

Vol. 10 No. 36

INTERNATIONAL
PRESS

7th August 1930

CORRESPONDENCE

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: Dönhof 2856 and 2867.

CONTENTS

Z. Kalandra: The International Red Day	698	The Negro Movement	
Politics		G. Padmore: British Imperialism in Nigeria	705
W. H.: The Commencement of the Election Campaign in Germany	699	Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union	
Z. K.: The Agrarian Conferences in Bucharest and Sinaja	700	Introduction of Compulsory Education in the Soviet Union	706
Against Colonial Oppression		In the International	
P. Ch.: Letters from Egypt I.	701	Open Letter from the C.C. of the C.P. of Norway	706
Fascism		Proletarian Women's Movement	
Appeal of the Scandinavian Sections of the C.I. for the Stockholm Anti-Fascist Conference	702	M. Bulle: The First International Conference of Working Women in Moscow	707
The Labour Movement		Proletarian Youth Movement	
The C.P.F. and the Revolutionary Trade Union in the Struggle for the Leadership of the General Strike	702	Walter Kirshai: The First International Youth Conference	708
G. Sobottka: The Betrayal of the Mansfield Workers	703	XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.	
The White Terror		Kuybyshev: The Carrying out of the Five-Year Plan of Industry	709
Arrest of the Revolutionary Journalist Aladar Tamas in Budapest	703	Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Stalin and Kaganowitch	716
Before the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U.		Discussion on the Report of Comrade Molotov	731
Jan Sverma: The Red Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia before the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U.	704		

The Occupation of Changsha by the Chinese Red Army.

By Chie-Hua.

Changsha, the capital of the province of Hunan, one of the most important provinces in the heart of China, was captured on the 28th of July by the victoriously advancing 5th Red Army of the Chinese Soviet territories. Supported by the insurgent workers and peasants in town and country and by the mutiny of some of the government soldiers, who turned their rifles against their own commanders, the red workers and peasants' army was able, after heroic fighting, to achieve this tremendous victory.

The government troops and the "troops for security and order" (the police) who offered resistance were annihilatingly defeated and disarmed, the reactionary officers stood up against the wall, the police stations and the public building, post and telegraph offices occupied. The government buildings, the chief camp of reaction, were set on fire by the insurgent masses. The rich, the foreign capitalists and the missionaries fled in the greatest panic. Reactionary elements who organised counter-actions were shot. Amidst the boundless enthusiasm of the revolutionary masses, the Red Army, numbering ten thousand men, marched in well-disciplined ranks into the town.

In a surprisingly short time the whole of Changsha was covered with a sea of red flags, as the revolutionary population had held their flags in readiness long before the capture of the town. Leaflets were distributed and placards pasted on the fronts of the houses. The Soviet Power, the power of the workers, peasants and soldiers was proclaimed. In one of the important industrial centres of China, which recently was still a stronghold of the bloody Kuomintang reaction, there now waves the red flag with the hammer and sickle, the flag of the Soviet revolution.

In the great Chinese revolution from 1925 to 1927, the workers and peasants of the province of Hunan played an important part. In the Hankow period the so-called "Left" Kuomintang, the representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, were so terrified by the radical actions of the revolutionary workers and peasants of the province of Hunan, that, like their predecessor Chiang-Kai-shek, they went over with flags flying to the camp of the counter-revolution. After the defeat of the great Chinese revolution, the peasants of Hunan, making use of the experiences acquired in their past fights, in spite of the

bloody terror, continued to fight under the flag of the Soviet revolution. Out of these fights against the unbearably high ground rents and taxes, there developed armed fights which led to the establishment of village Soviets. Out of the partisan fights there arose the Red Army, which systematically advanced against the centres of power of the bourgeoisie. Already for some considerable time there has prevailed in nearly all the rural districts of Hunan the red power, which has now penetrated to the capital of the province.

With the capture of Changsha there has commenced a new chapter in the history of the Chinese revolution. It is the first time since the Canton Soviet revolt in December 1927 that a great industrial town is in the hands of the revolutionary workers. In the midst of the Soviet villages and small towns there now stands a big town as the main point of support of their power. The peasant Soviet districts thereby acquire a broader social-economic basis, which constitutes a driving force for the further development of the Chinese revolution. The leadership of the city proletariat in the whole revolutionary movement of China is strengthened by this victory. The working class, together with their peasant allies, will consolidate and drive forward the power of the revolution.

The victory of the Red Army in Changsha proves the uncheckable advance of the revolutionary workers and peasants. The Chinese revolution is undoubtedly approaching a fresh upsurge. To set up the Soviet power in one or a number of provinces is the next chief task confronting the revolutionary masses of China. The main line of the Chinese Communist Party is to unite all the existing Soviet districts in order to create a central Soviet Power. Up to the present there exist in all the Southern provinces small town and village Soviets. The Communist Party of China is of the opinion that, in order to concentrate these according to their geographical and political positions, the Soviet districts of these provinces must be divided into two chief groups, the first group embracing the provinces of Kwangtung, Fukien, and Kiangsi, and the second group embracing the provinces of Hunan and Hupeh. Red Changsha would form the centre of the two groups of power.

At the beginning of July the 5th Red Army occupied the town of Yochow, situated in the North of Changsha, but was compelled to evacuate it owing to the bombardment by the gun-boats of the English and American imperialists. The evacuation of this town by the Red Army was, however, not a direct retreat, for it thereby concentrated its forces in the hinterland in order to advance on Changsha. Yochow forms the entrance and exit of the province of Hunan. It lies directly on the Northern frontier and is connected with the Yangtse river by lake Tung-Ting. Yochow is connected with Changsha not only by the river Siang, which runs into Lake Tung Ting, but also by a railway line, which also leads to Hankow. In order to secure the safety of Changsha the Red Army now has the task of advancing on Yochow. Yochow is not only of military-strategical importance to Changsha, but it is at the same time important as the point of departure for an advance on Wuhan (Hankow, Wuchang and Hanyang).

The capture of these three sister towns, the largest industrial towns of Central China, is the aim of the Red Army of Central China. All round Wuhan there already exist Soviet districts. The Red Army is endeavouring, with the aid of the insurgent peasants, to extend its field of operations more and more to the centre and to encircle Wuhan.

In addition to the province of Hunan, the Red armies of which have almost crossed the Yangtse, the revolutionary situation in the neighbouring province of Kiangsi is very acute. According to all reports, Nanchang, the capital of this province, has been captured by the 4th Red Army. This, of course, would greatly strengthen the position of Changsha. Nanchang has for a long time been besieged by the insurgents. Already in the middle of April the capture of Nanchang by the Red Army was continually expected. While the rich and the foreign capitalists fled and the highest government officials sought refuge on the warships of the imperialists, the revolutionary population held their red flags in readiness for the capture of the town. It is exceedingly likely that the Red Army has now succeeded in taking this town. The town of Kiukiang, on the Northern frontier of Kiangsi, directly on the Yangtsiekiang, which is connected by the river Kan and by a railway line with Nanchang, is likewise beleaguered by the

Red Army. Kiukiang possesses for Nanchang the same military-strategic importance as Yochow has for Changsha.

In regard to the question of the capture of Wuhan, the Communist Party of China is convinced that a victorious advance on Wuhan can take place only by the combined action of the workers, peasants and soldiers under the leadership of struggles by the revolutionary workers in the town. Without great fights on the part of the workers in the town it is impossible for the Red Army alone to capture Wuhan. The maintenance of the Soviet Power in Wuhan would be secured by an upsurge of all the revolutionary fights in China. The revolutionary workers of Wuhan, who conducted a heroic fight in the great Chinese revolution, are being roused to fresh struggles by the latest events in the neighbouring provinces and in the environs of Wuhan. It will not be long before the preconditions for a victorious attack on Wuhan will be created.

The Chinese revolution is directing its eyes not only to the centre of China, but it also attaches great value to the province of Kwantung, of which Canton, the capital town, was the stronghold of the great Chinese revolution. The fights of the insurgent peasants and of the Red Army in the North and East of Canton are continually increasing. The districts of Hailufung to the East of Canton, whose local Soviets existed for over six months in 1927/28, have been for a long time again in the hands of the Soviet peasants. The Labour movement in Canton, as the fighting days of the 1st of May and 1st of August have shown, is experiencing a revival. The whole revolutionary movement of China is on the upgrade.

In spite of all the conflicts and bitter fights among the Kuomintang generals, the Chinese counter-revolution will oppose with all the means at its disposal the advance of the revolutionary workers and peasants.

After the fall of Changsha and Nanchang there set in a furious press campaign of the Kuomintang and imperialists. Trembling inwardly, the whole of the imperialist press is raising an outcry over the "plundering and murdering red bandits", and demanding the joint intervention of the imperialist Powers. "In order to protect the lives and property of foreigners", gunboats and warships are being sent up the Chinese rivers. The mouths of the guns of the imperialists are being directed against the red cities of China.

The whole of the world proletariat is watching with enthusiasm the advance of the victorious red army of China. It sees, however, with watchful eyes the danger which threatens the Chinese revolution from the side of the imperialists. In order to aid their Chinese brothers in their bitter fight, the workers of all capitalist countries must redouble their efforts and strengthen the fight in their own countries in order to prevent a robber-campaign of the imperialists against Red China.

In spite of all the talk of the leaders of the II. International that the Chinese revolution is dead, and in spite of the cowardly assertions of our Right and Left renegades, as Chen-Du-sia and the Trotzkyists, that the Chinese reaction will consolidate itself for a long time, the Chinese revolution is marching forwards.

The Chinese revolution, conducted under the banner of the Soviets by millions of workers and peasants, under the leadership of the C. P. of China and supported by the whole of the world proletariat, will, in spite of all the counter-revolutionaries and imperialists, achieve the final victory, the victory of Soviet China.

The International Red Day.

By Z. Kalandra (Prague).

In spite of the most comprehensive terrorist measures in most of the capitalist countries, the bourgeoisie could not prevent that on the 1st of August the world proletariat expressed in mass demonstrations its will to fight against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

The social fascist lackeys of British imperialism have just concluded a new Iraq Treaty, destined to open up for the British army a new jumping off ground against the Soviet Union — in the immediate neighbourhood of the Caucasian oil fields. It is not so long ago that MacDonald

was present at the great manoeuvres of the British air fleet, which was instructed to bombard a "town" built expressly for this purpose and which everybody could at once recognise to be Baku. The same MacDonald stands, so to speak, in the background of the fascist upheaval in Finland, destined to become another jumping off ground of world imperialism against the country of the proletarian dictatorship. And the answer of the English proletariat? A mass demonstration of the London workers on anti-war day; even bourgeois papers speak of 20,000 demonstrators.

In France the 1st of August was marked by the great strikes against the "social insurance" of Tardieu. In Paris the government had mobilised the whole police force and great divisions of troops in order to prevent the anti-war demonstrations. Comrade Bouté, chief editor of "L'Humanité", was arrested almost on the same day on which the bourgeoisie arranged imposing festivals to celebrate the anniversary of capitalist "freedom of the press". Nevertheless the anti-war day demonstrations proved that ever larger masses of workers are following the call of the C. P. of France.

The social fascist government of Czechoslovakia made the greatest efforts in order to prevent the workers' demonstrations on 1st of August. It "prohibited" the anti-war day; on the 1st of August it converted Prague and all the bigger towns into military camps, and numerous arrests were carried out already some days before the 1st of August, with the only result that in Prague, for instance, a crowd numbering several thousand penetrated to the inner parts of the town and that also in the industrial districts of the country many demonstrations were held.

In spite of all the terror of the Schober police, the Vienna proletariat also marched to the mass demonstrations of 1st August, and in Styria the workers succeeded in breaking through the police prohibition of the anti-war demonstrations.

30,000 workers demonstrations in Union Square and a further 25,000 workers in the neighbouring streets of New York, made it clear to the American Government that the proletariat of the United States is prepared to defend the Soviet Union, the State of victorious socialist construction, which the corrupt government of Rockefeller and Ford are endeavouring just now to provoke. Also the working masses of Latin America followed the call of the Comintern: thousands and ten of thousands demonstrated in the streets of Buenos-Aires, Rosario, Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro, La Paz and other big cities of Latin America.

The powerful upsurge of the revolutionary wave in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, which is evidenced by the victorious advance of the Chinese Red Army, by the revolutionary movement of the suppressed masses of India and in the civil war in Egypt, found its expression in the fact that the international front of the struggle against the imperialist war was joined by the toiling masses of the colonial peoples. The demonstrations of the Shanghai proletariat, against which Chiang Kai-shek had mobilised in vain his tanks and machine guns, was the most powerful of all.

And in the Soviet Union? In Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov, Vladivostok, Irkutsk, from one border of the vast territory of the workers' and peasants' State to the other, huge demonstrations were held. And everywhere they were inspired by the will to show the imperialist warmongers that the toiling masses of the Soviet Union are ready at all times to defend their fatherland against any attack.

Throughout the whole world August 1st was marked by powerful demonstrations of the international proletariat against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union. The successes of International Red Day cannot be called in question even by the class enemy. These successes, however, must not be allowed to blind us to the many shortcomings of the campaign; which the Communist Parties of the various countries must expose by means of bolshevist self-criticism and, by means of hard organisational work, remove their causes, which above all are to be found in the faulty organisational consolidation of ideological influence, in order to be able to cope with the great historical tasks which they have to fulfil.

POLITICS

The Commencement of the Election Campaign in Germany

By W. H. (Berlin).

The special character of the Reichstag election in Germany is expressed in the fact that, contrary to former elections, almost two months before the actual polling day and immediately after the dissolution of the Reichstag the election campaign is in full swing. The present Reichstag elections, which have arisen as a result of the crisis, are being carried out in an atmosphere dominated by the **political crisis of the capitalist system**. The unrest and uncertainty of political conditions, the continued regroupings, the shakings of the old forms of political life — all this gives to the commencing election campaign its special note.

The old bourgeois parties no longer venture to come before the mass of electors in the forms hitherto employed. Old parties are being refounded under different names. There are new combinations and splits — in short, a complete disintegration in the whole of the bourgeois camp.

The beginning was made by the **Democratic Party**. At the end of 1918, in the first throes of the November Revolution, this Party was patched together out of some remnants of the old Left bourgeois fractions of the former Reichstag. The Democratic Party succeeded at the elections to the National Assembly in 1919 in polling over 5 million votes, thereby obtaining 75 seats. Since then the Democratic Party has experienced an uninterrupted decline. Already in May 1928 it obtained only 25 seats. In the present elections its prospects would have been hopeless. So it happened that the Democratic Party pronounced its own **death-sentence** before its former supporters could do so. The Democratic Party, like an adventurer, is appearing under a new name: the so-called „German State Party“.

Behind this change of name, undertaken out of fear of having to face the electors, there is something else to be seen. The new party is coming into existence by uniting with the fascist armed organisation — the **Jungdeutschen Orden**. This fascist organisation, which attempts to conceal its dependence upon this or that big capitalist paymaster, with the masquerade of medieval ceremonies and rituals, is now being linked up with the party of the stock-jobbers, of commercial capital, of bankers and Jewish financiers. The ruling power of the new party, however, are the heads of the **J. G. Farben Industry**, this gigantic German chemical concern.

The strange marriage between the antisemitic "knights of order" and the Jewish stock-exchange speculators and jobbers, has come about obviously on the orders of chemical capital. The Young German Order has always been the private organisation of the notorious **Arnold Reebberg**, one of the leaders of the potash industry, whose anti-bolshevik war intrigues and negotiations with France and England regarding common German-English-French plans of campaign against the Soviet Union have been exposed more than once.

It is no mere chance that the events of 1918 are being repeated. There is again to be seen, although as yet only in its commencing stages, the **political crisis of the capitalist system**. The old bourgeois parties are again changing their names, in order thereby to catch the electors once more. But the difference in which the greater acuteness, the higher stage of development is reflected (although the crisis has not by a long way reached the high point attained in 1918), consists in the fact that today the Left fraction in the camp of the bourgeoisie throws aside the democratic mantle and makes common cause with the fascist Young German Order.

The founding of the "State Party" of chemical capital, of the poison hells, which already a few days after its inception was dubbed by the people the poison gas party, was preceded by another action, which the former leading party of German capital, the German people's party, had initiated in order to bring into one group the various fragments of the bankrupt bourgeois middle parties. The People's Party hoped, by absorbing the economic party, the democrats and the

moderate German nationalists who had split away from Hugenberg, to bring about a block which would have given it again its former leading position in the camp of the bourgeoisie. The fact that the democrats, acting on the instructions of the chemical trust, frustrated these intentions, characterises the differences between the individual capitalist groups and those who represent their political interests. The People's Party is still continuing its efforts. There is still a possibility that they will lead to a certain, at least outward, success. But the chief aim of the people's party, i. e. to obtain the leadership of bourgeois politics as at the time of Stresemann, has very little prospect of success.

This leading role has been seized by the **Christian Centre**. The fact that it is the only one of the bourgeois parties which has emerged more or less unscathed from the general disintegration, and that by its special structure, by the effectiveness of the religious discipline of Catholicism, in spite of its being a party of big capital, it has among its followers broad strata of toilers and also of the working masses, gives to the Centre this exceptional position. In addition, it has the key position in Prussia, where the days of the social-democratic coalition government again appear to be numbered. At the meeting of the Central Committee of the Centre, which was held on the 29th of July, the leaders of the Centre, the prelate Kaas and Hess, declared unanimously that a continuation of the coalition government with the social democrats in Prussia was out of the question, for the latter had not ceased its sham fight against Brüning. Needless to say, the social democracy replied to these threats with servile asseverations of their loyalty. But these fresh humiliations to which the social democratic party of German voluntarily submits, can scarcely change the actual development, which will lead also in Prussia to a government of the Right, after the model of the Brüning Cabinet in the Reich.

The unrestrained course to the Right of all the openly bourgeois parties is still being continued. The split-off German Nationalists have now constituted themselves as the Conservative People's Party.

The whole policy of all the bourgeois parties, including the leading Centre, will, however, be influenced to a considerable extent by the remnants of Hugenberg's German Nationalist Party and the National Socialists, the Hitler party, which is closely allied with it.

Hugenberg, for the purpose of achieving his political aim, which is at the same time the actual class aim of the capitalist class, has shattered his own party. But he has thereby at the same time considerably accelerated the fascist development in Germany. He ventures to drive the supporters of his own German Nationalist Party into the ranks of the Hitler Party. Numerous press reports state that he directly or indirectly finances the "hostile" National Socialist Party. How far the Hitler party will succeed at the Reichstag elections in gaining the adhesion of the masses who are breaking away from the old bourgeois parties as a result of the class crisis and placing them in the service of fascism, depends to a considerable extent upon the anti-fascist fight of the C. P. of Germany.

Whilst on the Right wing of the bourgeoisie the party of the fascist brown shirts (national socialists) and Hugenberg's German Nationalist are making a drive for an open fascist dictatorship, on the other wing of the bourgeois front the social democracy is making desperate efforts to prove itself fit to govern. But with all its grovelling it is achieving very little. The bourgeoisie knows that it can fully rely upon the aid which the social democrats, even when outside of the government, will give to the capitalist system, in spite of all the kicks they have received. In the present election campaign the bourgeoisie forbids the social democratic party to make use of the most primitive and harmless demagoguery or to carry on a sham opposition to the Brüning government. And the party of social fascism makes use of every opportunity in order to proclaim its complete readiness to follow the German bourgeoisie in its fascist course through thick and thin.

Over against the bourgeois camp, which on all sections of the front reveals the symptoms of disintegration, ferment and crisis, there stands the **Communist Party**. Its inner firmness, its complete unanimity, in striking contrast to the confusion in the camp of the bourgeoisie, is only a reflection of the rallying of the proletarian revolutionary forces. The C. P. of Germany, which, with a Manifesto of the Central Committee, was the first Party to open the election campaign, is making use of the political tension in connection with the Reichstag election, in

order to mobilise the masses for the revolutionary class struggle for the overthrow of the capitalist mismanagement, for overcoming the capitalist catastrophe by the victory of the working class and by Socialism. It is conducting its campaign with the object of making plain in its whole agitation and propaganda the role of the Communist Party as the only anti-capitalist party, as the only anti-fascist party, as the only party which is fighting the Young Plan, as the only party which can realise the united front of the toilers under the hegemony of the proletariat and indicate the proletarian way out of the threatening catastrophe.

The huge and increased attendance of the masses at the meetings and demonstrations of the C. P. of Germany since the dissolution of the Reichstag, and in particular the magnificent anti-war demonstration on August 1st, are indubitable signs of the great headway being made by the Party. The Party, which by its policy has enforced the new elections and brought about the dissolution of the Reichstag of the bourgeoisie and the social democracy, is conducting the election campaign in the consciousness of its power, with the firm will to march forward victoriously. The more brutally the bourgeoisie carries out its offensive against the working masses, the more firmly the ranks of the proletariat and of all workers are being closed under the banner of Communism.

The Agrarian Conferences in Bukarest and Sinaya

Block of Central European Agrarian States.

By Z. K. (Prague).

The "Little Entente", which has hitherto formed the block of Central European "victor States", is now in a process of uninterrupted disintegration. Its last Conference, recently held at Lake Csorba, it is true concluded with the acceptance of the so-called "status of the Little Entente", which the press of the Little Entente, and in particular the Czechoslovakian press, endeavoured to represent as "a consolidation of its unity". But this "consolidation" which was so loudly proclaimed, has not been able to check for a moment the process of rapid disintegration.

Equally ineffective in this respect has been the conclusion of the Czechoslovakian-Rumanian trade agreement, which also took place at Lake Csorba. The Czechoslovakian imperialists, who had been rendered nervous by what their press described as "persistent rumours of attempts at co-operation of the Southern agrarian States, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Hungary", expected a peaceful future as a result of this treaty. The official "Prager Presse" wrote at that time:

"by this treaty an economic front in which neither of the two States were represented, will be abolished once and for all. We are thereby relieved from a great anxiety, for we ran the danger of being pushed into an economic front which would have been in no way agreeable to us."

Rumania and Yugoslavia make no secret of the fact that their attempt to form a central European agrarian block is a reply to Briand's "Pan-Europe" plan, in which they see an attempt at an economic and political rapprochement of the industrial states of Europe and, consequently, a danger to the agrarian States. At the end of July a conference of representatives of Rumania, Yugoslavia and Hungary was held in Bukarest for the purpose of bringing about a block of these three agrarian States.

Whatever the official communiques may assert regarding the "successes" which have been achieved, one thing is certain: the chief aim of the conference, the formation of an export cartel of the three agricultural Danubian states, was not achieved. All that was accomplished in this direction is an agreement that, in supplying the neighbouring industrial countries with agrarian products, the three countries shall as far as possible avoid mutual competition. To this end the export institutes of the three new "allies" are to keep in touch with each other, and in October exchange the experiences they have had during the present harvest.

For the rest, in Bukarest there was issued a further slogan, which one has heard in stereotyped form at every customs conference of late: Away with the most-favour-nation clauses, up with the preferential tariffs! In this sense a general

answer was drawn up to the questions put at the Geneva Customs Conference, and then the delegates went home.

More correctly said, it was only the Hungarian delegation which went home. The representatives of Rumania and Yugoslavia proceeded only as far as Sinava, in order immediately to open a more select conference. The mere holding of this second conference, which took place from the 31st July to 1st August, shows that Yugoslavia and Rumania, in the difficult times of the economic crisis, wish to "collaborate" somewhat more closely with each other than with their newly-found Hungarian "friend". Naturally in Sinava the delegates took great pains to hide this state of affairs from Budapest. Thus the official report states: The two delegations unanimously declare that there exist no contradictions between the two conferences. But nevertheless they have "examined the methods by which an economic agreement between Rumania and South Slavia and collaboration with the other states is to be realised".

The meaning of this diplomatic language is fairly obvious: Bukarest and Belgrade are now endeavouring to play off their "friendship" with Budapest against Prague, in order to induce the latter to meet their economic desires (without regard to Hungary)—a thing which has been all the more difficult to achieve hitherto because, as is known, the agrarians play a decisive role in the politics of industrial Czechoslovakia.

And now, after these two agrarian conferences, a third one is to be held shortly, i. e., the great conference which is to take place in Warsaw at the end of August on the initiative of the Polish Government. At this conference, in addition to the three agrarian Danubian states and Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Baltic states will also be represented. In view of the fact that it has been impossible up to now to bring about even a Danubian cartel, one has every reason to be sceptical beforehand regarding the purely economic "successes" of the Warsaw conference. These "successes" will be even less than those of Bukarest. But one must not on any account lose sight of one important and dangerous circumstance: Here we have an attempt of the agrarian states of Central and Eastern Europe to create a broad imperialistic grouping of powers on the frontiers of the Soviet Union -- of that Soviet Union in whom they all see a tremendously powerful competitor, and whose socialised agriculture causes them sufficient fear that they wish to expedite as much as possible the campaign of world imperialism against it.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Letters from Egypt.

By P. Ch. (Cairo).

I. The General Situation.

Two facts characterise the present situation in Egypt. In the first place the catastrophic intensification of the crisis of Egyptian economy which has been latent for years and secondly the political crisis, which was initiated by the resignation of the Wafdist government of Nahas Pasha and the nomination of the "non-Party" Cabinet of Sidky Pasha and which has already assumed the character of a civil war. The economic and political crisis have a close causal connection.

The causes of the Egyptian economic crisis are to be found in the character of Egypt itself as a definitely agrarian country and its consequent absolute economic dependence upon foreign countries, particularly Great Britain. This dependence has resulted in the general intensification of the world economic crisis having a very serious effect in Egypt as a crisis on the international cotton market.

The consequences of the Egyptian economic crisis are assuming more and more disastrous forms. The constantly growing disparity between exports and imports in favour of Egyptian exports leads to an ever increasing weakening of the inland purchasing power, and at the same time to a constant increase of the prices of all the most important necessities of life. The burden of this development falls in the first place upon the propertyless and poor fellahen and the workers. But the middle classes of the Egyptian urban population and the middle

peasants are also being drawn more and more into the vortex of the economic crisis. The outer symptoms of this development are, great unemployment, constantly increasing misery of the workers, complete impoverishment of the poor peasants, numerous bankruptcies in trade and industry and an ever-increasing expropriation of the middle peasants by the Egyptian big landowners. The general result is a growing radicalisation of those strata of the population who are hit by the economic crisis, which radicalisation has already led to a political Left development among a part of the workers and in general finds expression in growing resentment against the possessing class.

This development was to be seen already during the London negotiations and caused the Wafd delegation in London, under the leadership of Nahas Pasha, to abandon the line of coming to an understanding with British imperialism, which had already led to an agreement in principle on all the Egyptian questions, and, by making use of the difficulties in regard to the Sudan question, to bring about a breaking off of the negotiations. Nahas Pasha hoped by his attitude in the Sudan question and by his platonic declarations that the Wafd would carry on the fight for the complete independence of Egypt right to the end, to restrain the growing opposition of the workers and peasants who had hitherto followed the Wafdist. But he has not succeeded in doing this. On the contrary, the aggravation of the Egyptian economic crisis in the last few months has essentially promoted the radicalisation process. The Wafd was, therefore, faced with the decision, either to remain in the government and thereby lose its influence among the Egyptian working population, or to reject the responsibility and to go into opposition. In addition to these considerations there is little doubt that the development of the national revolutionary movement in India also helped to cause the Wafd to adopt the second course.

The Egyptian bourgeoisie, which has attentively followed this development, attempted on its part to weaken the Wafd government by discrediting Nahas Pasha. In close connection with the feudal big land owners and with the active support of the representative of British imperialism, it strove for the overthrow of the Wafd government in order to get control of Egyptian politics again in its hands. The influence of this political circle upon the king then led to the conflict between the king and the Wafd government, which Nahas Pasha made use of in order to free himself and his Wafdist friends from the burden of responsibility.

The king appointed as Prime Minister the Vice President of the Liberals, Ismail Sidky Pasha, a typical representative of the feudal Turkish aristocracy. Sidky Pasha endeavoured to get the Liberal Constitutionists and the Ittihadists to take part in responsible work. Both parties placed their leading men at his disposal, but refused to assume any responsibility for the measures of the government.

Thus the new government was able to rely only on the armed forces of the State, the police and the military. The first measures of the government were the prorogation of Parliament, which is only the prelude to its coming dissolution and the bringing into force of the so-called "democratic rights" contained in the Egyptian Constitution—a measure which is deliberately directed against the government party of yesterday, the Wafd. Nahas Pasha replied to these dictatorial measures of the new Cabinet by convoking a national Congress. This Congress, which consisted in the first place of the Wafd deputies and senators, decided to demand of the government the convocation of Parliament. In the event the rejection of this demand the Congress proclaimed that it would refuse all co-operation with the government of Ismail Sidky Pasha.

The government replied to the decisions of the Wafd Congress by an open challenge to Nahas Pasha under the slogan of securing order in the country and the authority of the government.

Following the Congress the Wafd began an agitation-campaign in the Egyptian provinces under the slogan of "defence of the Constitution". The government mobilised the police and the military and imposed a state of siege without officially confirming this measure. As a result, it came in a number of localities to bloody collisions which reached their highest point in Mansurah and Alexandria, where the military attacked the Wafd leaders and their followers with bayonets, resulting in 26 killed and several hundred wounded.

This letting loose of civil war in Egypt is the first practical result of the policy of the Sidky Pasha government, which in spite of its obvious dictatorship policy is repeatedly designating itself as a Constitutional government.

The British Labour Government has repeatedly declared through Henderson and MacDonald, that it regards the differences between the Wafdists and the government as an inner-political affair of Egypt to which it remains completely neutral, and therefore it must refuse to interfere. These declarations by Henderson are a lying gesture by British social imperialism. For in reality while declaring its neutrality the Labour Government is supporting the present government in Egypt and its fascist methods of government. Thus also in this situation we see the social imperialists in one front with British imperialism, which was the driving force in the overthrow of the Wafd government.

The decisive characteristic feature of the present disputes between the Wafdist and the government is the fact that the fight is not being waged round any questions of principle of present and future Egyptian politics, but that it is exclusively a question which of the two groups shall exercise power, and this purely for reasons of profit. Both parties, the Wafd and the government declare that they are constitutional; both parties declare that they are national; both parties declare that their fight is for the salvation of Egypt. Nevertheless, in this fight between the Wafd and the government it is not a question of differences in principle in regard to the home and foreign policy of Egypt. In spite of the fact that in this fight the question of the independence of Egypt does not stand in the foreground, the issue of this fight is nevertheless of decisive importance for the future development of the Egyptian independence movement, insofar as it plainly and unmistakably reveals the role which the bourgeoisie of Egypt as a whole will play in the future inevitable conflicts with British imperialism.

FASCISM

Appeal of the Scandinavian Sections of the C. I. for the Stockholm Anti-Fascist Conference.

A number of proletarian organisations and anti-fascist committees in Stockholm have decided to convene a Scandinavian-Finnish Anti-Fascist Conference for the 10th of August at Stockholm. All the revolutionary workers, all the real enemies of fascism have welcomed this initiative with great enthusiasm.

The fascist attack of the Lappo movement in White Finland has aroused an echo in all Scandinavian countries and the bourgeoisie of these countries are preparing for the adoption of similar measures against the revolutionary organisations of the workers. The fascist advance in Finland is a typical expression of the attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie and of the big peasants to find a way out of the prevailing economic crisis, a way out closely connected with the imperialist preparations for war against the Soviet Union. The most active elements of Swedish imperialism are hand in glove with White Finland in the question of the war-preparations, and Sweden is allotted an important role in the anti-Soviet front. In view of these facts it is the urgent duty of the workers who wish to fight actively against fascism and against the imperialist preparations for war as well as for the defence of the Soviet Union, to form a strong proletarian united front for the struggle against fascism, in particular in White Finland.

