

**- INTERNATIONAL -**

Vol 6 No. 73

**PRESS**

11<sup>th</sup> November 1926

**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

**The 15th Party Conference of the C. P.  
of the U. S. S. R.**

**Discussion on Comrade Bucharin's Report on Questions  
of International Politics.**

(Verbatim Report.)

Moscow, 27th October 1925.

Comrade MANUILSKY:

Comrades, I believe that in general no objections can be raised to comrade Bucharin's report. It appears, however, to me that the structure of the report has one great defect. Comrade Bucharin has dealt mainly with the problems of the partial stabilisation, and in connection with this has touched upon the latest fundamental phenomena of world economics — trustification, rationalisation, etc. After this general and introductory part of his report, Comrade Bucharin passed immediately to a characterisation of those changes now taking place in the international Labour Movement. This was the scheme of Comrade Bucharin's report. I can fully understand that Comrade Bucharin must have been very exhausted, but still I do think that there is still something more that should have been contained in this extremely valuable and many-sided report. There should have been a reference to those regroupings taking place at the present time in the international arena, in the relations among the various great Powers. This is now one of our main problems, for the changes taking place in the economic structure of world capital influence not only the regrouping within the international working class, but the regroupings in the reciprocal relations of the world Powers. Thus, for instance, the transformation taking place in German capitalist economics in connection with the economic revival of Germany has found its political expression in Germany's admittance to the League of Nations. This fact is

at the same time determinative for the line of the new international regroupings. We are aware that extremely sharp differences have arisen within the League of Nations of late. The League of Nations, which its originators had imagined would be a huge society for the exploitation of the colonial and agrarian countries, and which should have ensured for its members a certain mutual support and common line of action in pursuit of this object, is now becoming more and more the scene of those internal contentions which in reality undermine the League. What is the general tendency of these regroupings?

Up to recently Germany had to play the rôle of an object of colonial exploitation, but of late Germany's economic power has begun to make itself felt again in the collective system of capitalist world economics, in connection with those changes mentioned by Comrade Bucharin when dealing with the advance of German imperialism. Germany's policy shows a tendency — if only slight at present — towards increased aggressiveness. German imperialism is itself still a product of the conflicting currents of European capitalist conditions. It is true that German imperialism rests upon a certain economic basis, in other words, it displays the characteristic features of every imperialism; in the first place an enormous concentration of capital, secondly the merging of industrial and bank capital. Nevertheless the economic character of German imperialism still lacks such a factor as capital export. German capital is, however, already endeavouring to make its way in South America, and to penetrate into China. But still the absence of capital export imparts a distinctly "shorn" character to German imperialism.

*Comrade Bucharin's Speech in reply to Discussion appears on page 1266.*

In addition German imperialism is still lacking many political elements: army, colonies, etc. This inconsistency between the economic basis and the political possibilities of German imperialism is expressed in the contradictory character of German politics (first inclining to the East, then to the West). Thus at the present time we can only speak of tendencies — though extremely strong ones — towards the development of German imperialism.

At the present juncture I should not care to assert categorically that Germany has definitely chosen the path of imperialism. But the fact that Germany is endeavouring to utilise its present economic revival for the purpose of regaining an imperialist position has a very great influence on the new groupings. The union of the ore of Lorraine with the coal of the Ruhr forms the basis of that political rapprochement observable of late between Germany and France. This rapprochement may create an entirely new constellation in Europe. Above all, we see (and it is just this that Comrade Bucharin did not mention) that the basis of the Franco-German rapprochement is this economic one. What are the possibilities of this rapprochement? I believe it may have one of two results. In the first place a strengthening of the rapprochement probably involves a widening of the breach between England and France. France and Germany, in combining with Belgium and Luxemburg to form the steel trust, have done so against England. We are thus confronted by the possibility of a certain continental bloc (which may be made to include such countries as Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, and Austria) against Great Britain.

What are the indications of such a possible development in this direction in European politics? One of the chief indications is the founding of the steel trust. We know how anxiously England endeavoured to prevent the formation of this trust. It even promised extensive loans to Belgium. Another factor is the English tradition that Great Britain has to play the part of "judge" in continental disputes.

But another issue is possible. It is possible that the struggle between the Continental steel trust and Great Britain may presently end in an understanding.

It is difficult to say at the present moment which of these two possibilities is more likely to come to pass. I myself incline to think that the first will gain the upper hand, and the conflict against Great Britain be intensified.

What does a Continental bloc against Great Britain mean? It means the aggravation of all antagonisms and raises the danger of war. Comrade Bucharin has not dealt with the question of the possibility of fresh wars. But it must be dealt with; it is a question which is receiving insufficient attention. Our press is fully occupied with questions of our internal affairs, and with the questions of the international Labour Movement. The very real danger of war is pushed into the background of our consciousness. We hear the warning of danger so to speak, as a kind of "music of the distant future". But, comrades, it is our duty to awaken the European proletariat fully to the danger of war. We must devote careful study to the ramifications of the subjects of dispute in European and international relations, and form a judgment on the most probable point of the next armed conflict.

In my opinion there are two such particularly dangerous points in world politics at the present time, round which a possible war may be waged. The first is the Pacific Ocean, the second the Mediterranean. I do not assert that the next great war among the capitalist States is bound to originate over one of these points. It is very possible that the starting point of the next world war may be in Europe or in the Balkans, just as the immediate cause of the outbreak of the great war in 1914 was the conflict between Austria and Serbia. But there can be no world war in which the question of the struggle for hegemony between Great Britain and America does not form the decisive dividing line between the armed forces of the international conflict.

In the next great war two forces will stand opposed to one another: American imperialism, powerfully developed, and English imperialism, fallen into decay. It is easy to foresee that in such a conflict Great Britain would be doomed to the fate that overtook Germany in the last great war. But what are the possible conditions under which this Anglo-American struggle for hegemony would not form the decisive factor of the future world

war? The sole possibility is that the decay of Great Britain proceeds more rapidly than the approach of this conflict, and that a European or English revolution would bring about a new state of affairs.

That this Anglo-American conflict is no figment of the imagination may be seen in the rivalry between Great Britain and the United States in South America, in Mexico, and in the economic struggles for the sources of naphtha, rubber, copper, etc. The scene of this conflict will be the Pacific Ocean.

The second point around which a tremendous armed conflict may develop is the Mediterranean. Here the points of contention have been rendered the more acute by the Franco-Moroccan war. That was already a concealed war between France and Italy. The Riff Kabyles were merely the object of these conflicting interests. The Morocco question is bound up with the struggle for Tangier. And the Tangier question is again the question of the hegemony over the Mediterranean. France dreams of the Mediterranean as a French "lake". Italy and Spain see it as a Latin ocean. In actual practice Great Britain holds the keys of the Mediterranean; Gibraltar and Suez. The new feature characterising the present struggle for the Mediterranean is the appearance on the scene of a fresh and aggressive Italian imperialism. Italy, after its defeat in Abyssinia in 1896, withdrew from the struggle for colonial possessions. But a fresh step towards expansion was taken by Italian imperialism in North Africa, in the struggle for Tripoli. Today the young Italian imperialism has become an actual factor of aggressive policy. This is the new factor in this section of capitalist antagonisms.

Italian imperialism is seeking an ally in British imperialism. It shares with it the sphere of influence in Abyssinia; it relies on its support in the struggle for Tangier. The meeting between Chamberlain and Mussolini, and the anti-French campaign now being carried on in Italy, are matters of common knowledge. These two Latin "sisters" have once more reached a stage in their mutual relations resembling that of the nineties of last century. This all tends to a further aggravation of the antagonisms existing among the great powers. The attitude taken by Italy in the Mediterranean, the conflicts in North Africa and Tunisia (a matter of supreme importance for Italy as a possible territory to which it could export its superfluous population) — all this is characteristic of the imperialist struggle as it is today.

We are thus witnessing in Europe the gradual crystallisation of the two groupings: France and Germany, and Great Britain and Italy. I should, however, like to warn those comrades who are inclined to regard this constellation of Powers as an accomplished fact. What do these two-sided agreements mean? Is economically dismembered Europe turning from the triple alliance system existing before 1914, to the system of alliances between two countries, which is determined by the economic decay of Europe?

I should like to warn our comrades against such hasty conclusions. The international situation is not yet settled; as yet we see only the first vague outlines of the new groupings. It is too soon to say whether these have already assumed their final forms. But one thing is certain: the present events in Europe are intensifying the conflict. There is no doubt, for instance, that Italy is not taking up the struggle for Tangier single-handed, but with the active support of Great Britain. This does not, however, by any means reduce the contradictions of the situation, but rather increases them.

Tangier represents a military basis competing with Gibraltar. Gibraltar is an old fashioned rock fortification, Tangier its growing competitor. Thus, for instance, the mounting of long range guns at Tangier would signify that the Power in possession of Tangier would command the Straits of Gibraltar.

