

SPECIAL NUMBER

~~English~~ Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 91

PRESS

30th December 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

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

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

Eleventh to Thirteenth Session.

Full Report.

Eleventh Session.

Moscow, Nov. 28, 1926.

Comrade REMMELE:

Comrade ROY (Chairman):

Today's session is opened. The order of business consists of the report of Comrade Tan-Ping-Shan on the situation in China.

Before proceeding to this point, Comrade Remmele will make an announcement.

Whilst we are meeting here today, a memorial meeting is being held in the Bolshoi Theatre for our late Comrade Krassin. The Presidium of this Plenum has sent a delegation to the meeting, consisting of Comrades: Bell (Great Britain), Eberlein (Germany), and Bernard (France). Comrade Bell will speak at the meeting in the name of the Presidium.

The Situation in China.

Comrade TAN-PING-SHAN (China):

A written report has already been submitted to the Plenum. But since too little light has been thrown upon the Chinese question I consider it desirable that the situation in China be characterised briefly, in such a manner as to bring into relief the principal questions.

The entire period prior to the Shanghai events in May of last year can be divided into three stages:

1. From the Shanghai events to the mutiny of Kwo-Sung-Lin against Chang Tso-lin. This was a period of full revolutionary offensive against the Imperialists.

2. From the defeat of Kwo-Sung-Lin up to the time of the northern expedition of the Canton troops. This period might be described as the counter-attack of the Imperialists against the Revolution.

3. From the northern expedition of the Canton troops down to the present, during which the revolutionary forces are resuming the offensive against the Imperialists.

It is not necessary to discuss the first and second of these stages — these are already sufficiently well known.

With the third stage the Chinese Revolution has entered upon a new period in its development. Many important changes in the situation are to be noted, among them being:

1. The occupation of Wuchang and Hankow by Cantonese troops, whereby the revolutionary forces have spread out in Central China.

2. Consolidation of the Left wing of the Kuomintang. Thanks to mass pressure, the C. C. of the Kuomintang has adopted a resolution calling upon Wang Ting-Wei to resume his position.

3. A leftward turn of the Kuomintang centrists as a result of which there is the chance that this wing can work together with the Left.

4. The movement for the re-admission of the expelled Kuomintang members who formed a group, a fraction, last year in Szechuan, near Peking.

5. The official organisational relationship between the Peoples Armies of Feng-Yu-hsiang and the Canton Government.

6. The victories of the II, III and V Peoples Armies and the occupation of Kiangsi province and its capital Sianfu.

7. The broadening of the organisation of the Communist Party of China.

8. The new boom in the labour movement of Hankao and the new strikes in Shanghai, etc.

9. The rapid development of the peasant movement in the provinces of Kwantung and Honan.

10. The disorders, and uprisings of the well-known "League of Red Spears" in the provinces of Honan, Shantung, and Chipli.

11. Formation of organisations of intermediate and small merchants in the towns of Shanghai, Hankow, Canton, etc.

12. The sympathy of the bourgeoisie in Shanghai for the Canton revolutionary government.

13. The differentiation within the military cliques in the provinces of Szechuan, Kweichow, Honan, Chekiang, etc.

14. Differentiation in the nationalist organisations and among the so-called Sun-Yat-Senists.

These facts are to be accounted for by the revolutionary elan and the military victories of the Canton troops.

To summarise we may say that, firstly, the revolutionary movement is more and more finding support and confidence among the masses; secondly, that a gradual concentration of revolutionary forces is in process. If this broadening, spreading, and concentration of revolutionary forces goes further, we may, to some extent say, that there is a very good chance of a revolutionary unification. We know, however, that the Chinese Revolutionary movement is only in its opening stages. There cannot yet be any talk of a completion of the revolution. Anyone who maintains that the Chinese Revolution is already accomplished, that the mission of 1911 is already fulfilled, is entirely wrong. We can only say at this time that there is the greatest possibility of a revolutionary unification.

How do matters stand in the other camp, in the camp of our enemy in China? We can see this from the following facts:

1. Conflicts between the British and American, between the British and Japanese, and between the Japanese and American imperialists.

2. The disintegration of the semi-feudal military camps, the disintegration of the troops of Wu-Pei-Fu and of Sun-Chuan-Fang; and finally, the conflict between Chang-Tso-Lin and Chang-Zuen-Chang in the Mukden camp.

3. The mutiny of Hsia Chow against Chuan.

4. The beginning of disintegration in the armed forces in the provinces of Honan and Anhwei.

5. The movement against Sun-Chuan-Fang by the governors in Shanghai;

6. The anti-militarist movement of the merchants in Peking, Tientsin, etc. because of the unbearable tax burdens.

7. The movement against foreign stocks and bonds in Harbin.

8. The uprisings of the League of Red Spears' against the rule of the reactionary militarists.

These facts show that on the one hand the militarists are going through a process of disintegration, that the strongholds of the imperialists are shaken and weakened, and that on the other hand, the oppressed and exploited are embarking upon the revolutionary road more consciously than heretofore. The statement, therefore, that the Chinese Revolution has the greatest chance to unite China, is not exaggerated.

Lenin once said:

"A basic revolutionary law, which has been confirmed by all revolutions and particularly by the three Russian Revolutions of the 20th century, consists in the following: it will not suffice for a revolution that the exploited and enslaved masses realise the impossibility of continuing to live in the old way, and in that they demand a change; what is necessary for the revolution is that the exploiters can no longer live and govern in the old way. Only if the "lower strata" no longer intend to live as they have been

living, and the "upper strata" no longer can live in the old manner, only then can the revolution be victorious."

The correctness of this thesis was also confirmed by the Chinese Revolution. The oppressed masses of China have in fact become conscious that they cannot continue to live in this way, and likewise the contradictions and differences among the rulers are beginning to intervene in a period in which they cannot continue their rule along the old lines.

The Chinese Revolution will be victorious. It has already won a partial victory. But we should not forget, firstly, that revolutionists should not lose their heads, either because of victories or of difficulties, secondly, that they must consolidate victories already won so that they may maintain their power; thirdly, that the enemy must be destroyed because they have thus far been defeated, but are still far from being obliterated. Comrade Lenin uttered these words in 1907 at the London Party Congress. I believe that these words will help the comrades who are much too optimistic about the Chinese Revolution. The Chinese Revolution has only made its first step. The foe is not yet beaten, and there can be no talk whatever of his having been already destroyed. How, then, can we be altogether too optimistic? A great Chinese strategist of old once said that victories can be won only if one knows oneself and the foe perfectly. In order to maintain our victory, and in order to win new successes, we must be clear as to our own weaknesses and as to how we can consolidate our victories.

We have many weaknesses:

1. Our military forces are not yet fully concentrated.

2. The development of military power is outstripping the development of the power exerted by the masses of the people.

3. Our material support is inadequate.

4. The mass organisations are still weak and the masses which live under the military rule are not yet in position to form, organisationally and systematically, organisations for the uprising.

5. The policy that the present Canton Government has put into effect by no means meets the demands and requirements of the masses.

Many critical points can still be felt within the Chinese Revolutionary movement.

1. The military intervention and imperialist intrigues, e. g. when last year Japan sent its forces to Mukden and Taku, when England concentrated its fleet, its cruisers, in the Pacific Ocean. The imperialists intend to maintain their privileges in China, and hence we have such happenings.

2. A disintegration of the revolutionary forces is also to be feared, as well as a degeneration in the revolutionary camps.

A further danger consists in the possibility that the imperialists and militarists will again combine against the Canton groups.

In order to consolidate our already won victories, we must:

1. Develop the peasant movement broadly and lead it to a direct participation in the actual struggles.

2. Establish a united battle front of all classes for the national revolution, which includes the proletariat, peasantry, and the urban petty and middle bourgeoisie. Under certain conditions we can also work together with that big bourgeoisie which has, thus far had no relations with the imperialists, in connection with which we must, by all means, relentlessly expose its treacherous, compromising character.

3. Have the support of the West European proletariat which must prevent a free hand for the imperialists in suppressing and destroying the Chinese Revolution. A united revolutionary battlefront without the active support of the proletariat in the advanced countries, without the struggle of these proletariats against their own imperialisms, is hopeless. This is the kernel of Leninism on the national question, and is simultaneously one of the chief premises for the consolidation of the victory of the Chinese Revolution.

