and ruled that the members of this bureau might not take any leading Party office for two years. Why? Because the ruling order must be such that the whole bureau, with the secretary, is responsible for the organisation, for the whole of the work: if the bureau sees faults, it must expose them with Bolshevik determination. This one example suffices to show that the C.C. has placed itself at the head of the mass wave of self-criticism, and has resolutely exposed and overcome both the suppression of self-criticism and the excesses of self-criticism, thereby leading the way for the masses and the cadres in the struggle against the elements of bureaucracy and opportunism.

The C.C. combating the artificial "coining", has inexorably swept aside the real bearers of opportunism, of bureaucracy, disruption, etc.

Who ventures to affirm, in the face of all these facts, that Bukharin was right in his slanderous statement that the Party is rearing bureaucracy?

The Right have suffered defeat, a severe defeat. They have suffered defeat for the reason that our self-criticism and our inner Party democracy have proved powerful levers, consolidating the Party firmly, and giving it the opportunity of striking a final blow at the Right opportunists. (Applause.)

Self-Criticism and Inner Party Democracy in the Struggle against Opportunism and for the General line of the Party.

The C.C. and the Party have mobilised the masses, on the basis of developed self-criticism, in the struggle against opportunism in theory and practice. The result of the exposure and

unmasking of a number of facts relating to Right opportunist practice has been the strengthening of the wave of criticism arising from below, and the development of the struggle against every form taken by opportunism in actual practice.

Self-criticism has dealt a cruel blow at the degenerated opportunism of actual practice. The events in Smolensk and Astrachan are not characterised solely by the existence there of disruptive elements, but by fact that this disintegration was connected with a class degeneration. This has been the condition of affairs in the Smolensk, Astrachan, and other organisations.

We have heard utterances characteristic of the Right deviations, in actual practice, among people whose ideology has not been Right. The C.C. has corrected these, the C.C. has improved their work. But when no result followed these corrections, the C.C. raised the question of removing these persons from their work, and during the period of this report a number of such functionaries were relieved of their posts. With respect to the "Left" exaggerators, in actual practice the overwhelming majority of these are people (with the exception of a small group of semi-Trotskyists) who are sincerely anxious to follow the general line of the Party. The great majority of them are not deviators with a fraction of their own, and deliberately combating the C.C. and its line.

We have corrected them, in ideology and in organisation, and shall continue to instruct them. There have been some such "Left" exaggerators who have clung to their errors, have not acknowledged these, and have refused to correct them. The C.C. has been obliged to raise the question of removing these members from their posts. And not only the C.C., but the local organisations, have dismissed from their functions their regional and district secretaries, when the latter have resisted the correction of their errors.

The light which has been thrown on the decisive struggle of the C.C. against opportunism, and against the suppression of criticism, has shown very clearly the calumny and falseness of the assertion of the Trotskyist and Rights regarding a regime of pressure in the Party.

Yes, we know that the lovers of oppositional criticism do not like our self-criticism or inner Party democracy. They state that "we cannot make sufficient use of either democracy or self-criticism", for the reason that democracy itself and self-criticism as such are used for the determined and immediate overcoming of any desired shade of opinion. In accordance with this (with the overcoming of any desired shade) the cadres of the Party functionaries too are selected. All this greatly increases the difficulty of "treating the questions properly".

They demand freedom for shades of opinion, a freedom of criticism such as that referred to by Lenin in his polemics against the Mensheviks. It is characteristic that the lovers of such criticism generally declare that the activity of the masses does not direct itself to the discussion of fundamental political questions, nor to dealing with the questions of inner Party life. But is it their fate that they invariably feel on their own backs the blows of precisely that political criticism on the part of the masses gathering around their C.C. in the struggle against the "Left" and Right sectarians.

This was especially the case during the period under report, when we concluded the struggle against Trotskyism by completely crushing it, and when the Right attempted to occupy the place vacated by Trotskyism and to attack the C.C. and its line, and when finally relapses into the Left deviation occurred in the question of inner Party life, and in the collectivisation question. The correction accomplished in the question of the collectivisation exaggerations proved the extraordinary authority and power of the C.C., the maturity of our Party, the maturity of its cadres, even of the considerable part of those cadres which committed errors in the collectivisation question, but which speedily recognised these errors and changed front "on the march". Not only the Party, but the broad proletarian masses, united on the basis of the carrying out of the general line of our Party, and this in spite of the difficulties of socialist reconstruction, the difficulties in supplies, etc. The organised ranks of the working class in the trade unions and in the youth leagues have shown that they will permit no attempt to be made to deviate these organisations from the path of Leninism. The trade unions have been successful in overcoming the turbid Right narrow trade unionist tendency striving to oppose the trade unions to the Party, and the Y.C.L. has proved a trustworthy aid to our Party in the struggle against both the Right deviation and against relapses into the "Left" deviation occurring under the special circumstan-

ces of the youth league. Of course in our Party too there are passive elements, stagnant elements, conciliatory elements, upon which the Right deviators reckon as their main reserves. The struggle against these elements is an essentially important task.

The fight on two fronts, the fight for the line of the Party and the C.C., found expression once more on the eve of the XVI. Party Congress. We witnessed attempts to attack the C.C. of our Party in a number of towns in the lower organisations. This was the case in Moscow, in Kharkov, in Leningrad, and in other places. Some of these attempts were open, some concealed. Here it is characteristic that it was difficult to differentiate the Trotskyists from the Right opportunists. Here we had a "unification of souls" on the basis of hand-in-hand work among the Trotskyists and the Right deviators.

Their tactics have been extremely interesting. As soon as one of them notices, when speaking publicly, that he meets no sympathy of any kind in the nucleus — and this has been the case everywhere — he begins immediately to draw the mask over his face, to declare that he has been mistaken, has not formulated his ideas correctly, and the like. And of course there are a few confused heads who do not come forward against the line of the C.C., but have been brought into a state of confusion by some of the difficulties of the collectivisation movement. We cannot however, close our eyes to the fact that the Trotskyists and the Right deviators tried to take revenge before the XVI. Party Congress. It is true that these were only lamentable attempts.

It is needful to exercise the utmost care with regard to those who "change colour", and to be extremely cautious in contact with those who come forward and declare that they see their errors. There are people who declare that they recognise their errors, but attack the C.C. at the first opportunity. At the present time we must be especially careful. The whole of the organisations of our Party proved their Bolshevik consolidation on the eve of the XVI. Party Congress, and showed that they would resolutely repulse all deviations and all tendencies conciliatory towards these.

It is our task, in the course of our joint practical work, to expose, to unmask the Right deviation, and to train the broad masses of the Party and the working class, by means of concrete facts, in the spirit of Leninism.

The C.C. has secured, by its whole organisational practice, the general line of the Party. When the question arose that the Moscow leaders, headed by Uglanov, wanted to transform Moscow into a base for a struggle against the C.C., to make Moscow the centre of the attacks on the Party, the Moscow Party organisation, with the aid of the C.C. and under its leadership, resolutely, and with Bolshevik energy, repulsed these attempts (Applause).

We should be no Bolsheviks were we merely to speak of the political line, and did not consolidate it by organisation. Uglanov had to go. And now we see plainly how right we were in this, for Uglanov is still working to-day against the C.C., he still maintains his relations with the deviator elements in the Moscow organisation, and still secretly and quietly endeavours to influence people against the C.C. of the Party. (Voices: Shame!) The C.C. not only removed Uglanov, but joined the Moscow organisation and the Moscow districts in causing the removal of a number of other functionaries from the Moscow organisation. It may be said that this is a violation of inner Party democracy. But, comrades, for us Bolsheviks there exists no inner Party democracy which gives everyone the right and the possibility to carry on fractional work and to disrupt our Party. (Applause.)

Comrades, on the front of socialist reconstruction, and on the front of civil war, the Party has shown great steadfastness, self-sacrifice, and heroism, during the period of this report. Just as the Party took the lead at the front in war, and lay in the trenches with the Red Army soldiers, in the same way it has now led the gigantic development of the work of socialist reconstruction; it has organised the shock brigade movement; it works in the factories, collects the grain, builds up the collectives, and is organising millions and millions for the victory of socialism. (Applause.)

Not only has the Party grown, but its organisation is more firmly established. The magnificent structure of socialism, the enormous tasks still before us, demand a corresponding intensity and a corresponding adaptation of our organisational work, the elimination of the last remnants of petty economics, the profound and close contact with the masses, the creation of fresh cadres, and the unification of the Party on the basis

of the carrying out of the general line of the Party and of the successful offensive against the capitalist elements.

Our Party is the backbone of the proletarian dictatorship. Our Party leads the whole organisation of the proletariat and the whole of the functions of the proletarian dictatorship, beginning with the defeat of the class enemy, and rearing of pigs. Our reconstruction is progressing under the conditions imposed by the capitalist encirclement. We encounter gigantic difficulties and obstacles on our path. The Party can only overcome these difficulties and antagonisms, can only struggle successfully against them, if it consolidates its own ranks, if it carries out Lenin's legacy, if it watches over the unity of the Party as over the apple of its eye. Our Party, with its organisational principle, with the tasks before it, cannot tolerate any fractional work in its ranks, and will not tolerate it. (Applause.)

Contrary to the prophecies of the opportunist degenerates, we have preserved the unity of the Party, its iron discipline, and the fighting capacity of the Party ranks, under the most difficult conditions. That the C.C. and the Party have succeeded in doing this is due solely to the fact the Party has held closely to the path of Leninism, to the fact that in the period of this report the Party has attained a higher step, as vanguard, in its ideology and class-consciousness, to the fact that it has fought resolutely against the deviations from the general line, to the fact that the ideological struggle has been

strengthened by the action of the Party in removing from their posts all the opportunist, useless, and rotten elements which had separated from the masses.

In the future, too, we must fight with the same determination not only against the open deviations, such as the Left semi-Trotskyists and the chief danger the Right, but as Leninists, as Bolsheviks, must continue to expose the conciliatory attitude towards the Right and "Left" deviators; we must fight against the complaints raised over the organisational measures securing the successful carrying out of the general line of our Party.

We may maintain with pride that the Party, under the leadership of its C.C., has come to the 16th Party Congress more closely connected than ever with the proletarian masses, in closer contact than ever before with the international revolutionary movement, more united and welded in the struggles against the class enemy. (Applause.) The Central Committee, by the whole of its political and organisational work, has consolidated the ideological and organisational fighting capacities of our Party, it has preserved the main mass of the old Leninist cadre, it has created and trained fresh tens and hundreds of thousands from the ranks of the proletariat for our cadres. We can say to the opportunist of all shades, and to the conciliators: Know that the whole Party, under the leadership of its Leninist C.C., has fought, and is ready to continue to fight, against the revisionists, for the general line, and for the victory of socialism! (Enthusiastic applause.)

Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Stalin and Kaganovitch.

Full Report.

Comrade Postyshev (Ukraine):

At the VI. Party Congress the Party appeared with its Bolshevik ranks more closely serried than ever. The Party Congress has been the expression of this rallying round the Central Committee and our leader, Comrade Stalin. The tasks set the Party by the process of the socialist offensive demand from us the mobilisation of all our forces and means, the most effectual distribution of our human material, and above all the intensification of the struggle against the class enemy. The prerequisite for the efficient and timely accomplishment of these tasks is, now as ever, the unwearying struggle of our Party on two fronts, the struggle for the general line.

The indisputable successes which we have won in the Federal Republics are due to the fact that the Party, under the leadership of C.C., has led, and continues to lead, the struggle against every form of the Great Russian deviation in the Soviet apparatus and among individual groups of communists.

Comrade Stalin, very opportunely and rightly, drew the attention of the Party Congress, and therewith of the whole Party, to this very important question. We, who are working in Ukraine, very frequently encounter this deviation. The bearers of the Great Russian deviation regard the reorganisation of the economic organs, especially the founding of a Union Commissariat for Agriculture, as the signal for the liquidation of the questions of national cultural development. Among us in Ukraine we find the following standpoint among a part of the specialists and among some communists, especially students: Either industrialisation or Ukrainisation. Some propose that Esperanto should be taught in the schools instead of Ukrainian. They fail to grasp that just at the present moment, in the period of industrial advance, in the national Federal Republics, too, the basis is being created for the rise of a culture international in form and socialist in content.

The district and regional conferences preceding the XVI. Party Congress, as also the corresponding national conferences of the Communist Parties in our Federal Republics, have agreed in their estimate of the line of the Party and of the leadership of the Central Committee. In this connection we may place on record that both the "Left" Trotskyists and the Right opportunists are still endeavouring, as ever, to

discredit all the higher organs of the Party (the Party Congresses and Conferences). They declare that at the conference it is not sufficient to declare that the Party has attained great successes. Even our enemies are now talking of these successes the proceedings were bureaucratic, everybody defending the general line of the Party; but, they ask, how can a defence of the general line be spoken of at all, if nobody has ever even thought of attacking it. — Such observations as these, heard not only among us in Ukraine, are extremely characteristic of the opportunists, and reveal them as petty bourgeois democrats of the parliamentary type, unable to imagine Party life without groupings and squabbles.