This situation is characteristic of the false nature of that present day pacifism with which both the bourgeoisie and the social democrats are endeavouring to stupefy the working class. It is the task of the Communist International, and especially the task of our Party, to agitate energetically against these capitalist illusions. I consider this to be one of the first tasks of the next Plenary Session of the E. C. C. I.

We must make a careful analysis of the nature of present day pacifism. The pacifism of today differs greatly from pre-war pacifism. Pre-war pacifism was the ideology of the citizen living on the income from his investments, and anxious only regarding his dividend warrants. If he was to be left in peace with his dividends, there must be a stable economic situation, without any

crises and wars. This ideology was expressed in a book by Norman Angel, in which the author, only a few months before the great war, attempted to prove its impossibility.

To-day the social basis of pacifism is very different. What do we see to-day? The small investor has vanished from Germany since the inflation; he is vanishing from France; but he is celebrating his rebirth in America. Thus today pacifism is receiving a certain amount of support from these American dividend receivers. And this is not all. American finance capital, with an eye to the "open door" in Europe and the colonies, is also inclined to coquette with pacifism. And since Social Democracy always hangs on to the coat tails of the most powerful capitalists, it here represents the second tributary of this pacifist stream. The powerful financial capital of America does not wish to see Europe an active volcano, but a peaceful region for the safe investment of capital and for exploitation. And thus this big capital comes forward today in a pacifist disguise. For this reason it is necessary for us to analyse the class basis of this pacifism. The war question must be raised in the press, and every possible light thrown upon it. This is one of the chief tasks of the Communist International at the present time. Although much was written about war before the war broke out in 1914, still it found the Second International unprepared. We must now clearly see the dangers confronting the international and the European Labour Movement. We must proclaim these dangers loudly, we must prepare and mobilise the European proletariat against that which is taking place in the sphere of world imperialism.

This is the more necessary as our Soviet Union is not secured against mad attempts at attack on the part of expiring capitalism. This is another point not touched upon by Comrade Bucharin. Here again we must follow the ramifications of war danger. These run in two directions: firstly along the routes connecting our revolution with the European proletariat (Poland, Roumania), and secondly on the path between our October revolution and the awakening peoples of the East (Central Asia, China). Our Opposition has done a great deal to prepare for an ideological demobilisation of the European working class in the event of an attack by the capitalist world on the Soviet Union. We for our part must now make use of the experience gained in our struggle against the intervention of 1918 and 1919, and prepare a number of measures in order to frustrate the adventurous intentions of this or that accomplice of British imperialism. This question, too, must occupy a forefront place in the attention of the world communist movement. (Applause.)

#### Comrade PEPPER.

It is necessary to differentiate between the present ultra-Left wave in the Comintern and those Left currents which made their appearance earlier in the history of the Comintern. If we analyse these, we find the four following main currents:

Characteristic of the first wave, in 1919/20, were various anarcho-syndicalist tendencies in the Latin countries, the founding of the party known as the K. A. P. D. (German Communist Labour Party) in Germany, anti-Parliamentary trends in England, and currents in the C. P. of Great Britain opposed to communists joining the Labour Party. At the end of this period comrade Lenin's book on "Infantile Diseases" appeared.

The second wave arose at the beginning of 1921, at the time when the so-called offensive theory was brought forward in connection with the March insurrection in Germany. This second wave was put an end to by the III. World Congress.

The third wave was in connection with the resistance against the united front tactics. It ended at the V. World Congress.

The fourth wave has arisen in the course of the last few years in the form of the ultra-Left in Poland, headed by Donski, in the form of Bordiga's standpoint in Italy, the tendencies opposed to the formation of a "Labour Party" in Norway, the opposition within the C. P. of the Soviet Union, and the ultra-Left in Germany.

The first difference between the new-ultra Left and the old Left wave consists of the changed objective situation. Just before 1921 there was an immediately revolutionary situation in Europe. Today we are passing through a period of capitalist stabilisation, which, however partial and uncertain, is still a stabilisation. From this arises the difference in the ideology of the new and the old tendencies. The roots of the ideology of the old Left were implanted in the then revolutionary situation, and

above all in the fact that this revolutionary situation had developed unequally in the different countries. The roots of the errors of the present ultra-Left lie in the partial stabilisation in the leading countries.

The second difference arises out of the first. The old Left expressed the idea of **revolutionary impatience**, Lenin accused them of wanting to thrust the vanguard of the working class too early into the battle, alone and unsupported, exposed too soon to the blows of the bourgeoisie. The present ultra-Left are characterised by precisely the contrary: Their whole trend of thought is unrevolutionary and **defeatist**. The Left of 1921 were too optimistic, the present ultra-Left have lost all faith in the power of the revolution, they cannot keep pace with the Communist International and the working class.

The third difference relates to the estimate of the development of the revolutionary movement. The old Left failed to notice the ebbtide of the immediately revolutionary situation. The present ultra-Left not only do not mention any immediately revolutionary situation whatever, but they anticipate — especially Maslov — an almost unending period of stabilisation, or at least a period of decades of stagnation.

The fourth difference consists of the attitude of the old Left, and that of the present ultra-Left, to the Soviet Union. The old Left were full of sympathy for Soviet Russia. They justified the March rising in 1921, for instance, by pointing to the necessity of hastening to the aid of the Soviet Union. They regarded Soviet Russia as the centre of world revolution. The present ultra-Left, on the other hand, does not regard the Soviet Union as the centre of the world revolution, but as its enemy. They declare that the Soviet Union is not a proletarian State, that there exists in it a tendency to bourgeois degeneration, that the C. P. of the Soviet Union is in reality not a proletarian party, and must be combated.

The old Left were anxious for an immediate revolution in Europe. The ultra-Left of today demand in place of this a second revolution in Soviet Russia. In reality this is a desire for counter-revolution, for there is no third possibility: Every revolution against the proletarian revolution is a counter-revolution.

There are still a few other essential differences. Thus, for instance, the old Left was anti-Parliamentary, whilst the ultra-Left holds an anti-trade union standpoint. They are very willing to accept seats in Parliament, but feel no inclination for trade union work.

With regard to the social foundations of the ultra-Left, there are four social strata upon which the ultra-Left ideology can base itself.

The first stratum is a part of that petty bourgeoisie ruined by the inflation (especially in Germany), and reduced socially to a position similar to that of the working class.

The second stratum is formed by declassed intellectuals (thrown out of customary conditions of life in the postwar period; the social position of these has been greatly proletarianised, and in many cases they attempted to approach the Communist Party.

The third stratum consists of the declassed members of the proletariat itself, the workers condemned to permanent unemployment.

And finally, the fourth stratum consists to a certain extent of the workers employed in small undertakings, and of the proletariat in the countries with a preponderantly petty bourgeois population.

It need not be said that we must adopt a different attitude towards the declassed intellectuals than to those sections of the working class which have been temporarily thrown out of the process of production.

This analysis is necessary if the ultra-Left are to be successfully combated.

If we seek for the sources of the recent ultra-Left revival, we find these in the following five phenomena:

1. The partial stabilisation of capitalism, and the slower speed of the revolution;
2. The difficulties connected with the building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union;
3. The offensive policy maintained by imperialism against the Soviet Union, the capitalist policy of encircling the Soviet Union, expressed with great aggressiveness in the "adaption to the West" adopted by the German bourgeoisie. Both the social democrats and a section of so-called communists have fallen under the influence of this trend to the West.

4. Right errors committed by some of the Communist Parties. Those who have not grasped the nature of Braudler's errors in 1923 cannot comprehend the ultra-Left deviations of Ruth Fischer and Maslov. One must not, however, overestimate this fourth source of the ultra-Left revival. The first three are much more important and decisive, being of a social and political nature.

5. The opposition in the C. P. S. U. It is probable that our Russian comrades are not all fully aware of the enormous amount of damage done to our brother parties abroad by the oppositional attitude of Comrade Zinoviev, and by the action of the Opposition against the Leninist line pursued by the C. P. of the Soviet Union. The capitulation of the Opposition in the C. P. of the Soviet Union, the defeat of the ultra-Left in Germany, and the almost hundred per cent defeat of Bordiga in Italy, all go to show, however, that the ultra-Left will soon be a thing of the past.

A final victory over the Opposition is necessary not only because the opposition carries on a fraction struggle and because a leadership is impossible in a Communist Party where permanent fractions exist. This is only one of the reasons why the ultra-Left should be liquidated with all possible speed. The second and decisive political reason lies in the political line taken by the ultra-Left, in the fact that they are opponents of the united front tactics, that their attitude towards the social democratic workers is false, that they actually undermine the work being done in the trade unions, that they oppose the Soviet Union and demand a "second revolution" in Soviet Russia, that they wish to replace Leninism by some new and special West European Communism, that they oppose the so-called "Moscow dictatorship", and that they are opposed to revolutionary centralism under the leadership of the Comintern. All this makes the liquidation of the ultra-Left necessary. The old Left have adapted themselves to the Communist International. The path of the ultra-Left leads further away from the Communist International, into the camp of the social democrats, and often into the camp of open bourgeois counter-revolution. The ideological struggle against the ultra-Left is of first importance, but organisatory measures are necessary at the same time. The Communist International can only march forward over the political corpse of the ultra-Left.

