

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 89

23rd December 1926

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

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. *Eighth to Tenth Session.*

Full Report.

Eighth Session.

Continuation of the Discussion of the First Point on the Agenda.

Moscow, Nov. 26, 1926.

Comrade THALMANN (Chairman):

The eight Session of the VII. Enlarged Executive is open. Comrade Remmele will report for the Mandate Commission:

Comrade REMMELE:

The Mandate Commission completed its work in the course of four sessions. The Plenum consists of 191 members, of which 100 are voting delegates. Of this 100, there are 38 members of the Executive, the rest are delegates. There are in attendance also 91 delegates with consultative votes. With regard to these consultative votes, we had to make various deletions. Decidedly more delegates were announced than for whom we issued mandates. We proceeded on the principle that delegates with consultative votes should be admitted only to the extent that the conditions unquestionably warranted. After this decision was made no protests were received.

* * *

The report is received unanimously..

Comrade TAN-PING-SHAN (China):

Comrades, I should like to make a few remarks on the question of the peasant movement in China as well as on the stabilisation of capitalism, questions which were dealt with by Comrade Bukharin in his report.

We know that on the question of stabilisation several conceptions have been put forth here. One of these standpoints is that, thanks to the formation of the Anglo-American bloc, the antagonisms between England and America are alleged to be gradually overcome. Comrades, this is entirely wrong, for in reality

we see a competition between England and America for the widening of their spheres of influence, we see how this competition is being intensified in the Far East, especially in China. Simultaneously the sharpening of the antagonism between America and Japan must be taken into consideration. These antagonisms will in the future inevitably lead to an armed clash.

The second standpoint is that Europe is an American colony, that capitalism is already cured and that it has now entered upon the same high road of development it formerly trod. This is also entirely untrue. I shall not take this question up in detail since our delegation, the Chinese delegation, is in complete solidarity with the standpoint of Comrade Bukharin. He has given us a correct analysis of capitalist stabilisation, he furnishes proof of its relativity, its partial character, its lability. He proves this also from the standpoint of the present-day revolutionary situation.

At the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U., Comrade Bukharin said the following:

"The international revolution is today marching in three columns, in the East there marches a column of hundreds of millions of the Chinese people, in the West, it advances in the menacing strides of the British miners, and in the Soviet Union — in the increased offensive against the capitalist elements of our economy."

Comrade Bukharin, in his printed report to the Enlarged E. C. C. I., said further:

"At the present time the support of the most important centres of the international revolutionary movement — the British workers, the Chinese revolution and the U. S. S. R. — is one of the most important tasks of the Comintern."

Comrade Bukharin, in applying one of the fundamental tenets of Leninism on the question of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples and the proletarian revolution also to the concrete reality of the present day, combines the three chief factors of the present revolutionary situation into a united front against their common foe, against capitalism, against the present capitalist situation, and thereby emphasises the role and importance of the Chinese revolution as one of the chief factors of the revolutionary movement of the present time.

Now as to the question of the peasantry, as to the criticism of the peasant movement, which was raised by Comrade Bukharin in his report. We heard from Comrade Bukharin about the mistakes of the Chinese Communists. He told us:

"The chief error committed by the Chinese Communist Party, despite its generally correct policy, was the insufficient attention of the Party towards the peasant question. Unnecessary fear as to the development of the peasant movement and insufficient insistence on the necessity of conducting agrarian reforms in the areas occupied by the Kuomintang constituted the main trend of the errors."

The mistakes in the work among the peasantry ascribed to us by Com. Bukharin, we of course acknowledged, yet we believe however, that this mere acknowledgement is not sufficient. The causes of the mistakes made must also be found in order to avoid their repetition and in order to remedy them. I believe that these causes are the following:

1. The C.P. of China is, as you know, numerically still weak, and likewise also organisationally. At the time of the Shanghai events of last year the Chinese Communist Party, grew up in the process of the revolutionary struggle. It is today five times as strong as it was prior to these events; yet owing to the vast extent of the country and the rapidly augmenting activity of the peasantry, the peasant movement arose spontaneously in many places, thus, e. g. the uprising of the "Red Lances", and a number of other peasant organisations. Due to the lack of leadership, the Chinese peasant movement is extremely unorganised, it lacks a clear agrarian programme and uniform slogans for which the peasantry of the whole country would fight.

2. The Chinese comrades, especially with regard to the peasant question, are still inexperienced and have little theoretical training. The situation of the peasantry in China is a very complicated one. They still suffer under the prejudices and survivals of the feudal order. Two years of the Chinese peasant movement gives us still too little experience in order to cope with the complicated tasks that confront the revolutionary peasant movement in China. For this reason we hope to learn from the Communist International and its Sections the theory and practice of the peasant movement. Only on this condition shall we be able to solve the Chinese question, in spite of all its difficulties.

Our mistakes in the peasant question are also determined by objective causes. The first of these causes is the following: during the recent years in the Chinese revolution the revolutionary flood alternated with the revolutionary ebb, that is, at the time when the People's Army had to begin its retreat from Peking, and the national revolutionary Canton army had not yet gone beyond the borders of Kwantung province, we inevitably had to consider, to a greater or less extent, the reactionary mood.

At the same time however, it must be pointed out that even now we have not yet worked out an agrarian programme. This is our greatest shortcoming.

The second and last cause consists in that the Chinese revolution urgently required a national-revolutionary united front, a front of all revolutionary strata of the population against the imperialists and against the feudal relics. We must safeguard the interests of the peasantry, but on the other hand we must maintain and solidify the united front of the national-revolutionary movement. In so contradictory a situation it is not so easy to maintain a correct tactical line. Our mistake consists in that we did not sufficiently utilise this contradiction for the development of the peasant movement and for the simultaneous consolidation of the national united front.

These basic causes of our mistakes were recognised by us, and we shall endeavour to correct them in every possible way.

The position of the peasantry in China consists in that a process of the gradual concentration of land into the hands of a group of big landowners is taking place, that the oppression of the peasantry is growing daily, that pauperisation is increasing, that the landowners are exploiting the peasants, without taking any sort of measures for the improvement of the conditions of labour. One result of this is the ruin of agriculture and the intensification of the class struggle on the countryside. In such a situation we had to adopt the proper decisions in the question of land tenure and the drawing in of broader masses of peasants into political administration, otherwise we should not be able to conduct the Chinese revolution to the end, nor would we be able to hold the successes and achievements gained recently.

What policy must we pursue in regard to the peasantry? In this question we stand completely on the standpoint of Comrade Bukharin: the development of the Chinese peasant movement, while at the same time maintaining the united front of all strata of the population in the national revolutionary movement against imperialism. I believe that the standpoint of Comrade Bukharin must serve as our starting point in solving the question of our tactics towards the Chinese peasantry. Only this standpoint can protect us against Right or Left deviations on this question.

I shall refrain from any detailed discussion of the situation of the peasantry at this time since an extensive description of the conditions of the Chinese peasantry was given in my general report on the Chinese question.

Comrade RIESE (Wedding Opposition — Berlin):

Comrades, in considering the sphere of the tasks of the Communist Party of Germany as the leader of the masses we must ask: How strong is German capitalism and whither goes its course? The world war, which was essentially the struggle for the division of the world market, robbed Germany of all sources of raw material. Consequently, it was no longer possible for Germany to find any sort of major improvement in its position. The Ruhr resistance, instigated by the German bourgeoisie, was intended to serve to loosen somewhat the shackles of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Because of the superiority of the Entente nations, the victors, in a military as well as economic sense, this Ruhr resistance inevitably collapsed and German capitalism surrendered: it agreed to the Dawes Plan. After the Dawes Plan Germany could be considered only as a colony of the victorious countries.

The relative stabilisation and the good market which, in the opinion of certain comrades, we now have in Germany, will become considerably worse after the termination of the British strike.

The fact that in the Ruhr area today, as in other coal districts, big overtime shifts have been put on, that all the yards which were glutted with coal prior to the British strike are now empty — all this is not a sign of the beginning upward development of capitalism, it is accounted for by the British miners' strike.

This disrupted economy is to be set going again through rationalisation, which is being effected by German capitalism in the most brutal forms. At the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U., Comrade Bukharin said that Germany was developing into an imperialism in full bloom. Since conditions have not changed even through Locarno and Thoiry, I believe that this view of a Germany developing into full bloom imperialism is surely wrong. I see absolutely no strengthening in German economy, and if the comrades think that the fluid money, which we find in Germany today, is a symptom of the recovery of Germany economy, then I will tell them that this fluidity means a depression, that this fluidity of money exists because the money cannot be absorbed in German economy.

I look upon conditions in Germany, and upon the policy of the Communist Party, somewhat differently from Comrade Thälmann.

The ultra-Left in Germany last year, when the German capitalists launched the rationalisation programme, when the factories closed their gates and the unemployed spontaneously,

without any leadership from the Communist Party, organised demonstrations, demanded that the Communist Party put upon its agenda the question of the unemployed, in closest connection with that of the factory councils. We were thereupon told that such proposals were anti-Leninist, anti-Communist and ultra-Left sentiment, that it was necessary in our whole policy to take into consideration the getting of the A. D. G. B. to interest itself in the question of the unemployed. But when the A. D. G. B. nevertheless did nothing it was again our comrades who told us that we had to separate ourselves from these unemployed masses. Thereby the K. A. P.ist and syndicalist sentiments found wide-spread acceptance among the unemployed.

Now the German C. C. has recognised that it must actually put itself at the head of the unemployed movement. This means a confirmation of our correct position. Thus we were punished for something last year that the C. C. is now carrying out.

We not only demanded a solution on the question of unemployment, but we also realised clearly, that the unemployed question could be solved only in closest connection with the factory councils. In an official article in the "Rote Fahne" we read that the Hamburg strike furnished proof that one could also lead struggles without and even against the A. D. G. B. This is again a confirmation of the position which we, as Left Communists, have advocated in Germany.

I must state that on the basis of the slogan that comrades in the factories count for more than those who are unemployed — the comrades in the factories entertain the illusion that they need not be so personally active inside of the factory because they would be needed for struggles that are to be waged in the future.

The Berlin traffic workers presented the following incident — the only one in history. They wanted to strike. A two-thirds majority voted for a strike. After the Arbitration Commission had granted a two pfennig rise and this was rejected, the Arbitration Commission granted still another pfennig. Thereupon our comrades, as factory councillors, on the instructions of the leading bodies, proposed to take no further vote but to accept the proposal. In the spring it would be time enough to see what would be done. The next morning we had a hot time in the factory because we, as Communists, without asking the masses, who wanted to strike, had made the strike illusory.

When Comrade Bukharin says that the Social Democratic Party in 1914 was a different one from that of today because the present day Social Democrats have gone over frankly to the counter-revolution, then I believe that this is absolutely correct. Notwithstanding this, this counter-revolutionary Party, supported by the Communists, can form a government in Mecklenburg.

(Interjection: "In our tactics we must consider the mood of the masses".)

Comrades, the results of the elections in Saxony show a Leftward swing of the German workers, and this is also expressed in other elections that have taken place in recent months. In an article headed "Our Victory", (in the "Rote Fahne"), it is stated: "We were victorious because for the first time we went into the election struggles with the basic slogan: Democracy or dictatorship of the proletariat; Capitalism or Socialism".

But, comrades, are not these the claims of the German Opposition?

Comrades, I speak here on behalf of the Wedding Opposition. In Saxony we are confronted with the formation of a government, and it seems to me that not only the Wedding comrades, but other comrades also believe that the attitude of the C. C. towards the question of a new government in Saxony rather strongly resembles the 1923 course. We warned the C. C., we warned against such a policy as would actually lead back into the 1923 channel. If we want to enlighten and lead the masses, then we cannot say today that the Social Democrats are counter-revolutionists while at the same time voting for these counter-revolutionists, because we believe that they will fulfil the workers' demands.

I come now to the inner Party course in Germany, which cannot be designated as a Bolshevik and Communist one. I know, Comrade Thälmann, that this course as it has been followed by you until recently, is not one that will give the Com-

munist Party a solid foundation, but instead it is one that will help to shatter the last weak foundations that still exist. (Laughter).

Not long ago we conducted a recruiting campaign in a situation that was objectively very favourable to the Communist Party, and the Social Democrats, despite their unprecedented betrayal of the interests of the workers, also conducted a recruiting week. I believe that the Social Democrats, despite their unbelievable treason, gained just as many members as did the Communists.

The workers, though they were repelled by the policy of the Social Democrats, and had broken ideologically with it, nevertheless did not come to us because, judging from the inner Party course of the C. P., they do not look upon our Party as their ideal.

Another thing: Comrade Thälmann said in the discussion that if the ultra-Left had been victorious in Germany the German Party would have become the foe of Soviet Russia. (Interjection: "Of course!") Comrade Thälmann should defend that sentence at the next delegate Conference of the Wedding workers; then these Wedding workers will tell him how they stand towards the Soviet Union. (Interjection: "We hope it will be different from the declaration of the 700!") Members of the Central Committee have tried to brand us, because of our views, as counter-revolutionists, anti-Leninists. (Interjection: by Thälmann: "That was Giwan!") Do not make me responsible for the activity and views of those comrades who are today no longer members of the Party and who never held the views of the Wedding comrades.

(Interjection: "Why are they no longer Party members?") I positively do not defend the views of Comrade Giwan, but...

(Interjection by Eberlein: "Ask for Giwan's readmission?") We, in Wedding, adopted a resolution in which we declare that the position of Comrade Giwan is wrong and that we repudiate it.

As to the question of the new Reichstag list of the expelled, I repudiate it, it does not conform with our Communist principle.

We fought against the Open Letter because we knew that this Open Letter represents the platform of the Right elements in the struggle against everything in Germany that was Left. This is confirmed by the statement of Comrade Thälmann who said: the victory over the ultra-Left was the result of the work of the last year. The work of the last year is supposed to be the carrying out of the Open Letter. The carrying out of the Open Letter was therefore looked upon solely as the smashing of everything that revealed itself to be Left.

(Interjection: "What is Left?")

The former Central Committee, that was sacked, is reproached with having entirely neglected the trade union question, and now Comrade Thälmann declares here today that the present Central Committee has likewise done nothing in this respect, but instead that it will only put this question as the chief task for the coming period.

All in all it must be established that the Right dangers that now show themselves in the Communist Party of Germany are a sign that penalties were dealt only towards the Left, while the combating of the Right was entirely forgotten. What has been said here, that only the Russian question was the chief point in the oppositional sentiment, is false. We have many German questions to discuss and we will continue this discussion on the basic problems in Germany.

In Germany terms of surrender are being presented to the comrades. It is demanded from them that they sacrifice their convictions, etc. On this just one word. We stand upon the position that factions have arisen in the Communist Party of Germany because the inner Party course of the C. C. was a wrong one. If one imagines that an oppositional sentiment can be killed by arbitrary measures, by a campaign of suppression, then logically a faction will crystallise.

Factions cease to exist at the very moment when a Bolshevik inner Party course is actually embarked upon.

Comrade SCHULLER (Y. C. I.):

Comrade Riese has taken the greatest pains here not to present the ultra-Left tendency in the German Party as it really is. We could all point out what a complete confusion is shown in the question of the perspectives. It has been shown how correct it is to say that on the question of stabilisation the Opposition does not at all know what it wants.

Comrade Riese came along with the senseless statement that stabilisation in Germany is only a result of the British strike. As if stabilisation existed in Germany only since the British strike! A year ago, even two years ago, Maslow himself spoke about stabilisation. But Comrade Riese has forgotten this, with such a policy one can lead the working class, the proletariat, only into dangerous paths. This is shown in the remarks that Comrade Riese made on various questions of German politics. What is our appraisal of Hamburg, which lasted only a short time, but which nevertheless marks the beginning of the activity of the working class in Germany? Comrade Riese tries, by means of a play on words concerning the "Rote Fahne" to minimise the significance of Hamburg.

It is absolutely untrue that the Party members are divided into first and second class members — into employed and unemployed.

But no one can deny that which the ultra-Left refuses to see, that one must first of all work in the factories, this means, first of all, in the trade unions. Perhaps the Party did begin a little tardily with work among the unemployed, but to make up for this it carried the work through with all its power, and no one can criticise this.

Comrades, the ultra-Left indulges in demagoguery. It plays around with the unemployed. It is trying to use the unemployed against the employed section of the workers, against the Party and against our policies. This comprises the chief error of the ultra-Left. They look upon this question only as one of factional advantage, as against the interests of the workers.

If, in the Party's recruiting campaign, the Social Democratic workers did not all come over to the Party, then this is to be ascribed solely to the Ultra-Leftists. How can we expect that a Social Democrat who works together with Riese or one of his colleagues in the factory to come over to the Party when he hears from him that Soviet Russia is not a proletarian State, that Soviet Russia has been kulakised, that the Dictatorship of the Peasant King, Stalin, is being prepared? On the basis of these facts we can say that in a certain sense we have lost recruiting power towards the Social Democratic workers, and the fault is the Ultra-Leftists!

Furthermore, if Riese says here, with a tragic voice, that he will not tolerate our saying that he is against the Soviet Union, then we must reply that such pathetic declarations are not worth a farthing as long as one stands in one bloc with elements that not only speak of a bourgeois degeneration, but even call for an uprising, for a second revolution against the regime in the Soviet Union. If Riese says here that he does not agree with the views of Givan who demands this second revolution, but that he is opposed to the expulsion of Givan and others like him, then this shows that Riese is still in one bloc with those elements that are hostile to Soviet Russia.

With this I will close my remarks against Riese, since I wish to turn to certain other questions, first of all to the question of Rationalisation.

I should like to advocate that, in the question of rationalisation, we do two things:

First, to give the most complete description of the essence of rationalisation possible, and of the meaning of the same.

Secondly, the most complete possible slogan in reply to rationalisation.

As far as the slogan is concerned, we should be guided by the following trend of thought:

First, the principal foundation of the slogan should be: **Fight against Capitalist Stabilisation;**

Second, its weight should be upon the formula: **Fight against the Consequences of Stabilisation;**

Third, together with this fundamental formulation and emphasis of the question, we should try to find some sort of general

slogan that gives an answer to the general significance of the capitalist offensive which proceeds under the watchword "Rationalisation".

Why should we make these proposals?

First, because there are differences among us as to what rationalisation really is.

Second, because we must reckon with certain deviations of a Right or possibly also Left character, and we must therefore express ourselves clearly and distinctly.

There are tendencies to look upon rationalisation solely as the introduction of new technical methods, as if from the standpoint of the engineer. I must point out that this is entirely wrong. Rationalisation is not only the introduction of new technical methods, but also all the other circumstances, above all, the serious social consequences, which Comrade Bukharin has enumerated.

Further, there are comrades who even put the question of technique wrongly, not only do they raise the question of rationalisation solely from the viewpoint of technique, but they even put this question abstractly.

Proceeding from the correct Marxist standpoint that we are not against technical progress, they are inclined to apply the sentence to present-day technical progress critically and abstractly. I think that this is not correct. Marx writes, in his "Capital", about the relationship of labour and machinery, and about economy in the process of production, that it must not be overlooked in relation to machinery in general and its concrete capitalist application. Of course, we are not against machines, but we must connect up the question of technique and rationalisation with the question of the class situation and the actual political situation — which our comrades in Germany have done quite correctly. One must also bear in mind a certain difference in periods. I do not like the too often repeated reproaches of machine-breaking. This reproach is either senseless or opportunistic. The machine-breakers at that time defended a backward system against the capitalist system, which at that time was a progressive one, whereas we, who of course are not attacking the machines, are engaged in general struggle against capitalist stabilisation and for a progressive system, the Socialist system, and we are in a position, since such a Socialist system is already in existence (viz. in the Soviet Union), to issue also general political slogans to counter capitalist rationalisation, and not, merely its consequences.

In the factory in which rationalisation is to be applied, we must first of all bring into action the slogan: "struggle against the consequences of rationalisation". But we must raise the question of rationalisation also outside of the factory and we must therefore extend beyond the limits of the factory general slogans in connection with the questions of government, power, unemployment, etc.

In this connection I should like to speak of the capitalist offensive against the youth.

1. It is clear that where rationalisation is applied it increases the role of the youth in the labour process, since rationalisation increases the application of unskilled labour power, especially of the youth. On the other hand, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that rationalisation creates a much greater mass unemployment of the youth than was formerly the case. In addition, capitalist rationalisation brings worse conditions for the working youth on all fields.

The Comintern and the Y. C. I. must therefore fight in a concrete form against capitalist rationalisation and its consequences, and it must combine this struggle with that of the adult workers.

2. Important also is the immediate effect of militarism and the danger of war upon the working youth. This is inadequately expressed in the practical conclusions on the combatting of the war danger.

There are to-day a whole series of reorganisation plans for the armies of the various countries. There is a trend towards the adoption of the British-German example of creating cadre organisations which, while reducing the size of the army, are technically very well equipped.

Our youth Leagues must fight concretely for work in the army. I should like to indicate particularly the experience of the French Y. C. L. pointed out by Comrade Semard.

Comrade Kuusinen says that the Youth Leagues, although they have a correct political line, develop too little recruiting power.

Comrades, it is no petty detail if we can say that the Young Communist International, which after all is a large organisation, has maintained a correct political line despite all vacillations in the Parties in recent times.

In Germany, we of course had a certain ultra-Left tendency which we have almost completely liquidated by means of ideological work — there were practically no cases of expulsions.

In France, we had no such difficulties whatever.

In other countries we have the same situation. We recorded success practically everywhere in the struggle against the Opposition.

As for the vacillation in the Youth Executive itself, we had the two cases of factional activity by Vuyovitch and Michalec, which we have liquidated completely. The Executive, and the Y. C. I. as a whole, stand upon the correct, Leninist, Bolshevik line.

With regard to the policy of our Leagues, we are not sectarians we are concentrating chiefly on mass work. One thing is certain, that the Youth Leagues, in comparison to certain bourgeois and, in part, Social Democratic organisations, still have a smaller recruiting power. I should like to express two limitations here:

1. That we suffer from the same illness as do the Communist Parties: we have a much greater influence than we have taken hold of organisationally. Our circle of influence is extraordinarily large, while its organisational coalescence has remained very backward. This we admit and we shall direct our future attention to this shortcoming.

2. With regard to recruiting power, we have also made progress. In the months since the last Plenum, our Youth International has increased by about 14% (exclusive of the Russian League), whereas the Social Democratic Youth finds itself in a constant decline.

At our Plenum we have worked out decisions in which we take pains to deal with the question of concrete mass work in detail. We concentrated upon the following points:

1. Active economic and trade union work. In trade union work, we have thus far been weak, but we can already record active participation in the struggles of the working class and of the working youth (e. g. British general and coal strike).

2. A concrete anti-militarist activity.

3. Concrete application of the united front tactic, formation of united front mass organs, delegations to Soviet Russia, etc.

4. A systematic combatting of the opponents' organisations.

5. Attention to the work in the colonies, above all in the Far East.

Finally, 6. new, more lively internal working methods, and new external propaganda methods, viz., a livening up of our work.

I now come to the last point: our connections with the Parties. Comrade Thaelman has already pointed out that the Party also must take upon itself a portion of the responsibility for the past weakness of the youth. I should like to point out that there is a very good resolution on this, the resolution passed by the Presidium of the Comintern last summer regarding the support of the Young Communist Leagues by the Communist Parties. And I should like to include among those resolutions and decisions about which the Communist Parties are to be particularly reminded, also the resolution about the support of the Young Communist Leagues by the Parties.

Comrade CLARA ZETKIN:

(Received with great applause.)

All Sections of the Comintern certainly welcome the effort to proceed from a general analysis of the world situation to the exact and detailed dissection and illumination of the economic and political status, phenomena and events in the various countries or groups of countries, the effort to give a detailed dissection and illumination of these factors and the effects they exert for one another, upon one another and against one another. The Comintern as a whole, and its various Sections, thereby receive a firm foundation for their work and their struggle as the leading revolutionary world organisation of the proletariat.

In the centre of our investigation we find capitalist stabilisation, in other words: the class rule of the bourgeoisie. It is obvious that as Marxists, we seek in economics the decisive dri-

ving force of the social development process. Consequently we try to arrive at conclusions concerning the existence, strength and tempo of capitalist stabilisation by studying, with all conscientiousness, the comprehensive statistical material on production, trade, stock exchange quotations, and other phenomena of economic life. Thereby we gain not only exceptionally valuable but even indispensable material on the question of the stabilisation of capitalism.

In my opinion, however, we must direct our attention beyond the phenomena of economic life and its effect upon politics to those events which — aside from politics — occur in the fields of the super-structure of bourgeois society. Capitalism is an organic social whole whose foundations and super-structure remind us of the letter of our old master Engels to Block regarding historical materialism. It states there that the economic factor, which is finally determinative, is nevertheless not the sole factor which determines history. We know that mutual reactions constantly take place between the economic basis and the super-structure of society. If we desire a clear, exhaustive reply to the question of how things stand with regard to capitalist stabilisation, we must consider not only the political events but also the phenomena in other sections of the ideological super-structure of society.

What does a glance at the present show us? That the whole super-structure of capitalist economy is suffering from deep, lasting and increasing shock. This elementary shock to the ideological super-structure of bourgeois society shows us clearly that, 1) capitalist stabilisation is only a temporary, transitory phenomenon, and is, besides, an extraordinarily fragile thing.

How could it be otherwise: The antagonisms and contradictions which affect capitalism in the depths of production not only cause eruptions through the economic crust of stabilisation, first here and then there; they cause not only the shifting and displacement in the present relationship of forces, of the strata of bourgeois society as well as in the relationships of interest and power among the States; they cause also shocks to the whole super-structure, which in their part again react upon the depths. The supporting pillars and columns of the capitalist super-structure are beginning to shake and totter, they are crumbling; glowing streams of lava and hot ashes are devastating and destroying the erstwhile blooming gardens of bourgeois ideology, of the world view of bourgeois society.