I shall now take up the chief aim of the Chinese Revolution and the relations between the Chinese Revolution and capitalist

stabilisation. At the present time the Chinese Revolution must set for itself the following aims:

1. Consequent emancipation from imperialism.
2. Complete destruction of the semi-feudal military system, and the establishment of a united revolutionary government.
3. Democratisation of politics.

We must fight under the following practical slogans:

a) A movement for the annulment of the unequal treaties. This movement has already called forth, since the Shanghai events of last year, mass movements even in far-distant villages. We must demand: self-administration of customs, withdrawal of foreign military forces, restitution of leaseholds and abolition of extra-territoriality.

We must fight for the slogan of the national assembly. This slogan concretises the so-called democratisation of politics. Organisations supporting and fostering this movement are spreading throughout the whole of China. The masses demand not only one uniform national assembly that will cover the whole country, but they also demand the democratisation of local political power. They demand Provincial country meetings, etc.

With regard to the annulment of the unequal treaties we must first shatter the prestige of the foreigners, and then, after a certain time in which we are sufficiently entrenched, we must tear these treaties into shreds. The imperialists, particularly the British, have already partially lost their prestige, especially in Kwantung where the Canton Government has put into effect its own customs tariffs, and also in Peking, where the Government which is dominated by the reactionary militarists, was forced by mass pressure to declare invalid the Belgo-Chinese Treaties. These facts have inspired great fear, especially among the British imperialists. They believe that China has already adopted the Bolshevik theory of repudiating all foreign loans and unequal treaties.

As far as the stabilisation of capitalism is concerned, we must note that the Chinese Revolution has delivered a heavy blow to imperialism in that it is beginning to cut down the market for commodity capital.

It further intensifies the conflicts between the imperialist groups, and arouses and strengthens the liberation struggle of colonial countries such as Indonesia, India, Korea, etc., which undoubtedly still further undermines the labile capitalist stabilisation.

We realise that two possibilities are characteristic of the present Chinese Revolution: either the Chinese proletariat, with the support of the world proletariat, will succeed in carrying out a consequent national revolution, or else the new Chinese bourgeoisie will be in position to take into its hands the leadership of the Chinese Revolution, and by means of the imperialists' support, develop a Chinese capitalism or slowly liquidate the Chinese Revolution by means of compromises.

Since the Shanghai events, the Chinese proletariat has proven its political importance. Especially in the strikes in Shanghai, Hongkong and Canton, the latter lasting over a year, broad anti-imperialist movements were instigated, and the Canton Government was consolidated. The peasant masses in Kwantung also followed the propaganda and slogans of the Communist Party of China. Under the initiative of the Communist Party of China, the peasant movement in other provinces is growing more and more, and is developing further and further under the leadership of our Party.

These facts prove that the Chinese proletariat really has a chance to capture the hegemony of the national revolution. The Chinese bourgeoisie also, which suffers under the political and economic oppression of the imperialists, is spurred on by the general revolutionary mood and is beginning gradually to participate in the national revolutionary movement. It has already tried, and continues to try to seize the leadership of the revolution. In May of last year, the Shanghai bourgeoisie deserted the 17 demands of the Union of Workers, Merchants and Students and formulated a set of 13 demands of its own. The formation of Dai-Tsi-Taoism and the March affair this year in Canton, are attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie to take the leadership of the revolution away from the proletariat. Hence

there are two possibilities, two tendencies in the Chinese Revolution. The leading position of the Chinese proletariat in the national revolution is not sufficiently secure. The Chinese proletariat is still in a period in which it must fight the bourgeoisie for the leadership of the national revolution. In order to capture the leadership of the Chinese revolution, the proletariat must:

1. Win the broad peasant masses and the support of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, while preventing the rightward swing of the bourgeoisie. Only then will it be possible for the proletariat to organise a united battlefront under its leadership.

2. The proletariat must consolidate and extend the trade union movement, in the course of which it must work for the organisation of all industrial workers, handicraftsmen and agricultural labourers. The Communist Party must do everything possible in order to lead these elements directly into the revolutionary struggle. And, finally, the Chinese proletariat must get the support of the entire international proletariat.

The Kuomintang is precisely a united organisation of the revolutionary forces of all classes. We must do everything possible in order to develop the Kuomintang further, and with its aid carry out consequently the national revolution. If it is maintained that the Communists should withdraw from the Kuomintang, or that they should organise a third party in the place of Kuomintang, then this would mean the splitting of the united battlefront. Through our own initiative, we must develop and consolidate the power of the Left wing in the Kuomintang, while at the same time not forgetting to prevent the further rightward swings of the Kuomintang's right wing.

What is the Status of the Chinese peasantry in this national revolution? The landowning class forms the basis of the Chinese military system. In order completely to put an end to the semi-feudal system of the militarists, we must solve the agrarian question, we must smash the weapons by which the big landowning class oppresses the peasant masses. Only thereby can the bases of the militarists be shattered. Under the rule of the Canton National Government we must win the support and sympathy of the broad masses of peasantry in order to maintain the victories we have won. We must enrol the peasantry in the united revolutionary battlefront.

We now come to the question of the Chinese labour movement and of the development and importance of the Communist Party of China. The Chinese proletariat will not only be the driving force of the future proletarian revolution, it is also the directing power in the present national revolution. Without a mighty labour movement the national struggle cannot develop further. The ups and downs of the labour movement in China at the same time mark the trend of the national movement as a whole. In the three stages of the Chinese labour movement, from the sailors' strike in 1922 up to the railwaymen's strike of 1923, from this to the Shanghai events, and from the Shanghai events to the present time, the Chinese working class has shown its fighting ability and its valour in the front ranks of the revolution. The whole Shanghai movement rallied around the strikes in Shanghai and Hankow. The Canton Government could wipe out the counter-revolutionary troops only with the support of the masses of workers and peasants. And now also, after the occupation of Hankow and Wuchang by the Canton troops, the victory can be maintained only if the labour movement is consolidated and strengthened.

The influence of the reformists in the Chinese labour movement must also be thwarted. The reformist movement can find no place among the Chinese labouring masses who suffer under a double oppression and exploitation by their own and by the foreign capitalists. The Asiatic Workers' Congress, which was called last year, was already a sign that the international reformists have made efforts to extend their influence among the Chinese labouring masses. While it is true that the Chinese working class has a low cultural level, in a revolutionary sense one can say that it is most revolutionary.

The Chinese Communist Party is thus far still weak, but of late it has grown very rapidly and consolidated itself. In the course of one year, it increased its membership four-fold. The Communist organisations in Canton, Shanghai, and in O-Ku-Han province, have already become mass organisations. The Chinese Communist Party is the vanguard of the national revolution. In the unification of Fontung Province during the

war against Mukden, against Wu-Pei-Fu, and during the present Northern expedition of the Canton troops, it has further consolidated its influence in the masses, and it has accomplished a great deal. The working class has a constantly growing confidence in our Party. The peasants, petty-bourgeoisie, and democratic elements also follow us to some extent.

Our organisation still has many shortcomings. It does not by far extend over the whole country. The lower cadres are too weak. The organisation is not altogether healthy. While the basic organisations consist of factory nuclei, yet because

the comrades have insufficient experience and training, these organisations are not strong enough, the Party is weak in theory and also suffers from a lack of international experiences.

We must concentrate our work and forces upon the consolidation of the victories which the Chinese Revolution has already won, upon the consequent extension of the national revolution, and upon aiding the Kuomintang to broaden the united battle-front in order to complete the national revolution of China.

(Stormy Applause.)

Discussion of the Report on the Situation in China.

Comrade MANUILSKY (Soviet Union):

I should like to direct the attention of the whole Comintern upon the Pacific problem as a whole, viz., upon the conflicts which develop where the paths of three Continents, America, Asia and Europe, cross one another. Three imperialist powers stand face to face there: The United States of North America, Japan and Great Britain.

The armed clash which may break out there in the future, will be of unimaginable violence and serious consequences. If prior to this fateful moment, no decisive battle has taken place between proletariat and bourgeoisie in England or the United States, if, until then the victorious Chinese national revolution does not change international relations on the shores of the Pacific, we may witness a war which, with respect to its grimness and the extent of its losses, will put the great imperialist war of 1914—18 in the shade. The British military writer, Bywater, defines the importance of the Pacific Ocean in the coming imperialist wars as follows:

"When, on November 21st, 1918, the German war fleet surrendered unconditionally to the victors, this meant the close of a brief but fateful chapter in the history of the struggle for the seas (the author had in mind the struggle in the North Sea between the German and British fleets). The next chapter begins in August 1919 when the newly created Pacific fleet of the United States passed through the Panama Canal on its way to its naval base in San Francisco."