#### Comrade STEN.

Comrade Bucharin's report has given us a fairly complete survey of the stabilisation. This question is one of the utmost importance, and full light must be thrown upon it in order to answer the questions regarding the immediate prospects of our revolutionary development. Comrade Bucharin has pointed out that present day capitalism is undergoing certain changes, that capitalism is endeavouring to reorganise its basis of production. Capitalism is seeking on the one hand to perfect its technical basis and on the other to raise its capitalist industry to a higher stage.

This does not mean, however, that the basis of revolution is destroyed, or the revolutionary perspective liquidated. It is obvious that such changes in historical development naturally give rise to Right and Left deviations. Thus we have had an ultra-Left wave of late. It has mirrored the lack of comprehension for new tasks among those petty bourgeois elements which joined the communist movement at a moment of intense revolutionary advance.

In the actual situation in which we are placed, we must not confine ourselves to a general declaration as to the necessity of combatting Right and ultra-Left tendencies, but must realise that at the moment the combatting of the ultra-Left is of paramount political importance. This does not, however, mean that there is no Right danger whatever with us. Now that the ultra-Left opposition has suffered severe defeat with us and in Germany, and now that the new tasks towards realising the united front under the present peculiar circumstances completely absorb the energies of the Communist Parties, the danger of a swing towards the Right becomes more imminent. Already there is a certain ideological and political revision of the importance and possibilities of the post-war crisis of capitalism beginning to make its way to the surface. Already we may hear some of our comrades hinting that the post-war decline and post war crisis in capitalism cannot serve as the basis of the revolutionary working class. Thus, for instance, Comrade Lapinsky writes

as follows on this question in his article on "The disintegration of reformism" in No. 7 of the "Bolshevik":

"The inequality of capitalist development was regarded by Lenin — and quite rightly — as a factor of revolutionary development. This (what we see today) is, however, no longer an inequality of "development", for there has been no sign of development whatever for years, but an unexampled heterogeneity in the whole economic situation, expressed in an unexampled dependence of one country upon another, and leading in this case to a **checking of the revolutionary development**. In countries like Germany and Austria, which, were literally put "on nations" — and starvation rations at that — by other capitalist countries, the consciousness of their own national and political impotence, cultivated to the utmost by the social democrats, and even by the so-called "independent" social democrats (and this was the original sin under the burden of which the independents sunk down again to the level of Scheidemann, Ebert, and the rest) has clipped the wings of the proletariat, and robbed it of its faith in its own powers and in the possibility of the social revolution.

Kautsky and those in agreement with him have merely expressed these pessimistic tendencies existing among wide sections of the working class and impoverished bourgeoisie, and put them into words in their criticism of the "socialisation of poverty and devastation". The central idea of this critical "theory" is that the proletariat is not even capable of securing even the barest necessities of existence without the help of the national and international bourgeoisie, and without allying itself to it. Kautsky, in criticising the "socialisation of poverty", has made himself actually the representative of the socialism of pauperisation, of the socialism of the slum proletariat in those countries in which the whole working class (and with it a considerable section of the petty bourgeois masses) have been pauperised (plunged into poverty) by the international bourgeoisie."

This super-original idea, the idea that Kautsky is the representative of pauper Socialism, of ragged proletarian socialism, now comes to our ears for the first time through the agency of comrade Lapinsky. But the originality of this theory does not guarantee its correctness. We have hitherto been of the opinion that Kautsky expressed the aspirations of the labour aristocracy, and that this labour aristocracy has been the greatest obstacle in the path of revolution in Europe; exploiting its influence on the working class, seizing upon the old organisations of the Amsterdam and Second Internationals, and serving in the hands of the European bourgeoisie as a very efficient brake on revolutionary advance. But it now appears, according to Comrade Lapinsky, that under the conditions of general decline, in which the whole working class is alleged to be pauperised and demoralised, the working class cannot be victorious, since its wings are clipped. But have the revolutionary Marxist ever regarded the impoverishment of the masses as a brake on revolution? Those who make such assertions are well on the road to become followers of Bernstein. This is a standpoint which relieves social democracy from the responsibility of being the most powerful brake hindering the advance of revolution and throws the blame on to a "historical process of decay". Here we have a revisionist attempt at revising the significance of the revolutionary period following the war, a period brought about by the direct collapse and direct disorganisation of European capitalism.

It is equally anti-Leninist to regard revolutionary development as based solely on an automatic decay and direct collapse of capitalism.

Capitalism is now attempting to render its stabilisation permanent. But this does not mean that this attempt has been successful, or will be successful. The nature of the attempts themselves engender the factors likely to undermine the stabilisation, and to confront the Communist Parties of Europe once more with an immediately revolutionary situation. This moment has not yet come. Our main task therefore, is to utilise to the utmost that trend towards the Left now showing itself in the working class of Europe, to build up the proletarian army, to form a correct estimate of the dangers which can threaten us at the present time, and to lead the Communist Parties in the right path, in the spirit of orthodox Leninism.

## Comrade RYUTIN

The ultra-Left maintain that the stabilisation of capitalism is at an end. If this were the case, then we should have to draw the conclusion that the moment has come to call the proletarian masses to arms. The opposition does not do this however; firstly because it would thereby most clearly expose its own bankruptcy, and secondly because the standpoint of the opposition has its rise in pessimistic and liquidatory trends of thought.

With regard to the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world, these have become somewhat acute in character of late. The Soviet Union is becoming more and more a centre of attraction both for the proletariat and for the other masses of working people all over the globe. The Soviet Union has become so strong that the Soviet proletariat is able to lend more and more efficient aid to the international working class and to the oppressed masses of the East. This has been proved once for all by the enormous amount of support rendered the English miners by the workers of our Union. This has been bound to intensify the opposition against us in the capitalist world. And the imperialists also realise that the Chinese people, carrying on a heroic struggle against imperialism, profits by the experience gained in the proletarian socialist revolution of the Soviet Union.

These facts, opposed to the assertions that we are departing from internationalism and that we are building up socialism "by districts", strikingly demonstrate the truly international spirit of the C. P. of the S. U. During the last few years we have proved our internationalism, not by words, but by deeds.

## Comrade LOZOVSKY.

A number of the factors adduced by Comrade Bucharin go to show that the bourgeoisie has doubtless learnt something during the last five or six years. The understanding arrived at between the German and French heavy industries is in itself a great stride forward from the standpoint of the bourgeois attempts at stabilisation. The European bourgeoisie is endeavouring with the aid lent by the weight of American capitalism, to overcome the crisis caused by the war and by the Versailles peace treaty.

The changed relation of forces between Europe and America has, however, called forth a number of new and acute antagonisms.

Europe does not oppose America as a united whole. America has its agents in Central Europe. And what does Germany represent today, financially? It is an agent of American capitalism, and relies for support on the power of the capital of the United States. The growth of competition is therefore not leading to increased unity in Europe, but to further cleavage, in which the United States draws one part of Europe over onto its side, whilst England still strives to bring the other part under its influence. In this struggle France sides with America.

And into this fabric the Soviet Union economically and politically thrusts itself like a wedge. What does our stabilisation mean, from the standpoint of capitalist stabilisation? It means the weakening of all capitalism, it means increased insecurity of all capitalist relations.

Under the changed conditions resultant on the changed centre of gravity of European capitalism, discontent is growing in the working class. It is seeking for new forms of struggle, for new tactics; it rejects the old social democratic policy, but without definitely breaking with the social democratic upper stratum. This Left trend in the European working class is accompanied by a Right trend among the social democratic and reformist leaders of the European working class.

If we turn our attention to the labour movement outside of Europe, we observe the following: In the United States, in this country of powerful and growing capitalism, the official trade union organisation, the A. F. of L., is going more and more to the Right, although it might be thought that it could not possibly go any further in that direction. It is conducting a furious struggle against the recognition of the Soviet Union, although many of the more far-seeing of the American bourgeoisie are in favour of this recognition.

We see something very different when we pass to the labour movement in the new countries and new continents.

The labour movement in China is completely under the influence of the Communist Party. The labour movement in such countries as Indonesia, Australia, etc. shows a decidedly Left revolutionary tendency. The workers of these countries are entering the international arena for the first time. And it is not by accident that the trade unions of Australia have taken the initiative in convening the trade union congress for the countries of the Pacific Ocean. It is not by accident that so many countries have declared themselves in favour of this congress. This movement raises a new aspect of the united front question, the question of a united Trade Union International. Up to recently the average European worker, nurtured in the spirit of social democratic theory and practice, has regarded the International as an association of solely European organisations. He has seen nothing of the workers of China, Indonesia, Australia, and the other countries. This is an ideology reflecting the hegemony — now past — of European capital.