The XVI. Party Congress is a Party Congress of growing socialist offensive, of inexorable struggle on two fronts, against the "Left" and the Right, against the conciliators, and against those who deliberately cloak opportunism, and thereby make themselves the accomplices of the conciliators. What is the characteristic feature of the present tactics of the Right deviation, which continues to be the main danger? The former leaders of the Right deviation, Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsy, from the time that they acknowledged their errors, have at bottom not carried on any Bolshevik struggle against this deviation. Comrade Tomsy admitted, chiefly under the pressure of the Party Conference in Trans-Caucasia, the fact of his opportunism and the detrimental effect of his struggle against the C. C. Comrade Rykov, at the Ural Conference, did not criticise his errors to even this extent. Comrade Bukharin continues to preserve silence, and he is not to be seen at the Party Congress. By his silence he maintains to its fullest extent his theory of "organised capitalism". Comrade Uglanov continues to combat the C.C.

Why do the Right now not turn against the Trotskyists, against the platform of capitulation and restoration openly and plainly laid down by Trotsky? In 1927 they accused the Party of Trotskyism, and the exaggerations committed in the collectivisation movement gave them occasion to again advance the indictment of Trotskyism. Does not the present silence of the Right signify an actual amnesty for Trotsky, with the object of forming a bloc with him? We have already experienced such attempts: Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev in 1928.

When in 1929 Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsy, forced into a corner, made a declaration, the Party demanded of them, in the resolutions of their nuclei, that they should prove the sincerity of their acknowledgment of their errors.

deeds. Comrades Rykov, Tomsky, and Bukharin, still owe an unequivocal answer since the Party Congress.

It is not sufficient to admit errors and to declare: We shall join the Party in the struggle to overcome the difficulties, successes. The Party has won these successes in the midst of struggles against false, damaging, anti-Leninist, and opportunist views. And this you must declare straightforwardly to the Party Congress.

Comrade Andreyev (North Caucasus):

The present Party Congress is the first in the history of our Party with such obvious achievements in socialist reconstruction. It suffices, for instance, to point out that our Party policy has advanced our country to its present position on the verge of the transition from an agrarian into an industrial country. The most remarkable victory which has been won by our Party since the XV. Party Congress is, however, the fundamental change which has taken place in the attitude of the great mass of the poor and middle peasantry towards the building up of socialism. Our Party has never been so near the solution of the most difficult question of proletarian revolution, not only in our own country, but in all the countries in the world: the question of the socialist transformation of the economics of the small producers. The events taking place at the present time in agriculture may be designated as the mightiest social-economic revolution, liquidating the whole class of the kulaks, and reshaping from the bottom upwards the life of the village, the life of millions of peasant farms. The third achievement which the Party places on record at this Congress, finally, is the record of what the Party itself represents: the demonstration of an hitherto unattained unity and strength in our Party (Applause).

The successes attained by the Party are clear to every member, to every worker in the Union. Only those who are the open foes of the Party, or people who have completely lost their heads, can fail to see, or can dispute, these stupendous historical successes. If Comrades Tomsky, Bukharin, and Rykov, do not want to be counted to this sort of people, they must make a declaration to the Party of such Bolshevik determination that no doubt can arise again in the Party. (Applause.) I think that in view of the historical work achieved by the Party, it is their duty to burn behind them every bridge, large and small, leading back to the Right anti-Leninist views which they have represented and led. These comrades may raise the objection: we have already admitted our errors, cut ourselves away from them. But in my opinion their admission has been rightly met by serious doubts on the part of the Party. The Party demands very different admissions of error. Comrade Tomsky, at the Trans-Caucasian Conference, took an earnest step in this direction, and I believe that he, and with him many others present at the XVI. Party Congress, will have to take an even more serious step.

In order to lay due stress on the complicated nature of the work before us, I shall deal in detail with only one section of the front of our socialist reconstruction, the socialist reorganisation of agriculture. Comrade Stalin, in his report, referred to the success gained in this section of our economy. We from the provinces can report many achievements, both quantitative and qualitative, in the sphere of the reorganisation of agriculture. We must however not be content with these achievements. We must be the less content that the industrialisation problem collides seriously with the backwardness of agriculture. We require a perfectly mad speed in the reconstruction of agriculture, in the development of its productive forces. We have every reason to believe that we are entirely capable of securing the tempo needed in the development of agriculture. We are in the midst of the transitional phase of the socialist reorganisation of agriculture. And it is the task of the communists to ensure that the transition stage is brief. This is facilitated by the fundamentally changed attitude of the overwhelming majority of the small and middle peasantry, and will be further facilitated by the fact that industry is becoming more and more able to satisfy the needs of agriculture.

Let us consider the situation in North Caucasus. It will be known to you that in North Caucasus 60 to 70 per cent of the peasants farms are collectivised, and that here we have achieved fairly definite success in the liquidation of the kulak as a class. North Caucasus is able to state that the socialist

sector has secured 74 per cent of the area under cultivation this year for summer grain. On this basis it has been possible to increase the sown area, during the spring campaign, by 15 per cent; for the whole year by 13 to 14 per cent. It must be said that this result has been made possible by intense exertion in preparatory work, and by an inexorable struggle against the kulaks.

I have stated that collectivisation is not an automatic process, but one decided by active policy and practice. What must be the nature of this activity? Nothing can be gained by force. The main lever for the acceleration of collectivisation is socialist industry. Here we must exercise pressure, especially in the industries upon which the transformation of agriculture depends. It must not be forgotten that the vacillations observable among the peasants, and not only among these, but in part among the peasants who have joined the collective farms, will always appear again and again until we have welded every single collective farm into a whole by means of machine technics.

Further, the path towards the realisation of collectivisation leads through the consolidation of the positions already won. In North Caucasus the number of collectivised farms has reached 60 to 70 per cent, on the Volga 50 per cent, on the Middle Volga 25 per cent, in Ukraine 40 per cent. An advance can already be made from these positions. It is now of first importance to establish these positions speedily and to prove the advantages of the new system. The consolidation of these positions means the solution of the problem of complete collectivisation. In North Caucasus we have already proved the advantages of collectivisation. One proof is the fact that during the spring campaign the individual peasant cultivated three hectares, whilst 7 hectares fell to the collectivised farm. We must now, in the second stage, that of the distribution of the revenues, demonstrate all the advantages of the large scale undertaking. However difficult this may be in the initial stage of collective farming accumulation, we must demonstrate it. We can do this, if in the first place we fulfil our obligations and promises with respect to the privileges for the collective farms, in the second place if we rapidly and efficiently organise our collective farms. In North Caucasus we observe the proof of the advantages gained in the distribution of income in the fact that here we shall realise complete collectivisation by the autumn. (Applause.)

With respect to a system of labour organisation in the collective farms, it must be admitted that this does not yet exist. Here we must learn from the wide experience already gained by industry, from the experience of the Soviet farms: in the application of this experience we must not, it need scarcely be said, work mechanically, but with the greatest elasticity. Industry must now furnish not only the basis supplying agriculture with machinery, but must at the same time place its wide organisational and economic experience at the service of the collective farm.

A few words on the role played by the Youth and the women. In North Caucasus we have convinced ourselves of the practically decisive part played by peasant youth in the sphere of collectivisation. The importance of the help given by the women too must not be forgotten. Collectivisation alters the lives of the peasant women, especially among the poor and middle peasantry, and is the fundamental means for the emancipation of the peasant woman from the fetters of her daily life. The collectivisation of the branches of industry not yet socialised, of livestock breeding, etc., will depend substantially upon the extent to which we are successful in inducing the participation of the peasant woman, who clings to her little house, her kitchen garden, her cow. We must make the peasant woman an active co-worker and organiser, with equal rights, in the collective farming movement. The old forms of women's work (women's delegates, etc.) are now, it must be openly admitted, no longer of much use, at least not in the districts where collectivisation has been completely carried out. In North Caucasus we have already taken steps towards organising special production conferences among the women, and towards forming a special system of agrarian organisations with full powers of authority, by means of entrusting women with the complete organisation of such branches of agriculture as livestock breeding, poultry farming, gardening, etc.

In this connection we must again apply Comrade Stalin's words on the cultural revolution. Up to the present we have

spoken a great deal about the cultural revolution, but have delayed energetic measures, in order to save our resources for industry. We need a culture which will secure the rapid progress of socialist reconstruction, which will equip the backward peasant with the armour of knowledge, giving him the possibility of effectually combating sabotage and other elements injurious to agricultural progress. Spread more knowledge and culture, more technique in the sphere of agriculture, and we, with our rich country, will speedily emerge from all our difficulties.

The present period still faces us with a great task. We need the utmost unity in the Party, and therefore we must demand from all vacillating elements an unconditional submission to the line of the Party, and an iron discipline in our ranks. (Prolonged applause.)

Comrade Uglanov:

After the two years of somewhat violent struggle which I carried on in the ranks of the Right opposition, a struggle against the line of the Party, and against its leaders, it is naturally difficult to suppose that the present Party Congress will place confidence in my spoken declarations . . . (Interjection: That is true.) . . . in my explanations regarding the points in which I was in error, my mistakes, and my determination to submit to the decisions of the Party in future, and to defend them unreservedly. I understand this very well, and know that if I am to win the confidence of the Party, I must do this by deeds.

(Interjection: Hear, hear. Stir.)

Uglanov: I think that we shall endeavour to do so in our future work.

(Interjection: Who is that, we? You think? Disturbance.)

Uglanov: I am of the opinion that the path covered by the Party between the XV. and XVI. Party Congresses will be recorded in the history of the socialist development of our country as a stage in which our Party undertook a determined turn in socialist development, especially in the acceleration of the tempo of socialist reconstruction, and in the intensification of the struggle for the overcoming of capitalism in our country. The Party, in striding forward in the period between the XV. and the XVI. Congresses, has overcome the resistance of our class enemies, shattered and swept away our vicillations and our struggle against the line of the Party, and attained great successes in socialist development, in the development of industry, in the development of collectivisation, in the questions in which we showed serious waverings during this period. I held grave doubts as to the possibility of that tempo of economic reconstruction initiated by the Party in this period. I must honestly declare that in all the questions in which I have been defeated, I seriously vacillated, and did not believe it possible to realise the economic development at the rate initiated by the Party.

You are aware of the stage just passed through, the history of my work in the Moscow organisation. You know the preliminary history of the origin of our struggle against the C.C. of the Party, against the line laid down by the Party.

Now, two years later, at this actual moment, two years since the time when I began to deviate from the fundamental line realised by the Party since the XV. Party Congress, I now see quite plainly, so to speak, the position which we occupied, and which may obviously be designated, from the Bolshevik standpoint . . . (Interjection: Speak out!) as Chvostistic.

(Interjection: That is not enough. Weak. Not Chvostistic, but Right opportunist.)

Uglanov: Wait a moment, comrades.

(Interjection: and from the class standpoint. — Stir.)

Uglanov: Comrades, it need not be said that if one has failed to comprehend, and has not kept pace with the Party, one inevitably lags behind, derails, takes a position actually erroneous and non-Bolshevik (Sensation)—and this is what happened to us. If one takes a non Party standpoint, it is clear that this standpoint cannot be a class one (Interjection: it is a class standpoint, only it is the standpoint of another class), for we are all perfectly aware that the standpoint of our Party is that of the revolutionary proletariat. In the period just passed, it must be admitted, our attitude, our struggle against the general line of the Party, against the leadership of the C.C. of our Party, the opposing of another line, often led inevitably in actual fact, whether we wanted this or not, to a strengthening of the position of our class enemy. Seen from this standpoint, it must be said that our views reinforced the

Right opportunist trends. It need not be emphasised that at the present stage of our socialist development the deviation which we represented is the most dangerous of all, and an unceasing fire must be directed against it.

Comrades, at the November Plenum of the C.C. (1929) I declared that we acknowledge our errors, etc. This declaration was by no means accidental. The decided successes gained by the Party and the proletariat in the autumn of 1929, both in the development of industry and of agriculture, and besides this the iron determination with which the Party gathered round the C.C.—these, as may be easily comprehended, were the actual stimuli, the actual reasons forcing us to alter our position and to lower our arms before the Party.

I am fully agreed with the justified assertion of those comrades who have maintained here that I have failed to fulfil the obligations which I undertook at the November Plenum (1929).

I confess quite openly that I have not worked during this time as I should have done, not as I have done my duty in the 23 years in which I have been a member of the Party. I confess that of the 23 years of my Party membership, I have not worked well for the last 2 years . . .