Evolution is ever more and more approaching that point at which, according to Marx, property is guaranteed only by theft, and right only through murder and perjury. My honoured friend, Riazanov, the great Marxist, will forgive me for citing only the sense and not the actual words. To make good I will cite certain social phenomena of the present day which completely confirm Marx' words: that property is only guaranteed through robbery.

Comrades, have we not seen in these very days that the Hohenzollern's property was guaranteed by a theft of the people's property more gigantic than ever before imagined? This robbery remains robbery even though it was sanctified by parliamentary formulas, even though the Special Democracy in the Prussian Landtag aided in this theft. The 14½ million men and women, who demanded the expropriation of the nobles at the referendum, must look upon the so-called settlement as theft.

Another social phenomena that teaches the same thing: the horrors of inflation which passed over Germany, Poland, Austria and other countries. In France it also began, and my friend Semard correctly pointed out here that the present official deflation goes on side by side with a secret increased inflation. If we throw the light on it — what is this inflation? It is the guaranteeing, yes even the enlarging of the property of a tiny minority of big industrialists, trading gentry, big agrarians and finance capitalists, by stealing the property of the small savers, by stealing from the mouths of the proletariat — whose real wages are depressed. What else is inflation except robbery?

Another accompaniment of capitalist stabilisation: the decay of justice in bourgeois society, its transformation into murder and perjury. Just recall the Vehme Murder Trials in Germany: What else were they than the legalisation of murder and perjury? The same applies to the Matteotti trial in Italy, to the innumerable other Fascist trials there, as well as to the verdicts of White Terror justice in a number of other countries. It is to the great credit of M. O. P. R., (Red Aid), this non-Party mass organisation, that it illustrates, by mountain-high material on the raging White Terror justice, the decay of what calls itself justice in

bourgeois society, wherever the masses of toilers resist their subjugation by property.

Another portion of the super-structure of capitalism, of the capitalism that is rationalising and stabilising itself! The holiest of holies in bourgeois society is the family based on **property**, among the essentials of which are purchase and barter-marriage, supplemented by prostitution. This family is the legally recognised form of sex life and is supposed to assure society a physically and spiritually healthy new generation. Under the impress of the revolutionising economic relationships the bourgeois family is disintegrating, **new forms of sex life** are endeavouring to crystallise. The outlived bourgeois family is to an increasing degree losing its power to assure the development of a healthy rising generation, the greatest of social riches.

Two mass phenomena are characteristic of this. The movement for the **abolition of the penalties for abortion** and the movement for so-called **birth control**, i. e. the prevention of conception. Here we find a separation of sex life from motherhood, the declining valuation placed on motherhood as a social function, and the inability of society to assure material protection to new life. Various kinds of movements and an extensive literature on reform of sex life in the family, announce the **uncheckable disintegration of the old order** despite economic stabilisation. From all of these there proceeds the impossibility of solving the decisive problems upon the basis of capitalism. The dissolution of the bourgeois family smells to the heavens.

Religion has lost its power to dominate and rule over life, it no longer plays a formative social role. It is, in the words of **Karl Marx**, now only the opium of the people. The cultured require a finer narcotic. They turn from churchly dogma to mysticism, to Buddhism and similar outlived ideologies.

Bourgeois science has today also lost its socially formative force; it no longer exerts a vitalising effect. In certain fields, for instance in those of the natural science, it can record great progress, but the results of social and natural science are no longer combined into a uniform, compact, clear philosophy. The lack of such a philosophy expresses itself in **literature**, it appears in every field of **art**. The increasing disintegration and decay of the bourgeois world leaves its impress upon the whole cultural life of our times. It strikes us with particular clarity in the field of so-called **people's education**, from the **elementary school** to the **press**. The decay, the corruption of the press is obvious.

And how about the development of the **elementary school** in the various countries? Republican **France** can vie with democratic **Germany** for the honour as to which has the greater number of school teachers who have been victimised on account of their objection to the degradation of the public school into a drill room of capitalist opinion and the misuse of the school for the training of docile machine- and cannon-fodder. The decline of bourgeois culture is most crassly expressed in the draft of an education act by the German government, which hands over the public schools to the priests.

It would be entirely mistaken to ascribe the cultural decline of **Germany** solely to the economic misery of a defeated State. Let us take a country of rising militant capitalism, let us consider the **United States!** And what do we find there? A press corruption that stinks to the very heavens, as **Upton Sinclair** describes it in his book "**The Brass Check**". A complete dependence of the higher educational institutions upon the capitalist magnates, as described by the same author in his "**The Goose Step**". The spiritual physiognomy of this bourgeois libertarian country is a mixture of vicious, greedy, calculating business sense and a sentimental, slobbering, hypocritical religiosity. The culture of the most stabilised capitalism of the whole world is characterised by the "**Monkey Trial**".

In short, everywhere we find the **signs of disintegration and decay in the super-structure of capitalism**. Signs of disintegration and decay which most decidedly warn us against any faith in a real lasting stability of capitalism.

In sharpest contrast to this is the new revolutionary construction in the **Soviet Union**, the socialist upbuilding of the Soviet Union under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This construction does not confine itself to the socialist economic foundation, no, it reaches far beyond, it also creates in the social super-structure **new relations between man and man**, relations that are liberated from the subjugating power of property. Just look at the blooming, rich life that is developing in the

social super-structure founded upon the socialist economy of the Soviet Union. Economic and social arrangements guarantee **women's complete equality to man**. **Motherhood** is recognised as a social service, and the **right of the child** to care and training is guaranteed by society. New forms are sought for the family, for the raising of the children; a transformation of the whole field of rights is in process.

New content seeks also new forms in science, **art**, on all fields of **culture**. Comrades, under the proletarian dictatorship everywhere there is new creative life, which, even though not as yet fully developed, as yet only in the bud and not yet ripened into bloom, yet it is nevertheless already so sturdy that we may be convinced of its future complete bloom and ripening.

If we want to combat capitalist stabilisation with highest energy, if despite stabilisation, rationalisation and all other forces we have faith in the defeat and shattering of capitalism and in the emancipation of the proletariat, we must direct our glance not only into the depths of science, but also towards the ideological super-structure of society. Death, disintegration, decay, in all fields of bourgeois society; new, sturdy, creative, fruitful life wherever the proletariat has overthrown the economic and political rule of the bourgeoisie and is overcoming capitalism and upon the basis of a socialist economy, it is also erecting a new **socialist** super-structure.

A consideration of the signs of disintegration in the super-structure of bourgeois society, in relation to its meaning to capitalist stabilisation, does not lie outside of our struggle and is no idle speculation. Let us not forget that capitalism rules not only thanks to its economic and political weapons, but also through its **ideology** and through the arrangements and forms of the super-structure it creates. The **bourgeois philosophy** still determines the attitude of broad **working masses** towards capitalism, it obscures their vision of the historical necessity of its destruction, and of the historical need for Communist upbuilding. All the institutions of the ideological super-structure are bastions of bourgeois class rule from which it exercises its subjugative power over the proletariat. Capitalist ideology furnishes weapons which the bourgeoisie turns against the proletariat.

The more and the sharper that we recognise that the ideological super-structure of capitalism is breaking down, the more boldly will we press forward through the breaches in bourgeois society, the more relentlessly will we dull and break the ideological weapons of the bourgeoisie, the more powerfully also will we lead the masses in the struggle against capitalism, its stabilisation, and all the methods of exploitation and subjugation. To this must be added one thing more. The decay, the disintegration of the ideological super-structure of bourgeois society leads new allies to the revolutionary fighting proletariat, provided that we clearly recognise and forcefully exploit the development now in process.

Not only hundred thousands, but millions are suffering, not only under the direct material effects of capitalist power, no, millions are suffering because they can no longer find a content to their lives which is seriously and imperatively bound up with society. Bourgeois ideology no longer serves the maintenance of society, it furnishes no prospect for an escape from the needs of the times. There are not only hundreds of thousands, there are millions who suffer from the disintegration and decay of the ideological super-structure of capitalism just as severely as other suffer for the lack of a piece of bread or a protecting roof over their heads. Thus we gain fighters not only from the proletariat, but also from the middle- and petty-bourgeois strata.

By following up the signs of ideological disintegration in bourgeois society, by exposing its causes, by showing the way out that will relieve all from their misery, we gather and we train additional battle-forces who will go forward in a united front against capitalism now in process of stabilising itself. And it is exactly the necessity of enlightening these masses, of drawing them to us, that establishes the sharpest differentiation of our fundamental conception, our ideological attitude, from the world of bourgeois ideas, (also in their **Social Democratic-reformist** guise).

Precisely in that we make also the decay of the ideological super-structure of the bourgeois order a starting point in our social criticism, in our revolutionary struggle, there results the **complete separation from the reformists, from the Social**

Democrats. Why is this? Because thereby we are forced to work out our own Communist ideology with greater clarity, we are compelled to confront lack of principle with our principle. There is not a single ideological field of the decaying capitalist ideological super-structure which the Social Democracy does not hasten to support and defend. We, on the other hand, concentrate all our powers to overthrow capitalism and thereby clear the road for the new society. This is impossible without taking up the struggle also on the ideological field with the fullest utilisation of all signs of decay and disintegration in fierce combat with the Social Democracy.

And one thing more: there is no doubt that the picture of decay and disintegration in the capitalistic ideological super-structure imbues the fighting proletarian masses, the toilers as a whole, with determination to fight, with militancy and confidence of victory. These are the essential factors for struggle and success.

In his report our Comrade Kuusinen, in my opinion, was entirely right in pointing out that the combination of the partial and immediate demands which we raise, with the great historical goal of the conquest of power, is still in many cases quite superficial, quite mechanical. How can this be changed? Not only in that we weld together all our demands, link by link, into a logically connected chain, from the defence against the constant worsening of conditions of life and labour by stabilising capitalism all the way to the revolutionary struggle for the conquest of power. No, also in that we innerly, organisationally link up all our demands and aims with one another.

This is done by our carrying into all the day-to-day struggles the full, revolutionary, Communist idea. The struggle against the lengthening of the work-day, against the increasing of the intensity of labour and thereby against the squeezing of the last ounce of muscle and nerve force out of the workers, the struggle against the cutting of wages, even by so much as a farthing, must be lit up by our most fundamental, most revolutionary position against capitalism, against the bourgeois order. These daily struggles, also, these struggles for the so-called little things, must be carried on with the consciousness, with the will of the proletarians, the toilers: *Ecrasons l'infame!* Let us crush the infamy, let us shatter the capitalist order!

Comrades! Karl Marx said in his theses on Feuerbach:

"The idea becomes power, when it penetrates the masses."

The truth of this dictum confronts us, historically realised, vital, creative in the form of the Soviet Union and its socialist construction. The idea that is penetrating the masses stands before us as the revolutionary shattering force of the Red October. The Bolshevik Party has been able to raise the idea of the necessity of conquering power to the battle goal of the masses. It has been able, in civil war, in the war against the intervention and blockade of the capitalist States, in the struggle against famine and frost — to raise the revolutionary idea of the masses into the most determined will to self-defence. The idea became power — a power that triumphed over all the foes of the proletarian dictatorship. The Bolshevik Party made the idea into power for millions upon millions of toilers, into the power, the irresistible victorious power, that carries on the socialist upbuilding.

Comrades, in our struggles let us learn from the example given us by the October Revolution and its leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Right the way round the globe, everywhere that capitalism still reigns, where it is stabilising itself, where it rationalises, the exploited masses are getting into ferment, into motion. Let us carry into all these uprising masses the revolutionary, Communist idea that capitalism must be destroyed! As the idea of millions it will become power. If we succeed in this, in releasing this power, in making it count in every daily struggle and even in the most insignificant detail work, if we succeed in setting the masses in motion, led by the revolutionary idea, then we need not fear any stabilisation of capitalism.

Then we can say: **Despite capitalist stabilisation, despite rationalisation; the world will be ours despite all!** The irresistible force of the revolutionary idea borne out among the masses, means the advance of the proletarian world revolution, means the irresistible victory of the proletarian world revolution!

(Stormy and long continued applause.)

Comrade WESCHE (Germany):

The course of the discussion, with few exceptions, has shown that the line of the proposed theses on the international situation and the immediate tasks of the Comintern will be ratified.

I will nevertheless try to refute the statements of Comrade Riese, who opposes this line. Comrade Riese refutes himself in his statements on the stabilisation question. He credits the Opposition with the special service that already in the past it pointed to the need of organising and activating the unemployed. Comrade Riese is entirely mistaken. The Central Committee gave practical consideration to the question of organising the unemployed not only in the last few months, but already since last year, and to an increased extent since the beginning of 1926. Wherever the trade unions refused, independent and even excellent campaigns were carried out under our leadership. In this connection I would remind you of the conference in Saxony, and the very successful delegation to the Landtag, which consisted not only of Communists but also Social Democrats and non-Party people, men as well as women. This increasing activity of the unemployed expressed itself outside of Parliament in the arrangement of demonstrations and meetings, the reaction of which was then felt in Parliament.

If Comrade Riese imagines that the inadequate recognition of the need to organise and activate the unemployed caused an increase of K. A. P. influence, then I must deny this also. On the contrary, wherever it was attempted to popularise such sentiments these attempts were nipped in the bud by the activity of the Party.

Comrade Riese thinks it necessary, furthermore, to mention the Mecklenburg case in which, owing to the bad policy of the Mecklenburg comrades, the danger arose that we lose influence among the masses. Of course, here and there we will have cases in which, due to the false application of our tactic and a wrong appraisal of the role of the Party, the danger will arise that our comrades and our whole movement will slip up; but in such cases also the C. C. took radical measures.

I must also oppose Comrade Riese's charges with regard to the alleged failure of the Party in the British Miners' Strike. Quite vigorous efforts were made to move the miners to a solidarity action, but the influence of the reformist trade union bureaucracy is still strong enough that their counter-measures are able to restrain the miners from solidarity action. This makes it the more incumbent upon us to put the question of work in the trade unions to the foreground; and it is our duty not only to enter the trade unions, but to work there in a Communist sense.

The treatment of the question of Saxony by Comrade Riese constitutes a special chapter. By distorting the slogans and their treatment in the "Rote Fahne" he thinks he can prove that the present C. C. is at last approaching a fundamental policy. But here also his arguments are wrong. It would have to be proven where the Party has ever neglected the fundamentals in any of its actions.

The whole argumentation offered by Riese culminates in the fear of a recrudescence of a new 1923. We can calmly declare that the Party of today will not experience a new 1923. Its experiences, especially also in Saxony, have created a mood within the Party in which the membership considers every action critically.

Comrade Riese bases his fear of a relapse to the conditions of 1923 on the charge that Communist support in the election of the Prime Minister to a certain extent will awaken the impression that the Communists could carry on a labour policy with the Social Democrats, especially in the Saxon Landtag. Exactly the opposite was the case: I believe that it is necessary to show the position of the C. C. on the forming of the Saxon Government, so that the comrades will have a complete picture of it.

On the basis of the demands which we have formulated fundamentally in the election struggle and which, in the main, are demands that cannot, of course, be realised in Parliament or without mass mobilisation, the Communist Party will cast its vote for the Prime Minister. In case these definite demands are not carried out by the Social Democratic Government the Communist Party will mobilise the masses of workers against this government and bring about its overthrow.

This does not involve the strengthening of the Saxon S. D. P. leadership which appears before the masses with radical

phraseology, but which in actual dealings carries out the official policy of the Social Democratic Party. This group, which designates itself as "Left" in Saxony, still has great influence among the masses. To separate these masses and win them for ourselves, is our goal. This is what is involved, and not to make possible the birth of a Social-Democratic Government which might then, as in Mecklenburg, carry on its policy against the workers. We believe that a slogan has been found here with which all Party members can declare themselves in agreement.

In none of these questions has Comrade Riese pointed out any other road. He has conducted an absolutely negative criticism, which can bring no result, and which inspires only passivity in the membership. And precisely at this time, when we are confronted with great tasks, this render us no service.

The other measures of the German C. C. which Comrade Riese cites, particularly the expulsion of oppositional groups and certain members, are not to the point either. With a number of members the German C. C. for months showed a really lamb-like patience. The factional freedom demanded by him must be rejected decisively.

Another few words on Rationalisation. It is clear that with the concept "Rationalisation" the worker can do nothing. Of scientific explanations we have had plenty. We must explain it very graphically, just as our Russian comrades do on various questions. In fighting rationalisation we must formulate the question of the eight-hour day, in the following manner:

In Germany there are 20 million workers who, by agreement, have a 52-hour week. Actually they are working longer. If these 20 million workers fight for and win the 48-hour week, this makes 4 hours per week, which multiplied by 20 million workers is 80 million hours. With these 80 million hours (which we can win), the 1,8 million unemployed workers can be brought into the process of production. With this method of propaganda I believe that we can draw even the most primitively thinking worker into the support of our agitation. He will realise that the Communists have issued a slogan that can actually be realised. Of course it means struggle, but the masses understand what for. The day to day questions, which we perhaps draw up too much as "Party" questions, must also be brought to the masses rather more through the channels at our disposal. A whole series of these questions are not merely Communist questions, but they concern the whole working class, they are questions on which every worker will feel we are correct. If we put up to the trade unions the fulfilment of these demands, recognised by the workers to be correct, then this method will lead to the activation of the masses.

It is important in such a meeting as this, to consider whether the tactics of the united front was correct as we have applied it. Here we must reply unreservedly in the affirmative. All of the measures carried out by the Party, from the elections to the workers' congress, have become our assets. Everywhere the recognition penetrates that the Communist Party is really able to lead the masses. This has been shown also by the Workers Delegations and in the expropriation campaign. We have not lost contact with the Social Democratic and non-Party workers, and, particularly in Saxony, we brought it about that left leaders were chosen. In consequence of our work, we saw the split of the social Democratic Party in Saxony. The hope which the workers have in us can be realised only if the adopted policy will be continued and carried out, in unity and solidarity, without vacillations. Then we can also hope that at the next Plenum of the Executive we will be able to record further progress. These are the tasks what we have set ourselves, and I would appeal to the comrades, especially to Comrade Riese, to give up the negative attitude to the questions dealt with here and to help in carrying out the tasks we have set unitedly and solidly.

Comrade KILBOM (Sweden).

The four Scandinavian Delegations are in agreement with the view presented by Comrade Kuusinen according to which the Communist Parties in Scandinavia must intensify the struggle for the winning of the masses. We realise fully that, first of all the work for trade union unity and for the revolutionisation of the trade union organisations, must be fostered.

But it must not be forgotten, in judging the situation in Scandinavia, that class antagonisms are still relatively little developed. The workers, above all in Sweden, do not suffer under intensified capitalist oppression, under entirely obvious

exploitation — as is the case in many other countries. This circumstance naturally contributes to the preservation of faith in the reformists and in their tactics. In addition, it must be remembered that the Social Democracy, especially in Sweden and Denmark, is extraordinarily strong. These two Parties are among the strongest and most ruthless of the II International.

For Scandinavia also however the pacifist era is a stage that has almost been left behind. The stabilisation of capitalism, as far as Sweden is concerned, has gone quite far; one might say, exceptionally far. Class antagonisms are increasing more and more. The bourgeoisie is on the march under the slogan: "increased intensified struggle against the working class".

An armed strike-breaker guard is being formed. Even Fascist organisations have formed, which are already embarking upon expeditions, even though these are thus far confined to the distribution of leaflets and other innocent affairs. But the workers are openly hostile to the Fascists. The police are being supplied with modern machine guns from secret funds. The bourgeoisie announces quite openly and clearly the intention that the Communists are to be beaten down with all possible means.

Simultaneously parliamentary proposals have been introduced for a considerable lightening of the tax burdens on the capitalists. These burdens are to be loaded upon the working people. The whole bourgeois world in Sweden is united for the introduction of a partial strike prohibition. It is very characteristic of the situation that the leaders of the Swedish Social Democrats very openly give this demand their blessing.

There has long been a conscious activity on the part of England to bring Scandinavia completely into the wake of British imperialism. The reactionary British Government is not only trying to isolate the Soviet Union through the border States. It is also striving to make Scandinavia subservient to its interests.

The British Government is being energetically supported in its efforts by the reactionaries in the various Scandinavian countries. The Finnish White-guardists were the most prominent in this. For several years an intensive activity to "strengthen the ties of friendship" between the various Scandinavian countries has been in process. The most unmistakable language on the plans now being carried out is spoken by the lively mutual relations between the defence corps, viz., the armed fascist organisations of the various countries.

Simultaneously an intensive activity on the part of the II International for the complete concept of the Scandinavian labouring masses is to be noted. The Social Democratic press in Scandinavia disseminates without scruple practically any kind of penny-novel tales about the Soviet Union.

At the present time, especially in Sweden and Finland, the Social Democrats are carrying on an energetic and deliberate activity to bring the masses of workers under their Parties. In Sweden this is done through the collective affiliation of the trade union departments to the Party. The trade union members who do not want to submit to the policy of the Social Democratic leaders, are being terrorised. If they have the courage to acknowledge themselves Communists, they are denounced in many work-places, and, with the help of the Social-Democrats, they are discharged. Immeasurably reactionary and ruthless is the activity of the Social-Democratic Youth Executive. It is at the head of all campaigns against the Communists and against the workers of the Soviet Union.

After all this it is natural that the gentry of the II International and Amsterdam possess faithful tools in the Scandinavian Social Democratic leaders, for the splitting of the trade union movement. The effort to split the Finnish Trade Union Federation, which was financed by Amsterdam and attempted by the Finnish Social-Democrats, was unsuccessful; but the effort is being continued in Norway where a danger exists that the Trade Federation will be affiliated with the Amsterdam International and the organised trade union movement split. In Sweden, they are busy in battering down the unity will of the workers, which has been organised on the part of the radical trade-unionists. The most direct provocatory measures are applied for this purpose.

Along this line of activity for a split on the part of the II International, and of attempts to isolate the workers of the Soviet Union, there is also the "Scandinavian Conference" called for Stockholm on December 6th. In the course of the exceptionally hot and active debate on this matter in Scandinavia, its character was fully exposed. The purpose of this manoeuvre is to force the trade union Federations of Finland and Norway into the Amsterdam International. If this should fail, there is a

danger that the Social Democratic leaders of those countries will split the trade union movement. In Denmark the Trade Union Federation has already been split as a result of the policy of the trade union leaders, since, a few days ago, the Union of Workmen, with 90,000 members, was provoked into withdrawal from the Federation.

In spite of everything the unity movement of the workers is making progress. The Trade Union Federations of Finland and Norway have already demanded that the Trade Union Federation of the Soviet Union be invited to the Scandinavian-Baltic Conference. In a daily and bitter struggle against the Social Democratic and reformist leaders in Sweden, about 100,000 workers have directed the same demand to the Swedish Trade Union Federation.

It should also be clearly noted that the workers are more and more liberating themselves from bourgeois ideology which is preached by the Social Democratic leaders. In the question of the capitalists' demand for legislation against strikes, for example, one trade union organisation after another has clearly and definitely taken issue with the Social Democratic leaders.

Viewed objectively, the perspectives for the work of the Communist Party in Scandinavia are favourable. All the more so since a shifting towards the Left is also to be noticed among the peasantry, in Sweden and Norway as well as in Finland. Already several years ago, the Communist Party of Sweden, in parliament as well as in hundreds of public meetings, raised the demand for uncompensated expropriation of the holdings of large land companies, entailed estates and big agrarians, in order to make possible a distribution of the soil to the peasants whose farms are small, and also to provide land for the agricultural and forest labourers. A peasant conference held recently, and called by radical and Communist minded peasants, likewise adopted a radical programme for a peasant organisation to be formed not only for the purpose of uniting the working people of the rural districts, but also for the tightening of the ties between it and the industrial working class in the struggle against the exploiters. The Social Democrats, on the other hand, have on several occasions opposed our demands for expropriation.

The Scandinavian Sections of the Comintern recognised fully their duty to do everything possible in order to win the masses of workers and peasants for the revolutionary movement. In reciprocity, however, we wish that the Comintern and Profintern, as well as various other Sections, would give greater attention, as helpers and advisors, to our efforts.

While we give our support to the proposed resolution of Comrade Bukharin with regard to the tasks of the Comintern, we would like to give special emphasis to the following tasks, as being particularly weighty:

Increased activity and intensified struggle for:

1. The winning of the workers organised in trade unions for the revolutionary struggle, as well as for national and international trade union unity; we are in complete agreement with the remarks of Comrade Thälmann on the experiences with trade union work. We have encountered the same shortcomings in Sweden as were met with in Germany.

2. The winning and organising of the working peasants and agricultural labourers; and

3. the winning of the toiling youth for the Communist youth movement, to which the greatest attention is to be devoted.

Comrade NIKOLAI EVITCH (Yugo-Slavia):

In his written as well as in his oral report, Comrade Bukharin has not said a word about the Balkans. This is unquestionably a shortcoming. There was a time once, when, in my opinion, the revolutionary significance of the Balkans was over-estimated. But it would be a still greater mistake to underestimate them.

I should like to touch upon the general question of stabilisation in the Balkans. Is there any sort of capitalist stabilisation or not? This is the question which we must answer quite clearly and frankly, for only upon the basis of a correct appraisal of the concrete situation can we carry on a correct policy. There were a few quasi-Leftist comrades in the Balkans who wanted to deny completely all signs of stabilisation. Nevertheless, in the Balkans also there are obvious stabilisation phenomena that are not to be denied unless we are to follow an ostrich policy.

What are the general features of capitalist stabilisation. Raising of production, increase of foreign trade, and improvement of valuta conditions. We see all of these symptoms of capitalist stabilisation also in the Balkans. Nevertheless there is a difference between the stabilisation process in Central or Western Europe and that which is found in the Balkans, but this difference is a difference not in principle, but in degree. This difference consists in that the general situation in the Balkans is more complicated and more involved than in Central Europe. In what consists the complication of the situation in the Balkans? First of all in that the bourgeois democratic revolution was not carried to its conclusion there. The relics of feudalism have not yet been liquidated. The bourgeoisie has shown itself completely incapable of carrying to its conclusion the bourgeois democratic revolution in the Balkans.