But now matters have taken a new turn. Now we see that the workers of a great number of countries are regarding the problem of the International precisely as we have regarded it, in opposition to the Amsterdam International, against European reformism. At least this was the case with the Australian trade unions at their last congress in August 1926, and it is also the case with a great number of the trade unions of the countries of the Pacific Ocean.

## Comrade KUSMIN.

The present situation consists essentially of reciprocal manoeuvres among the class forces, for at the present moment neither we nor the bourgeoisie can gain the upper hand. Both we and the bourgeoisie are seeking allies for the struggle which is bound to come sooner or later. Our allies are the working class of the West, the peasantry, and the colonial peoples. The events in China and the insurrectionary movement in India are undermining the prestige of the British bourgeoisie. Great Britain is being greatly disquieted by our Leninist work among the peoples of Central Asia, for this work is aiding these peoples to rise on new bases to a higher cultural life.

Our present task is to combat pacifist illusions. Above all we must spread knowledge of the fact that the whole policy of the international bourgeoisie is concentrated upon an attack upon us. Our successes, and our economic growth, increase the intensity of this attack.

Whilst the working class delegations which visit us promise to combat these bourgeois endeavours to the utmost extent of their powers, we witness attempts to undermine the support of the working class for us. The working class is supporting its own interests in supporting us, and realises this, but yet there are one-time communists, and others who are still members of Communist Parties, who are striving to destroy this alliance between us and the world proletariat, and endeavouring to prove that Soviet Russia is not building up a Socialist State of society. We must sweep aside this danger with the utmost determination.

## Comrade SKRYPNIK.

The main feature in the life of our Communist International of late years has been the detailed discussion, in all the Sections of the Comintern and in our brother Parties, of the question of our Soviet Union.

And here there arises in the first place the question of the stabilisation of capitalism.

What are the views held by the opposition as regards the stabilisation question? These views practically lead to the conclusion that the proletarian revolution is only possible on an international scale, and as the result of a general "collapse" of capitalism. This is an entirely false and unLeninist view. But we can now comprehend why the opposition brought forward their proposals regarding the Kuomintang and the revolutionary movement, practically suggesting the withdrawal of the Chinese Communist Party from the Kuomintang. They made these proposals precisely because they have no belief in the possibility of the victory over international capitalism, and have therefore no faith in a victory in China.

At the July Plenary Session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. Comrade Trotsky, when replying to Comrade Stalin, threw doubts on the correctness of the line taken by us in the national

question. It is probable that the opposition was anxious to make a strategic attempt to make use of the national question for their fight against the Party. They succeeded in part in doing this in Transcaucasia, where a tiny group of Georgian "deviators" went over to the opposition. But they did not succeed, and will not succeed, in proving that the Party has departed from the right path in the national question.

I wish now to point out the errors connived at by Comrade Zinoviev during the time that he was at the head of the Communist International. He encouraged a certain revisionism of Leninist views in the national question. I refer to the well known letter sent by Comrade Zinoviev to the Czech C. P. in the name of the E. C. C. I. in 1924, with reference to the national question, and further to the passing of resolutions in the Communist Parties of Yugoslavia and Poland; resolutions which represented the principle of autonomy in the national question, and which were then finally rejected at the Enlarged E. C. C. I., after a long struggle in which Comrade Stalin spoke the decisive word.

### Comrade RASKOLNIKOV.

If we are to form a correct judgment concerning events in the East, we must first get rid of the idea that the East is a homogeneous whole. Regarded from the standpoint of economic development, the countries of the East may be roughly divided into three categories.

To the first group we may reckon the most backward countries, in which industry is undeveloped, where there is no working class, and where the conditions are completely non-capitalist. This group includes Morocco, Afghanistan, Mongolia, and Tannu Tuvin. In these countries it is the duty of the communist elements to support the united national revolutionary movement.

In the second group agriculture is the predominant form of economics, but traces of capitalist development are already observable, and an industrial proletariat is forming (Egypt, Turkey, Persia, Corea). In these countries the small and middle

bourgeoisie composed for the most part of representatives of commercial capital are the chief representatives of the national revolutionary movement. The working class of these countries, gathered together in independent parties, supports the national bourgeoisie in its struggle against imperialism.

In the third category we must place India and China, that is, those countries in which capitalist development has proceeded at a terrific pace, especially since the war. In these countries we can already observe a strongly developed labour movement. Here the working class is already fully class conscious. And therefore the Communist parties have special tasks here. The bourgeoisie no longer represents a homogeneous whole. The big bourgeoisie, out of fear of the labour movement, has gone over to the imperialists and plays a counter-revolutionary rôle. The small and middle bourgeoisie have, however, not yet fulfilled their progressive mission, and their rôle is still objectively a revolutionary one.

Thus in China, for instance, where capitalist development is advancing with tremendous rapidity, the working class has the opportunity, of playing an active and leading rôle in the revolutionary struggle. The Communist Party of China has its own independent tasks, and it need not be said that one of its duties is to lend every support to the national revolutionary movement, the Kuomintang. Nothing can be more incorrect than the assertion that the Kuomin government is a workers' and peasants' government. The Canton government and the Kuomintang represent to a great degree the small and middle bourgeoisie who have awakened to their national interests. But none the less it is our present duty to maintain the united front of the national revolutionary movement, and to avoid any split.

For the immediate future the simultaneous existence of two governments appears to be unavoidable; the government in North China headed by Tschang Tso Lin, and the Canton government in South China. But revolutionary prospects in China are most favourable at the present time, and we may hope for the revolutionary unity of China in the not too distant future. This will form one of the leading factors in the continued victorious advance of the world revolution.

## Comrade Bucharin's Concluding Speech.

The comrades who have spoken here in the discussion are in agreement for the most part with the views expressed in my report. I should however, like to refer briefly to those points which I had omitted from the report for the reason that this had already become too lengthy.

With regard to the stabilisation question, I should merely like to lay special emphasis on the most important points of my report and of the speeches of the comrades taking part in the discussion. In my report I observed that the different aspects of this question must now be differentiated. An examination of the elements constituting the world's economics of today reveals the entirely relativity of this stabilisation. If we make a concrete definition on the relativity of the stabilisation, we may do so as follows: The Soviet Union is the main wedge driving capitalist stabilisation asunder; it is a factor of leading importance. Is it possible, at the present time, to touch upon any single question of importance in international politics without meeting with the so-called Russian question in one form or another? The stabilisation of Socialism in our country, that is, the growth of socialist elements in the Soviet Union, is a highly important factor, destroying capitalist unity, and thus driving a huge wedge into capitalist stabilisation.

The Chinese revolution, involving an enormous mass of human beings, the largest section of humanity on the surface of the globe (430 millions out of 1 2/3 milliards), represents a force hitherto unknown in history. If we regard the Chinese revolution from the standpoint of all the possibilities and potentialities contained in it, and if we remember the enormous significance of the Chinese revolution for so many of the Eastern, colonial, and semi-colonial countries, then we see in the Chinese revolution a factor of tremendous importance, of international historical importance, which is likewise a huge wedge forcing apart the components of capitalist stabilisation.

Again, if we turn to Great Britain, if we remember the general strike in England, and more especially the struggle of those brave miners who have already held out for six months under the most difficult conditions; if we consider every aspect of this struggle from the standpoint of its universal historical

importance; if we recognise the unmistakeable connection between this struggle and the indubitable decline of British capitalism; if we recollect that a weakening of the British Empire, the weakening of its power, is bound to signify the unleashing of all the centrifugal forces in this enormous imperialist State, the strengthening of the centrifugal tendencies in the colonies, dominions, and dependent parts of the British world-wide empire; when we remember that in the capitalist world Great Britain is only second to America as a powerful, world embracing capitalist State; then we must realise that British events, and the whole complexity of phenomena connected with them, are again another tremendous wedge driven into the body of capitalist stabilisation.

If we then turn our attention to a whole number of countries of secondary importance on the continent of Europe, which were mentioned in my report as now falling into permanent decay and agrarianisation, we find that these, too, are a factor of great significance in forming an estimate of the relativity of the capitalist stabilisation. And if in conclusion we survey the developing class struggle, which is continually growing even on the background of the stabilisation, and even, as I have endeavoured to show you, where the curve of stabilisation is still following an upward direction, then this increasing acuteness of the class struggle, and the tremendous difficulties encountered by the bourgeoisie in the social sphere, must also be recognised as a factor which must be not underestimated if we are desirous of making a thorough analysis of the position of world economy and of capitalist society.

Our analysis therefore emphasises the relativity of the stabilisation and substantiates the revolutionary trend of its development. What is specific and peculiar to our analysis, however, is that it emphasises the necessity of our refraining from any summary definition of our standpoint towards the stabilisation, as a standpoint thus formed helps us but little, if at all, in determining our tactical line.

In my report, and here again, I consider it to be my duty to lay special emphasis on the extraordinary character of the

present over-production crisis. It does not appear to me to be quite correct to apply to the present situation, mechanically and without analysis of the specific post-war conditions and the present crisis, all those questions of the hopeless or not hopeless prospects of capitalism, the crisis or inequality in capitalist development, and a great number of similar questions already dealt with by Lenin in his work on imperialism. The general fundamental principles of the analysis of imperialism must be accompanied by due consideration of the concrete historical epoch, the peculiarities of which form part of our own actual experience.