The C.P. of Sweden and the Young Communist League of Sweden assure this Conference its full support and call upon all their organisations, members and sympathisers to do everything to ensure the largest possible attendance at the anti-Fascist Conference. Organise meetings in the factories and elect anti-fascist committees! Discuss the question of sending delegates to this Conference in all workers' organisations! Elect delegates to this Conference at the demonstration of 1st of August! Create a broad proletarian mass movement against Fascism, against the Lappo bandits, against the imperialist war-preparations, for a strong proletarian united front for the protection

of the Soviet Union, the country in which Socialism is being built up!

Beat fascism by means of the revolutionary struggle and the proletarian united front!

For proletarian solidarity with the fighting and persecuted workers of Finland!

Down with the Lappo bandits and their hangmen's regime! Down with the war-mongers and the organisers of imperialist war!

For the active defence and the protection of the country of socialist construction—the Soviet Union!

C.P. of Sweden. Y.C.L. of Sweden.

The undersigned organisations fully endorse the above appeal and will issue special appeals in Norway and Finland calling upon the workers' organisations to send delegates to the Stockholm Anti-Fascist Conference.

C.P. of Norway. Y.C.L. of Norway.
C. P. of Denmark. Y.C.L. of Denmark.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The C. P. F. and the Revolutionary Trade Unions in the Fight for the Leadership of the General Strike.

Reformist Workers Follow the Slogans of the C. G. T. U.

Paris, August 5th, 1930.

The situation in the strike area in the north of France has in its main features, developed as follows in the course of the last few days:

The strike slogan of the revolutionary trade union federation against the "Social Insurance Law" was up to Wednesday July 30 followed by about 100,000 workers, above all by workers in the textile industry. The attempts of the reformists to hold back the workers from the fight against the "Social Insurance Law" failed.

On Wednesday July 30, the revolutionary trade unions of the northern area, which was regarded as a reformist stronghold, decided to summon the workers to enter on a general strike. The number of the strikers increased by leaps and bounds; the general strike, even if not up to 100 per cent, is already in progress.

On Thursday negotiations took place between the all-powerful Textile Consortium and the reformist trade union leaders, at which the latter sought to make clear to the Consortium the danger of a general strike which was threatening, and how necessary it was for the Consortium to grant great concessions to the workers in order to secure the influence hitherto enjoyed by the reformist leaders. But these "demands", put forward by the reformists under the pressure of the textile workers already on strike or about to strike, were rejected by the Textile Consortium. The reformist trade union leaders, who for ten years had succeeded in holding back the workers from every fight, right up to the fight of the textile workers of Halluin and Tourcoing, which was led by the revolutionary trade unions and broken by the reformists, this time failed. But in spite of the obdurate attitude of the Consortium, the reformists still hoped that they would be able to hold back from the fight those workers who had not already gone on strike. They called a meeting of functionaries to be held on Sunday in Lille.

On Friday, the day on which, according to the decision of the revolutionary trade unions, the general strike was to commence, a further 10,000 workers ceased work.

This development of events continued on Saturday August 2nd. In view of this extension of the strike-front the reformist trade union leaders changed their tactics. They recognised that there remained only one hope for them to master the movement: to whittle down the demands for which the struggle was being waged, and then to place themselves at the "head" of this fight.

At the meeting of functionaries which was held on Sunday in Roubaix (similar meetings were also held in Tourcoing, Lannoy and Halluin), there was only one opinion among the

assembled functionaries, consisting for the greater part of middle and lower functionaries: **General Strike.** The reformist trade union leaders were this time unable to prevent the decision for a general strike, but in a special declaration they formulated the aim of the strike as being not directed against the "Social Insurance Law" as such, but only against its effects. They demand a wage increase of 25 centimes an hour, and at the same time advise the workers to whom this increase has been already granted, to resume work.

On the same day there took place in Lille a demonstration organised by the C.P. of France and the revolutionary trade unions, which was attended by 5,000 workers who marched through the streets. The demonstration concluded with a huge meeting attended by 10,000 workers, to whom Comrade Thorez delivered a great speech, in which he exposed the treacherous tactics of the social democrats and indicated the fighting aims of the C. P. of France and of the revolutionary trade unions. Precisely at the same time the reformists held a demonstration in Halluin, at which only 800 were present, the greater part having been gathered together from Lille, Roubaix and Belgian Menin. Escorted by a strong force of police, they marched through Halluin, where several hundred workers carried out a counter-demonstration, which was brutally attacked by the police.

The revolutionary trade unions, as well as the Communist Party, are already able to-day, when the fight is still growing, to record the recruitment of many new members to their ranks.

The Betrayal of the Mansfeld Workers.

By G. Sobottka (Berlin).

The strike of the Mansfeld miners and foundry workers has been brutally crushed. The trade union apparatus, the police and State apparatus, all working in the interests of the Mansfeld Aktien Gesellschaft, have driven the strikers back to work. The Mansfeld workers have got to accept a 9½ per cent wage cut and a great part of them, about 40 per cent, even a 12 per cent wage cut.

Already on the 16th July, the bureaucracy, at a Conference of the organisations which are parties to the collective agreement, succeeded in passing by 68 votes to 58 a decision to break of the strike. In accordance with this decision work was to be resumed already on Friday 18th of July. The striking workers, assembled in big strike meetings, denounced this treachery and decided to continue the fight. Thus work was not resumed on the 18th of July.

The trade union bureaucracy thereupon arranged for a great force of police and gendarmerie to be concentrated in the strike area. From the ranks of their faithful followers they organised gangs of strike-breakers. With the help of these gangs they succeeded on the 25th and 26th of July in bringing a great number of workers into the works. Under these circumstances the Central Strike Committee of the Red Trade Union Opposition on the 26th of July ceased to carry on the strike any further. In their appeal to the strikers the Central Strike Committee declare that the strikers do not regard themselves as defeated but will organise for fresh struggles.

At the annual conference of the union of mining workers the reformist miners' leader Husemann declared that the union must agree to a 9½ per cent wage cut, because otherwise the Mansfeld A.G. would not be able to work at a profit and the undertaking would be closed down. Husemann made this statement in the name of his committee. At the negotiations, lasting for several weeks, which the committee of the union had conducted with the Mansfeld A.G. before the strike, the same committee declared that the Mansfeld A.G. was quite in a position to grant a wage increase.

In May, before the strike, the bureaucracy delivered radical speeches and talked a lot about striking. But in reality they did not want a strike. They believed that, by splitting the workers into organised and unorganised they would be able to throttle very quickly any strike that might break out and then place the blame upon the unorganised workers. But in this they made a mistake. Thanks to the active mobilisation of the workers by the revolutionary trade union opposition, the strike was unanimously undertaken. By means of the energetic work

of the R. T. U. O., the unorganised, just as the organised, were included in the strike committees and organised in a firm fighting block. Support of all workers was initiated and carried out by the Workers' International Relief. The solidarity of the workers in the other districts furnished the guarantee that also the unorganised would be able to hold out for weeks even if they did not receive any trade union strike pay. In the eighth week of the strike the fighting front still remained firm and unshaken.

All hopes of the social fascist bureaucracy to throttle the strike by means of underhand trickery and then to cast the blame upon the unorganised workers, had vanished. The bureaucracy had to resort to open strike-breaking and police terror.

In the Mansfeld fight, however, the part played by the social democratic government of Prussia became plainly apparent. On Tuesday the 15th of July the agreements between the bureaucracy, the Mansfeld A.G. and the Reichs Government were concluded, according to which wages were to be reduced by 9½ per cent while the government would grant a subvention to the Mansfeld A.G. amounting to 500,000 marks. The Prussian government was to give its approval to these agreements. But for the social-democratic Prussian government the wage cut of 9½ per cent was not enough; it demanded a further wage reduction of at least 2½ per cent—that is 12 per cent in all. The social fascist trade union bureaucracy expressed its agreement with this. Thus the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy and the social-democratic Prussian government have taken good care of the business interests of the Mansfeld A.G. The workers receive a 12 per cent wage cut and the Mansfeld A.G. a subvention of 500,000 marks a month.

The Red Trade Union Opposition was the only force which organised the defence against the insane wage reductions. The employers and the social-democratic bureaucracy have once again succeeded in throttling a heroic fight. But the R.T.U.O. is growing in strength. It is now necessary for all workers who wish to fight against wage reductions and increased exploitation to rally round the leadership of the Red Trade Union Opposition. The behaviour of the social-democratic Prussian government and of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy in the Mansfeld fight proves beyond all doubt that the social democracy is brutally and ruthlessly supporting the wage cutting campaign of the employers, and in addition organising gangs of strike breakers.

THE WHITE TERROR

Arrest of the Revolutionary Journalist Aladár Tamás in Budapest.

On the 27th of July, Aladár Tamás, editor of the only Marxist review in Hungary, "Hundred per cent", was arrested. The police justified their action by saying that Tamás had conducted anti-war propaganda on the occasion of the anniversary of the outbreak of the world war.

The fascist dictatorship of Horthy-Bethlen is at present faced by an economic crisis which is intensifying the class struggle from day to day. It attempts to mitigate this crisis by means of feverish preparations for its participation in the anti-Soviet war. Therefore it tries by all means to suppress any anti-militarist propaganda.

After the defeat of the Hungarian proletarian dictatorship Aladár Tamás went to Italy, where he actively participated in the struggles of the Italian proletariat. Later he returned to Hungary and joined the struggles of the Hungarian working class. In the year 1927 he founded the review, "Hundred per cent", a cultural-political organ, in whose columns he courageously fought for three years for the emancipation of the working class.

The arrest of Tamás was preceded by attacks of the fascist papers, which were soon joined by the social fascist press with Ludwig Kassák at the head. Whilst the fascist press openly demanded of the authorities the suppression of the review, the social fascists denounced in the "Nepszava" and in leaflets the collaborators of "Hundred per cent". Aladár Tamás was expelled from the cultural organisations

and from the social democratic party, and the social fascists made use of every opportunity in order to denounce him to the police. The result of this systematic campaign was his arrest, by which the authorities seek to silence the writer of the proletariat and at the same time to annihilate the cultural organisations of the young workers which he has founded.

The fascist Horthy-Bethlen dictatorship and the social fascist bureaucrats are afraid of the growing influence of "Hundred per cent". The fascist and social fascist press are expressing their satisfaction at Tamás' arrest. The "Nepszava" writes:

"We have long expelled him and his followers from the organisations of our party on account of their peace-disturbing attitude."

Simultaneously with Tamás more than 50 workers were arrested for making preparations for 1st of August.

The international working class and all Left inclined intellectuals must raise the sharpest protest against this new campaign of terror on the part of the Hungarian government.

BEFORE THE V. CONGRESS OF THE R.I.L.U.

The Red Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia Before the V. Congress of the R. I. L. U.

By Jan Sverma (Prague).

The tasks which confront the red trade unions in the new period of the class struggle, as well as the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U., encountered the greatest resistance particularly in Czechoslovakia.

The red trade unions were headed by the opportunist Hais group, which consisted of old trade union functionaries of the reformist school, who by their whole life and practice were closely connected with the methods of the reformist trade union work. This leading group based itself upon a functionary-apparatus consisting for the greater part of highly skilled workers, who in the factories stood much nearer to the reformist functionaries than to the broad masses of the working class. The members of the red trade unions remained passive and continually fluctuated.

This composition was quite in keeping with the policy of the red trade unions, the policy of "pressure upon the reformist leaders", the policy of the united front from above, which led the red trade unions sometimes even to the policy of class peace.

The radicalisation of the working masses, which in Czechoslovakia found expression, even before the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U., in stormy demonstrations against the worsening of social insurance and in the metal workers' movement, took place outside of the red trade unions. The opportunist policy of the red trade unions deepened from day to day the chasm between the revolutionary energy of the working masses and the revolutionary trade unions.

The North Bohemian textile workers strike, which broke out in January 1929, showed the whole depth of this crisis. This strike was the first attempt to apply the new strike strategy in practice: it was the first great struggle against the social fascists and the terror of the State apparatus; it was the first attempt of the red trade unions to conduct the strike independently.

But the strike of the North Bohemian textile workers was also the signal for the open putch of the liquidatory elements. It was the immediate reason for the split of the red trade unions, whereby the Hais group, supported by the bourgeois State apparatus, appropriated the whole property of the red trade unions.

This putch has also numerically weakened the red trade unions. Out of the 100,000 members, 70,000 went over to the red industrial unions, 12,000 went into the Hais trade unions, the rest remained unorganised or went over to the reformist unions.

In spite of these temporary losses, the struggle with the liquidators meant a great stride forward for the red trade unions. The most important decisions of the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U. were popularised in the course of this struggle, and the basis created for the red trade unions to fulfil those

tasks which confront them in the present period. Immediately after the split, the red trade unions had to show how far they are capable of fulfilling these tasks. Throughout the year 1929 there was a number of partial strikes, which were exclusively conducted by the red trade unions against the social fascists and the fierce terror of the State apparatus, which is coming forward more brutally against the workers in every strike struggle.

But also in this period the growth of the red trade unions lagged far behind the development of the situation. The red trade unions are often taken by surprise by the spontaneous strikes which break out.

The resolution of the VI. Plenum of the R.I.L.U. on the Czechoslovakian question precisely points out these weaknesses and sets a number of new tasks: to convert the red trade unions into factory organisations, to reorganise the functionary cadres, to recruit new members.

Immediately after the Plenum of the R.I.L.U. the red trade unions were confronted by new tasks as a result of the profound changes in the situation. Already at the beginning of 1930 the economic crisis seized one branch of production after another; unemployment is becoming a scourge of the Czechoslovakian proletariat.

The red trade unions suddenly were faced with new conditions. The economic crisis created very favourable objective conditions for a rapid growth of the red trade unions, but the latter had not yet developed to such an extent as to be able to cope with the new tasks arising out of the economic crisis.

The first attacks of the employer's offensive ended with a success for the capitalists, who succeeded in Unter-Reichenau, Bleistadt and Römerstadt in isolating the striking workers and throttling their resistance by means of gendarmerie bayonets. The social fascists have had better success in their attempts to isolate these strikes than the red trade unions in their efforts to extend the struggle.

The red trade unions committed serious mistakes on the occasion of mass dismissals of the workers. In a number of localities they remained passive; in other localities the functionaries of the red trade unions started negotiations with the employers on the question who shall be dismissed, which shifts shall be dropped etc.

The Ghent system naturally also rendered the situation of the red trade unions very difficult. The red trade unions, deprived of all funds as a result of the split, and the only class trade unions, which therefore have to bear the whole burden of financing the economic struggles, were unable to pay out the unemployment benefit according to the Ghent system. There was only one way open to the red trade unions: to organise a mass struggle of the working class against the Ghent system and for full State benefit. The 6th of March, the fighting day against unemployment, was a serious attempt to pursue this path. The red trade unions, together with the C. P. Cz., had organised mass demonstrations and led tens of thousands of workers into the streets in spite of all the terror exercised by the State power. But after the 6th of March, the activity of the red trade union ebbed somewhat. The inner difficulties are growing. And we are in fact unable to initiate a mass struggle of the working class against the Ghent system. The red trade unions are taking up an opportunist attitude to this question: they declare a boycott of the Ghent system and adopt the standpoint that they, as revolutionary organs of the class struggle, cannot on principle pay out any benefit.

This attitude, which with Left phrases only served to cloak the weaknesses of the Red trade unions in the struggle against unemployment and for complete State benefit, increased the inner difficulties. The social fascists are conducting a stubborn struggle against the red trade unions by making use of the question of benefits. The tasks laid down by the VI. Plenum of the R.I.L.U. remain on paper. The recruiting campaign yielded very small results, whilst on the other hand the red trade unions are losing a portion of their members.

It is only recently that a change has come about in this situation. The attack of the employers on the revolutionary stronghold in the Ostrau district, on Karlshütte, ended with complete failure on the part of the employers. Under the leadership of the red trade unions the workers are going on strike; powerful demonstrations are being organised. The capitalists are compelled to drop their demands.

This success not only strengthens the position of the red trade unions in Karlshütte, where the workers unanimously

decided at a factory meeting to join the red trade unions collectively, but it is stirring the whole of the working class.

The workers in the textile factories in Friedek are replying to the employers' demand for a reduction of wages by a determined strike. Under the leadership of the red trade unions over 6000 textile workers went on strike, and after a few stormy days won the victory and forced the textile barons to retreat. Under the leadership of the red trade unions the workers of the Heinik firm in Prerau entered on a strike against wage cuts; several weeks later the glass workers of Josefodol go on strike and partial strikes of the building workers break out at the same time.

The red trade unions are now beginning to understand their tasks in this period: they are beginning to fulfil their tasks, even if with great shortcomings and mistakes.

The rapidly progressing disintegration of the liquidatory Hais group constitutes a great political strengthening of the red trade unions. The economic crisis accelerated the final and open going over of the liquidators to the social fascists. The Executive committee of the Hais trade unions decided at a stormy meeting to unite with the social fascist trade unions. This decision encountered great resistance on the part of the rank and file members of these trade unions. A number of groups collectively joined the red trade unions; thousands of members are leaving the Hais unions and remaining unorganised or individually joining the red trade unions. The liquidatory Hais unions are disappearing from the scene of the class struggle, while they are able to bring over into the reformist trade unions only an insignificant number of members and the apparatus of secretaries.

The work in the social-fascist trade unions, where a great amount of discontent has been observable of late, is practically virgin soil for our revolutionary trade union work. Also in the Czechish-nationalist trade unions this discontent finds expression in the decline of the trade union groups.

The preparation for the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U. was carried out in the sign of self-criticism, of exposure of our shortcomings. It was opened by a discussion on the vital questions of the red trade unions and of the Czechoslovakian proletariat. The recent events in the Ostrau district, in the Briix district and in other places demonstrate that these discussions are closely bound up with actual practice, with the struggles which are rapidly developing under the leadership of the red trade unions.

The growing strength of the labour movement as well as the growing confidence of the workers in the red trade unions, which is shown by the results of the last factory council elections, are the basis upon which the red trade unions will accelerate their development and consistently fulfil not only those tasks laid down by the IV. R.I.L.U.-Congress, but also the new tasks which the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the approaching great class battles in Czechoslovakia will set them.

THE NEGRO MOVEMENT

British Imperialism in Nigeria.

By G. Padmore.

The bloody policy of British imperialism increases in proportion as the British bourgeoisie find themselves enmeshed in the crisis of world capitalism. Faced with the rapid disintegration of the Empire, the imperialists are turning their attention more and more to the colonial and semi-colonial countries in order to unload the full burden of the crisis on the backs of millions of dark skin slaves. The crisis has affected with particular force the millions of super-exploited Indians and Negroes who live under the iron heel of British imperialism. It has aggravated unemployment. Wage cuts and speed up are being inflicted upon these colonial workers in the most merciless way. The situation is even more accentuated among the peasantry. In Africa and India, millions of peasants are being expropriated from their lands, while entire villages are faced not only with economic ruination but rapid depopulation.

However, these colonial workers, goaded to desperation, are answering the offensive of their imperialist slave drivers by ever increasing mass struggles.

Of particular significance was the mass revolt which spread over the South-eastern province of Nigeria. That this revolt took place in the next largest British possession after India is of tremendous significance, for it shows that the struggle of the oppressed black slaves against their imperialist overlords is no isolated phenomenon, but part and parcel of the world wide struggle of the toiling masses for liberation. British finance capital, desirous of procuring a broad economic base in West Africa, is attempting to develop large scale plantations. To facilitate this prospect, the Government, in collusion with the dominant agricultural and trading interests, introduced a law to the effect that all peasant women must pay a head tax. The purpose of which is to force these women to leave their holdings and seek employment from the imperialists in lieu of which their land holdings will be confiscated by the Government and turned over to British corporations.

The United Africa Company Ltd., composed of a merger of all the big West Africa Trading Companies, has recently been organised with a capital of millions of Pounds Sterling for the purpose of exploiting the agricultural resources of the country. This policy of land robbery of British imperialists was the cause of the revolt which broke out on December 11th, 1929. The peasant women refused to pay the tax and organised a protest demonstration in which it is estimated that over 30,000 participated. The Government determined to carry out its high handed policy, ordered troops to the scene, and without any notice being given to the demonstrators opened machine-gun fire, resulting in the death of over 80, many of whom were pregnant and carrying children on their backs at the time. In some places, especially in Aba districts, where the uprising assumed tremendous proportions, the soldiers bayoneted a number of women and children and drowned them in the river. For days dead bodies lay about in the villages. According to the evidence of Dr. A. W. Howells, Bishop of the Niger, before the Commission of Inquiry, the massacre was carried out in the most ruthless manner. People were not only shot down, but a number of homes were also set on fire by the soldiers in order to force the people into submission. This barbarous act has had a tremendous effect in intensifying the bitterness of the masses against the British, as a result of which the sections where the revolt occurred have been converted into armed military camps for fear of renewed uprising.

In order to add insult to injury, and to justify the atrocious outrage perpetrated against black toilers, Dr. Drummond Shields, Labour Under-Secretary of State for Colonies, has instructed the Governor of Nigeria to impose a fine of £ 850 upon the natives of Aba in order to provide funds to compensate the British merchants for whatever losses they sustained during the uprising.

In consequence of this, mass meetings have been held and telegrams despatched to the Central Government in Lagos, protesting against this fine. The native peasants who are already over burdened with taxation have refused to pay and will resist any attempts of the Government to distraint upon their crops. It is interesting to know that all European residents at Aba are exempted from the tax which applies only to natives of all classes. Even the "Nigerian Daily Times" — the semi-official organ of the Government — in its issue of June 9th states editorially:

"The punishment of the Government on the people of Aba will undoubtedly open sores which were on the way of being healed."

This action of the MacDonald Labour Government as well as its prohibiting the holding of the First International Negro Trade Union Conference in London, is sufficient to convince the most backward Negro colonial workers that they cannot expect anything from the Social Imperialists but cold steel and machine-gunfire. Negro workers in the colonies must carry on a more and more intensive campaign to organise their own ranks and to draw the peasant masses into the struggle against the imperialist oppressors as well as their own capitalist and reformist exploiters. It is also the task of the workers in the imperialist countries, especially the British workers, to rally to the aid of these colonial masses by doing everything in their power to expose to role of MacDonald and other agents of British Imperialism.

SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

Introduction of Compulsory Education in the Soviet Union.

Moscow, 28th July 1930.

The Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union has decided, beginning with the year 1930/31, to introduce **compulsory education** for children of the age of 8, 9 and 10 years, and subsequently to extend general compulsory education to children of 11, beginning with the year 1931/32. In this respect the particular local organisational difficulties are to be taken into account in suburban settlements, in various national Republics and districts, as well as in distant provinces, but only to the extent that the non-fulfilment of the terms must not exceed one year and two years respectively. In each individual case the approval of the government of the respective Federal Republic must be obtained.

Beginning with the year 1930/31 general compulsory education is introduced for children of 11 to 15 years of age who have passed through the elementary school. These children will attend courses of one to two years. Beginning with 1930/31 general compulsory education extending over seven years is being introduced in the industrial towns, factory districts and worker's settlements for those children who passed through the elementary school (1st stage) in the respective year. In particular the school for the youth of the collective farms (day and evening schools) are to be developed in order to include the main mass of the youth in collective farms at the end of five years.

• In addition to a considerable increase in the financial means for meeting the cost of general compulsory education as well as the construction, maintenance and equipment of the elementary schools, the economic, trade union, co-operative and social organisations are to be drawn into this work. Further, the initiative of the broad masses is to be mobilised for this purpose, i. e. in the form of socialist competitions, allotting for these purposes the revenues obtained by the collective farms from trade plants, the support afforded by the patronage organisations, assistance by gratuitous labour etc. The economic organs must include in their industrial and financial plans the means for the construction of schools and for general compulsory education, under the same heading as the means for the construction of big buildings. Former landowners' houses, confiscated kulak buildings etc. are to be used for schools. In the expenditure of means on the construction of schools, consideration is to be given in the first place to the requirements of the chief industrial districts, the workers' centres, the districts with complete collectivisation, as well as all the culturally backward districts.

In order to guarantee the schools the educational staff which is necessary for general compulsory education, the network of pedagogical institutes, of seminaries, of pedagogical special courses is to be extended. In view of the new tasks of the teachers, the material position of the elementary school teachers must be considerably raised; the village school teachers shall be granted rations equal to those of the workers. The Marxist-Leninist training and the technical qualification of the teachers in particular is necessary. The nucleus of Communist workers among the teachers must be enlarged. The Central Committee of the Young Communist League is to be called upon to mobilise at least 20,000 members annually for work in the schools and for training in the pedagogical institutions.

In order to guarantee the practical results of school education the quality of instruction must be raised. Beginning with 1930/31 material support of the scholars with gratuitous school material, shoes, clothes, food, fares etc. for the children of the poor peasantry is to be granted. For this purpose the budgets must be enlarged, among other ways, by making use of the means available in the new special funds formed by the social organisations; at the same time the formation of preparatory groups of the children of workers, day labourers and poor peasants before their entrance into the schools shall be taken in hand by means of the cultural campaigns.

In order to facilitate the preparation for the introduction of general compulsory education, the Central Committee calls upon the Party organisations to consider the introduction of general compulsory education as the most important political campaign during the whole of the next period and to induce the Party members to participate actively and systematically in the work of the auxiliary committees and of the elected school organisations (school councils and parents councils). The Party committees must receive, at least twice annually, the reports of the fractions of the Executive Committees and Soviets regarding the progress of the introduction of general compulsory education, and systematically discuss in the nuclei meetings the questions of its practical carrying out under the local conditions.

The Central Committee considers it necessary, in order to mobilise means and teachers for the introduction of general compulsory education, to form auxiliary committees of active workers and functionaries of the collective farms who are working in cultural spheres for the introduction of general compulsory education in the town Soviets, village soviets and executive committees, with the participation of the Sections of people's education, of the trade unions, of the Young Communist League, of the society for the liquidation of illiteracy, of the society of children's friends. The Central Committee calls upon the local and central press to develop a large scale campaign in connection with the introduction of general compulsory education by means of systematic discussion of all questions of this work.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Open Letter from the C. C. of the C. P. of Norway.

Oslo, July 20, 1930.

The Political Bureau of the C. P. of Norway has issued an appeal to its members in the form of an Open Letter. The letter states that the political influence and also the strength of the Party in the period since the third Party Congress (February 1929) have by no means increased to such an extent as would correspond to the objective possibilities, the growing revolutionisation of broad strata of the working class and the considerable development to the Right on the part of social democracy, which has already passed the first stages of social fascist development. In spite of various partial successes in campaigns, in the organising of united front actions (congress of Left workers, revolutionary chemical workers conference, growing participation of the workers in the May Day demonstrations etc.), the Party has not succeeded in essentially increasing its mass influence. On the contrary, in such decisive spheres as trade union work the Party has lost important positions, above all the leadership in important trades councils. It is true, in the economic struggles the Party has since the third Party Congress made various attempts to carry out the new strike tactics and strategy. In some cases strike committees were elected which achieved certain successes in the fight against the social-fascist bureaucracy. In general, however, the Party was not in a position rightly to prepare or correctly lead the economic struggles. In connection with the questions of trade union tactics there were glaringly revealed not only Right renegacy, but also lack of understanding and resistance in our own ranks, as well as opportunism, in practice, which was most clearly seen in the strike of the municipal workers in Drontheim. The national conference of the trade union opposition showed the great weaknesses of the work in the factories, the almost entire lack of any foundation of the opposition in the works and factories, although out of 125,000 members in the Trade Union Federation almost 20,000 had taken part in the election of delegates to this conference. In the trade union work Left deviations also made their appearance and rendered more difficult the carrying out of really bolshevist mass work. In the Open Letter all these factors are connected with showing the ideological errors in the estimation of the Norwegian social democracy. The letter states:

„The most important causes of the lack of connection with the masses are in the first place, the inadequate preparations

for the economic struggles and the lack of a concrete leadership of these struggles, passivity in the factory work, faulty fraction work in the trade unions, faulty connection between the Party leadership and the members and the faulty instructional activity in all spheres. The shortcomings in the organisation apparatus and the practical methods of work of the Party have their profound ideological causes. The Party was not completely clear in regard to the demands which the accentuated class struggles of the third period placed on it. The Party has not understood the importance of the organisation question. Further, in the decisions adopted by the workers' congress and the Plenum of the C. C. in October 1929, an estimation of the Norwegian social democracy was given which stands in contradiction to the political decisions of the Party Congress and which cannot serve as a basis for a correct bolshevist tactic in the fight for the masses of social democratic workers, who at the present time are marching at an ever increasing pace to the Left. The assertion that the social democracy is the leading party of the bourgeoisie and that the Norwegian Labour Party is a party which, even as regards its social composition, has lost every stamp of a workers' party, is not calculated to concentrate the attention of the Party on the main task i. e., to win the members and supporters of the Norwegian Labour Party away from the reformist leadership, which is becoming more and more social fascist."

The Letter calls attention to the most important tasks of the Party in connection with the 1st of August, the Parliamentary elections in the autumn and the preparation of the congress of the Trade Union Federation in December. The Letter especially emphasises the great organisational weaknesses of the Party, especially in the big factories, and demands a decisive change of course in the whole practice of factory work. Great stress is laid on strengthening the trade union work — including thereunder the question of recapturing the lost positions in the trades councils, strengthening the influence of the Communist press, winning new members and combating the great fluctuation in the membership.

The Letter is to be discussed in the Party press and in all Party organisations. The next Plenum of the C. C., which meets in the middle of August, will make use of the results of the discussion. Upon the basis of the discussion and a close examination of the mistakes and shortcomings in the Party work, a concrete plan of work, to be carried out within a definite period, is to be set up in every district.

PROLETARIAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The First International Conference of Working Women.

By M. Bulle (Moscow).

The First International Conference of Working Women will be held after the conclusion of the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U. The representatives of the organised and unorganised proletarian women of the most important capitalist States, of the toiling women of the colonial and semi-colonial countries and of the working women of the Soviet Union will attend this Conference.

The following items are on the agenda:

1. The working women in production and in the class struggle.
2. The organised forms and methods of work among the working women.
3. Women's work and the change in the manner of life in the Soviet Union.
4. Women and child labour in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Each of these questions is of great political and organisational importance, particularly in view of the increased part played by women's labour in the production of the capitalist countries.

In Germany, in the year 1927, women constituted 31.49 per cent. of the proletariat engaged in production; according to the latest statistical data obtained in Germany, this percentage

has now risen to 40 per cent. In the textile industry women are employed to the extent of 62 per cent, in the box-making industry to 64 per cent, in the paper industry about 50 per cent. Women's labour is enlisted to a growing extent in the heavy industry, engineering, machine construction, chemical, electro-technical and wireless industries.

In Great Britain the number of working women engaged in production has increased in the period from 1924 to 1929 by 11 per cent, whilst the number of male workers increased by only 3.2 per cent in the same period. Women constitute 27 per cent (in round figures 3 million) of all industrial workers in Great Britain; in addition, about one million female employees are working in Great Britain. The working women are represented most strongly in the textile industry, in the garment, tobacco and metal-working industry and in shipbuilding. The number of working women in the chemical industry and in aircraft construction is increasing. Working women are occupied in the manufacture of artificial silk.