Comrade Kolarov, in his speech yesterday spoke of signs of stabilisation in the Balkans. He answered the general question correctly, in the affirmative. But he made one statement with which I am not in agreement. Comrade Kolarov maintained that the stabilisation of the Balkan countries amounted to their colonisation. In my opinion this statement, formulated in this way, is incorrect. It is too general, too schematic. Comrade Kolarov projected the fate of Bulgaria as the future of the whole Balkans. He has "Bulgarianised" the whole of the Balkans (laughter). In my opinion this is wrong.

Between Bulgaria and Yugo-Slavia for instance, there is quite a considerable difference, and for obvious reasons. Bulgaria is a vanquished nation, it must pay reparations, whereas Yugo-Slavia is numbered among the so-called victors, it is to receive reparations not only from Bulgaria, but also from other countries.

This fact alone suffices in order to show that there must be a difference between the stabilisation process in Bulgaria and that in Yugo-Slavia, a difference in both extent and tempo. Yugo-Slavia also is basically an agrarian country, but in comparison with its pre-war status Yugo-Slavia has become industrialised to a greater extent than is the case with Bulgaria.

The identification of stabilisation and colonisation of the Balkan countries has led Comrade Kolarov to a further incorrect conclusion. He said that the colonisation of the Balkan countries consists in that without outside help the Balkan countries could not arrive at any stabilisation whatever. That is correct. But I would like to ask, can Germany, Austria, or any other capitalist country arrive at any sort of stabilisation without foreign aid? Certainly not. This is the only possible method known to capitalist stabilisation. Thus stabilisation with the aid of foreign capitalists is not a specific feature of the stabilisation of capitalism in the Balkan countries. There is only one single country that could stabilise itself under its own power, that is the land of the proletarian dictatorship, that is the First Proletarian State, the Soviet Union. Not a single capitalist country has succeeded in so doing.

Comrade Kolarov maintains further, on the basis of the false premises of which I have spoken, that the proletariat of the Balkans alone, without aid from other countries, cannot overthrow, cannot conquer its bourgeoisie. This is a false theory that is somewhat dangerous. It is, one might say, a passivity theory. The unevenness of the stabilisation in the Balkans is, basically, nothing else than the working out of the general Leninist law of the unevenness of capitalist development.

Yugo-Slavia has undeniable results to record on the road of its industrialisation. The Social Democrats, the reformists, like the capitalists, describe Yugo-Slavia, in the press, as a completely consolidated country. The Social Democrats maintain that Yugo-Slavia has entered upon a period of normal capitalist development. Of course this is nonsense. The Social Democrats and the capitalists raise this nonsensical view of stabilisation phenomena in Yugo-Slavia because they do not consider the stabilisation process dialectically. In Yugo-Slavia we find a raising of production, an increase of foreign trade, a considerable improvement in the valuta — all these are positive elements, they are one side of the stabilisation process. The other side about which the Social Democrats as well as the capitalists wish to know nothing, consists in that in Yugo-Slavia, first, the agrarian question has not been solved, second, that in Yugo-Slavia the national question has not been solved, third, that the war debts amounting to more than 30 milliard dinars have not been covered, fourth, that the State budget has not been balanced, fifth, that the valuta reform has not yet been carried out. These are, it is plain, from the standpoint of capitalism, a series of negative, destructive factors. What is involved here is not a

consolidation of capitalism in Yugo-Slavia, but a relative stabilisation.

After a period of industrial advance, an **industrial crisis** has set in in Yugo-Slavia. During this crisis, certain tendencies towards agrarianisation have also become discernable. This tendency towards agrarianisation consists not only in that a part of the industrial productive apparatus that has become superfluous is shut down, as Comrade Varga implies, but also and above all, in that capitalism is orientating itself towards the raising of agricultural production and the so-called agrarian industry. It is characteristic that this tendency towards agrarianisation draws support from the generally growing influence of the British imperialists in Yugo-Slavia.

The Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia has had to suffer under the heavy blows of White Terror for a full six years. Mussolini, in his struggle against the Communists, has invented nothing new. He borrowed his weapons from the arsenal of the Yugo-Slavian white terror.

The Communist Parties must be able to **mobilise the masses for the struggle against the white terror, despite their illegality.** For this, suitable organisational forms are necessary. We have succeeded in getting certain successes in Yugo-Slavia also on this field.

On conclusion I should like to make the following remarks: the number of illegal Parties is growing, and, in my opinion, it will continue to grow. This is an additional reason why the C. I. should devote somewhat more attention to the study of the specific methods and forms of the work of illegal Parties than has hitherto been the case.

Two, chief tasks confront every illegal Communist Party: first, the creation of a **powerful and healthy illegal apparatus** which must remain the basis of the whole activity of an illegal party, and, second, to find the **legal forms of work** that will make it possible for us to keep contact with the broad masses not only of the workers, but also, what is far more difficult, of the peasants. In this consists the chief task of every illegal Communist Party in the present period, and, in my opinion, in this consists also the central point in the preparation of the proletarian revolution.

Comrade BRANDT (Poland):

Comrades, I would like to direct your attention towards certain characteristics of the world economic situation which are already mentioned in Comrade Bukharin's report, but which I should like to go into in somewhat more detail. One is the question of the **qualitative changes in the basis of world economy, the technical transformation in the productive apparatus of world economy, especially in Europe.**

Eight years have already gone by since the war, not a very short time, to be sure, and if in these eight years even only a simple reproduction has taken place, i. e. no accumulation, technique has nevertheless changed and developed to a tremendous extent. Of course a consideration of the changes in the technical basis will not suffice in order to judge the whole situation, but since many political aspects have been dealt with extensively here, I will confine myself to this special field. I maintain therefore, that in these eight years, tremendous transformation and changes in technique have gone forward, changes whose causes are to be found partly in the war. I will enumerate them briefly.

The energy basis of economy (**electricity, electrification etc.**) has made tremendous progress, especially in Europe. The capacity of power plants in recent years has risen from two to four-fold, the exploitation of water-power has been begun on a large scale and this in all countries that suffer from the coal crisis.

The new technique compels a re-equipment of electric stations and these electric stations must be managed as a whole, which in turn compels a **concentration, a trustification** of the production of electricity.

The **motor-ship** is beginning to defeat the **steamship.** Almost half of all vessels are now propelled by Diesel motors. What does this mean? It means a devaluation of old ships and of old capital.

In France, England, Switzerland, and Italy, an enormous extension of the **chemical industry** is taking place. In Germany, the industry for the production of **nitrogen** has grown into a tremendous industry. We find an entirely new dye industry in

a number of countries. An equally rapid advance is to be seen in the industry for production of artificial silk.

One of the chief features of this technical process is that it demands a **concentration of capital.**

Let us take **metal finishing.** On this field the war, with its mass production of war materials, created a mass production which won great importance especially in the newly developing machine industry, it revolutionised the whole machine industry.

But this transition to mass production demands a **powerful concentration of capital, therefore a destruction of old capital.** It demands, in addition, new tools. And these technical improvements, which in part, have already been introduced everywhere, or which must be introduced everywhere because of competition — all this heightens production, and intensifies the contradiction between the capacity of the productive apparatus and its market.

Contiguous therewith we have a terrific impoverishment of the masses, as a result of the war and of the inflation. This is the second part of the contradiction.

How was such an extension of production possible during the last eight years?

1. As a result of technical progress;
2. Precisely by means of the impoverishment of the broad masses which came into being as a result of the enormous concentration of capital.

Summarised briefly — we have an enormous **enlargement of the productive apparatus which stands in sharp contradiction with the narrowed inner market.**

We have still a further factor. During the war a vast industry grew up outside of Europe in America and Japan. On the other hand, the **Soviet Union** is now closed against the expansion pressure of European capital. This also partly applies to **China and Turkey**, so that the market has been considerably narrowed.

First: new technique, trustification on the largest scale. Second: contradiction in the production possibilities. Third: the struggle for the market between strongly capitalised countries.

The depreciation of old capital burdens primarily the old imperialist countries, above all Great Britain. Thus the antiquated British production capital has become a factor of British reaction, and the British miners are fighting against precisely this reactionary antiquated capital.

The depreciation of old capital gives a certain premium to the new capitalistic countries, but it gives no premium to a part of the new capitalist countries, which are developing an industry of their own, but which are condemned to agrarianisation, — such as Poland, Yugo-Slavia, and in part, Italy. These countries cannot accept the agrarianisation and are trying to fight against it, in part through political means, and in part by increased pressure upon the workers. These agrarianisation tendencies sharpen the social crises in the weakest countries.

The necessity for an extensive widening of the market, which leads to wars and conflicts between the imperialist States, increases the pressure against Turkey, against the Soviet Union, against China.

This raising of the productivity of labour, which is fostered through new technical methods, brings to light a large chronic unemployment, since the market is not widened. New reserve armies are created in Europe, and here it is shown quite clearly how technical progress under capitalism becomes a factor of unemployment and, further, a factor of disintegration. On these facts there unfortunately still prevail to some extent among our comrades certain false views. **Trotsky maintained** in a speech that the productive forces had not grown in Europe and that all market fluctuations take place upon the basis of the old fixed capital. Peculiarly enough, Comrade Lominadze arrives at such a conclusion that he says that the productive apparatus has not even as yet crept up to the pre-war standard. This picture is still more false. There is convulsion, somersaults, but no "creeping". This is basically wrong and contravenes the facts. The productive apparatus is larger than before the war and at that, Comrade Lominadze imagines that he can cite the Bukharin report. That is wrong. If we should stand by such a tendency it might become very dangerous.

The chief contradiction in the situation consists of two parts:

1. The purchasing power of the masses.
2. The vast productive apparatus.

If one wishes to prove that the productive apparatus is smaller than before the war, then the difference between possible consumption and production is much smaller. This is a definite tendency towards the minimisation of the chief contradictions of capitalism. It is folly to believe that if a growth of the productive apparatus is recorded, this signifies a general enrichment of the people. Nothing of the kind. Quite the contrary. The productive fortunes were created at the expense of the impoverishment of the masses.

In conclusion. Like everything else in the world, the post-war crisis has, as Lenin says, a **yesterday** and also a **tomorrow**. While the yesterday did not bring us the victory of the revolution on a world scale, it did create Soviet Russia and powerful Communist Parties. The to-morrow is a new explosion of the social and political antagonisms and, in order that this to-morrow will bring a victory for the proletarian revolution, we must to-day look the facts in the face, we must give a correct perspective, we must draw the correct conclusions.

(Close of Session.)

Ninth Session.

Moscow, November, 27, 1926.

Comrade Gallacher (Chairman) opens the Session at 11 a.m. for the continuation of the discussion on the first point of the agenda.

Comrade FIALA (Austria):

Comrades, I shall confine my discussion to one point, the point of rationalisation. On the other points of the theses, as well as on the reports of Comrades Bukharin, and Kuusinen I am in agreement.

With regard to the question of rationalisation, I find the formulation which Comrade Bukharin has given us to be insufficient, viz., his formulation that we must fight only against the consequences of rationalisation. I am of the opinion that in this question we must adopt a very clear-cut formulation, one which in its preliminary form should read: the combatting of capitalist rationalisation as such. The formulation given by Comrade Kuusinen does: that we are against the consequences rationalisation, is only applicable under certain conditions. Where and when could this formulation be applied? I believe only there where the workers already hold power in their own hands.

How do matters stand in capitalist countries in this regard? I am of the opinion that we must raise this question quite gruffly among ourselves, because rationalisation is one of the chief methods used by the bourgeoisie to bring about its stabilisation, and to consolidate this stabilisation still further. For this reason, in my opinion, it is necessary, in the capitalist countries, to fight not only the consequences of rationalisation, but also rationalisation as such. Rationalisation is not only a process of technical improvement — the characterisation given by Comrade Bukharin in his report on this question is entirely correct. In this characterisation the process of technical improvements is mentioned as the last of the points of rationalisation primarily at the expense of the workers, it strives towards the better organisation of labour, i. e., it tries to exploit every minute and every muscle of the worker in such a way that he will have no time left for any possible recreation during the labour process. I do not think that we can formulate it as Comrade Kuusinen does: that we are against the consequences of rationalisation, but that if a capitalist introduces a new machine, this is none of our business. In practice this can lead to various sorts of disintegration in our tactics against the capitalists, and for the following reasons: the introduction of a machine is an extraordinarily weighty matter for the workers employed in the factories. With the introduction of new machines, wages are cut, the worker, e. g. if a machine strikes a hundred blows a minute, must keep up with these hundred blows per minute — this means an intensified exploitation and an accelerated undermining of the worker's health. Here also we must fight against. We cannot simply say that we are opposed to the consequences of rationalisation, no we are against rationalisation in itself, without being machine-breakers.

What is the attitude of the Social Democrats towards rationalisation? I should like to cite predominantly the Austrian Social Democrats who are in all probability the slickest element in the II. International. The arguments of the Austrian Social Democrats on the question of rationalisation are basically the following: Fordism, intensification, rationalisation — we are in favour of all these things, but this rationalisation, this Fordism, must be coupled with social consideration. They tell the workers: rationalisation will bring you higher wages, through the mechanisation of labour, through the introduction of new

technical improvements (which they put to the foreground) you will have a better living; they declare that these technical improvements will ease the labour process, and that with the growth of capitalism, Socialism will be more easily realisable. They are not against rationalisation, they cannot be, because they are for the reconstruction of capitalism. It would therefore be dangerous for us to take this ground of standing opposed, not directly against rationalisation, but only against its consequences.

Is it true that with rationalisation there will come a rise in wages, that there will be an improvement of the living standard of the workers? I think by no means.

With the progressing rationalisation more and more workers will become superfluous and unemployed. In Austria we have a quarter million unemployed at this time. A bourgeois journalist says that at this time, in Austria, a country of about seven million inhabitants, the number of unemployed and part-time workers, together with their dependence and all who are excluded from the process of production, reaches almost a million, and it is still constantly rising. This is also a result of the rationalisation endeavours which now make themselves felt in Austria, even though not in so crass a form as, for example, in Germany.

I believe that in our concrete application we must conduct the struggle against rationalisation along the following line:

First of all a decided sharpening of the struggle for control of production so that the bourgeoisie will not be in a position to divert all the costs of rationalisation upon the workers.

Secondly, as one of the most important measures for the combatting of unemployment and of rationalisation, the demand for a shorter work-day. I believe that it is highest time that we counter the rationalisation attempts with the demand for the six-hour day.

Now comrades, the conclusions: sharpened struggle for control of production, shortening of the work-day and combatting of the rationalisation endeavours of the bourgeoisie.

I should like to propose, so that no misunderstanding can arise, that the formulation read quite sharply in the following manner:

The sharpest struggle against all and any rationalisation and intensification attempts whatever.

We should not do this because we will thereby differentiate ourselves from the Social Democrats, but chiefly because rationalisation signifies, firstly, an immeasurable impoverishment of the proletariat, and secondly, it fosters the stabilisation efforts of the bourgeoisie. On the basis of these two arguments we must not only combat the consequences, but the rationalisation itself, because we are opposed to every stabilisation of capitalism.

Comrade HERTHA STURM (Women's Secretariat, E. C. C. I.):

I shall speak on one single point that Comrade Kuusinen has touched upon in his report: on work among the women. Comrade Kuusinen was entirely right in pointing out that the parties do not yet recognise the full importance of the work among the women, nor do they value it accordingly. Our years of experience only serve to emphasise this. As in the past period, so also in the immediate future, one of the most fundamental tasks of the Women's Department will consist in fighting for the recognition which work among the women deserves throughout the whole Party.

Although the Women's Departments have thus far worked rather with their own forces, we can record certain noteworthy successes in the work among the women.

I shall draw from our ample experiences examples from two important countries: Great Britain and Germany, where we can note efforts and successes of international interest.

In Great Britain the Party has attained extraordinarily big results in the mobilisation of the women in the miners' strike. For this success we can thank a systematic detailed work of many years standing by the Communist Party in the mass organisations of the proletariat. Because of its numerical weakness and the danger of the complete isolation from the masses, the British Communist Party was compelled to lay the greatest emphasis upon the work in these organisations. The women Communists worked primarily in the Women's Sections of the Labour Party, in the Women's Co-operative Guilds, and, somewhat less actively, in the trade unions. This resolute detailed work bore its fruits during the strike: the Communist Party dominated, in organised form, the movement of the masses of women.

During the action itself the Women's Departements of the C. P. of Great Britain not only themselves took an active part in the formation and work of the committees of action in the battle areas, but beyond this they were able to bring the broadest masses of women into mobility. In many cases the committees of action established sub-committees for special tasks which were exclusively in the hands of the women. These committees served splendidly in the enlightenment of workers' wives, in messenger service, in feeding the strikers by means of communal kitchens, in the collection of aid for women and children of the miners' union, in the struggle against the strikebreakers, in defending the revolutionary leaders from the police, in demonstrations to the authorities in order to compel the continuation and increase of the relief to the strikers.

This great movement could not come to a standstill with the termination of the strike. These committees of action had to find an organisational continuation in order to maintain the newly won influence over the masses. Such a form was discovered in the Women's Guilds of the trade unions. In the battle areas, especially in Nottingham, the miners' wives have organised into trade union women's guilds, the women Communists immediately put themselves at the head of this movement and, upon the initiative of the Communist Party, these guilds were affiliated as auxiliary organisations to the trade unions in order to have this movement politically and organisationally integrated in the great stream of movement: in trade union work.

That the Communist Party, in the consciousness of the masses was the leader of the miners' struggle, is evident from the fact that during the action the number of women Party members rose from 600 to more than 2,000.

According to the report by PUGH, at the Trade Union Congress in Bournemouth, five and a half million women are engaged in British industry. But there are only 300,000 women trade union members altogether. Here we see what a tremendous task confronts us. The task of the trade union organisation of this gigantic army of women workers cannot possibly be solved by the women's department of the C. P. G. B. alone, the less so since in its ranks there is only an insignificant fraction of women workers. Here is the most striking point for the British Party, which Comrade Kuusinen indicated in a general way: the whole Party must support and supplement the work of the Women's Department in such a way that a powerful living contact be established with the women workers in the factories and trade unions.

The Scarborough and Bournemouth Congresses by their decisions for a recruiting campaign among women workers, pointed out the road, but the trade union leadership has undertaken the carrying out of these decisions very lackadaisically. The reformists know that every mobilisation, every politicalisation of the women workers, will in the last analysis turn against themselves. Hence, it is left more or less to the Communists' initiative and activity through their fractions in the Minority Movement, to put themselves at the head of the women workers' campaign and take over the leadership of the masses of women. The direct work of the trade unions must be effectively supported and supplemented through the work in the factory nuclei and through women delegate meetings.

In Germany, side by side with extraordinarily great successes we also have serious dark sides. This hangs together with the peculiar development of the C. P. G.

The Women's Department of the C. P. G. has set itself the task of bringing the women workers into the Left wing of the labour movement. In this it starts from a fact that will very probably attain great international significance: rationalisation, in consequence of the dislocation of necessary working forces

to the advantages of the unskilled, must lead to a stronger attraction of women into the production process. With this the role of woman in the labour movement wins new importance.

The German Party is trying to take hold of the Left wing of the women workers through three methods:

- 1) Through the women's delegate meetings;
- 2) through the trade union work; and
- 3) through the Red League of Women and Girls.

The Women's Delegate Meetings, which constitute a novel method of work, represent one of the most prominent successes of the Party. In the last three months we held seven such women's delegate meetings, chiefly in districts with a strongly developed women's industry, including Berlin, Lower Rhine, Cologne, Stuttgart, Chemnitz, and Hamburg. These women's delegate meetings revealed certain extraordinarily interesting points, which I shall touch on here. They offer the opportunity of drawing the broadest masses of women into the general campaigns of the Party. In the present situation, e. g. the Party has brought the women's delegate meetings into contact with the Workers' Congress.

The second valuable point in the delegate meetings consists in the fact that in this way, we for the first time systematically penetrated the factories on a large scale.

The third noteworthy point is the relation of the Trade Unions to these Women's Delegate Meetings. In Stuttgart the Executive of the Textile Workers Union sent a circular to the factory councils stating that "for our colleagues there is no reason to answer or comply with invitations for the election of women delegates." This proves how much the trade union bureaucracy is afraid that through this method its influence will be broken. And this is a fact: In all the delegate meetings the resolutions and programme of action of the Communist Party were adopted unanimously by the same women workers who unresistingly follow the leadership of the reformists in the trade unions. This points the way for us. Here it shows itself that the delegate meetings must be exploited by us to make a breach in the reformists' sphere of influence.

At this point I shall proceed to the Trade Union Work. The most instructive example of recent times is the national congress of the women textile workers in Gera. It was attended by 280 delegates, including 12 oppositional women workers. Here we see the weakest point of our work which has already been touched upon by several speakers, also by German comrades, particularly by Comrade Thaelmann. In trade union work we still have the most to do. In Gera the reformist trade union bureaucracy proposed resolutions utterly unacceptable from a Communist standpoint.

Let me cite just a single passage which gives classical expression to reformist collaboration. In the introduction of the resolution containing the demands of the women textile workers it is said:

"In the interest of a healthy development of our German fatherland, in the interest of its textile industry and its whole economy, and in the interest of the adolescent as well as the coming generation, the Congress demands on behalf of the women workers...."

Of course a representative of the Communist fraction opposed this resolution and introduced a substitute. Now it is interesting that when the resolution of the Executive came to a vote only one single delegate voted against it. Not even the 12 oppositional workers, to say nothing of a larger minority, were politically clear and firm enough to be able to stand up against the trade union bureaucracy even only by voting. And this, even though it could be seen from the speeches of oppositional workers and known Communists that the sentiment of the women workers was favourable to us, and even though the speeches of numerous women workers sounded altogether different from the Executive's reporters. This shows that our whole work in the trade unions has thus far not yet been intensive or thorough. It was impossible, even with systematic preparatory work, to catch up in a few weeks before this Congress, with what had been neglected for years.

The task of organising the women workers in the trade unions is a question, that is of highest importance, not only for Germany but internationally. We can see already now that the trade union bureaucracy is proceeding absolutely systematically to make the politically undeveloped women workers into defensive troops in the struggle against the growing opposition in the trade unions.

Now as to the last point in the work of the C. P. G. The **Red league of women and girls** is an extraordinarily splendid phenomena of the entrance of broad masses of women into the class struggle. It was launched with a few hundred members in November of last year and in May of this year it already numbered 9,000, while at present it has 18,000 dues paying and 20,000 — 25,000 registered members. This evidences the truly favourable situation for our work among the women proletariat of Germany, and the pressure of the masses of women towards organisation and towards political activity.

Because of these fine sides we must not overlook a dangerous side of this development. In quite broad circles of the Party there is no complete clarity on the fact that the R. L. W. G. is only **one** of many forms of work among the backward strata of working women, it is, so to say, a transition stage on the road of these masses towards the general class organisations, and particularly towards their enrollment in the trade unions and finally, into the Communist Party. Against this there is a rather far-reaching dissemination of the conception that the R. L. W. G. is the form of Party work among the broad masses of women. A part of the party membership does not yet understand the importance of the women's departments as organs of the Party for the direction of the work among the proletarian women. This lack of clarity on the role of the R. L. W. G. on the one hand and of the Party on the other is to be explained from the situation which prevailed at the launching of the R. L. W. G. Under the ultra-Left course of the Party, prior to the publication of the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I., actually, no work was done among the masses of women. The Party lacked the understanding for the approach to the masses, for the necessity of raising partial demands, for an active trade union work. The effect of this was that the workers, and naturally first of all the politically backward masses of women, were estranged from the Party. In connection with this the Party apparatus for work among the women was disorganised and disorientated. For the most part the women's departments were altogether broken up, and for the rest they were manned by inexperienced and politically untrained forces, which only too easily fell in with the ultra-Leftist course. How great the difficulties in this connection were can be measured by the recent estimate of the women's Secretary of the Berlin-Brandenburg Party district, that only recently about half of the Women's Departments throughout the Reich (and that of the Berlin sections probably even more than half) were occupied by women comrades of the opposition. In the Autumn of 1925 the R. L. W. G. came into being, at a time when all activity seemed to have died down among the masses of women. The R. L. W. G. was the first noticeable sign of a new life.

At the same time there appeared the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I., which brought no clarification on the question of work among women. In connection with work in the mass organisations the letter contains a sentence which reads as follows:

"Speedy orientation of the Party towards such organisation (sport, tenants, freethinkers, Red League of Women and Girls) and their utilisation for the strengthening of trade union work is necessary."

This sentence, in itself, is of course unassailable. It is necessary to work in such organisations, and it is very correctly formulated when it is stated that this work shall serve primarily for the strengthening of trade union activity. But since this sentence was the only reference to any kind of work among women contained in the letter, it did not objectively contribute to the elimination of existing lack of clarity, but it even strengthened it.

Comrades, it would have been desirable to have stated quite clearly what was necessary for the Party. Comrade Clara Zetkin at that time pointed out this shortcoming of the Open Letter in the Presidium meeting, and this shortcoming was also recognised. The greatest weight should have been laid upon the fact that work among the women is a fundamental task of the Party, and that the Party must set its whole authority against the neglect of women's work, that women's departments are necessary in the Party in order to instigate and carry out, under the leadership and control of the Party Executives, the work among the women on all basic fields, especially in the factories and trade unions; that the women's departments of the Party are the organs which shall coordinate all work on the various fields according to a uniform plan. This defect has not

ben overcome to this day. We must express this and make good the neglect.

On the basis of a few examples, I should like to show where there are many things left for us to do.

For the **Workers Congress** the Party issued a manifesto. Definite demands directed towards the working women were formulated for this manifesto by the Women's Department, and after proper negotiation and agreement between the Women's Department and the C. C., they were referred to the Polbureau. Yet these demands have not appeared in the manifesto, so for this Party action the masses of women do not exist.