The special peculiarities of the capitalist crisis which we are now witnessing include, however, the fact that post-war devastation has not yet been made good, and must still be taken into account. It still exercises an influence in determining the present critical position of capitalism, and it appears to me to be wrong to ignore the specific post-war difficulties as a coefficient, and simply to judge the present situation as if the present over-production crisis were a normal one, or one merely caused by the inequality in capitalist economics as called forth such crises before the war.

The third observation which I should like to make is in connection with Comrade Manuilsky's speech. I may say that I spoke little on the regroupings among the powers for the reason that this question has been so widely discussed in the press that it is difficult to say anything new about it. In all essentials I am in agreement with comrade Manuilsky as to the utmost importance of combatting that specific pacifism which is being so much lauded by the social democrats and which is being utilised in order to conceal the antagonisms among the Powers, for concealing the armaments and war danger etc. In reality I replied to this question when I spoke of super-imperialism, for this is one and the same question, only differently formulated.

If emphasis must now be laid on this, and it is true that it must, I have no objection to raise. I only wish to state that in this general phase of development we should not lay emphasis so much on the possibility and inevitability of a war between the capitalist Powers as on the preparations being made for a "bloc" war against the Soviet Union. This is the main point. The various capitalist combinations, and the various centrifugal tendencies which the social democrats are pleased to term a transition to a fresh stage of imperialism, or super-imperialism, have as a matter of fact as one of their leading tasks to attack the Soviet Union, or to prepare to crush the Soviet Union by surrounding it by enemies. The diplomatic preparations run parallel with this. All the blocs directed against us, all the recent agreements, military conventions, etc., possess a certain economic basis in the latest developments of capitalist economy.

It appears to me to be very dangerous to prophesy whether or not there will be war in the near future. We should do better to look to our practical criticism on the war danger. One of the most determinative factors for the likelihood or non-likelihood of immediate war is the trend of feeling in the working class, its activity, fighting capacity, etc. Here we must carry out a mobilisation of the social forces in the working class. In the present situation this factor must not by any means be underestimated.

It goes without saying that for the bourgeoisie too the war question is a very uncertain one. It is extremely difficult for Great Britain to begin a war just now, even though the ground is beginning to burn beneath its feet. The example furnished by the Chinese revolution, the fact that it has proved impossible to organise a great intervention in China — all this shows a certain weakness and uncertainty in the ranks of the great capitalist Powers. However this may be, all these attempts at the consolidation of capitalism, at military conventions, negotiations, or the formation of a certain diplomatic basis for imperialist diplomacy, have precisely the opposite effect. The danger of war must therefore be expressly emphasised, but at the same time it must be pointed out that the most imminent danger is war against Soviet Russia.

And now, comrades, I should like to elaborate slightly some of the points which I only touched upon in my yesterday's report. I spoke of the new forms being taken in united front tactics, and adduced a number of examples showing the forms in which the

united front is developing, and the forms taken by the radicalisation of the working class. This analysis showed that one of the main points upon which communist work is to be concentrated at the present time is the trade unions. Yesterday I was unable to follow out this idea sufficiently, although in my opinion it forms one of the central points of our tactics, the tactics of the communists in the revolutionisation of the working class. We have in a number of European Parties certain cadres of communists working in the trade unions, and taking part in all the ordinary daily work of the trade union. These communists differ but little from the social democrats of a good type working in the trade unions.

But if we take the revolutionary type of communist, then we very often find that these comrades, although fully recognising the principle of working in the trade unions, pay but little attention to this work in actual practice, or they endeavour to accentuate their revolutionary character and communist ideas in their trade union work, so that they involve the ordinary trade union work, actually differing but little from social democratic work, in some revolutionary "final" slogan: workers' and peasants' government, dictatorship of the proletariat, and so forth, all ideas which have nothing to do with the work in hand. Of course it is obvious that if the communists are taking part in trade union work at the present time, and are bound to do so, they must come forward as communists. The communist work being done in the trade unions must be really communist work. The finding of the right line to pursue gives rise to a number of highly complicated questions and highly complicated standpoints. Again and again we have to ask ourselves: By what must we be guided? In what way is our standpoint to be sharply distinguished from that of the social democrats? Along what lines, and with what main objects in view, are we to work?

It seems to me that the communists have a number of tasks to which the social democrats are not in the least likely to aspire. Above all, the communists must here concentrate their main efforts against trust capital. There is no doubt whatever that at the present time the communists are faced, in the rationalisation and trustification of industry, etc., with an enemy no longer organised on the same lines as formerly. The communists are confronted by a united, and consolidated enemy, economically armed to the teeth, and in alliance with the government. This tendency has been long in existence, even before the war, and is in itself nothing new or special, except that quantity has now been converted into quality.

Though this tendency was already observable before the war, it is now a very different matter, and the process of trustification in industry has advanced with such rapidity, in a comparatively short space of time, that it becomes the duty of the communists to reorganise their forces in many directions in order to keep pace with the consolidation of the forces of the enemy. Therefore our slogans for the reorganisation of the trade unions according to industries, for the formation of huge trade union combinations, of capable fighting trade union cartels, of suitable factory council organisations (where factory councils exist), and to direct our trade union work, not only against the immediate capitalists with whom we are in contact, but against all trust capital and its consequences.

Our second main line of policy concerns our standpoint towards capitalist stabilisation. This is the main point of departure of the absolute differences existing between us and the social democrats, who support this stabilisation in every possible way. They call upon the workers to have patience, to submit. They are actively engaged in helping the capitalists to hold production consultations according to our pattern, in which the factory managers report to the workers on the production. In this respect that comrade was perfectly right who observed in the discussion that the bourgeoisie has learnt much from us. The formation of certain groups of labour aristocracy, and the attitude adopted by the social democrats, are inducing their politicians to summon a section of the working class to co-operate in the work of capitalist reconstruction, great hopes being here placed on the objective difference in the position of the workers in employment and those out of work.

We must take into account the important circumstance that in a country like Germany, in which the process of capitalist rationalisation is proceeding with the intensest rapidity, the chronic and enormous unemployment (the unemployed run into

millions) is dividing the workers into employed and unemployed. Here every worker lives in fear of losing his job, and the bourgeoisie speculates to a wide extent on this fear. In this speculation the bourgeoisie is striving to utilise the social democrats and the trade unions for the purpose of moulding the workers into instruments for helping them out of their present difficult position.

At the present time the general situation is extremely favourable for the communists. The communists can, under present conditions, work on an extremely broad base, for this process of rationalisation is pressing very heavily indeed on the working class. The communists must mobilise the working masses who are weighed down by these burdens. This is the foundation stone for the whole of our work in the trade unions. For our trade union campaign the first prerequisite is to combine the efforts of the employed and the unemployed workers, to admit the unemployed into the trade unions, and to mobilise the working masses for the campaign.

The main features of specific importance in our trade union work are: First, the preparation of a great general battle of the working class, secondly, the gathering together of those various sections of the working class now objectively separated from one another to a certain extent by the present position in capitalist economy; thirdly, the entire difference of our standpoint from that of the social democrats in the question of rationalisation; and finally, the mobilisation by us of all proletarian forces, our support of the unemployed movement, and our demands for the reorganisation of the trade unions according to industries. This facilitates for the communists the work of leading the working class (which is not yet on our side) from these tasks over to the tasks of the immediate struggle, i. e., to the comprehensive and fundamental political slogans (slogans of the workers' government, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc., etc.).

I must here devote a few words to a question which appears to have caused a certain amount of uncertainty, to judge by the written inquiries which I have received. When I spoke of the advance to be made by the Red International of Labour Unions under present conditions, of its increased and more energetic appearance in the arena of the international labour movement, and of the work to be done by the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union in the R. I. L. U., I had no thought of suggesting that all this was to imply any alteration in the decisions come to by us with reference to the Anglo Russian Committee, etc. Here there is no reason whatever to depart from the tactics which we have pursued and continue to pursue. Our tactics are being tested by actual experience, like everything else in this world. And that our tactics are standing the test of experience no one can deny.

No one can deny that, thanks to our tactics, we have not only not destroyed our connection with the British working class, but are even increasing our influence over the British working class from day to day. This cannot be disputed. And even should the Anglo-Russian Committee not be destined to live long (we must reckon objectively with actual possibilities), we have already thrown up a number of supplementary trenches, the Anglo Russian Miners' Committee, etc.

It is not necessary to speak of the growing influence of the masses of the miners as the most important section of the most advanced of the masses of the British workers, in whose footsteps the other sections inevitably follow, upon the British proletariat.