And not only Bywater, but also a number of other military writers in America, Japan and Great Britain, are of the opinion that after the world war, which bled Europe white, after the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914, the epoch of Pacific imperialism has dawned.

In the United States a law has been passed against Japanese immigration which arouses the deepest indignation of the Japanese people. One need only follow up the Japanese press, or give heed to the expressions of Japanese military circles, in order to become aware of the full reality of the menace a Pacific war. This is evidenced by last year's naval manoeuvres off the Hawaiian Islands, which taught that this American naval base could be captured by Japan in the fight for the Pacific. The United States and Great Britain, are watching with great uneasiness the process of Japanese colonisation on the shores of the Pacific.

Japan, a nation of 60 million inhabitants, tightly crowded upon the limited area of its islands (Nippon, Sikok and Kiu-Siu) has a natural pressure towards the Philippines, towards the Malay Archipelago, towards the innumerable little islands scattered over the immeasurable surface of the Pacific Ocean. The British Dominion, Australia, is busy stirring up the nationalist passions of the white race, through its capitalist press reports on the "yellow peril". In order to justify the military fortification of Singapore, the British press exploits Japanese naval armaments and war preparations, by describing in detail the capacity of the Japanese guns, and by representing the launching of every new Japanese torpedo boat as a sign of the coming Japanese offensive against the old countries of capitalist culture. And in fact the naval programme of 1923, which is to be completed in 1928, gives reason for some concern. Despite the restrictions of the Washington Conference it has

been possible for Japan to build a new fleet of 25 light cruisers, 90 destroyers, and 70 submarines.

In Japan itself, an active nationalist agitation is being carried on, directed primarily against the United States, as the power which stands in the way of Japan's further development, and which condemns it to colonial enslavement. In Japan the threatened war in the Pacific is discussed openly and unconcealed; speeches are made about it, whole books are written, plans are worked out for supplying Japan with raw materials in case of a blockade, etc. To be sure, this war factor is sometimes veiled over by modern trade and financial relations which appear in the "peaceful guise" of an economic collaboration.

It is well-known e. g. that Japan is greatly interested in the American market for its export of silk and tea. Aside from this, Japan, as a result of its serious losses during the 1923 earthquake, was in need of American credit. The United States exploited this circumstance and penetrated more and more into Japan. Yet even if we discount a good part of the exaggeration inherent in this militarist agitation, the tremendous importance of the Pacific problem nevertheless remains an undeniable fact.

The Comintern, however, has devoted too little attention to this problem in the past: we were too much a European International. We were inclined to look all problems of world politics and of the international labour movement through the prism of European relations. Parties directly involved in the Pacific problem, such as the American and British, are also devoting but inadequate attention to it. Only after the outbreak of the Chinese national revolution did the question of conflicts in the Far East arouse our interest, and we looked attentively into the crystallising grouping of forces on the Pacific. Yet the Chinese Revolution we have also thus far considered from the viewpoint of its perspectives of internal development; and we lay too little weight upon its significance as a factor which revolutionises Pacific relationships as a whole.

The struggle in China, which raged for decades before the world war, 1914—1918, was a struggle for the partition of Asia. Here there met the imperialist paths of tsarist Russia, Japan and Great Britain. In 1904 and 1905 the struggle between tsarist Russia and Japan took place here, and from it Japan emerged firmly entrenched. Until recently, China was one of the objects of the struggle on the Pacific. By China's appearance as the subject of an active national revolutionary policy in Asia, it completely overturns "all analyses" and prophecies which military and Pacific experts have made concerning the probable grouping of forces. All these people proceeded from the premise of a split-up China, rendered powerless by internal conflicts, a country whose inescapable fate it is to be divided up into spheres of influence. They took as their starting point the ratio system between the United States, Japan and Great Britain, established by the Washington Conference, without taking into consideration the new, potentially powerful factor of future Chinese policy.

The Chinese revolution can under certain conditions, first, hasten the armed clash of Big Powers on the Pacific — "a possibility that bourgeois experts on the Pacific problem" put off for a number of years; second, it will exert a revolutionising influence on the movement of all Asia, especially India, whose national-revolutionary movement seems to have been ebbing somewhat in recent years. This is likewise a point in the sharpening of antagonisms in the Pacific. That this view of the

role of the Chinese Revolution is entirely justified is proven by the Indonesian uprising. This uprising also (side by side with the Chinese Revolution) moves the Pacific problem into the foreground.

There is ferment also in the Philippines. This summer Calvin Coolidge, the President of the United States, sent a certain Colonel Thompson on an investigation tour of the Philippines where agitation had been aroused among the population over the American plans to establish rubber plantations there. The honourable Colonel returned with an extraordinarily optimistic report that the population of the Philippines had no strivings for independence but instead entertained a passionate desire to plant rubber for Mr. Firstone. At the same time, he was compelled to admit, however, that "the propaganda of certain politicians for the independence of the Philippines was finding response among the less-cultured strata".

At the present time there can be no great colonial movement that fails to cut deeply into the diplomatic web of international relations of the big capitalist bandits. Such a movement radically changes the relation of forces between them, sharpens their struggles, and stimulates their appetite. The Chinese Revolution and the colonial revolutionary movements have prospects of success because they occur at a time in which antagonisms on the Pacific are not lessening, but sharpening. A third circumstance that plays a certain role in the sharpening of the rivalry in the Pacific is the question of the British dominions. The struggle between Great Britain and the United States over such dominions as Canada, Australia, etc., is well-known. Under the pressure of extraordinary political and economic difficulties, England is more and more forced to orientate itself towards its colonies and dominions. Voices are already being heard in the British press asking whether it would not be better for Great Britain "to turn its back to Europe" and to direct its whole forces to the maintenance, regulation and establishment of closer economic relations with all the far-flung parts of the Empire scattered over land and sea. If England should actually embark upon this course, it would in a certain sense signify the victory of the policy of Pacific orientation.

Finally, the actuality of the Pacific problem is increased by changes within world economy. The whole post-war development was characterised by the shifting, slowly but uninteruptedly, of the centre of gravity of world economy to the overseas countries. The tremendous development of capitalism in the United States goes hand in hand with a similar development in a whole series of "virgin countries" — Argentine, Brazil, Canada, Australia, etc. If a great economic crisis does not lead to an economic collapse here, then only an armed struggle on the Pacific Coast can create an immediate revolutionary situation in these overseas countries.

The great importance to world economy of the Asiatic and Pacific colonies must also be taken into consideration. If we take e. g. the share of Asia and of Europe in world trade, we find that Asia's share has risen considerably from the beginning of the world war to 1923. Thus in 1913 Europe's share in world trade amounted to 64,2%, while Asia's share amounted to only 10,1%. But in 1923 Europe's share was 51,9%, while that of Asia was 14,2%.

This phenomena as a whole forces us to enter more deeply into the antagonisms in the Pacific. From the beginning they are to be considered under a dual viewpoint:

1. as the object of an investigation concerning a possible war in this section of the capitalist front so far removed from Europe;

2. as an investigation of the perspectives of the Chinese revolution in the light of the ripening antagonisms on the Pacific.

Before going into these, I should like to remark on this latter point that the whole constellation of forces on the Pacific, and primarily the relation of forces between the United States and Japan, gives us the possibility of predicting the victory of the Canton Government with some certainty. We have not the slightest occasion for pessimism. If the Canton Government, while simultaneously consolidating its internal situation by means of a closer alliance with the peasantry, will be able to exploit these contradictions skilfully, then it will undoubtedly emerge victorious from the Chinese toiling masses' present heroic struggle for their national liberation.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN THE FIGHT FOR THE PACIFIC.

The objective role of attacker on the Pacific will in the future be played by the United States of North America, while the objective role of defenders falls to Great Britain and Japan. American imperialism is intricately bound up with the struggle for world hegemony. In the coming world war, if the fate of humanity is not previously fundamentally remodelled by the proletarian revolution, American imperialism will play the leading role. America is already arming now for this war on the Pacific; there is already an extensive literature which discusses this question in detail; and even the very time (1931—33) is set; plans of operations are described; in brief, the picture which we had several years before the war in Europe, is beginning to resurrect itself. At that time, prior to the world war, one could find in military literature detailed drafts of the German attack upon Belgium, which were later, in the first days of August 1914, carried into effect with photographic fidelity.