A second example is the **Party organ for women**. Comrade Thälmann is entirely clear that the German Party must have a women's organ if even such small Parties as those in Switzerland and Austria have one. Before Comrade Halbe came to the International Conference in Moscow last May she was emphatically told that the Party is convinced of the necessity of this paper. But it took six months before it was finally established, and we do not know how long it will be maintained.

The **Party's central organ**, the "**Rote Fahne**", in our opinion has no real understanding of the necessity of work among the women. The **German Working Women's Delegation** to Soviet Russia, which should have been the starting point for a great mass movement of women workers in the factories and trade unions, was not exploited by the "**Rote Fahne**". For the **Workers Congress**, for which the Party began its preparations already in July, the "**Rote Fahne**" had not a single word to say about the mobilisation of the women until November.

Here is a point for the German Party to which Comrade Kuusinen has justifiably pointed. Here, by means of a strict control of the work of all its organs, by means of serious criticism wherever necessary, by means of positive support, the Party must help in order to achieve everything possible along the line of winning the masses of the women under the existing extraordinarily favourable situation.

Our **international conference** very earnestly and thoroughly analysed the successes and shortcomings of our Parties and has come to the unanimous conclusion that despite all difficulties, and despite the lack of positive support by the Parties as a whole, a good step forward has been made. We are certain that the Parties are becoming more conscious of the great task and responsibility that devolves upon them on the field of work among the women (Applause).

Comrade HILT (Norway):

The Norwegian delegation declares itself in complete agreement with the theses of Comrade Bukharin, in regard to the International situation as well as to the tasks of the Communist Parties. Only we should like to insert a few words about the situation in Norway.

1. Scandinavia is at the moment not one of the least important strategic points of the European labour movement, and it would therefore have been desirable if the Scandinavian question had been given a more detailed treatment in the report of Comrade Bukharin and his draft theses, as well as in the report of Comrade Kuusinen. The II International is actually at this moment trying to unite organisationally the trade union and political movement in Scandinavia under its direction. It is trying to affiliate the Norwegian and Finnish trade union federations to Amsterdam, and it is working for an amalgamation of the Norwegian Social Democratic Party and the Norwegian Labour Party. The secretary of the Amsterdam International, Oudegest, has already visited Scandinavia and has arranged for the calling of a Scandinavian-Finnish Conference. This conference has decided to call a new Enlarged Scandinavian-Baltic conference for Stockholm on December 6th and 7th.

The reformist general staff is thereby directing considerable effort to consolidate and extend its positions in Scandinavia.

2. The Norwegian delegation must admit that the work of the Norwegian Party on the trade union field might have been done better. But we must, however, call to your attention that the trade union movement of Norway is in an exceptional position, on a Scandinavian as well as West European scale. The Norwegian trade union federation is, as you know, affiliated with neither the Amsterdam nor the Red Trade Union International, yet its leadership is predominantly reformist. Nevertheless, chiefly through the initiative of our Party, we have succeeded in frustrating the reformists' efforts to affiliate the

trade union federation to Amsterdam. The trade union congress of 1925 unanimously adopted a resolution in favour of affiliation with the Anglo-Russian Committee, and breaking off connections with the Labour Bureau of the League of Nations in Geneva. On the occasion of the renewed effort to bring about affiliation to Amsterdam, the Secretariat of the Norwegian trade union federation, upon motion of our comrades, proposed the invitation of the Russian trade unions to the Scandinavian-Baltic trade union conference.

The Norwegian Party is ready to accept criticism. But we must record the fact that it is precisely on the trade union field that the Party has done the best work, and that it has achieved quite great successes.

During the wage agreement struggles last spring, which coincided in point of time with the first months of the British strike, the whole reformist trade union leadership was reconciled to defeat, and tried with all possible means to liquidate the big struggle as quickly as possible. The workers on the other hand wanted to fight and our Party put itself fearlessly at the head of the workers' battle. In this we succeeded in exposing the reformist leaders and in separating the workers from them, thereby winning the sympathy and confidence of large elements of trade unionists for our Party.

In connection with this there must be mentioned also the part which our Party took in the struggles of the agricultural labourers and the small peasants. It was first of all the members of the C. P. N. which went ahead, in the big agricultural labourers conflict, in the organisation of these workers, and in the organisation of the mass movement among the small peasants for a moratorium and cancellation of debts.

On these fields we showed, in practice, that we had found the road to the masses.

In the formation of a trade union Left bloc we did not get ahead as fast, perhaps, as we might have desired, but in this we must remember that the official trade union bodies in Norway, even though only formally, nevertheless stand so far Left as to give us trouble in finding the necessary broad basis for the creation of a Left bloc. Nevertheless, our Party succeeded, in Oslo, to win a majority, in a meeting of trade union delegates from industrial local councils, for the formation of a trade union opposition.

3. As to the second part of Comrade Kuusinen's criticism, the criticism concerning internal quarreling, this is completely justified. Yet we must state that despite its inner quarrels the Party has been able, in the course of the last year to strengthen its ranks and consolidate its influence in the masses through direct participation in the struggle for the existence of the workers and peasants.

4. Our Party did not remain inactive in the face of the Social Democratic unification efforts. By our participation in the daily struggles of the workers and peasants our Party tried to bring into being a real class rally in opposition to the Social Democratic Party.

5. As one link in our work for the unity of class forces, we must mention the organising of a joint municipal conference in Hedmark. Similar conferences have been decided upon for other districts.

In the work for the support of the British miners our comrades took the lead in the trade unions, and despite lockout and unemployment, the Norwegian trade unions raised 100,000 crowns by means of collections. In addition our Party, in October, took the initiative for the formation of a relief committee which is to collect food and wearing apparel for the children of the British miners. On this committee there are trade union functionaries who are members of the Social Democratic and Norwegian Labour Parties and the trade union federation is also represented on it. Despite bitter resistance on the part of Tranmael the committee is actively engaged in organising a nation-wide relief campaign.

The objective premises for the Party's further activity are very favourable. We can record that through its own experiences the Party is learning, that it is today better equipped for the solving of its historical task than ever before.

In conclusion we should like to emphasise the necessity for effective collaboration in Scandinavia. The form in which this collaboration is to take place must be looked into more closely; but the collaboration of the Scandinavian reformists makes it urgently necessary that our Parties also establish a systematic and effective collaboration.

Comrade ROY (India):

Comrades, apart from the U.S.S.R., the revolutionary situation in England, and the Chinese revolution, there are other factors which disturb the schemes of capitalist stabilisation, I want to deal with one or two of these factors.

The first of these is the Anglo-American rivalry. The second, closely related to the first, is the decline of the British Empire. These two are the most important factors in the international situation today.

When we want to estimate properly Anglo-American rivalry and to draw the correct political conclusions from it, we should avoid any hasty inferences. It would be a mistake to state sweepingly that world hegemony has passed away from British imperialism and into the hands of America. It would be equally incorrect to state that the British Empire is still as strong as ever and that all talk about the decline of the British Empire is an illusion. We must study this struggle for supremacy as a process.

First, let us take the position of the British Empire. That it is on the decline is unquestionable, the alarm has been raised by a section of the ideological spokesmen of the British Empire itself. British imperialism is so much on the decline that in no other country is the term stabilisation less applicable. In no other country is the capitalist crisis more insurmountable. Why? What is the basis of British imperialism? Naturally, the strength of the British capitalist system which is aided very much by colonial exploitation, foreign investments, etc. But these in their turn, are dependent on the prosperous condition of British imperialism in Britain.

The days of British classic imperialism must be considered gone for ever. Imperialism, based upon export of capital from the metropolis, has passed. Britain today cannot export capital, and as a result of her progressive inability to export capital, the political foundation of British imperialism has weakened.

Now the British bourgeoisie have been trying various means of solving this situation. As you know, the most popular attempt has been the so-called Imperial Federation. Not only the British bourgeoisie place their hope on the success of this scheme, but even among some of our own comrades there prevails a belief that British capitalism, by mobilising the resources of the Empire can really recover its position for a considerable time to come. The fact that Britain is not in a position to supply the increasing capital demands of the colonies and Dominions is sufficient to prove that the attempts of the British bourgeoisie to mobilise the colonial resources in order to stabilise its position is doomed to failure.

When we talk about the attempt of the British bourgeoisie to mobilise the resources of the Empire to overcome the present difficult position of British capitalism, we must keep in mind that the British Empire is not a homogeneous whole. It can be divided at least into two principal groups, namely, the so-called self-governing Dominions, that is the "White" colonies, and the colonies proper. In the first group, Britain practically exercises no political power. The basis of the relation of Britain to this self-governing part of the Empire, is British finance. Only insofar as Britain is in a position to finance the self-governing Dominions, that is, provide the self-governing Dominions with the capital needed for their progressive industrial development, Britain can maintain a certain control over these Dominions.

As far as the other group is concerned, the position is more hopeful for Britain. There the political power is in the hands of the British bourgeoisie. By exercising this political power they can direct the economic and industrial development of these parts of the Empire in a way helpful to British capitalism.

What two measures did Britain propose to regulate her relations with the self-governing Dominions? The one was a programme of "Imperial Preference" and the other was a scheme of "Empire Settlement". The programme of imperial preference was put into effect to some extent, but the opposition of the self-governing Dominions to it kept on growing everyday. The scheme of "Empire Settlement" has been a complete fiasco. There was a sub-committee on this at the last session of the Imperial Conference. The report of the sub-committee states that the scheme of "Empire Settlement" is impracticable. It says that any considerable immigration from England to the colonies is possible and practical only in the days of prosperity when sufficient capital is available. What does it mean when the self-governing Dominions say to Britain — "We don't want your unemployment

to be passed on to us; if you cannot give us capital, we do not want you to dump your unemployed workers on us?"

There is another side. I am not quite sure that the British bourgeoisie want Empire settlement. Why? The Empire was settled by British immigrants when British capital also flowed into the Empire, so the colonial development remained inside the frame of British capitalism. Now, Britain cannot export capital. Therefore, the British bourgeoisie while talking of Empire settlement, has been sabotaging the scheme.

Now about the colonies proper. There again we find the same difficulties. If Britain wants to develop the resources of these parts of the Empire, she must also be able to export capital. Britain there is trying to get around the difficulty in a different way, which may be successful for the immediate future, but which is creating a new set of contradictions. In the more advanced parts of the colonies, like India, the new British policy is to develop the inner capital resources. Britain hopes by keeping the entire capitalist structure in these countries under the financial domination of London, it will be able to utilise the available capital resources of the colonies to help British capital.

This policy has met with some success, for example in India where an enormous amount of the wealth is hoarded wealth. If this wealth is converted into money and becomes capital, India will be in a position to export capital. We have already had indications of India exporting capital and so this little child that Britain is nursing for her own benefit may begin to kick before very long.

This is indeed a very gloomy picture for a power which wants to contend with American imperialism, which is at the very zenith of its power today. Some of our American comrades say that it has not yet reached its zenith, but I do not think the situation is as bright for America as it might seem. Behind the apparent prosperity of American capitalism we find indications and signs which prove that everything is not going so swimmingly. American capitalism is not entirely free from the shock that capitalism as a whole is suffering today. That means that the perspective is not that we must wait for a big imperialist war; but really, that side by side with the development of imperialist forces, are developing revolutionary forces in every country. That is, the forces of civil war are developing side by side with the forces of imperialist war. The task of the Comintern and the tactics of the Communist Parties should be not to wait for the development of this imperialist war, but to help the development of the forces of civil war. It is possible perhaps that the civil war will come before the imperialist war.

I want to inform the Plenum of the Communist International that the general opinion prevailing in the Communist International as to the power of the American Party is absolutely incorrect. The American Party is not a negligible factor. It has made very much progress in the last six months. And as the growing signs of the weakening of American capitalism go on, so side by side the revolutionary forces in America are also developing, and the American Party has known how to step forward in due time, as the conscious vanguard of the evergrowing and developing revolutionary forces. (To be completed in the records.)

The discussion is interrupted.

Comrade GALLACHER (Chairman):

Comrades, a short break in the discussion will take place so that Comrades Yefimov and Orlov, from the Army School, may greet the Plenum. At the same time there will take place the presentation of an honorary diploma to Comrade Thälmann.

Comrade YEFIMOV:

(The delegates rise and greet Comrade Yefimov's appearance upon the tribune with stormy applause, which merges into the singing of the "Internationale".)

Comrades, the participants in the training courses of the Red Workers' and Peasants' Army, have the great honour of greeting the only real leader of the International working class, the Communist International, which is also our patron. The participants in the training course "Vystrel" (shot) have observed with closest attention the international situation during recent years. The commanders in the "Vystrel" course follow up attentively all international events and clearly recognise that only the experienced leadership of the Communist International, and of our Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has guarded us against the intervention of the bourgeoisie. The participants in

the "Vystrel" course, the Red Army men and commanders are conscious of this, and they assure the Communist International, and all the progressive workers of Europe and America, that every future effort of the international bourgeoisie to launch an intervention against our Soviet Union will meet with the firm resistance of the whole Red Army, over whom you are patrons. And they assure you that when the Communist International will be strong enough to lead the closed ranks of the working class in the assault against the international bourgeoisie, the Red Army will put itself at the head of these columns, and among the leaders of these columns will be found the students of the "Vystrel" courses.

Long live the only true leader of the working class, the Communist International!! (Stormy and long-continued applause.)

Comrade ORLOV:

(Received with applause.)

Comrades! Comrade Thälmann is an honorary soldier of our special sharp-shooters battalion of the school "Vystrel" (applause). This battalion is that section of the iron-disciplined Red Army which during the four years of civil war dispersed everything hateful to it. Comrade Thälmann is an honorary soldier of our Red Army and this will help him to master even still better and still more correctly the aims and tasks which the Red Army has set itself.

We present today, to our honorary Red soldier, our military uniform, which is worn by thousands of the liberated workers of our Union. (Applause.)

(In the Presidium Comrade Thälmann is presented with the uniform of a Red soldier, which he puts on. The Plenum greets Comrade Thälmann with stormy applause and hurrahs.)

Comrades, we are very sorry that Comrade Thälmann cannot always remain with us in our Soviet Union, yet that does not matter. We hope that Comrade Thälmann, who is our honorary soldier, and at the same time in his own country the representative and leader of the Red Front League, will in the not-distant future organise in his own country, a German red army on our pattern and according to our principles (stormy applause), an army that under the skilful leadership of Comrade Thälmann will overthrow the hated bourgeoisie and help us to wipe out the international bourgeoisie.

Comrades! In his capacity as an honorary soldier of the Red Army Comrade Thälmann will doubtlessly convince himself that the heart of the Red Army is as virile as ever, and that he, Comrade Thälmann, himself represents a tiny fraction of our tremendous army, which in the no longer distant future — with the fire and flame that streams from its red five-pointed star — will enkindle throughout the whole world the fire that will destroy everything that stands in the way of the revolution. The road that we travel is the Leninist road. On this road we shall fight, and if need be, we shall die. As our honorary Red soldier, Comrade Thälmann, will have to keep constantly before his eyes the aims and tasks of the Red Army. He will always bear this in mind.

And, comrades, here in the presence of our general staff, the III. Communist International, I declare that the Red Army, if it shall be necessary, will march with Comrade Thälmann to the defence of the toiling masses of the whole world, for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie. (Stormy applause, all delegates rise to their feet.)

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

Comrades, since the "Vystrel" battalion has nominated me, an honorary soldier, through its patron, I believe that I can declare in the name of the Communist Party of Germany and in the name of the Red Front League, that this expresses the deep revolutionary solidarity of the fighting German working class with the Russian workers and peasants. In those days, when for the first time in the world, the Russian proletariat and peasantry stormed and tore down the strongholds of bloody tsarism, the German working class understood what the historic step of the victory of the Russian revolution, the creation of the Red Army, the tremendous ideas of Bolshevism, meant in the revolutionary labour movement of the world. When, among the Western European proletariat and particularly among the German working class we speak of the Red Army, of its heroic struggle, of its victories, of the present task which it is fulfilling in the direction of the Socialist construction of Russia, enthusiasm grows,

the workers think of their own fighting slogans and understand all the more the importance of the Russian revolution as a step towards the world revolution. The ties of solidarity between the Red Army, the German workers, and the international proletariat, have become firmer than ever. The VII. Enlarged Executive had the opportunity today to witness the spirit of the Red Army in the words of two Red soldiers, and to note with what energy, with what enthusiasm, they are awaiting and longing for the day on which the proletariat in a capitalist country shall follow the example of the Russian revolution.

I believe that the best reply that we can give to the comrades of the Red Army, and particularly to the delegates of this battalion, will be to pledge ourselves to follow the road that they point out to us, the road which appears in the building of Socialism in Russia, and that with all our forces, with all our energy, we shall work for the victory of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries. In this sense, and only in this sense, I believe that I am nominated honorary soldier by this school battalion. I assume the obligation, as representative of the Communist Party of Germany, and of the Red Front League, to report to the workers in the various organisations what revolutionary spirit, what tremendous sympathy, what fraternal solidarity, what fighting energy, imbues the Russian workers and peasants. If we carry that militancy into the organisation of the German workers, first of all into the Communist Party, then we shall establish the foundation for the revolutionary struggle, and we shall tear apart the chains of capitalism. This is the task that we, as Communists, set ourselves. In the name of the Presidium and of the Executive, I may well say that we are all determined to tread the path that the Russian workers and peasants have traversed, and on this path we will be directed and guided by the fighting experiences which we have learned from the Russian proletariat. A Red Army stands at its post, a second Red Army on a world scale is being born. If we shatter the trenches and fortifications of the bourgeoisie, and if a second Red Army organises itself throughout the world, then the world proletariat will win, in revolution, victory over world capitalism.

The Communist International, the Communist Parties of the various countries, have written upon their banners and in their programmes, this line, this tactic, this road that is to be followed. In this sense I promise the commanders and students in the school and sharp-shooter battalion "Vystrel" that also in this meeting of the Plenum of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International we shall proceed to lay down the correct tactics and furnish the weapons for our struggle, as soldiers of the revolution, to overthrow world capitalism. (Great applause.)

Comrade GALLACHER (chairman):

Three cheers for Comrade Thälmann! (Cheers.)

The Plenum, in acknowledging the greetings of the Red Army School pledges itself to carry the spirit of the Red Army into the struggle of the workers of the whole world. (Applause.)

The discussion is resumed.

Comrade WITTDORF (Germany):

I shall try to throw a little light on the statements of Comrade Riese, from the standpoint of the overwhelming majority of the Party membership. I believe that all Comrades who heard his speech yesterday will share my view that the effort he made to prove the non-existence of a relative stabilisation has been a 100% failure.

If it were true, as Comrade Riese maintained in connection with his obviously erroneous estimate of the situation in Germany, that the German Party is embarking upon an opportunist course as a result of its incorrect appraisal of the situation, then this means neither more nor less than that Comrade Riese charges 99% of the German Party membership with being opportunists. This is a charge that no serious minded Comrade can credit.

I should like to enter upon a few special matters that Comrade Riese wanted to illustrate as the standpoint of the Wedding Opposition. The most interesting was the following:

Comrade Riese said that Comrade Thälmann had maintained that through the Party Majority's victory over the Ultra-Left a part of the German working class had been saved from being enrolled in the battlefield against the Soviet Union. That is absolutely right. And when Comrade Riese said to Comrade Thälmann yesterday: "Just try to prove that to the Wedding workers", it is certain that the Party C.C. as well as Comrade Thälmann will be ready to prove this even more clearly than ever before after yesterday's speech by Comrade Riese. Are such documents of the German Opposition unknown to Comrade Riese as, for example, the Memorandum of the Wedding Opposition on the Russian Party Discussion, which constitutes one unbroken line of falsification of the character of the Soviet Union? Or the "Declaration of the 700" — you know that Maslow, Ruth Fischer and other politicians issued a declaration on the Russian question signed by 700 functionaries, among them also Comrade Riese — which likewise represents an absolutely hostile policy against the Soviet Union. In addition we have here a document which was issued by the Wedding fraction only in the last few days before we left for Moscow. It states:

"The oppositional views are based upon the exaggerated N.E.P. course of Stalin which must have the result of awakening a growing dissatisfaction of the workers and rural poor at whose expense this concession course for the N.E.P. elements is being carried out."

What does this mean? Is this a policy of recognising the significance of the revolutionary factor which Soviet Russia constitutes in the movement, or is it not an open slander on the character of the Russian revolution? No comrade can answer this in the negative, all will have to reply affirmatively. From this viewpoint the overwhelming majority of the German Party membership, as well as the Oppositional workers in Wedding will declare that what was presented at the Plenum by Comrade Riese was absolutely demagoguery. Here where he should have stood by his colours, comrade Riese made a cowardly retreat.

Lacking a real political standpoint the leaders of the Wedding opposition have taken to the stumpy field of factional activity. When Comrade Riese declared yesterday that he, as well as the whole Wedding opposition, most energetically refuse to tolerate being considered hostile to Russia, he must declare whether he still stands by these three documents that were issued by the opposition and with his signature. If he does not then we will acknowledge this as a welcome progress towards the liquidation of the opposition in Germany.

Comrade Riese said that the inner Party course was an entirely unbearable one, that it was a mechanical oppression of every single expression of an oppositional comrade, and he warned the C.C. against the shattering of the last foundations of the Communist Party. What, in his opinion, are the last foundations of the Communist Party? Obviously what he wanted to say was that he considered the Wedding opposition as the only foundation of the Party. I hope that heaven will protect us from such a foundation. We have no occasion whatever to look upon Comrade Riese as the saviour of the Party's foundation.

Comrade Riese maintained that the inner Party course is a suppression of the opposition — which is absolutely untrue. All comrades who have actually gone through the battle can testify to this. In every meeting the opposition was given an opportunity to express its views. In this connection he demanded no more or less than the legalisation of Communist fractions. He said that because it was not possible to express its views, the opposition sought a way out in factional activity, in other words: in the activity of a party within a party.

To this must be added a third point.

(Interjection by Domsky: "Mecklenburg!")

The German Party is strong enough to admit every mistake that may occur in its practical work, and what is most important it corrects them itself. We do not need the advice of Comrade Domsky in these affairs.

Comrade Riese then complained about the expulsions which have taken place in our Party and connected up this complaint with the demand that all who had been expelled on the basis of unheard of breaches of discipline and anti-Party activity, shall be readmitted to the Party because, forsooth, in the opinion of Comrade Riese they are "Left" elements in the Party. Comrade Riese yesterday flung around the argument about "Left elements"

in the Party. I asked him in vain what he meant by "Left". I believe that without exaggeration it can be said that the standpoint of the opposition on questions of tactics and principle has nothing Left about it, but instead it is the reverse side of Menshevism. (Applause.) This has become clear, in practice, for every Party member. What entitles the Communist Party to expel a member? Can the Party tolerate an open call for civil war against the Soviet Union, as in the case of Korsch and other people? Can the Party tolerate that its members stand in constant contact with such Party foes, that unheard of breaches of discipline are committed? No, under no circumstances. The Party membership has built up our Party at far too great sacrifices to permit rampaging politicians. —

(Interjection by Riese: "Are West Saxony, Saar, and Berlin rampaging politicians?")

(Interjection by Thälmann: "Ruth Fischer and Maslow!")

I repeat. The Party membership, in Berlin as well as in all other districts, has made far too great sacrifices to allow the Party to be broken up by the frivolous tricks of such petty-bourgeois groups.

Comrade Riese said further that the recruiting power of the Party had suffered in connection with the political course. In other words this means, he indirectly implied, that the Communist Party was sailing directly into the wake of the Social Democratic Party. I should like to just mention one case from the practice of the Opposition in Berlin in order to illustrate how they themselves, with practical activity among the workers who are to be won over, contribute to the discrediting of the Party. A functionary in a Berlin nucleus declared quite openly that of course he wanted to win recruits for the Party, but that he would recruit only such workers as were against the policy of the Central Committee. (Interjection: "Hear, Hear!")

Surely, it is an unheard of state of affairs when a Party functionary openly declares, in the presence of other comrades, that he will recruit only such members as are against the policy of the C. C.! How can this be squared with a really honest work in the Party?

A few words more about the argument of the opposition, that the Party is travelling towards Social Democracy. Can a Party which is "travelling towards the Social Democracy" win 70,000 workers' votes in the Saxon elections from this Social Democracy for itself? I believe that this theory of the entrance of the Communist Party into the Social Democracy is best refuted by the facts of the elections in Saxony.

The majority of the German Party membership is absolutely confident that such mistakes as were undoubtedly made in the past will never be made again.

Comrade Riese made a remark with respect to certain comrades who support the present Party leadership and who were in the Party executive in 1923 when the Party made those mistakes. But Comrade Riese forgets that this is 1926, and that the Party has drawn two important lessons from the October defeat:

1. It has corrected the erroneous conceptions of the former majority of the Party executive on the question of the theory of the State.

2. In the question of the role of the Party on which at that time there was no clarity, now we are clear. By means of a correct Leninist policy we must succeed in isolating the counter-revolutionary leaders of the Social Democracy from the honest Social Democratic workers. It is therefore unheard of to maintain that the Communist Party is going over to the Social Democracy. Even such a trend of thought leads to the obvious liquidation of the Communist Party, for can one possibly win over a Social Democratic worker if one is convinced that the Communist Party is going over to the Social Democracy? No, absolutely not.

We must therefore tell Comrade Riese very seriously that such sentiments are dangerous to the entire working class. Comrade Riese and the Wedding opposition must make an end to this. They must no longer allow themselves to be used by such conscience-less demagogues who exploit the revolutionary convictions of the oppositional workers and their doubt of the correctness of the Party line, in order to harness them to the cart of their factional activity, not only against the Party, but also against the Comintern and the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the honest workers of the Wedding opposition will very quickly, in practical work, find their way back to the Party policy.

Comrades, the opposition must be told: Stop hindering the German Party in its practical work through your shrieks about the "kulakising" of the Soviet Union, about the entrance of the C. P. G. into the S. D. P., about opportunism, etc. By this you are hindering the Party in its fulfilment of important tasks. We know that in the present complicated situation it is not always easy to carry on a correct policy, that mistakes may happen, but they will be corrected. But a C. C. that would be opportunist, that would embark upon the road to the S. D. P., would in the quickest manner be removed by the German membership. This is the standpoint of the overwhelming majority of the Party membership and it is highest time, that without any deviation, in the quickest possible manner, we liquidate the relics of this non-Communist ideology of the opposition in the Party.