(Interjection: What about your work against the Party? You are evading the point.)

Uglanov: It need not be said that when anyone has adopted a certain position and has defended it, it is not so easy to desert it immediately. I feel myself for the first time that it is not so easy. I am sincerely anxious to work, and to work on the Party platform. But I cannot succeed in doing so all at once.

What offences have I committed against the Party line since the November Plenum of the C.C.? Comrade **Kaganovitsch** declared yesterday in his report that Uglanov continues his struggle against the C.C. in private conversations with individual comrades. I admit candidly that during the period just passed this has been the case; I declare that in March and April, in the matter of the exaggerations in the collectivisation movement, and in connection with a number of fresh events in the village, fresh vacillations arose as to the correctness of the Party line . . .

(Interjection: And how will it be in a month's time? Or to-morrow?)

Uglanov: The result of this was conversations with some of the comrades, in the course of which I expressed my doubts as to whether we were pursuing the right course, etc.

(Interjection: And why have you continued the fight?)

Uglanov: Comrades, I carry on no fight, nor do I intend doing so. I declare that I shall fulfil, sincerely and conscientiously, all the duties falling to a Bolshevik.

(Interjection: And why do you carry on fractional work?)

Uglanov: Comrades, I tell you plainly that in the period just passed, between 1928 and 1929, we have carried on no special fractional work like the other oppositions, as you very well know.

(Interjection: What does that mean — no special? And the not special? Disturbance.)

Uglanov: You can see for yourself . . . I have organised no fraction, and do not intend to do so.

Peters: You simply have not succeeded in doing so.

(Interjection: Haven't you been able to manage it?)

Uglanov: No, that is not the reason, not because I have not managed it, but because my long years of membership in the Party, and the struggle against the Trotzkyist opposition, have shown me what consequences (laughter) ensue for the Party and the revolution from such struggle. (Laughter. Noise.)

(Interjection: Especially for the fraction mongers.)

Uglanov: Certainly, for the fraction mongers, too. And therefore we have not carried on any organised fractional struggle. In view of the acuter struggles of these last years, our struggle, whatever its form, has of course been a detrimental, a fractional struggle. In this sense conversations of any description, even with individual comrades, are injurious, and — as I must candidly admit — unallowable for a member of the C.C. They contain a fractional element, as I must honestly and conscientiously admit. Therefore I shall now take all measures to prevent a repetition of this.

(Interjection: And up to now? That is not enough. It had to be combated. What about the industrial academy?)

Uglanov: I shall not only not permit that matter, but shall combat it. (Laughter. Noise.)

Kalygin: Only at Plenums and Congresses.)

(Interjection: And what are your vacillations to-day?)

Uglanov: To-day I do not vacillate; were I to waver, I should either not have mounted the speakers' platform, or I should have said something very different.

(Interjection: What would you have done? That is no definite language. Express yourself more plainly. That is not convincing! That is no serious way of speaking!)

(**Kalygin:** You change your mind every minute.)

Uglanov: I must say that in the present stage of historical development there can be no other attitude taken, no other line advanced, than that represented by our Party; no other line than the general line pursued by our Party in the socialist development of the country, in the overcoming of the capitalist elements in the sphere of international politics. I completely agree with the estimate made of the period of work just passed, both in the sphere of foreign policy and of home policy, and with the estimate of our oppositional activities as injurious. I am in complete agreement with the estimate formed by Comrade Stalin on all these questions.

(Interjection: To be hoped so.)

Uglanov: I am in agreement with the estimate expressed in Comrade Kaganovitch's report, on the inner Party struggle, on inner Party life, as also with the organisational policy which Comrade Kaganovitch has proposed here for the further strengthening of the ranks of our Party and of its influence over the masses of non-Party workers and peasants, and for the organisation of socialist economics — for the overcoming of all possible vacillations and deviations from the fundamental political general line of our Party. I am not only agreed with this estimate, but declare that I shall realise it unconditionally, honourably, energetically, to the utmost of my power and will.

(Interjection: And what is your opinion of Rykov's report at the Ural Conference?)

Uglanov: I did not hear his report. I do not know what it contained; I cannot undertake any responsibility for Comrade Rykov's speeches. (Noise. Interjection: You know nothing about it? That is rather too much. You must have read the report.)

I declare that I am in no personal communication with anyone. I am responsible for my own words and my own conduct. I declare that I shall continue to do my best to prevent any oppositional trends from arising, and that I shall combat them in every way, for the reason that I believe that every direct or indirect opposition to the general line of the Party, of the Party leaders — is disastrous for our Party and for the revolution. Therefore it is the task of the Bolshevik to fight for the unity and consolidation of the Party. (Interjection: What do you think of Bukharin's silence?) I shall endeavour to prove this after the Party Congress, not in words, but in deeds. (Interjection: As a matter of fact you have said nothing at all.)

Comrade Vareikis (Black Earth District):

Comrades, at first a few words on Comrade Uglanov's explanations. He wanted to speak straightforwardly, but his speech was hypocritical through and through. (Interjection: Hear, hear.) He began by stating that he was convinced beforehand of the justified distrust, so to speak, of the Party Congress towards himself and his friends, Comrade Rykov and the others of the Right opportunist fraction. This was right enough. He guessed correctly. There is great distrust amongst us. And it must be said that after such speeches this distrust does not lessen, but rather increases. (Interjection: Hear, hear.) Comrade Uglanov says that he will strive to gain our confidence in the future. I think we shall save up our confidence, our conviction of your sincerity, in the name of the Party Congress, for a later date. (Interjection: Hear, hear.) It seems to me that the hypocrisy shown here in Comrade Uglanov's speech is typical of the political nature of all Right fraction-mongers, who declare themselves in words in agreement with the general line, but in actual fact pursue quite another line, an attitude of sabotage by means of "secret undermining".

Comrade Uglanov states that they, the Right, including himself, have not carried on any special factional work. In my opinion this statement is impudence on the part of Comrade Uglanov. Is it not generally known that the Right, in the persons of Uglanov, Bukharin, etc, have carried on a regular factional struggle? Did not the Moscow organisation go

through an acute inner Party struggle in 1928 in consequence of the fractional work of Comrade Uglanov and his group against the C.C.? Who supported Comrade Uglanov? Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky. This is universally known. Who does not know of Bukharin's attempt to form a fractional bloc with the Trotskyists, or of his negotiations with Kamenev, the Trotskyist of yesterday? Was that factional work or mere harmless conversations as asserted by Tomsky at the time? Did not Uglanov, Rykov, and Tomsky draw up a declaration at that time, intended to justify the fractional, anti-Party attack, of a kind hitherto unknown in the history of the Party, on the part of Comrade Bukharin? And now Uglanov comes forward, and asserts that they have carried on no fractional work. This is pure hypocrisy.

Comrade Uglanov further states: we were only Chvostists, we had only lagged behind, had not learnt enough. This is not true. You were not a Chvostist group, you were, and remain, a kulak agency, until such time as you convince the Party by your actual work for the Party line. (Applause.) This is in my opinion the decided class content of the ideology of the Right deviation.

The Right opposition in the C.P.S.U. is incontestably the most dangerous at the present time. Its resistance has never been so violent as at the present time, in the period of the transition to the complete collectivisation of agriculture. It is precisely on the collectivisation front that we invariably observe the acuteness of this petty bourgeois danger.

The 2½ years of struggle carried on by our Central Committee for socialism set an example of Leninist leadership. In spite of the difficulties, in spite of the errors committed in some places and by some comrades in the collectivisation movement, we have attained mighty successes. The achievements of great industry, and of the collectivised reconstruction of the village, provide us, as Comrade Stalin has pointed out, with a fresh material basis for the socialist offensive along the whole front. Can we carry out this offensive successfully? We can!

It is not by accident that Comrade Uglanov did not have anything to say about this. It is not by accident that there is amazing unanimity of opinion among the Right opportunists and the Trotskyists in the matter of the offensive. And it is not by accident, it seems to me, that Comrade Bukharin is absent. Perhaps he is really ill. However that may be, his failure to appear is characteristic of these people.

I believe, comrades, that all circumstances convince us of the necessity of a determined struggle against the Right. The Party must once more, at the XVI. Party Congress, mobilise its utmost forces for the enormous tasks of the socialist offensive, outlined in Comrade Stalin's report.

I am convinced that the Party, after this Party Congress, will be more firmly consolidated and better armed than before. In this struggle we must maintain the tempo laid down by Comrade Stalin. Then the complete collectivisation will be actually realised, and socialism built up in our country. (Applause.)

Comrade Tomsky:

Comrades. Before I mounted this platform, I asked myself the question several times, what does the Party really expect of us, and in what have we made ourselves guilty in the eyes of the Party; in doing so I have remembered that we have been the leaders of the Right opposition known to you. It would be wrong of me, were I in particular to attempt, after the lengthy period of wearying inner Party struggle, to excuse this struggle or my own faults. That would not be the right thing. Every Bolshevik who is a politician must bear the responsibility for his actions, and is responsible to the Party.

But the Party is right to call to account people who have carried out important Party functions for years, and after a wearying and obstinate inner Party struggle, lasting for years, shaking the Party down to its last nucleus, and reflected not only within the country itself, but outside of its borders—I repeat, the Party is right to call to account the authors of this struggle. And it is the duty of every Bolshevik who is a real politician to draw the balance of this conflict honestly and conscientiously. The Party is justified in asking: Who has been right? And this question must be replied to not only by those who have led the struggle against the opposition and have defeated it, but at the same time by those who have been defeated, inasmuch as these are honest and conscientious, and are anxious to make good and correct their errors. The

Party is justified in asking: Is the conflict ended, or is the Party still not secure from relapses into the struggle? A straightforward answer must be given to this question. And, finally, the lesson to be learnt from this conflict should be learnt.

I shall not enter in detail into the question of who has been right. That has already been confirmed, self-evidently proved, demonstrated—not only at the Party Congress, not only to the Party—but to the whole world. The Party has proved to be right from the beginning to the end, and we have proved to be wrong from the beginning to the end. Not only have we been wrong in our ideological constructions, but in the forms of our struggle. I should like to deal briefly with the forms of this struggle.

We had no intention of forming a fraction, for every reasonably thinking politician knows only too well the danger and enormous damage to Party work caused by any fraction. Therefore those comrades who have attempted to show an analogy in every point between our opposition, which our Party has named the Right, and the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition, have been wrong in their endeavours to construct a complete analogy. But endeavour is one thing and reality another. We have striven not to carry our struggle beyond the confines of those Party organisations, of the Central Committee, in which we were working. We endeavoured to remain within these confines. But history shows that the logic of a struggle does not depend on the good will and the intentions of its leaders. The logic of this struggle led to its increasing acuteness, till this acuteness reached a point at which the struggle, whilst formally confined to the Party organisations, in reality assumed new forms breaking down these confines or rendering them illusory.

This struggle—formally carried on within its proper limits—finally led to very sharply expressed formulations speedily changing to sharply expressed slogans. And these slogans were taken up outside the Party, and were bound to be so taken up.

In order to give an example of this, I may remind you of the sharply expressed documents which we submitted. Documents in which whole phrases became slogans, or could become slogans, and were at times seized upon outside of the Party organisations, against our wish and will, and converted into special slogans around which discontented elements gathered. Finally, this led logically to quite new forms of inner Party conflict, to such forms as for example our famous withdrawal, or my voluntary resignation from the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union.

But no-one who begins any inner Party struggle is naive enough to believe that he will fight alone, or in twos or threes. (Laughter) Rykov, Tomsky, and Bukharin, that suffices! (Laughter.) We have grown out of the age of those social revolutionary organisers who contented themselves with a following of high school girls in their organisational activities. The struggle within the Central Committee, the struggle for our own line within the Party, whatever forms this struggle assumed, was bound to be concentrated on the conquest of the majority: And this aim is bound to be the same, whether the Central Committee is employed as platform from which to speak to the Party, or the nuclei, etc.

And every leader, every politician, knows perfectly well that when he seeks adherents, he will find some. Every leader is aware, and cannot refuse to be responsible for the fact, that these adherents will invariably exaggerate, against his will.

I should like to refer in particular to the errors in which I have taken a personal part. I shall not enumerate the whole of the differences of opinion; it would be a tiresome repetition of what has already been said many times. Have I any intention of extenuating or justifying my errors at the present Party Congress? I should consider this beneath my dignity. And this for the reason that when I state that the moderate words of a leader are invariably repeated in stronger terms by his followers in the heat of the conflict, I consider it impossible to suggest that anyone who has worked in the Party for a quarter of a century could deny the responsibility of misleading "small people".