In France before the war women constituted 20 per cent of the workers; they have now increased to 40 per cent (3½ million working women). In the textile industry 60 to 70 per cent of the workers are women; in the leather industry 75 per cent, in the rubber industry more than 50 per cent, in the automobile and metal industry about 40 per cent, in the artificial silk industry about 80 per cent. Women are gradually ousting the male workers in the heavy industry and in the production of electric lamps.

In Czechoslovakia women constitute 33 per cent of the labour forces (about 2 million). In the year 1927 the working women of Czechoslovakia constituted 25.8 per cent of the labour forces. According to the data of the State Statistical Office there were in all 1,024,920 working women in Czechoslovakia in the year 1921; this means that the number of working women has nearly doubled during the last eight years. Also in connection with the mechanisation of agriculture the number of agricultural working women has increased in the last few years.

In Poland the working women constitute about 33 per cent of the whole working class. In the garment industry, in the textile and paper industries, more than 50 per cent of the workers are women; in the tobacco and artificial silk industries the percentage is even as high as 80 and 90.

In Sweden the working women constitute about 30 per cent of the workers. In a number of industries women constitute the main mass of the producers. Thus for instance, in the box-making industry 67 per cent, in the hosiery trade 87 per cent, in chocolate manufacture 80.2 per cent. In Norway also women constitute about 30 per cent (about 50,000) of all those engaged in industry; chiefly in the textile, food, shoe and tobacco industries.

In Austria 36 per cent of all those engaged in industry are working women; in Finland 48 per cent. The fact of the continued growth in the employment of female labour is also established in the United States of America, where the number of women independently earning has risen by 30 per cent in the period from 1920 to 1930. The total figure of women working in industry is not available, but data on the employment of female labour in the individual industries testify to their growing importance. Thus, in the textile industry of the United States 43 per cent of those engaged are women; in the hosiery trade 51 per cent; in the garment industry 64 per cent. Working women are increasingly employed in heavy industry, in the iron industry, in the automobile industry, in aircraft and wagon construction.

In the countries of the East women are mostly engaged in the textile industry. In India, where 38 per cent of those engaged in industry are women, the latter constitute 71.5 per cent of the textile workers. In China the female labour forces constitute 51 per cent of the whole working class; in the textile industry 70 per cent. In Japan among 15,970,000 toilers there are 8,167,000 women, i.e. 51 per cent of the proletariat and 30 per cent of the total female population of the country.

Simultaneously with the growth of women's work in production, the role of women in the economic and political struggles of the working class is growing. The working woman, who constitutes the most exploited and oppressed portion of the working class, who does not receive equal pay for equal work in any of the capitalist countries, who in public life, in the family and everywhere is considered the inferior of the man, is seeking a way out of her unbearable situation in the struggle, in revolutionary actions.

These actions are sometimes of a spontaneous, unorganised character. The work of the Communist Parties and of the revolutionary trade union movement among the working women is not yet quite up to the mark and does not yet comprise the broad masses of working women. The growing revolutionary activity of the working women must be consolidated by persistent, systematic work in the factories. Experienced cadres must be trained for the leadership of the struggles carried on by the working women for the improvement of their position. The First International Conference of Working Women in Moscow will survey the shortcomings and experiences in the work performed up to now and elaborate the new forms and methods of work among the working women of the whole world. The Conference will also consolidate the connection between the free working women of Soviet Russia and those of the capitalist countries.

PROLETARIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT

The First International Youth Conference.

By Walter Kirshal.

The most oppressed and exploited section of the proletariat is undoubtedly the working youth. Although the young workers often do the same work as the adult, they receive much lower wage rates. For the majority of the young workers, the working day lasts more than 9 and 10 hours.

Under the cover of apprenticeship, millions of young workers are exploited for the stretch of 3 and four years, and even more, receiving for this only pin-money and being subject to all sorts of persecution and bullying. For the unemployed young workers practically in all countries there are extraordinary rules and regulations: this category of unemployed as a rule does not receive any relief whatever, or get a very miserable amount of a few pence. Thousands of unemployed young workers are daily handed over to the rich landowners for ridiculous pay, — in other words, they are forced to work in agriculture. Capitalist rationalisation draws ever greater numbers of young workers into the big industry.

The working youth suffers not only from unprecedented cruel exploitation, but particularly from political disfranchisement and oppression. The bourgeoisie has done its utmost to introduce measures and laws, whereby the young workers are forbidden to take part in almost all political and trade union life. The young workers are not permitted to take part in factory committee elections, and according to the capitalist laws, have no right to participate in economic battles. The bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to get the young workers under its influence. It organises for this purpose sport organisations, tourist circles etc.

The leaders of the Social-Democratic youth organisations confer peacefully with the leaders of the bourgeois and Fascist youth unions on the Government Commissions and on the different conciliatory bodies.

Throughout all countries the young workers are actively coming forward and participating in economic battles, putting up their special demands. Of still greater significance are the independent strikes waged by the young workers in great numbers in all the capitalist countries. In France alone, during the last month, 18 strikes of young workers occurred; in Germany 14, in Czechoslovakia also very many, etc. These struggles in the majority of cases break out spontaneously, and bear witness to the growing leftward trend of the working youth, to their growing militancy. A fine example of such a movement among the young workers is — the strike of the apprentices of the trade schools. When in Harmandsdorf and Worms the police shot down the young workers, the students of some of the schools walked out in sign of protest. The young workers are particularly active during demonstrations.

Another very important factor is the growing militancy of the young women workers. A great number of the youth's strikes are carried out by the young women workers.

During the preparations for the V. RILU Congress and the First International Youth Conference we should analyse thoroughly, from the angle of self-criticism, to what extent we succeeded in preparing for and carrying out the struggles of the young

workers, the extent to which we have really become the leaders of the proletarian young workers in their struggle.

The fact that the young workers' strikes in the main break out spontaneously, proves that we are not sufficiently connected with the youth in the enterprises, that we have not acquainted ourselves sufficiently with its moods and with the degree to which it had been prepared for the given struggle, and that we were unable to draw these young workers into the struggle on the basis of concrete demands and a militant programme. The fact of the matter is that in most instances, we are still isolated from the masses of young workers in the larger enterprises. The adult workers are not sufficiently drawn into support of the demands of the young workers, and the new forms of independent militant leadership are not applied to a sufficient extent (militant committees and strike committees).

In the capitalist countries millions of young workers are lined up in the bourgeois and Social-Democratic Youth Organisations. Here we were confronted with the task of mobilising these masses on the basis of the tactic of the united revolutionary front and on the basis of a concrete militant programme, to line them up in our united front organs, to wrest them from under the influence of their leaders and organisations and win them over to our ranks. We have not fulfilled this task.

The second most important question is the extent to which the youth has been organised in the revolutionary TU. movement. In this regard practically nothing has been done by the Red trade unions. Thus, for example, in Czechoslovakia, the Red trade unions in the majority are comprised of workers over 35 years of age. During the period since the IV. RILU Congress we were unable to line up new masses of young workers and young women workers in our organisations. The Red trade unions have neglected systematically to recruit young workers, and as a result of this the reformists in practically all countries line up greater numbers of young proletarians than we. The task of the V. Congress will be to map out the line and forms for the work of the Red trade unions and for all RILU supporters, for winning over the young working masses.

In its resolutions, the IV. RILU Congress spoke of the necessity of lining up all young trade union members into Youth Sections according to enterprises. This decision, with a few exceptions, has not been carried out by the Red trade unions. Up till now, there are only a few Youth Sections in existence, and even so they do not represent any real mass organs and do not play any role whatever in the life of the young proletariat. The same can be said of the organisation of a network of shop delegates from the young workers at the enterprises, with regard to which we also cannot boast of any achievements, with the exception of Germany.

The International Youth Conference has on its agenda a special point on the professional training of the young workers in the Soviet Union. It is very important to familiarise the masses of proletarian young workers of the capitalist world with the conditions of the working youth in Soviet Russia. This will not only be of general agitational significance—for according to the conditions of the Soviet youth we should draw up our demands concerning the professional training in the capitalist countries. The conditions of the Soviet young proletarians and their professional training can serve as the basis for mobilising the proletarian youth of the capitalist countries for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the Conference of the Young Workers will devote itself to the question of convening a World Congress of the Working Youth. Such a Congress will be of particular significance especially to-day during the stage of acute economic crisis and the growing danger of war.

Such are the principal task confronting the International Youth Conference. Each militant of the revolutionary trade union movement should realise that it is his duty to carry on daily and continuous work among the ranks of the young workers; that it will be possible for us to win over the working youth only when we shall prove capable of defending its everyday interests at the enterprises, in the schools and at the labour exchanges, when we shall no longer drag along in the tail-end of the movement, but will head all the militant actions of the young workers. It is essential to put an end to our isolation from the young workers. And the objective pre-requisites for successful work now are now to be seen.

XVI. Party Congress of the U.S.S.R.

The Carrying out of the Five-Year Plan of Industry

Comrade Kuybyshev's Report.

From the 15th to the 15th Party Congress.

Comrades, the 15th Party Congress assembled in the historical year in which our socialist industry, after having practically concluded its restoration period, entered on the broad path of reconstruction.

The 16th Party Congress has met in the year of the great change in the development of our revolution, and has heard the records of the mighty achievements gained in the work of socialised industry.

Six years lay between the 15th Party Congress and that 10th Party Congress which marked the adoption of the New Economic Policy: six years were needed by our socialist industry to overcome the ruin of our economy and to regain the pre-war level of production.

Only 2½ years have passed since the 15th Party Congress. And this short time has sufficed to enable our socialist industry to double the pre-war production attained at the time of the 15th Congress. And the single year 1930/31 promises such an acceleration of the tempo of development of industry that we shall triple the pre-war standard of industrial production.

Tsarist industry required decades to attain what the proletarian dictatorship — thanks to its special structure and to the active participation of millions of workers in the reconstruction of industry — has attained in a single year.

You may remember how the Five-Year Plan was received, not only by the bourgeois economists, but the Right opportunist elements of our Party.

The president of the "Russian" committee of German economics, Kramer, speaking of the Five-Year Plan, observed: "Were the Five-Year Plan possible of execution in 50 years, even then it would be magnificent. But it is a Utopia." (Laughter.)

Some of our specialists criticised the Five-Year Plan in a very similar manner, if not so openly as Kramer. "The figures put forward by the Peoples Supreme Economic Council" — said Professor Bogolupov, who failed to grasp the peculiarities and possibilities of our socialist order — "lie beyond the bounds of possibility of the next five years".

Another specialist, Professor Kalennikov, stated even more definitely: "I am of the opinion that the Five-Year Plan advanced by the Peoples Supreme Economic Council requires in reality eight, if not quite ten years, for its realisation." That is to say, the plan which we anticipated would be executed within five years, could not in Kalennikov's opinion be carried out under eight or ten years.

These economists shared the opinion of the foreign economists with respect to the Utopianism of the Plan, merely differing in regarding only ten years as necessary for its execution, whilst foreign opinion demanded 50 years.

It is perfectly obvious that the proposal made by the former leaders of the Right opposition, to replace the Five-Year Plan of industrialisation by a two-year plan of agrarisation, was also a result of lack of faith in the possibility of the realisation of the Five-Year Plan.

Enough time has now elapsed to enable an idea to be gained of some of the results and successes of the Five-Year Plan. How far are we, what has been accomplished in the first two years of the Five-Year Plan?

In the sphere of industrial production, the Five-Year Plan assumed a growth of production to the extent of 21.4 per cent in 1928; in reality the figure attained was 23.7 per cent. In 1929/30 21.5 per cent was to be attained, and the actual figure will be 32 per cent. In 1930/31 production is to increase, according to the estimate of the Five-Year Plan, by 22 per cent; this estimate has already been raised to 47 per cent, and the actual increase will probably be even greater. The growth of industrial production in the first three years of the Plan is 250 per cent as compared with the 180.1 per cent of the first

estimate. In other words, we shall produce 2½ times as much as in 1927/28 instead of 1.8 times as much (as envisaged by the Five-Year Plan).

In a number of the most important branches of industry the Five-Year Plan — as Comrade Stalin reports — will be fulfilled in three years, in some branches even sooner.

In the field of basic capital investments in industry, the Five-Year Plan took as a starting point the sum of 1650 million roubles for 1927/28, estimated 2331 million roubles for 1928/29, and 2879 million for 1930/31. In reality we had already reached the figures of the plan in 1928/29, whilst by 1929/30 the investments reached 3960 millions, and will attain the sum of 5500 millions in 1930/31. That is to say, the investments made in basic industrial capital in the first three years of the Plan will amount to 11,087 million roubles as compared with the 6860 million roubles provided by the Plan. The Plan envisaged industrial investments to the amount of 13,500 million roubles in the Five Years, but in the first three years alone we have invested 11,000 millions.

Who ventures to assert to-day that our Five-Year Plan is Utopian, unreal? Have not the leaders of the Right opposition been obliged to heat a retreat, have they not been forced to admit the fallaciousness of their criticism of the Five-Year Plan?

They have been defeated by facts. And it is not by accident that the capitalist press now finds itself obliged to replace its scoffs on "Bolshevist flights of imagination" by expressions of alarm, and unequivocal threats to frustrate the Five-Year Plan by all possible means, even that of military attack.

Our old acquaintance Leslie Urquhart writes in an American periodical: "We are all convinced that if the Soviet government succeeds in realising the Five-Year Plan of industry, it will develop such power that it will destroy our whole civilisation, or at least deal it a severe blow."

We have no reason to console Mr. Urquhart. The Soviet State is attaining great success in the carrying out of the Five-Year Plan, and he may be perfectly sure that his civilisation, the Urquhartian civilisation, the civilisation of capital, the civilisation of exploitation and of robbery, will really be destroyed by that Socialism which is being built up in our country. The victory of the Five-Year Plan is the death of capitalism.

The great German financier Solmsen declares openly:

"The advance of Bolshevism forces the European states, sooner or later, to form a united front and to arm it."

Here there is no concealment. The tone adopted by the French, Polish, German, and the rest of the press is becoming more and more open.

The Path of Reconstruction.

There can be no doubt that the Five-Year Plan is eminently calculated to arouse the savage hate of the capitalists, for it is a plan of great work for the socialist reconstruction of our whole national economy. No doubt the difficulties of its realisation are very great. The great tasks of the socialist reconstruction of national economy, the securing of the economic independence of our Union, the consolidation of its defensive capacity, all demand a radical reconstruction of the technical basis of the whole of our national economy, and above all of our industry.

What does the process of the socialist reconstruction of industry mean?

Firstly it means the execution of the large-scale plan of industrial reconstruction, for there can be no Socialism on a low level of industrial development. Secondly, it means

the execution of a comprehensive plan of electrification, for it is solely on this basis that the necessary, level of industrial and national economic development can be secured. Thirdly, it means the securing of the preponderate development of heavy industry, this fundamental of Socialism.

Fourthly: The forced development of machine-building, since it is solely on the basis of our own machine-building that the necessary tempo of industrial development in every branch of our national economy and the liberation of our country from dependence on the capitalist countries can be guaranteed.

Fifthly: The forced development of new branches of production and industry.

Sixthly: The broad development of scientific experimental work and geological research.

Seventhly: The most rational geographical distribution of industry.

Eighthly: The insistence on the opening up of reserves, the intensified struggle against losses in industry, the rationalisation of production.

The pre-requisites for our successful socialist reconstruction have been: the Leninist guidance of socialist construction by the Party; the enormous initiative and political activity of the broad masses of the workers; the training of proletarian cadres for our industry, and the penetration of our industry by the latest achievements of foreign technics. How has this programme of socialist reconstruction been carried out?

Above all the building programme. What methods were adopted for carrying out the building programme accepted by the Party when it confirmed the Five-Year Plan? The whole programme of industrial building activities was estimated by the Five-Year Plan to require 18,600 million roubles (at unaltered prices), or 13,500 million roubles at the prices resulting from the lessened cost prices in the corresponding year. Of this sum 78.7% fell to heavy industry. This plan of industrial building work presupposed a considerable alteration in the extent and structure of the basic capital of industry. The share falling to group A, that is, to heavy industry, of the basic capital of all industry, was to increase to 75% by the end of the Five-Years (as compared with 57% on 1st October 1928) whilst the capital invested in heavy industry was to increase, in absolute figures, by three and a half times. More than 30% of the total production was to be supplied by the new works to be built in accordance with the latest achievements of international technics. There is no doubt that the execution of this stupendous plan of work, of gigantic achievement, has encountered enormous difficulties.

But how has it been carried out? In 1928/29 the amount of the investments corresponded to the preliminary estimates of the Five-Year Plan; by 1929/30 it has far exceeded these, reaching 3960 million roubles instead of 2331. In 1930/31 the 2879 million roubles of the Plan will be replaced by 5500 million roubles, and the total of the three years will be 11,000 million roubles instead of the 6,800 million estimated in the plan. The whole of the Five-Year Plan of capital investment will be realised in 3½ to 4 years instead of 5, and in group A even in 3, for in these 3 years we shall invest 9,700 millions in heavy industry, whilst the Five-Year Plan envisaged 10,000 millions for the whole five years. Basic capital has increased as follows:

By 1st October 1928 6,700 million, by October 1930 10,000 million roubles, and in next year, by 1st October, 13,000 to 14,000 million roubles.

Basic capital will thus be doubled within three years. Where has there ever been a country in which basic capital has doubled within three years? At the same time the share allotted to group A, heavy industry, will increase in this same period from 57.5% to 72.8%, that is, to approximately the level envisaged by the Five-Year Plan for the end of the Five Years.

We have already a large number of undertakings which, in respect to technical equipment, are beginning to compete with the best model undertakings of West European and American industry. To these we may count such enterprises as the Stalingrad tractor factory, which was opened at the time of the beginning of the Party Congress, the foundry of the

"Red Putilov Works", which is fully equal to the most up-to-date American foundries; the Rostov agricultural machinery factory, which surpasses all that has hitherto been accomplished in the field of agricultural machine manufacture. The new factory "Electrosila", with its powerful generators, is not yet quite completed, but will rival the best undertakings of the West; the electric factory in Moscow, the factory in Mariopol, surpassing every undertaking of the kind in production. The paper factory at Balachna, the naphtha utilisation factory in Baku, the Grosnephth undertakings, the wood utilisation factories in Archangel and Dubrovka, and the many power stations ("Red October", etc.). It suffices to remember that whilst in 1927/28 newly erected factories were set working at a cost of 156 million roubles, in this year 221 works will be opened, entailing an expenditure of 8396 millions.

Another calculation illustrating the scale of our building activities is the following: the total costs of all undertakings now in course of construction amount to 12,000 million roubles, whilst the total basic capital of our industry will amount to 10,000 million roubles on 1st October 1930. This is easily comprehensible, since such gigantic enterprises as Magnitogorsk, Kuznyetzk, the Dniepr combine, the tractor factories of Chelyabinsk and Charkov, the motor-car factories at Nizhni-Novgorod, the machine-building factories at Moscow, Nizhni, and Charkov, the chemical combines in Beresnyaki and Bobriki, the combine factories in Siberia and Saratov, are now in course of construction. Great mining shafts are being sunk in the Donetz basin, in Siberia, and in Ural; mighty power stations are being erected. All these enterprises are being pushed forward at a pace involving a total expenditure of 12,000 millions.

The Five-Year Plan.

The increase of the productivity of labour is one of the leading tasks of our whole national economic policy. But the level of labour productivity is in part directly dependent on the amount of electric energy placed at the disposal of the workers. If we compare the level of energy-equipment among our workers with that of the American, the comparison is unfavourable for us. In 1925/26 the consumption of energy per head of our workers was 2,300 kilowatt hours, whilst in America the corresponding figure was 7,300 kilowatt hours. Hence the electric-energy equipment of our workers is three times less than that of the American workers. In 1927/28 the amount of electric energy consumed per head of the workers in America was 8800 kilowatt hours, in the Soviet Union 3200. Thanks to the progress of electrification, the level of the Electric equipment of our workers has improved of late. In 1928/29 we consumed about 3,700 kilowatt hours per worker, in 1929/30 about 4400, and in 1930/31, according to the calculations of the State Planning Commission (stated at the recent World Power Conference), the consumption per head of the workers will be 5250 kilowatt hours. This means that in the coming year — in spite of the enormous progress of our building activities and in spite of the great investments in electrification — we shall not by any means overtake America with respect to our electric supply. It is perfectly obvious that here we must set ourselves the aim of catching up with and passing America at any price within the next few years. It is obvious that when we have reached this level of electrical energy supply, then we shall be able to advance in our development at a greater pace than at present, since thanks to the increased electrical energy at our disposal we shall be able greatly to increase our labour productivity.

Comrade Stalin was right in saying, when speaking of the Five-Year Plan, that for us this Plan cannot represent anything permanent or unalterable, but that on the contrary we must make it our constant endeavour to revise the Plan during its execution. And the first revision which we must make, a very urgent one, is the extension of the production of electric energy, and of the whole of the electrical energy part of the Plan.

The C. C. of the Party has passed a corresponding decision on the forced development of our electro-energy basis, and the government has increased its expenditure for electrification from year to year in accordance with the directives of the C. C. By 1928/29 we had invested 320 million roubles (at the prices ruling in 1926/27) in our total long-distance centres and

power stations; by 1929/30 these investments are to reach the sum of 640 million roubles, and by 1930/31 1180 million roubles; that is to say, in the coming year the sums expended on electric construction will be double those of this year, whilst this year's expenditure is double that of last.

Our output of electric energy grows in proportion to these increased investments. In 1928/29 we produced 6,000 million kilowatt hours, in this year we produce 8,000 million, and next year the amount will be 13,000 million kilowatt hours.

In order to force the development of our energy basis, especially of our electrification, we must develop our electro-technical basis at all costs. It is only by means of an electro-technical industry of our own that we shall maintain the high tempo without encountering the necessity of imports. And we know that the question of imports sets the limits restricting our tempo of development. Hence we must develop the electro-technical industry and the building of turbines at a maximum speed.

What is the position regarding the electro-technical industry? The total output of our electro-technical industry, which has surpassed the pre-war level sooner than any other branch of industry, reached the value of 272 million roubles in 1928/29, and totals 503 million roubles this year, or almost double. In 1930/31 production again doubles, and will reach the value of 1,084.8 million roubles. The pre-war level has of course been passed long since. These three years 1928/29, and 1930/31 have been years of intensest development of the electro-technical industry.

We possess the possibility of doubling the output of our electro-technical industry from year to year.

With respect to turbines, before the war we manufactured turbines producing 5900 kilowatts; by 1926/27 we exceeded this by manufacturing turbines producing 34,000 kilowatts, by 1929/30 200,000 kilowatts, and in 1930/31 our turbines will produce a total output of 660,000 kilowatts, or three and a half times as much as in this year.

The production of fuel, the essential basis of the production of energy, is developing at a sufficiently rapid rate. The coal output, which amounted to 35.4 million tons in 1927/28, will reach 72 to 73 million tons in 1930/31, whilst the actual output laid down by the Five-Year Plan for the end of the fifth year was 73 million tons. This means that next year we shall have nearly reached the Five-Year goal. For the present year the Plan envisages 52½ million tons.

You will observe that our tempo is not inconsiderable. But here, too, although the Five-Year Plan is being almost realised in three, we must make the fullest use of every opportunity of increasing our output of fuel; we must endeavour to attain a greater rate of growth.

The naphtha industry, thanks to the investments made, will attain an output of 17.2 million tons this year, and 23 million tons in 1930/31. The Five-Year Plan confirmed by the Soviet Congress made a preliminary estimate of 22 million tons for 1932/33, but by next year our output will have already exceeded this.

In 1927/28 our peat output was 6.9 million tons. In 1929/30 we have already increased this output considerably, i.e., to 16 million tons. The question of whether the programme of peat production will be attained depends on the struggle now going on around this extremely valuable fuel in a number of industrial districts. We shall, however, in any case reach in 1930/31 the figures contained in the Five-Year Plan (the Five-Year Plan envisaged 16 million tons for 1932/33).

In the coming year the fuels of every description and the electrification set us many great tasks. And there is one other circumstance which may force us to fulfil these tasks with the greatest energy. I refer to a decision of the C. C. of the Party which plays a historical role of the utmost importance, both for our industry and for our whole national economy. This is the decision to increase the output of crude iron to 17 million tons by the end of the Five Years. This decision was only recently arrived at by the C. C., and we have not yet been able to calculate the consequences upon other industries of this increased production of crude iron. It is, however, easily understood that this increase in the output of crude iron is bound to affect almost every branch of industry, and even our whole national economy. Therefore, this necessity of increasing the production of crude iron must obviously cause us to revise our programme of electrification and fuel output for the coming year, 1930/31.

Heavy and Light Industry.

A most important question of the socialist reconstruction and technical transformation of our whole national economy is the question of the relations between heavy and light industry. One of the most important indications of the progress of a country is invariably the degree of development of its industry; on the one hand in the production of fuel—coal, oil—and on the other in metal production—crude iron steel. The relations of heavy and light industry to one another characterise, finally, the degree of industrial development attained by the country in question.

How have matters stood with us of late? From year to year heavy industry has increased its specific weight in the gross production of our whole industry, and in the basic capital of industry, and has thus laid the firm foundation for the reorganisation of our whole country on new and technically higher bases.

The relations between the productions of group "A" and group "B" have been as follows during the last few years: gross production of heavy industry in 1927/28 43%, in the following year 46.8%, in 1929/30 48%, and next year, presumably, 52%, so that heavy industry will then preponderate in our industry. Heavy industry will account for more than half of our total production, so that we shall be able to provide from our own resources for the needs of the other branches of our economy and industry with respect to the means of production.

We observe the same advance with regard to basic capital; in 1927/28 the specific weight of the basic capital of group "A" was 57%, in 1928/29 60%, in this year 66%, and next year the specific weight of heavy industry with respect to basic capital will have increased, in accordance with our calculations, to 72%. Almost three quarters of our total industrial basic capital will be invested in heavy industry.

By next year the Five-Year Plan will be fulfilled in every department of heavy industry. The Five-Year Plan laid down a heavy industrial production of 14,500 million roubles by the last year of the Plan. But already in the coming year we shall attain a value of 16,200 million roubles. We have therefore exceeded the Five-Year Plan with respect to the production of the means of production.

After the production of energy, the production of black metals is the most important branch of heavy industry. In 1929/30 we surpassed the pre-war standard of the smelting industry to a considerable extent. This year we must produce 5,500,000 tons of crude iron as compared with the 4,200,000 before the war.

In the production of iron ore we exceeded the pre-war standard this year; we produce 11.3 million tons as compared with 9.2 million before the war. Next year, it may be assumed, we shall raise our output of iron ore to 14.7 million tons, leaving the pre-war figures far behind.

In the smelting industry we have attained a tempo exceeding that of the Five-Year Plan, nevertheless the development of a number of the branches of industry working up metals—general machine-building, agricultural machinery, motor car and tractor manufacture—requires a forcing of the pace of black metal production. It was therefore a perfectly right step on the part of the Central Committee of the Party to set us, the whole country, the working class, the great historical task of producing 17,000 million tons of crude iron by 1932/33, that is, to exceed by 70% the preliminary estimate of the Five-Year Plan.

Comrades, I do not know whether you remember that when the Supreme People's Economic Council named the figure of 10 million tons output of crude iron, this was regarded by many as unattainable. And now this "unattainable" has been exceeded by 70%.

The bourgeois economists derided us and called our plans wild imaginings, scoffing especially at these 10 million tons of iron. And now this flight of "imagination" is being exceeded by 7 million tons. This extension of our plans is arousing correspondingly increased rage in the whole capitalist world. In realising this programme, Comrades, we shall become the leading country in Europe, in the production of crude iron. (Applause.)

The standard set for the last year of the Five-Year Plan—10 million tons—will have been reached by 1931/32.

Mention must here be made of the inevitable inequality of growth in the black metal smelting industry. In 1930/31 and 1931/32 we shall continue to work mainly with the pro-

duction of the old smelting works. It will not be until 1932/33 that the new giant enterprises will be set working, and the great constructed works of Southern Ukraine and Ural completed. In 1932/33 Magnitogorsk with a production of 2.6 million tons, Saporoschy with a production of one million tons, Kusnetsk with a production of one million tons, Mariopol with a production of 600,000 tons by the last of the Five Years, and above all the factory of Nishne-Tagilskiy with a production of 300,000 tons, will be set working. By 1932/33 we shall be producing 17 million tons of crude iron.

These three giants, the works of Kusnetz, Magnitogorsk, and Saporoschy, already in course of construction, will yield $4\frac{1}{2}$ million tons of crude iron, or 26 % of the total production of the smelting industry. This alone shows the importance of the building of precisely these works, and the amount of public attention which must be accorded to the building of these three undertakings.

The progress of black metallurgy is characterised not only by its increased tempo, not only by the dimensions of the new enterprises, but at the same time by the degree of concentration of production, its concentration in a few works of enormous size. The greatest smelting works in the world, in the United States, produces about 3 million tons. In the Magnitogorsk works we shall produce 2,600,000 tons. Magnitogorsk will be the second largest works in the world.

In the sphere of black metal production, the Five-Year Plan drew up a programme envisaging not only the overtaking of the capitalist countries, but the out-distancing of many of them, enabling us to take the place of the second country in the world, after the United States, at the end of the Five Years.

But, comrades, although the Five-Year Plan provides a firm metallurgic basis for our Union, it must nevertheless be admitted that here measures must be taken for accelerating our building tempo to a speed exceeding the Five-Year Plan.

What other works shall we build in these Five Years? As I have already stated, besides the above three giant undertakings, the Nishne-Tagilsky works will be set going within the Five Years. At the same time we shall begin to build another smelting works in Ural within the Five Years, in accordance with the decisions of the C.C. to produce one million tons. This undertaking will probably begin work in 1933/34, but it is very possible that circumstances will oblige us to force its completion, so that we can obtain metal from these works before the close of the Five Years.

In 1933/34 and the years following the growth of national economy will stride forward even more rapidly, and the amount of metal required will increase enormously. How are we to ensure further progress? Obviously we must begin to think in good time of the possibilities of building further smelting works, and the C.C. has already decided to begin with the erection of still another undertaking in Lipezk, besides that in Ural, within the Five Years. I may say that when we work through the control figures for 1931/32, we shall probably find it necessary to consider the possibility of still more smelting works. Not only Ural, which of course possesses every advantage promoting the further development of the metallurgic industry, demands the erection of such an undertaking, but the Lower Volga district, the Middle Volga district, etc.

With respect to the non-ferrous metals we have also successes to record. In 1930/31 we are producing two and a half times as much as in 1927/28. In the course of three years the production has increased two and a half times, whilst only a 50% increase is laid down by the Five-Year Plan. But capital has this rapid tempo the production of the non-ferrous

By 1st October our weak points, and great attention must be million roubles, all it by all organisations, and by the whole 4,000 million roubles.

Basic capital will thus be doubled in rapidly enough, Where has there ever been a country in which... (part item) has doubled within three years? At the same time the... (part item) allotted to group A, heavy industry, will increase in this same period from 57.5 % to 72.8 %, that is, to approximately the level envisaged by the Five-Year Plan for the end of the Five Years.

We have already a large number of undertakings which, in respect to technical equipment, are beginning to compete with the best model undertakings of West European and American industry. To these we may count such enterprises as the Stalingrad tractor factory, which was opened at the time of the beginning of the Party Congress, the foundry of the

there is no department dealt with by the Five-Year Plan which it is so urgently necessary to develop as the chemical industry. For it forms the basis of our defence, and is an essential in the rapid advancement of our agriculture.