Has the test of experience fully confirmed our tactics in this case? Or can it be maintained that our influence has lessened, and that we have not done everything possible to revolutionise the British working class? I think that nobody can go so far as to say that our tactics have not proved the best possible. Precisely here we have pursued the sole effective and sole revolutionary available tactics. This is what I maintain, and I am of the opinion that no one has the slightest reason to reject these tactics. Every definite concrete historical situation has its centre of gravity in one particular thing; with another situation, however, in another thing; the one penetrates the other, the one goes over into the other.

We must not by any means break with the Anglo-Russian Committee, we must continue along the line which we have

commenced, and we must accentuate this line still further in the future. But other and further steps must also be taken. The fact that our tactics have proved to be perfectly correct affords us the possibility of taking these further steps. One step forward is the fact that the tactics of the British labour movement have been brought to a higher stage, so that the distrust which existed in the British labour movement towards such an organisation as the R. I. L. U., compared with the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, has now disappeared to a great extent. On the other hand we must bring about an increased internationalisation of the labour movement. This internationalisation of the labour movement is a most urgent necessity at the present juncture, as the lessons of the British strike have amply proved.

The obvious conclusion is that we must now direct our course towards increased activity in the Red International of Labour Unions, the more so that we can only be in complete agreement with those parts of Comrade Lozovskys' speech in which he told us of the prospects opening in the East, in the countries of the Pacific Ocean, in South America, etc.

I should like to add a few words on our Parties, and on the epoch they are now passing through. I touched upon this subject in my report, and should like to supplement my remarks.

The Communist Parties came into being, as everybody is aware, during a period of storm and stress, a period of direct assault upon the capitalist regime. During this period, lasting a fairly long time, a peculiar division of labour came about between the social democratic and communist parties, a division caused by the fact that the period was one of immediate attack upon the capitalist regime. The Communist Parties cried: "Go, storm, smite the foe full in the face!" The social democratic parties buried themselves in the petty trifles of the moment... (Lozovsky: "And at the same time struck the communists in the face.")

Apart from this, a failing from which our Parties suffer to a considerable extent is their insufficient ability to combine their revolutionary aims with the daily needs of the workers. Here we must enter into competition with the social democrats, and learn this line of work better. And not only for the purpose of combining this work with our general revolutionary aims, but for the purpose of bringing trade union work thoroughly within the ken of our Communist Parties, which have hitherto been trained to a different type of work, and have not yet learned the whole art of combining partial demands relating to daily needs with the general slogans and great aims of the Party, and further for the purpose of giving this work such forms that its specifically communist character is clearly shown, and its influence used for leading the working masses to the conquest of proletarian power.

During the present period the Communist Parties have also to learn not merely to grope about in economic questions, but to attack economic problems in their direct connection with our policy. The first task of the Communist Parties is to acquire the capacity of combining the small demands with the great tasks, the daily trade union struggle with the political struggle, and to cultivate the ability of perceiving the conclusions to be drawn from the urgent economic demands arising out of the existing situation, combining these conclusions with the great slogans of the revolutionary proletariat.

This process of dialectic combination of small affairs with great conclusions is the school in which the Communist Parties are being trained at the present time to the consciousness of their most fundamental task for the present epoch.

It has been rightly pointed out here by various comrades that even in the countries where the capitalist stabilisation is most firm, there is none the less a growing consciousness of the class struggle. The workers of these countries will be the sooner revolutionised when the Communist Parties have become perfect masters of the art of manoeuvring under the new conditions, when the Communist Parties defeat the social democratic parties, not merely because they are a highly revolutionary party, but because they have proved themselves to be the better defenders of the interests of the workers in their everyday struggles, and lead them forward on the path of their daily needs to the great goal of the world revolution.

This is the situation. And when we survey its results, we find a plus in favour of the Comintern.



Even if we take **Great Britain**, where the position is somewhat peculiar, since the Communist Party of Great Britain came into the world as a very weak seedling indeed, consisting literally of only a handful of people, struggling against unheard of difficulties, and unsupported by a single intellectual (a great obstacle to the development of the movement, but on the other hand ensuring positive results). This was a Party which was only referred to with a smile, and mentioned in the bourgeois press as if the Russians, when speaking of Soviet trade, meant by this the import of their own agents. But it very soon appeared that it was by no means a question of any fantastic "import" from other countries, but a real and systematic Party work by the Communist Party of Great Britain among the masses.

I have already spoken on this subject, and need not deal with it further. I observed that the Communist Party of Great Britain has already penetrated far into the masses in England. The British Party is one of the few Parties which has proved able to exercise an influence on the trade union movement among the workers. Thus one of the members of the Political Bureau of the C. P. G. B. is for instance, a trade unionist of established reputation, spoken of with respect by even our enemies in the trade union movement. It is thanks to the fact that the Communist Party of Great Britain has been able to exercise influence upon the trade union movement that it has become a force with which our enemies have to reckon. At one time the Party could be passed over with a smile, but now there is not an article written by any bourgeois politician which can ignore the Communism which has become so obvious a danger, so obviously an explosive at the base of British great Power imperialism (Lozovsky: Thanks to the Minority Movement). Yes, thanks to the Minority Movement.

Let us take our Communist Party in Germany. Has it not learnt something of late? It has long striven to become something like a mass party. Here it has been defeated again and again. It must, however, be admitted that of late such facts as that of the plebiscite for the expropriation of the princes, politically organised and led by the Communist Party, have secured the Communist Party its mass influence. And although the C. P. of Germany has not yet become a mass party in the strict sense of the word, still it already exercises a mass influence, and will become a mass party in the actual meaning of the term as soon as it has learnt to increase and organise its influence over the masses. At the present time we see a situation in which our comrades carry out a brilliantly successful mass campaign. When this campaign is over, they begin another, but meanwhile the organisatory results of the last campaign have not been thoroughly secured. This organisatory security must be learnt. As soon as our comrades have learnt to secure their results by organisatory measures, the C. P. of Germany will rapidly advance to the position of a mass party. I need add nothing further on this subject.

Approximately the same may be said for a number of other Communist Parties in various countries. Our present era is an era of advance, and at such a moment the anti-Leninist deviations occurring in a number of Parties are especially detrimental. It is true that only small strata have been influenced by these deviations, but they have none the less hampered our work. Their centre has been in Germany, although, of course, only in some parts of the C. P.

When speaking of deviations, I must emphasise that we fully recognise and draw attention to the existence of Right and "left" deviations, and to the necessity of combatting these. The dialectics of the present situation are such that the ultra-Left can scarcely shift a fraction "to the Left" without beginning to talk exactly like the ultra Right. The phraseology may differ, but the substance is the same. This is a confirmation of the thesis that the only correct and revolutionary policy to be followed is the Bolshevik-Leninist policy. Deviations to the Right or "Left" find themselves in the same camp. If we take the ultra-Right expelled from the Comintern, Souvarine for instance, or such people as Rosmer, Monatte, etc.; if we observe what is being written by the ultra-Right of France and the ultra-Left of Germany, what they say about the Soviet Union, about our relations to the peasantry, or about the dictatorship

of the proletariat, we find that there is nothing to distinguish them from each other. There is practically no difference; such slight shades as exist are of little political significance.

There may be some variations in political viewpoints and points of departure, but as a general rule they all go with extraordinary speed along the same road. We must defeat both of these flanks. It need not be said that in one country we shall find the centre of gravity in one spot, and in another somewhere else, but in every case we must direct our fire against both these deviations, for only their defeat can ensure for us the pursuance of the correct Bolshevik policy.

Another observation on the events in China. There is nothing special to add on this subject. It is only necessary to keep in mind the necessity of solving the extremely complicated and difficult problem of the transition from one combination of forces to another. I pointed out the main difficulty yesterday. This difficulty arises from the objective inconsistency involved in the necessity of maintaining the largest bloc possible for a certain stage of the combat against imperialism, and on the other hand the necessity of developing the peasant movement. This is the objective inconsistency of the present moment. How is it to be solved? It must be solved by approaching the second task gradually, thus ensuring the highest degree of effectiveness.

With respect to future prospects, I have dealt with these in general, and it seems to me that this suffices. With respect to the relations between the Kummintang and the Communist Party, — I have received a written inquiry on this — our comrades are probably aware that close relations, and fairly close co-operation, exists between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. I can only confirm the fact that certain prospects have been opened of late in connection with the victories of the Canton armies; the centre of gravity has shifted slightly to the Left, as may be seen from the decisions of the last session of the Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, which you will all have read in the newspapers. Here we see an unchaining of revolutionary forces accompanied by an inevitable participation of the peasantry in the revolutionary movement, leading to a certain regrouping in the Kuomintang; its Left wing will increase in strength, its Right wing gradually lose all power.

The struggle of the British miners, which I should have dealt with in much greater detail had I had not had so many matters to discuss, has proved the great powers of endurance and courage of this section of the working class. It opens before us tremendous revolutionary prospects in Great Britain. These tremendous prospects will be realised in any case, whether the miners' struggle ends in victory or defeat. The results of a victory need not be discussed here; but even in the case of a half defeat, or of an unfavourable issue, still the struggle will have had an enormous and unprecedented influence in revolutionising the whole working class. This process of revolutionisation is still going on as a tremendous force. The working class of Great Britain constitutes one of the main strongholds of the proletariat within the European working class, and it is perfectly natural that the revolutionisation of this section of the working class, the transference of the guns of this fortress into the hands of the revolutionists, means a mighty regrouping of the forces of the international proletariat in general, and of the European proletariat in particular.