With respect to my personal errors, these commenced at the July Plenum with the perfectly sincere mistake that in my opinion the difficulties existing at that time for the Party in the matter of grain supplies were so great that it was the duty of the Party to alleviate the strained conditions

in the village by means of concessions to the middle peasantry, this meaning at bottom concessions to the individual farms, and to signify nothing else than in the given objective situation and when translated into political language, a concession to the individual undertaking by means of developing the circulation of goods and by means of the circulation of goods, that is, the actual return to the 14th Party Congress. (Noise, Interjections: Say something about the kulak.) When comrades now judge both us, designated as the leaders of the Right opposition, and this Right deviation itself, with extreme harshness, in my opinion much too harshly, still I am very well able to understand as politician that this cannot be otherwise, although the matter does not stand exactly as many suppose.

The error which I myself consider to be my greatest was my under-estimate of that policy of the gigantic reconstruction of our whole national economy, and not only of our whole national economy, but of the whole life of the Soviet Union, a task taken up, carried forward, and accomplished by the Party. My mistake was my under-estimate and too narrow view of this powerful policy of the Party in its essential nature as technico-industrial revolution. I failed to grasp the social import, the great import of this policy, the fact that not only a reconstruction on a higher technical basis was concerned, though this was a socialised industry, but at the same time a social reconstruction, a reshaping of our whole national economy, involving the reorganisation of the whole life of the country, the transformation from a backward agrarian country, from a land of petty bourgeois anarchy, and of an agriculture consisting of small individual farms, into an industrial and socialist country, a country of socialised large scale agricultural undertakings. My failure to grasp all this involved me in a number of resultant errors, of which in my opinion the gravest was my promulgation of a wrong standpoint, in a number of cases, in the trade union movement of which I was a leader.

As result of my increasingly oppositional trend, comrades infected with this oppositional tendency gathered around me, comrades who had become accustomed in the course of years to see in me their leader. The result was, thought at times against my will, an increasing opposition of the majority of the then leaders of the trade union movement to the Central Committee of the Party. This entailed the simultaneous deviation of the trade unions, the distraction of their attention from the tasks whose speedy fulfilment was so imperative — the tasks set by the reconstruction period, by the mighty work of building up socialism, and by the work undertaken by the Party. What happened was that conflict, well known to all of you, in the fraction of the 8th Trade Union Congress, and my absolutely unallowable and arbitrary withdrawal from the function of a president of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, causing a demoralisation in the ranks of the trade unionists, and forcing the Central Committee of the Party to the only right measure, although a very difficult one: the measure of removing from their posts the whole of the leaders of the trade union movement.

I regard this error of mine as my greatest, the very greatest, and deem it my duty to state this openly.

Did a fraction exist? That is, a fraction in the formal sense generally understood? Certainly not. We did not want any such fraction, and made no attempt to form it. We did our utmost to confine our struggle strictly to the limits permitted by the statutes.

But now the objection is raised: Was there not a beginning of a fraction? True, the beginning was there. How could it be otherwise? Comrades, when we regard these conceptions generally — group, elements of a fractional formation, fraction — we find no clear definition of them. The point is very indefinite and conditioned at which the fraction or the group begins, or the preparations for the formation of a group are commenced. That does not come about so easily! If three members of the Central Committee meet and carry on a political conversation, that is by no means a group.

(Ordshonokidze: But if you draw up a platform?)

Tomsky: If members of the C. C., three or five in number, meet and carry on a political conversation, this is naturally not forming a group. But if they begin to work out a joint document, and if the differences of opinion arising in the

formulation of this document are settled within the four walls of a room, whilst the differences of opinion existing among the members of the C. C. in political questions should in reality be settled openly, in the presence of the whole of the members of the C. C. — then some elements of a fractional formation may be said to exist, which may lead later to the organisation of a fraction.

If the document is drawn up jointly, this means that each formulation is attained by mutual understanding, by mutual compromise. Here again are the elements of fractional formation. And if an understanding is arrived at in the most important political questions, and this understanding laid down in a document, then this represents a platform to a certain extent for those involved. It is not yet a fraction, there are as yet no elements of fractional discipline, there are no fraction organs or fraction apparatus, the stage of fractional formation has not yet been reached. There are not yet elements of the clear outlines of a separate organisation, etc. But every prerequisite for the fraction is there, and in the further course and aggravation of the conflict this leads directly to the formation of a fraction, which, under our present conditions, can lead to nothing more nor less than the formation of a second party, if not destroyed by the Party in time.

I need not emphasise that this conflict within a Party which has been carrying on, during the whole time, the most difficult and heroic work, has been bound to harm this work to a certain extent, to distract the attention of the whole Party from the stupendous tasks in course of fulfilment and requiring the utmost concentration, and has at the same time undoubtedly awakened outside of the Party, independent of our will, an echo dangerous both for the Party and for the dictatorship of the proletariat. These sharp formulations and sharp phrases have been, inevitably, seized upon by a third power; they have formed the organising slogans for such allies as we have never desired.

What then is the lesson which we have to draw? That every opposition, every struggle against the line of the Party, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the conditions imposed on a Party whose whole life lies open to the whole population, a Party which leads one of the greatest states, is inevitably bound to awaken an echo outside of the Party. Whether the platform of this opposition be Right — this is especially dangerous — or whether it be "Left", even arch "Left", the moment it is directed against the line pursued by the Party in power, it finds an echo and it finds sympathy, and becomes the organising basis of the third power, of the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For these do not care under what flag the conflict in the Party sails, all that it cares for is the weakening in our ranks, that they may have the opportunity of gaining the victory over us. Every slogan, every movement against the line of the Party, is converted into a weapon against the Party, and is inevitably seized upon by the foes of the Party. Here we can observe a very graphic application by our enemies of the principle of: I care not who you are; you are the foe of my foe, and therefore my friend.

It need not be said that any weakening in our ranks affects the Sections of the Comintern, and awakens an echo among those social democratic elements which have are still concealed in our brother parties. Our conflict against the general line of the Party had the effect of activating the Right elements in almost all our brother parties, and even occasioned a number of splits leading in some cases to a strengthening of the influence of the social democrats. Both the Brandlerists in Germany and the Right in other countries approach equally to social democracy. However sharp the line they draw between themselves and social democracy, the situation forces the rapprochement, for they find themselves in the camp of those jointly attacking the Comintern. And finally, our struggle is bound to awaken a certain negative echo even in our capitalist environment, for the capitalists of all countries have always kept their eyes open, and will always do so: Is there not some faint sign of a split among the Bolsheviks—perhaps they will start quarrelling, and then everything will go to pieces. All these injurious effects have undoubtedly been caused, and here lies our—especially my—greatest fault.

The Party has proved right in every point, and we have proved wrong. We have recognised this slowly, and under difficulties, for we have not found it such a simple matter as many good humoured comrades proclaim so easily from the

platform: If you have been wrong, well, admit it at once in a Bolshevik manner.—That is not so easy! (Laughter.)

This conflict ended with our declaration. First with the first declaration at the November Plenum, and then with our written declaration after the November Plenum, in the same month. The Party is justified in asking: Now, are your confessions sincere, or are they a manoeuvre? (Artyuchin: You have hit it!)

When thinking over my speech, and realising the responsibility, I considered whether it would not be better to write it down, but abandoned the idea: that would have been another document.

Since the declaration signed by us had been sent in November, from November onwards I voted in the Central Committee for all the important political documents of our Party. When my Central Committee then commissioned me to draw up the report of the activities of the C.C. for the Trans-Caucasian Congress, I fulfilled this task, it seems to me, honestly and conscientiously.

(Voroshilov: You have forgotten to mention the third period.)

Tomsky: You may be right about the third period ... In Tiflis I adopted the attitude which I thought to be right—honorable, loyal, Bolshevik—I represented my Central Committee. There are comrades here who were in Tiflis and heard my report, and these will support my assertion that two ideas ran through my report like scarlet threads. The first of these was that the Central Committee, in its struggle against us, had been right from beginning to end, that both the line and the practical work of the C.C. had been right, Leninist, and Bolshevik, that the Party had attained great successes, under the leadership of its C.C. in every sphere of work,—and all this in the midst of the struggle against the Right and "Left" deviations. The second thought was that I myself, in my struggle against the Central Committee, had been wrong from beginning to end.

Comrade Andreyev observed that it is not a question of doing penance, but of burning behind us the bridges across which we might retreat again. I now ask Comrade Andreyev: Do any bridges still exist, after this speech of mine, across which I may retreat?

(Andreyev: No, they exist no longer.)

Tomsky: Andreyev has granted me amnesty—he says No. (Laughter.)

After all the political lessons which our Party has learnt, there must be no more manoeuvring in the Party. One must be a complete idiot, comprehending nothing of the whole history of our Party, to suppose that the Party, after so many oppositions in different variations and combinations, and after such far-reaching political experience, at a time when a month signifies more than a year formerly, is going to permit manoeuvres. I have committed many sins and faults, I have made mistakes more than once in my fairly long political life. I have been set right severely and painfully more than once by Lenin, but nobody who has known me in the Party during the last decades will assert that I am capable of manoeuvring.

Is there a danger of a Right deviation? I believe that Stalin was right in saying: Three have sent in a declaration acknowledging their errors, but does this exhaust the danger of the right deviation, or do away with the necessity of the struggle against the Right deviation and the possibility of its reappearance in other variations, under other leaders, among other persons? By no means. I referred to this when speaking in Tiflis. And I repeat the more emphatically that the formulations which we made during the struggle, the intellectual luggage which existed and continues to exist, may feed the Right tendencies, may be utilised by the Right elements in our Party. The Party has grown broader than ever before. In the ranks of the Party there are certainly numerous new members, workers still in immediate contact with the village. Besides this the Party contains thousands of members of new categories, peasants belonging to the collectives, among whom there exists the possibility of various vacillations. And finally, there is the petty bourgeois influence over the working class. All this confronts us with, and forcibly emphasises, the danger of the Right deviation and the necessity of an irreconcilable struggle against these deviations.

I consider it however my duty to declare that from the moment of the signing of the declaration in November 1929 onwards I did not combat the C.C., nor could I do so. Anyone maintaining the contrary is wrong. I decisively declare the

utter uselessness of any attempt to connect my name with any political grouping against the C. C., and decisively condemn any struggle, in any form whatever, against the C. C. and the general line of the Party.

Our Party has long since outgrown its old confines, and has become something very different from that illegal party which trained us. And when I look back upon the many errors which I have committed, upon the many faults in the forms and methods of our inner Party struggle, upon the possibility of there being an inner Party struggle at all, upon the certain carelessness with which it is entered upon—then I see that the roots of these errors are perhaps to be found in the fact that we—trained in the traditions of the old Party, a Party comprehending but a small circle—forget and underestimate, even fail to grasp, the fact that the Party has advanced from a narrow, enclosed, illegal organisation of a circle type into a mighty international factor, the actual master and leader of the whole political and economic life of the largest country in the world. Dozens of millions of workers look to it as their acknowledged leader, follow every step it takes, regard it as example to be followed. Under these conditions, and in view of the position of the Party, even the raising of the question of an inner Party struggle is unthinkable. Therefore the forms and methods used in defence of opinions, permissible and useful in an illegal party and even in the first stage of the rise of a great party, now become absolutely harmful and absolutely unallowable to-day, when the Party is actually living in a glass house, the cynosure of the eyes of the whole world, and when every tremor which runs through our ranks is felt not only to the utmost ends of the country itself, but in the exchanges of London and New York, and every stumble arouses joy in the ranks of our enemies and often enough discouragement and disappointment in the ranks of our most devoted friends, among the millions and dozens of millions of workers in the capitalist countries and among the colonial proletariat.

Every more or less lengthy opposition against the Party line and its leaders is bound to become, under our circumstances, an opposition against the Party itself, is bound to arouse an echo outside of our Party, and to merge into a struggle against the Party of the proletarian dictatorship. And this is the struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the Soviet power. Every opposition paralyses and threatens to destroy, under our present conditions, the whole creative activities of our Party; it involves a danger not only for the Party, but for the Soviet Union.

And then another lesson of a political nature, to be drawn by the experiences of our struggle. We have seen in actual practice that in a situation of violent class struggle, in the numerically strong Party, closely connected by ties of blood to the masses of the people, that private matters have sometimes become general and personal matters political. We have seen that formally private conversations among political leaders have become political factors, and that, when two people have met together . . .

(Leonov: One of them Bukharin and the other Kamenev.)

Tomsky: . . . and one or the other of these has played a part in the leadership of the whole political life of the country, if they have discussed political subjects, though privately, then their conversation has still not been private. When people holding the helm of state in a great country hold private conversations at a time of severe political strain, these private conversations are political, however often you may repeat that they are private.

What have been the results of this struggle?