Comrade LOMINADZE (Soviet Union):

Comrades, I should like to enter upon two questions, which are connected with one another. First, upon the appraisal of the present situation in capitalist Europe, and, secondly, upon the question of rationalisation.

I consider it necessary to take up the first question because, in my opinion, Comrade Brandt has dealt with it entirely erroneously. Yesterday at the conclusion of the evening session Comrade Brandt appeared and tried to show us that a tremendous change has taken place in the capitalist technique of Europe during recent years, that in a number of industrial districts, at least in all of the most important branches of industry, a technical revolution had taken place. After this statement, which he based upon citations of concrete facts, Comrade Brandt went over to an attack upon me.

First of all, what is involved here? In one of my articles I wrote that the production apparatus of capitalist Europe is already approaching the pre-war level. It is clear that I fell into an error. In the connection in which these words were used what is involved is the productive forces of capitalist Europe, and Comrade Brandt knows very well that what we are talking about is the productive forces of capitalist Europe. Nevertheless, he exploited this slip of the pen in order to ascribe to me false tendencies of minimising the contradictions of capitalist society. This incident had really the purpose of justifying another tendency, not in harmony with the policy of the Comintern, which is defended by Comrades Brandt and Koschthewa.

Comrade Koschthewa maintained in an article in the "Bolshevik":

"What other way out than a new war holocaust can capitalism find, it is incapable... in order to escape from the magic circle created by the fantastic development of the productive forces, and the impossibility of finding a market in view of the ever-shrinking consumption."

The fantastic development of the productive forces — this is said not concerning capitalism as such, but of capitalism in Europe in the present concrete situation of Europe. The fantastic development of productive forces! I took issue with this and made a perhaps not altogether applicable reservation with regard to the productive apparatus of modern Europe. What should have been said is that the productive forces of Europe, as they now appear, are only approaching the pre-war level, but Brandt has seized upon my inexact formulation in order with its aid to cloak the false thesis of Comrade Koschthewa. What is involved here is that definite thesis of the fantastic development of European productive forces. Comrade Brandt has said nothing about this thesis, he has said nothing about the falseness of the way Comrade Koschthewa has put the question. Comrade Brandt has appeared here because he shares the viewpoint of Comrade Koschthewa, but he has not enough courage to openly defend this standpoint. Comrade Brandt here reports about what tremendous changes, what new development of productive forces, what technical transformations have taken place in a whole series of industrial fields. But without exception Comrade Brandt enumerated here all of the chief fields of industry. But he himself said nothing more about it, he stopped with this establishment. In such a cursory observation it does not seem to be quite certain whether Comrade Brandt did not identify the productive apparatus, whose changes and improvements he enumerated here, with the productive forces. It appears to me that he has identified them in fact. This was the trend of Comrade Brandt's speech.

this was the sense of his speech. Yet he had in mind only one side of modern capitalism. He takes only that which was positive in the development of modern capitalism during the last eight years. From his viewpoint one arrives at the following: the productive apparatus developed to gigantic heights, there is a growth — says Comrade Brandt — of the productive forces of capitalist Europe, and in consequence we see the progressive development of capitalism.

I will now go over to the question of whether one can confuse the productive forces with the productive apparatus. Brandt does not distinguish one from the other in his speech. Can one identify the level of development of productive forces with the status of the productive apparatus? In my opinion it is impermissible, it is basically wrong. The level of the productive forces must, in my opinion, be measured from the following viewpoint: If one speaks of the quantitative appraisal of the productive forces one must take the amount that is produced and from this point compare present capitalism with pre-war capitalism. I shall not cite the report of Comrade Bukharin here, but all comrades will remember and know that if we take the total production of the most important productive areas we find that at present no more is being produced than in the pre-war time. To be sure in certain, and at that, not in the most important branches of industry, more is being produced than before the war. But if we consider what European industry, and not only industry but also agriculture, is producing, then we find even a retrogression from the pre-war standard in Europe. Brandt himself knows that the present production can hardly be compared with the pre-war period. What did Comrade Bukharin do in his report? He takes a number of commodities from the chief productive areas, and he compares their amount with the pre-war figures. This is how Comrade Bukharin puts the question of the level of productive forces.

However, one might reply to this: but please, the productive forces must be determined by the productive capacity of the machines, and by the modern organisation of technique, etc. Yet, comrades, if we speak of the productive forces then these surely do not consist only of machines and raw material, but they include also the working class. But then, take the question of the tremendous growth of the army of industrial reserve labour in recent times. We now have an unemployment figure in the whole of Europe that far exceeds the extent of unemployment during the sharpest crises in the past. The question now arises, do the workers who are divorced from the means of production and who find no place for their labour in industry, do they constitute a positive factor in the productive forces or not? Can one say that the productive forces have grown tremendously because we have a vast unemployed army of 5½ millions, in addition to the workers employed in industry? That would be wrong. Can one say that a factory which is closed down can be counted in with the productive forces? What is a factory that is standing idle? This factory is being ruined, its value destroyed. It is a minus and not a plus of the productive forces. That is what it is. One must therefore, when speaking of the productive apparatus, not mix this up with the growth of the productive forces. The productive forces, during the labour process, are composed of labour power, machines, raw materials, and all kinds of auxiliary material during the labour process. The level of the productive forces is measured quantitatively, by the amount which they produce. Of course one gets a somewhat different picture if one approaches this question from a quantitative point. Yet what is involved in this question is a quantitative comparison. Comrade Brandt makes himself guilty of this error and likewise of the mistake of presenting merely the development of technique as the development of the productive forces — otherwise he would not defend the standpoint of Comrade Koschthewa.

In his speech, Comrade Brandt spoke of the contradictions in capitalist development. He spoke of capitalist contradictions that are characteristic of every period: the contradiction between the absorption power of the market and the growth of productive forces, furthermore the contradictions between the growth of production and the growth of the industrial reserve army. The industrial reserve army grows in every capitalist society. Capitalism always feels a severe shortage of markets, and through the struggle for markets world history is determined. But he overlooked the signs of rot in capitalism. Comrade Brandt has appeared here as the troubador of capitalist progress. With ob-

vious enthusiasm and in full swing he has told us about the gigantic transformation that has taken place in the motor industry, in the application of electricity, in shipbuilding, etc. Comrade Brandt sees only the rosy side but about the rotten spots of capitalism which can also be established from the standpoint of technical progress he remains entirely silent. Not a word did he say about capitalism's disintegration. Yet this decay of capitalism is the background for the modern development of technique and the partial growth of the technical productive forces. The decay of capitalism does not exclude the growth of the productive forces upon various fields, yes, even in individual countries, but it does determine the general tendency of modern capitalism. Comrade Brandt has not said a word about this basic tendency, which is not only an essential feature of modern capitalism, but also of the entire capitalist period. He did not give an accidental slip of the tongue. Comrade Brandt did not raise the question from the standpoint of a politician, but from the standpoint of an engineer.

Comrade Brandt spoke here about tendencies, about the danger of the tendencies of my formulation. He implied that I showed a tendency to present the antagonisms within capitalism as smaller than what they are. — That this tendency resulted from the claim that the productive forces have not yet reached the pre-war level, that they were only first approaching them. Comrade Brandt finds a false, a dangerous tendency in the statement that a destruction of productive forces is taking place, or that the productive forces are lagging behind the pre-war level. This is supposed to be a minimisation of the contradictions, this is supposed to mean an inclination towards opportunism. This is just about the sense of Comrade Brandt's whole speech. I find that everything is wrong with Brandt, and I have never made the statement that the status of the productive forces of capitalist Europe is approaching the European pre-war level, this is a generally known, and entirely correct formulation that the development of productive forces has been checked severely in the post-war period.

We now have a situation of affairs in which the capitalist shell, that is the capitalist property relations, interfere with the development of productive forces. We have a condition of affairs in which science, as always, fructifies technique. As in the past industry, science and technique now open up gigantic possibilities for the development of agriculture, the development of productive forces as such. And yet all these scientific and technical achievements are choked and suppressed in the capitalist wrappings, that is why, despite the gigantic possibilities, we have no such rapid development of productive forces as in the pre-war period. This is the kernel. This is how matters stand.

In my opinion this does not mean that one minimises or glosses over the contradictions if one maintains that productive apparatus is being destroyed. That is nonsense. It means to deviate from every sort of class struggle, to surrender the standpoint of the working class and to advocate only naked schemes and formulas, if one maintains that the contradictions would become smaller if productive forces were to be destroyed. If the productive apparatus is destroyed supply declines, the difference between supply and demand becomes smaller, and Comrade Brandt sees in this a weakening of the most important contradiction in capitalist society. The most important contradiction is supposed to exist in the relationship between supply and demand. The working class disappears entirely from the field of vision of Comrade Brandt, here we actually have a "tendency".

In a letter by Engels it is said that the war in which 15 to 20 million people kill off one another, will lead either to an immediate victory of the revolution, or else will bring Europe into such a chaos and to such ruin and disintegration of productive forces that even then the victory of the proletarian revolution, after a delay of 10 to 15 years, is inevitable.

Such a ruin of productive forces, according to the views of Comrade Brandt, is supposed to lead to the weakening of the contradictions. It would appear that Engels entertains the same dangerous tendency that I do, because I have learned this tendency from Engels — he did not learn it from me.

I must refer to Comrade Lapinsky, who in his investigation of the post-war situation of Europe, establishes absolutely correctly that the situation of European capitalism is an uneasy one. When Comrade Lapinsky speaks of the post-war epoch he does so not as an engineer but as a politician and a sociologist. And

he says that the first post-war years were years of the decay and ruin of the productive forces. That is what Lapinsky says. That does not quite fit in with your scheme, Comrade Brandt.

(Interjection by Lapinsky: "Kostschewa says the same thing!")

I do not know what relations prevail between you and Kostschewa, but here is a big difference between you. Of course one can say a thing and then refuse to admit what was said, but in the case of Kostschewa it stands in black and white that we have a phantastic development of the productive forces. Lapinsky speaks of decay and destruction, Brandt states a gigantic growth of the productive apparatus which he confuses with the growth of the productive forces, and Lapinsky establishes that an unsteady condition prevails. If there are no contradictions here, then you can settle with your own logic. Comrade Brandt almost accused me of Trotskyism here. That is nonsense. I feel however, that Comrade Brandt's error here is no accident, but that he reflects a tendency here — a tendency that is best embodied in the theses submitted to the Polish Commission in July of this year by Comrades Brandt and Kostschewa. In these theses the stabilisation of Poland with the aid of American loans is presented as most highly probable. Poland will receive loans and will be flooded by a golden rain. This will lead to the loss of independence, to the restriction of industry... and to a stabilisation upon this basis. It is stated further that this plan will be carried out in such a way that the Polish labour movement will be Americanised.

I am of the opinion that this plan is the most unlikely of all other bourgeois stabilisation plans, and that the entertaining "golden rain" and the Americanisation of the Polish labour movement betrays only the opportunistic tendencies of the writers of these theses. A similar tendency is shown also in the formulation concerning European productive forces. Comrades, I believe that this is no casual jest, and that for Comrade Brandt the one question is tied up with the other. If Comrade Brandt considers it necessary to charge me with Trotskyism (and furthermore I am not afraid to say that in one question or another I am in agreement with Comrade Trotsky, although with regard to the European productive forces I do not completely share Trotsky's viewpoint), then, in my opinion, Comrade Brandt was wrong in this. My relations with Comrade Trotsky are but casual, yet the regularity of your mistakes, comrade Brandt, is unquestionable. Here we can take dates and stages, as we like, 1920, 1922, 1923, and 1926. Your theses in the Polish question, your attitude here, — all this constitutes only one single line.

I will close with the question of productive forces. It is necessary to take into consideration all sides of modern capitalism in Europe. Also from the viewpoint of the productive apparatus things are not such as to permit it to be said that the production apparatus is growing everywhere. We must at the same time indicate the actual destruction of means of production where factories are shut down and where the toiling masses are sentenced to ruin. Comrade Brandt does not see this side.

I should like to deal with a second question; with the question of rationalisation.

Comrades, it is necessary to deal with this question because it is one of those questions on which a rather interesting discussion has developed in this Plenum, and on the other hand because our press reflects a whole series of absolutely wrong views in this question. I will first point out the position that Comrade Lenin had on the trusts, because in my opinion it would not harm us to take into consideration Lenin's position on this question, instead of trying to invent a new one. In 1916 Lenin said in an article concerning "The Slogan of Disarmament", the following:

"It is the business of the bourgeoisie to develop trusts, to drive women and children into the factories, to torture and demoralise them there, and to condemn them to the deepest misery. We do not demand such a development, we do not support it, we combat it. But how do we combat it? We know that the trusts and the women factory workers are in line with progress. We do not want to go back to handicraft, to premonopolist capitalism, to the housework of the women. Forward beyond the trusts and other things, and still further forward towards Socialism."

Here the slogan is given: "Forward beyond the Trusts, and Further to Socialism". We are fighting this development but not

in such a way that we demand a return to pre-monopolist capitalism, we counter this development with our slogan of Socialism. Nevertheless we fight this development. I believe that Lenin's advice is extraordinarily weighty and timely.

In our press voices are heard that are absolutely impermissible. In today's issue of the "Komsomolskaya Pravda" the following is said:

"The Communists wage a struggle against rationalisation. We are not against rationalising production, viz., we are not opposed to the introduction of new machines, against technical improvement, but we are against the weakening of the living labour power, we are against the rationalisation at the expense of the workers."

Lenin said that we fight against a development such as the present rationalisation. The "Komsomolskaya Pravda" says that we are not against rationalisation and it supplements this: viz. we are not against the introduction of new machines, against technical improvement, etc. This "etc." betrays the whole mendacity of this position. The "Komsomolskaya Pravda", with its "etc.", tries to confine the whole rationalisation merely to technique. With its "etc." it remains silent on the accompaniments of rationalisation. Rationalisation is supposed to be introduced without "weakening of labour power", without exploitation, etc. But this is nonsense, it is incurable confusion.

Still more peculiar is it that Comrade Smoliansky, who knows perfectly well that rationalisation does not mean merely perfection of technique, tries to prove exactly the same thing as the "Komsomolskaya Pravda". He tries to deal with the question more seriously and thoroughly than the "Komsomolskaya Pravda", but in contents he says the same: If on the one hand we cannot embark upon the road of "raising" the rationalisation, yet on the other hand the tactic of the Communist Parties cannot be built up upon the slogan of fight against rationalisation as such. This is the worst mistake of Comrade Smoliansky. The proletariat fights and must fight against rationalisation "as such", because this rationalisation is primarily the greatest attempt of capitalism to retain power, and because it constitutes the greatest means of pressure against the working class. Capitalism can garner in success only by means of an unexampled reduction of the standard of living of the working class, or by means of bloody colonial wars. Against such a rationalisation, against this rationalisation "as such" we fight because it is a raging attack upon the working class.

(Interjection by Skrypnik: "You are against the theses of Comrade Bukharin".)

Comrade Bukharin says that we cannot be opposed to technical progress as such, and Comrade Smoliansky says that we should not fight against rationalisation as such. Rationalisation is not merely technical progress, as everyone knows, and this is also known to Comrade Smoliansky. "The working class can be neither for nor against rationalisation", says Comrade Smoliansky. Show me such a passage by Bukharin. The working class cannot be against technical improvement, but it cannot be for a technical improvement in capitalist society. Yet with Smoliansky we talk of rationalisation, even though Comrade Smoliansky himself knows perfectly well that rationalisation is not confined to the technical factor.

Comrade Smoliansky speaks further on about confusion in the heads of Communists and cites the German Communist Ludwig who says the following:

"The reply of the proletariat to rationalisation must be: fight for the realisation of Socialism, against rationalisation of the means of production, trustified by finance capital. Fight for the conquest of state power, for the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Comrade Ludwig sets up against rationalisation the dictatorship of the proletariat, the conquest of power, etc. Bukharin did the same, when he spoke about our replying to rationalisation with the struggle against capitalist stabilisation, and Smoliansky makes exactly this reproach against Ludwig. He says:

"What can we say, the slogans are good, yet they will hardly be able to mobilise the broad masses of the German proletariat in the present stage for a correct struggle against unemployment and other social concomitants of rationalisation."

How about it now, who is against Bukharin? Comrade Smoliansky. Bukharin is for the formulation given by Ludwig. Of course we cannot confine ourselves to the naked contraposition of a general slogan against rationalisation. A struggle must be launched against every partial demand, against every expression of rationalisation. This struggle is absolutely necessary, but it must not confine itself to the struggle over partial demands, this would mean the treading of the trade unionist path. Against this last resource of capitalism, against this unprecedented pressure upon the working class, we must reply with the slogan that combines our partial demands into a political line.

As such a slogan against the stabilisation of capitalism I consider also the slogan: "against capitalist rationalisation". There is absolutely no conflict between my conception and the Bukharin theses. I defend these theses and stand by them. There is not even a glimmer of principial difference with Bukharin.

Now a few words more about progressive capitalism. Lenin said that capitalism is progressive in the sense that through the trusts we come to Socialism. Comrades, that was correct, when contiguous to capitalist society there existed no other Socialist organisation of labour. At the present time, in my opinion, there can be no talk of a progressive capitalism. At the present time every consolidation of capitalism, on every field, everywhere, has a reactionary significance. Capitalism is completely reactionary because we already have a higher organisation of labour, so that if the formulation of Lenin in 1916 was correct it is now correct in an even greater measure. It is necessary to emphasise more strongly that we fight against rationalisation and against capitalist development, because contiguous to the capitalist form there already exists a higher Socialist form. Capitalism has become reactionary in every respect and the fight against rationalisation under the slogan of Socialism is more necessary than ever before.

Comrade MURPHY (England):

Comrades, first of all I want to make a correction. In the report as presented to the Plenum, and I believe in one or two of the speeches already given, the impression is given that the attack which has recently been made upon the miners and is now proceeding is something which has only just begun. This, comrades, I think to be somewhat of an exaggeration; the figures will correct this impression that the standard of living of the British workers has been uninterruptedly rising until the attack during 1926. The highest point in real wages reached in British history was in 1900, and from then onwards there has been a steady decline in real wages. Not only so, but I believe that the figures show that disputes over wages and hours have been numerous and lengthy. For example, when we speak of the struggle of 1926 we cannot forget the struggle of 1921 when we had the great attack on the miners and a number of other industrial disputes which involved a loss of 86 million working days during that year.

During the period of 1921-23 the British working class lost in wages to the extent of £ 10,000,000 per week. From 1923 onwards the workers have been in the trough of despondency until 1925. Then came a revival and the further development of the attack with the long disputes of 1926. If you will note these figures and observations you will get the correct impression of the actual situation in Great Britain, which, whilst presented in this way, does not alter the main contention that the British bourgeoisie are now attempting to put through as rapidly as possible the same process which has gone on in Germany. This I believe to be sound; but the period is a longer one than indicated.

A further correction I want to make is in regard to the polarisation of the classes. The report speaks of the passing of the Liberal Party into the Tory Party. That is true, but still more forces be added, and that is, that a large proportion of the Liberal forces have passed also over into the Labour Party.

Now as to the general situation: During the last few years, especially the last few months, we have witnessed a number of important changes in Europe. In fact the situation is characterised by a series of rapid changes. We have witnessed the breakdown of the Versailles Treaty, featuring the British and French alliance against a beaten Germany. We have seen this piece of political orientation changed entirely in the direction of the Locarno Pact. We have seen the Locarno Pact exploded at Geneva by the interfering hand of America. We have witnessed after-

wards, a growing entente between France and Germany. These changes have been developing so quickly and have been so complex in the manner in which they presented themselves to us, that there has been some confusion and quite a number of varying notions with regard to the possibilities of a united European bloc against the Soviet Union on the one hand and America on the other.

Some comrades question the possibility of a united European bloc, and insist upon the importance of the rivalries between the various powers. But from which ever angle we may view the situation, the one fact which is outstanding is the **growing tension between the great rivals**. That this tension is accentuated by the developments in the Far East goes without saying, but I doubt whether the full significance and importance of this Far Eastern development upon British imperialism is sufficiently appreciated. The movement of world trade to the Pacific Ocean, taken in relation to the direct reactions of the Chinese Revolution upon Great Britain, is a most serious and decisive factor in the fate of the British Empire and increases the tension between the powers enormously. Britain's rivals have immense advantages in all dealings with the Far East. Take for example the length of the trade route from Britain to China. Which ever way British trade moves to this far distant land, America and Japan have the advantage over Britain by many thousands of miles. Advantage in the trade route in this case also means advantage in the movement of the fleets.

Already with the success of the Chinese Revolutionary forces there is a decided change in the relations of the imperialists both to the revolution and to each other. Their rivalry has prevented a collective military intervention in China. Now they are on the point of scrambling individually for the best bargain they can make with the new situation, thus increasing the tension in their relations to each other. Simultaneously, we have to face the remarkable conclusions of the British Empire Conference which appear to indicate very clearly that in the not far distant future it will be very questionable whether the British Empire can hold together for common action.

I suggest, comrades, that we are not yet studying thoroughly enough the problems of war. Have we asked ourselves, what is the role of the trade unions in the coming war and how are we preparing them for such a development? Have we studied the importance of having them on the side of the revolution as the war situation develops? Have we considered the strategy of war and what unions would be involved in the most strategical tasks of war? Have we followed up the trade unionists when they join the army, or have we been content to wait until they return to the ranks of civil life before speaking to them again concerning the problem of class solidarity? These questions I put in order to relate them to the one fundamental question which lies before us as the war situation becomes more serious, and that is the preparation of the working class and the parties of revolution for the tasks of civil war. Theoretically, we agree that it is necessary to transform imperialist wars into civil war. But I maintain that without thoroughly preparing the forces of civil war in this developing situation we are not fulfilling our revolutionary obligations. Therefore, in bringing this situation briefly to the forefront of the discussion, I want to emphasise again the necessity of a deeper study of all the problems attendant on war and how we can prepare the way for the transformation of imperialist war into civil war — the only real answer that can be possibly given to imperialism.

Comrade PODVOISKY (Chairman of the Red Sport International):

In carrying out the instructions given me by the Executive Committee of the Red Sport International, permit me, before proceeding to my remarks, to greet the VII Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. in the name of more than two million workers and peasants of the Red Sport International as well as in the name of that section of the Pioneer movement which is affiliated in some countries with the organisation of the Red-Sport International. In my capacity as Chairman of the Red Sport International on the one hand, and because Comrade Bukharin, for lack of time as he told me, did not enter upon the work of the Sections of the Communist International in the Workers' Gymnastic and Sport movement, permit me to go into this part of the work, upon the active day to day execution of which by the Communist Parties depends: 1. the enlivening, strengthening

and deepening of the organisational and cultural work of the trade unions, the Communist youth and the Communist Children's groups, 2. the improvement of the means, forms and methods for organising and training the masses; 3. the increased revolutionary militarisation of the masses; 4. an increase of the means with the aid of which the bourgeois army can be influenced; 5. the creation of a broad concrete basis for the crystallisation of a defence organisation of the proletariat.

At present there are, in the Workers' Gymnastic and Sport Movement, three fronts: the bourgeois, the revolutionary-proletarian, and the reformist proletarian fronts. These three fronts include about 30 million people.

Permit me to deal briefly with the situation on these three fronts, and to describe their role in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS' SPORT FRONT.

The vanguard of the revolutionary workers' sport front is the sport movement of the Soviet Union. The gymnastic and sport movement in the land of the Soviets is becoming one of the factors of the Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. This movement participates in the task: 1. of organising the masses; 2. of preparing the forces for the defence of the Soviet Union; 3. of preparing the productive forces for the upbuilding of Socialist economy and society. It is comprehensible that the C. P. S. U. (b), the trade unions, the Communist Youth, the Communist Children's group movement, and the State organs, ascribe a great importance to this movement and give it considerable political, organisational and material support. The Workers' Gymnastic and Sport Movement of the Soviet Union, which originated six years ago as a workers' and peasants' mass movement, was never a non-political movement; on the contrary, it has at all times been a revolutionary movement. The short history of this movement which confirms this runs as follows: the workers gymnastic and sport movement which originated as a revolutionary mass sport movement of the working class and of the peasantry, was created in 1920 in the land of the Soviets, by the "Vsevobuch" (organisation for general military training) in support of the civil war.

After the termination of the civil war, with the transition to economic construction, there fell to the workers gymnastic and sport movement, in addition to the task of preparing the children and youth for the defence of the U.S.S.R. naturally also the task of training the productive forces for Socialist economy. By its forms, methods, by the technique of sports, games and gymnastics, which are as easy and as interesting for adults as for children, this organisation contributes to the training of children and youth for the best fulfilment of their duties of citizenship in the industry and defence of the state.

The Soviet orientation in the sport movement leads consistently towards the end that the workers and peasants, and especially their youth, cease to regard sport as amusement, recreation and a means of health. In some countries, e.g. in Germany, the working class is already seeking organisational roads of bringing the workers gymnastic and sport movement closer to the Red Front organisation in order to create a new, joint, broad workers defence organisation. The Red Sport International decided to foster the development and deepening of the revolutionary sport front through the arrangement of an "Octoberiade" in 1928. This Octoberiade is to be a demonstration of international proletarian solidarity, and a battle review for the October. This Octoberiade, which has a big political purpose has already aroused great enthusiasm in all parts of the hitherto not yet united international workers Sport front. The Red Sport International is convinced that there will participate in the organisation and carrying out of the Octoberiade not only the workers gymnastic and sport societies, but also all workers organisations that stand upon the basis of the class struggle against the bourgeoisie. The Red Sport International reckons with the political, organisational and material support of the organisation of the Octoberiade by all proletarian organisations of the world, because this celebration will be the first international demonstration of the solidarity of the masses of workers and peasants that are organised in the workers gymnastic and sport movement. The Red Sport International also counts upon the help of the proletarian class organisations

to finish the building of the international red stadium of which the corner-stone was laid by the delegates to the II. Congress of the Comintern, the delegations of the English proletariat, of the army-eligible youth of the Soviet Union and of all sport organisations of the Soviet Union. This was done in Moscow in 1920 upon the Lenin Hills.