The whole development of American imperialism in the last 25 years testifies that this relentlessly approaching struggle on the Pacific is in no sense a creation of fantasy. The ruling classes also recognise this. Prof. Holl, of Sydney University, one of the most prominent experts on Pacific problems, expressed himself on the situation in the Pacific as follows:

"In studying the situation which has arisen on the Pacific" — he said three months ago — "One cannot avoid a deep concern. This talk of the Pacific taking the place of the Atlantic as the international arena, must not be taken lightly. Precisely on the Pacific the apparatus for the settlement of international conflicts is weaker than anywhere."

And the same Holl complains with lyrical sorrow, that no such institution as the League of Nations prevails on the Pacific:

"The League of Nations, despite its shortcomings, is a body that tries to be of service in international questions (!). Yet it is impossible to turn to the League of Nations in any more important conflict because the United States is not a member."

It is, of course, an entirely debatable question as to how far the League of Nations can be an instrument "for the settlement of international conflicts". Yet it is extraordinarily symptomatic of the entire international situation that it is just the Pacific Ocean which is not subject to the influence of even so powerless an institution like the European League of Nations.

The notorious Washington Conference (1921) gave rise to certain pacifist illusions, because it put a check on the growth of naval armaments. Yet it eliminated neither the causes nor the chances of the conflict, it merely deferred them. Prior to this conference, American imperialism worked tirelessly and persistently on the strengthening of its military-strategical positions in the fight for the Pacific, for the markets of the Far East. In 1898, as a result of the Spanish-American war, the Americans took Cuba from the Spaniards, an Island near the shores of Central America and the key to the Atlantic side of the future Panama Canal. At the same time, the United States annexed also another Island, Porto Rico, which is of great importance in guarding the entrance of the Panama Canal.

An additional result of the Spanish-American war was the annexation of the Philippines, at the entrance of the South China Sea, on the Asiatic shores of the Pacific Ocean. The Philippines can be compared to a revolver, the muzzle of which is pointed at Japan. The revolver is dangerous, because at the very opening of the war it could be captured by Japan, since the Philippines lie opposite the Japanese naval base of Formosa. Yet the Philippines have economic importance also for the United States. It is well-known that the United States are absolutely dependent upon Britain for their supply of rubber. Investigations undertaken recently have shown that climatic and soil conditions are favourable for the raising of rubber in the Southern part of the islands. On the island of Mindanao and the small islands adjacent there can be accommodated at least 1,500,000 rubber trees which will produce approximately 200,000 tons of rubber, enough to supply the world market.

In the same year 1898 the United States, by skilful utilisation of the revolutionary movement in the Hawaiian Islands

(on the way between the American Pacific coast and the Philippines), annexed also these islands and transformed them into one of the chief links in the chain of naval bases on the Pacific Ocean. In order to comprehend the importance of these islands in the struggle for the Pacific, one must take into consideration the fact that not a single ship can sail across the Pacific and back without at least running into one of their harbours. Aside from the Hawaiian Islands there is not another point on the Pacific where ships can supply themselves with coal and fresh water. Thanks to this importance the Hawaiian Islands might to a certain extent be reckoned as the Gibraltar of the Pacific Ocean. Here upon these islands at Pearl Harbour the American Navy concentrates its aeroplane fleet consisting of 150 aeroplanes. A fleet of submarines alternative with torpedo boats. The dry dock can accommodate simultaneously a dreadnought and a cruiser. The range of the radio station in Hawaii includes China, Australia, and New York. In concrete barracks there is infantry equipped for gas warfare, mine throwers, etc. This is the switch-yard of the coming war in the Pacific Ocean. Only very recently the United States assigned 20 million dollars for further fortifications on Hawaii.

All these annexations were only the prelude to a step that is of dominant importance for the imperialist offensive of the United States on the Pacific — the building of the Panama Canal which was completed in August 1914. The cannons roar of the imperialist war drowned out this event that signified a new Pacific epoch of American foreign policy, so that as a result it failed to receive the attention it deserved. But only after the opening of the Panama Canal which saved the American fleet 8—10,000 miles and the hazardous trip around Tierra del Fuego and through the Magellan Straits, could American imperialism write upon its banners Roosevelt's words: "In the history of mankind there begins a Pacific era", and "the domination of the Pacific must belong to the United States". At the same time it must also be noted that the Washington Conference, (which naive pacifist sheets designated as the beginning of a "peaceful" period in the development of Pacific relations), was nothing other than the carrying out of American plans of advance in the Pacific. At this very conference, the United States succeeded in isolating Japan and in breaking off the latter's alliance with Great Britain. A war by America, against the combined Anglo-Japanese fleet would have been an extremely difficult task. Japan, thanks to its military-strategic position, and its system of coastal fortifications, is almost impregnable against attack from the sea. It could be overcome only by a blockade extending over a period of years. But such a blockade is impossible for the American fleet if at the same time it must fight the British navy with its two strong bases on the Asiatic coast, in Hongkong and Singapore. From this standpoint the Washington Conference has strengthened the diplomatic position of the United States, while the possibility of a war between Japan and America is by no means eliminated, but on the contrary, it is increased. This military-strategic preparation on the part of America was in conformity also with its economic expansion.

THE ESSENCE OF AMERICAN "PACIFISM".

In its economic programme of expansion, American pacifism has passed through three stages:

Firstly, the Monroe Doctrine. The origin of this doctrine, "America for the Americans", coincided in point of time with that period in the development of the United States in which the markets of North and South America were the highest goal of the American bourgeoisie.

Secondly, at the end of the 19th century, when capitalism in the United States, as a result of its turbulent development, felt itself restricted within these confines, when the American bourgeoisie for the first time turned its eyes to the Pacific and to the Chinese markets, American capitalism unfurled a new banner upon which was blazoned the programme of the "Open Door". The "Open Door" is the policy of every rising young imperialism that comes into the world somewhat belated, i. e. when the world is already divided among other capitalist rivals. When the United States made its appearance in China, it found that country under the practically unrestricted influence of Japan and Great Britain. Great Britain was the

first capitalist country which had gained a foothold in China. With the aid of Hongkong, its frontier posts in the Far East, which had been occupied in 1842 under the terms of the Nanking Treaty, England had been working for decades in consolidating and extending its strongholds in China. On the other hand, however the geographical situation of Japan made it easier for this young Japanese capitalism, which at the beginning of the 20th century was already considerably developed, to penetrate into China. The virile Japanese imperialism crowded England out of its strongholds step by step. Even though Japanese capital was still weak in Japan itself, it penetrated industry, stock companies, and participated as largest shareholder in the banks. It requires only a glance at the curve of Chinese imports from Japan and Great Britain to convince us of the rapid tempo of advance of Japanese capital in China. Thus in 1870 British imports constituted 37% of the total, Japanese about 2%. In 1923 British imports declined to 13%, Japanese rose to 23%. Thus matters stood when the United States appeared on the scene. In 1910, American imports in China amounted to about 5%, while in 1923 it had already outstripped Great Britain and amounted to 16%. The unsuccessful tariff conference of this year indicates the differences of interest that exist between the United States and Great Britain. Thus e. g. American exports to Asia prior to the war, amounted to only 4.6% of the total, while they rose to 12%, and thereby became a powerful competitor against English trade, which, in addition had been injured by the boycott. What else is there for American imperialism in China, than a policy of the "Open Door"?

The third phase of development of American imperialism begins after the world war of 1914—18, after the economic collapse of Europe which followed this war. The Dawes Plan is a programme of the enslavement of European industrial countries by the far stronger American imperialism. American imperialism no longer contents itself with the countries of Asia, but it invades Europe. In addition to Germany, it also "cleaned up" Austria, it prepares "sanitation plans" for French finances, slinks unobserved into Italy, etc.

Each of these three periods of development of American imperialism also found its expression in the foreign policy of the United States. In view of the three expansion trends of the United States — America, Asia, Europe — this foreign policy is extremely complicated. In the struggle for the American Continent the United States comes into sharp conflict with the annexation desires of British imperialism. In Canada as well as in Mexico and Brazil, and also in Chile and other smaller nations of the American Continent, a stubborn battle for influence over these countries has been in progress for some years between the United States and Great Britain. This antagonism is extremely sharpened by the struggle of these strongest imperialist States over oil and rubber resources (America controls more than 70% of the total oil production, while England has practically a monopoly of the rubber supply).