It does not suffice to state that we have been wrong, that we have been defeated, and that the Party is right. It does not suffice to state that we have recognised our errors, and that the Party has emerged stronger than before, having learnt new lessons, from this struggle. To state this is naturally a very poor consolation to me. The recognition of the fact that we have committed many mistaken and foolish actions, and have caused much damage . . . to state that the Party has finally emerged stronger than before . . . this is but poor consolation to me, for if the Party emerges reinforced every time from such a struggle, this signifies a bad system of training the Party. Without this inner Party struggle, the Party would perhaps be even stronger and more firmly consolidated, and no vacillations, doubts, and waverings would interrupt its creative activity.

Our activities have been very violently characterised, and this characterisation has frequently merged into a severe characterisation of me personally. I raise no objection to this. It would indeed be ridiculous for me, after reaching such a venerable political age, not to be aware, or to feel surprised, that such a struggle ends with such unpleasantnesses for those who have proved wrong and have been defeated.

There was a certain moment at which I joined Zinoviev in saying to Trotsky: "Bow your head to the Party." To Zinoviev I said later, when he went with Trotsky: "Bow your head to the Party." I have made more than one mistake, and I am not ashamed of it, nor am I ashamed to bow my head to the Party. I think that I have acknowledged my errors as openly and sincerely in this speech as the present moment demands.

Our Party has attained mighty results. The Party has undertaken to bear an enormous burden, to accomplish tremendous tasks. The stupendous extent of these tasks involves a number of great difficulties. It is not easy to realise the reorganisation of the whole vast economy of a country, when capitalist encirclement threatens from outside, and within the country itself there are many petty bourgeois commodity producers.

The whole Party is labouring at the great work, the building up of socialism. The Party is labouring successfully, and will assuredly carry on the cause once begun to a successful end. It shows an example, hitherto unknown in the history of humanity, of the creative capacity of the working class under the leadership of its vanguard, the Communist Party.

I do not justify myself, for to do so would be needless, injurious, and foolish. The Party will draw the necessary political and organisational conclusions. In view of the vast and difficult tasks falling to the Party, it is the duty of every communist at the present moment to cherish more carefully than ever the unity of the Party, to undertake nothing which might shake or confuse this unity only for a moment, which might bring disorder into the ranks of those building up socialism, might undermine the authority of our Party or shake the faith of the millions of the workers in it, or might give one moment's pleasure to our enemies—this is the duty of every communist, I permit myself to assure you that I know my duty as a communist, and shall prove capable of fulfilling it.

And quite apart from the question of whether I shall be a foreman in this great work of reconstruction, or a plain labourer, I shall honestly and conscientiously do my part in the general great work of the Party. The Party will carry on its work to a successful end, giving to all mankind an example of how the working class builds up socialism under the leadership of the Party.

Comrade Rykov:

It is somewhat easier for me to speak than for Comrade Tomsky, as he has already said much of what I wanted to say. Therefore I shall begin my speech with the declaration that I fully and entirely agree with everything which Comrade Tomsky has just said on this platform with regard to the general line of our Party, the correction of the errors which we have committed, the acknowledgement of the correct course of action of the Party and the Central Committee in the struggle against us at the time when we defended our errors. What I shall say here will therefore form a supplement to Comrade Tomsky's speech, although we did not arrange anything of the kind beforehand.

First I must settle a small episode in connection with Comrade Uglanov's speech. In the most important part of this speech, Comrade Uglanov made use of the plural—"we". At the close of his speech he said that this had been a slip. However this may be, I must emphasise that I personally have no relation to this "we", and that since the November Plenum I have had no further connection with Comrade Uglanov beyond the purely business relations entailed by the fact of his being Labour Commissary.

I appear here at the Party Congress under much more difficult circumstances than I had supposed until recently to be the case. A considerable part of the district and regional conferences of the Party, as also a number of speakers from this platform, have brought such accusations against me, and put such demands upon me, that I feel myself carried back to the time of the November Plenum. It would almost seem

as if our open acknowledgement, before the whole country, of our wrong standpoint, the recognition of the standpoint of the Party and of the C. C., the experience of seven months of work on the basis of the general line, the defence of the general line of the Party—have made no difference at all. And yet at the passing of the resolutions for the present Congress, and the whole of the practical work done during this period, have not shown the slightest shadow of fractional formation or differences of opinion in matters of principle! But in spite of all this, some comrades adopt almost the same tone as in the period of the November Plenum.

Obviously there still remains a considerable stratum of comrades who believe that these people are not yet completely disarmed, have not yet fully recognised their errors, are manoeuvring. This is, so to speak, the definite situation which has come about, and which makes it so difficult for me to speak here. But however the matter may be regarded, the seven months of work for the realisation of the general line of the Party, work carried out in collaboration with the Party and the C. C.—this is at least a fact. (*Interjection: And the Ural Conference?*) With respect to the Ural Conference, no comrade there can maintain that my report at that Conference did not represent the general line of the Party. (*Interjection: We have heard something different.*) Then it should be stated. (*Interjection: And Comrade Kabakov's speech?*)

The actual question under discussion here is whether we really acknowledge our errors, and if our collaboration during these seven months has been manoeuvring or not. Did not our declaration made at the November Plenum contain the elements of a struggle, of a struggle for a pause for breath, aiming at enabling us to return to our old positions in the course of events—this is the tone underlying every speech.

This is the actual question submitted to the Party Congress, if not openly expressed. This is the sole explanation of what is going on at present. And if we admit that this is the actual question—what does it mean? It means that a member of the Polbureau is manoeuvring within this Bureau, and in such a manner that in his speeches in public, he pursues the policy of the Party, but secretly manoeuvres against the Polbureau of the Party and against the C. C.

(*Leonov: Or waits for a favourable opportunity.*)

Rykov: Or waits for a favourable opportunity.

In the first place I must say that from the political standpoint a secret struggle in our Party is foolish and nonsensical. Foolishness! (*Interjection: A real fact.*) Only an idiot can struggle secretly for a Party of millions. (*Interjection: And the frequent visits to Kamenev?*) I shall not praise myself: but when I am suspected of such intentions—I really do not know what to say. (*Laughter.*) It is idiocy. And anyone who should make the attempt to carry on such a political "struggle" in secret, would be bound to sink down into the worst forms of petty bourgeois, semi-anarchist struggle. (*Interjection: And Bukharin?*)

I have already stated that I undertake no responsibility for Uglanov. Nor does Uglanov bear any responsibility for me. No triumvirate exists. If Bukharin is referred to, Bukharin should be applied to. You know very well that I adopted an entirely rejective attitude with regard to the discussion between Bukharin and Kamenev, and declared this at once. (*Interjection: To whom? Lobov: That is not how matters stood.*)

I have declared my standpoint openly. Bukharin too has acknowledged his errors. But if the question is put in this manner, how can it be answered? We work, speak, give reports on the basis of the general line of the Party, represent this line; there is already a certain amount of joint work to be recorded since the November Plenum; what proofs are further needed that we are not carrying on any struggle against the Party, but are working on the basis of the general line of the Party?

(*Lyubtsenko: An active struggle against the adherents of yesterday.*)

Rykov: You mean that I should fight against Tomsy and Tomsy against me, and both of us against Bukharin and Bukharin against us? (Noise, laughter, interjection: And "organised capitalism"? the "merging of the kulak in socialism"?)

Should Bukharin continue in his errors, of course I shall stand up against him, fight against him. It must be remembered that we made our mistakes in common. If he now commits

errors . . . (*Interjection: He does!*) . . . if he commits errors to-morrow, I shall fight him. But how can I fight him on account of mistaken activities which I shared with him? (*Interjection: You should attack Bukharin's theory, not Bukharin himself—that would be a real action.*)

Of course I shall combat Bukharin's wrong ideas. But tell me where Bukharin is wrong at the moment. We have both abandoned our errors. I cannot understand why I should scold Bukharin for my mistakes instead of myself. I shared his errors. It is proposed that in the matter of my differences of opinion with the C. C. before the November, I should point at Bukharin and cry: Stop thief! I face the responsibility for my errors myself, and shall not thrust the blame onto any Bukharin. This cannot be asked of me. I must be punished, and not Bukharin, for the mistakes which I have made.

The second cause of that distrust which exists, and is comprehensible, takes its origin in quite different political circumstances. The present situation, in the midst of the realisation of the general line of the Party in the sphere of industrialisation, in the sphere of the socialisation of agricultural production, is accompanied by an extreme aggravation of the class struggle in our country. This cannot be otherwise, for the essential character of the general line itself, the essential nature of our successes, consists of the offensive against the capitalist elements, which offer furious resistance, and cannot but continue to do so.

Under these conditions of intensified class struggle, the hostile elements in our country exploit every difficulty, every possibility of an attack on the Party and on the dictatorship of the working class. This is an absolutely incontestable fact. The bearers of this discontent, in the country itself, are the bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements.

Our former standpoint, which we defended during the period of conflict, and which is abandoned as far as my personal relation to the general line of the Party, to the C. C., and to the Polbureau, is concerned, still represents, apart from my attitude, a certain organising force of discontent. This is the most regrettable and damaging result of my former struggle against the C. C.

If I am asked if I am personally to blame for this, I am obliged to reply: I am to blame for it inasmuch as I fought in the Party for my erroneous views. It is of course difficult, and for a revolutionist extremely painful, to admit this. But this is no reason for releasing him from the responsibility. And the distrust which is still felt towards me is due to this. Let us assume that Rykov has unconditionally placed himself on the side of the general line of the Party, perfectly sincerely and irrevocably. The differences of opinion which were once his, and which are known in the country, still continue, however, to play their part. These opinions still exist, and are supported by certain facts. Under our present conditions, those of the dictatorship of the proletariat, such results of the inner Party struggle are in most cases inevitable. Even wild rumours, spread abroad intentionally at times by our enemies, and pure inventions not about my conflict with the Central Committee but about quarrels between some of the members of the Polbureau, though these have never had political differences of opinion—even such rumours can become of political importance at times. They are exploited by the enemy, always ready to pounce on anything in order to throw mud at the Party and its C. C. Our direct class enemies are the more ready to exploit the differences of opinion which have been made known to the broader public. One and all have attempted to utilise our differences of opinion as a stepping off place. I only need remember that in a document written by Lovestone, this deserter, renegade, one-time member of the Communist Party, refers to Bukharin, to me, and to others, in justification of his struggle against the Comintern. (*Interjection: Mamayev in any case.*) Not only Mamayev, but much worse. I know of cases of the vilest exploitation of my name by completely petty bourgeois, anarchist, counter-revolutionary elements. (*Interjection: Is the Party to blame for that?*) I have already said that this is the greatest evil arising out of my mistaken struggle.

What means have we of putting an end to this? Besides combating obviously hostile elements, our most effectual remedy is the unification of the Party, the firmer closing of its ranks. If I can be of special use in this matter, I need not say that I consider it my duty to aid. (*Interjection: Say something about the Kulak basis of the Right deviation, and where this would have led to had your position been victorious.*)

I shall do this. In order to make the subject clear, I must devote a few words to the nature of my errors and their results. My fundamental error was my conception of the solution of the problems of the village, of the peasantry. Briefly summed up, my error lay in my under-estimate of the possibility of the socialisation of agricultural production and of the liquidation of the petty bourgeois structure of the village, and in my under-estimate, extreme under-estimate, of the possibilities already open to the Party in that period. This was my main error, and one of supreme political significance, for it was an error referring to the decisively important spot in the policy of the Party, the centre to which all threads run, the junction of the mighty socialist offensive.

From this there sprang a number of further differences of opinion, among them the over-estimate of the importance of the individual farm, of market relations, especially in the forms assumed by these differences before the 15th Party Congress; and here lay, in so far I can now judge of my then standpoint, the decisive, the fundamental, the main error.

This fundamental error has of course led to many others, but it is the fundamental one, for it refers to the question forming the pivot upon which socialist reorganisation swings. For the liquidation of small peasant commodity production, its socialisation, forms the central point of the problem of the socialist organisation of society. The under-estimation of the power of the Party to solve this problem is of paramount significance at the present juncture! It is indeed the last of the great questions of principle which we are solving in actual practice in the transition period, after the abolition of the private ownership of land, the means of production, and factories, after the extermination of the city industrial bourgeoisie. The socialisation of agricultural production is the last link in the chain of transition to socialism. Hence this error is a very grave one.

And since the struggle for victory has required the utmost exertion of the whole of the forces of the Party, and has aroused the resistance of the bourgeois classes and strata doomed to extinction and a violent aggravation of the class struggle, our position during this period was objectively not a support of the offensive against the petty bourgeoisie, but the contrary.

This is the main content of my error. The Central Committee, which has mobilised the Party, the working class, the village poor, and all forces for the accomplishment of this task, demanding the utmost exertion and determination, acted correctly in attacking us resolutely.

The period which began after the 15th Party Congress has been a period of the socialisation of small peasant production, of the socialist reorganisation of agricultural production, of simple commodity production. This is a question of enormous international importance, and one which can only be solved with closely united ranks. Hence the necessity of resisting anyone who interrupts this work is self-evident.