THE REFORMIST WORKERS' SPORT FRONT.

A great change has taken place recently in the situation in the reformist workers sport front. Here of late confusion and dissolution has prevailed. Not long ago this front seemed absolutely solid. There it was preached that the workers' sport movement had to be non-political. The leaders at that front took the liberty only recently to propose to the Red Sport International that it dissolve. But under the pressure of the bourgeois offensive against the proletariat, and the general insecurity in the situation of the working class, as also under the influence of the organisational experiences of the Red Sport International in organising and training the masses for the struggle against the bourgeoisie, in recent years a powerful leftward trend has set in among the masses on that front. These masses are forcing their leaders toward the Left, they are forcing them to an actual class struggle against the bourgeoisie. The masses of the reformist sport movement support the campaigns of the Red Sport International for the amalgamation of the international workers' sport movement on the basis of the sharpening of the class struggle, and they are freeing themselves from the influence of their leaders and are setting their course towards the Red Sport International.

THE BOURGEOIS SPORT FRONT.

The plans and programme of work of the bourgeoisie on the sport front show that no one understands how to exploit the sport movement so well, so cleverly and so finely as does the bourgeoisie on behalf of its own manifold interests. Immediately after the war the bourgeoisie in the course of a few years engaged itself in utilising the sport movement for a broad militarisation of the population, and for a military training for children and youth.

When the October revolution unleashed a revolutionary movement in many countries, the bourgeoisie put its sport movement, and to a considerable extent also the sport movement of the workers, ably and cleverly into the service of the counter-revolutionary movement. But best of all it utilised the sport movement as the basis for the development of the Fascist movement.

During the last years the bourgeoisie makes use of the sport movement as an aid in the stabilisation of capitalism. It made this movement into an important factor in the rationalisation of the labour of the proletariat. With the aid of a specially created system, the bourgeoisie in all haste created a network of gymnastic and sport organisations in the factories, in the commercial and industrial enterprises. It spared no means to furnish gymnasiums, sport clubs, swimming pools, playgrounds, etc., for these organisation. Nor did it spare any means for the hiring of the best sport teachers. Thus, e.g. in Germany an engineer is given a wage of 350 marks a month whereas a sport instructor receives 1,000 marks a month. The bourgeoisie knows that thereby it kills two birds with one stone: on the one hand it keeps the worker in his free time in the factory gymnasiums under its influence, and on the other hand it turns the sport organisations in the factories into schools for the voluntary training of the workers in their special work, in this way selecting the best of them and training them in order to make better use of their strength in the factory.

For the purpose of successfully carrying out the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie the following tasks must be solved.

1. The carrying out of a systematic, determined and painstaking activity through the revolutionary press and the revolutionary propagandists among the broad masses, and the awakening of understanding for the revolutionary purposes and aims of the workers sport movement.

2. The setting of political aims for the international meets of workers sportsmen, celebrations, demonstrations.

3. The carrying out of a theoretical and methodical programmatic work in the study of the experiences of the workers gymnastic and sport movement, and also that of the bourgeois sport movement, for the purpose of creating the basis of a more revolutionary system in the sport movement of the proletarians and peasants.

4. A further development and deepening of the work for the creation of a uniform workers' sport movement under the hegemony of the Red Sport International.

5. The utilisation of the revolutionary workers' sport movement. a) For the organisation and revolutionary training of the workers and peasant youth; b) for the separation of the masses of worker sportsmen from the bourgeois sports movement, and a unification with the revolutionary workers' sport movement; c) for the exercise of a revolutionising influence upon the bourgeois army; d) for the organisation of a proletarian defence corps and primarily for the broadening of the movement of the Red Front.

6. The establishment in Great Britain, America and Sweden of an independent workers gymnastic and sport union.

7. The coalition of all sport societies in China which stand upon the basis of the revolutionary national liberation struggle.

8. The selection and training of a revolutionary proletarian kernel of organisers, leaders, instructors for the work on the sport front, and for the training of a kernel troupe of theoreticians and scientifically trained functionaries for the work on this front.

9. An augmented recruiting campaign for the attraction of the workers and peasants of all countries for the organisation of the "Octoberiade" arranged by the Red Sport Inter-

national for Moscow 1928, as well as for the participation of these masses in this demonstration of international proletarian solidarity.

10. Collaboration in the completion of the International Red Stadium already begun in the Lenin Hills of Moscow.

I appeal to the Plenum to appoint a special sub-commission charged with the task of looking into my proposals, upon instruction of the Executive of the Red Sport International, for work on the sport front.

COMRADE LENSKI,

on behalf of the minority of the C.C. of the Communist Party of Poland, at the close of the Session, presented the following declaration:

TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE VII. ENLARGED PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.

As a representative of the view-point of the minority on the C.C. of the Communist Party of Poland I cannot unreservedly endorse the theses of Comrade Bukharin.

At the same time I declare that in the leadership of the C.P.P. there are differences on most important questions of Party activity. Since, however, I am of the opinion that these differences require a careful detailed study, I shall refrain from dealing with questions concerning our inner Party situation in the Plenum, and will submit them to a commission.

(J. Lenski.)

(Close of Session.)

Tenth Session.

Moscow, 27. Nov., 1926.

The Chairman Comrade Maggi, opened the Session and called upon Comrade Ercoli to speak.

Comrade ERCOLI (Italy):

What is noteworthy with respect to the theses placed before us is, in our opinion, the fact that this is the first time since the question of stabilisation was broached in the Communist International that we have to do with a deliberate and comprehensive attempt to give not only an analysis of the term, but also of the substance of the relative stabilisation of the capitalist system, and to examine this fact from the viewpoint of its basic value as a phenomenon, as well as from the viewpoint of its quantitative content so as to ascertain the specific weight of the various elements which create this relative stabilisation.

We could no longer rest content with simply saying: "stabilisation exists", and then proceed to give a string of attributes which not only narrow the term itself, but which hedge even this restriction with reservations. To rest content with this system would mean to leave the door open to even more serious political mistakes. If we have no clear notion of what stabilisation really is, there would always be the possibility that, in the face of a new event arising in the international situation (for instance the British strike), we would deviate from the correct policy either with regard to the appraisal of this event, or with regard to the tactics which should be adopted.

And now a few words on the results of this analysis and also on what we consider the kernel of the whole matter. There is a considerable number of elements which contribute to the definition of the present situation, and which characterise the present crisis in the capitalist regime — a considerable number of elements either dovetailing with or opposed to one another. Nevertheless, there exists a fundamental line which we must try to work out, for what is involved here is the question of defining our tactics. This fundamental element is, perhaps, the same as that emphasised at former sessions of the International. But as we have met here to see whether our tactics have stood the test and what form they are to take in the immediate future, we must emphasise once more this fundamental element.

We have listened here to many reports from the various countries. In all these reports it is emphasised that one of the conditions — and in most cases the basic condition — which has led to this period of relative stabilisation of capitalism, — consists in the victory won by capitalism over the working class, or, in the defeat which — at a certain historical moment — capitalism was able to inflict on the working class. This is the first point.

What then is the meaning, the economic and social substance, of all the efforts made by capitalism to stabilise itself, in the general sense of the word. By raising the question in this manner, we do not leave out of account that a series of economic and technical measures have been taken, neither do we forget that a number of political measures were taken. I think that what Varga told us in his report, and particularly with regard to the economic side of the question, is extremely important: Varga says: "What is today the aim which the capitalists pursue, what do they want?" The attempts at "rationalisation" as a method of stabilising the capitalist regime can be reduced to the application of a plan to increase that part of the national revenue which is the share of the capitalists, or to decrease that part of the national revenue which is the share of the workers. The same applies to the other methods of "stabilisation" which have not only a technical, but also an economic and general political meaning. In his report, Comrade Bukharin comes to the following conclusion: "The bourgeoisie attempts to indemnify itself by decreasing the share of the working class in the national revenue, or, by seizing part of the revenue of the workers". This assertion was fully borne out by the reports of all the other countries.

This must, therefore, be our point of departure if we are to find a correct definition for the real nature of the present period and if we are to make a correct decision with respect to our tactics. Here I should like to mention briefly a point made by Lominadze in his interesting address.

His presentation of the problem of the relative stabilisation of capitalism was as follows: "There are on the one hand

objective elements — the productive forces and the production apparatus". He said, I admit that an increase and a "positive" result exist. For the capitalists this positive result is bound up with a whole series of negative results, but — he said — when I consider the productive forces in their entirety, that is to say, not only the material basis of production, but also the subjective elements of production (the working class) I must certainly admit that progress is out of the question.

I think that there is something in this manner of putting the problem which does not ring quite true, and which is not quite right. There is no doubt whatever that we cannot rest content with saying that technical progress has been made. We must point out all contradictions bound up with this technical progress, or rather, we must lay stress on the value of these contradictions, their significance, their acuteness and their bearing on future events. We cannot assume that — in the event that there is technical progress — this progress can constitute the basis for a new epoch of upward development of the capitalist regime. This would be a very serious error. But we must also not be blind to the fact that with respect to the subjective elements, the capitalists have succeeded in achieving definite results. We cannot be blind to the fact that during the immediate post-war period and right up to the present period, the capitalists have to a certain degree succeeded in inflicting a defeat on the working class. This is the point which the International began to take into consideration at the III. Congress and which has always been brought forward after the III. Congress in order to define the fact that we find ourselves in an epoch of relative capitalist stabilisation, or, in order to decide which tactics we have to adopt. It would therefore be erroneous to change today this verdict. And yet it is just this tendency which I noticed this morning in Comrade Lominadze's arguments.

Let us also consider the decision of the International at the IV World Congress, upon examining the capitalist offensive with respect to its forms and significance. In connection with this question the minutes of the IV World Congress contain the following statement:

"The only way out for capitalism with respect to the reconstruction of the capitalist system is to throw off the cost of this reconstruction on to the shoulders of the workers... At the present juncture capitalist reconstruction is only possible at the expense of the working class".

Comrades, I reiterate that in view of the thorough character of our analysis, we must also give due emphasis to this point, which is essential in determining our tactics.

It is on this point that our entire policy and our most important slogans rest, as for instance the slogans "To the masses", and "Organisation of the masses against the capitalist offensive". This is the starting point of the method which we must apply for the capture of the masses. We must mobilise the masses for the struggle for their immediate everyday demands. In this struggle, we must succeed in coordinating the masses, in reorganising them and in reserving a support on which they can rely in their resistance to the power of capitalism, and which will set limits to the stabilisation of capitalism, limits which the capitalist offensive, with its attempts to saddle the workers with the cost of capitalist reconstruction, must not be allowed to transgress.

Thus, it is this fundamental conception which must be our point of departure if we are to discover, determine and overcome all the deviations and mistakes which can arise in the advance of our Party.

We already have results in winning the masses through the systematic application of united front tactics and the struggle for international trade union unity. We have succeeded in imbuing once more the working class with energy and confidence in its own strength, and we have been able to achieve considerable political successes in all countries. This fact must also be emphasised in the general discussion because it is in itself an indication of the manner in which all special problems are to be solved.

Comrades, this problem of the general line of the situation as well as of our tactics is closely connected with a separate problem — the problem of rationalisation.

I consider it a dangerous tendency to narrow down the scope of the consideration of this problem, and to look upon rationalisation only from the technical standpoint instead of con-

sidering it in its entirety, as a process of the stabilisation of the capitalist regime. This all too narrow consideration of the problem can only lead to a point where, in our discussion, we will fail to make clear to one another what our attitude shall be. We are of the opinion that the theses on this question are basically correct. The point on which we must concentrate is the struggle against the consequences of rationalisation. The solution offered in the theses is closely connected with our entire tactics in the present epoch, or rather with our tactical policy, which consists in setting the Communist vanguard the tasks of coordinating the masses against the capitalist offensive and of calling upon these masses to enter into the struggle for their immediate every day demands. This is the most important point.

And now just a few details. It is said that we must not limit ourselves to the struggle against the consequences of rationalisation, and that we require a general slogan. Various slogans of a general nature were also proposed. We are also of the opinion that a general slogan is required but one should take into consideration that with respect to a number of countries, the slogan will be only of a propagandist value and that it can in no case have the value of a slogan for the immediate struggle. It is only as the objective situation changes and we succeed in coordinating the masses and in leading them into the struggle for their immediate everyday demands that this slogan can become a direct fighting slogan.

Comrades, another point is: can we issue, generally, the slogan "Against Rationalisation?" Here great caution must be exercised, because any attempt to translate this slogan into direct action might lead to anarchistic deviations on our part, and might induce the masses to sabotage the industrial apparatus, i. e., it might lead to a struggle of small groups and not to a mass struggle against the capitalist offensive.

Finally, there is a third point on which we must lay special emphasis. We must save our Parties from the danger of being drawn into a discussion on the nature of technical rationalisation. We have discussed this side of the question in the Italian Delegation, basing ourselves on the experience which the Party has had in the factories in Italy, namely, the experience of 1920, a period when the slogan "workers' control" had not only a propagandist, but a direct political meaning. Nevertheless, the "factory councils", which proceeded to make a practical investigation of technical improvements, and the "factory councillors" who sat down with the civil engineers and employers in order to discuss what machinery should be introduced and what improvements should be made, etc., — after a few weeks, were compelled to desist because the working masses rebelled against them. What really happened when this path was pursued was — class collaboration from below.

From this standpoint we are to-day in a very dangerous situation because there is a considerable number of industrialists who make use of the trade union bureaucrats in order to issue, from below, the slogan of class truce and class collaboration.

Unless we act with great circumspection, the Social Democrats will succeed in beating up precisely on this point, and will create a situation favourable to the capitalist offensive against the working class.

Comrades, after dealing with the general lines of the theses and having emphasised a few particularly important points, I will say a few words about our experience, the experience of the Italian working class with respect to the attempts to stabilise the capitalist regime.

You listened last night to a comrade who told us that what the Fascist regime has done in Italy was introduced long ago in a number of countries. We cannot deny that in many countries terror took a more virulent form than in Italy. But it is not a question here of quantity, but rather of quality. What I mean is that the character of the Italian Fascism differs from other methods of capitalist stabilisation just as much as it differs from the other kinds of terrorist regime existing in Europe.

This point was already emphasised at the IV. World Congress of the Communist International, when Fascism was studied as one of the forms of the capitalist offensive. We pointed out then what characterises Fascism as a method of stabilisation. It is precisely this special element which has become the starting point of all the contradictions of the stabilisation that Fascism endeavoured to effect.

Jointly with Fascism, the bourgeoisie has endeavoured to give its stabilisation efforts a mass basis, that is to say, to mobilise large sections of petty-bourgeois elements, peasants, and also politically backward workers in order to use them as an army with the help of which it proceeds against the working class in order to create in this manner the basis for stabilisation.

When Fascism came into power and had mobilised a section of the middle classes, when it had given these classes a special ideology, an ideology which is to accustom them to the idea that they are to become the ruling class or that they are even now ready to direct the policy of the country in their own interest, it proceeded to carry on the policy of the big bourgeoisie, the big banks and the big landowners.

Has it achieved any sort of results in this?

Most decidedly so! On what basis?

On the basis of the defeat of the working class and of the wage reductions which were the consequence of this defeat, and, on the other hand, on the basis of the economic situation created by inflation.

On this basis of "freedom", i. e. a freedom bestowed on capital in order that for its interests it could oppress the overwhelming majority of the population, a remarkable extension of the technical production basis has been obtained in Italy. This extension of the production basis became at the same time the source of a new crisis which takes on almost the same form as the crises in other countries, — a market crisis called forth by the diminishing purchasing capacity of the home market and by the narrowing down of the export market.

I will not go into detail concerning these matters. The most important thing is that all the measures with which Fascism is endeavouring to overcome the crisis only have the result objectively, of making still more acute the economic struggle against the middle sections of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie, who are the social basis of Fascism. Such is the nature of the capitalist crisis after the "Fascist" attempt to stabilise capitalism. The economic crisis is accompanied by a social crisis just now in its initial stage and the starting point of which is the disintegration of the basis of fascism, i. e. of the basis on which were made its efforts to construct a new social order.

With this special character of the Italian situation is connected on the one hand terrorism, and on the other hand, the imperialist policy of Fascism.

The sum total of these economic factors, together with this social and political factor, distinguish Italian imperialism from the imperialism of the other European countries and make it to-day the greatest menace to peace.

The second element is terrorism. I cannot go into detail now on this point, but it is interesting to note that Fascism was compelled to increase the terror because it felt the growing opposition of the masses, because it felt that its policy of oppression of the masses had not succeeded in permanently eliminating the prospect of proletarian revolt, but that on the contrary, this policy led to the radicalisation of the masses of the workers and peasants. This is largely due to the success of the Communist Party, to our propaganda and our factory meetings. I mean the success which the Communist vanguard of the proletariat has achieved in the struggle for the unification and the leadership of the masses, a success which has disturbed the Fascist peace of mind, which has made Fascism lose its self-confidence and has compelled it to let loose a new wave of terrorism.

There are various matters I cannot go into because my time is up. Dozens of comrades and hundreds of workers were killed whilst thousands have been thrown into prison or exiled.

But there is one thing about which I cannot be silent and which is for us the most important factor, — namely: the fact that in the face of the new wave of terrorism, the Party remains at its post. A few days after the attempt on Mussolini's life, when the rage of the Fascists had reached its climax, the ninth anniversary of the Russian Revolution was celebrated in the industrial centres of Italy, and the Communist organisations succeeded in disseminating their literature, and in bringing back to the minds of the working class the anniversary of the October Revolution, — thus showing that the Party has once more raised the battle-cry of the working class (applause).

The vanguard of the proletariat is at its post. It does not give way to despair and it knows the work it has to do.

Comrades, our experiences in Italy are of international importance. It has shown that the method by which Fascism has tried to stabilise capitalism: through the mobilisation of certain sections of the middle class on the basis of struggle against the working class and the establishment of a new regime, from the economic viewpoint, is not a very satisfactory method. The antagonisms which it has called forth far outweigh the advantages which it procures.

It should also be stated that the pressure which capitalism is compelled to exercise on the masses in order to make stabilisation possible has its effect not only on the working class, but also on the various sections of the middle class and the petty-bourgeoisie, which will henceforth not lend themselves so readily for mobilisation against the proletariat. On the contrary, it has become easier for us, the vanguard of the proletariat, to go back to the position which existed in 1919 and 1920 when the proletariat had a decisive influence and was leading into the struggle all the elements opposed to the capitalist regime.

We find ourselves to-day between two waves of the revo-

White Terror in Poland and in the Balkan Countries.

Comrade SEMARD:

On behalf of the Præsidium I move the following resolution: "White Terror rages unabated in the agrarian countries of Europe. Its virulence subsides for a little while only to break out with still greater fierceness. During the last few months, Poland and the Balkan countries have experienced a renewed attack of the White Terror.

Thousands of Communists are perishing in the dungeons of the Polish Republic; thousands of Communist workers and peasants are in the dungeons of White Poland. Pilsudsky's Okhranka has perfected its spy system and is applying it cold-bloodedly and with most refined Jesuitism. People are given long prison terms for the sole reason that they belong to the Communist Party. Only a few days ago the Court in Tarnopol condemned the peasant Biely to death because he was a member of the West Ukrainian Communist Party. Mass trials are taking place now in Lutzk and in Lemberg, in which workers and Ukrainian peasants are charged with the crime of "adherence to the Communist Party". A monster trial of the same kind is being prepared in White Russia. In Lodz, mounted police, equipped with machine guns, are sent against imprisoned workers who dare demand to be treated like human beings. On the occasion of the mutual aid fund elections, there were 300 arrests. The Polish authorities confiscate any publication which displeases the Government: editors of legal newspapers are sentenced to 2 and 3 years.

In Roumania, General Averescu continues Bratiano's terrorist regime. A few months ago the indignation of the international proletariat was aroused by the news of the cowardly assassination of the Communist fighter, Tkatchenko in one of those classic "attempted escapes". The general indignation aroused by this cowardly murder saved the life of the militant worker, Boris Stefanov. In the course of this year hundreds of workers and peasants were charged with political offences and given heavy sentences. Many victims of the capitalist and Bovar dictatorship perish in the fortresses which, under the terrible regime prevailing there, are in the nature of catacombs. It frequently happens that these unhappy victims go out of their mind. Many are kept in prison without trial. The courts pass long sentences of imprisonment on workers whose only crime is that they had pre-war socialist literature in their possession. The notorious Siguranca (Criminal Investigation Department) goes on with its work, worthy of the days of the Inquisition, without letting anything interfere with it. The government of General Averescu has distinguished itself by its brutal persecution of the trade union movement and by making the regime of the emergency law more rigorous in Besarabia and in the Dobrudja. Terrorism in these provinces beggars description. In July, 1926 the authorities brutally murdered 40 inhabitants of the Staroselo village. The farms of the Bulgarian peasants are being confiscated in the Dobrudja.

In Yugo-Slavia, the ruling classes stay in power only by a brutal terrorist regime and by draconic laws for the enforcement of the Defence of the State Act which provides for death sentence or 20 years penal servitude for Communist propaganda or any other revolutionary action. During the elections of 1925-26 the

lution, and we are all of us aware that in the revolutionary movement there are not only objective factors which make themselves felt, nor only mechanical factors, but there are also subjective factors which play a much more important role. We have witnessed events such as the British Strike, which give us an idea of the magnitude of these subjective forces and of the decisive role which they may be called upon to play. We witness events which remind us that the working class is there as it used to be, that it cannot be so easily brushed aside, and that its resistance can check-mate any attempt to stabilise the capitalist regime.

Comrades, in the present situation, this is the starting point for the tasks of the proletarian vanguard.

I think that when our Parties will have understood these tasks, affairs will not be so easily managed as the Social-Democratic traitors, who collaborate actively in the reconstruction of the capitalist regime, prophesy. (Applause.)

Comrade MAGGI (Chairman):

I call upon comrade Semard to read a resolution on

authorities of Yugo-Slavia instituted an unheard of Terrorist regime, particularly in regions inhabited by the national minorities, (in Macedonia, Vovodine, Montenegro and Croatia). The Government of Yugo-Slavia is making a fierce attack on the trade unions and on all active trade unionists. Terror is particularly fierce now in Vovodina, Dalmatia and Macedonia. In Dalmatia alone, 517 people were thrown into prison this year charged with political offences.

In Bulgaria White Terror continues to bathe the country in blood notwithstanding the change in government. Zankov is no longer in power, but the Zankov system remains. The same clique of militarists and bankers continues its work under Lapchev's banner. It applies terror, torture and assassination with increased vigour and mounting brutality as it feels the ground under its feet gradually give way. After several amnesties, there are still thousands of champions of the revolution rotting in Bulgarian jails. Most of them are condemned to penal servitude and some of them to death — reaction looks on all of them as brigands. Recently martial law was declared in three districts and armed government bands perpetrated their unspeakable atrocities against the working class population. In the vicinity of the villages of Borema and Zhelesna, dogs have dug up hundreds of dead bodies of inhabitants who had disappeared without trace. During the last few days over 100 workers, peasants and intellectuals were arrested on the charge of belonging either to the Communist Party or to the Y. C. L., or of getting relief from the International Red Aid. In the Okhranka, all prisoners are as before subjected to cruel tortures. The number of those lost "without trace" is very big, as well as the number of those who were publicly killed or tortured. The young Communist Dudov threw himself from the fourth floor of the Okhranka in order to escape the unbearable tortures. The writer, Tordor Pavlov, was arrested and twice attempted suicide. The school master Perdovsky was found hanging at the police station in the town of Wratza. Since January 1926, the courts have sentenced 60 people to death and a still larger number to life-long penal servitude. Mass trials are to take place shortly throughout the country. Persecutions against the independent trade unions are increasing. In the towns of Jambo, and Stara Zebora, the authorities killed people just for distributing the trade union organ "Unity". In Varma, Abram Stojsniv, a member of the Trade Union Committee, has been tortured; another member of the committee of independent trade unions, Boisjief, has been arrested; the old trade union champion Milev has been threatened with death.

In all these countries White Terror is mainly directed against the revolutionary vanguard of the workers and the poor peasants, against the Communist Parties which are everywhere outlawed. The cliques in power do not only defend their own class domination by terrorist means, they also do the counter-revolutionary work of the big imperialist powers. International imperialism wants full sway over these peoples in order to be able to throw them unhindered against the Soviet Union. The revolutionary movement is being throttled, the Communist Parties in Poland and in the Balkans are being destroyed. It is for this reason that the imperialists encourage White Terror

and give these terrorist governments political and financial support.

But this merciless offensive makes the economic crisis more acute in all the countries, lowers the living standards of these sections of the population, and widens the gulf between the bourgeoisie and the workers and poor peasants. The workers of town and country are more and more imbued with invincible hatred against the ruling classes, and no terror in the world can reconcile them with the capitalist regime. The Communist Parties derive their strength and their confidence in victory from the terrific anger of masses always ready for the fray. Like the phoenix, the Communist Parties rise from the ashes of terrorist devastation even though after each of these attacks the bourgeoisie still fatuously believes that it has completely destroyed the Communists. The best proof of the futility of the bourgeoisie's efforts to consolidate its rule through White Terror, is the stubborn and heroic struggle which the masses have been carrying on continuously under the leadership of the Communist Parties, despite emergency laws and their countless victims and cruel tortures. At present the struggle against the regime of exile, for amnesty, for the victims of White Terror, for the right of assembly and association, for legal recognition of the Communist Parties, etc. in Poland and in the Balkan States has reached its climax.