We have just received a number of telegrams informing us that whilst we are conferring here, the process of haggling and bargaining over the British miners is continuing. There has been some secret conference between the government and the representatives of the general council. It is plain that the question here is as to whether the General Council is going to sell the miners' struggle or not.

And it is equally plain that some of the miners' leaders have a hand in the matter, among them Cook, who has pursued a very ambiguous policy of late. Here we must be prepared for everything, and must support the miners' struggle with undiminished energy. I believe therefore, that you will be in agreement with me when I propose that I end my concluding speech at our XV. Party Conference by the words: **Long live the British miners!**" (Enthusiastic applause.)

## (Telegraphic Reports.)

**Second Day. Evening Session.**

Moscow, October 28th, 1926.

**Comrade RYKOV**

at yesterday's session, delivered his report upon the economic situation in the Soviet Union and the tasks of the Party.

Comrade Rykov declared that the period of reconstruction has now been completely passed. Various branches of industry have passed the pre-war level both qualitatively and quantitatively. This reconstruction of agriculture and industry has taken place under quite different circumstances from those existing before the war. The reconstruction of agriculture took place under a radical alteration of property relations in the land, under new forms of taxation and parallel with the entrance of the co-operatives into the village and with the creation of new collective, economic forms, agricultural communes. The reconstruction of industry also took place together with a revolutionisation of the whole economy. Above all the industrial reconstruction took place parallel with the carrying out of the electrification plans. For this reason one can only use the term "reconstruction" in a limited sense as the whole economy has been radically changed.

The period of reconstruction could only be passed through by tremendous internal accumulation. For this reason the opinion of some comrades that there is a difference of principle between the period of reconstruction and the period of industrialisation, is incorrect, because previously our economy lived upon its reserves. During the period of reconstruction we had not only accumulated raw stuffs and rallied the working class, but we have also formed great masses of circulating capital. Now the industry which previously worked with a deficit, produces with complete amortisation 500 million roubles profit. Therefore the most important difference between the present and the past stages of the development is that now our resources must be used to enlarge our basic capital, to found new undertakings and to make new investments.

Our capital investments have three sources: the accumulated capital of the industry itself, the transformation of the accumulation from other economic sources into industry and the savings of the population. The opinion of the oppositional comrades that gold emissions could serve as capital for the state industry, is basically false because such emissions would reduce real wages, interfere with the circulation of commodities and produce crises. The capital investment must take place first of all in the engineering industry, then in the fuel producing industries, the electrification plan and transport.

The most important immediate task in the reorganisation of industry is the carrying out of the economy campaign and the alteration of the administrative system in our industrial undertakings. The party conference must give the Central Committee general directions for the carrying out of this task.

**Third Day, Morning and Evening Session.**

Moscow, Oct. 28th, 1926.

These two sessions were occupied by the

**Discussion on the Speech of Comrade Rykov.**

Once again no single speaker of the opposition took part in the discussion.

The speakers taking part in the debate were mostly workers from the provinces who stressed the correctness of Rykov's thesis and pointed out that in the work of industrial reconstruction the party had achieved complete harmony with the working class which was particularly to be seen in the provinces where the process of industrial reconstruction proceeds at a rapid rate. The opposition has suffered a defeat on the whole front. Its silence at the conference when economic questions were being dealt with, although it is in these questions the opposition has criticised the party most strongly, strengthened

Proceeding to the question of agricultural policy, Comrade Rykov declared that a closer connection must be established between industry and agriculture. All information upon the differentiation taking place in the villages proves that instead of the decay of the middle peasantry there is a general improvement in the situation of all classes of the peasantry, and above all a strengthening of the middle peasantry to be observed. The contention of the opposition that our policy with regard to the peasants is a capitulation in face of the Kulaks is completely refuted by the information concerning the differentiation which is proceeding amongst the peasantry and by our tax policy in the villages.

In connection with the growth of private capital the opposition contends that the private capital will swallow us. The following figures prove the absurdity of this contention: In 1923/24 the share of private capital in large-scale commerce was 22% but in 1925/26 it has shrunk to only 9%. The respective figures for retail commerce are 57% and 39%. In other sections of our economy the role of private capital is quite insignificant. We see, therefore, that far from private capital swallowing us, we are forcing it from the field of commerce in those places where we can easily control and regulate it.

In the concluding part of his speech Comrade Rykov dealt with the questions of shortage of commodity and with the price policy. The most important factor in this connection is the existence of the "scissors" between the prices of agricultural and industrial commodities. The good harvests in the last two years made it possible to lower agricultural prices, but in connection with the lowering of the prices of industrial commodities we have only had minimal successes recently. The opposition demands a policy of increasing prices, we, however, pursue a policy of price reductions. The opposition forgets that the policy of high prices means a coalition not with the village poor, but with the village Kulaks and the Nepmen, because high prices would make industrial commodities inaccessible for the village poor and even for the middle peasantry. High prices would mean the breaking of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

The opinions of the opposition must be called defeatist in a double sense. First of all the opposition expresses the defeatist tendencies of a few party groups, the opposition does not believe in the power of the working class and retreats in a panic of fear before the smallest difficulty in the way of socialist reconstruction. Second, if the party would follow the advice of the opposition it would suffer a complete defeat.

Comrade Rykov concluded his speech with the following words:

"The leader of the opposition, Comrade Trotzky, forgets that it is good to be a defeatist during an imperialist war, but bad to be a defeatist when the proletariat is fighting for the consolidation of its dictatorship." (Protracted applause.)

merely the impression of the untenability of the ideology of the opposition. After the economic difficulties which appeared in the autumn of 1925, were overcome, the interest which the opposition had aroused in the beginning, vanished. The declarations of the opposition that an increase of the shortage of commodity was to be expected, were unfounded because they did not take into consideration the speedy development of the small and middle industry. In the immediate future the attention of the party must be increasingly directed to the questions of the reconstruction of economy, the building up of local industry and the consolidation of local finances.

In describing the progress of industrial development in the Soviet Union, the speakers declared that this development is proceeding upon the basis of a consolidation of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry and that the complete carrying out of the tasks of industrialisation is only possible by the further maintenance of this alliance.

## Fourth Day, Morning Session.

Moscow, 29th October 1926.

The discussion upon the report of comrade Rykov upon the economic situation was concluded. 28 speakers took part in the discussion.

Comrade RYKOV

then delivered his closing speech.

Comrade Rykov declared that numerous practical proposals of the various speakers deserved consideration. A comparison of the reconstruction of industry and of the extension of the basic capital of industry in the Soviet Union with the same process abroad reveals the fact that the process of reconstruction in the Soviet Union is proceeding twice as quickly as that abroad, with the exception of the United States. The continuation of this work of reconstruction demands the greatest possible systematisation in the management, nevertheless, the central organs must not interfere in questions of details and the local peculiarities of the various districts must be taken into consideration. The greatest possible attention must be paid to the industrialisation of each district of the Soviet Union. Separatist tendencies must however be avoided.

The discussion showed that there is no other parallel platform to that of the C. C. in economic questions. It is not probable that the silence of the opposition means agreement with the theses of the C. C. however. After its recent attitude it would have been the duty of the opposition to come forward and explain what it is which separates it from the Party as a whole. That is all the more necessary as the platform of the opposition is not merely basically false and untenable, but it is also demagogic and therefore dangerous for the Party. The opposition is playing for support amongst the unemployed by proposals to increase the taxation of the peasantry, to raise new millions for the state industry, to make new increases of wages etc. The acceptance of the opportunistic platform of the opposition would mean the dissolution of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry. It would have been the duty of the opposition to declare before this conference whether it still retains this platform or whether it has abandoned it. The Party conference must draw its own conclusions from the non-appearance of the opposition.

After the concluding speech of comrade Rykov the Party conference unanimously adopted the theses put forward by him as a basis and referred them to a commission for final settlement.

Comrade TOMSKY

then delivered his speech upon

### the activity and the tasks of the trade unions.

He declared:

The number of workers in the Soviet Union is steadily growing. On the 1st April 1925 the total was 6,035,300. This figure does not include the members of the working communes. On the 1st April 1926 the total number of workers in the Soviet Union was 7,700,600. That is an increase of 27½%. On the 1st April 1925 the total number of members of the trade unions was 6,950,400. On the 1st April 1926 the total membership was 8,760,600. That was an increase of 26.2%. The difference between the number of workers employed and the number of members of the trade unions is explained by the non-registration of the seasonal workers, a section of the landworkers and the unemployed.