In the industry producing building materials our tempo is as follows: According to the Five-Year Plan, gross production, including forestry and the wood industry, is to increase in value as follows: 1927/28 800 million roubles, 1928/29 over 1,000 million roubles, 1929/30 1463 million roubles, and next year 1930/31 1920 million. That is to say, the anticipated growth in the three years since 1927/28 was estimated at 137 %. In actual fact a considerably more rapid rate of development proved necessary. Although the Five-Year Plan had set the building material industry fairly extensive tasks, and although this branch of industry has gone far beyond the demands of the Five-Year Plan—for 1930/31 the value of the gross production will exceed 4,000 million roubles—we must still further accelerate the tempo. The building material industry must at all costs keep pace with our building plans.

Group "B" (light industry) has made the following progress in two years of the Five-Year Plan: 1928/29 19 % as compared with the previous year, then 21.9 %, and in the 7 months of the current year 22.9 %, that is, we are approximately maintaining the rate prescribed by the Plan. Some branches of light industry have out-stripped the tempo of the Five-Year Plan; the canning industry and the garment making industry for instance. For the development of the whole of our light industry we must, however, attain a level in keeping with the tasks of the Five-Year Plan. When we take into consideration that the population of the cities, and especially the number of workers, grows more rapidly than anticipated in the Five-Year Plan, it becomes clear that when light industry lags behind this tempo a number of disadvantageous economic factors are bound to arise. This lagging behind is explained by the difficulties connected with the insufficient development of our raw materials basis, and has nothing to do with the status of basic capital of light industry.

In our cotton industry, for instance, as Comrade Ordshonokidse has already rightly pointed out, the manufacturing plant at our disposal would already enable us to work up twice as much raw material as we receive. How can we solve this problem of the development of group "B" without coming into conflict with the necessity of restricting our imports at the present time, and of freeing ourselves completely from them in time? It is obvious that the way to solve this problem is the same as that already taken to solve the grain problem. We must begin with organising collective and Soviet farms on a large scale in the raw material districts—the small and middle peasant farms being of course stimulated at the same time. There is no doubt we shall be able to solve the raw material problem of industry in this manner, for even the present area under cultivation for the various technical plants, given satisfactory crops and intensive culture, would suffice to supply our industries with raw materials to an extent ensuring the full utilisation of their plant. At the present time the area under cotton cultivation is 1.6 million hectares, for flax again 1.6 million hectares, hemp 1.9 million, etc. This area could guarantee sufficient raw material supplies for our industries, were the yield per unit of soil increased. The cotton growing area, for instance, was already 30 % larger in 1928/29 than before the war. But since the crops only reached 79 % of the pre-war harvests, the increased amount reaching the markets has been only 2%. With regard to the cultivation of flax, the figures are less satisfactory. In 1928/29 we could record a slight increase in area as compared with before the war. But the poor crops and the increased consumption among the peasants themselves resulted in only 52 % of the pre-war proportion reaching the market. This appears to be chiefly the result of the extremely scattered condition of the farms. We are not in a position to utilise the cultivated area as effectively as would be the case in an organised large-scale socialised undertaking. The agricultural year of 1929 shows no better yield of the crops. Cotton growing offers no better figures; the yield has improved but slightly. The flax crops have even fallen off somewhat.

The question of agricultural raw materials has frequently on the subject of discussion in the C.C. of the Party. The government rightly in prescribing an increase of the cultivated from year directing the attention of all economic organs to C.C. By 19 Here, and here alone, have we the possibility of prices ruling the tempo of the development of light in-

dustry. But we must not only increase the cultivated area, but solve the whole problem of increasing our crops of technical plants. This problem is closely bound up with the necessity of creating large-scale agricultural undertakings, for the small peasant farm, tilling a small piece of land with antediluvian methods and agricultural implements is not in a position to increase its crops and to ensure sufficient supplies of industrial raw materials. It is only large collective and Soviet farms which are able to cultivate the soil by machinery and undertake an effectual manuring of the ground, whether for growing cotton, flax, tobacco, etc., and they alone are capable of solving completely the raw material problem of our light industry.

The second problem, with which I shall deal briefly, as the time is too short to allow of its discussion in detail, relates to the new kinds of raw materials for light industry. I refer to the raw materials for the textile industry: kender, kenaf, etc., which are being cultivated only experimentally at present, but will certainly and inevitably play a great role in supplying our textile industry in the future. The experiments in the cultivation of kender promise the greatest success. This is a perennial found chiefly in Kasakstan. This year about 10,000 hectares, or perhaps even 15,000 hectares, will be planted with kender, so that by next year we shall already have 100,000—200,000 poods of finished fibre, supplying an excellent raw material for the textile industry. The other plant "rami", found in Caucasia, is of even greater interest. The fibre won from it is of better quality than cotton fibre. At the present time this plant is not being grown to any great extent, and it is our task to introduce it.

The forced creation of a raw material basis requires that agriculture be supplied to a greater extent by heavy industry (manufacture of machinery, fertilisers, building materials for the Soviet and collective farms, etc.).

Special attention must be given to those Soviet and collective farms engaged in securing the raw material basis of the textile industry and other light industries. We must realise that the road to textile production, to cotton fabrics, leads us to the tractor, to the development of heavy industry, to the advancement of the industries manufacturing machinery and the means of production.

I do not refer specially to the fact that at the present juncture the development of light industry is necessary for the raising of real wages. There can be no doubt that it will be much easier to increase real wages after we have developed light industry to a point enabling the demands of the consumers to be met to a considerably greater extent than at present. We are now in a position to raise this question in its full extent. Now that we have a heavy industry, now that we can solve the problem of light industry with the aid of heavy industry, both with respect to the erection of plant, and to the production of building materials and the organisation of great mechanised socialist large-scale farms for the cultivation of technical plants—we can and must now accord considerably more attention to light industry than we have hitherto done, and secure for it a more rapid pace of development.

In connection with light industry, a few words must be said on the home handicraft industries. I refer especially to those handicrafts working up those raw materials with which we are amply supplied. I need only name one figure, which however, shows the actual importance of house industry for supplying the markets with articles of mass consumption.

In the current year the house industries organised in the co-operatives will alone supply the country with goods, chiefly articles of mass consumption, to the value of 2,500 million roubles. 2,500 millions! We see that we must realise that our house industries form a powerful aid to large light industry in increasing the tempo at which we can satisfy the mass needs of the population.

Engineering.

It need not be said that our immense reconstructive work demands enormous quantities of machinery. A few figures may illustrate this. Whilst in 1927/28 our total requirements in industrial plant reached a value in round figures of 450 million roubles, in the present year the corresponding figure is 1500 million roubles, that is, our present requirements are more than triple those of 1927/28, the year preceding the Five-Year Plan. Within two years our requirements have increased more than threefold! Next year, 1930/31, will witness a further extensive growth. Our industrial requirements in mechanical

equipment will reach the figure of 2300 to 2500 million roubles. 2,500 million roubles as compared with 1,500 million this year!

It is clear that we cannot depend on imports to cover this enormous demand for machinery. Here we can tolerate no dependence on the capitalist world. We cannot leave the fate of our reconstruction, of our technical re-equipment, in the hands of our imperialist opponents. Purely economic consideration, too render it unallowable for us to depend on imports.

The perspectives of growth are, however, so extensive for our industry that during the next few years we shall have to absorb a very considerable part of the whole world's production of certain kinds of plant. A characteristic example: Within the next three years we shall have to set up 10-12 iron rolling plants, whilst at the present time there are only 40 such plants in the whole world. The same applies to a number of other machines. We cannot, may not, and will not, become so dependent on the capitalist countries that the lords of the machine-building monopolies of the capitalist world dictate to us the policy of our technical reconstruction. We must exert our utmost efforts to create a mighty industry in our own country, furnishing the foundation of the productive forces of modern society.

In the question of the iron rolling plants in particular, we could make these ourselves after the technical and other re-organisation of our works and factories. Given suitable technical aid, it would, in my opinion, suffice for us to import two rolling frames at most, and we should be able to master this task ourselves and ensure therewith the necessary development of our ironworks industry.

The tasks confronting us are gigantic. And the state of our machine building industry is far from being able to cope with these tasks.

Capitalism has left us an inheritance in which a machine-building industry of our own is almost entirely lacking. We must begin almost from the beginning. Besides this, the dizzy pace of technical advance of the last few years has made the small machine building industry of pre-war Russia sink into utter insignificance.

We are reconstructing our country in accordance with the last word in technics, on the basis of the latest technical achievements of the advanced capitalist countries. The knowledge of machine building possessed by our country before the war no longer suffices for modern technics. We must manufacture machinery of up-to-date types, machinery capable of satisfying the growing needs of the technical re-equipment of our country. The shortage of cadres of qualified engineers and technicians, the shortage of skilled workers — all this places great difficulties in the way of the development of machine building. But these difficulties can and must be overcome at all costs.

But this is not the only obstacle hampering the development of machine building. There is still another stumbling block in the way: The status of our metal output, our requirements in special sorts of iron and steel, in soft and light metals — all this, plus the enormous scale of our machine building in the next few years, involves tremendous difficulties.

Seen in the light of these difficulties, the decisions of the Central Committee of the Party with respect to increasing our crude iron production to 17 million tons, and to the creation of a manufacturing basis for metals of higher qualities in Ural and Saporoshye, are of decisive importance.

What progress has our machine-building industry made? To its credit be it said that in spite of the great obstacles in its way, its development has been extremely rapid.

Before the war the value of the output of our machine-building industry (recalculated on the basis of the prices of 1926/27) amounted to about 307 million roubles. We can oppose to this low figure the following achievements of the Soviet Union: 1928/29 703 millions, 1929/30 1300 millions, and 1930/31 2500 millions. Compared with pre-war figures, 814 %. This year we shall quadruple pre-war production; next year our production will be eight times that of pre-war.

We have attained definite results, actual and effectual. The organisation of the manufacture of new machinery can also record notable progress.

We have not only succeeded in manufacturing a large amount of machinery, and some new kinds of machinery, but we build well and comparatively cheaply. It may be known

to you that we sell our agricultural machinery at pre-war prices (according to the price lists published before the war). Despite this, our agricultural machine building is making progress without subventions.

We manufacture Diesel engines at a somewhat higher cost than other countries, but the difference is not great.

It must, however, be admitted that we have attained cheap machine prices and the manufacture of high-grade machines only to a limited degree up to the present.

We have to confess that the greater part of the machinery manufactured by us does not satisfy the requirements, and is higher in price, and that this circumstance is incompatible with the systematically planned tempo of development of our industry and of our whole national economy.

The machine is the nerve of the reconstruction of national economy. It is the machine which in the last resort will raise our technical basis to a high level, and will thereby furnish the possibility of really and practically solving the problem of "over-taking and out-distancing". Therefore, we cannot be indifferent to the high costs of production and inferior quality of our machines. A sound Bolshevik tempo presumes good and cheap machinery.

With respect to the actual capital invested in the machine-building industry, this amounted in 1929/30, for machine building including tool and boiler manufacture, to 237 million roubles, for the electro-technical industry to 62 million roubles, for motor-car manufacture to 198.5 million roubles, for agricultural machine-building to 100 million roubles, making a total of 617 million roubles.

In connection with the rôle played by machine building in the reconstruction of our whole national economy, an increase in the capital invested is planned for next year to the amount of 1,175 million roubles, or almost double the investments of the present year.

We do not regret the large investments in machine building. This is a section of the economic front which will actually render a Bolshevik tempo possible: our whole industry is based upon machine building. Upon its development depends the development of coal mining, of electrification, of smelting, of the chemical, cement, and paper industries, etc. Machine building must be furthered to the utmost of our powers, for it is that link in the chain which we must grasp if we are to raise our whole national economy to a higher stage.

New Branches of Production.

I shall refer later on to the relations between machine building and the other branches of our national economy. I should first like to refer, if briefly, to the new branches of production which we are organising in all industries, and which are of peculiar interest in the present period. Pre-revolutionary tsarist Russia was a predominantly agrarian country, in which technics developed but slowly. The war years, the revolution years, the years of the blockade, the isolation from foreign technics, caused us to fall even farther behind in technical respects, whilst the capitalist world was advancing rapidly. Capitalist progress in this sphere is proceeding more and more in the direction of new branches of production. We have fallen far behind modern technics, and it is only during the last few years that we have pressed them into our service. We have, however, already attained some success, especially of late, since we have increased our expenditure for building new plant. We have now the possibility of organising and developing numerous branches of production entirely unknown to pre-revolutionary Russia. A few figures will illustrate our comparatively great quantitative and qualitative successes.

The production of new machines, of types which have not hitherto been manufactured here, has developed as follows: the value of these machines manufactured in 1927/28 amount to 41 million roubles, whilst for next year the production planned will reach a value of 552 million roubles; in other words, a tenfold increase within three years.

The share falling to these new branches of production, out of the total production of the machine-building industry, will increase from 7 to 21%, a threefold increase.

These successes may be grasped more graphically if we compare the above mentioned value of the output of the new branches of production for the coming year with the total output of the machine-building industry before the war. For next year alone a production figure of 552 million roubles is laid

down for the new branches of production, whilst the total production figure of our pre-war time attained, in round figures, only 300 million roubles. Hence the production yielded by these new branches next year will exceed by 41% that of all machine-building undertakings before the war.

The group of the new branches of industry includes: tractors, motor cars, powerful turbines and generators, many heavy agricultural machines, drilling machines to the value of 5 million roubles (next year); some descriptions of equipment for the naphtha industry, reaching the value of 17 million roubles this year; machines for cooling plant, this year to the value of 6 million roubles and next year 14 million; bakery machines to the value of 4 million roubles, this and 18 million next year; machines for the tobacco industry in quantities covering the whole requirements of our tobacco industry; drilling apparatus to the value of 12 million roubles this year and 26 million next; Diesel engines of entirely new construction and high efficiency to the value of 15 million roubles this year and 40 million next. With regard to numerous important articles we have already made ourselves independent of imports. Our whole leather and shoemaking industry is now being equipped with machines of our own manufacture. The equipment of the match industry is entirely of home manufacture. The plant and machinery for the textile factories is manufactured by us: the carding engines, shearing machines, drawing frames, etc.

Most agricultural machines belong to the new branches of production. Despite this, we are already supplying our agriculture with our own machinery to a greater extent than before the war. Whilst before the war approximately 50% of these machines were imported from abroad, in 1930/31 we shall manufacture the greater part ourselves.

In the current year the imports of agricultural machinery are only 12%.

In the chemical industry we have a number of branches of production completely unknown to pre-revolutionary Russia. In Leningrad an artificial fibre factory is already running. Next year two similar factories will start work in Mohilic and Klimsk.

In our textile industry we have taken up the manufacture of special fabrics for the electro-technical and rubber trades. We are now manufacturing electrical apparatus, tungsten filaments for lamps and radio valves.

It is impossible to enumerate everything. It need not be said that there are still many branches of production which we have not yet developed on the scale required. We have not yet freed ourselves of our dependence on foreign countries. And this is a task which must be speedily fulfilled.

The first steps have been taken, if hesitatingly and inadequately, towards our independence of foreign imports of raw materials. In reality we have only now begun to take up the cotton problem seriously. Hitherto we have imported from abroad cotton to the value of dozens of millions of roubles. Cotton-growing has only recently been extended to the European part of the Union. And it is only recently that the raw material basis, which will render our rubber industry independent of foreign countries, has been formed.

Next year we must produce 2,000 tons of caoutchouc. Measured by our needs, this is of course very little, and does not render us independent. But still we shall have at our disposal next year 2,000 tons of rubber, of our own manufacture, apart from the 200 tons produced in the current year. Vast tracts of land have been discovered upon which rubber-containing plants are growing wild; the roots of some of these plants contain as much as 20% caoutchouc. We shall first grow these plants on 33,000 hectares of land, and extract the rubber from a part of the wild plants (hundred thousand hectares).

Is this programme possible of realisation—have we really taken the first steps toward our independence of foreign rubber? In my opinion we shall not only carry out this programme, but go beyond it. Comrade Makohon, who is at the head of the rubber trust, naturally names somewhat more cautious figures.

Personally I am convinced that the programme could be extended, for the results of the last expedition into the region where the rubber containing plants were discovered open up wide possibilities. I repeat, this programme must not only be carried out, but exceeded.

Industry and Agriculture.

Quite new tasks—new even as compared with the original assumptions of the Five-Year Plan—are now set all branches of industry having anything to do with agriculture.

We are not merely concerned with the manufacture of agricultural machines and tractors. The Soviet and collective farms, the machine and tractor stations, need numerous other articles, without which the technical basis of agriculture cannot be brought into harmony with the social and economic changes which have taken place in agriculture. We require fertilisers, means for combating insects pests, fittings for repairing workshops, motor lorries, camp kettles, tents, wireless apparatus, electric lighting plant, enormous quantities of building material, fuel depots, motor cycles for communication service, etc.

Although much is already being done by industry towards the mechanisation of agriculture, it is not nearly sufficient.

With respect to the manufacture of agricultural machinery, I shall give only three figures: This year the production of agricultural machinery has reached a value of over 400 million roubles as compared with 67 million before the war. Next year the manufacture of agricultural machinery is to reach the figure of 845 million roubles, that is, 12.5 times the pre-war figure. **This means that next year our manufactures of agricultural machinery will exceed the annual output of the American agricultural machine factories.** In the field of agricultural machine-building we have accomplished a real step towards the realisation of the slogan of "over-take and out-distance". (Applause.)

If we add to this the 58,000 tractors which we shall build in 1930/31, and remember at the same time that we shall equip our agriculture with 745,000 horse-power, going beyond our programme, we gain a complete idea of the success attained.

The other needs of agriculture have not been so efficiently met by industry. The production of mineral fertilisers, for instance, is still very insufficient.

The chemical industry must mobilise the whole of its forces to fulfil the tasks imposed upon it by the socialised section of our economy. Matters are also unsatisfactory in the organisation of repairing workshops, supplies of motor lorries, camp cooking outfits, tents, telephone and similar material, radio, etc. Here the extent of production is still too small to enable it to meet the constantly growing demands of agriculture.

The manufacture of adequate quantities of agricultural machines and implements is in itself not sufficient. These machines must be adapted to the reconstruction of agriculture. Here the tractor has wrought a transformation. We require trailer implements for the tractors. How have the conditions been hitherto? In 1927/28, only two years ago, 97% of the agricultural machinery manufactured was intended for hand or draught animal power, and only 3% for mechanical drive. In 1929/30 a substantial improvement was observable, 24% of the agricultural machinery made being tractor accessories. In 1930/31 this percentage will increase to over 60%. The greater part of the products of the agricultural machinery industry must be of the latest models. A revolution is necessary in this branch of industry. A transformation which would otherwise require years must be accomplished immediately, and at the

same time, during the transition stage, the demand for up-to-date and perfected implements must be satisfied.

Our programme of tractor and agricultural machine building is as follows: Within one and a half years we must build the tractor factory in Chelyabinsk, a gigantic undertaking which will have nothing to match it in the whole world, and will produce 40,000 caterpillar tractors yearly, each of 50 to 60 horse power, supplying our agriculture with two million horse power annually. These works must be completed by the beginning of the calendar year 1932. The size of this enterprise, and the period within it is to be built, surpass anything of the kind known in the capitalist countries. It need not be said that the accomplishment of this task is possible only under the advantageous conditions given by our economic system, and only under the advantageous conditions given by our economic system, and only if the whole of the proletariat devotes maximum attention to it.

Within an even shorter term, by the summer of 1931, we must finish the erection of the Kharkov tractor factory. This will supply yearly 50,000 tractors, 15 to 30 horse-power, equivalent to a total of 750,000 horse power. This too is an extremely important and very difficult task.

We have a huge programme in combine building. We must erect a factory in Saratov and others in Siberia. Here it must be remembered that two years ago we had not yet thought of using combines, much less of manufacturing them. This year we have already imported a considerable number. But we must not only use combines for tilling our fields, we must manufacture them ourselves. Here we can record a very great achievement, which I must bring to the cognisance of the Party Congress. This is a special type of combine invented by our engineer Borodin, and differing from the foreign models in employing the motor of the tractor as driving force. This means cheaper and simplified working, a saving of fuel, and a reduction of the costs of production. Trials have already been made with this new combine in the course of the summer. This month further and severer tests will be made. But expert opinion no longer doubts that the victory is already secured, and that we shall presently be using combines of our own design for the cultivation of the soil. (Applause.)

The Soviet combine factories are among the tasks which must be fulfilled as speedily as possible. Two factories are planned. It is difficult to say at the moment whether this will suffice to meet the needs of the Union. It is not unlikely that we shall have to begin with the erection of still another factory in Rostov next year.

This does not exhaust the whole programme laid down by the Central Committee of the Party. The C.C. has set us the task of raising the tractor output of the Putilov works to 20,000. And this programme will be carried out. The building work has already been begun, and no doubt exists that next year the "Red Putilov" works will be producing 20,000 tractors, or even 22,000, and 5,000 spare parts.

The reconstruction of the existing agricultural machinery factories, and their reorganisation for the manufacture of tractor accessories, too, involves an enormous amount of work. Indeed, all these tasks entail far-reaching effort. But they form the most important branch of the activities of our industry. Every Bolshevik, every worker taking part in this work, every proletarian, must deem it his duty, a matter of honour, that the Plan is carried out at any cost.

(To be concluded.)

Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Stalin and Kaganovitsch

Full Report.

(Conclusion.)

Comrade Selensky (Central Asia).

Comrades, The Party is now drawing the balance of its activities between the 15th and 16th Congresses. At the Conferences of the districts, rayons, and Federal Republics, the greatness of the achievements of the Party and of our country, during the period alluded to, were made clearly apparent to all.

The speeches delivered here by Comrades Tomsky, Uglanov, and Rykov have been a capitulation in face of the victories of the Party, a capitulation, but not an acknowledgment of the standpoint of the Party. It is not, however, sufficient that they formally lay down their arms. The Party must demand from the Right not only a loyal fulfilment of its directives, but that the Right leaders take up a determined, open, and sincere struggle against that system of views, which they have defended during the course of the whole period up to the 16th Party Congress. This is the only way in which the question can be put, and the Party satisfied. Quite apart from Comrade Uglanov's speech, none of the speeches heard here yesterday from the Right met this demand. Comrade Rykov complained that the Right leaders, after working for seven months, feel themselves thrust back to the days immediately following the November Plenum. But Comrade Rykov did not explain why the Party has adopted this attitude towards the Right opposition. He further complained that the names of the Right leaders have been misused by anarchist, petty bourgeois—and, I may add, kulak—elements, for the purposes of attacks on the policy of the Party. But again he left open the question of who is to blame.

Does the Right danger, after the November Plenum of the C.C. and after the acknowledgment of their errors by the Right leaders, still exist as the main danger against which the Party has carried on, and continues to carry on, a determined struggle? Yes indeed, it exists. I do not believe that the leaders of the Right opposition can adduce one single case in which they have in any way come forward actively against the Right danger in its capacity of kulak ideology, against an ideology which attempts to disarm the Party of the proletariat in its struggle for socialism. The fact that in these 7 months there has been no such combating of the Right deviation on the part of comrades Rykov, Bukharin, Tomsky, and Uglanov, is the explanation why they are still regarded as the leaders of the Right opposition, and why they still remain that centre around which kulak desires and kulak ideology concentrate. If these comrades are really anxious to gain the confidence of the Party, then we must demand from them an indefatigable, systematic daily struggle, in the front ranks of the Party, against the Right deviation. If they cannot do this, then we are obliged to state that the whole of the decisions passed at the November Plenum with reference to the leaders of the Right deviation remain fully in force, and that the comrades concerned have to bear the consequences of these decisions.

A few words on the leadership of the Central Committee. Comrade Stalin stated in his report that correct leadership assumes that the C.C. does not confine itself solely to working out the general line, but keeps a constant watch over the carrying out of this line. It seems to me that the period just elapsed furnishes a striking example of just these enormous successes gained by the Central Committee in the work of practical daily guidance. We see this, for instance, in the fact that the C.C. has superintended the plans and the speed of development of industrialisation during the period under report. We see it again in the fulfilment of the tasks set our organisations in Central Asia for the purpose of freeing the Soviet Union and our industry from dependence on capitalist foreign countries in the matter of the cotton supply. The forcing of the tempo of the development of cotton cultivation has proved quite possible of realisation. We have the possibility of not only entirely covering our own requirements in cotton, but of producing considerable quantities for export.

The Politbureau of the C.C. has at the same time issued definite decisions with regard to the manner in which the cotton programme is to be carried out. These decisions must be employed as a basis, not only for the solution of the raw material problem in its relation to cotton supplies, but for the solution of the problems of other branches of industry. The cotton programme assumes the social and technical reconstruction of agriculture; the fulfilment of the cotton programme within the confines of small scattered agricultural undertakings is unthinkable. We must continue our labours for the extension of irrigation plant, we must solve the fertiliser problem by ensuring at all costs the building of a new factory for the manufacture of artificial manures. We cannot have our cotton production dependent on the import of foreign fertilisers.

That we in Central Asia have achieved great successes, in spite of the errors committed in the collectivisation, which were criticised in the directives of the C.C. and in Comrade Stalin's articles, is due solely to our timely and rapid resolution to reorganise our activities in accordance with the decisions and instructions of the C.C.

Mention must also be made of our great successes in the national question: the cultural progress and the raising of the material level of the workers in the Central Asiatic Federal Republics. These are well known facts. They are due to the efficient carrying out of the Leninist national policy, and, in connection with this, to the rallying of the peasant masses in the national territories around the Party and the working class. It is solely due to this rally that we have succeeded in carrying out the seed campaign.

We are carrying out our national policy in a situation of aggravated class struggle. When the question of national policy was combined with the question of socialist reconstruction, many elements dropped out which had up to then followed us in the question of the solution of the national question. The kulak elements strive to thwart our national policy and our work for the building up of Socialism. These strivings are observable not only in the interior of the country, but among elements from outside, among the émigrés who have settled in West China and Afghanistan.

The greatest and most urgent task confronting the Soviet Union, and upon whose accomplishment the success of our socialist reconstruction depends, is—especially in our regions—the training of cadres. We hope that the C. C. will help us in the training of the cadres required for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, cadres to be drawn chiefly from the midst of the national population.

I repeat that the leadership of the Central Committee has been maintained perfectly at the Leninist level (Applause).

Comrade Kossior (Ukraine):

Since the 15th Party Congress the Party has achieved great successes in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. It is not by accident that precisely in this sphere of work the Right have concentrated their activities in their struggle, and have advanced their various prophecies. The Right have been especially hard hit by the successes of the Party in the building up of collective farms. The Ukraine can already boast of a broad collective farming basis. About one half, or more of the cultivated area is collectivised, the total cultivated area being 27 million hectares. 30% of the peasant farms have united to form collectives. It is entirely due to the existence of the collective farms that we have been able to carry out the spring campaign, and indeed the whole agricultural campaign, in a satisfactory manner.

But what would have happened had we, on the threshold of this most important stage on the road to socialist reconstruction from the bottom upwards, followed the instructions of Bukharin and Rykov? There can be no doubt about what would have happened. By following the path indicated by

the C. C., we have been able, as some speakers have rightly observed, to solve the grain problem. It seems to me that we can be equally convinced that we shall solve, with equal rapidity and success, the problem of next importance, that of livestock breeding, and that we shall do this by the same means, that is, with the aid of Soviet and collective farms.

At the present time we are passing through a difficult stage in the meat and fat supplies question. These difficulties must not be under-estimated. Since, for objective reasons, they cannot be rapidly removed, the greatest possible effort is necessary in order to ensure the maximum alleviation.

I should like to underline, not so much from the standpoint of light-industry as from that of the interests of the heavy industrial districts, the thought expressed by Comrade Stalin, that we possess all the possibilities, and must put greater pressure on our manufacturing industry, in order that the store of goods in our country may be increased. This is one of our leading tasks and should be accomplished as speedily as possible.

After the speeches delivered by Comrades Rykov, Tomsky, and Uglanov, we are justified in assuming that their capitulation is due to the hopelessness of their position. (Hear, hear!) We know from our military experience—Comrade Tomsky too referred to this in his speech—that an opponent, when surrounded and forced to the wall, has no choice but to surrender. But this does not by any means exhaust the essence of the matter. I believe that we must put the question as follows: Have these comrades recognised the whole significance of their errors, and laid bare their theoretical roots? This is the essential point, and by this alone can we judge of the genuineness of their renunciation of their errors. In my opinion there has been no such complete admission. Both Comrade Rykov and Comrade Tomsky have spoken only in general terms of having been in error. They have also stated that objectively, quite against their will, a third power has exploited their errors. Comrade Rykov made the direct declaration: What more do you want . . . a political functionary tells you openly that he has been exploited by a counter-revolutionary power, that his errors have been misused by this power against his will.—I believe that this, too, cannot suffice us. We have received no reply to the question of why it has been possible for our enemies to make so much capital out of the errors of Rykov and Bukharin, and of the whole platform of the Right opposition. The fact that counter-revolution, that the kulak, have been able to make use of the Right platform with such signal success, proves in itself that the Right opportunists have gone 100% to meet the wishes and hopes of the class enemy, not only by their struggle against the Party, but above all by their theory, which embodies the strivings and interests of the kulak and all other capitalist elements of our country.

Only recently two great counter-revolutionary organisations were liquidated in the Ukraine. It is interesting that these organisations, in their slogans and in their programme, were a faithful repetition of the platform of the Right opportunists. An active member of one of these organisations made the following written declaration:

"Stalin's policy is leading to decline, to ruin, whilst the policy of the Right, and the measures proposed by Bukharin, Rykov, and Uglanov, are the sole right measures in the spirit of Leninism, and these alone, that is, Bukharin, Rykov, and Uglanov, are capable of leading the country out of the blind alley into which Stalin has brought it."

And now the declaration of a leader of the second organisation, also liquidated by us:

"The organisation set itself the task of altering the policy of the Party and of the Soviet power by means of an armed insurrection and the establishment of another Soviet power, but of a Soviet power based on a programme such as that proposed by the Right deviation."

I must admit that I was therefore much astonished at the comparison drawn by Comrade Rykov when he declared here that his name has been misused by counter-revolutionary organisations. He observed: What is to be said in the face of what we experienced only recently, when a dispute between members of the Polbureau, having nothing whatever to do with the Right deviation, was made the occasion for spreading the widest rumours and slanders.—Comrade Rykov here placed on a par a calumny such as is spread by the enemies of the Party daily and hourly, against the Party or against

some member of the Polbureau, and the incalculable damage done to the Party by the Right opposition, whose platform is identical with the restoration of capitalism in our country. This shows in what way Comrade Rykov has recognised his errors.

I believe that the basis of the Right deviation, and of Rykov's and Tomsky's errors, is that they have gone astray in their theory. The theory which the Right hold, and which they did not create only yesterday, is an anti-Leninist and anti-Party theory, which they have maintained, and which has now been taken up by their successors. Who has failed to comprehend that the basis of this deviation is a revision of Leninism?

Let us take the question of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Is this not one of the most cardinal questions, in which Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, and the others have sinned in the most abominable manner? Is this not the starting point of their errors in the sphere of agriculture, of collectivisation, of their attitude towards the kulak, etc? We only need to recollect the theory that the kulak would grow into socialism, and that the aggravation of the class struggle is the result of the wrong policy of the Party! Even if we have not fully recognised the profundity of the anti-Leninist character of these errors, when we come to this we are bound to falter. During the whole course of this struggle we have observed among the Right a most amazing lack of faith in the powers of the working class, a state of panic with regard to the class enemy, and a striving to conclude at any price a compromise with the kulak, with the capitalist elements. Rykov and Tomsky must ruthlessly lay bare the roots of these errors of theirs. This they must do with the openness which we have a right to expect from well-known political functionaries—and they must not try to thrust it aside with a few jocular phrases.