The VII. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive Committee of the C. I. condemns the terrorist regime under which the workers, poor peasants and the national minorities are groaning, sends hearty greetings to all the victims of capitalist dictatorship, and expresses its admiration for the devotion to the cause which the Communist Parties have shown in this struggle. The Communist International is convinced that in spite of the raging terror, its heroic Sections will remain unflinchingly at their post as the leaders of the people, and that they will carry the struggle to a victorious conclusion. The Communist International pledges them the full support of the international proletariat in the accomplishment of their difficult task. At the same time, the Executive Committee of the Communist International urges the Communist Parties of all countries to do their utmost in support of the struggle of the Communists in

Poland and in the Balkan countries. This call is addressed mainly to the Communist Parties of the big imperialist powers, (Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany); they are urged to expose continually the counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet policy of their bourgeoisies, and to do everything in their power to frustrate the support which their governments give to the terrorist regime in eastern and south-eastern Europe.

Down with the hangman of the workers and peasants in Poland and in the Balkan countries! Down with their instigators, the international imperialists!

Under the leadership of the heroic Communist Parties, the masses will break through the front of White Terror, and will march in triumph towards the world revolution, united with their brothers, the workers and peasants of the other countries.

VII. Plenum of the E. C. of the C. I.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Comrade MAGGI (Chairman):

I call upon Comrade Kuusinen to make a statement.

Comrade KUUSINEN:

To save time I will not make a concluding speech, since the most important questions which I have broached have not yet been sufficiently discussed, collectively, to serve our practical tasks. I think that we should first of all discuss these questions in the Political Commission, whereupon we can — if it should prove necessary — again place them before the Plenum.

But there is just a small matter which I must put right. When I spoke in my report on the non-publication of the telegram of greeting to the British Party Congress, I was not aware that this telegram was subsequently published in the central organ of the British Party, although not in the first number, but later on. If I had known this I should not have broached the question of non-publication. Thus the error which has occurred is the unintentional error of an editor and nothing more.

Chairman: Comrade Bukharin will now address the Plenum.

Comrade Bukharin's Speech in Reply to the Discussion on the E. C. C. I. Report.

Comrades, the discussion has shown that on the whole we are on firm ground. A number of comrades have introduced various addenda, but the discussion has shown that complete ideological unity prevails on the fundamental questions of principle. Many of the addenda proposed are quite correct and acceptable, but if they are all included in the theses it will make the latter extremely bulky. This question must first of all be settled by the Political Commission, which will submit its considerations to the Plenum. I am unable to analyse all the addenda introduced and I will try to deal in a critical manner only with the most important points of the discussion.

THE ANTAGONISMS BETWEEN EUROPE AND AMERICA AND WITHIN EUROPE.

First of all I will deal with the international situation and the general estimation of it. Here I will reply first of all to Comrade Treint, although other comrades have replied to him already.

I will first of all deal with Comrade Treint's preliminary artillery fire. He asserts that the draft theses ignores one of the fundamental questions, in Comrade Treint's opinion the fundamental question, namely, of the relations between Europe and America. In his speech he said that I "barely make reference" to America and that in my analysis no mention is made to the "monstrous and most powerful militarism on the face of the earth".

Of course if this were actually the case my theses would be useless. As it is I must ask Comrade Treint to do what he asked us to do, to quote me and not misrepresent me. In the introductory part of my theses there are two postulates; the

first of these says that the economic hegemony in world economy is in the hands of the United States. Is that a trifle? Does this mean that I pass by America "sous silence"?

I do not think this is the case. If Comrade Treint understands it this way then his capacity of understanding must be quite a peculiar one.

The second postulate in my theses concerns the "absolutely exceptional role" of American capital. Does the assertion of this fact mean anything? Of course it does.

I must make a third remark of a more or less formal character. Comrade Treint spoke after I had made my oral report. In my report I spoke about the existence of "two zones" in the world situation. One of these zones is America, the other is the U. S. S. R. I spoke of two "Unions" (Unionen). You all heard this, comrades. And after this Comrade Treint is bold enough to assert that I almost passed by America in silence. He spoke about these "two zones" as if he was the first to discover them. I put it mildly, this is not "in accordance with the facts".

Now for the substance of the question. I will deal with what Comrade Treint concretely said in his speech. Comrade Treint is filled with what one might call intellectual elan (a voice: "elan vital!").

And he with much elan exaggerates real vital tendencies. He loves the word "monstrous" and similar strong expressions. I read the whole of his speech very carefully and therefore I am able to quote it. Here, for example, are several of his principal postulates.

"Objectively there are tremendous reasons for establishing capitalist European solidarity as a counter-balance to the United States."

In this connection Comrade Treint asserts that the antagonism." When we speak of antagonisms between the imperialist with the principal antagonism between America and Europe. To a certain degree Comrade Treint is right, when he puts the latter antagonism in the first rank. As in every error this one has a grain of truth. Wherein lies Comrade Treint's error? This must be carefully examined in order to safeguard ourselves against repeating at the next Enlarged Plenum what he has been dinning into our ears for the last half year.

I see two fundamental errors in Comrade Treint's analysis. One is that Comrade Treint transforms an existing tendency into an accomplished fact; the second is that he identifies the conception of "great antagonism" with the conception "acute antagonism". When we speak of antagonisms between the imperialist powers we must make a distinction between these two conceptions. And this I will illustrate to you by two examples.

Take the occupation of the Ruhr by French imperialism. Was not the fundamental thing here, from the point of view of scope, the antagonism between America and Europe? Of course it was. However, America did not fight Europe or alternatively Europe did not fight America. The Franco-German antagonisms however, led to the occupation of the Ruhr. The antagonisms between France and Germany were of a more acute character, but the antagonisms between America and Europe were greater. Scope and acuteness are not the same thing. I will give you another example, in order to make my idea clear. Take for example the greatest antagonism in the world, — between the capitalist States and the U. S. S. R. What is greater: the internal antagonisms among the capitalist states, or the antagonisms between the capitalist states and the U. S. S. R.? In the last resort a settlement of this latter antagonism will decide the victory of either capitalism or Socialism. The occupation of the Ruhr was a continuation, or a resumption of the war against Germany, whereas, neither France nor any other of the European States waged war on the U. S. S. R.

Hence the profundity and the scope of antagonisms is one thing, but the degree of acuteness is something altogether different. These two conceptions do not exclude each other. The grain of truth that lies in Comrade Treint's analysis lies in his understanding of the fact that the antagonism between America and Europe on a world scale, in the framework of world economy, has genuinely assumed tremendous dimensions. But he confuses this point with another; he confuses the scope of this antagonism with its degree of acuteness; he identifies these two conceptions and this represents a fundamental error in his analysis. I repeat: the Ruhr was occupied, but war against the U. S. S. R. or war between Europe and America did not break out... I ask you, is it not possible for a situation to arise in the near future when, say war will break out between Italy and France, or between France and England? This is how the question should be presented. Comrade Treint presents the question quite differently. In his opinion such a perspective is excluded. The antagonism between America and Pan-Europe shuts out everything else from his view; in this light all cats look grey to him, and he does not observe any other shades of colour. A practical statesman, however, should not present a question in such a manner. In the present case a theoretical error becomes transformed into a practical error, which is the continuation of a great political error. For at the present time very acute antagonisms exist among the European States.

We all know that an extremely bellicose mood prevails at the present time in Italy. In France even several Communist nuclei have passed resolutions in favour of declaring war upon the Mussolini Government. Of course, this is tantamount to supporting the French Government. This must of course be severely condemned. It is undoubtedly an echo of the bellicose attitude of so-called "public opinion". Has not this question assumed a certain acuteness?

Comrade Treint is a member of the Communist Party of France, and the Communist Party of France, in conjunction with the Communist Party of Italy, issued a special manifesto directed against the menace of a Franco-Italian war. Why have not these Parties, and indeed all the other European Parties issued a manifesto against war between America and Pan-Europe? Why has not Comrade Treint now proposed that we issue a manifesto

against the alleged imminent outbreak of war between America and Pan-Europe? Is it not because among other things Pan-Europe does not yet exist? Pan-Europe as yet exists only in the imagination of Comrade Treint, and so far there is no war between America and Pan-Europe. It is difficult to carry on war if one of the belligerent sides does not exist. Comrade Treint sees a most acute danger in the antagonisms between America and Europe. I, of course, do not wish to say that in the event of war breaking out between America and Europe that this war will not be immensely "worse", greater and far more destructive than a possible war between Italy and France (I quote this merely as an example). But that is quite another question. It is a question of the scope of the profundity of all the consequences of possible wars in the future and not a question of the prospects of imminent war and its dangers.

The deductions from what has been said above are as follows: In my opinion war is possible in the near future between European States and only later war may break out between Europe and America. The prospect of inter-European war is more imminent than the prospect of war between Europe and America. (A voice: "Prospects of inter-European war!")

I repeat: the prospects of war between European States, or between European States and the U. S. S. R., are more imminent than the prospects of war between the whole of Europe and America and America and the whole of Europe.

"PAN-EUROPE" AND "ULTRA-IMPERIALISM".

This is the general presentation of the question. Now I will take up the question of Pan-Europe as such. Is Pan-Europe, i. e., the combination of the imperialist powers of Europe into an alliance of one type or another at all possible generally? In my opinion it is possible in a certain sense, — I will deal with that later. But our task is not to put forward a general presentation of the question, but to analyse a concrete situation. The question before us is as follows: Is it possible to expect in the near future a combination of European Powers or not? This question must be presented absolutely concretely, and thus presented our reply must be in the negative. Comrade Treint refers to quotations from Lenin. This practice has become the fashion among us. There is not a man in Pan-Europe or in America who will not refer to some quotation from Lenin. But everyone who has read Lenin's article on "The United States of Europe" must know perfectly well what reference is made there. Lenin in that article speaks of a possible combination of the European imperialists as a temporary combination, principally as a combination directed against the Socialist Revolution.

This gives rise to the question: Is such a combination of European capitalist powers possible in the event of a war between Europe and the U. S. S. R.? In my opinion it is possible. Such things have happened in the past. Take the example of the so-called European expedition to China commanded by Wilhelm's generals. This expedition was undertaken jointly by the "civilised" Europeans against the Chinese "barbarian Boxers". Is a joint expedition of the "civilised" governments against the Bolshevik "hordes of Attila" possible in the near future? It is possible. But this is not the only question. Comrade Treint raises the question not on the plane of temporary combinations against the U. S. S. R. He presents in its full scope a problem of a Pan-European combination, i. e., the formation of a Pan-European coalition of powers and their economic combination as is advocated by the prophets of the Pan-European "idea". In my opinion under the present conditions it is not possible. "Speaking generally" it is "purely economically" possible. In the event of war breaking out between various European powers there will be victors. It is quite probable that these victors will absorb some States and that a clearly expressed hegemony of the victorious powers will be established. If we admit the possibility of a number of wars and the concentration of powers as a result of these wars or through agreements, then of course in the final resort we shall get "Pan-Europe". But all this would be possible if such "premises" as the revolutionary working class, the revolt of the working class, etc. were totally absent. The whole process would be analogous to the process which goes on in the reorganisation of industry when large organisations absorb the smaller ones. But to present the question in this manner, particularly in our times, after the first imperialist war, would be radically wrong. Another two or three wars would

certainly make the existence of the capitalist powers impossible. Consequently, real Pan-European perspectives are impossible. For long before Pan-Europe could be established the proletariat would achieve victory. War would demand enormous sacrifices on the part of the proletariat and the political level of the proletariat in our days is far different from what it was in 1914. This is one of the most important reasons why the bourgeoisie does not make war so readily. Why? After the first imperialist war we have the U. S. S. R. After the second imperialist war we may have something more, but the antagonisms between capitalist States are so profound that wars will break out for all that.

Comrade Treint collected an enormous amount of material. He quoted to us newspaper articles written by leading politicians, he gave us the opinions of bankers, Statesmen and intellectuals who create "public opinion", etc. But why has he not analysed the absolutely concrete "plans", which are being advanced at the present time. Take for example the plans of the Vienna Pan-European Congress. Why did that congress put forward a plan for a Pan-Europe from which England is excluded? Why is Italy opposed to the League of Nations? Why has the League of Nations become so weakened? Why is the "Big Entente" breaking up?, etc., etc. All this should be emphasised. Comrade Treint declares that the European capitalists have big organisation ideas which are steadily developing. Nobody will deny that such tendencies exist. But something else exists also. There are counter-tendencies, antagonisms, which Comrade Treint does not see. He does not wish to see them. Comrade Treint agrees with us that stabilisation is only relative, but he ascribes a totally different character to this stabilisation when he ignores these antagonisms. What was the most "striking" manifestation of this "organising", "constructive" etc., idea? The League of Nations. Why did the Social Democrats of all countries blow the trumpet of the League of Nations so loud? All hopes were placed on the League of Nations. But precisely at the present time all the hopes lose, at least, their relative basis. Should this fact be analysed or not? In my opinion it should.

Comrade Treint, in arguing against my deduction concerning the social instability of contemporary inter-State groupings, regards this as a truism which it was superfluous to attempt to prove (although this "truism" fundamentally contradicted Comrade Treint's own conceptions).

But take the very last fact. The agreement between Germany and France at Thoiry. Now the Press everywhere is trumpeting abroad that things are not running so smoothly. In my theses I pointed out that the France-German combination is the axis around which a great regrouping of forces is taking place. But I add that this combination bears a rather relative character. Most recent facts have proved the correctness of our analysis which asserts that these regroupings are unstable. Why does Comrade Treint lose sight of this?

Another remark in passing. In arguing against me on the question of the relations between Europe and America, Comrade Treint declared: Fordism is not only rationalisation, but it also means high wages and other good things. But this is a great exaggeration. Facts speak differently. In America wages have not risen during the past two years, and these two years were years of increased American rationalisation. Everybody is talking about the policy of high wages in America. But the high rate of wages in America is the result of all previous historical development. In America there was hardly any feudalism. The development of America is fundamentally different from the development of the other countries. The relation between the supply and demand of labour power in the market of America was different from that existing in Europe. High wages were dictated by these circumstances, by necessity and not by the philanthropy of American capitalism. That is the first thing. The second thing is this: can we in analysing such things ignore the intensity of labour in America, which is so much greater than in Europe? Can we ignore the fact that the American worker is worn out much more quickly than is the worker in Europe. Moreover, the "full utilisation" of labour power in America is not carried on for the purpose of raising wages, but to reduce prices. All this loud talk on the part of those who advocate Americanisation for the purpose of convincing the workers that everything is excellent in America makes no mention of this fact. And Comrade Treint also ignores it.

The "Pan-European" problem is connected with the question of ultra-imperialism. This question must be placed on such a plane: is the formation of a world trust of all capitalist States possible or not? I repeat now what I have already partly said about Pan-Europe. "Speaking generally", if we disregard a factor like the proletariat, then the formation of such a Trust in the last resort is possible. Some States will absorb others. America, perhaps, would conquer some States, other States would conclude alliances with each other, etc. If we look a hundred years ahead and throw aside all factors like that of the proletariat, then this in the last resort is what would take place. Such a centralisation of capital within the framework of world economy will become a fact.

But this "general" presentation of the question suffers from "only" one defect, and that is; No place is given in it to the working class and the proletarian revolution.

The process of development is extremely contradictory: it holds out the prospects of tremendous crises. In these circumstances, being Marxists, we cannot under any circumstances exclude a factor like the proletariat. Speaking objectively, even a European war would lead to great proletarian revolutions, would alter the whole world situation and the result would be that the dictatorship of the proletariat would not only be in the U. S. S. R. Hence no ultra-imperialism is possible even in the course of a hundred years. Hence the organisation of world economy can be brought about only by the dictatorship of the proletariat and by it alone. Comrade Treint fails to see either this or other contradictions. He does not see that Europe is pregnant with internal wars; the antagonisms between Europe and America have closed his eyes to everything else. I am not opposed to a more detailed examination of the question of America even in theses, but in that case we must deal in more detail with the inter-European antagonisms and include in the theses other points, for example the point made by Comrade Kolarov concerning the antagonisms in the Balkans, or develop the theme of the antagonisms in the Mediterranean, etc.

With this I will conclude my reply to Comrade Treint. I must add, however, that on the whole Comrade Treint's speech made a very good impression upon me. He ponders very deeply over these questions, although he does not solve them correctly. But in our days even this is a virtue.

THE CHARACTER OF THE CRISIS IN CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM.

Now I come to the question of the character of the present crisis. Wherein lies the difference in the appraisal of the present crisis of capitalism between ourselves and the Social Democrats? In my opinion, the difference lies in that the Social Democrats are inclined to picture this crisis as a normal "crisis of over-production". We, however, lay emphasis on the fact that a most important role in these crises and shocks is played by the fatal consequences of the war and the post-war period. This is the principal difference between us. Does this mean to deny the fact of the growth of the apparatus of production? In my opinion it does not. To deny that the apparatus of production has expanded would be an error. It is a fact. Among us there are various shades of opinion concerning the quantitative appraisal of the growth of the apparatus of production. In my opinion it is not correct to regard as Social Democrats, or as Kautskians those comrades who merely over-estimate the situation somewhat. That is of no use. Various shades of opinion may exist concerning the question of the growth of the apparatus of production. I have referred to this already in my written report. Now I would like to draw your attention to the following problem.

We talk about the apparatus of production. But what is this "apparatus of production"? Perhaps some comrades will regard this question as a funny one, but the point of view from which we regard the apparatus of production is of extreme importance. We can appraise the apparatus of production from the point of view of value, concretely from the money point of view. We may take the balance-sheets of various enterprises and look down the column referring to amortisation, or down the column referring to new capitalist invest-

ments and on this basis draw certain conclusions regarding the apparatus of production. In so doing, however, we shall be concerning ourselves with the value of the apparatus of production.

It is quite another thing however, to appraise the apparatus of production from the point of view of things, from the point of view of the number of machines, spindles, etc.

Finally, there is a third method of presenting the question, namely, the approach to the apparatus of production from the point of view of its power of production.

These methods of approach are not identical. We must bear these distinctions in mind, because some people identify the rise in the index of the power of production of the apparatus with increased accumulation, i. e., with the increase in the sum of values. This is not correct. It is incorrect also to confuse the number of machines, the various instruments and other things with power of production. With important technical changes the number of machines and instruments may diminish, but the power of production may increase considerably. Moreover, the contradiction between power of production and the prevailing purchasing capacity may increase considerably. Hence, the question of the apparatus of production is not solved so easily as may appear at first sight. I think that this complexity causes confusion in the presentation of the question, because only the conception "apparatus of production" is employed. The question: from what point of view we appraise this apparatus is ignored.

Yet, in explaining crises we must bear in mind the important role that is played in the growth of antagonism between production and effective demand by various technical improvements, for the apparatus from the point of view of quantitative dimension and cost, may not grow so rapidly as its power of production. This must be noted.

My second remark refers to the controversy that took place here. Speaking of the apparatus of production and forces of production, etc. There is a grain of truth in this, but a half-truth is worse than a lie. Marx has analysed such cases. Upon what does Comrade Lominadze base his argument? He reduces one case in which there is no machinery whatever to the level of another case when there is machinery but, it is "not working". Everyone will understand that these are two different things. Non one can say that not to have machines at all and to have machines which are "not working" is the same thing. In the latter case I must manufacture or buy the machines, and for this I must have money. In the first case I do not need any money. This slight difference must not be forgotten. And this gives rise to the question: how, according to the manner in which Comrade Lominadze presents the question, would he formulate the principal problem, which is the problem of the contradiction between forces of production and purchasing capacity? In his view there is no contradiction. In so far as the machines are idle there is no antagonism between idle machines and purchasing capacity. And in so far as he regards all idle machines as non-existent, to that extent, with a sweep of the hand, he brushes away the whole question which to us is the principal question. If we accept his argument, then it follows that a situation in which there is a contradiction between power of production and the purchasing capacity of the population would never arise. These are the "consequences of rationalisation" according to Comrade Lominadze!

In my opinion his conception contains a grain of truth: a "working" machine is not the same thing as an idle machine. But on this basis to draw the conclusions that Comrade Lominadze arrives at means to drop into a sort of "deviation"; whether it is a "Left", "Centre", or "Right" deviation I cannot say.

I accept as correct the postulate which lays down that capitalism in our day no longer plays a progressive role. And when in any of our commissions a South American comrade tries to talk about the progressive role of capitalism in some colony, I must say that I cannot agree with him. I consider that it is incorrect in our day to talk about the progressive role of capitalism as a system, because the centre of gravity at the present time lies in the struggle between capitalism and Socialism. We already have a Socialist State. An absolutely new situa-

tion is arising in which the Communists or Communist organisations are fighting against the capitalists and capitalism for influence over those regions, which had not yet been drawn within the orbit of capitalism or have only been slightly drawn into this orbit. Take for example China, and the question of the prospects of its development. Under these circumstances to talk about the progressive role of capitalism generally and above all of its progressive role in colonial regions, is impermissible. Already at the present time rivalry exists between the capitalist and the Socialist methods of production. Formerly there existed rivalry between the feudal and the capitalist methods of production. Now the rivalry goes on principally between the Socialist and the capitalist methods of production. However, it would be absolutely incorrect to assert that capitalism is incapable of any technical improvement. It would be absurd to assert that the technical improvement of machines is impossible, because they serve moribund capitalism. A distinction must be made between the world historical role of capitalism and the appraisal of certain technical points. Of course capitalism can still bring about technical improvements. Comrade Trotsky goes wrong on this question when he asserts that if capitalism as a whole is moribund it is absolutely incapable of developing forces of production. That is incorrect. But the technical improvement of machinery and methods of organising production is no evidence of the progressive role of capitalism.

STABILISATION AND THE MISTAKES OF COMRADE RIESE.

I come now to the question of stabilisation. Here in the first place I must assert, and all comrades will agree with me, that under present conditions and in the present stage of our work, we must differentiate in the question of stabilisation and of course on the basis of this differentiation we must draw our conclusions.

Just a few words on the speeches delivered by Comrades Bittel and Riese, I assume that neither of the comrades will take offence at my grouping them together. I do this only to save time and not because of the "kinship" of their positions. Of course there is no similarity in their positions.

Comrade Bittel said that some of the statistics I quoted, particularly the statistics of world trade, were not correct, and from this he draws very definite conclusions. With regard to the figures I must say that, generally, they are rather inexact. Comrade Varga may confirm this. The difficulty, lies in the necessity to reduce various currencies to one common denominator, and this is an extremely complex task. Figures taken from various sources differ from each other. This has given Comrade Bittel grounds for asserting that the figures we quoted were wrong. But let us admit, for the sake of argument, that the figures I quoted are wrong to the extent that he says. Nevertheless this does not refute my theses. The figures may be an under-estimation, but one thing is beyond dispute, and that is that the curve of development during the last few years is an upward one. This can be proved by studying any source of information. And this is the determining fact. We may err in the quantitative estimation of the statistics, some errors are highly probable. But no one can deny the rising curve of development. And this is the most decisive factor.

Now with regard to the remarks of Comrade Riese. He wants to "maintain principles", and his "principles" carry him to the extent of denying stabilisation. He thinks that stabilisation was "invented" by the Right Wing in Germany. Let us admit that this is so. But then what took Briand to Stresemann if stabilisation is a pure invention? Is the Cabinet of the French Republic a body subordinate even to the "Right Wing" Communists? I do not think so. The Right Wing is not so strong as to dictate its will to the capitalist states. How are such facts to be accounted for such as the Steel Cartel, etc. This cannot be explained from the manner in which you present the question. According to you all things remain as before and yet all things change. The regrouping of various States has a material cause. It cannot be denied that Germany now plays a more important role than it did before in what was termed the "concert of Europe". Can that be denied? Since this is a fact we must explain what economic basis there is for it. If the economic basis is the old one, what has caused this significant regrouping

among the powers? Can we just simply deny the technical changes, the trustification of production, the stabilisation of currency, etc.? If this had not taken place we should have a direct revolutionary situation in Germany. Unfortunately, the German situation is **not** such. If this were the case we would welcome it with the utmost enthusiasm. But unfortunately this revolutionary situation, for the time being, exists to the same extent as does Comrades Treint's Pan-Europe. "Ex-comrade" Maslow says that revolutionary prospects in Germany are out of the question for whole decades. We do not share his view. But it is a strange thing that Comrade Riese, who stands close to the Maslow group, did not say a single word about these views. Perhaps this "leader" who has been expelled from the Party for his non-Communist "wisdom" and "practice", really gave utterance to a great truth when he said that the possibility of revolution is excluded for whole decades? We would like to hear from Comrade Riese himself whether he shares these views or not. If he does not share them he should have said so here. We cannot remain silent about this matter when we discuss these questions. When silence is maintained about these things then our discussion is not about principles, whatever else it may be.

In my speech at the Russian Party Conference I stated that the world revolution is marching forward in three columns. In Soviet Russia under certain conditions, under conditions of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, and also in China and in Great Britain. This does not mean that Central Europe is not pregnant with revolution. Europe is pregnant with revolution and so is Germany. This is directly due to the growth of antagonisms on the background of relative stabilisation.

These are the principal features of the present position and these explain the great changes that are taking place in the international arena in the relations of class forces and particularly among the proletariat. From the manner in which Comrade Riese presents the question these points find no explanation at all.

OUR ATTITUDE TO CAPITALIST RATIONALISATION.

I will now turn to another problem, the problem of rationalisation. Above all, I declare: "Neutral Rationalisation does not exist. Rationalisation is a concrete process under quite definite conditions; either under the conditions prevailing under the capitalist system, or else under the conditions of the Socialist system, or of some mixed system. But rationalisation outside any conditions of rationalisation, like something neutral, does not exist at all, just, for instance, like technical perfections (I am for the time being only speaking of this side of the question) must always be carried out in some social environment or other and not in some vacuum space. Machinery has never been applied regardless of all conditions: it is applied either in capitalist or else in Socialist conditions. The machine is the technical basis of social organisation, and without people the machine cannot function, it can only stand idle like something dead. If, for instance, Comrade Riese throws some machine on to the moon, it will not lie there as a machine, but like any other physical body. A machine only functions when it is included in some social organisation.