"The rubber war which we have witnessed for more than a year, has given renewed indication of the original sources of these antagonisms between the United States and Great Britain. With no less clarity however, they appear also on the Asiatic Continent, where an economic rivalry is going on over the Chinese markets between American and English imperialism. This is the first factor which determines the policy of American imperialism, it is pushing America into an armed conflict on the Pacific with Great Britain. In the same manner in which the world war of 1914 was in the main determined by the British-German competition, the future world war will be a struggle between the United States and Great Britain for the position of world leadership. Only under two premises would this perspective be vitiated: if the proletarian revolution were to break out in these countries before the armed clash between them comes to a head, or else, if the disintegration of the British Empire takes on a more rapid tempo than heretofore, and if Great Britain were to be crowded out and forced to vacate its dominant position.

Much more complicated is the "European" policy of American Imperialism. The distance between the United States and Europe is too great to permit the former to exert, today, any direct intervention in European affairs. Even in Asia, in the fight with Japan, the U. S. A. tries to shove forward a third power. All the more so does it avoid a direct mixing into European affairs. American imperialism intends to play, in

our century, the same role that Great Britain played in the 19th century with respect to the Continent. The U. S. A. will exploit European antagonisms and make use of first one and then another of the bourgeois states or groups as the instruments of its policy. Thus far England has to a certain extent been the instrument of American policy. Yet it is by no means excluded that the present rapprochement between France and Germany will be utilised by the U. S. A. against England. Yet precisely this need of America for some big power to serve as its tool is the cause of the prevalent "Anglo-American collaboration". This was the second, "European", face of American Imperialist policy. Those comrades, as e. g. Comrade Radek, who put this phase of Anglo-American relations into the foreground, make the mistake of "Europeanising" this phenomenon too much. It is obvious that this "collaboration" of American and British capital in Europe could not be without effect upon Anglo-American relations also in other parts of the world. But anyone who draws from this the conclusion of a lasting collaboration, who sees in this the decisive point of Anglo-American relations, embarks upon the road of vulgar pacifism. The "European pacifism" of the U. S. A. is a transitory policy determined by the fact that America is not prepared for direct intervention in European affairs. This "Pacifism", which for the time being contents itself with economic expansion, is no new phenomenon, for the history of diplomacy gives a plentitude of similar expressions of "love of peace".

AMERICAN POLICY IN CHINA.

That American imperialism is by no means peaceable is clear from the whole history of its preparations for war on the Pacific. But even here the offensive of American imperialism takes on special forms. The military-strategic situation, the naval forces, and the coast defenses of the United States are for the time being still such as to serve only a defensive war. On the Pacific coast, all the way from the most important naval base in Puget Sound down to the border fortress at San Diego, a whole series of important points of naval importance are fortified, including the important harbour of San Francisco. These forts and naval bases guard the United States from attacks that might be made upon it from the Pacific.

The American navy is worse off, however, when it comes to offensive operations. Modern naval warfare demands, for successful operations on the seas, that naval bases be not more than 500 miles apart. Nevertheless America has points of naval support on the Pacific, such as the Philippines, Pearl Harbour, etc., which, because of the vast distances separating them from one another cannot insure the fighting efficiency of the American fleet. Sufficient to point out that the Philippines lie 7000 miles away from San Francisco, and Pearl Harbour 2100 miles from San Francisco and 4800 miles from the Philippines. In addition Japan would probably take possession of the Philippines, so close to the Asiatic coast, immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities. Everybody knows this — that the capture of the Philippines will be the first task of the Japanese fleet. On this question America entertains no illusions whatever. Japan is furthermore irresistible on its strategic naval front, from the northern entrance to the Sea of Japan down to the southern section of the East China Sea.

Japan is much worse off on its flanks. In America there is being considered a project whereby, simultaneously with naval operations, a land army is to invade the shores of Japan. Theoretically such an attack could be executed by thrusts from two directions: a) from the North, from Alaska, by way of Kamchatka in the southern Arctic Ocean down to northern Manchuria; b) from the South, through a landing on the coast of the South China Sea, (French Indo-China), and then into South and Central China. But both of these plans are bound up with tremendous hazards that the troops, transport, etc. may be sunk — and this contradiction between the economically aggressive role of American imperialism, and its military-strategic possibilities, determines the attitude of the United States towards China.

The United States has an interest in the rising of a more or less powerful State in eastern Asia, capable of challenging Japan for the domination of the Asiatic peoples of the Far East. Hence the "neutral" watchful-waiting attitude of the United

States towards the military struggles now taking place in China. If the worst comes to the worst the United States is even ready to make a settlement with a victorious Canton Government, since the practical Yankees weigh the perspectives of the Chinese revolution from a business standpoint.

When the armed struggle is ended and the unification of China accomplished, and there enters the phase of economic construction, then the U. S. S. R. will be the only State honestly ready to support the economic resurrection of China. Yet the Americans assume that the U. S. S. R. will for a long time be unable to come to the aid of the Chinese working masses on the economic field. The American imperialists are of the opinion that then their hour will have come. The workers and peasants of China will be compelled by force of circumstances to introduce the "American NEP.", and then it will be easy for the United States to make itself master of China. But once American imperialism has taken economic root in China, it will not be difficult for it to break the Japanese rule and to reject Japan's claims for mastery over the Eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean.

Only through such an economic enslavement can China become the arena of the struggle between the United States and Japan. For the same reason American imperialism considers it wise, in contrast to the brutal unadaptable British policy, to appear in China in white gloves. It prefers to apply the contributions which China must pay for the Boxer uprising, for "cultural" purposes for the Chinese. In the mission societies, American imperialism has an army to propagate its influence. It seeks to entice the Chinese bourgeois into American universities because it realises that in the future they can be utilised as agents of American expansion in China. All these things are only an advance payment on a profitable business. The interest will have to be paid in the future by the toiling masses of China. This is the essence of American policy. There seems to be little use in discussing these questions with American jingoes.

The question once raised by Lenin for the Russian revolution "Who — and for whom?" is certainly no idle question for the Chinese toiling masses. Great dangers await the great Chinese revolution on the day after its victory. They lie also at present in the web of international interests surrounding China. American imperialism is now the most dangerous, the most cunning, the strongest enemy of the toiling Chinese masses. If the national revolution were to pass into bourgeois channels it would have the "bourgeois democracy" in its wake. But the American imperialists are going to miscalculate, they are bound to miscalculate because they overlook the historical role which China is called upon to play in Asia and on the Pacific. That unclear Pan-Asiatic movement which Japan has thus far endeavoured to master, which it has been trying to give the character of a race movement in order to turn it into a tool of its imperialist policy, will unquestionably take on a new face through the victory of the Chinese workers and peasants revolution. It will turn into a vast movement of the Asiatic countries oppressed by world imperialism, for their liberation from the imperialist yoke. Japan, which jointly with the white imperialists played an active role in the suppression of the Boxer uprising in 1900, will not fulfil this mission. Only revolutionary China is qualified for this task, and this movement of the Asiatic peoples will be directed against Japanese imperialism as well as that of England and America.

At the same time liberated China will become the magnet for all the peoples of the yellow race, who inhabit the Philippines, Indonesia, and the numerous islands of the Pacific. China will become a major power on the Pacific; it will become a menacing threat for the capitalist world of three continents. China must inevitably clash with American imperialism because the problem of spreading its gigantic population out over the Pacific confronts it even more intensely than it does Japan. China will fulfil this task among the island inhabitants of the Pacific, not with fire and sword, but bound up with the process of the revolutionisation of the native population. Yet this is not the most important task of the moment. The Kuomintang Party is now confronted with the chief problem of how it can exploit the antagonisms between the powers that encircle China in order to foster the cause of the revolution. America's position makes possible greater manoeuvring. The plans of American imperialism constitute a terrifying economic and military-strategic menace to Japan.

JAPAN'S POLICY IN CHINA.

American advances in China involve the very existence of **Japanese imperialism**. For Japan it is a question of — to be or not to be. This very danger may contribute to the hastening of the armed clash upon the Pacific between the U. S. A. and Japan. For Japan, China is a vast reservoir of raw material; it is to China that Japanese capital is exported. Manchuria is an especially important field into which Japanese capital is penetrating. Japan has no iron, its whole war industry to a large extent depends upon China. Japan contains only 0.1% of the world's iron supply. It receives about 40% of the iron required for industry from China, the balance from the U. S. A. and Great Britain. Japan has a powerful navy, and excellent imperialist army, yet if it is cut off from China, this means the loss of iron and steel supplies and a still greater dependence upon the capitalist countries against which it must wage war in the future. Therefore Japanese capitalism is to an increased extent concerned simultaneously with the import of iron from China, in penetrating into the centres of the metal industry itself, especially in the provinces of Shantung and partially Hankow, in order to grab the overwhelming majority of metal works.