The difference of opinion existing in this fundamental question has been bound up with a number of other differences of subordinate importance; for it is not possible to disagree on the main point and to agree on the lesser ones. The results were numerous additional errors. I shall not enumerate them here. Once the centre, the backbone, of the difference of opinion has been removed, all its resultant consequences are simultaneously removed.

It is characteristic that the petty bourgeois nature of Trotskyism is revealed precisely in the fact that in the period when the Party had already gained conspicuous success in the important question of the village, Trotskyism came forward as an opponent of this cause. Trotsky came forward as opponent, declaring that our workers cannot liquidate the kulak, but only the workers of foreign countries, that in our country we do not possess the powers enabling us to gain the victory over the kulak.

This main difference of opinion which I have mentioned gave rise to various differences of opinion on the character of the alliance with the decisive masses of the peasantry, on the nature and methods of the offensive against the capitalist elements and the liquidation of the kulak as a class. Differences of opinion on these matters were perfectly inevitable, after differences had shown themselves in the decisive question. This demonstrates the correctness of the attack carried on against us, the correctness of the struggle against our standpoint. And at the present time, now that

the decisive, although the first, successes have been achieved, now that the further development of the general line is bound up with the consolidation of these successes and the rapid advance along this line, now it is perfectly obvious that the most determined struggle against all who fail to comprehend the enormous significance of this question—the question of the socialisation of agricultural production and the change of the class attitude of the overwhelming majority of the population of the Union—becomes absolutely inevitable, absolutely necessary.

During the Ural Conference I knew only of the attacks on the C.C. with regard to the collectivisation exaggerations and the responsibility of the C.C. in this matter. I opposed this standpoint with my utmost energy and determination. Later on a number of notices appeared in the press, reporting other attacks with reference to other questions. Mamayev and a number of others put in an appearance. And as these may still believe that I maintain my old standpoint... (Interjection: Your standpoint has not been clear.) ... I declare with the utmost decision that during the struggle against the C.C. I committed a great error, and that they are committing a still graver, simply for the reason that in the meantime, since the liquidation of my differences of opinion, the Party has again advanced a long way. The last winter, the few months which the Party has spent in the struggle for the collectivisation of agricultural production, represent a whole epoch, seen from the standpoint of historical importance. This period has already been passed by some districts. And when people continue to attack the general line of the Party, after this epoch of gigantic historical importance, and in face of the utter clearness of the practical arguments adduced, then these people must be chastised, certainly no less severely than we were chastised, actually perhaps even more severely, since they fail to comprehend even now that anyone attempting to alter the general line of the Party in the question of the socialisation of agricultural production will encounter the energetic resistance of not only the working class and its Party, but the most energetic resistance of the great masses of the peasantry, who have become the active promoters and creators of this cause.

Then to the question of the difficulties. We have one stage of the great transformation behind us—the transformation towards the new organisation of agricultural production. Like every reconstructive work, the organisation of agricultural production, the reconstruction of grain production on a large scale, requires both vast investments and certain terms within which the work is to be carried on at full steam. The Party has succeeded in accomplishing this stage of the socialisation of agricultural production with such efficiency that more than the share formerly supplied by the kulak is now being produced. This is a gigantic success. And yet socialised agricultural largescale production does not by any means yield as much as it could, or as much as it will in the near future. A large number of the difficulties which we are now passing through are due to this period of reconstruction in the agricultural production of the village, which cannot yet produce those results which it will produce when it is consolidated, improved, and completed. Hence the question of tempo is of paramount importance, for the overcoming of these difficulties, their final solution, can solely and exclusively be accomplished in combination with the continuation of the work along that same path upon which the Party has already gained such conspicuous success. Every exploitation of the difficulties for the purpose of criticising the general line of the Party is in its very nature an invitation to join the petty bourgeois elements against the socialist elements of the village. It is possible to overcome the difficulties only by following the general line of the Party, by attaining the maximum acceleration of our tempo in the organisation of socialised large scale agricultural production and in the development of industry.

In the press, or in one of the speeches, I have been reproached with having said that 5–7 years ago nobody foresaw, in my opinion, the tempo now attained. In any case, at that time I had no differences with the Central Committee of the Party on the general line of the Party. Therefore I could not take as starting point any different standpoint. But if anyone had asked me at that time whether in the third year of the reconstruction period it would be possible to record a tempo of almost 50% in the increase of gross pro-

duction, I should have replied that this was not realisable. I do not adduce this for the purpose of accusing anybody or justifying myself. I adduce it to show what extraordinary possibilities we possess for the acceleration of the tempo. Comrade Stalin has already told us in his report that extensive sections of the Five Year Plan will be accomplished, not in four years, but in three, some even in two. Today it is scarcely possible to place faith even in scientific economic calculations, since any reckoning of a possible rate of development is still based to a certain extent on some comparison with the tempo of the bourgeois countries. The events in our country are happening for the first time in the history of the world, and can be compared with nothing else; no-one can say at the present moment: These are the limits of development in this given period, and cannot be exceeded. Therefore among us the question of the tempo must be combined with the exhaustion of the whole of the possibilities, many of them still untapped, of its maximum acceleration.

It seems to me that at the Ural Conference somebody named me and Trotsky in one breath. I must declare that I have always been a consistent enemy of all Trotskyism, and always shall be. I was the bitterest enemy of Trotskyism at the time when it first took rise, and both at the time of its existence during the illegal period of our Party and in the period after October, and shall remain its bitter enemy.

Now to the question of tempo. Trotsky advances two Menshevik theses. Firstly he throws discredit upon the carrying out of the Five Year Plan in 4 years, although this slogan is receiving the support of every single worker in the Soviet Union. It has already become a people's slogan, known in every factory, in every collective farm, in every workshop. Secondly he rejects complete collectivisation and with this the liquidation of the kulak as class. Therefore a resolute struggle against any relapse into Trotskyism, against any sign of Trotskyism, is an imperative necessity.

The question of the Right deviation is generally combined with the question of the tempo of industrialisation. With respect to this question I find myself in a peculiar position, since I have proved myself to be one of those people who have formed the centre of attraction of the Right opportunist tendencies. Certainly, I must admit that among the Right opportunists there are sufficient people who have opposed the tempo of industrialisation which we have taken, whilst I personally, though I have perhaps erred at times, have invariably endeavoured to attain the maximum. This does not of course release me from the political responsibility incurred by the fact that all elements of the Right opportunist type have clung to me. (Interjection: What have you to say about the 2 years plan?) With respect to the 2 years plan, perhaps an error was made here . . . (Interjection: Perhaps?) Perhaps the fault lay in causing it to be opposed to the Five-Year Plan. I advocated the operative plan of 2 years of the Five Year Plan in agricultural production, for the reason that it is very difficult to survey the process of agriculture within the confines of a calendar year (control figures). (Interjection: Where was the error then?) The political error arose from the fact that the 2 year plan furnished the possibility of interpreting my words as if I opposed the operative 2 year plan of agricultural production to the whole 5 year plan. (Interjection: That was the only error?) Only that. Practically, the necessary measures for the following economic year can be laid down in the annual control figures. (Lyubtschenko: Do you then agree that the standpoint of the Right deviation is the standpoint of the petty bourgeois liberal?) This combination of the petty bourgeois and liberal conceptions applied to me, is not quite comprehensible to me after all I have said.

Now to the question of industrialisation. In connection with what I have already said, I shall leave no doubt as to my standpoint in this question, but declare categorically that just at the present moment, when one of the most decisive battles is being fought in connection with the enormous aggravation of the class struggle, the chief weapon of the working class in these class struggles and battles is unquestionably the factory, the industrial undertaking. Hence we may figuratively compare the question of the development of industry, and its tempo, with the provisioning of the army with weapons and ammunition in wartime.

At the present time we are carrying on a tense planned economic struggle. The question of the development of industry, and of the tempo of this development, is the question

of the arming of the working class for the class struggle. Hence anyone treating with contempt or inattention such factors as the shock brigade, the socialist competition, the participation of fresh masses of the workers in the great upsurge of labour enthusiasm in our country—not only among the workers, but among working youth, working and peasant women—commits a very grave error indeed. I have already emphasised several times, and repeat once more, that the error of the trade unions under their old leadership, their very serious error, was their failure to keep up with this process. The trade unions, in their capacity of the greatest mass organisation of the working class, must lend their support to the mighty labour upsurge, must give all that the greatest mass organisation of the workers is capable of giving. It is a great merit of the C.C. of the Party, the Polbureau, that they and the whole Party have succeeded in achieving such a hitherto unheard of upsurge among the masses of the people for the realisation of the general line of the Party.

Comrades, I have tried to make plain to you all that has been most painful to me personally in my struggle with the Party. I repeat that there is probably much which I have not said . . . (Interjection: You have not said the main thing!) . . . much which I have overlooked, but I have endeavoured to speak of fundamentals . . . (Interjection: And you have left out precisely the fundamentals!) . . . of the points around which my differences of opinion with the Central Committee have concentrated. It appears to me that the differences of opinion with which I have dealt fully confirm the conclusions drawn by the Party in its struggle against us—that our standpoint has been in actuality a standpoint defending petty bourgeois resistance, the petty bourgeois struggle against the socialist offensive.

I close with a brief reference to the speech of one of the comrades from Ural, Comrade Finkovsky. I believe. He spoke to the following effect: The declaration made by Rykov, that no line could guarantee that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be victorious—is practically the slogan of: "give it up".

In this question I have said what Comrade Stalin said in one part of his speech. I have maintained nothing different, nor had I any intention of doing so. I differ with nobody on this question, except with the Trotskyist opposition. I have taken as starting point the decisions of the Party and the Comintern, the resolution of the 15th Party Conference, in which we read:

"The experience gained in the Russian revolution has proved that the first victory is not only possible in one country, but that under given important conditions this first country of the victorious proletarian revolution (given a certain support on the part of the international proletariat) may be maintained and consolidated for a long period, even when this support does not take the form of direct proletarian revolution in the other countries.

But Leninism teaches us at the same time that the final victory of socialism, in the sense of a complete guarantee against the restoration of bourgeois conditions, is only possible on an international scale (or in some decisively important countries)." (Resolution passed by the 15th Party Congress on the tasks of the Comintern.)

Never and nowhere have I said anything else, nor could I have said anything else. It is right enough to chastise me, but not without reason. Comrade Finkovsky would like to represent me as a person so ignorant that I am not aware what the building up of socialism in one country is, or what the complete guarantee is. It is enough to make a cat laugh! On this very point I have disputed with Trotsky, as many of those present can bear witness. How can I be accused of such things? It is unheard of! It may be that my report at the Ural Conference was clumsily expressed in this or that point, but it certainly did not contain any such nonsense as that foisted upon me.

(Kabakov: If it did not contain such nonsense as that, all the same it contained obvious nonsense.)

Rykov: However that may be, I made that report desiring to defend the line of the Party. No-one can assert that this was not the case. I made the mistake of saying too little about myself personally, about my differences of opinion. (Interjection: And about the struggle against the Right deviation.)

I said more about the Right deviations than was said in

the other reports. I made a survey of it. I was of the opinion that the question of the differences of opinion was exhausted.

I do not in the least deny the political responsibility which I incurred when I combated the Central Committee and the general line of the Party before the November Plenum. My errors in this regard are further enhanced by the position which I held in the country and in the Party. And this circumstance furnished the hostile elements with the opportunity of exploiting my differences of opinion to a much greater extent than in the case of the other adherents of the Right deviation.

This increases my responsibility. In speaking from this platform, I am not making my declarations with the intention of extenuation. To me it seems that I have striven to show how serious have been the consequences of my errors—serious not only for me, but for our common interests. I undertake to do all that the Party considers necessary to wipe out as speedily as possible the consequences of these errors.

Comrade Kirov (Leningrad):

Comrades, Yesterday we listened to the circumstantial speeches of those comrades who have formed the head of the Right opposition. They gave us their views on the status of our socialist work at the present time, expressing themselves sometimes in a somewhat merry manner, sometimes threateningly, and sometimes with truly Biblical pathos. We have listened very attentively to these comrades. I do not wish to be harsh, but it seems to be that the speeches heard yesterday, reduced to a brief formula, yield the conclusion that Comrades Rykov and Tomsky thought they were in the presence of an audience who had lost their memories, and had forgotten the phase of our struggle and work just passed. (Interjection: Hear, hear!)

Comrade Tomsky expressed his standpoint very merrily.

Kasanovitsch: Truly, most merrily.

Kirov: It seems to me that his whole speech, although he several times claimed to be a politician, and fully aware of the responsibility incurred by his words, was clearly characterised by the endeavour not to express political petty bourgeois views too crassly.

Voroshilov: Right!

Kirov: We have listened to lengthy expatiations on various intentions and errors. Sub-tones of repentance might be heard. But in spite of all this, the main point, the decisive factor of the cause of the whole disputes in our Party, was not touched upon.