The contention of the opposition that the trade unions have been extended by the admission of non-proletarian elements, and that the number of workers in the state industry and in transport is only 3,000,000, is untrue. In the period already mentioned the membership of the Transport Workers Union increased by 22%. The increase in the number of employees as distinct from manual workers, in the same period was 19.4%. The number of actual manual workers on the 1st April 1926 represented 53.1% of all members of the trade unions and the number of organised transport workers represented 14.9% of all the members of the labour unions. The number of organised public employees including those in transport was 22% of the total trade union membership.

The contention of the opposition that the state apparatus in its composition and its standard of living is developing ever farther away from the proletariat and into the hands of the rising town intelligentsia, the traders and the kulaks, is refuted by the statistics concerning the standard of living of the employees of the state. 73% of the state employees in the towns and 90½% of those in the country earn a wage of less than 80 Roubles. Broad masses take an active part in the work of the unions. The number of shop councils has grown from 30,000 to 56,000, and their membership from 200,000 to 800,000. This means a number of 2,000,000 workers active in the unions.

The Union of Land and Forest Workers has particular success to show in this connection. 15,000 landworkers and 6,934 shepherds took part in the newly organised workers committees of this union. 3,245 landworkers and shepherds took part in the district committees of this union. This is the sort of success which carries the influence of the Party and of the trade unions into the village.

At the last elections of the lower trade union officials, 50 to 80% of the elected officials were quite new. An increase has taken place with regard to the participation of the women in the activity of the trade unions, nevertheless, this increase cannot be regarded as sufficient.

The cultural work of the unions is being strengthened by the so-called "red corners" in the branch rooms etc. of the trade unions. In order to extend the net of union clubs it is necessary to erect new buildings under the general building plan. The liquidation of illiteracy has made great progress.

The weakness of the trade union work is very often shown in the lack of sufficient representation for just demands of the workers on their part as against the economic bodies. The phenomenon which we could observe last year, i. e., the unconditional united front between the red directors and the officials of the trade unions, has disappeared. In its place has come a passive toleration of the economic measures of the red directors on the part of the unionists. The unions must pay more attention to the petty daily needs of the workers. These requirements of the workers express a healthy interest for improvement in the common work of socialist reconstruction.

The question of conferences of production has very often caused differences of opinion, particularly amongst the economists. The importance of these conferences has been proved without a doubt. The contention of the opposition that these conferences are dying, is without basis. On the contrary, these conferences are working well and are now able to discuss more general questions like the situation of production, etc. In recent years thousands of working men and women have been advanced to various administrative posts through these conferences. However, there are still certain deficiencies in connection with the carrying out of this system of advancement. For this reason the trade unions must pay greater attention to this question.

At the present time the question of wages is of especial importance, but neither demagoguery nor the irresponsible attitude of the opposition are able to offer us any solutions. The carrying out of the proposals made by the opposition during the severe economic difficulties in April would have led to a rise in prices, to a depreciation of the Tchervonetz and thus to an actual decrease in real wages. We acted correctly when we rejected these proposals. Only after the harvest prospects had improved, the productivity of labour had increased and we had observed a levelling of prices, did we make the proposal to the Polit Bureau of the C. C. after conferring with the comrades in the unions, that the Polit Bureau should discuss the question of raising wages. This question had to be dealt with in a concrete manner.

Unemployment in our country has its own special character owing to its seasonal character and the excess of the population on the land. There is no unemployment amongst the qualified workers. The statement that in consequence of the process of differentiation in the village, the village poor are leaving the country side for the towns, is incorrect. The migration into the towns is specially marked amongst the youth of the villages, particularly amongst the sons of the middle peasantry. Unemployment amongst the youths who leave school and find no place in industry, must receive the greatest possible attention. This question is particularly acute because without work these youths easily come under the influence of socially dangerous elements. The struggle against vagrancy must be strengthened and the

youths must be brought under the influence of workers organisations by improving the workers clubs.

The relations between the party organisations and the trade unions show definite improvements. Nevertheless the decisions of the 14th party conference in this connection must receive more attention in the lower organs of the party.

Dealing with the unions and the question of international policy, Comrade Tomsky proved the incorrectness of the attitude of the opposition which demanded the liquidation of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This proposal would mean in practice that the British communists would leave the trade unions. This is false. The most important task of our Communist brother Parties

is to win the trade unions and thus the working masses by untiring efforts.

In conclusion Comrade Tomsky declared:

"Our trade unions have achieved great successes. In the nine years of Soviet Power we have created a firmly organised and centralised trade union movement which has two million functionaries. The unions have worked and fought hand in hand with the party during the civil war, together with the party they have built the Soviet Power and now they are building socialism with the party and will continue with it until our aim is achieved." (Stormy applause.)

### Fourth Day, Evening Session.

Moscow, October 30th, 1926.

The

### Discussion following the speech of Comrade Tomsky

upon the activity and the tasks of the trade unions took place on the evening session on Oct. 29th.

25 speakers took part in the discussion.

The chief question discussed was that of the co-operation between the economists and the trade unionists in connection with the management of production and the solution of labour questions. The speakers in the discussion stressed, however, apart from this, the importance of the cultural work in the unions.

#### Comrade LOZOVSKY

described the great tasks of the Red International of Labour Unions, the winning of the working masses away from the influence of Amsterdam and, particularly from the influence of the so-called American methods. The working masses of Europe will be won not by the spirit of America but by the spirit of the trade unions of the U. S. S. R.

In his concluding speech

#### Comrade TOMSKY

pointed out that numerous speakers had touched partial questions of the practical work in the trade unions. These questions will be dealt with at the coming congress of the trade unions. The complicated situation of industry and the work of reconstruction made the tasks of the Soviet economists very difficult. There had been an excellent support by the trade unionists of the economists in relation to questions concerning the organisation and the management of production. The improvement of the material situation of the proletariat and the raising of its cultural level caused a growing desire amongst broad masses of the workers to take an active part in the work of socialist reconstruction. The proposed workers control commissions should serve to organise this mass initiative in the shops, in accordance with the teaching of Lenin to draw ever broader proletarian masses into the work of economic reconstructions.

The interests of the working youth are considered by the trade unions in close co-operation with the Young Communist League. The trade unions will direct still greater attention to the general education of the youth, and support the work of the Educational Commissariat.

The closing speech of Comrade Tomsky was interrupted very often by applause. After the speech the Conference unanimously adopted the theses submitted by Comrade Tomsky.

### Declaration of Comrades Shlapnikov and Medvedyev.

#### Comrade MOLOTOV

then read a statement of the Central Committee upon the declaration of Shlapnikov and Medvedyev to the C. C. and the C. C. C.

The statement of the C. C. and the C. C. C. declares:

"The C. C. and the C. C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. inform with pleasure all party members that Comrades Medvedyev and Shlapnikov have made a declaration to the C. C. and the

C. C. C. in which they do not merely admit the damaging nature of their fractional work, but in which they abandon the basically false opinions which they have previously propagated. With this declaration a further step is made in the decay of the oppositional block. This means the complete and absolute victory of the idea of the Leninist unity of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. The declaration of Comrades Medvedyev and Shlapnikov will be published today in the 'Pravda'."

The declaration of Shlapnikov and Medvedyev addressed to the Polit Bureau of the C. C. and to the Presidium of the C. C. C. dated 29th of October reads as follows:

"In the interest of the party and its real unity we openly declare: 1. The letter of Comrade Medvedyev to the comrades in Baku (1924) contains a number of erroneous opinions directed against certain principles of the party and in contradiction with Leninism and the principles of the Comintern.

2. The most erroneous part of this letter was that which mentioned the methods and the activity of the Comintern and which contains an odious comparison with regard to one of the Comintern sections ("petty bourgeois slaves who are supported by Russian money"). This important section of the letter is completely false and does not reflect our real attitude towards the Comintern.

3. The sentence mentioning the Red International of Labour Unions is also false because it permits the assumption that the author of the letter is in favour of the liquidation of the R. I. L. U. We consider this formulation to be false. In connection with the R. I. L. U. we stand upon the basis of the decisions of the party.

4. We are decisive and unconditional supporters of the Comintern and just as decisive opponents of the Second International. We believe that the leaders of the present social democratic parties have betrayed the interests of the working class. We believe that they are the agents of the bourgeoisie.

5. We recognise that a number of similar vulgar errors have caused accusations to be made against us in the columns of the "Pravda" and the "Bolshevik".

6. We consider the polemical tone and a number of biting expressions in the article of Shlapnikov in number 17 of the "Bolshevik" to be impermissible.

7. In connection with the "Baku opposition" we directed a number of abrupt demands both by word of mouth and by letter to the C. C. and the C. C. C. We regard this as having been incorrect.

8. We decisively and unconditionally condemn the methods used by us in the fractional struggle. We also condemn every organisational expression of opinions which are in contradiction with the decisions of the party. We appeal to our sympathisers who have commenced to build fractional underground groupings, to immediately liquidate the same. We hold the decisions of the congresses and the conferences of the party, its C. C. and its C. C. C. to be absolutely binding for us and we will carry them out unconditionally.

With communist greetings

Shlapnikov, Medvedyev.