In the summer of this year the "New York American" published a sensational document. It was a secret document of the Japanese General Staff on the question of preparatory measures to be taken by Japan in case of a war with the United States. This document appeared in the American press in June 6 and would be worthy of publication in full, were I not prevented by the narrow limits of my report. This document discloses the importance of China, particularly Manchuria, as a base of supplies during the war. The contents of the document can be summarised under four points: a) only the exploitation of the rich natural wealth of Manchuria and in part also of Korea (iron, coal, oil, food supplies) will enable Japan properly to organise its defence; b) the necessity to establish an extensive net work of railways throughout Manchuria and Korea for the transport of these products; c) the guarantee of free sea passages across the Korean Straits and sea of Japan; d) the advisability of a "policy of friendship" on the part of Japan towards China in order to assure the realisation of the Japanese programme of exploitation.

Important for Japan is also China's role with respect to coal exports. Thus of the total Japanese imports of coal, 80% come from China and Shantung. The same also applies to cotton, if Japan desires to free its textile industry from dependence upon America. Yet in China itself, Japan has concentrated more than a third of the textile industry in its hands, whereas British capital has captured only 5% of the textile factories. These figures alone do not give an exact picture, because Japan has used the crisis in the Chinese textile industry to buy up a part of the Chinese textile industry which outwardly continues to appear as "Chinese" enterprises. Japanese railway capital now holds first place. Even though Japan has no such banks as the Hongkong-Shanghai Bank which in practice handles all currency questions, it has nevertheless 31 smaller banks. And in recent times, especially after the Hongkong events, Japan has made still further headway in China. It is sufficient to point out that Japan's favourable balance of trade with China during the first quarter of this year has doubled in comparison with the same period last year. Thanks to low wages in China the profit of the Japanese capitalists in the textile industry takes on literally terrific dimensions. Thus, e. g., certain Japanese textile enterprises in China pay their stockholders 150% dividends. The military-strategic and the economic interests of Japan are too deeply anchored in China to tolerate a realisation of the American plan. From this the labouring masses of China can draw three different conclusions: a) it must be taken into consideration already now that further American advance in China will compel Japan to launch a preventive war sooner than the American and Japanese war literature predicts, provided Japan succeeds in assuring British neutrality in this war. b) It must be considered that if this war on the Pacific breaks out before the unification of China, Japan will make a predatory attempt to occupy China in order to make herself master of the vital arteries required for its defence and for its industry. c) Of most practical importance for the present foreign policy of the Kuo-

mintang is the circumstance that Japan is interested in preserving friendly relations with China precisely with an eye on future wars in the Pacific.

It may be predicted that if the Canton government succeeds by means of the Northern expedition not only in extending but also consolidating its basis, Japan will go over to a certain "defensive policy" and prefer to keep Northern China in its hands with the aid of Chang-Tso-lin rather than plunge into a dangerous adventure and thereby mobilise still broader masses of the Chinese people against itself. That such a perspective is by no means impossible is shown by the latest note of the Japanese government to Canton containing the four well-known questions as to whether the Canton government has the intention of extending the revolution into other countries, of establishing a Communist order in China, etc. Such questions would only give evidence of a more or less astounding naivete of Japanese diplomacy if they did not simultaneously serve the purpose of cloaking Japan's change from its former policy in China. Already since the Hongkong strike the Japanese have really dissociated themselves from the brutal British policy of conquest in China, thereby leaving the British alone to receive the blows of the national revolutionary movement. Japan's policy of an actual recognition of the Canton government is based upon the hope, on the basis of race relationship, to find sympathy with the Right Wing of the Kuomintang for a new alliance. Furthermore the Japanese cannot disregard the fact that an economic revival of China offers big possibilities to the marketing of Japanese industrial products. First of all the Chinese market is closest to Japan, secondly, the Japanese merchants have better knowledge of the market than have the others, and thirdly, the Japanese goods are, quality for quality, cheaper and more fit to meet the low purchasing power of the Chinese population.

But what is the promise of such a Japanese policy to British imperialism? Its complete isolation. The attempt of the British, after the massacre in Wanhhsien, to bring about a joint intervention of all three Pacific powers, resulted in a failure. This failure reminded British imperialism that the times of Boxer uprising suppressions are gone for ever. Those methods with which the brazen British colonisers ruled in China, those unequal treaties like the treaty of Nankin, of Tsientsin in 1856, of Peking 1860, with the aid of which Britain created a privileged position for itself and burdened China with contributions — those methods must take their place in the archives of the British Museum. If Great Britain does not want to lose the positions it has conquered in the Far East, it must keep up with the times. This appears to be dawning even upon such conservative newspapers as the "Morning Post". Of late voices are heard more and more in England demanding a change of policy in China. British imperialism in China already looks like a whipped dog who has his tail between his legs and looks around in all directions for some way in which to carry off safely what he has stolen. It is the task of the Chinese revolution to give this dangerous thieving cur its death blow.

British imperialism is the deadly, most implacable foe of the Chinese revolution. America and Japan have not yet ruled in Asia, they are first making their imperialist bid for mastery. England is already an Asiatic State which must be driven from the strongholds it has build upon the Asiatic continent. And this struggle of the toiling masses of Asia against the British robbers is likewise one of the factors that may accelerate the bloody solution on the Pacific. Capitalist England, which in China is already being held in an iron ring by America and Japan, looks uneasily upon the possibility of a coming American expansion to China, and it is making desperate efforts to launch a war to be fought by others. The fortification of the Singapore naval base which took place after England had signed the Washington treaty, proved that the British Admiralty by no means considers impossible such a solution of the present struggle for Asia, for China and for the Pacific. The British government intends to spend about 9½ million pounds for the building of this naval base. If we are to credit the "Times" vast preparations are already in progress for the building of this base; dredges are at work, buildings are springing up like mushrooms, branch railway lines are being built, a gigantic naphtha station is being established.

Whither will the mouths of the guns of this naval base be pointed? Primarily against Japan, but what is even more

important, is that these guns will also be directed against revolutionary China. It seems to me that we are underestimating the importance of this latter fact. The Communist press of all countries, and especially the British comrades, would otherwise have made some stir about it. This is not as yet to be observed. But the British Admiralty does not content itself with the naval base at Singapore. The British Admiralty has long had the intention to establish a naval base at Port Darwin, on the Northern coast of Australia for the protection of that dominion and New Zealand. Furthermore, there also crops up, after the seizure by England of the German colony "Bismarck Archipelago" after the war, the question of creating a new naval base in the German built town of Rabole, on Blanche Bay. The location of this naval base would be so central that neither Port Darwin nor any other Australian base could be compared with it. The naval base in Blanche Bay would be a new Malta in the heart of the Pacific. The Washington Conference forbade the British the establishment of this base, but the Washington treaty expires in 1931.

The future will show how these systematic preparations for war on the Pacific will end. It is difficult to make any predictions because of the complicated relations on the Pacific coasts. Yet two phases in the development of the Pacific conflict can be predicted with tolerable certainty. The first phase is the struggle of the United States against Japan. While England did tear up its treaty with Japan at the Washington Conference, it made no alliance with the United States. It kept its hands free and only made the reservation that in case of complications on the Pacific a preliminary conference would be called of the four Powers which signed the Washington treaty. This position enables England, in case of a war, to manoeuvre and to orientate itself in accordance with the situation. On the one hand it takes over the role of an arbitrator who sells his neutrality at the highest possible price, on the other hand, it is the one that eggs on others into war in order, when the foes clash, to seize the fruits of victory for itself. And the Washington treaty gives England the chance, in case of a war between the United States and Japan, of either remaining neutral or else participating in the war either on the side of Japan or the United States.

The present grouping of forces makes the second possibility at least likely. It is now clear that England's intervention on the side of Japan would have the immediate result of its losing Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Japanese mastery of the Pacific subjects these dominions to a constant threat of attack. And if Canada, Australia or New Zealand feel themselves mutually bound up with the metropolis, this is only because the latter protects them from foreign attacks. The question of the Dominions, in the present phase of antagonisms on the shores of the Pacific, is the point that impels Great Britain, in case of a Japanese-American war, to an alliance with the United States. Hence the prospect of a joint attack by England and the United States against Japan seems more likely. England is interested no less than the U. S. A. in the elimination of Japanese competition in the Far East, primarily in China. England could combine with Japan for a joint struggle only if the separation process of the Dominions was already so far advanced as to call into question the continued existence of the Empire. Nothing further would be left for British imperialism than to stake all on a single card, in order to save its continued existence.