Now, first of all, I deal with various technical perfections. I ought to speak about this in greater detail. Comrade Schuller quoted from Marx to the effect that a distinction should be made between machinery under capitalist conditions and machinery under Socialist conditions. Marx was naturally quite right, and in so far as Comrade Schuller repeated what Marx said, he also was quite right. But have Communists or Bolsheviks ever said that they are hostile to the introduction of machinery? No. They never said anything of the kind. And have they ever written that they are in favour of capitalist technical perfections? Again I say, never. There have been such tendencies, but they have been of a bourgeois nature, from the progressive role of capitalism they drew the conclusion of a policy of support to the capitalist, a policy of anxiety about capitalist "progress". This was not a revolutionary, but just the opposite — a bourgeois viewpoint. We cannot be in favour of this introduction of machinery under conditions of capitalism, just as we cannot be against it. In Comrade Jacquemotte's speech there is a certain loophole for a possible conclusion as to the necessity of supporting the introduction of machinery, etc. although he was

speaking of the past stages of capitalism. But under the conditions of capitalism, we could by no means do this either formerly or now. We should never take up a positive position on this question. That is for the capitalists to worry about, and not the workers. The capitalist economic system was "better" than the feudal system. But that is no argument for becoming a defender of capitalism. The Russian Narodniki (populists) told us Marxists, that we would inevitably have to play such a role. We, on the contrary, always said that the various perfections, progressive economic forms, were not our affair, that they did not concern us, proletarian revolutionaries. Our task consists in organising and rallying the working class in order to overthrow the entire capitalist order. And that was our position also in former times. Then, also, we adopted the standpoint of the necessity of revolution and all others were subordinate to this main object. Therefore our policy is quite clear. The development of capitalism is the business of the capitalists. Our task is to organise the proletariat and utilise all difficulties confronting the capitalists with the object of struggling against the capitalists. That is how we present the question. It may be objected that this was in the old capitalist days, whereas now we have the epoch of capitalist decline. In reply to this I may refer to Lenin. He wrote in 1916 that we cannot fight against machinery. Therefore, the argument about "the decline" of capitalism is not opportune in the present case. It may be said that in our days the introduction of machinery has particularly acute results which did not exist formerly.

But this is not corroborated by facts. In the early capitalist epoch when machinery had only just been introduced, it absolutely ruined wide strata of the population. Hauptmann's "Weaver" is a literary illustration of this process. If we, in our propaganda, were to defend the hypothesis that consequences are now more acute it would be misrepresenting the entire history of capitalism.

On the other hand, of course, there is a great difference between the present process of rationalisation and the former state of affairs. But the difference here is not that there is anything new in principle: practically all the component parts of the process also existed formerly: the introduction of new machinery, the conveyor system, Taylorism, the intensification of labour, — all these things existed and nothing new in principle is being introduced. What is new is that all these methods are being applied under special conditions, with a special situation of capitalism itself and under special conditions of the class struggle. What is NEW is the social environment, the concrete situation of capitalism and the classes. And the fact that it is now a question of a direct struggle against capitalism, that we have a tremendous mass of unemployed, that the capitalist offensive is proceeding, masked by the slogan of rationalisation — all these factors also represent something new, arising from the specific position of capitalism, from the actual existing concrete struggle of social forces. Under such conditions it is necessary to present the question in the following manner: how are we to formulate our tasks and our slogans in order to be more certain of winning over the masses. This is decisive, everything else is absolutely secondary. Our main policy is to win the masses and this general directive also holds good in respect to various partial slogans. From this viewpoint above all the present question should be estimated.

On the whole one may observe two sides of a single process of rationalisation:

1. The technical and the organisational side having also economic consequences.

2. The social side.

These are two sides of one and the same process.

The technical-organisational side consists in the application of various inventions, machinery, and apparatus, in new methods (I will not go into whether they are good or not) of organising labour, in the new relations between the working class and in general among the people participating in the productive process. All this comprises the technical and technico-organisational side.

But there is also the social side, which in practice, in life, merges into one complex with the technico-organisational side. The social side consists in the raising of the intensity of labour, in increasing the proportion of surplus value (i. e., increased exploitation of the working class), in discharging workers and changing the proportion between the number of employed and unemployed workers, and similar matters.

The fact that all these factors are different sides of a single process does not give us the right not to distinguish between machinery and living people, between the technical-organisational and the social side of rationalisation.

I will present the question as follows: **what is the centre of gravity in this question for the Communist Party, for this main revolutionary force of capitalist society?** In my opinion the centre of gravity consists in the social side of the process. Comrade Fiala said in his speech that my presentation of the question would be correct for a Socialist State. It is just the contrary. In the Socialist Soviet State the centre of gravity consists in the **technico-organisational** side. We are fighting for rationalisation in a technical sense, we are introducing various improvements and thus **improving** the position of the working class. Fundamentally speaking there is no contradiction in our country between the technical side of rationalisation and the position of the working class. Our rationalisation is **for** the workers and not for the profit of capitalists, it is for an improved standard of living for the masses. In capitalist States the most important thing for the Communist Parties is the **social** side of the question. Comrade Fiala was absolutely wrong, he placed the question on its head and I would like to place it on its feet. If **everyone** agrees that in capitalist countries, the centre of gravity lies in the **social** side of the question, I would present a further question, **should not this main fact find its expression in the formulation of corresponding slogans?** Of course it should. If we see the centre of gravity in the social, and not in the technico-organisational side of the question, this circumstance should be reflected in our slogans in some form or other.

I will now turn to the strategy of Social Democracy. What is the Social Democratic viewpoint, what is the aim of Social Democracy? The views of the Social Democrats may be stated thus: they really are in favour of the stabilisation of capitalism, for the transformation of the organs of the labour movement **into auxiliary organs of the entire capitalist economic apparatus** (under the slogan of "economic democracy"). Such is the strategy of the Social Democrats, such is its viewpoint on this question. On what do the Social Democrats speculate? Their calculations are by no means foolish; they say: in our country the workers are not barbaric like the Russians, but Social Democratic workers, technically skilled, understanding progress in technique, accustomed to value new machinery, good instruments, etc. With the Social Democrats and their slogans of general recognition of rationalisation, the centre of gravity consists in utilising the labour power of the proletariat as an auxiliary force for rationalisation, emphasising and magnifying in the latter its technico-organisational side. This means: they raise this question in the factory committees, in trade unions, etc. in such a way as to concentrate the worker's attention on technical innovations, better organisation of labour, etc. People may be finely fooled in this manner. And it is done: the workers are told that they should put up with the temporary conditions and that after a short time they will again receive work, etc.

It would be dangerous for us if we were to conduct a discussion in the factory committee and similar organs on this technico-organisational plane, while the Social Democrats under the slogan of "economic democracy" would make use of this technical side. We must take care not to fall into this trap. We must again and again emphasise the other, the social side of the question. Even if only two workers are discharged from a factory **for the sake of profits for the capitalists**, we should protest; if the intensity of labour increases without a corresponding increase in wages, we should declare that we are against this; if the position of the working class deteriorates, we should struggle against this. In a word, we must concentrate our whole attention on the social side of the question, but not on technical questions. The latter would be very favourable, not for us but for the Social Democrats, who are out for "economic democracy" within the capitalist system, i.e., who are anxious about their role as the **supporters of the capitalist order**. That is how I presented the question. I can only admit that the formula "struggle against the consequences of rationalisation" could be wrongly interpreted just because there exist **two processes**: on the one hand rationalisation "in itself" and on the other hand, after a definite length of time, —

its social consequences. I specially discussed this question with leading German comrades, and we are moving a joint proposal comprising the following five points which should act as slogans for us:

1. Against capitalist stabilisation!
2. Against all deterioration of the working class position due to rationalisation deception!
3. For raising the standard of living of the working class!
4. For Socialist organisation of economy!
5. Not capitalist, but Socialist rationalisation!

It is clear here that the last slogan is of a propagandist nature and arises directly from the slogan of the Socialist economic organisation.

In our formula: "Against all deterioration of the working class position due to rationalisation deception", we compromise the whole process by the word "deception", avoiding; however, the difficulties to which I referred above. By this formula we say that the centre of gravity for the Communist Parties consists in the social side of the question. I, therefore, consider that the present formula is quite acceptable; it is the best of all the formulae we have found. This question has now been dealt with exhaustively.

Now allow me to say a few words about one or two other questions.

ON THE TACTICS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY.

The Chinese question, the question of the Chinese Party and the British Party will be examined separately in connection with the respective points on the agenda. But I would now like to make a few remarks concerning the tactics of certain Parties. I am compelled to do this by the speeches of our French comrades. Comrade Semard said that he would contest certain "incorrect remarks" in my report. The main contested point is the following: It says in the theses, in black and white, that the Party did not do everything in the critical situation, the Party slightly **overlooked** this situation. With regard to this Comrade Semard replied to me in certain directions and I would like to refer to this.

Firstly, Comrade Semard refers to the theses in which it is stated that the working class was not able to be mobilised. Comrade Semard says in regard to this that the very terms of this are absurd as the working class in general cannot mobilise itself. The mobilising force he says is the Party; the Party should mobilise the working class. In my opinion, this is verbal hair-splitting.

In order to explain this point, let us take for example the conquest of power. We say: **The proletariat** has conquered power (it goes without saying, under the leadership of the Party, because without the Party it is impossible, as a rule, to conquer power). Comrade Semard's argument, however, is also directed against this formula. For how can one conquer power without mobilising the forces of the working class? Hence there is nothing wrong in the theses. Now as to the substance of the question. Here I tell our friend Semard that I said no more and no less than what Semard himself admitted. And, indeed, the fact is that Comrade Semard on the one hand polemicalised against me, while on the other hand he said the same as I said only in different words. For instance he says:

"Our Party at that time (referring to the most critical moment — N. B.) during these 48 hours between two crises . . . was in a certain state of indecision. I do not say that it was taken unawares, but it did not sufficiently analyse the situation and did not immediately issue appropriate slogans".

Is this not a recognition of my viewpoint? Comrade Semard himself says that they "overlooked" the situation, that they did not make the necessary analysis in time and therefore they did not issue the proper slogans. What more do you want? That was all that I said.

We have the same thing in other places where Comrade Semard says the same thing. I will cite for instance the following place:

"Undoubtedly by virtue of a certain feebleness of the cadres of our Party in certain large districts of France, and in view of the certain weakness of our apparatus, we mobilised the workers slowly... But this is a defect of our Party which we can rectify only by improving our cadres..."

All that is true. But after all the reproach in the theses were addressed to the Party and not in any other direction.

Therefore, I am quite satisfied with what Comrade Semard said here; I have not said anything besides what is admitted by Comrade Semard himself, only he polemicised against my remarks.

What was the position at the time in question? There was general excitement in the country. Is this true? Undoubtedly true. The Party overlooked this situation and at a definite moment did not do what it was necessary to do. This was an error. We speak of it, not because we have any special desire to criticise errors, but because we must use these errors to draw certain lessons and learn from them.

I have before me a manifesto of the C. C. of the Communist Party of France from which it is clear how the position is estimated and how the C. C. had to justify itself.

It is stated in this manifesto:

"The wind of panic has blown over the country". That is the commencement, and what is said further on? Further on we read:

"The toiling masses have been shaken; they remain in a state of indecision, they prove to be inactive, they left the streets at the mercy of Fascist disorders..."

I ask you: Was it not just here that the Party should have been spoken of and not the working class? Otherwise it amounts to trying to get out of things and trying to find a scapegoat for our shortcomings. The workers were on the streets, the workers were roused. One cannot imagine such a state of affairs where the petty bourgeoisie are in a state of great ferment, while the working class stands by and waits. I think that the manifesto was written incorrectly. To present the question in such a way is to weaken the proletariat and is not an appeal for the mobilisation of the proletarian forces.

Comrades, this little strategy confirms what Comrade Semard himself said. Errors must be openly admitted and openly formulated.

ON THE GERMAN ULTRA-LEFTS AND THE SPEECH OF COMRADE RIESE.

Now allow me to say a few words about Comrade Riese. I have left him until the last by way of a tit-bit.

Speaking seriously I cannot understand why Comrade Riese had hidden his own programme in his pocket and not shown it to us. Everyone in this hall knows that you have definite views on the question of stabilisation, although these are expressed by Maslow. Further, you have a quite exact view of the so-called "Russian question" which for a fairly long time you endeavoured to use as a "trump" in your hands. Then you have a common estimation of the Communist Party of Germany. For instance I will take the reply to the ultimatum of the Central Committee where the German Party is regarded as a non-Bolshevik Party and where you express your views on the question as to the methods of internal Party struggle, about which it is true you have also said a little now, but not particularly clearly or in detail. Indeed, the "Russian question" has played a big role in the internal struggle in the C. P. G., as also the question on the estimation of the C. P. G. itself. But you have spoken of petty methods and kept quite silent about these most important questions as if they were some kind of secret illness. Can that be called a presentation of the question in principle? After all we do not intend to execute you, we will be moderate, we only want to know what viewpoint you defend. This would be useful both for us and for you.

After the entire discussion in the whole German Party was based on the Russian question, one cannot say as Comrade Riese does, that they "do not know" how things were in Russia, and how the discussion took place here. No one will believe that. We are ready to discuss here honourably every deviation

and every nuance of each deviation and every serious question no matter how sharply it be presented. Perhaps you will return to Germany and say that we did not allow you to speak. But we want you to speak, we even ask you to do so. And you merely refer to various trifles. You may reply that we want to discuss the Russian question afterwards. But we have touched on this question in our report, brought it forward in the discussion speeches and theses. Every Communist Party should base its policy on an appreciation of the general activity of the Comintern. It is clear for everyone that an underestimation of the Soviet Union means going over to quite different positions. Why, the most important things depend upon this estimation. If, for instance, we see a preparation for war against the Soviet Union, if such preparation is really taking place and at the same time you look upon our country as a capitalist country, or almost a capitalist country; if at the same time you estimate our dictatorship, not as the dictatorship of the proletariat, but as the dictatorship of the kulaks and semi kulaks, you will in no way be able to defend us, for, if you wanted to be honest with yourselves you would have to oppose support for the U.S.S.R. Korsch, was consistent and said: If the Communist Party of Germany will defend the Soviet Union in a war, this is analogous to the German Social Democrats defending their dear imperialist fatherland in 1914. With Korsch, this is quite consistent and can be understood.

On such questions one cannot keep silent: one can make errors, but not keep quiet. Here a "neutral" position is quite out of the question, as every problem of international policy, including German international policy also is entirely determined by this.

Why do you speak about a new orientation of Germany towards the West, why do you consider this a change of principle. This is absolutely unnecessary: If in the East there is a capitalist country, and in the West there is a capitalist country, this means there is absolutely no fundamental change and the general situation has not changed. This is one of the fundamental questions having general significance for the Comintern. If the C. P. S. U. is a kulak or semi-kulak Party, we cannot allow this Party to lead the Communist International. In this case we must break up the International and openly say: "We are in favour of breaking up the International, as this International is corrupted by the influence of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union". That would be consistent if the premise about kulakisation and degeneration be true, then these conclusions are excellent and 100% correct. Can such questions be hushed up and, instead of them, can one talk about Thuringia and about posters, about the piece-rate question and pass these problems by in silence? Is this so or not? It is so.

Today for instance I was given the last number of the "Prussian Gazette" where I found an article on the Conference of the supporters of Katz.. At this conference there were already Social-revolutionaries speaking! They said that Soviet Russia was no better than the capitalist State, that it had become a capitalist State. At this conference there were social Revolutionaries and in a short time there will probably be Mensheviks also. What does this signify? It is quite clear that these people arrive at the same conclusions in various ways. Of course these people do not represent any force, they are merely miserable, confused individuals, objectively playing the role of counter-revolutionary agents. They will tell fairy tales about our prisons, about our G. P. U., an old habit of all counter-revolutionary parties. This is how they earn their miserable existence with the help of the bourgeoisie. Their path is clear.

But let us take Urbahns and the rest. In their reply to the ultimatum to the C. C. of the C. P. G. they stated: "Yes, fractions are a bad thing for a Bolshevik Party, but within a Non-Bolshevik Party, they are good". Just think of these words thoroughly and you will get the line of a consciously conducted split of the Communist Party of Germany, a Party, which, in the opinion of the Ultra-Lefts "is not" Bolshevik. And we are striving for the unity of the trade unions, but cannot by any means agree to unity with a non-Bolshevik Party. We can work in reactionary trade unions, but cannot be in a political, perhaps Social Democratic, non-Bolshevik Party in Europe — that we cannot do —. We have only one exception — Great Britain where the Labour Party has quite a specific structure. It is an intermediary link between the Party and trade unions. But we cannot belong to any Social Democratic Parties, therefore if

you estimate the German Party in that way, you yourselves should leave the Party if you have the slightest grain of logic. But Comrade Riese omitted to present all these questions. It is very pitiful and very sad. It would be much more expedient if he were to explain the doubts existing in the minds of the so-called ultra-Left workers. We were in favour of inviting the ultra-Left comrades in order to obtain clarity. We are even ready to speak on every separate question which evokes doubt amongst them. But here everything you like has been spoken about except the main and decisive question.

I would like to say a few words about the organisational methods of the German Party. Comrade Riese says: They are expelling and expelling without stopping, this is not Bolshevism. Comrade Riese told us in passing that Givan who propagated the necessity of a "revolutionary" rising in the U. S. S. R., was expelled despite the fact that he had the right to defend his views in the Party. All right then, but in that case why not ask Kautsky to join our Party? For there is absolutely no difference between Kautsky and Givan on this most important — world-question! Will we have a real Bolshevism Party if we will collect all kinds of muck in it? Of course, general and wide "liberty" would be very great in such a Party, but please do not call it a Bolshevism Party! It would be any party you like, but not Bolshevism. In my opinion — and I say this quite frankly — the existence of "Korschists" in our Party is absolutely impossible. For ours is a real revolutionary Party and we kick out all counter-revolutionaries (Applause).

The system of the worst enemies of the working class has always been to hide under the slogan of "freedom of opinion". Many years ago I attended the Party Congress of the German Social Democratic Party at Chemnitz — Comrade Clara Zetkin was also there — where they excluded Hildebrand (Bukharin turns towards Treint) who wrote the first book on mutual relations between Europe and America. (Laughter.) Hildebrand justified colonial policy. For that he was excluded. And the entire revisionist pack howled: what sort of "freedom of opinion" do you call this? Freedom of opinions, yes — but freedom of opinions within definite bounds. Otherwise the Party will not be a Party, but a kind of meeting place for all kinds of views. Freedom of opinions means freedom of opinions within the framework of the Party, which is an organisation of people thinking the same thing. Anything outside this framework has no connection with the Party. Deviations not affecting the fundamental principles of the Party are something different from divergences on fundamental problems of ideology. We will suppress such "comrades" with all organisational measures.

To howl about the poor excluded Givan — is absolutely out of place. The Party would have been a miserable Party if it had left Givan in its ranks.

These are my observations on Comrade Riese's speech.

FOR THE MONOLITHIC LENINIST UNITY OF THE COMINTERN.

I am now coming to an end.

With regard to the significance of our discussion, it has not been on a bad level. Many problems of a fairly important nature have been touched on.

The task confronting our Plenum on the first question of our agenda consists in occupying a concrete position on the question of the process of capitalist stabilisation. At former Plenums we spoke of this in general lines, and now we are concretising our general conceptions, we now need a differentiated analysis of the world situation. As far as our chief tasks are concerned, we also differentiate them, above all, separating countries with an acute revolutionary situation. For the countries of Western Europe, the task also consists in concretising the general slogans we formerly accepted, such as the slogan of the united front, etc. We are now deciphering these general slogans. I also think that we should here concretise the question of the bolshevisation of the Party. The bolshevisation and strengthening of our Parties is our main task. Therefore we must above all declare that we cannot now tolerate fractions in Communist Parties (Applause).

The fractions formerly existing in various Communist Parties, were an expression of the weakness of these Communist Parties and not an expression of their particular benefactors on the breadth of their views. Now our Parties have grown,

become strengthened and this should also find reflection in the organisational question. Our reply to this question should be that we cannot now tolerate any fractions in our Party. The time when we could allow fractions has gone by. We need strong Parties capable of manoeuvring, strong in the community of their fundamental views, sufficiently compact to win the masses.

We have already said that in general the situation is favourable for our Party. The most depressing moment has now passed. We are marching forward in many respects. We have a fairly good situation on a world scale; we have the Chinese revolution, we have our constructive work in Soviet Russia and the British strike. Even if it should end in defeat — which is not out of the question, and thanks to the conduct of the leaders, very probable — it nevertheless signifies a colossal process of movement amongst the working class of Great Britain. This move will inevitably lead to further encounters, to the revolutionising of this section of the European working class, a section which was formerly the most conservative.

In Central Europe we will have an ever more acute situation, which is already now expressed in the leftward trend of the working class. This swing to the Left is a symptom of our future victories. And from this viewpoint, from the viewpoint of strengthening the revolutionary forces, we require complete unity within our Party and the same unity within the framework of the Comintern.

Therefore, our slogan is: down with attempts at scission! Long live the real united Communist International, leading the entire working class to the world revolution! (Stormy applause).

After Comrade Bukharin's concluding speech Comrade Kolarov read the following two declarations:

DECLARATION BY THE MINORITY OF THE C. C. OF THE C. P. P.

On behalf of the minority of the C. C. of the C. P. P. I identify myself with Comrade Bukharin's theses.

At the same time I feel in duty bound to bring to the notice of the Enlarged Executive that in our Party there is divergence of opinion on the fundamental questions dealt with in Comrade Bukharin's theses and speech, but the divergences of opinion which exist in our Party are of such a complicated and peculiar character and are so closely connected with organisational matters, that for these and other reasons, I have abstained from dealing here with the question of the situation within our Party. I consider it more expedient to refer this question, which requires a careful and thorough examination, to the special commission.

With regard to the speech made by Comrade Brandt, who is a member of our Delegation, I have the following statement to make:

Comrade Brandt belongs to that tendency in our Party which is represented by Comrade R. Sch. Kotscheva, Comrade Varski and others.

The basis of the views held by this group on the situation in Poland and the tasks of our Party is an opportunist attitude to the question of stabilisation. The same erroneous interpretation of this question which found expression in the speech delivered yesterday by Comrade Brandt is to be found also in Comrade Kotscheva's and Comrade Brandt's theses which were placed before the Polish commission of the Presidium of the C. I. in July and which are contrary to the interpretation of the situation and also to the tactics held by the leading group of the C. C. of the C. P. P.

There exist three viewpoints in our Party with respect to the question of stabilisation; a Right, an ultra-Left, and that of the minority of the C. C. The first viewpoint is a variation of the Trotskyite interpretation of the question of stabilisation. The Trotskyite conception of ultra-imperialism and of the rationing of Europe by America corresponds with the conception of stabilisation in Poland with the help of the golden rain of foreign loans, including the Americanisation of the labour movement. This opportunist viewpoint, which was subjected to correct criticism in Comrade Lominadze's speech, is contrary to the revolutionary perspective expounded in the letter of the E. C. C. I.

to the Communist Party of Poland. In lieu of this perspective we find in the theses of the said group a perspective of the passive decline of the toiling masses.

Domski's standpoint consists in a hurrah-revolutionary, mechanical denial of the serious character of the stabilisation efforts, in reliance on automatic collapse and on the inner struggle in the ranks of the bourgeoisie itself.

Both these standpoints condemn the Party to political passivity.

The third standpoint — that of the minority of the C. C. — is identical with Comrade Bukharin's standpoint which sees in stabilisation not only an objective process, but also an object of the class struggle. In the draft theses brought forward by us at the September Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. P. we use the following arguments:

"The attempts to stabilise capitalism will be frustrated by internal differences and class antagonisms, by the subordination of the interests of the productive forces of Poland to the interests of the capitalist big powers, or else they must be inevitably frustrated by the revolutionary forces aroused through these differences and antagonisms."

In accordance with this perspective, the minority of the C. C. places into the forefront the struggle of the workers and peasants against the stabilisation efforts of the bourgeoisie and against Pilsudski's Fascist dictatorship, and also the active role of the Communist Party in this struggle as the main factor militating against stabilisation.

The opportunist estimate of the stabilisation in our case is a phenomenon with a historical basis, and is the outcome of the Right policy of the Varski, Kostcheva, Brandt, etc. group which the Party has not yet overcome. It is closely connected with that appraisal of the driving forces of the revolution which ascribes to the petty bourgeoisie an independent role in the first stage of the revolution (theory of two stages), it is swayed

by disbelief in the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and has no faith in the capacity of the proletariat to bring the petty bourgeois masses under its leadership. Moreover, this standpoint is connected with a whole series of tactical questions which I refer to the commission for further consideration.

(J. Lenski.)

TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE VII ENLARGED EXECUTIVE OF THE C. I.

In connection with Comrade Lenski's declaration, the Polish Delegation wishes to make the following statement:

1. This declaration presents a very distorted picture of the attitude of the C. C. of the C. P. P. to the question of stabilisation in general and to its prospects in Poland in particular. Our Delegation has explained the standpoint of the C. C. of the C. P. P. with regard to Comrade Bukharin's and Comrade Kuusinen's reports in the speech of its representative, Comrade Pruchniak, and has identified itself completely with these theses.

2. Comrade Lenski's attitude on this question amounts to an ultra-Left denial of any stabilisation, which viewpoint found expression in his articles in the "Novy Psheglond" (January-February 1926) and in the "Communist International" (April 1926) as well as in a number of his speeches.

From this same viewpoint Comrade Lenski considers the draft theses which Comrades Kostsheva and Brandt placed before the Polish Commission of the E. C. C. I. in June, and he distorts the sense of these draft theses.

3. In the Commission we will throw light on all the other false assertions made by Comrade Lenski.

On behalf of the Delegation of the C. P. P.
(Vysotzki).

After several announcements by Comrade Rennele, on behalf of the Presidium, the Tenth Session was declared adjourned.