Comrade Rykov stated that in his report at the Ural Conference he defended the general line of the Party. Let us suppose that he did so. But it is possible to defend the Party line in such a manner that it emerges in a bent condition from the process. What we know of Comrade Rykov's report at the Ural Conference we cannot regard as a real defence of the Party line.

We have at the same time no further reason to trust only the words of these comrades. We must fight the Right deviation as the chief danger. And in this fight—fought not with words, but with deeds—we can find no common language with these comrades, in spite of their formal capitulation. We have heard how Comrade Rykov attempted to cast ridicule upon the matter. We see that in the interests of the building up of Socialism in our country we must continue our inexorable struggle against the Right deviation, including these comrades, until they have finally recognised their errors and changed their attitude.

In conclusion a few words on the national question. Comrade Stalin has dealt with this question in detail for the present period. We have stupendous achievements to record in the carrying out of the national policy, especially in the Ukraine. But there is one element to which attention must be drawn, and that is the conciliators in the national question. We often hear the remark, when the national policy of the Party is spoken of: That has nothing to do with us, you are the secretary, that is your affair. But the national question is one which must be reckoned, in all our Federal republics, among the leading problems of socialist reconstruction. Therefore, such a conciliatory attitude must be done away with. A further opinion exists that a correct line in the national question concerns the separate Federal Republics only, and has nothing to do with the central authorities of the Union. In this respect our Central apparatus is very culpable. (Hear, hear!) The question must be tackled in such a manner that not only the Federal Republics, but the Union authorities, pursue a correct policy in the national question. (Applause.) This is necessary for the further victorious reconstruction of our country. (Prolonged applause.)

Comrade Baumann:

The reports given by Comrades Stalin and Kaganovitch cover a wide range of questions. With respect to the errors which I committed as secretary of the Moscow District Committee, the wish of the comrades is justified that I should in the first place deal with these errors separately. As early

as January, the Moscow District Committee committed the serious political error of substituting for the slogan of the C. C. on the liquidation of the kulak as a class, the formula of the liquidation of the kulak and of the new bourgeoisie in its entirety as a class in our country.

It need hardly be said that this formulation contains a definite error, the fact that no difference is made between the city bourgeoisie, which possesses no production basis, having been deprived of this by the October revolution, and the kulak, who has a production basis. This formulation led at the same time, in actual practice, to harmful results, expressed in pressure on the small traders and home handicraft workers. On the instructions of the C. C., this error was speedily corrected by the Moscow District Committee.

Further, in the Moscow organisation we committed an incontestably great political error, when, in the Moscow district, which is not a grain district, whose agriculture is very multifarious, where there is much home handicraft and journeyman's work, where there are but few Soviet and collective farms, and where we have but little experience in the development of these farms and have but few tractors—when in this district we became enthusiastic for a tempo of collectivisation which we were unable to maintain. In practice this led to numerous administrative deviations and clumsy measures. If we draw the balance of this error, we see that in its character it was a Left swerving, a hastening ahead.

Of course it is not a question of merely acknowledging and admitting one's errors, what is required is to draw the necessary conclusions. (Hear, hear!) The political lesson to be learnt from these errors is, in the first place, that the fundamental principle of leadership of the masses must not be violated, whilst on the other hand we must not lag behind the masses, must keep pace with them, march at their head. In the second place, the correct principles of the strategy of the offensive must not be violated. We must not, as Comrade Stalin rightly pointed out in his report, regard the offensive as an "unconsidered summary advance without corresponding preparation, without regroupings of forces during the attack, without the consolidation of the positions conquered, without the utilisation of the reserves for the development of the successes gained.

I must also mention an error made by me in my concluding words at the 3rd Plenum of the Moscow Committee. Taking as premise a formal similarity, based on the uneven curve, rising and falling, of the collective farming movement, I compared the ebb and flow of the collective farming movement with the rise and fall in the whole revolutionary mass movement. It need not be said that there is no inevitable law to be observed determining the back-stream out of the collective farms. The back-stream itself was chiefly a result of our errors. This false analogy led to the drawing of the false conclusion: If there is a streaming back out of the collectives, this signifies at the same time a drop in the revolutionary curve. As early as the 4th Plenum of the Moscow District Committee I admitted the wrongness of this analogy. My former standpoint, and my present one, is that we are in the midst of a period of greatest upsurge, of a period of gigantic acceleration in the advance of socialist construction, prophesied by Lenin. At the same time I must state that although these faults and Left derailings have occurred, still it would be absolutely false and wrong to represent the line taken by the Moscow District Committee, and especially by me, to be a special line opposed to the Party line, as some of our zealous friends have attempted to do. This is not the case. It is pure nonsense. The Moscow District Committee has always followed and defended the line of the C. C. The whole time it has been fighting on two fronts for the line of the C. C. It cannot, however, be denied that the errors committed by the Moscow organisation, and especially by me, in the collectivisation question, have aided the Right and "Left" opportunists in their attempts to attack the C. C., and to ascribe these exaggerations to the C. C. It is known to all that the directives issued, especially those of 5th January, by the C. C., are absolutely correct. It is known to all that the planned economic tasks set by the C. C. on 5th January for the development of the collectivisation movement have been carried out. In spite of the violent resistance of the kulaks, in spite of the petty bourgeois elements, in spite of all the errors committed by numerous local organisations, the Party, under the leadership of the C. C., has won a tremendous victory in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

In the course of the period covered by the report the C. C. has been unwearied in its efforts for the firmer establishment of the alliance of the working class and small peasantry with the middle peasantry.

New forms of the production alliance are developing among us, which Comrade Tomsy has utterly failed to comprehend. He wondered "what kind of production alliances" these could be. The production alliance between town and country has developed in such forms as the organisation of agricultural machinery and tractor centres and gangs, especially in the period between the 15th and 16th Party Congresses, the organisation of the development of Soviet and collective farms, the organisation of supplies of machinery, etc. for the village. By these means we have actually increased the labour productivity of agriculture, the efficiency of the work of ten millions of human beings, and this naturally means that new perspectives of vast progress are opened up to the national economy of our country. At the same time this strengthens our support in the village, the poor peasant. At the 15th Party Congress we mentioned the fact that 8 million peasant farms still existed which were economically so weak that it was not worth while employing even horses in their cultivation. We had a number of farms possessing no agricultural equipment. The liquidation of such farms, without horses and agricultural implements, took place very slowly by means of aid for the individual farms. With the aid of collectivisation, on the other hand, we have seen that these poor farms, without horses and machinery, are disappearing. This real and effectual help for the poor peasantry is accompanied by the consolidation of the collective forms of production, and the alliance with the middle peasantry. The furnishing of the village with tractors and machinery, accompanied by the growth of the guiding influence of the proletariat over the village, has won over the masses of the middle peasantry to collectivisation, as Lenin foretold at the time when he spoke of the hundred thousand tractors. The collective farming movement has now actually become the vast movement of the masses of the poor and middle peasantry. We see that the middle peasant, too, is taking an active part in the collectivisation movement. The spring campaign confirmed this political thesis. On the Middle Volga, for instance, the number of collectively assembled peasant farms has increased fivefold, the area cultivated by the collective farms tenfold. This means that the middle peasant is participating in the collective undertaking.

In industry, as Stalin has already declared at this Party Congress, we have already solved the question of "Who—whom"; by the end of last year we had already accomplished the historical turn from the policy of political limitation and supplanting as means of combating the capitalist elements in the village, to the policy of the liquidation of the kulak as a class by means of complete collectivisation. Our old village, backward, based on the individual farm, is being rebuilt on new socialist lines. We have districts in which processes are passed through in one year which have required centuries in the capitalist countries, where there has been an immediate transition from the wooden plough to the tractor, from the flail to the combine. These mighty changes in the village are the result of the tremendous development of industry and of the growing social and political influence of the proletariat in the country.

Involuntarily our memories go back to the time when individual Narodniks, for instance Schelyabov, went out into the villages in the seventies, attaining, it need not be said, extremely meagre results under the conditions obtaining at that time. But now hundreds and thousands of proletarian Schelyabovs are gathered together, and join the active small and middle peasantry in reorganising the village on socialist lines. Even in Middle Asia, where I stayed not long ago, tractor and agricultural machine stations were already working. The peasants, 90 per cent illiterate, are forming collectives under the guidance of the proletarian cadres.

We see that the village is marching forward to Socialism. This is a mighty advance achieved by the Party and its C. C. in the period covered by the report. At the same time we see before us a perfectly clear and definite path toward the abolition of classes in our country, inasmuch as the small and middle peasantry, by means of the transformation of their position as small producers, are gradually made collaborators in socialist economy by means of their participation in the collective farms.

It seems to me that what we have heard at this Party Congress from the academician Marr and from Professor Keller shows us that the new and brilliant possibilities of the present stage of our development are recognised even by gray-haired scientists in the retirement of their studies: that the proletarian revolution and its successes cause even the hearts of these savants to beat somewhat faster. Simultaneously with these successes in the Soviet Union, with the advance of the world economic crisis, along with the growing upsurge of the revolutionary proletarian movement in the West and of the national revolutionary movement in the East, we achieved, thanks to the correct policy pursued by the C.C. on the diplomatic front, a brilliant victory in the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway. Here it was not only a question of a struggle between our country and the Chinese generals, but of a wrestle between our country and the imperialists, from which we emerged victors. At the same time we have been victorious in the Comintern; we have defeated the Right, and destroyed the theory of "organised capitalism". Is it most desirable that Comrade Bukharin should quickly and categorically renounce his theory of "organised capitalism", which is being exploited by the agents of capitalism in their struggle against the Comintern.

We see that the C.C. of the Party, leading the Party and the working class, has won a series of victories on the front. These goals have been reached, thanks to the unceasing struggle against sabotage, on the front of the struggle against kulakism. These goals have been reached, thanks to the unceasing struggle maintained within the Party on two fronts. Trotzkyism has been crushed, and at this Party Congress, as is patent to everyone, we have witnessed the defeat of the Right deviation. This struggle on two fronts, against Right and against "Left" opportunism, will be continued indefatigably by the Party. The "Left" deviation is a petty bourgeois radicalism, in which personal impatience is adduced as a theoretical argument, and in which the intermediate stages of development are leaped over. At the same time the struggle against the "Left" derailings, and against the conciliatory attitude towards these trends, are a necessary part of the combat against the Right deviation, for these "Left" tendencies promote the Right deviation by exaggerations hostile to the middle peasants.

It must be kept in mind that the Right danger is the chief danger. Therefore our comrades here are right in pointing out that the explanations given by Rykov, Tomsy, and Uglanov, are obviously inadequate. Tomsy does not appear to understand what petty bourgeois liberalism is. But all those here present certainly understand very well that petty bourgeois liberalism is a Right deviation in the C.P.S.U. in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the period of socialist reconstruction. Rykov does not understand how he can be reproached with actually treading in Trotzky's footsteps. He has always been against Trotzky. But the fact remains that, moreover, at one time the very antipode of Trotzky, subsequently formed a bloc with Trotzky. The fact remains that the Right and the Trotzkyists have joined, consciously or unconsciously, in their struggle against the Party, against the strained tempo of industrialisation, against the policy of complete collectivisation, against the liquidation of the kulak as a class.

Uglanov has reached the point at which he sees the comrades whom he has informed on the political situation, whom he has schooled on his lines, now commit the most reprehensible actions. An abyss has literally opened before Uglanov. Hence his confusion. One cannot deceive one's own party. One thing is very much to be desired—I worked for four years with Comrade Uglanov in the Moscow District Committee — and that is that he finds his way back from this abyss as speedily as may be, that he finds himself again, and becomes once more that active Party member, that co-worker and fighter, which he was at one time.

I believe that general protestations of allegiance to the Bolshevik general line of the Party no longer suffice our Party. In actual practice we have been able to observe cases in which it has been said: "We are for the Bolshevik general line", and in the same breath it has been proposed to slow down the tempo of industrialisation. Or it has been said: "We are for the Central Committee, but under the condition that Stalin leaves it". The opportunists of every shade agitate against Stalin.

I believe that all assembled here have more than general phrases for the Bolshevik general line of the Party, that we realise the necessity that the leadership of the Central Committee remains as it has developed with Comrade Stalin at its head. (Applause.)

It may be asserted with absolute certainty that the period since the 15th Party Congress has completely confirmed Lenin's characterisation of Stalin as an eminently competent leader for the present C.C. of our Party. (Applause.) It cannot be disputed that the celebrations held on Comrade Stalin's fiftieth birthday, that the attitude prevailing towards him in the working class and in the Party is the same as that felt in the works and factories towards the heroes of labour, towards those who lead the way in the realisation of the plans of industry and finance, towards those who march in the foremost ranks of the work for the realisation of the Five-Year Plan. Comrade Stalin, too, is such a hero of his class. Therefore he is surrounded more and more by the love of the masses of the workers and peasants. (Applause.)

The Party Congress has been greeted here by workers from the city quarter of Chamovniki, who declared that we are building and living for our children. Comrades, we are not living **only** for our children. We do not only prepare the soil for history; we are building up Socialism to-day; we are grounding Socialism in daily life; we are labouring with growing system and purposefulness, together with the great masses, towards Socialism, and at the same time we are improving our own lives.

May I be allowed, I who have erred and been recalled to the right path by my Central Committee, to repeat with the greater sincerity the words which have resounded so often at this Party Congress:

Long live the Leninist Central Committee!

Long live the leader of the victorious Communist Party and of the whole working class, Comrade Stalin! (Applause.)

Comrade Lominadse (Caucasia):

Comrades, The clearest confirmation of the political line and the practical work of the C.C., of the Bolshevik correctness of its leadership, appears to me to be contained in the turn executed by the Central Committee in the period between the 15th and 16th Party Congresses. I refer to the slogan of complete collectivisation, to the slogan of the liquidation of the kulak as a class, and to the practical realisation of these slogans.

This turn has been made possible solely by the course steered by our Party towards the utmost acceleration of socialised industrialisation, whereby the social and technical transformation of our village has been ensured.

The greatest merit of the C.C. lies above all in the boldness and resolution with which it has accomplished a turn of such international historical importance.

Every historical turn is inevitably linked up with a regrouping of class forces. The change taking place in our country in the given period is leading, however, not only to a radical reshaping of the comparative forces of the classes, to the advantage of the proletariat, but to the profoundest alterations in the social-economic structure of even our country, of the class structure of our society.

The liquidation of the kulak as a class is the beginning of the process which will abolish all classes and create the classless socialist order. Here, it seems to me, lies the international historical significance of the turn which we are accomplishing. To be sure, the abolition of the classes is a protracted process, and one which will be carried out amidst extremely difficult and complicated contradictions, and under the conditions imposed by the extreme aggravation of the class struggle.

As Comrade Stalin rightly pointed out, the fundamental factors in the liquidation of the kulak as a class are not violence and suppression. Repression and state force are obligatory and necessary, but only as auxiliaries for the fulfilment of this task. Not even the expropriation of the means of production owned by the kulak is the decisive factor. The fundamental and decisive point is that the basis disappears upon which capitalism is built up. The small producer disappears, the small peasant farm is remodelled and disappears, the conditions are abolished which permit of exploitation.

The abolition of the kulak is, however, accompanied by an alteration in the social and economic structure of the village in its totality, and above all by a change in the class relations within the collective farms, from the bottom upwards. Lenin defined the class differences in accordance with the rôle played in social production, that is to say, in the first place in accordance with the relation to the means of production.

I regard the artel as the fundamental type of the collective farm. In the artel the means of production are socialised. They are no longer private property. And this is the fundamental factor, the decisive, the socialist — if not yet consistently socialist — type of the new socialised labour organisation. This new form of labour organisation is now being organised in our village in the artel.

It is true that the inequality of ownership relations still exists within the collectives. The non-socialised branches of economy on the one hand, and the differences in ownership among the various social strata of the agricultural workers, small holders, and middle and well-to-do peasants on the other, create that economic inequality in the collective farms which cannot be wiped out all at once. The figures adduced by Comrade Andreyev, and published by Comrade Schatzkin in the "Pravda" of 3rd July, show, however, that already the first results of the seed campaign have raised the material level of the small peasants and of the least secured strata of the collective farmers to that of the middle peasants, whilst at the same time the material position of the middle peasants has correspondingly improved.

This circumstance — the abolition of the private ownership of the most important means of production, the transformation of the scattered peasant farms into the new form of the socialised labour organisation in the village, even though this form of organisation is not yet consistently socialist in type — enables the Central Committee of the Party, in the theses on Comrade Yaklovlev's report, to state quite decisively, and rightly, that a fresh auxiliary has been created in the grain districts, and that in these districts the question of social support is now in a different position from what it was before the complete collectivisation.

Some comrades have made the mistake, when referring to the present situation, of speaking and writing of the former small and middle peasants, of the former agricultural workers etc., in the collective farms. This is wrong. The social nature of the agricultural worker, who brings nothing with him which can be socialised when he joins the collective farm, is different from the social nature of the middle peasant, who places one part of his means of production at the disposal of socialisation and retains one part for his personal benefit, and who is in his views, his mentality, and habits still a small owner, though one who has taken a step towards the renunciation of his small property. His nature as small property owner has not yet been overcome. If we expropriate the means of production owned by the kulak, he does not immediately lose his social character with this loss, though only recently some comrades raised the question whether the expropriated kulaks should not be called upon to join the collective farms.

In the discussion carried on in the "Pravda" before the Party Congress, on the question of the social shiftings taking place in the village, a number of incorrect scholastic utterances were made, among these an article by Comrade Fain. Comrade Fain and some of his followers maintained that within the collective farms there is already no political difference, in spite of the former differences of economic position in the various strata. This fundamentally wrong premise results in a number of practical conclusions which appear to me unacceptable.

The class antagonisms and the elements of class warfare continue to exist in the collective farms, although the bases are vanishing which would enable these antagonisms to be reproduced. This factor we must stress in the immediate future, not only from the theoretical but from the practical standpoint.

The kulak is still extremely active. And the further we advance in the extermination of the kulak system on the basis of complete collectivisation, the greater will become the resistance of the kulak, since we have not yet entirely settled the kulak, and he will concentrate the remainder of his intensified class hate against us.

With respect to the kulak our tasks in the grain supply question are the same as they were last year. The methods

must be the same, but their concentrated application will obviously be required. On the grain collecting front we shall attack the kulak with the same energy as last year, but more systematically. The kulak will exert his influence not only over the individual farms, but over the irresolute elements in the collectives. Can we, in such a situation, begin to disband the groups of the poor peasantry, if only those of the artels? In my opinion we must retain the groups of the poor peasants for some time. I am convinced that the decision of the District Conferences of the Lower Volga and of North Caucasia, that the groups of poor peasants in the artels must be retained until we have created a more firmly established and consolidated position in the collective farms, is perfectly correct; at the same time it is self-evident that this position will be attained before long by numerous collectives.

The immediate dissolution of these groups, as suggested by various comrades, especially Comrade Ustinov in the discussion supplement of the "Pravda", is wrong. It is proposed to begin with this disbanding in autumn, at a time when we are in the midst of grain collecting, and when we may expect a number of serious difficulties and vacillations in the collective farms. The decision of the C.C. with reference to the support ensured us is a fundamental political decision of great importance. It is unconditionally correct. It would, however, be wrong to take this as a reason for the immediate dissolution of the existing groups of the poor peasants.

The complete stability of the collective farms is a question which will not be solved in one day, nor in one month. The collective farms still have a period before them in which they stand on trial, and only after this shall we be able to calculate on their stability on a perfectly secure foundation.

There can be no doubt that in the autumn, before long, we shall encounter a series of difficulties, to which we must already devote our serious attention. These difficulties will arise chiefly in connection with the distribution of the harvest among the members of the collective farms. You will know that according to statute the revenues of the collective farms are divisible among the members, after the deduction of the socialised fund, on the work principle, in accordance with the quality of the work and the time expended. But in the majority of the collective farms the check kept on the number of hours worked, and on the quality of the work, is still very imperfectly organised. On some collective farms no such check is kept at all. On the other hand, cases are known in which, during the period of vacillation, 25 to 30 per cent of the members did not come to work at all. These have done no work and have consequently earned nothing. Can we pass over these groups entirely in the distribution of the yield? Obviously not. Obviously we shall not be able to adhere to the work principle this year in the distribution among the collective farm members, but shall have to decide on a number of adaptations, such as the distribution of a certain share per head of the members.

In this connection we must aid the village by sending it the most competent cadres of our Party functionaries. The decision of the C.C. on the liquidation of the regional organisations and the transference of the centre of gravity of the work into the districts is perfectly correct. But our subordinate organisations in the village must also be strengthened. That the collective farming movement is stronger and more firmly established in North Caucasia than in other districts is due to a certain extent to the fact that here the most competent functionaries have been secured for the village; that the secretaries of the village nuclei in North Caucasia have on the whole attained a higher political level than the secretaries of other districts, especially in the village. One thing is now perfectly clear: The activity of the masses has now increased to such an extent, the idiocy of village life, of which Marx spoke, has been so thoroughly shattered, that we shall not be able to cope with the task of leadership, nor guide the movement of the masses in the village with the aid of the forces already present there, nor win over this movement politically and organisationally, nor lead it in the right direction, unless we can provide new and extensive cadres of Party functionaries.

A few words on the position of the working class. Above all we must place on record the enormous growth of the creative and social initiative of the working class, the absolutely changed attitude of the working class towards work, and the extended sphere of communist work, the beginnings of which were mentioned by Lenin in 1919. The mighty growth of socialist competition, of the shock brigades, accompanied by the movement of the working class into the village, without

which the village could not have been reorganised, the campaign of the working class against the bureaucratic elements in our institutions, the new forms of the workers' patronages over the authorities and offices, the selection of the most capable heads among the workers — all this bears witness to the enormous growth and the new qualities of the decisive power of our dictatorship. At the same time the standard of living of our workers has considerably improved.

In spite of the difficulties in food supplies, we possess sufficient sources of materials enabling the provisioning of the working class to be improved and therewith the real level of wages secured, if we prove capable of accomplishing a decided reorganisation of the work of our distribution centres, and of setting our cooperative apparatus in order. The overcoming of these difficulties, too, lies along the line of an intensified tempo in the development of light industry, as Comrade Stalin rightly observed. These difficulties must be overcome by an actual reorganisation of the work of the trade unions.

Nothing but the regulation of the work of the trade unions, and the reorganisation of the trade unions, can guarantee their turn with their faces towards production. The trade unions must build up their work on fresh lines, must enter into closer contact with our undertakings. They must organise the new forms of the movement of the working class and march at the head of these, a form of work against which the old leaders of the trade unions have striven to the utmost of their power.

After the report given by Comrade Tomsky at the Party Conference in Caucasia, and especially after his concluding words, we, the functionaries in Trans-Caucasia, had the general impression that Tomsky was endeavouring to fulfil the obligations which he undertook towards the Party at the November Plenum last year. We saw how difficult it was for Comrade Tomsky to break with the past in which he had been up to the neck in the quagmire of opportunism. Tomsky himself expressed himself to this effect in his speech to the Party Congress. We regard his words as a step forward, but consider them, it need not be said, as entirely insufficient, since they failed to give any reply to a number of important questions of principle.

In our opinion Comrade Tomsky's speech to the Party was inadequate, for the reason that he does not lay all the cards on the table and take an irrevocable step signifying an absolute break with his old opportunist position, the overcoming of this position.

I believe that Comrade Tomsky cannot justifiably complain, like Comrade Rykov, of having to speak here under extremely difficult conditions, in an atmosphere of distrust, of justified distrust, carrying him back to the day of the highest point of the struggle of the Party against the opportunists. At the Party Conference in Caucasia we believed that we could make it easier for Comrade Tomsky to break with the past by a comradelike criticism of his errors. The matter turned out differently, that is, it turned out worse for Comrade Tomsky. At the 16th Party Congress Comrade Tomsky could not or would not take the step which the Party expected of him. In his speech he did not state in principle his attitude towards the errors and differences of opinion dividing him from the C. C. and the Party as a whole. He referred to the consequences of his errors as the most important lesson learnt in the struggle which he had carried on conjointly with Comrades Rykov and Bukharin against the line of the C. C. of the Party during the last two years. But were these lessons unknown to Comrade Tomsky when he joined Rykov and Bukharin in taking up the struggle against the C. C.? Did not he himself teach these very lessons — first to the Trotzkyist opposition in 1923/24 and then to the Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition in 1925! Obviously the most important lessons taught by the struggle led by Comrades Tomsky, Rykov and Bukharin against the C. C., are not those which he states. The main lessons taught by this struggle are, on the contrary, that Comrade Tomsky has regarded the political standpoint of the C. C. wrong in the fundamental political questions, and has insisted upon an entirely opposite line. The struggle of the Party against the Right deviation has been the struggle of the proletarian Bolshevik line against the line of petty bourgeois capitulation, that reflection of the pressure exerted by the small producers upon some strata of the working class and in our Party, that line which coincides with the demands of the kulaks in central questions. This

should have been definitely stated, and not merely a general class description of the Right deviation given.

A voice: He should have stated it in Caucasia ... and two years ago.

Lominadze: Certainly it should have been done in Caucasia. It seemed to us though, that at the Party Conference in Caucasia Comrade Tomsky made at least a step forward. At the 16th Party Congress the last misunderstandings should have been made clear, and nothing should have been left unsaid. Comrade Tomsky has failed to fulfil this duty, and has not taken the step expected by the Party towards breaking with the past.

Tomsky stated that the bridges to the Right opposition were swept away! This statement cannot be taken on good faith and cannot stand as guarantee, the more so that Tomsky, having failed to show the essential character of his errors in political principle, has not provided even himself with the most elementary guarantee that he will not relapse immediately difficulties appear. Such a relapse may easily occur, for there will be no lack of such difficulties. We have already witnessed such a relapse on the part of Uglanov, after his declaration. In my opinion, therefore, the judgment pronounced on Comrade Tomsky's speech by the delegates to the Party Congress is the sole correct reply which can be given to it. And the logical conclusion to be drawn from these two years of struggle is the necessity of ensuring that the Right opportunists, whether open or concealed, no longer find any room in the ranks of the Party. (Great applause.)

Comrade Rudzutak:

Comrades, During the last two and a half years our Party has been working in the midst of a most difficult economic reconstruction. A large number of questions and problems which had just arisen at the time of the 15th Congress have been solved. These two and a half years have demanded the utmost exertion from the Party, the country, and the working class, not only for the accomplishment of the stupendous task of reconstruction, but in order to overcome the serious waverings observable even in the head staff of the Party, in the Central Committee.

The economic measures now being carried out in the sphere of industrialisation and collectivisation are bound to lead finally to the extinction of class society. Therefore, the most dangerous resistance is that offered by the elements doomed to disappear as a class by the present system of measures. Our whole fire must be concentrated against this resistance, both in our economic and in our political work.

When listening to the speeches made here by the former leaders of the Right opposition, I involuntarily drew a comparison with the occasion, not so very long ago, when Comrades Rykov, Bukharin, and Tomsky, at the joint meeting of the Polbureau and the Presidium of the Central Control Commission explained their platform. I regret to state that the explanations brought forward by these comrades here do not appear to me to differ in their meaning from that document which they read at the joint session mentioned. They have not confuted that document.

What was the main import of the declaration made by the Right at the Polbureau session?

First principle: The measures taken by the Central Committee in agriculture have led to the retrogression of agriculture, and are bound to lead to the impoverishment and ruin of our country.

It was also stated that the Soviet and collective farms would not be able to take the place of main grain supplier within the next few years, and that in this respect we should long be dependent on the individual peasant farm.

The next principle of the declaration was the assertion that the tempo of industrialisation was beyond our powers. The Right repeated in substance the present views of the Trotzkyists and of Trotzky, to the effect that we maintain the tempo of industrialisation at the expense of the impoverishment of the country. The declaration proclaimed that the industrialisation must not be based on wasting our funds down to the last penny, but must have as foundation the promotion of the small and middle peasant farms and the general growth of labour productivity.

The third principle of the declaration consisted of an attack on the organisational line of our Party, and against unconditional Party discipline. The principle of Party discipline did not suit the opposition. The declaration states that the

attitude of the Polbureau towards the opposition is to be explained by the fact that the collective leadership of the C. P. S. U. has actually been done away with:

"We are against questions of Party leadership being decided by individual persons. We are against the control of the collective being replaced by the control of an individual person, however authoritative."

This formulation in the platform of the opposition contains not only a protest against the regime existing in the Party, but a direct calumny of the Party, of Comrade Stalin, whom it is attempted to accuse of the despotic leadership of our Party. I, as member of the C. C., must remark in passing that during all the years of our joint work with Comrade Stalin in the Central Committee, we cannot adduce one case in which he has ever tried to oppose his will and his opinion to those of the C. C. members, the collective.

Have the speeches which we have heard here refuted the principles of this platform? At bottom they have not done so. I do not refer to Comrade Uglanov's speech. Uglanov has practically given no explanation whatever. I have tried to ascertain from the stenographic report what Uglanov actually said, but there was nothing which I could comprehend. (Hear, hear.) He only stated: We believe that we shall improve, we believe that we shall co-operate with the Party, and so forth. But the 16th Party Congress can be but little interested in all the things which Comrade Uglanov and the sharers of his views believe. What interests us at the present time is the question of the further fate of our Party, the question of whom we are collaborating with, of where we are going and with whom we are going . . . (Hear, hear.) . . . and of the means and methods with which we are going to work.

How do the opposition describe their differences? Uglanov states: "Our position may perhaps be named Chvostistic." Tomsky says: My decided differences of opinion with the Party consisted of the fact that it appeared to me that at the most difficult juncture in the grain collecting campaign we were drawing the bow too tightly in the direction of strict measures, especially towards the middle peasants, in the matter of grain collecting.—He alleges that he agreed to putting pressure on the kulak. Rykov declares that his decided errors lay in his having under-estimated the possibilities possessed by the Party in the reorganisation of agriculture. Only that and nothing more! In the platform of the Right we read differently. And the work of the Right in the period just elapsed also speaks a different language.

Their work has been directed against the fundamental measures of our Party in the spheres of economy and organisation. But on this point they preserve silence. And more than this, when Comrade Rykov states here that he recognises the Five-Year Plan as right, and consequently also the tempo of industrialisation, and that he never opposed the two-year plan to the Five-Year—then this an obvious historical untruth. Let us consider the content of the two-year plan. Rykov says: I drew up the two-year plan for the purpose of comprehending the agricultural process, within the Five-Year Plan, in two years, since I was of the opinion that within one year the agricultural process could not be improved and controlled." This was not the import of the two-year plan. The two-year plan did not contain the reconstruction of heavy industry, nor even the elements of industrialisation. This is decisive. How did Lenin regard industrialisation? He declared that industrialisation is the key to the reconstruction of agriculture. And what do we read in the Five-Year Plan? In the Five-Year Plan it is stated that the development of industry is the key to the development and collectivisation of agriculture. The industrial basis, the technical basis, is the most important link, the lever enabling the individual farm to be advanced along the line of the collective farm. The two-year plan does not contain this element of industrialisation. The idea that agriculture could be reconstructed within two years, without an industrial basis, is wrong. And when Comrade Rykov comes forward and states that he did not oppose the two-year plan to the Five, then this means that last evening he himself was not yet clear on the actual nature of the differences of opinion existing between him and the Party, between the Right opposition and the Central Committee.

And if I am asked: How about the Right opposition in the future: Peace or truce? Then I shall reply: neither peace nor truce, but war, for the class struggle will continue to exist in one form or another in our country until we have a society without classes. It is another question whether

Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky are going to take part in the class struggle against the line of the Party. Perhaps they will, perhaps not! But if the question is put: what about the Right opposition after the capitulation of some of its members? Then we answer: The same relentless combat which we have hitherto carried on will be continued (Applause).