Absolute clarity prevails in the United States on this situation of Great Britain. In America the Singapore naval base is considered a point of support for a future joint campaign of the Anglo-American fleet against Japan. The strategic necessity of England to guard its possessions in the Pacific makes it very little likely that England will go into action. Every clash, even with France or Holland, threatens British possessions in the Pacific. England needs the freedom of the South China Sea which is a main highway to India. For this purpose England has established a protectorate over the north western portion of Borneo. England will never consent to Japanese occupation of the Philippines or of Indo-China, because this means a deadly danger to its naval base, Singapore. Furthermore, England is interested in maintaining the domination of the southern seas which in a certain sense form a corridor between two

rows of islands which connect England and New Zealand. Japanese expansion becomes an immediate menace to Australia, New Zealand and the whole oceanic Archipelago. England would thereby be driven from the Pacific. Still more likely appears British neutrality during the first phase of the Pacific conflict, especially at the beginning of the campaign. England will prefer not to mix in the struggle from the first day in order to get herself into a position similar to that occupied by America in the European war from 1914 to 1918. The difficulties of the British government also speak in favour of this attitude. England is the country primarily threatened with a social revolution. The ruling classes of England would therefore have to give this serious consideration before embarking upon a war adventure.

The struggle for the dividing up of the Japanese spoils, and the struggle between England and the United States for spheres of influence in Asia and the dominions, will be the second centre of the armed conflicts. Will the capitalist world venture to plunge into this new blood bath? Will it not shrink back from the mood of the toiling masses, in whom still lives the remembrance of the devastation of the great imperialist war? There can be no doubt that fear of revolutionary upheavals holds the present capitalist governments within bounds. Yet the Pacific conflict, especially in its first phase, is dangerous for the Communists precisely because it takes place on a front so far distant from Europe. Its participants will be two countries which suffered least during the imperialist war of 1914-1918. The 50,000 American soldiers who fell on the French front are but a very small number in comparison with the sacrifices made by the European peoples. America and Japan were affected but lightly by the war, they saw only its victorious side.

And this danger the Comintern must foresee. We are a world party which does not close its eyes to its own weaknesses and its own mistakes. The British strike already showed our weak spots. If the European proletariat did not react sufficiently to such an event as the British General Strike, or to the miners' struggle, the question arises whether, in the face of a new war, when the situation becomes all the more complicated and difficult for a mass action, whether we are prepared for resistance. A specially responsible task confronts our Young Communist Parties of the Far East at this time, particularly the Chinese comrades. They must even now foresee all the tricks that the imperialist cliques will play upon them in the course of the victorious march of the Chinese revolution.

You will win, comrades, the whole international situation assures us of this. Yet even after you succeed in uniting China — you must not lose sight of this — the imperialist bands will continue the struggle through agents in your country, within your boundaries. Before the capitalist world sinks beneath the depths of the Pacific Ocean, it will probably make an attempt to fight in China. The victorious Canton government, at the head of the peasant masses, will have to be a barrier to these efforts also in the future.

Revolutionary China, which has become an active factor in Far Eastern politics, can become, in alliance with the U. S. S. R., the greatest world factor in the Far East. Your 400 millioned Hinterland in the Pacific Ocean, and its position in these wars, weighs in the scales so heavily that the imperialist governments cannot leave it out of reckoning when counting up their chances in an armed struggle. What the II. International failed to do during the imperialist war of 1914, the organised national workers' and peasants' State of the Chinese toiling masses will fulfil. And in the fulfilment of this historical mission, the awakening, rising China combines the greatness of the Chinese revolution, the greatness of its fate with the October revolution of our toiling masses, on the road to a workers' and peasants' alliance.

In alliance with the world proletariat, with its vanguard — the Communist world Party, China shall and will become the guardian of peace, the fighter against imperialist wars on the Pacific.

(Close of the Session.)

Twelfth Session.

Moscow, Nov. 30, 1926.

The 12th Session of the Enlarged Executive was opened at 6.30 p. m. with Comrade Birch in the chair. Before beginning the order of business, the floor was given to Comrades Rasgon and Funikov, representatives of the school for military engineers, "Comintern", who brought greetings to the Plenum.

Comrade RASGON:

Comrades! When our Red Army was in action on the fronts, the news that the workers of other countries sympathised with and supported our struggle, meant a strengthening, a tightening of our ranks. This news helped us to win. From the first day of its organisation the Red Army has considered itself as an army of the world proletariat, as the armed section of the fighting proletarians of the entire world. Today, too, the Red Army considers itself the armed advance guard of the world proletariat. It looks to the Communist International as to the general staff of the world revolution. Comrades, every Red Army soldier, every commander, every political worker of our Red Army is trained in this spirit.

The military school which I represent before you today, is bound by specially close ties to the Communist International: our school has the honour to bear the name of the Comintern. This school has requested us, in the name of 400 students, 200 Red Army soldiers and 200 members of the permanent staff, to bring to its ideological chief, the Communist International, our warm Red Army greetings (Applause).

Our school has already been visited by a number of members of the E. C. C. I. Those E. C. C. I. members who have visited us have learned to know our work in peace time; and they have been able to convince themselves that our Red Army men, if it should be necessary, will throw themselves into the struggle. Our school has asked me to assure the E. C. C. I. that it is always ready to respond to your call, that it is always ready to place itself in the service of the world revolution whenever and wherever it may be required. (Applause.)

Long live the Communist International!

Long live the World Revolution!

Long live the E. C. C. I., the leader of the Communist International. (Applause.)

Comrade FUNIKOV:

The students, Red Army men and Commanders of our school have requested our delegation to bring warmest greetings to the general staff of the Communist movement, the general staff of the world revolution. Permit me therefore, comrades, to greet the Plenum in the name of our students and to wish it success in its work.

In the storm and stress of the October Revolution, the ninth anniversary of which we have just celebrated jointly with the workers and peasants of the whole world, the mighty Red Army was born; it emerged victorious from the severe struggles of the civil war, and today is working in preparation for new world struggles. These world struggles are inevitable; we

know that they will come and we are preparing for them. Our school is part of our Red Army; it is a fighting unit in which commanders for our red workers and peasants Army are trained. We never lose sight of our main task, to be that which we always have been — a Red Army of the working class and peasantry of the entire world. This task is written on our banner; with it we have always been — with it we shall continue to be — victorious. With this task in mind we train our commanders and political workers in the Red Army. Every year there flow into the Red Army new reserves of commanders. These commanders are reliable leaders and fighters in the Red workers and peasants Army; they are under the firm ideological leadership of our Party and of the Communist International. Permit me, comrades, to assure the Plenum that we shall continue to work, energetically and conscious of our goal, to strengthen the Red Army; and that every year we shall place our best fighters and best leaders in its ranks. We are always ready to follow the call of the general staff of the world revolution. Under your leadership we shall fight and win.

Long live the general staff of the world revolution!

Long live the Comintern!

Long live the world revolution! (Applause.)

Comrade SEMARD (France):

Comrades!

The Executive of the International greets the representatives of the school for military engineers, "Comintern". We request the representatives of the school to transmit to the students and staff the Communist greetings of the representatives of the various Sections of the Communist International.

After the destruction of capitalism in Russia the essential task is to defend all the achievements of the revolution against all its enemies.

Among these tasks is also the task of strengthening the Red Army. We congratulate our Comrade engineers, that they are able to place all their abilities into the service of strengthening the Red Army for the defence and the ultimate triumph of the proletarian revolution.

We know, comrades, that the Army, the military engineers, the civil engineers, and the masses of Russian workers are all working successfully towards the improvement of economy and the building up of Socialism in Russia.

We believe that this joint work of the civil engineers, the military engineers, the workers and peasants and the toiling masses as a whole will attain victory. We are convinced that the Red Army will stand in the forefront of the defence of the achievements of the Revolution.

The Executive sends you its fraternal greetings.

Long live the workers and peasants!

Long live the military engineers of the "Comintern" School who have united for the victory of the Revolution in Russia!

Long live the victory of the world revolution!

(Applause.)

Continuation of the Discussion of the Report on the Situation in China.