What is the real point? Before this present audience the question must be placed in a clear, simple, and Bolshevik form. It should have been stated plainly and openly in these speeches, as it was long ago stated by our Party and our Central Committee, that since a certain time, after the 15th Party Congress, two fundamentally different lines made their appearance within the Party, two different programmes of the building up of socialism in our country: The line of the Party and the line of the Right opportunists, and that the victory of the opportunist line would have led inevitably in the end to the restoration of capitalism. This should have been stated. This is the decisive and fundamental point. The general line of the Party consists of the resolute pursuance of our course towards the industrialisation of our country, and of working for the realisation of the reconstruction of our agriculture, on the basis of this industrialisation, by means of socialisation and collectivisation.

The Party, faced by such mighty tasks, has energetically tackled the question of the reorganisation of work in all its ranks, the question of the work of the transmission organs establishing contact between our Party and the proletariat and all workers: the trade unions, Soviets, etc.

At the same time the Party has set itself the task of aiding, to the utmost of its power, the Comintern in the consolidation and intensified Bolshevisation of our brother Parties. The Right have deviated from the Party course in defending their own programme, differing in principle from the general line of the Party. The Right came forward quite openly and resolutely in opposition to the tempo of industrialisation initiated by the Party. Their propaganda of "adaptation to the weak spots", of throttling the tempo of industrialisation, would have inevitably led in the end to the frustration of the industrialisation and socialist transformation of the Union.

The Right defended the principle of "adaptation" to the

individual peasant farm at a moment when there could be no advance toward socialist reconstruction without a socialist transformation of small-scale commodity production and without overcoming the extreme backwardness of this production. In this connection the Right opposed energetically all the measures taken by the Party in the village. Whether we take the question of grain collecting, of individual taxation, it will be seen plainly that the Right did not approve of the general line of the Party in the decisive questions relating to the village.

The Right were in agreement with the liberal interpretation of the New Economic Policy, and inclined towards the abandoning of proletarian state regulation in commercial traffic with the peasantry. The Right opposed the reorganisation of Party work, the reorganisation of the work of the transmission organs of our Party. Further, the standpoint of the Right inevitably led to a weakening of the Bolshevisation of the communist brother Parties.

A moment's consideration shows that if the Right stressed the importance of the development of the individual peasant farm, precisely at a juncture when the Party and the working class had reached the point of the socialist transformation of the peasants farm, the logical continuation of this standpoint was bound to bring them to the position of defending the kulak farm, of representing the ideology of the kulak. If we decipher this situation from the viewpoint of our international work, we arrive inevitably at the following result: The bourgeois counter-revolution outside of our country finds an immediate point of contact with our country through the kulak. And if the Right opportunists preach that the kulaks are inevitably bound to grow peacefully into the socialist system of our economy, then everyone accepting this view must comprehend that in the eyes of the opportunists therefore, the contact of capitalism outside of our country with the remnants of capitalism in our country does not represent that main danger which our Party has always so expressly emphasised, and which imposes upon us the duty of strengthening the defence of the Soviet Union by all means.

Other inevitable results of the Right standpoint are the demobilisation of the Communist Party, the veiling of the dangers of a military intervention, and the lulling to sleep of the revolutionary watchfulness of the Communist brothers Parties.

And finally: Armed with this opportunist ideology, the Right opposition set itself the goal of reaching the position of leaders of our Communist Party.

Who does not know and remember the agitation carried on by the Right against the policy of the C. C. of our Party, the violent attacks to which the general secretary of our Party, Comrade Stalin, was subjected? We all recollect very well the plans which matured in the brains of the Right, aiming at capturing the leading Party organs, to the end that an abrupt turn might be carried out in the policy of the Party.

And after all this these comrades come forward here and talk at length, half naively, half peevishly, half reservedly, about all sorts of trifles.

It should have been stated from this platform what would have happened had the calculations and hopes of the Right been fulfilled, if the Right had succeeded in seizing the leadership of the Party and the C. C., and had been able to realise their opportunist programme.

No member of the Party can now feel the slightest doubt that the triumph of the Right views, the realisation of the opportunist theory of "constant concessions" to the peasantry, of the Tomsky theory, would have signified the unfettering of the capitalist elements in our country, the strengthening of their positions in town and country, and the extinction of the socialist section of our economy.

The Party did not tread this path. The Party pursued more resolutely than ever its course towards the realisation of its slogans, the Leninist slogans, and began its unwearying struggle against the Right opportunists.

To-day the Right enjoy but slight prestige. But how were matters a few months ago? Of what did they not accuse our Party and the leaders of the C. C.? They accused the Party and its C. C. of sliding into Trotskyism. The C. C. was accused of carrying on a policy of military-feudal exploitation of the peasantry. The Party was reproached with rearing bureaucracy everywhere, and finally our C. C. was accused of such crime as the disruption of the Communist International.

Interjection: That is their catchword.

Kirov: It is called their "catchword", but I do not know whether it is a catchword or some other word. I doubt however, that it will catch. But I believe that it would be difficult to bring a graver indictment against our Party.

A few months now having passed, Comrade Tomsy now comes forward like some "Mameluke" (Laughter), and cracks jokes, and relates how it accidentally occurred ... quite imperceptibly ... quite gradually ... that an Ivan Ivanovitch and a Michail Pavlovitch met and how they started conversation and exchanged opinions on the line of the Party. Thus in reality nothing whatever had happened, except that this conversation found a certain echo outside of their own heads.

You, leaders of experience and repute, it is now alleged, knew very well that the struggle had to be carried on within the confines of the Party. But you could not help it, the logic of the struggle caused somebody or another to exploit your differences of opinion, and brought about exaggerations here and there, etc. At bottom, however, you say, fraction work has not been carried on. Comrade Uglanov, too, has dealt with this. But not we alone, but the whole Party and the whole working class are perfectly aware whether the Right opportunists were leading us. This should have been stated here. The actual programme represented by the Right deviation should have been stated. (Interjection: Hear, hear!) Comrade, Rykov, in the heat of the battle, replied to an interjection by saying: Truly it did happen that my name was misused by forces hostile to the Party. — I should like to recommend Comrades Rykov and Tomsy to read, if nothing else, at least the utterances of the academician Platonov. He describes the platform of the Right much better than Comrade Tomsy has done. He puts the the question unequivocally and clearly. He sympathises with the Right not only because they combat the general line of the Party. It is true, that every dispute within the Party is pounced upon by hostile elements. But here the case is of a much more serious and profound nature. Here it is a question of the programme of the Right being related by ties of blood, mentally and ideologically, to the conceptions of these Platonovs, Ustryalovs, and their consorts. This is the question. And about this we want to hear something at this Congress. It is no question of confessions of repentance, or of banishing anyone into the desert to live on wild honey. At the Party Congress it must be stated plainly, comprehensibly to all, what the programme of the Right represents, and what are its class roots and class content. It does not suffice to admit errors. I should have liked, Comrade Tomsy, to have heard you defend your Right views at this Party Congress, and to have seen what would have happened. (Laughter. Interjection: Hear, hear.) Our work is not accomplished within the four walls of this building. You are a far-seeing man. You know what goes on beyond this audience. You and your friends must surely see that mighty wave of energy with which the Moscow proletariat, and the proletariat of the whole Union, are reinforcing the work of our Party Congress, and what threads bind our Party to the whole working class. If you are the courageous man you say you are, and plunge into the conflict with a heavy fist, still I doubt whether you would have ventured, in the present situation, to stand up here and defend your opportunist errors! We heard confessions of error at the November Plenum. What do we need now? What do the Party and the working class expect from you? Comrades, leaders of the Right opposition, you must state plainly what your programme is from the Bolshevik standpoint, and say openly, without straying into theoretical prevarications, that your programme is at bottom a kulak programme ... (Interjections: Hear, hear! Applause.) ... whose execution would have led in the end to the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the restoration of capitalism.

Comrades, the programme of socialist reconstruction of the C. C. and the programme of the Right have been tested by real life. It was actually painful to me to hear Comrade Rykov speak here of the Five-Year Plan, our tempo, etc. He stated, that nobody had foreseen the present tempo of industrialisation and the achievements attained: he for his part had always stood for a rapid tempo of industrialisation and had only disputed the question of a few percentages this way or that, etc. Now that the tempo has been attained, they are all in favour of it. If you ask the most notorious bureaucrat in any Soviet institution — he too is in favour

of the tempo, of collectivisation. And more than this, even Lloyd George is of the opinion that our Five-Year Plan is not only bold, but, as he puts it, clever. Even good old Ford, the "enlightened" capitalist, has grasped the fact that our Five-Year Plan is something real. Did the Party Congress then need such acknowledgements on the part of the former leaders of the Right opposition?

Comrade Rykov stated that his fundamental and decisive error was his under-estimation of the possibility of the collectivisation of the peasant farms, and that this in itself is only a matter of under-estimating a possible percentage of 40, 30, or 50 percent.—This declaration cannot be otherwise designated than as a subterfuge, a camouflage of the essentials of the question. The chief deficiency of the speeches of Comrades Tomsy and Rykov yesterday consists of just this fact, that they give no answer to the question of the nature and class content of their opportunist programme. I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of these comrades, but we have every reason, every objective reason, to be on our guard, and to meet with definite mistrust everything which has been told us here.

I should like to add a few words on Comrade Uglanov's speech. At the November Plenum he confessed his errors, expressed repentance, and recognised the general line of the Party. But a few months passed, difficulties arose, a stagnation in the village — and once more, as he states himself, he began to waver. Now he has stopped wavering again and acknowledges the line of the Party to be perfectly right. Whether we want it or not, we come to the conclusion that if difficulties will arise again to-morrow — and this is inevitable in the present complicated situation of socialist reconstruction — then we have little guarantee that comrade Uglanov will not begin to vacillate again. Comrade Uglanov is not a simple Party member, not a Party candidate of yesterday; he is a member of the C.C., yesterday the leader of our advanced Moscow organisation. All who have followed his speech attentively must have observed the tendency underlying it. Comrade Stalin told us in his report that the opportunist tendency generates insecurity in the question of the victory of our cause.

Such a tendency as that expressed by Comrade Uglanov paves the way for the class enemy to one position after another.

It seems to me that we shall be right if we state at this Party Congress that we have not heard the fundamentals, the main point, from the representatives of the opposition. (Interjection: Hear, hear!) We need not hear from Tomsy and Rykov an admission only of their errors and of the renunciation of their platform, but at the same time — as I have already said — the stigmatisation of their programme as a kulak one, leading finally to the decline of the socialist construction. Without this fundamental differentiation they cannot fulfil the second demand made them by the Party. After the November Plenum they disarmed. Then they should have resolutely defended the general line of the Party, they should have consistently taken up the fight against the Right elements, against the Right opposition. Has it been observed anywhere that they have done their Party duty? Not in the very least, although the disciples of their views have spoken in the "discussion supplement" of the "Pravda" and in some of the nuclei. Has any one of them reproved the defenders of their opportunist views? Not one. Nor will they do this in the future, unless these comrades recognise the utter perniciousness of the opportunist platform which they formerly defended.

A good number of years ago, Comrade Bukharin described in lively colours the kulak theory of the growing of the kulak into socialism. At the same time he proclaimed the firm stabilisation of capitalism and of "organised capitalism" in the present stage of capitalist development. And what now? Now we are obliged to admit, objectively, that Comrade Bukharin is stranded in these questions. Comrade Bukharin is missing at this Party Congress. He is said to be ill. Obviously he is. But what is equally obvious? That Comrade Bukharin, yesterday still a leader of the C.C., could certainly have found ways and means of expressing his standpoint in the decisive questions of the policy of the Party. (Interjection: Hear, hear!)

The result is something quite impossible. You will probably remember the Mamayev article in the "Pravda", developing the ideology of the Right deviation. If I am not mistaken, Mamayev is much less versed in literary matters

than Comrade Bukharin. Could Comrade Bukharin really not express some opinion on the questions raised? At least in an article? But Comrade Bukharin preserves silence as if he had lost all power of utterance. Meanwhile, as I have already pointed out, the Party is waiting to hear his standpoint, and not alone the Party, but all those who yesterday set such high hopes on the famous "organised capitalism". And all this involuntarily sows distrust toward the former leaders of the Right, and keeps the Party on its guard against them. I believe that we are right in continuing to be on guard.

We all still remember the Kamenev-Zinoviev opposition, to which Comrade Bukharin and his friends erected very definite bridges, and concluded a very definite alliance and bloc. You all remember that five years ago the Kamenev-Zinoviev opposition was in its full prime. It has taken almost five years before Zinoviev has at last, within the last few days, found the way to a more or less correct Party language.