This in my opinion, replies at the same time to the questions put by Comrades Tomsky and Rykov. We can only repeat Comrade Tomsky's words, that repentance alone does not suffice. Did not Zinoviev repent in his time? He sent in a written declaration to the Polbureau, and contrived to travel on the evening of the very same day from Moscow to Leningrad, in order to speak in the factories there against the C. C., and to defend his own line. Did not Kamenev do penance after his expulsion from the Party, and did he not enter into negotiations with Bukharin? When he was negotiating with Bukharin, proposing that Stalin be overthrown, the Polbureau dissolved and reelected, etc. did he then come to the C. C. and reveal the conspiracy? It is not until now, when these events are a year old, immediately before the 16th Party Congress, that Kamenev has found an opportunity of writing an article letting out about these negotiations with Bukharin.

And how often has Comrade Uglanov repented? And how often has he agitated simultaneously against the C. C. As I have already said: Repentance alone does not suffice. And it does not suffice to confine oneself to the demand: Let me work. In the case of a simple Party member that might suffice. But here we are concerned with the general staff, the Central Committee of the Party. Every member of the general staff must be ready at his post at any moment, prepared to ward off the attacks of the class enemy, and to fight this enemy ruthlessly. Is mere repentance sufficient in this case, a passive, if loyal, fulfilment of the Party decisions? Comrade Rykov was very rightly interrupted by cries of: Do not attack Bukharin, but his idea." Comrade Rykov attempted evasions: "How am I to combat Bukharin's errors, since yesterday they were mine?—But that is just what is required, that is the right way to fight, not only against Bukharin's errors of yesterday, but against his errors of to-day and against our own errors. In other words, Bukharin, Rykov, Uglanov, and all of them, must not merely acquiesce passively in the decisions of the Party Congress, the C. C., and the other Party organisations, but must combat actively and determinedly those ideas of the Right opposition whose originators and bearers they are.

Has this been done in any way up to the present? Can we mention any case in which Bukharin, Tomsky, or Rykov has come forward in active opposition to ideas representing their own ideological platform! With respect to Bukharin, his aim is to become the great exponent of silence. We do not know whether he is among the repentant or whether he clings to his Right opportunist errors. It seems to me that we have most reason to suppose that he has remained the Right opportunist which he was before the November Plenum. (Hear, hear.) Comrade Tomsky, too, deserves this reproach: here he has quoted several proverbs, and there is perhaps another on which he might note: "The old Adam is dead, but he still lives". (Hear, hear.)

Hence we cannot content ourselves with mere declarations on the part of the Right opportunists of their submission to the decisions of the C. C. and of the Party. If they are really anxious to gain the confidence of the Party, if they really want to feel themselves as members of the Party with equal rights, they must come forward actively and disarm ideologically, that is, they must take up an active combat against the errors of which they have been guilty during the whole of the recent period.

The last two and a half years have been a time of severe trial for the Party. The Party has emerged as victor, but solely for the reason that the Central Committee, in spite of all difficulties, in spite of all vacillations, has held fast to the Leninist line. However base the attacks made upon our Party, whatever the calumnies ventured, especially against Comrade Stalin, whatever aspersions are cast upon its policy, the practical results obtained bear witness that the line of our Party is right, that the Party is on the Leninist path. We shall be victorious under the banner of Leninism. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Comrade Voroshilov:

Comrade Stalin described very graphically in his report the process going on in the countries of capitalism. I should now like to draw your attention to one of these processes. Upon the background formed by the collapsing partial stabilisation of capitalism since the war, by the great economic crisis which has seized almost every country, and by the advancing contradictions between two economic-political systems—the socialist of the Soviet Union and the capitalist of the rest of the world—armaments are increasing feverishly, as Comrade Stalin has already pointed out. A remarkable competition is going on among the imperialist countries in regard to armaments, and the equipment of the army with ever more perfect means of destruction. Frantic preparations are being made for the coming war with its unheard of bloodshed and devastation.

The imperialists are seriously arming for war, with methods whose extensive scale throws all that we have hitherto experienced into the shade. They are utilising the lessons and experiences of recent years. The army as such has ceased to play a fundamental and dominant rôle in the preparations for the coming armed conflicts. Economy as a whole—industry, agriculture, and the transport service, the cultural institutions and the scientific forces these are the levers being set in action in the preparations for the impending violent struggles. The armies of the imperialists differ essentially from those of five or six years ago. A small example of this: Whilst the French army possessed 1,300 machine guns in 1914, before the beginning of the war, it now possesses 35,000. Before the imperialist war the English army possessed only 9,000 machine guns, to-day 13,000 (in the mother country alone not including India); the United States formerly possessed 1,300 machine guns, it now has 35,000. Before the great war no army possessed tanks. To-day France has over 2000, England over 450, and the United States over 5550.

By the time war breaks out, the capitalist countries will possess many times more machine guns, tanks, aeroplanes, and other instruments of destruction, than at the present time. An approximate estimate of the armies during the war yields the following:

The American Expeditionary force, which operated in France in 1918, comprised 2 million men, with 5,000 guns, 300 tanks, 2000 aeroplanes, and 40,000 motor cars. In 1920 a law of national defence was passed increasing the strength of the army to 3½ million men, and its equipment to 15,000 guns, 6000 tanks, 5000 aeroplanes, and 200,000 motor cars (as compared with 40,000 in 1918). The decision of the United States government with respect to the new army was adopted ten years ago. We have no reason to suppose that this decision has not been revised during the last ten years in the direction of a further increase of the numerical strength and the armament of the army.

The quality of army equipment has developed tremendously and continues to develop in the literal sense of the word; it is being perfected. Thus for instance, the air fleet possesses bombing-planes which can carry a 12-ton load; this signifies that, quite apart from the other enormously important features of this new means of warfare, its possibilities are again radically extended. A squadron of ten such bombing-planes can throw 115 tons of explosives at once; one hundred such bombing planes could destroy a modern big city.

The reorganisation of the army is being perfected parallel with the technical development. The extensive technical equipment of the army and the evolution of techniques render new forms of organisation necessary. Numerically strong military units no longer meet the requirements to-day; they are not mobile enough and are too expensive to be operated with. In England, America, and in other capitalist countries, energetic work is being carried on not only in the laboratories and experimental workshops, but also for the immediate reorganisation of the structure of the military units. The English, for instance, are planning mechanised divisions. A comparison between such a division as this and those existing at the present time gives an idea of the perspectives of the further development of the armed forces of the bourgeoisie. The projected division will comprise only 4000 men instead of the 17,000 hitherto forming the normal war strength. It will possess 81 guns instead of 60, and only 26 light machine guns; but it will have 450 heavy machine guns in place of the 350 light and 192 heavy ones of the present division. The day's

march of such a division is no longer 20 kilometres, but 80; in other words, this division will possess greater firing powers than the present one, its mobility will be increased fourfold, and it will besides this, thanks to its comprehensive equipment with tanks and armoured cars, offer a considerably lessened object of attack from either land or air.

During the last few years lively discussions have been held on the composition of the army. Here two schools exist, if we may use this form of expression. The old school, represented by the "most honourable" military and political leaders of the bourgeoisie, which defends the necessity of the present maintenance of the mass armies. The ideologists of this school believe that under the present circumstances the sole possibility is the maintenance of mass armies for carrying on great wars and securing the victory. The other school insists on a thorough reorganisation of the whole system of armed forces. It demands small bodies of troops, mechanised and motorised to the uttermost, and able to be composed of politically reliable elements. Such an army as this, in the opinion of the new school, represented by Fuller, Soltan, and various other military experts, publicists, and politicians, would be enabled by its enormous technical strength not only to solve every fighting problem on the front, but would at the same time be prepared, and would be an obedient instrument in the struggle against the revolutionary movement, and for the suppression of the proletarian masses. At the present time the bourgeoisie, in spite of the weighty arguments of the "younger" school on the mechanising of the army, still maintains its old standpoint of the mass army, which must of course be perfected technically. At the same time ways and means are being sought to make these armies obedient tools in every respect.

England, America, and Germany have mercenary armies, composed solely of voluntary professional soldiers who have signed on for long terms of service. France, which possesses the largest standing army, is also obliged to strengthen the standing cadres and to decrease the proportion of the troops not to be mobilised till the outbreak of war, that is, to adopt the method in whose favour America and England have decided. The actual cadre of the French army, which was relatively small a few years ago, has now grown by almost 51% in proportion to the total strength of the army. The bourgeoisie has no longer any faith in the reserves of discharged troops. The anxiety of the bourgeoisie to ensure reliable cadres is, however, not confined to the standing army. The military leaders are perfectly aware that the professional soldier, the faithful servant of the exploiting classes, may form the greater part of the army in times of peace, but that in case of war, when the numerical strength of the army must be greatly increased, they are dependent on the masses.

Apart from the enlargement of the army of professional soldiers and the organisation of Fascist mass cadres, all measures are being taken to render the troops obedient tools, and to exclude any possibility of surprises. In France, Japan, and America, Draconic laws have already been issued, which will be proclaimed at the moment of mobilisation and will come into force at once. These laws prescribe the conduct of not only every citizen, but of every organisation, including the trade unions, etc. These laws determine the fate of our brother Communist Parties. These will of course have to withdraw into illegality on the first day of the mobilisation, or even earlier, and will have to take all measures for their maintenance and continued work.

The development of techniques, the changes in the structure of the armies—these determine the form of the coming conflicts. It is already a fact to-day that in the next war the conception of the front will be wiped out. Aircraft tanks, chemical war—these are methods of warfare which no longer recognise the old frontiers, or which the old idea of the front is no longer binding.

We shall draw the necessary conclusions from all this. The Central Committee, the whole Party, the whole working class, have already drawn these conclusions, and I hope that in the future we shall continue to take as a starting point of our practical work the necessity of following attentively the processes going on abroad, in order that we may not be taken by surprise, nor be too late with the urgently needful measures for the defence of our frontiers and of our proletarian revolution.

Now as to naval armaments. The bourgeoisie is arming on the water no less energetically than on the land and in

the air. Naval armaments are growing steadily, in spite of the outcry about disarmament, and in spite of the futile chatter at innumerable conferences. The nature of these armaments has changed in accordance with the tasks set the navies by imperialism.

The imperialist countries need their fleets in order to secure communication with the colonies and sources of raw materials in case of war, in order to destroy the ocean commerce of their opponents, and to make attacks on the coast and fleet of the enemy. For this numerous light fighting units are chiefly necessary. A tacit agreement has been arrived at among the five decisive great Powers in this question with regard to the cessation of the competition in the building of dreadnoughts, these extremely costly giants of open battle. This is in the first place of financial advantage, and serves in the second place to throw dust in the eyes of the masses by an apparent limitation of armaments. The bourgeoisie has decided in favour of the construction of light cruisers, mine-layers, and submarines. The following data fully confirm this. The five great Powers, England, America, Japan, France, and Italy, possessed 63 dreadnoughts in 1922, and will still possess the same number in 1932 according to the programme upon which they have agreed. But as compensation the number of aircraft-carriers will be increased from 7 in 1922 to 23 in 1932. The number of up-to-date cruisers will be increased from 56 to 222, of mine-boats from 437 to 831, and of submarines from 153 to 461. Technically, all these naval units are much superior to the types used in the great war.

We see that all this talk of naval disarmament is pure fraud. It is only intended to mislead.

The financing of the coming war, too, is developing at an accelerated pace. In 1913 these same five Powers expended in round figures the sum of £ 140,000,000 for their armies in their peace strength. This sum has now swelled to £ 570,000,000. We should be very simple-minded—and simple-mindedness was never an attribute of the Bolsheviks—were we to suppose that the armament expenditure is confined solely to that stated in the military budget.

Two words regarding our nearest Western neighbours. Whilst the bourgeoisie of the whole world is arming feverishly, our Western neighbours, especially Poland and Rumania, are straining every nerve to avoid being left behind. But the poverty of these countries, their acute economic difficulties, make it extremely difficult for them to keep pace with the "adult" countries. However, Poland, Rumania, and the other countries to which world imperialism has assigned the rôle of military vanguard protecting the bourgeois world against the Soviet Union, are at least sure of very solid support from their patrons towards strengthening their armaments. This support is indeed so substantial that Poland has been able to make great progress during the last few years in the exceedingly costly re-equipment of its army. With respect to the equipment of its divisions with machine-guns and artillery, Poland's army is to-day but little behind the up-to-date French divisions. Of late Poland has built up a very efficient war industry. Comrade Stalin rightly observed that in a general crisis of capitalism only the war industry prospers. This applies especially to Poland. It suffices to point out that in my report at the XV. Party Congress I mentioned that the Polish armament industry possessed 18 large scale undertakings, whilst to-day this number has increased to 32. These enterprises have been built by the best known firms of France, Germany, England, and Czechoslovakia. The old factories are being reconstructed. At the same time it must be remembered that the output capacity of the war industry develops incomparably more rapidly than the number of new undertakings.

It need not be said that the bourgeoisie is not arming merely for purposes of parade. The bourgeoisie is arming not merely with the idea of solving its insoluble contradictions by recourse to weapons, nor merely with the intention of finding a way of escape from the historical blind alley from which a world revolution is in reality the only exit; it is arming at the same time for the purpose of fighting against the approaching revolution, and above all for the purpose of attempting to frustrate our building up of Socialism. And since we know this, we must not be absolutely undisturbed about the fate of our country, we have no right to forget for a moment the necessity of every measure for securing the uninterrupted building up of Socialism. It is right to ask the C. C. what is

being done to enable our proletarian state to meet its enemies fully armed at the moment when it will be obliged to defend itself, when we shall be forced, in spite of all we have done to avoid war, to defend our socialist fatherland.

I must say that the general line of our Party, pursued by the C. C. with the utmost strictness and characteristic Bolshevik determination, has proved at the same time a line ensuring the strengthening and reinforcement of the defensive capabilities of our state. The increase of the programme of crude iron production from 10.5 million tons to 17 million tons by the end of the Five Years, the corresponding increase in the programme of steel output, the double and triple increase in the manufacture of tractors and motor cars, the revision of the programme of the non-iron industry (various metals) and of all our key industries, in the sense of increased outputs—all this signifies not only accomplishment of the urgently necessary acceleration of the tempo of socialist reconstruction, but forms at the same time a guarantee for the strengthening of the defensive capacity of the state—of the Red Army.

It need not be said that this would be insufficient were the Central Committee not to devote special attention at the same time to the special questions relating to our armed forces. During the last two and a half years the C. C. has been forced to deal very much and very thoroughly with questions of defence.

But a decision is one thing and its realisation another. And when Comrade Andreyev pointed out here that the decisive victory in the collectivisation question will be won only when our comrades the "industrialists", our economists, our socialised industry, take up the matter seriously, then I have an even greater right to declare that the actual defensive capacity, the power of our army, is dependent in the highest degree upon our industry. I cannot complain that anyone in the government fails to give attention to the questions of defence, but I have every reason, if not to complain, at least to draw general attention to the circumstance that our functionaries in our industry, including our war industry, do not yet sufficiently realise the full seriousness of the question, do not occupy themselves enough with the subject which forms their duty, not only as functionaries of industry, and not only as Bolsheviks, but as the people who have to fulfil their obligations towards their customers, that is, the military authorities.

In our opinion our work for the political and fighting preparation of the army is by no means bad. This work will only be properly tested by actual war. Therefore, our most difficult and responsible work demands the maximum, the hundred per cent, support of the Party and the whole working class.

With these reservations, I am bound to declare that we all, the functionaries of the army, that is, the military and political commanders, are able to state: The armed forces of our Union, in organisational, military, and political respect, form an absolutely secure armed support for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This declaration is no empty assertion. Of late the Red Army has been able to make practical tests of its fighting readiness and political steadfastness. In the Far East a division of the Red Army stood the test of fighting, preparedness and political maturity with the utmost brilliance. The special Far Eastern Army does not form any exception to the other formations of the Red Army in the other regions of our vast Union. The test stood by the Red Army in the Far East fully confirms the rightness of the methods of military preparation and political education used in the training of our troops.

Besides this trial of fighting capacity, there have been various other possibilities of testing the political maturity and steadfastness of the Red Army. The difficulties experienced in grain collecting, the advance of the kulak elements, the exaggerations in the collective movement in some districts, the machinations of the Right deviation—these are all factors which we have been able to use for the severest tests of the political firmness and devotion to the cause of the proletarian revolution among the masses of the Red Army. We can now declare proudly that in spite of all difficulties, in spite of the aggravation of the class struggle in these two and a half years, the Red Army has never once wavered. Even those whom we may well designate as notoriously Right opportunists, who in their oppositional zeal have not failed to "draw into their game" the questions of defence, can adduce no single case, no ex-

ample, no fact, which could bear witness to the political unreliability of our Army in its capacity of the army of the proletarian dictatorship. (Applause.)

But this has not prevented both the "Left" and the Right opportunists from calumniating our Army. In 1927 the "Left" made the following statement:

"A particularly dangerous situation arises in the Red Army. The commanding staff, in spite of the directives of the Party programme with respect to the necessity of 'class firmness', of the closest possible contact with the works and factories, the trade unions, the organisations of the village poor, and of the appointment to the 'commanding staff', if at first only to its subordinate positions, of class-conscious workers and peasants, is composed to a great extent of one-time officers and kulak peasant elements."

And further:

"The restrictions on non-worker elements are being more and more reduced in the army. In the territorial troops, especially in the cavalry, the well-to-do peasantry predominate; in the subordinate commanding cadre, the kulak. With regard to the Party members in the Committees of the Red Army, the bureaucratising of the Party and the weakening of its contact with the workers is bound to have an effect. The influence of the proletariat in the army is weakening. Under such circumstances the danger threatens of the army being converted into a convenient tool for adventures of a Bonapartist type."

Zinoviev, too, in an article entitled: "The outlines of the coming war and our tasks", wrote as follows:

"There can be no doubt that in the period of the N.E.P. and amidst the growth of the kulak and the new bourgeoisie, among the military experts there are developing and have developed those of playing the rôle of a Russian Chang Kai-shek. The working class of the Soviet Union must secure for the Red Army conditions automatically destroying any Chang Kai-shek before he can raise a hand against our revolution."

Both the Right and the "Left" have been anxious to build some bridge to the Red Army. It need not be said that such attempts could lead to nothing but the humiliation of the opposition. Our Red Army has matured politically; its Bolshevik military and political cadres represent a reliable organising force fully guaranteeing the devotion of the Red Army to the interests of the proletarian revolution.

At the present time the social composition of the Red Army is completely changed as compared with 1927. Whilst for instance in 1927 there were 23.8 % of workers and agricultural labourers in the ranks of the Red Army, by January 1930 this percentage was 32.9 %. In 1927 peasants comprised 63.4 % of the Red Army, now 57.9 %; employees 8.6 %, now 8.8 %; miscellaneous 4 %, now 2 %. As will be seen, the percentage of agricultural labourers has increased by a desirable replenishment of the army at the cost of the peasant and "miscellaneous". This signifies a strengthening of the proletarian influence in the army and the greater consolidation of its ranks.

The commanding staff, that is, the military and political leaders of the Red Army, form the main factor in the system of our armed forces, the leaven working in every division of the army, the organising force determining and regulating the political and moral preparedness of the Red Army in accordance with the changing social and political processes at home and abroad. And this factor, of which the Trotskyists said that it was degenerating, that it was "formed of one-time officers and kulak peasant elements", represents socially an entirely reliable revolutionary power. The worker stratum has now reached 30 % (without the political leaders, among whom the proportion of workers is 46.7 %), and the Party member stratum (without the political leaders) 51.1 %. Our military academies, in which our commanders are trained, are improving from year to year in their social composition. In 1928, 51.4 % of the students at the military academies were workers, whilst in 1929 67.3 % rank and file workers were admitted. Still I should like to beg the Party to devote more attention to the social replenishment of the military academies. (Hear, hear!)

In spite of the aspersions of the Right, our commanding staff is not at all bad with respect to its social origin. 96.6 % of the commanders of the infantry regiments and divisions participated in the civil war, and 97.5 % of the commanders of the cavalry regiments and divisions. We see practically the same percentage in the battalions. Among the company leaders 80 % took part in the civil war. They have all passed through the school of civil war with us. It need not be said that the proletarian revolution is as dear to them as to every worker and communist. The one-time officers, at which the Right and the "Left" point with condemning fingers, form 10.6 % of the middle commanding staff, the mainstay of the commanders-in-chief, and of these 10.6 % the majority are members of the Party. The foolish assertion that the Red Army is led by former Tsarist officers has now become a definite calumny. The 10.6 % of one-time officers, lost in the mass of the 51 % Bolshevik commanders who are members of the Party, do not turn the scale in the least. This is an old-wives' tale with which only very small children can be frightened, and affording only very scanty nourishment for the opportunist illusions of the deviators. (Applause.)

We are accustomed to believe — and this belief has become a certainty — that the Bolsheviks can do anything. And if there are many of these Bolsheviks, if they are organised on truly Bolshevik methods, and if they march side by side with the Central Committee of their Party, carrying out the will of the Party Congress, the will of the whole Party, then the Bolsheviks are omnipotent. In 1928 there were 82,000 Bolsheviks in our army, now in 1930 there are 129,000. (Applause.) And at the same time we must remember that besides this mighty organisation we have another, working with the same enthusiasm in the Red army, and marching side by side with our Party organisation — the Young Communist League. It has in its ranks 150,000 members. If we add to the 130,000 Party members the 150,000 members of the Young Communist League, we have a compact mass of 280,000 ready to carry out self-sacrificingly the will of our Party (Applause). Under such circumstances can the thought of political unreliability on the part of the Red Army arise at all? Can it be supposed that it could ever refuse to do its duty? Only the insane, only those who have no faith in the power of our Party, or in the power of the revolution, only those who cannot see the wood for the trees, or who suffer to a certain extent from softening of the brain, can imagine such nonsense.

In 1928 we had in our Party organisations 41 % workers, 32 % peasants, 25 % employees. In 1930, two years later, the Party organisations consist to 58.3 % of workers (Applause). Not every organisation can boast of this proportion. 58.3 % workers. The percentage of peasants is 29 %, of employees 12 %. Such an organisation as this, when adequately supported by the subordinate organs, and marching in step with the Committee, will ensure the hundred per cent, steadfastness of the Red Army. And political consciousness and constancy are decisive for the fighting strength of the army.

The Central Control Commission, after completing the purging and testing of the Party organisations and the Red Army, published the following resumé, which is, in my opinion, quite correct:

"An absolutely sound condition, growing ideological discipline and Bolshevik steadfastness of the Party organisations in the Red Army of the workers and peasants, who are successfully carrying out the general line of the Party and guaranteeing the political and military training of the Red Army."

In conclusion I should like to refer briefly to the Right deviation and to the high-sounding phrases which we heard here. The XVI. Party Congress has pronounced an annihilating Bolshevik verdict on the attitude and actions of the Right opportunists.

I should like to deal with one episode. Comrade Tomsky made a declaration from this platform to approximately the following effect: The Party has known us (Rykov, Tomsky, Bukharin) for a long time; we are tried and tested functionaries. In former times too we have made mistakes; Lenin often pulled us up sharply, especially me — Tomsky. Lenin did this for the same reasons as the Party Congress, the Party, does it now. Under Lenin these comrades had already committed

"oppositional" sins — Tomsky a little, Rykov somewhat more, and Bukharin a great deal more. And for this they were told off by Lenin. Lenin, in what is known as his testament, observed that the desertion of Zinoviev and Kamenev during the October revolution was no accident. It seems to me that the errors of Rykov, Tomsky, and Bukharin, during the whole of our collaboration with them since the death of Lenin, which has given them ample time for a thorough consideration of the causes of the chastisings which they drew upon themselves during Lenin's lifetime, and of the means which they might take to avoid these errors — I repeat, it is no accident that they have not reflected on all this and have not drawn the appropriate conclusions. On the contrary, they have arrived at opposite conclusions.

What is the problem? Comrades Bukharin, Tomsky, and Rykov have fought with us, so to speak, in a united front against the "Left" opportunists, the Trotskyists, and the Zinovievists. These we defeated by our united efforts. Why did Rykov, Tomsky, and Bukharin, literally on the very next day after we had forced the "left" opportunists to their knees, but had not yet fully annihilated them, deviate to the Right of the Leninist path? How can this be explained? Very simply. In Lenin's day they had been chastised and if not so severely at times, this was because they had not "sinned" so deeply. Under Lenin it was, however, extremely difficult to succumb to the "sin" of groupings and deviations. In such matters Lenin's hand was a hundred times severer and heavier than that of Comrade Stalin, who is accused of harshness on every possible occasion.

During the struggle against Trotsky and Zinoviev, the Right believed that the Leninist Party had openly accepted their Right programme, and that after the liquidation of the "Left" opportunists a new and Right path would be adopted, a path leading to a withdrawal from our positions, the liquidation of the general line, to concessions to the petty bourgeoisie, to descent by means of "applying the brakes". As all this did not take place, there followed the breach between the Leninist Party and Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, etc.

This Comrade Tomsky should have explained.

And when the Right who have preserved silence on this now ask us: Why are you beating us, we have acknowledged our errors, we are ready to work; when Tomsky appeals to the Party Congress: Let me work, I cannot go on doing penance for ever, test me in the work—then there involuntarily arise among us, especially among those of us who have been working practically all these years with Comrades Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov and Uglanov, grave doubts (these I share personally) as to the possibility of the "recovery" of these comrades.

When Rykov, Tomsky and Bukharin revealed their true countenances immediately after the XV. Party Congress, wheeled to the Right before our eyes, and turned against the policy of the C. C. (especially in the grain-collecting question), against the sole policy possible under our then circumstances, we took every possible measure for exercising a comradelike influence over the Right leaders. At first it appeared to us that they were misled into a temporary confusion by the difficulties. But in spite of our efforts, our good will to help these comrades, in spite of the patience shown by the Polbureau towards Bukharin, Tomsky and Rykov, especially towards the two first named, they have sabotaged the decisions of the Polbureau and the will of the C. C. for nearly eight months.

Will the XVI. Party Congress do them any good? Will they have the Bolshevik courage to go even as far as Uglanov in admitting their political errors, or take Uglanov's step in declaring that they really do their utmost to join the ranks of our Bolshevik Party, and to tread with us the difficult path which leads over enormous obstacles to final victory? The future will show!

One of the speakers at the Party Congress said that there exist all the objective preconditions for our final victory. The most important subjective factor is our Party. If this is united, cast in one piece, if the will of the Party is Lenin's will, if our Party knows no further vacillations, if it proceeds relentlessly against all deviations, and above all against their actual bearers, without respect of persons—then we shall fulfil the mighty task which has fallen to us, the emancipation of humanity from the yoke of capital (enthusiastic applause).

Comrade Pokrovsky:

The previous speakers have already pointed out that the explanations made on the origin of the Right deviation by its representatives, Comrades Tomsky and Rykov, explain nothing. Tomsky spoke of his errors, but all that I could definitely distinguish in his speech was that he had arbitrarily resigned his post as President of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. Comrade Rykov explained his theoretical error, his under-estimate of the possibilities of collectivisation. Were Comrade Bukharin here, he would probably discover some partial error explaining his deviation to the Right.

Lenin said that it was always possible to err, and the chief matter is not to make particularly big mistakes, and to correct them as quickly as possible. In the case in question we cannot however assert that the mistakes have been small, or that they have been corrected.

The Right deviation will survive all these confessions on the part of Comrades Tomsky and Rykov, even if they fulfil their elementary obligations. The Right deviation is not the arithmetical result of the errors of individual comrades, it is a view of life traces of which may be observed reaching far into our literature.

Comrades have come forward here who represent the political struggle against the deviations. But Lenin invariably accompanied the political struggle by the theoretical. And if we are anxious to abolish the Right deviation — and this is imperatively necessary — we must have recourse at the same time to theoretical weapons. Until we carry on a systematic theoretical struggle — and at present, unfortunately, we are not doing so — the underground struggle of the Right deviation will continue.

The comrades who have spoken here occupy leading functions; it may be, therefore, that they are not so well informed on this underground work. We are perhaps better able to judge of this. I am a member of the nucleus committee. The Right very seldom advance any definite proposals. They take the opportunity furnished by any theoretical question (if a high school nucleus is concerned), and are adepts and turning and twisting the matter until their resolutions are frequently accepted. It is only later that the comrades perceive the trap into which they have fallen. Our theoretical gaps are to blame for this, as Comrade Stalin showed on two occasions: at the Marxist agrarian conference and during the discussion with the Red professors.

It is necessary that we organise our theoretical forces, bring them together, so to speak, in a compact form. We cannot of course prevent certain comrades from taking over the leadership of the cultural work in one of our towns. But we must exercise a certain control over our scientific workers.

The second proposal which I have to make to the 16th Party Congress is that we at last take the step of mobilising all theoreticians for the theoretical work. The Soviet work will not suffer by this, and no empty space will result. A real theoretical centre must be created, or rather a sub-centre, for the actual centre is of course the Central Committee of the Party. But the C. C. does not possess an organised theoretical apparatus.

And then a third proposal. This sub-centre must maintain a more or less constant contact with the centre. Stalin's appearance at the Marxist Agrarian Conference was an epoch in the history of the Communist Academy. Stalin's words induced us to revise and alter our plans in the direction indicated by him.

Without a permanent theoretical apparatus, in the Communist Academy and in the various scientific institutions, without close contact between this apparatus and the Central Committee, our Leninist Party will not be able to carry on the theoretical struggle against the Right or any other deviation, but especially not against the insinuating nature of the Right.

In conclusion I should like to give expression to the feeling of overwhelming joy inspiring me at this moment. I regret that I am denied the oratorical power of "stirring the heart". Our generation is happy, for it is witnessing the building up of Socialism. This appears perfectly natural to the young people. But we waited, waited for years, for the opportunity to overthrow the accursed despotism. We experienced this overthrow. Eight months later the working class took over the

power. This was the first step towards the socialist revolution. When it was said in 1921 that the intermediate stage would last 25 years — this opinion was expressed at the 10th Party Congress — we thought: we shall not live to see it. But even my contemporaries, who have reached their seventh decade, have lived to see the building up of Socialism. I do not know whether I have the authority to do so, but I should like, on behalf of my generation, to thank all those who are working for the building up of Socialism. (*Enthusiastic and prolonged applause.*)

Comrade Yaroslavsky:

I should like to observe that the attitude of the leaders of the Right oppositions has somewhat diverted the attention of the Party Congress from those great and important questions raised by Comrades Stalin and Kaganovitch in their reports. (Hear, hear!) This confirms Lenin's words when speaking of the discussion in 1920/21. At that time Lenin observed that in the discussion with the opposition we were allowing ourselves a great luxury. But during all these years we see a series of new groupings arising on almost the same class basis.

I gathered from the speech of one comrade his opinion that in the coming period the soil will no longer exist upon which Right opportunism thrives, and that the appearance of Right opportunism in our Party is accidental in character. This would be true could we expect a weakening of the class struggle before long. But we are well aware that the advancing socialist offensive, its development, is inevitably bound to lead to a further aggravation of the class struggle.

The fact that the Party Congress has scarcely referred at all to Trotsky or Trotskyism seems to me a proof that Trotskyism is a disease which has been cured. Should some Trotskyist or another turn up to-day with the idea of teaching us what we should do, we can simply tell him that he has come to the wrong address, and that he must go the Second International, in whose bosom many a Trotskyist has landed.

It must be remembered that by no means all members of the Party are steeled in the struggle against Right opportunism. By no means all Party members have realised the danger of this deviation. We must, moreover, consider the many young people joining the Party. And precisely because we have so many young Party members, we must direct our attention to that front so trenchantly referred to here by Comrade Prokovsky: the ideological front. We must not forget that we are faced by the task of liquidating illiteracy among the members of the trade unions within two years. The demand for newspapers, too, will grow rapidly during the coming year. We must give the masses the opportunity, in the period now before us, of penetrating more deeply into Right opportunist theory, and of recognising the opportunist nature of actual Right practice in every sphere and in every form.

Our central organ enjoys great popularity. The figures of its circulation are alone ample proof of this. Its circulation has increased from 619,000 in 1928 to 1,350,000 in June 1930. Even the most modest calculations show that a two million edition of our central organ would not cover the demand. This applies equally to other organs issued by the Central Committee. The "Bolshevik", for instance, has recently been publishing editions of 165,000 copies. What is hindering us? There is a shortage of paper, and we have no adequate "polygraphic basis". I should like to remark here that the Five-Year Plan provides for the building of a gigantic works for the polygraphic industry, at a cost of 12.5 million roubles. This undertaking will be presently requiring 45 wagonloads of paper daily.

In this connection I may mention the publications of the Lenin Institute. We are now issuing Lenin's works in six volumes in an edition intended specially for the broad masses of the Party members. The first volume has already appeared. The first edition numbers 200,000 copies. But the Young Communist organisation has already ordered 500,000. What is to be done? The first edition cannot be fully issued until the autumn of 1931, the whole edition not before the end of 1932. Such a state of affairs is impossible. It is imperatively necessary that the question of the paper industry be included in Comrade Kuybyshev's theses, and accorded a special paragraph.

We demand at the same time that the polygraphic industry be included in the category of the most important industries. We must defeat the enemy as definitely on the ideological front as we defeat him on the economic front by means of our tractors and combines. Here our best weapons are Lenin's works. These are a revolutionising factor, a revolutionising material, which must be made as accessible as possible to the masses.

Besides this, I draw attention to the necessity of the closer contact of the central organ of the Party, in accordance with the rayonisation, with the districts, sub-divisions, etc. I ask, do we find in our central organ many articles from the pens of functionaries in the districts, or of the secretaries of the district committees? But the Party would like to know who is working in the districts and how the work is being conducted there. The Party would only gain if articles appeared in the central organ by Comrades Andreyev, Kirov, Cheboldayev, etc.

This question is connected with the numerous other tasks involved in the reorganising of the methods of our press, as for instance the forming of "brigades" of worker correspondents, which have proved extremely useful. It must be realised that at the present time the district newspapers must be reorganised and strengthened, and that we are directing attention to the newspapers of the collective movement, which will grow enormously. This entails the necessity of manufacturing printing machinery in our own country and of building more paper factories. If this is not done, we are practically gagged. The second and third editions of Lenin's works are to be 200,000 copies. But 370,000 had already been ordered for the XVI. Party Congress. With our old equipment we shall not be able to meet the demand for two or three years, and shall be compelled to put off the 170,000 subscribers for this length of time.

The ideological front is now acquiring vast importance. The speech delivered by Comrade Stalin at the Marxist Agrarian Conference showed the need for a more frequent direct participation of the C.C. in the control of the work done by our scientists and scientific institutions. Comrade Stalin's speech was extremely opportune, for it compelled a number of comrades engaged in this sphere of work to survey other spheres, and to inquire into question of political economy, of agrarian, philosophical, and other problems. The study devoted to these questions has frequently been scholastic, up in the clouds, isolated from the great problems of actual practice, of socialist reconstruction. The ideological front must be re-formed. It must not be imagined that this third front is separated from the others, or that special economic, political, and ideological fronts exist. We have one uniform front. Comrade Stalin concluded his report by pointing out that Leninism is the main thing, and this means that we must above all ensure that this front stands for the struggle for Leninism; for the struggle for Leninism is in the broadest sense of the term the main content of our work. The whole of our political work, the whole of our economic work, must be permeated by Leninism. Our work must be facilitated by the ideas of Leninism if it is not to remain a mere molelike burrowing. It is only if this premise is fulfilled that we shall realise in deeds the decisions of our Party Congress. (*Applause.*)

Comrade Mikoyan:

The correctness of the policy of the C.C. is so self-evident to the Party Congress, to the whole Party, and to the working class, that no further words are needed to support this fact. Therefore, the discussions have been distinguished by a unanimous approval of the activities of the C.C., and have been concentrated on the conclusions to be drawn from the past and on the tasks now facing the Party.

The chief lesson to be learnt is that the C.C., which has undertaken a turn of the greatest historical significance in the development of the revolution, has dealt an annihilating blow not only to the elements of capitalism in the country, but at their spokesmen within the Party, the Right and "left" opposition. The successes gained on the front of socialist reconstruction have been made possible solely by the fact that the Party and the Central Committee have overcome the "Left" and the Right deviations.

The Right danger is and remains the main danger, for it reflects the ideology of the kulak and the resistance of the

capitalist elements. Comrade Tomsy complained at the Conference in Caucasia, and here at this Congress, that they had been attacked too violently. But the danger of the Right deviation is so great that its representatives have not been beaten anything like severely enough. We have been anxious to retain them for the Party and have taken into account the work which they performed in the past. Had they been beaten properly, then Tomsy would have made a different speech here. (Hear, hear.) The Party Congress gave Comrade Uglanov a severe and Bolshevik reception, and designated his explanations as hypocrisy. After listening to the speeches of the delegates here, Uglanov has now sent in a declaration admitting that he did not expose his fundamental errors, and that the Party Congress has been right in regarding his speech as insufficient.

Comrade Rykov has attempted, both at the Ural Conference and here, to evade the essential questions. He was asked what would have happened to the Soviet Union had the platform of the Right opposition gained the upper hand. If Comrade Rykov had really surrendered his Right opportunist weapons, and had really placed himself fully at the service of the general line of the Party, then he should have replied: "It would have meant the decline of the revolution, the victory of capitalism." But at the Ural Conference he declared that no line could guarantee the final victory. At the Party Congress, again, he tried to make use of the decisions of the XVI. Congress, which stated that the final victory of Socialism is only possible on an international scale. Comrade Rykov has not yet finally broken with the ideology of the Right deviation.

To-day he acknowledges the erroneousness of his theory of the two years plan of agriculture, but veils the actual import of his error by declaring that he did not oppose the two year plan to the Five-Year Plan, but that this had been attempted by others without his consent. Comrade Rykov will, however, not try to dispute that discussions were carried on with him for several days in the Polbureau Commission; that it was suggested that he should propose alterations in the Five-Year Plan; that the division of the Five-Year Plan into annual sections was pointed out to him, a division rendering the supplementing of the Five-Year Plan by a two-year plan entirely superfluous. But he persisted in his standpoint. The political purport of the Rykov standpoint consisted of his propaganda for the replacement of the Five-Year Plan, in which he had no faith, by a "real" two-year plan lacking the basis of the Five-Year Plan, the industrialisation.

The Party Congress rightly expected from Comrade Rykov an open declaration of his errors, a Bolshevik estimate of the Right deviation, and a readiness to combat it determinedly. He has not fulfilled these expectations.

The Party Congress could not be satisfied with the declarations of the three former leaders of the Right opposition, not because it does not believe the words it has heard, although these still require confirmation by deeds, but because these words have not been convincing, have only been half words. They admitted this or that single error, without bringing them into connection; they even avoided the term "Right deviation"; they did not care to speak of the Right danger as the main danger, or of the fight against it and against the conciliators.

In the course of the two years of struggle just passed through, we have not been concerned with individual errors, but with a whole system of errors, with a whole programme of another Party in course of formation, and reflecting the ideology of the capitalist elements. The standpoint of these three comrades, of this Commission of Three, opposed another general line to the general line of the Party, a line of petty-bourgeois liberalism. And this, the chief thing, they will not state.

Comrade Tomsy described matters as if his error had consisted of his under-estimation of the social importance of the reconstruction of our national economy. Had this been the case, then we should have had to regard his error only as a conservative element hampering the Party in the accomplishment of the necessary turn. But the Bukharin group attempted another turn, a political turn which would have meant not the liquidation of the kulak and the victory of collectivisation, but the victory of capitalism. That is to say, what was at stake was the fate of the revolution: shall we turn into the path to socialism by the channel of the N.E.P.—which the Party has done—or will the N.E.P. lead to the victory of capitalism—whither the Right opposition was steering.

These two lines exclude one another:

In place of socialist industrialisation—reduction of the tempo; in place of the Five-Year Plan—a two-year plan; in place of the production alliance with the village—a "cotton alliance"; in place of the Soviet and collective farms—development of the individual farm; in place of the fight against and liquidation of the kulak—the demand for the abolition of individual taxation and of the restrictions on capitalism in the village, the theory of concessions and raising of grain prices; in place of the offensive against the capitalist elements—a summons to retreat, actually to begin a fresh N.E.P., veiled by the theory of the peaceful growing into Socialism on the part of the kulak; in place of a Marxist-Leninist agrarian theory—a slipping down into agrarian revisionism under the cloak of the accusation that the Party carries on military feudal exploitation; in place of increased watchfulness on the part of the Party and the working class in view of the aggravation of the class struggle, and in place of determined combat against the class enemy—abandonment of the Marxist theory of the class struggle and blaming of the deficiencies of the administrative apparatus for the aggravation of the class struggle; in place of new forms of the alliance and of contracts for the purchase of crops—the slogan of the "free" circulation of commodities and the "standardisation" of the market; in place of the increased training of young experts of our own—the declaration that without the aid of the old specialists we shall not be able to build up Socialism.

In place of the trade unions and the elimination of the narrow trade unionist elements—leadership by the opportunist wing in the trade unions; in place of the consolidation of the Party ranks—the accusation that the Party leaders are breeding bureaucracy; in place of unity in the Party—the Right fraction; in place of the struggle against the Trotskyist slanders of the Party—a repetition of these Trotskyist calumnies, especially with regard to Comrade Stalin; in place of the struggle against the Right deviation and the conciliators in the Comintern—support given to Brandier and Thalheimer and a campaign against Thälmann, the leader of the C.P.G., the attempt to overthrow the Bolshevik leadership of the C.P.G., in place of the recognition that the stabilisation is shaken—the slogan issued by Comrade Bukharin on the reconstruction of capitalism; in place of the Leninist theory of the unequal development of capitalism and the aggravation of its contradictions—propaganda for the social-democratic theory of "organised" capitalism.

Hence, it is perfectly obvious that the matter is not settled merely by admitting a few separate errors. If these comrades are sincerely desirous that the XVI. Party Congress and the whole Party place confidence in them, they must declare openly: We have been following another line, an anti-Party line; we have been in error, we admit these errors, and are prepared to correct them. (Applause.)

This they have not done. Their explanations at the Party Congress expressed nothing definite. I believe that their declarations show them to have left the Right deviation, but they have not yet reached the general line. But it does not suffice to cease to be a bearer of the ideology of the Right deviation; it does not suffice to disarm and declare agreement with the general line. It is necessary to take up the weapons of the Party and to prove ability to use them in the struggle against the greatest danger, the Right deviation. Then only, comrades, will the Party place faith in you. (Applause.)

I shall now refer briefly to some of the difficulties of our socialist reconstruction, especially to the food supplies difficulty, which is of paramount importance, since it exercises immediate influence on the tempo of reconstruction and upon the further increase of the creative energy of the working masses. We must ensure the solution of the problem of food supplies in the Five-Year Plan, and bring this section of the front into harmony with the tempo and the requirements of the whole course of socialist reconstruction.

During the last two years the grain problem, and the collecting of grain, occupied a foremost place. This problem has been essentially solved by the successes of the Party in the organisation of the Soviet and collective farms. If we are successful in the autumn in organising the collectivising campaign efficiently, in adapting ourselves to the new conditions under which the old market relations have disappeared and the new are not yet firmly organised, and in carrying through the campaign on Bolshevik lines—then we shall have every

possibility of providing the country with grain in abundance. This applies equally to the other grain products, which we shall also be able to produce in adequate quantities.

Our successes in cotton cultivation will enable us, as Comrade Stalin rightly observed, to ensure supplies of mass-consumption goods for the workers, especially for the working class. Next year we shall be able to free the textile industry from the difficulties which it has hitherto suffered through the shortage of raw materials.

Among the decided successes of the Party we must also include the cultivation of sugar beets, guaranteeing an ample supply of sugar for the country. In vegetable-growing too great progress is to be recorded; and after the working up and canning of these products have been properly organised, there should be no further difficulty in supplying all our industrial centres with vegetables.

The whole of the difficulties of the food supplies of the working class, and of the carrying out of the decision on the raising of real wages, are now concentrated, and will continue to be concentrated next year, on the fat and meat problem. The difficulties which have arisen in connection with the meat and butter supplies cannot be attributed solely to the mass slaughterings taking place at the beginning of this year. Let us glance at the situation in the butter market. Last year the number of our cows was already 16 per cent more than before the war. And yet the butter output was only 50 per cent of the pre-war output. It is perfectly clear to us that the livestock crisis is due to the same cause as the grain crisis now overcome: the utterly scattered condition of peasant farming. A simple example illustrates this. In Argentina cattle are ready for slaughter when 2½ years old; and have reached an average weight of 222 kilogrammes, whilst here in Kazakhstan the average weight reached in four or five years is only 70 kilogrammes.

Therefore, we shall adopt the same method for solving the livestock problem as that adopted in the grain problem: the organisation of large-scale undertakings by means of the establishment of Soviet and collective farms in the chief livestock breeding districts. You are probably aware that the Central Committee has already taken definite steps in the forced organisation of cattle breeding, pig breeding, etc. The system of Soviet farms now projected for the socialist reconstruction of livestock breeding will play the same revolutionising role as that played by the "Zernotrest" (grain trust) in solving the grain problem.

Further, it is necessary that we create a meat industry on the American pattern as speedily as possible. Whilst in America the waste products are utilised so effectively that 80 to 90 per cent of the live weight of the animal is worked up, we attain on an average only a 50 to 60 per cent utilisation.

The whole of the industries working up agricultural products are extremely backward. Their technical basis is the same as in the days of our grandfathers. We have sent commissions to America, in order that we may learn and apply American methods. We have already begun with the erection of a large number of foodstuff manufacturing undertakings of an American type and on an American scale. In this current year we shall devote special attention to pig breeding, in order to ease the situation until cattle rearing has reached the required level.

It is our present task to bring the raising of the necessary meat supplies into harmony with the organisation of large-scale livestock breeding for the market. The production of fish offers a source of aid. Last year our fisheries yielded an output of 30 per cent above pre-war. For the current year 21 million double hundredweight will be the output, as compared with 10 million before the war. If we carry out this programme—and we shall exert every effort to do so—our fish products may substitute meat to a great extent.

The situation remains difficult in the fat supplies question. Since there is a shortage of animal fats, we shall resort to vegetable fats. The cultivation of such plants, especially of the sunflower, has already been increased this year. The erection of 10 margarine factories is planned for next year.

An opinion prevails that the butter crisis is bound to last for three or four years, since this time must elapse before we can expect any considerable increase in the number of our cows. I am of the opinion that in the course of one year we can raise our butter supply to the level of former years, that is by about 100 per cent, and can then go rapidly forward.

Last year, with 27 million cows, we produced, in round figures, 3 million tons of butter and milk (calculated in milk). Given two million cows on Soviet farms, we could produce the same quantity of milk as that yielded by 27 million on the scattered peasant farms. Effective results can be obtained solely by concentrating efforts on the most important butter districts.

I believe that as early as the spring of next year we shall be able to achieve a radical change in the butter supply question. For this purpose the following tasks must be accomplished: the herds, controlled by the dairies of the Agrarian Commissariat, the sugar trusts, and the workers' cooperatives, must be increased to 500,000, meaning a yield of one million tons of milk; further, the herds of the collective farms in the cattle breeding districts must be increased to approximately 1 million head, again yielding about 1.5 million tons of milk. Given these prerequisites, the socialist sector alone could produce 75 per cent of last year's supply.

We have already various successes to record, for instance in Siberia and in the North District. The Barabinsk district in Siberia, for instance, is furnishing 25 per cent of the whole butter supply of Siberia, or 12 per cent of the whole Union.

Comrade Stalin rightly emphasised that the difficulties hampering the supplying of the workers with food are not merely objective, but that much depends on the apparatus, upon our economic organs. The Party must set this lever in motion with the utmost energy.

As has already been stated, the difficulties in our food supplies are not solely of an objective nature. At the time the errors were committed in collectivisation, the lower collecting organs were almost completely liquidated. Supplies were mainly left to the "natural course". We cannot by such means secure our food supplies. Every effort must be made to reassemble the agricultural production co-operatives in the villages, dissolved in the period of exaggerated collectivisation, to stimulate the collectivising activities of the co-operative societies, to raise the work of the collecting organisations to the required standard, and to ensure a definite advancement in the supply of agricultural products. This is quite possible, provided all Party organisations participate and help actively.

The growing acuteness of the class struggle, denied by the Right opposition, has found further expression in the foreign trade apparatus. Here, too, acts of sabotage have been observable. But whilst in our own country we possess all means of doing away with this sabotage at all speed, under the protection of the bourgeois police these traitors are able to injure us with increasing frequency and effect. It is therefore our task to ensure that our foreign trade apparatus is replenished by new cadres, better in every respect, staunch, tried and tested; for under the influence of our capitalist environment the dangers of demoralisation are very great indeed.

It is a well known fact that the production level of our industry is already double that of pre-war times. Our imports for the requirements of industry are substantially greater than before the war, and the import of machinery, etc. has increased fourfold. Exports are, however, still below the pre-war level, since at that time 50 per cent of our exports were grain.

The Central Committee has therefore secured the requirements of socialist industry in two ways: Firstly by means of the development of industrial exports, especially of what is known as the second rank exports, and secondly, by means of the severest restriction of unproductive imports, accompanied by the simultaneous adjustment of our industry to the manufacture of such articles as we are already able to make for ourselves. Thanks to the inexorable maintenance of the foreign trade monopoly and to skilful manoeuvring, we have been successful in meeting the needs of our industry to an extent enabling the Five-Year Plan to be accomplished in four. The foreign trade front is, of course, being maintained as before. We must increase our imports and improve the quality of our export articles, since every opportunity is seized upon to make an attack upon us. To this must be added the incapacity of our apparatus to adapt itself to conditions. The Party must, therefore, direct its utmost efforts to overcoming these difficulties, and must at the same time adapt the foreign trade front to the tempo and requirements of socialist reconstruction.

The Party has met at the 16th Party Congress after the successful accomplishment of a turn of world historical

importance. We have already left behind us the greatest difficulties of socialist reconstruction. The power of the proletariat has vastly increased. The Party has emerged from the conflicts more firmly welded together than before. It has destroyed every deviation from Leninism. It is more consolidated and united than ever. After the XVI. Party Congress it will proceed with the same energy, within the shortest possible time, to new victories of Socialism in the Soviet Union, the stronghold of the proletarian world revolution. (Applause.)

Comrade Stezky:

The socialist reorganisation of our economy is accompanied by changes on our cultural front. On this front, too, the aggravation of the class struggle finds expression in connection with the successes of socialist reconstruction, the liquidation of the kulak as a class by means of complete collectivisation.

I shall first deal with the decisions of the C.C. of the Party with regard to the cultural front, the high schools etc. The beginning was made by the decision of the June Plenum, which determined that some of the high schools should be subordinated to the economic organs, in order to bring about closer contact with production, and to improve the training of the cadres accordingly. The high schools and higher educational institutions are divided into special institutes, subordinate to the economic organisations and to the People's Commissariat concerned. The syllabus, and especially the methods, are being reorganised. At the present time there are 258 new agricultural, technical, economic, medical, and other special educational establishments, developed out of the former high schools and institutions with their numerous subjects. In other words, the number of higher educational establishments has almost doubled.

We are further faced by the necessity of taking up the reorganisation of the secondary schools. A lively exchange of opinions took place last year on this subject. There was a general complaint that the secondary schools do not impart sufficient practical knowledge. At one time the People's Commissariat for Education adopted a standpoint on this matter which was not quite correct. It regarded the secondary school as a sort of "corridor" leading to the high school. But this middle link of our educational system possesses besides this an independent importance of its own: the middle cadres for our economic and Soviet reconstruction must be trained here. The 2nd Party Conference on national education, held in May this year, passed radical decisions, on the reshaping of this middle link, basing these decisions on Lenin's theses of 1921. Lenin showed extreme interest in this subject, and even at that time he proposed a reorganisation in the direction of technical and vocational training to be given in these schools for the education of specialists of middle qualifications and of skilled workers. And it is precisely these cadres which we need so urgently.

With regard to the introduction of general compulsory education, Comrade Stalin has expressed himself categorically. I am of the opinion that this must be expressed with the same definiteness in the resolution. In this work we must depend upon the great reserves of energy in the masses.

It is needless to say that on the cultural front, too, we have our own special tasks, that here too we were and are obliged to wage a violent conflict with the class enemy. Only now, 13 years after the October Revolution have we succeeded in reorganising such an institution as the Academy of Sciences, and in guiding it into the general channel of the country.

The struggle is being carried on on various sectors of the ideological front. Comrade Kaganovitch mentioned in his report a reactionary idealist named Professor Losev. In the sphere of natural science we are experiencing many ideological distortions of a mechanistic description. Professor Savitsch, for instance, has attempted to explain history and ethics on the basis of physiology, stating thereby that the activity of the Bolsheviks and their energy are due to a certain surplus of "masculine energy". (Laughter.) And we have scientists working in spheres in immediate contact with our practical work, who are still obstinate defenders of bourgeois ideology. On the economic front we have been obliged to unmask and remove a large number of bourgeois and petty bourgeois theoreticians who have been closely connected with our economic organs. Professor Kondratyev for instance, who in 1922 welcomed the "return of Russian capitalism", and

remained faithful to his slogan, steering a determined course towards capitalism, especially in the village, both in his theoretical work and in his practical activities in the Commissariat for agriculture. Basarov and Gorman, whilst working in the State Planning Commission, advocated the market, actual capitalism, as the basis of our economy, in place of planned economics, taking as a starting point the perspective of a degeneration of our Soviet economy. Professors Chayanov, Chelintzev, and Makarov, workers in our Soviet organs, idealised the peasant farm, denied the reclassification, the advantages of the large scale agricultural undertaking as compared with the small, and indeed combated the Soviet farms and the collectivisation movement.

It must be regarded as a great achievement that our Party has not only exposed the bourgeois nature of the ideology of these professors, but has replaced these collaborators by new communist cadres.

We have had struggles with Menshevik distortions of Marxism in the spheres of economics, literature, philosophy (mechanists) etc.

One of the greatest evils resulting from the falsification of Marxism is the diversion of Marxist theoretical thought from reality. We know the cause of this. The scientists concerned do not recognise the Soviet economy. They are anxious to fly from it, and take refuge in the sphere of "pure" theory, in the world of abstractions. And it must be admitted that in many cases our communist theoreticians have followed the bourgeois falsifiers. This has happened when the theoreticians in question have looked down upon our socialist reality with the haughty condescension of the learned, and have been of the opinion that their sphere of work is pure theory, their vocation the solution of profound theoretical problems, whilst such questions as the organisation of work in the collective farms, the market problems of our new stage, etc., have nothing to do with them.

We have no use for learned men who sit at their writing tables inventing theories; what we need is scientists who work with us shoulder to shoulder, who take part with us in the building up of Socialism, and who are capable of throwing the light of their theoretical knowledge on our work.

Much has already been done towards replenishing our economic and planned economic organs by communist cadres. This must be admitted. But this does not yet guarantee the effectual utilisation of these scientists in our economic organisations and scientific institutions. We must set our scientific institutions the task of working upon the problems of socialist construction and world imperialism, and further, the task of working on these problems in their relation to collectivisation, to the distribution of products, the market-production, the localities chosen for industries, etc. Here the Communist Academy, whose work has hitherto been very weak on every sector of the theoretical front, must show much greater activity.

Let us take a glance at the Right deviation. Politically, it expresses the interests of the kulak. But its theoretical origin lies in the bourgeois ideology, the system represented by the views of Comrade Bukharin. The origin of this system is the Bogdanov theory, as Lenin frequently emphasised. The Bogdanov theory, in spite of its vulgar materialist and mechanist cloak, is in reality a misrepresentation of Marxism. Bukharin's teachings continue to live. Their effect is felt in the work of our scientific institutions, our schools, and of some of our theoreticians, who frequently defend the fundamentals of Bukharin's theory with the sincere conviction that they are at the same time defending the line of the Party.

The greater is the insincerity of those passages in the speeches of Comrades Tomsy and Rykov in which they attempt to evade the question of the struggle against the Right deviation. The active struggle against the Right deviation is the touchstone. The "inheritance" of the Right still remains, it continues to exist, and this must be destroyed. But we see that these comrades are not doing this. We have the distinct impression that this struggle is not being taken up for the reason that Comrades Bukharin, Tomsy, and Rykov, will not raise their hands against the system of views which they have created. Inasmuch as they fail to do this, the Party has no faith in their sincerity. The general line of the Party, the struggle for its pursuance, the organisation of the masses on the general line, form however the most important prerequisite for the victory of Communism. (Applause.)

Discussion on the Reports of Comrade Molotov.

(Full Text.)

Comrade Manuilsky:

In his report comrade Molotov touched on a whole series of important problems of the communist world movement with which it will be necessary to deal in greater detail were our time not so limited. As it is however, I will deal only with the organisational weaknesses of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, for only the organisational consolidation of the sections of the Communist International can create the preliminary conditions for the decrease of the disproportion in the development of the revolutionary processes, for the successful solution of the question of the development of the Chinese revolution from a bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution, for the necessary guarantees for the success of the revolutionary movement in India, and for the placing of the struggle against social-fascism on a firm basis.

The urgent necessity of dealing with the organisational condition of the Comintern sections results from the specific peculiarities of the present. The crisis has already led to a considerable intensification of the class struggle, but it has not yet shattered the capitalist stabilisation to such an extent that powerful revolutionary movements of the broad masses in the highly-developed capitalist countries have resulted. For the moment it is expressed in the stormy events in Spain and in India. In the highly-developed capitalist countries, however, the rise of the working class movement has not yet assumed open revolutionary forms. The bourgeoisie is utilising this transformation period in order to deal the heaviest possible blows at the working class, in order to weaken the proletariat with all possible means for the moment when a revolutionary situation develops.

The offensive of the bourgeoisie against the working class is much more brutal and bitter than it was a few months ago, where the attack was chiefly determined by the capitalist rationalisation. The resistance of the working class has also become more obstinate. And from this results the intensification of the class struggle. The bourgeoisie is already organising its forces, whilst we communists are behindhand in the organisation of the forces of the working class.

The bourgeoisie is organising its forces through the development of the fascist movement, the formation of fascist fighting organisations and fascist coups d'Etat in the countries bordering on the Soviet Union. One must be blind not to see that these preparations are not only for civil war, but also for war against the Soviet Union. The offensive of the bourgeoisie is now developing in various directions, above all, however, it is developing as a furious attack on the standard of living of the proletariat. Capitalism is striving to extricate itself from the crisis at the expense of the working class by casting the burdens of the crisis on the shoulders of the workers. What is happening at the moment in the Ruhr is only a small prelude to the great class struggles which we shall witness in the immediate future. In the factories the terror of the employers is growing. The capitalists are exploiting the crisis and the unemployment in order to clear the factories of the revolutionary elements. Tens of thousands of revolutionary, class-conscious workers have been thrown out of the factories. Works espionage was never more extensive than it is at present. Everywhere "Formations for the surveillance of the staff" are being founded in the factories from specially recruited police spies, fascists and social-fascists. The plan of the bourgeoisie resolves itself into an attempt to isolate the communists from the factories in the moment of decisive struggles, to make them into a party of the unemployed. From this result the tremendous difficulties of the Communist Parties in their struggle to win the masses of the workers in the factories. We must not close our eyes to these difficulties. We must see them in order to fight against them with the necessary means.

Economic and police terror go hand in hand, for politics is concentrated economics. In countries like Yugoslavia dozens of communists are being murdered without trial. In Poland the distribution of communist proclamations is punished with the death sentence. In the United States, in Georgia, the

Public Prosecutor threatens communists with the electric chair should they continue their work for the organisation of the unemployed workers. In Germany a new law for the Protection of the Republic has been adopted against the communists.

Parallel with the terror against the revolutionary movement, the bourgeoisie is using new methods of corrupting the aristocratic upper stratum of the working class. Here also there is a sort of "conveyor", a sort of capitalist "rationalisation". The methods of the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the working class movement to-day differ from the primitive police methods of Czarism, to the same extent that a muzzle loader differs from a modern tank. In October 1917 we took the Russian bourgeoisie by surprise. It did not seriously believe that we could seize power and hold it for any length of time. The bourgeoisie in the highly-developed capitalist countries has learnt from the October revolution and from our policy in the period of the proletarian dictatorship and the building up of socialism and uses its experience in order to fight against the influence of the Soviet Union on the workers in the capitalist countries. It seeks refuge at the same time in a social demagoguery on a broad scale. As far as the basis of reformism is limited, as far as the bourgeoisie is unable to manoeuvre further on the economic field it uses demagoguery so to speak on the ideological field. It forns agitation and propaganda departments in the factories in order to infect the working class ideologically; it creates clubs, captures the sports movement and organises hospitals and sanatoria for the workers. It organises its own "selection" amongst the most slavish and corrupt elements, and in some factories it even establishes higher technical schools. All its methods have, so to speak, a miserable character, but an irresponsible, claptrap advertisement is developed in order to demoralise certain elements.

The offensive of capitalism then also results in the attack of the social democracy, which is developing towards fascism, along the whole front against the class-conscious revolutionary workers and the Communist Parties. There is no possibility of it being any different because the power of the social democracy and its significance in the working class movement is measured not by its influence, but by the degree of capitalist pressure. When the bourgeoisie attacks the social democracy attacks also. When the bourgeoisie retreats social-fascism follows it like a beaten dog. A great number of the social democrats and the reformist officials in the factories are spies and informers who work hand in glove with the employers and the police.

The social democrats and the reformist trade unions appear openly as strike-breakers. For instance, during the strike of the Berlin plumbers 850 of the 1,100 strike-breakers carried membership books of the reformist trade unions. The chairman of the Berlin district organisation of the reformist Metal Workers Union, Urich, declared that the union would break the strike if it cost a hundred thousand Marks to do it.

Should there not be great revolutionary movements in a series of capitalist countries in the immediate future, it is nevertheless not out of the question that the Communist Parties will have to experience a period of illegality. We must be organisationally so strong, we must dig ourselves in in the factories so firmly, we must penetrate into the masses of the workers to such an extent that the enemy cannot take us by surprise.

The conclusion drawn from this offensive of the bourgeoisie against the working class by the right-wing opportunists however is that it is necessary to capitulate to the social democracy. Like deserters in face of the enemy they spread panic in the ranks of the working class by overestimating the forces of the bourgeoisie and underestimating the potential strength both of the resistance and the present counter-attack of the working class. The sections of the Comintern see the question differently. By mobilising the working class for the struggle and organising the proletarian forces they seek means to repulse the offensive of capitalism and launch the revolutionary mass struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. Just for this reason the old acute question of the Comintern sections, the question of organisational backwardness, wins

decisive importance at the present moment. Just at this moment of revolutionary advance and world crisis despite the barriers erected by the capitalists and the social democrats, the correct leninist policy of the Comintern must find its organisational expression in the organisational consolidation of the sections. One must not forget that the world economic crisis with its consequences for the capitalist world after the war of 1914/18, is the third powerful international event after the October revolution, and that it must have the greatest consequences.