This is evidently not so easy. Comrade Tomsy is right when he says that if one has been quite somewhere else yesterday, it is no simple matter to return to the Party Congress and make a clean confession. True, Comrade Tomsy, the liberation from the clutches of the kulaks is a difficult matter. The opinion prevails among us that Trotskyism signifies an inevitable desertion into the camp of counter-revolution. This is true. But it is equally true that Right opportunist viewpoints, if obstinately insisted upon, too can lead so far that it is exceedingly difficult to find the way back. In view of your candour, Comrade Tomsy, I am of the opinion that we must say at this 16th Party Congress: "What the Party wanted to hear, the fundamental, the decisive, the main point — this it has not heard from Comrades Rykov and Tomsy." In Comrade Rykov's speech we could hear, as ever, the undertone: "In reality our differences of opinion have been erased from the agenda by life itself; why then should we speak about them, why return to our standpoint, to our platform, etc.?" The industrialisation takes its course, collectivisation develops, the international position of the Soviet Union is becoming more firmly established, socialist reconstruction is going forward, what is there to talk about then, why rake up bygones? Let us look on and see how matters proceed."

"Give me the opportunity to work!" cries Tomsy. Who has prevented his working hitherto? Even at the time when Tomsy was a victim of the Right vacillations, even at that time we forced him to work very energetically. He did not want to. After his disarmament at the November Plenum, we gave him the full possibility: work, unsparing work. Who stopped him? And now he steps forward here at the 16th Party Congress and declares: "If you want to be convinced, give me the possibility of working." Tomsy gives a very goodnatureed description of the struggle of the Right opposition against the Party. A description which, to put it mildly, is hypocrisy through and through. What did Tomsy do at the Trade Union Congress? Was that not opposition? Had Tomsy not been rebuffed on that occasion, had he won over the half or the majority of the 2000 delegates of the 6th Trade Union Congress, instead of only 80 or 90, we can well imagine where he would have gone with his Right platform. In this he failed; he ran short of breath, he found no support in the Party ... and for this reason, for this reason only, he did not tread that path which Kamenev and Zinoviev trod in their more open and blunter struggle against the Party.

The demarcation insisted upon should also be noted. We have all known: Rykov, Tomsy, Uglanov, etc., belong together. But yesterday we heard differently. Rykov was even offended at being classified with Uglanov. He declared: "Uglanov says in his speech 'we', but I have no connection with this 'we'." Since how long? This is obviously intended to mean Rykov is of the opinion that Comrade Uglanov has not yet burnt all his bridges and will not burn them. It is scarcely possible to draw any other conclusion from Comrade Rykov's declaration. Yesterday they all ate from one common oppositional plate, and were friends, but to-day they do not want to hear anything about one another. Evidently there are various grades of acknowledgment of errors. Some go further than others, some save up a few reserves in case there should be another inner Party struggle, so that they will not then be left defenceless. But there may be some other reason. Perhaps Comrade Rykov will explain to the 16th Congress the perspectives of development of oppositional work. Perhaps the reason lies here. Perhaps he will try to reason whither

the continued struggle would have led. Perhaps, finally, Comrade Rykov now sees clearly that every initial means of struggle against the Party is now exhausted, and that, if the struggle against the Party is to be continued, it must be done by means of more effectual and comprehensive measures and methods of propaganda for and in defence of his platform. However this may be, in our eyes Comrades Rykov, Tomsy, Bukharin, and Uglanov, are all in one camp. (Interjection: Hear! Hear!) We, for our part, retain our old standpoint in our designation of the propaganda made by Right opportunism, we maintain our old decision that the propaganda of the views of the Right deviations is incompatible with membership of the Communist Party. (Applause.)

It has not been for the sake of words, not for the sake of a catchword, nor for the sake of agitation and propaganda in our Party regulations, that in the present stage of the building up of socialism we regard the Right danger as the chief and greatest danger, and that we shall therefore continue to struggle against the Right deviation, not less resolutely, but more determinedly than ever. (Applause.) Therefore we must say to those comrades who really and sincerely burn their bridges, as Bolsheviks: This is not enough; you must not only burn your bridges, you must declare publicly, before the whole working class, what bridges these are, of what material they are constructed, to what place the bridges of yours form a means of communication. Comrade Tomsy, you must not only burn behind you all your bridges, large and small, over which you passed so pleasantly only yesterday, but you must join your arms with ours from to-day onwards, and do your utmost to fight even more resolutely than we against those who will seek to utilise your experience to reach these bridges. (Applause.)

Now, to be sure, that we have been successful, now that we can record vast achievements and are absolutely convinced of the future perspectives of our socialist reconstruction, things are beginning to look a little more comfortable, even to Comrade Uglanov, and to Comrades Tomsy, Rykov, and Bukharin. But at the time when we were still busy consolidating our positions, at the time of our first decisive conflict with the last remnants of capitalism, with the classes now dying out, the sight of this acute stage of the class war aroused apprehension and terror among some strata of our ranks. Right opportunism placed itself in opposition to the Party line. All this is now brushed aside with a slight smile, as some humorous episode. It must, however, be said that every percentage which we have won in the tempo of our industrialisation, every collective farm more which we have been able to organise, has been an achievement won not only in a struggle against the kulaks and other counter-revolutionary elements in our country, but at the same time against Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsy, and Uglanov. (Stormy Applause. Interjection from the Presidium: Hear! Hear!) This must be realised, and after all this, these people make such complacent and good-humoured speeches here!

The Party is faced by gigantic tasks. We have accomplished much, but have still more to accomplish. Every objective prerequisite exists for the further successful building up of socialism.

Our first care must be for the decisively important factor, for our great Leninist two million Party, the Party cast in one piece, the Party forming the rock against which all are shipwrecked who seek to stand in the way of the victorious advance of socialism. (Applause.)

Comrades, this is what the Party now demands of us. And that is what the working class too demands of us. This is asked of us. (Interjection: Hear! Hear!) We shall not attain what we require by means of such trends as have been revealed here, by means of such fighting "pathos" as that employed here by the comrades of the opposition in explaining their standpoint. We do not doubt that our Party, armed by the experience of long years of socialist reconstruction, will prove capable of securing the conditions necessary for its continued victorious work.

Comrades, we shall leave this 16th Party Congress better equipped than before for our further struggles for socialism. Our further success depends solely on that factor stressed by Comrade Stalin at the close of his report, when he cried: "Long live Leninism!" Leninism, upon which the policy of the Party is based, is the guarantee of our victory, not only in our own country, but all over the world. (Prolonged applause.)

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

Reformist Co-operative Bureaucracy Making Ready for the Congress of the Co-operative Alliance.

By Heinrich Oswald.

The 13th International Co-operative Congress is to be held in Vienna from the 24th to the 28th. August.

It meets in a situation of steadily growing crisis, tremendous unemployment, of brutal offensive of the employers against wages and all social-political achievements of the working class on the one side, and powerful advance of socialist construction in the Soviet Union on the other.

The Consumers' Co-operative Societies are being drawn more and more into the general economic crisis. The new economic depression which set in in Autumn last year led to a considerable retardation of the development of the Consumers' Co-operative Societies. As a result of the maturing economic crisis this depression is growing both in depth and extent. The turnover of the Consumers' Co-operatives for the first months of 1930 is below the level of the corresponding months of last year.

In the fight to overcome the economic crisis, in the defence of the capitalist order there is revealed most clearly the class treachery of the reformist Co-operative leaders; it is becoming ever more apparent that they are the agents of monopoly-capital in the camp of the working class.

Co-operative reformism is preparing for the Co-operative Congress. The recent meeting in Leipzig of the Co-operative Alliance furnished unmistakable proof that the policy of the reformist heads of the Consumers' Co-operatives is becoming ever farther removed from the interests of the working masses and that in the fight between Labour and capital it is on the side of the latter. The best proof of this is the rejection of the motion brought in by the Soviet delegation to include in the agenda of the forthcoming congress a report on support by the Co-operatives of the unemployed and strikers.

The Co-operative social fascists are not sparing in the use of pacifist phrases („Universal peace“, „peace resolutions“ etc.). Nevertheless, they are working hand in glove with the social democracy and the reformist trade union bureaucrats in the preparation of the new war and the attack on the Soviet Union (the Boncour law in France, the law on the defence of the country in Czechoslovakia, Finland etc. provide for the incorporation of the Co-operatives in the military apparatus in the event of war). It is therefore quite understandable that at the same meeting the Co-operative leaders refused to discuss the question of the fight of the Co-operatives against war when the Soviet Russian delegation moved that this question form one of the items of the Congress agenda.

The brusque rejection of the Soviet Russian motions to place on the agenda of the congress the question of Co-operative support of the unemployed and strikers by the Co-operatives as well as of the fight of the Co-operatives against the danger of war suffices to show that the Vienna Congress — with the exception of the delegation from the Soviet Russian Co-operatives — will not stand for proletarian demands, will not oppose the capitalist offensive and the danger of war, will not come forward in defence of the Soviet Union, but will advocate industrial peace and will be a demonstration in the interests of the Austrian social democracy.

To judge from the appeal for International Co-operative Day recently issued by the Co-operative Alliance, the report will boast of the „great achievements of the Consumers' Co-operative Movement“. As usual there will be a detailed report on the relations between the Co-operative Alliance and the League of Nations. In the discussion, of this question, May, the General Secretary, will report on the various „fights“ which the Co-operative Alliance has conducted in the past three years — these are „fights“ for a place in the organs of the League of Nations. A considerable part of the activity

of the Alliance in the period covered by the report consisted in propagating the decisions of the economic organs of the League of Nations. All requests of its „patrons“ to grant its representatives seats and votes in the organs of the League of Nations were emphatically rejected. It appears that the Co-operative Alliance has not yet furnished sufficient proof that it can be useful to the League of Nations.

The attention of the Congress will apparently be concentrated on the resolution submitted by the Austrian Co-operatives on the future activity of the Co-operative Alliance.

Dr. Renner's work, „Ways of Development“ serves as the source of the programme which is to be submitted to the Congress for confirmation. The resolution proposes that all consumers' Co-operatives shall demand from their governments and from the League of Nations the introduction of a uniform customs tariff for all countries.

The lying character of the social fascist fight for reduced prices is shown by the fact that even in those countries where the social democrats are at the helm or where they are participating in coalition governments, customs duties are continually being raised. This means a tremendously heavy burden on the household budgets of all workers. Even if we accept the calculations of a bourgeois economist, K. Morrison-Bell, we see that the cost of living has been increased by customs duties as follows: England and Holland 8 per cent., Denmark 9 per cent., Norway 12.5 per cent., Finland and Sweden 13 per cent., Austria 14 per cent., Turkey 14.5 per cent., Albania and Lithuania 15 per cent., Estonia, Germany, Greece and Portugal 15.5 per cent., Yugoslavia 20 per cent., Rumania 21 per cent., Poland 22 per cent., Spain 26 per cent.

According to the above-mentioned resolution, the Congress shall also demand control by the governments and the League of Nations of monopolist cartels and trusts.

The official standpoint of the Alliance in the questions of trusts and cartels is as follows: The Consumers' Co-operatives must take part in the capitalist undertakings. . . . They must enter this organisation (trusts and cartels) with the express intention of „ousting the capitalists from them and getting the organisation into their hands“. (W. Servy, quoted in the official organ of the Co-operative Alliance „Internationale Genossenschafts-Rundschau“, 1929, No. 9.)

That is the way in which the Co-operative Alliance „fights“ against the trusts.

The Congress will also hear a report by Klepsig (Central Union of the Co-operatives of Germany) on the theme, „Principles of the Rochdale Pioneers and the Modern Credit Trade System“.

The Co-operative leaders of Western Europe cite the Rochdale foundation in order to combat most vehemently the demand of the revolutionary Co-operative opposition that members be granted credit, especially in view of the present difficult situation of the working class. The report and resolution by Klepsig are an attempt of the Hamburg tendency in this question, i. e. to get the Congress to approve the prohibition of credit to members, regardless of their situation.

On the agenda of the Congress there also stands the question of the establishment of connections between the Agricultural and Consumers' Co-operatives. The practical purpose of the discussion of this question is to help to bring about a corn-trade convention between the Canadian Wheat-pool and the English Co-operative Wholesale Society. In reality the object of this convention is to maintain the price of corn at a definite level.

The revolutionary Co-operative opposition must carry on a great work of enlightenment in connection with the approaching Vienna Congress and show the reformist Co-operators to the proletariat in their true light. They must stigmatise the social democratic leaders and the Co-operative and trade union bureaucrats before the broad masses as agents of monopoly capital in the ranks of the proletariat and fight for their expulsion from the proletarian ranks.

Unless the reformist bureaucracy is removed from its positions and from the Consumers' Co-operatives, the latter will always be mere appendages of the capitalist order. They can become organs of the revolutionary struggle only when their leadership has been captured by the revolutionary opposition.