Therefore the organisation of the revolution is more than ever a burning question for the Communist Parties. In their development the Communist Parties are entering into a historic phase in which they must not only conduct agitation and propaganda, but also organise great struggles of the working class and the working masses. The degree of organisation of the world bourgeoisie, which for the moment sits more firmly in the saddle than our ruling classes on the eve of the October revolution 1917, demands from the world proletariat a greater degree of organisation than that of our bolshevist party before October 1917. This causes us to place the organisational question in the sections of the Comintern into the foreground, for this is still our weak point. We have great influence. In all the countries of the white terror the communist is the living symbol of courage, persistence, and devotion to the cause of the working class. In the capitalist countries millions of workers take part in the movement under the slogans of the Communist Parties whilst we, like wasteful husbandmen, do not administrate economically and increase this tremendous capital represented by the confidence of the working masses in the Communist Parties as the result of the correct policy of the Comintern.

In what form must we place the organisational problems before the sections of the Comintern? In close connection with the tactical questions, with the questions of our policy for the winning of the masses. This means that we must turn our attention above all to: 1. the question of the organising role of the parties; 2. the organisational support points with the aid of which the parties embrace the masses organisationally and consolidate their influence organisationally (trade unions, committees of action, strike committees); 3. the methods with the help of which the parties win the working masses for their organisations, that is to say, the question of the united front tactic; and 4. the basis on which the united front tactic must be carried out in order to mobilise the broadest masses of the workers, i.e. with partial demands.

The whole complex of problems represents a close homogeneity of policy and organisation which in the practice of the Communist Parties are often severed and treated as independent problems. The connection of these two problems is however urgently necessary, for just as organisational work which ignores the policy of the party is bad, so is also a policy which is not consolidated by the organisational work. It is just this latter danger which threatens the growth and development of the Comintern sections.

I will now deal with the fundamental question of the organising role of the parties. In order to better understand why we put forward this question I will quote a few figures concerning the organisational condition of the sections of the Communist International.

During the course of a number of years we had to register the stability of the sections and this coincided with the partial stabilisation of capitalism and the obvious tendency for the memberships of the parties to fall. That was approximately the picture in 1924. Since that year the Communist Party of Germany has maintained a membership of about 120,000 to 130,000. In France the numerical strength of the party varied between 50,000 and 60,000. In Great Britain the party membership was between 5,000 and 6,000.

What alterations did the revolutionary advance produce? In Great Britain after the miners lock-out and the general strike the C.P. grew to 12,000 members, and then began a steady fall. At the present moment the Communist Party of Great Britain has only about 3,500 members.

We can also observe a reduction in the membership figures of other sections of the C.I. during the last two years.

Let us take for instance the French party. Its successes are indisputable. At the moment it is one of the best fighting sections of the Communist International. The way in which it organised the 1st May this year, the way in which it carried out a series of political campaigns and the way in which it

organised the defence of "l'Humanité" shows that we have a real bolshevist party in France. Nevertheless the French party has lost from 25 to 30 per cent of its membership during the last two years. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is also amongst those parties which have lost members. Recently it has lost about 50 per cent of its membership. The numerical loss is 50 per cent, but the increase in fighting capacity won by the Czech party is far more than 100 per cent. When the Czech party had 100,000 members it was unable to organise street demonstrations on the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Czechoslovakian Republic, but now it succeeded in organising the 6th March and the 1st May exactly as the other bolshevist sections of the Comintern did.

Have important changes taken place since the X. plenary session of the E.C. of the C.I.? Certainly and not bad ones. In the Union States the Communist Party has noticeably increased its membership despite the split. The German party has also made similar progress. On the whole, however, it must be said that there has been no serious extension of the organisational basis of the parties.

Let us now examine how far the organisational influence of the Communist Parties on the workers lags behind their ideological political influence.

A few figures in this respect: At the elections in Germany the Communist Party polled 3,260,000 votes, although the party itself has 120,000 members. What does this mean. It means that during the electoral campaign each communist has about 28 to 30 followers. In France during the elections we polled about a million votes. The Communist Party, however, has only 40,000 members. Here the individual communist leads a group of 25 workers. In Poland the party has 7,000 members. At the last election between 700,000 and 800,000 votes were given for the communist lists which were declared invalid by the fascist government. In a country like Poland each communist leads about 100 workers. During the best period of the British Communist Party, when the Minority Movement was powerful, each communist led about 100 workers.

Let us examine the statistics of the organised workers in the organisations allied with us. In France the red trade unions have 450,000 members, whilst the party has only 40,000 members, i.e. every communist leads a group of 11 workers organised in the red trade unions.

In Czechoslovakia the situation is very bad. There we have 60,000 workers organised in the revolutionary trade unions and 45,000 organised in the party.

Let us take a third measure, not only the level of organisation and polling strength, but also the fighting capacity of those proletarian elements under the influence of the Communist Parties. On an average the numerical strength of the August demonstrations 1929, in a situation of extreme tension when the whole apparatus of the bourgeoisie was mobilised against this movement, was about tenfold the party membership, i.e. each communist led 10 non-party workers. And these workers who followed the appeal of the Communist Parties at a time when right-wing renegades were sabotaging the demonstrations, at a time when cowardly voices were raised in our own ranks against the demonstrations, were they not communists who for the moment had not yet a membership book in the pocket. Why did not the sections win these workers organisationally, why are these masses of workers who marched together with the communists, who shared the fate of the Communist Parties to the last, why are these non-party workers not yet in our ranks? What are the causes of our unmistakable and crying organisational backwardness? The first cause is the spontaneity in our work, the "automatic course of events", our unconscious assumption of a spontaneous movement, in other words, the underestimation of the organising role of the party. It is no question here of complete theories which might be exposed, but of a fatal practice which moves along the line of least resistance and reflects the worst kind of passivity. The spirit of the opportunists in practice can be represented approximately as follows: why should we take the risk of running our heads in, why should we fight under difficult conditions in the factories and organise factory groups when the stormy rise of the masses will drive them with elementary force into our ranks? Why should we let ourselves into a hand to hand fight with the social democracy, with its whole system of strike-breaking, espionage, pogroms and expulsions from the trade unions when the masses themselves, recognising the abysmal treachery of this party, will

turn away from it at the moment of great revolutionary ferment? Some of the "left-wingers" add: Why do we need an organisation when a few dozen revolutionaries can express at the proper revolutionary moment the hopes and wishes of millions of toilers in their slogans? The result of these tendencies is that the Communist Parties often deal with the most fundamental problems exclusively from the political standpoint, without drawing the necessary conclusions for the organisational practice. The idea gains ground that it is important to put forward a correct political slogan, but that to organise its realisation by the masses is of no importance, that it is our task to throw slogans into the masses and their task to take them up. The Party is the embodiment of consciousness, the mass the embodiment of elementary force — without the mediating link of organisation — that is the attitude. Should the masses fail to follow the slogans of the Party, then that is their fault, they are not class-conscious, they are corrupt. The Party has done its duty.

But this is just the reason for the disproportion between the slogans and their realisation, between the words and the deeds. We have a mountain of resolutions, but they are hardly ever carried out. An irresponsible attitude towards the slogans of the Party is making itself noticeable. For instance, the workers are called upon to strike without previous organisational preparation. Our experience in the strike struggles in the last few years, in the years of advance, show that in 90 cases out of a 100 our strikes were extremely badly organised. But what happens when the workers see that a strike has been badly organised? They turn their backs on those who have led the strike and leave the union. One could quote dozens of examples: the heroic strike of the Berlin plumbers, the strike of the textile and glass workers in Czechoslovakia and the strikes in other countries, in order to expose our organisational weaknesses which are the cause of our decreasing influence upon the corresponding sections of the proletariat.

The underestimation of the organising role of the Party in the organisational practice of the sections of the C.I. leads inevitably to a separation of the organisational tasks from the policy of the sections. Let us consider for instance the question of the united front tactic. This question is treated by our sections exclusively as a political problem. The spontaneous mass movement which springs up without the Party and without leadership often falls under the conception of united front tactic. It is just such an interpretation of the united front tactic which causes the sections to lose sight of the organisational preparation, the organised carrying out of the united front tactic, the organisational consolidation of its results in the form of new members.

Or let us take the question of the political mass strike. Here we can see the same attitude towards the elementary process of the development of economic strikes into political strikes. A preparatory all-round organisational work is still missing. The whole initiative in this matter is left to the masses. The best illustration of incapacity to organise a political mass strike is the political strike in the Opel works where 8,000 went on strike against the dismissal of a communist. When one reads the report of this strike one is startled at the helpless fashion in which this splendid movement of proletarian solidarity was prepared, organised and carried out. There were neither clear slogans nor instructions to the workers what to do; the movement marked time whilst the employers played with the strike leaders like a cat with a mouse until the police arrived and arrested the whole strike leadership.

Or let us take in conclusion the question of the workers defence movement which was placed on the agenda by the X plenary session. It is not merely a question of workers defence organisations, but of all those fighting means which the proletariat has at its disposal to defend itself against the terror of the employers and the social fascists. We are compelled to register the fact that apart from general resolutions there is up to the present little to be seen of any organisational preparation for the defence of the working class.

The separation of policy from the organisational tasks sets its stamp on the type of officials who are developing in some places, and in part also on our young cadres. In the sections of the Comintern one often finds the type of "pure politician". The "pure politician" throws off fragments of ideas which the others must then catch, so to speak, and turn into action. The organiser on the other hand is a man who carries out petty

work without any wide political horizon and without any great revolutionary perspective. The politician has never organised a factory group in his life and the organiser has never settled a political question independently. The politician is a man who discovers changes every three months. The organiser on the other hand is the man who carries on his work in the same fashion as though nothing had happened through all the writhings in the party policy and through all its real changes. The result of this is often the cultivation of superficiality and on the other hand of organisational cretinism. And from this results the confronting of revolutionary perspective and organisational petty work. This results also in the failure in some places to understand the slogan of the last Enlarged Plenary Session of the E.C. of the C.I., the slogan of petty work which was put up just in a situation of revolutionary advance and world economic crisis. Comrade Molotov spoke in his report of its significance and its close connection with the revolutionary perspective.

What do the experiences of the C.P. of the Soviet Union teach us? They teach us that only the subordination of the organisational activity under a correct political line of the Party, only the elastic connection of policy and the organisational tasks, only the correct practical treatment of the question of the organising role of the Party, can guarantee the success of the Party in its closest connection with the broadest masses of the working class. At the head of our Party stand not journalists and not literary men, but great politicians and organisers who are leading the working class to new victories. We did not simply discuss with the opportunists in our Party, we organised this discussion. We did not merely throw the slogan of the struggle against the Kulaks around, as did for instance the "Leningrad opposition", but we organised the transition from the policy of the restriction of the Kulaks to the policy of the liquidation of the Kulaks as a class. The sections of the Comintern must learn this organisational grip from the C.P. of the Soviet Union.

With what is the underestimation of the organising role of the Party bound up in the practice of the sections of the Comintern? **With the agitational-propaganda period in its development.** With this I want neither to depreciate the significance of agitation and propaganda, nor to say that in our sections the agitation and propaganda has been well developed at the expense of the organisational function.

An agitator, a propagandist, who operates with hundreds and thousands of class-conscious workers is not yet considering the organisation of great working class struggles. He connects the perspective of the success of his agitation with the spontaneous rise of the revolutionary mass movement. The Party that is in the agitational-propaganda stage of its development, resembles more a great agitprop department than a Party which actually organises and leads the struggles of the working class.

This heritage of the agitational-propaganda period weighs down the working methods of a still considerable part of the sections of the Comintern. One finds its traces everywhere: long-winded theses as dry as the Sahara written for a small circle of the chosen and not for the broad masses of the workers; a language in those documents with which we address ourselves to the masses, taken from the lexicon of a propaganda circle and not that of a mass party; the factory newspapers repeat the formulas of our congresses and of the Enlarged Plenary Session of the E.C.C.I. without making them vivid and clear to the workers by illustrating them with concrete and familiar facts. From this results the tremendous distance between the leaders and the masses, between the upper bodies and the periphery of the Party. The lack of control over the carrying out of the decisions adopted is also connected with the heritage of the agitational-propaganda period. This heritage of the agitational-propaganda period is the second cause of our organisational backwardness.

The third cause is the practical opportunism which has not yet been exterminated and which is closely connected with the traditions of the social democracy from which the majority of the great sections of the Comintern came after the split. During the years of the bolshevisation of the sections of the C.I. we performed tremendous work in the struggle against deviations from the general policy of the Comintern and its sections. And this work was necessary, otherwise we could never have brought our ranks to the recognition of the necessity of setting up the front of the struggle against opportunism in practice. This struggle will not be easy because

opportunism in the practice of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries has still very strong roots. It is concealed in the methods of work and in the structure of our Party organisations and of the red trade unions. How is practical opportunism, which very cunningly puts on the protective mask of recognition of the general policy of the Party, expressed? First of all in the actual sabotage of the reorganisation of the Communist Parties on the basis of the factory groups, whilst only such a reorganisation can exclude the element of accident in the relations between the Party and the masses, and provide the organisational guarantees for the resisting capacities of the Party in case of illegality. Secondly in the self-exclusion of the Party from the leadership of the economic struggles of the proletariat on the pretext that this task belongs to the competencies of the trade unions. Thirdly in the practical abandonment of trade union work as the result of the inactivity of the communist fractions. Fourthly in the passivity of the masses of the membership which results in a tremendous fluctuation of the membership, even rising here and there to 60 per cent, and fifthly in the tendency to let the Party be dragged along in the wake of the reformists and the social democracy etc. These are a few of the subjective causes which determine our organisational backwardness.

What must we do in order to consolidate the Sections of the Comintern organisationally and to abolish the disproportion between the ideological and political influence of the Communist Parties and the effectiveness of their organisational influence on the working masses?

1. We must politicalise the organisational work of the Communist Parties and at the same time learn to organise the policy of the Party. This means that to-day we can consider no serious political question such as the political strike or the united front tactic, or the struggle against war, or the struggle against social fascism, etc., out of relation to those organisational tasks without whose fulfilment we can solve none of the questions (factory nuclei, trade union work, strike leadership, etc.).

2. The reorganisation of the system of Party work with a view to giving the organisational functions of the Party an increased weight in the system as a whole.

3. The increased promotion of organisers and politicians who have proved themselves in the practical work as experienced fighting bolsheviks with great organisational capacities, to leading Party positions.

4. A decisive and ruthless struggle against the practice of "automatism" in our organisational work, against the tendency towards spontaneity as the most damaging symptom of practical opportunism, against softness, lack of will, passivity and capitulation before the difficulties in the way of the winning of the broad masses by the Communist Parties.

5. An open courageous and bolshevist struggle without respect to persons against all the other forms of practical opportunism. A wave of proletarian indignation must be released against opportunism in practice such as we have seen on many occasions against deviations from the political line of the Comintern. Each individual case of practical opportunism must be ruthlessly exposed in order to school the whole membership with the lessons which result from it. The most watchful control of the methods of work of the upper Party bodies on the part of the membership masses is necessary.

6. In view of the world crisis and the revolutionary advance of the working class movement, the weapon of the united front tactic gains a special significance as a decisive tactical lever to consolidate the sections of the Comintern organisationally. In addition to agitational and propaganda work an untiring organisational activity is necessary to prepare and carry out actions of the working masses on the basis of the united front tactic. The initiative of the lower organisations must be developed in this respect. Now that we have put an end to the practice of open letters to the social democratic leaders we must begin to apply as broadly as possible the practice of open letters of our lower organisations to the non-party and social democratic workers.

All the campaigns of the Communist Parties, whether they are elections to parliament or factory council elections, August demonstrations or 6th March demonstrations, must be examined from the standpoint of organisational achievements. Every campaign must be crowned by the recruiting of new members for the Party, for the red trade unions, for the revolutionary trade union opposition, of new readers for the communist press,

etc. This recruiting must not be a chance occurrence and also not a concentrated drive, but a normal function of the Party. The Communist Parties must take up an energetic struggle against the fluctuation in their memberships, by carefully examining the causes for the falling away of certain sections and drawing conclusions for the consolidation of the nucleus of the membership. For the struggle against the membership fluctuation it is necessary that the work for the revolutionary bolshevist training of the members should be raised to the necessary level, that a correct system of drawing the members into the work and utilising them practically should be introduced with a view to securing that as a rule every member performs mass work.

7. The Communist Parties must consolidate the tactic of the united front by creating a network of auxiliary organisations: Minority Movement in Great Britain, the revolutionary trade union opposition in Germany, the committees for the defence of "l'Humanité" in France, the anti-fascist committees in Austria, strike committees and committees of action, etc. As a Party which represents the fighting advance guard of the working class and not embracing like the social democracy a loose mass of platonic sympathisers, but pioneers of the working class, as a Party which places high demands on each individual member with regard to political discipline, steadfastness and revolutionary experience, we need all the more urgently such organisations which embrace the broad sections of the working class which sympathise with the Communist Party and which are under its influence. This is all the more necessary as the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries know neither the preliminary stage of candidates for membership nor of sympathisers.

Only by such broad non-party organisations which are under the influence of the Party and work under its ideological leadership will we be able to shake the firmly built apparatus of the social democrats and the reformists, and extend our influence not only over the non-party workers but also over the best elements and the social democratic working men and women in the reformist trade unions.

8. The development of the social democratic apparatus towards fascism accelerated by the world economic crisis and the intensification of the class struggle, the refusal of the social democracy in the present stage of its fascist development to advocate social reforms and its cynical struggle not only against the final aims of the working class movement, but also against the immediate interests and the partial demands of the working class—all these things mean for the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries a situation in which we communists are not only the only Party of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also the only Party which to-day defends the immediate interests of the working class. By connecting the partial demands of the proletariat with the final aim of the proletarian movement, the Communist Parties must utilise the present economic crisis to mobilise the broadest masses for the struggle for the immediate interests of the working class. In the United States for instance, the communists must launch a powerful movement of the working masses in favour of social insurance. They must place themselves at the head of this movement and lead it to victory. In all the countries affected by the crisis the communists must lead the movement of the unemployed workers on the basis of demands discussed in mass meetings.

In the strike struggles the communists must change their attitude seriously and bolshevistically. Under the conditions created by the economic crisis and the mass unemployment strikes are more difficult and they must therefore be prepared with greater organisational care. The fifth Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions will have to draw up the balance of the experiences of the last few years in order to bring about a serious change on this field. We must make a determined end of the very damaging prejudice in our ranks that under the present circumstances every partial strike is doomed inevitably to failure. This philosophy of strike defeatism which reflects the influence of the social democracy results in a tactical attitude of capitulation.

9. And finally, the carrying out of the Leninist mass policy by the sections of the Comintern with the organisational consolidation of the results obtained, is inconceivable without a ruthless struggle against the so-called mass policy of the right-wing opportunist elements. It is not a policy of struggle against capitalism, but of capitulation to capitalism. It is not a policy of struggle against the social democracy, but a policy

of rapprochement and conciliation with it. This policy does not arm the proletariat in the face of the class enemy, but it disarm it. This policy is built up on the adaptation to the worst prejudices of the most backward sections of the working class which are still under the influence of bourgeois ideology. The supporters of this policy are the agents of capitalism and of the social democracy within our ranks. We shall only be able to strengthen the Sections of the Comintern organisationally after we have destroyed this capitalist agency whose role it is to raise a barrier to prevent the masses from going over to the side of the Communist Parties.

Comrades, if we are able to put these measures into action with a firm bolshevist hand in the near future, events will not wait for us, then we shall be able to achieve in months in our organisational growth what the sections of the Comintern could not accomplish in the years of stabilisation. We shall then, as is fitting for real bolshevists, face the approaching revolutionary events in full armour. Strong by virtue of their organisational bolshevist unity the Communist Parties will lead the working masses to great victories. (Applause.)

Comrade Siu (C. P. of China).

Comrades, permit me to greet the XVI congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the name of the Communist Party of China (Applause).

The Leninist C. P. of the Soviet Union carried out the October revolution. As the leading Party of the Communist International it stands at the head of the world revolution and the emancipation movement of the enslaved nations in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The great Chinese revolution and the Communist Party of China sprang up under the influence of the October revolution. A new revolutionary wave is now rising in China. The world economic crisis, the development of the revolutionary movement, and in particular the great successes and the consolidation of the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union, exercise a great influence on the revolutionary movement in China.

It must be placed on record that there is a general crisis in China and that the inner and foreign policy of the Kuomintang has suffered bankruptcy. In 1928 there was a certain revival of Chinese industry and commerce, but the present period can only be described as a period of decline for Chinese national industry. With regard to the manufacturing industry, it must be said that numerous mills, silk, tobacco and match factories have closed down. The majority of the railway and shipping lines are stagnant as a result of the war between the militarists. The mining industry is being limited. Only the war industries and the arsenals are extending their operations with the assistance of the imperialists. As far as the imperialist undertakings in China are concerned, however, we see exactly the opposite. These undertakings are developing. The agrarian crisis in China is becoming a permanent phenomenon. In North China starvation has been a permanent guest for three years. Of 60 millions who are starving, 10 millions are condemned to death in the near future. Last year the harvest in South China was only 50% of the normal volume. For this reason a general shortage of rice is making itself felt all over China. The rice prices in Shanghai have risen by 177%. The export of silk, tea and cotton is steadily declining. The protracted war between the militarists and the capitalist world crisis are ruining the villages still more. The banks are granting the provincial and central authorities in China loans under usurious conditions. In the recent period the Kuomintang government has floated internal loans to a total of about 400 million dollars. The money market has been heavily shaken. The silver quotations have fallen by 59%. This year a stock exchange collapse occurred in Shanghai. The rise in the cost of rice, the rise of the cost of living in general and the protracted wars of the militarists have worsened the situation of the workers and of the toiling masses in general to a catastrophic extent.

The struggle between the imperialist robbers is the chief basis of the wars of the militarists in China. The imperialists incite the Chinese militarists to war in order to increase the exploitation of the toiling masses of China still further; they exploit them as tools for attacks on the Soviet Union in order to consolidate their positions in the Far East. The events

on the Chinese Far Eastern Railway were a crass expression of the adventurist policy of the Kuomintang. And what was the result? The Red Army of the Soviet Union made a crushing answer to the imperialist attack. In the meantime the Chinese workers and peasants demonstrated under the slogan: "Armed defence of the Soviet Union!" When the Red Army delivered its first counter-blow against the offensive of the Kuomintang and the militarists, the workers in Shanghai and the peasants in Kwangtung asked when the Red Army under Comrade Bluecher would come to them (applause). The final victory of the Red Army of the Soviet Union in Manchuria strengthened in particular the ferment amongst the Chinese workers, peasants and soldiers. The slogan: Defend the Soviet Union and fight against the imperialists! met with a great response.

The bankruptcy of the foreign policy of the Kuomintang can be seen with particular clarity from its relation to the imperialists since the moment when Chiang Kai-shek so openly and cynically betrayed the national interests of China. Since this treachery the Kuomintang has not succeeded in misleading the masses with its national-reformist phrases.

The agreement concerning the customs tariffs, the concessions and the abolition of extraterritoriality shows how the Kuomintang betrays the interests of national independence at every opportunity and furthers the process of colonisation in China. The masses have lost all confidence in the fraudulent slogans of peace, the unification of the country, the liquidation of the League of Nations and the reduction of the army. Only the Trotzkyist renegades and the Chen Du-siu group still contend that the Chinese national bourgeoisie has any prospect of an independent development and stabilisation.

At the moment in China we are faced with a new rising revolutionary wave. The ruling classes in China are not only incapable of solving the contradictions produced by the great revolution, they are even incapable of carrying out the most moderate reforms.

Let us examine the development of the working class movement in China. In 1928 400,000 workers took part in strikes. By 1929 the number had swollen to 750,000. In the first half of 1930 the working class movement further advanced not only with regard to its rate of development, but also with regard to its content. In the spring of this year a great strike of 10,000 miners took place. 5,000 railwaymen struck in Tientchow and 2,000 in Harbin. In Tsingtau and Tientsin strikes and political demonstrations of the textile workers took place continuously. In April this year 10,000 workers of the power stations, the tramwaymen, and the employees of the motorbus company struck one after the other with a certain amount of success. The struggle of the textile workers is proceeding with unbroken strength. The strike and the demonstrations in Wuhan reflect the growth of direct mass action. During the preparations for the 1st May demonstrations this year, the MacDay committees, with the assistance of the workers defence corps, occupied public halls on a number of occasions and organised meetings which adopted resolutions of greetings to the first congress of the soviet districts in China. The same thing occurred in Wuhan. In Canton alone the labour movement was relatively backward.

The working class movement is developing: strikes are being prepared in whole industries, that is to say, strikes of very great extent for China. The organised forces of the workers, however, are still weak. In the large towns there are about 60,000 organised members of the revolutionary trade unions. All demonstrations prove that the Chinese working class is taking up the political struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party and despite the raging terror. The Chinese working class is gathering its forces under the slogan of the struggle for the overthrow of the Kuomintang and the setting up of the Soviet power (applause).

The struggle of the workers, who are leading the propertyless sections of the urban population, has once again released a revolutionary anti-imperialist movement. Organisations of the League against Imperialism have grown up. The new rise of the working class movement is taking place against the background of the peasant war. The agrarian revolution is developing in China. In South China the masses

of the peasantry are not only driving out and shooting the landowners, but they are dividing the land and organising the Soviet power. The Soviet power exists to-day in 7 provinces of South China, in 18 districts embracing 127 sub-districts with a total population of 14 millions (applause). If one adds the districts in which partisan troops are operating against the Nanking government then the population of the districts immediately affected by the revolutionary war totals about 50 millions (applause). This figure is about equal to the population of France. The territorial extent of the guerilla war operations is even greater. The guerilla war and the agrarian revolution in semi-colonial China take on special forms. A Red Army of workers and peasants is growing. In March of this year the Chinese Red Army had 62,000 men (applause). Now, however, there are almost 100,000 who are in possession of over 50,000 rifles. They are also using field guns, machine-guns and aeroplanes which they have captured (applause). The Kuomintang obtained the aeroplanes from the French imperialists in order to suppress the peasant movement. In the Red Army the majority of the troops are peasants and soldiers who have deserted from the Nanking forces. The troops of the militarists are composed of ruined peasants. These peasants are the victims of the militarist crisis. The influence of the agrarian revolution and the terrible worsening of their situation drives them into rebellion. In the second half of 1929 5 military mutinies occurred in China. A characteristic feature of the new revolutionary wave in China is the revolutionary movement amongst the soldiers in the Kuomintang troops. The Red Army in China is composed of 14 corps and is built up organisationally on similar lines to those of the Red Army of the Soviet Union (applause).

A Party organisation is attached to the Chinese Red Army with commissars and political officials (applause). Each Red Army man is not only a fighter but also a political propagandist and organiser.

A weak side of the movement is that North China lags behind South China and the Soviet power has not yet extended its power to the industrial centres. And finally, what is the most important, the contact between the workers movement and the peasant war is not yet close enough.

After the Canton commune the establishment of the Soviet power became the practical aim of the struggle in semi-colonial China. Only the Soviet power can unite China, overthrow the dominance of the imperialists and militarists and create a really independent China. At the present moment a congress of the soviet districts of the whole of China is being organised to deal with the question of the concentration of the leadership of the revolutionary military operations and the creation of a uniform revolutionary law.

Comrades, the Chinese revolution is alive and developing. Only the Trotskyist renegades and the Chen Du-siu group declare that the Chinese communists are lumpenproletarian putchists and the soviet districts are in the hands of a red army of bandits.

Although at the moment the Chinese revolution is developing along the lines of a struggle against the bourgeoisie its chief content is the destruction of feudalism and the overthrow of imperialist dominance in China. Therefore, in the given stage, the Chinese revolution is a bourgeois-democratic one, but this democratic revolution can develop logically with an alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the hegemony of the former. At the same time the Chinese revolution has the perspective of a non-capitalist development, it will develop into a socialist revolution — under the leadership of the world proletariat and under the influence of the powerful development of the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union.

A further characteristic is the unequal development of the Chinese revolution in the various parts of China. In individual districts the Soviet power and the Red Army exist before the revolution has embraced the whole of China. With the rise of the revolutionary wave all over China the revolution may be victorious first of all in one or more provinces.

The tasks of the Chinese Communist Party at the moment are: the consolidation of the working class movement; the increased organisation of the revolutionary trade unions; the leadership of the proletariat in the soviet districts and of the Red Army; the winning of the majority of the working class; the organisation of economic struggles; the organisation of political strikes; the preparation of a general strike; the adaptation of the strikes to the armed struggle of the peasants; determined leadership and development of peasant struggles in North China. The soviet districts must be extended and the leadership of the Red Army centralised and consolidated. In particular, it is necessary to fill up the leading cadres with workers. The military operations must be developed in the direction of the most important transport routes with a view to winning the industrial and administrative centres.

The work amongst the troops must be carried on systematically. We must take over the leadership of the soldiers' insurrections, particularly during the wars of the militarists.

After the occupation of the industrial centres the Soviet government will be sufficiently consolidated to challenge the reactionary Kuomintang government. This general tactic will be carried out by supporting the peasants in the districts where the Soviet power has already been set up, in their struggle for the distribution of the land and by winning the decisive masses of the peasantry in the struggle against the imperialists, the Kuomintang and the Kulaks.

Inside the Party a tireless struggle must be conducted against the opportunist deviations, the Trotskyist renegades and the Chen Du-siu group. Only in this way can the revolution be victorious. Under the leadership of the Comintern the Communist Party of China has been conducting a severe internal struggle for two years because in China, as in the other countries, the new Bolshevik policy met with opportunist resistance. First of all the Trotskyists, who represent a liquidated phase in Europe, cropped up in China. When the Comintern began to clean up the remnants of the opportunist elements, the renegades of the Chen Du-siu group appeared. This group now solidarises with the Trotskyists and recognises Trotsky as its leader. Bukharin's slogans concerning the alliance with the Kulaks and peace between the classes also had their influence on the Communist Party of China. The Chinese C. P. is fighting with all possible energy on two fronts, and in particular against the right-wing deviation and the conciliators. The right-wing danger remains the chief danger. This circumstance demands from the Party a determined struggle against right-wing opportunism and also against the left-wing putchist tendencies and sectarianism. Only in this way can the policy of the Comintern be carried out in China and the deviations in the Chinese C. P. liquidated.

Comrades, the Leninist C. P. of the Soviet Union has achieved tremendous successes in the work for the building up of socialism through the Bolshevik policy of the Central Committee and under the leadership of Comrade Stalin. In this period the C. P. of the Soviet Union also gave great assistance in their bolshevisation to the brother parties and in particular to the C. P. of China.

The imperialist robbers are attacking the Soviet Union from the west and from the east. The conflict on the Chinese Eastern Railway was an attempt to encircle the Soviet Union and put the adventurist policy of the imperialists into action. The rise of the revolutionary wave all over the world however frustrated this plan. The Chinese revolution is developing as a part of the world revolution.

Comrades, the young Chinese Party follows the Party of Lenin, the C. P. of the Soviet Union. It is developing in a violent revolutionary struggle. We shall fight together with you and the proletariat of all countries against imperialist war, against the attacks of the imperialists upon the Soviet Union and against the efforts of the imperialists to crush the revolutionary movement in the colonies.

Raise high the banner of Leninism! Forward! The decisive victory is ours! (prolonged applause).