Comrade DUNCAN (America):

Comrades, Comrade Lenin taught the revolutionary vanguard of the workers that the world does not consist of Western Europe alone, but includes also the great continents of Asia and Africa. It is not accidental that the renegade Kautsky has referred to the Communist International as an International of "Asiatic" Socialism. The Communist International is the revolutionary workers' Party of all the world and of all of the Continents.

The present events in China show us how tremendously important was Comrade Lenin's work in drawing the attention of the European workers to the fact that Asia would play an overwhelming role in the early future of the workers' revolutionary movement.

The events of the Chinese Revolution unfold before us to-day, and they are almost an impossible test of our credulity as to the rapidity of the development of the world revolution in that sphere. As these events proceed we are likely more and more to witness the destruction of the pose of the United States of America as the friend of the Chinese people and the popular revolution in China. American capitalism is the ultimate and most dangerous, the most powerful, the most diabolically clever of all of the enemies of the Chinese revolution and the world revolution. The annihilation of American imperialism is a task which becomes finally the supreme task of the world revolution of the proletariat and the Colonial peoples.

I want to point out the peculiar fitness of the United States for the role of the big bully, the big tyrant, the man on horseback, the agency of blood and iron in suppressing the revolution in China particularly. In America there is a peculiar culture which helps the American Government to play the role of what is called the "Champion of white civilisation". In America, where we have a population of Negroes to the extent of 12 million, we have a culture of "white supremacy", as it is called. Of course, we all know that questions of importance are not solved on the basis of race, but this culture of race "superiority" is an important instrument in the operations of imperialism, especially when it comes to conflicts between the peoples of Asia and those of the so-called white nations, the imperialist capitalist nations.

We have there in America the most completely hypocritical speaks openly of the conquest of Asia by American capitalism. This press speaks openly of the dangers of the "blacks, the yellows, and the reds". Of course, there is great logic in connecting up the "yellows", as they call them — the peoples of Eastern Asia — with the "reds", that is the revolutionary working class of the world. And, if we can do as well in connecting these two, we will have cause to be proud.

We have there in America the most completely hypercritical forms of democracy, which leave complete freedom to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to proceed as it wishes in all matters of importance. We have less real and more sham democracy, than in any other capitalist dictatorship, and at the same time we have the most reactionary imperialistically psychologised labour movement. The American trade union bureaucracy is more reactionary, especially in matters of imperialism, than many sections of the bourgeoisie. All of this indicates that the United States will be the most terrific enemy — this United States Imperialism — which must be destroyed in the course of the struggle of the workers and the Colonial peoples for freedom.

The Chinese Revolution proceeds with a rapidity so great as to compel us to resort to our best thinking to devise the proper tactics and to arrive at the proper forms of action for our Communist movement there. Unquestionably the fundamental, the biggest task of the Chinese Communist Party must be the establishment of the hegemony of the proletarian elements in the Chinese Revolution. The most necessary tactical line for the Chinese Party must be the preservation of the unity of action of all of those forces of Revolution which are now capable of being directed and are actually being directed against the forces of imperialism. In the past the Chinese Communists, our brothers of the Communist

International in China, have made their greatest error — and we must speak frankly of our mistakes — in the matter of the peasantry of China. The basic remedy of course, which I have absolute certainty the Chinese comrades will put through after this Plenum, is to intensify tenfold their operations amongst the peasantry and to gather that tremendous mass around themselves so that they can sweep all of the imperialists off the Asiatic Continent.

In the struggle with these imperialist powers it is necessary to remember that there are only two languages that these imperialists understand. One is the language of dollars, and the other is the language of guns. The language of dollars calls them to China and the language of guns must drive them away.

The Chinese comrades cannot for one moment overlook the fact which our Russian comrades have so completely demonstrated in action — that a major field of the operations of Communists is in the military forces, to put the military forces under complete command of the revolutionary directors in the given situation. The armies — the men with the guns perform those deeds which mean the fate of the revolution. The army means the youth. The youth means the army. Chinese comrades, do not forget your Chinese youth which will make your Chinese revolutionary army irresistible in exterminating your American and your British imperialist enemies, driving them out of China and bringing your great country into line with the Soviet Union, the vanguard, the leader of the successful world revolution.

Comrade KATAYAMA (Japan):

Comrades, the Chinese Revolution has begun with great power in China. The Chinese Revolution is working wonders as is shown in peasant uprisings. Revolutionary passion moves the Chinese people to-day.

While confronted with many dangers the Chinese Revolution will finally win. We have seen since May 30th of last year how greatly the Chinese Revolution has progressed. When the Canton army started some months ago, some considered it a doubtful quantity, but to-day the Canton army occupies Central China, the central point which commands almost entire China. The source of its success is that it is organised according to the model of the Red Army of the Soviet Union. It is strong, it commands the respect even of its enemies. The enemies are afraid of the Canton Army, because the army, the revolutionary army in China, that is different from all other armies of the reactionary generals.

We see in our Comrade Tan Ping Shan's report that there are many enemies within the country and outside. Although English imperialism is having a hard struggle in China, there is hardly any hope for England to get up an armed intervention. English power in China is going down. Japanese imperialism is thirsty after Chinese interests, it already has many interests in Manchuria and in Mongolia. I have read that Japanese capitalists have just organised a bank in Manchuria with a capital of a hundred million yen. Because of her economic penetration Japan will not easily be driven out of China. It is a great factor, a great menace to the Chinese revolutionary movement.

So with America. America poses as a sort of beneficial capitalism in China, but American capitalism, the all-mighty dollar policy of America, will not be beneficial to the revolutionary movement in China.

The tasks of the Chinese Communist Party are great. The Communist Party must penetrate into the Kuomintang, and in order to make the Kuomintang a truly revolutionary mass party the C.P.C. must work up its influence from below, must keep up the united front with the Kuomintang to the end and firmly establish the revolutionary government. It will not be difficult for the Kuomintang, that is the Canton revolutionary army, to fight still further and finally establish the revolutionary government in Peking, provided of course, that the Canton army first establishes strong foundations in Central China along the Yangtse Kiang River.

But what must the Chinese Communist Party, scattered throughout the country, do to organise the revolutionary forces? There are conflicting elements, conflicting forces. Of course, the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie and the workers and peasants differ, but it is necessary to accomplish first the national revolution. In order to do that, the Chinese Communist Party must bring together the petty-bourgeoisie and the workers and peasants, must mass these revolutionary forces together in order to fight against military generals and foreign imperialists, under anti-militarist and anti-foreign imperialist slogans. It is absolutely necessary that we bring together those revolutionary forces and solidify the revolutionary forces in order to accomplish the national revolution. Later on foreign imperialists will try to come out openly and fight against the Chinese Revolution. Until now they depended upon reactionary generals. Seeing that the revolutionary forces are now rising against them everywhere in China, they are planning a united offensive against the Revolution. It is a great and important task that the Communist Party should be prepared for the attack.

There is a foundation of revolutionary forces among the people. I will give a few facts. We know that the Chinese peasants are poor, ignorant, oppressed and exploited — so are the Chinese workers, handicraftsmen, millions of them! These people are all oppressed, and exploited on account of the great industrial revolution that has been extending throughout the land, flooded with European goods for which China is used as a dumping ground. Although they are oppressed, comrades, they have well organised old Guilds according to the craft lines. We have had guilds in Europe during the Middle Ages and they had great power under the protection of kings and princes, but the Chinese Guilds are much better because they are democratic and secret. They have most strictly disciplined membership. To-day Peking has many Guilds! Even the water carriers have a strong guild that has disciplined and organised members who enforce the guild rules upon all families to whom they supply water. This is the reason why the Chinese workers are so strong in fighting against the foreign imperialists.

They have had many great strikes. In 1922, the Hongkong seamen's strike, in 1923, the Peking-Hankow Railway strike, the Shanghai strike last year and also the Hongkong and Canton strike. The Chinese people, down to the coolies, are trained for long years in struggle and fight. They are still divided along craft lines so that they are weak, but when the Chinese Communist Party takes hold of them, trains them, and educates them, makes them into a strong Chinese revolutionary force against imperialism, against foreign capitalism, then our future is bright.

The task of the C. P. C. is to solidify, to organise, to build up, strong revolutionary forces, to fight against foreign imperialism. In doing so it should have the help of all the Sections of the Comintern.

Comrade Lenin said: those who are emancipated, who have accomplished the revolution, must give the greatest aid to the revolutionary movements in other countries.

The Russian workers and peasants are fighting against imperialism now in China, in England, and in all other countries; so you see our future, our Communist International's future, is bright and we shall move on with the banner of the Communist International and Leninism. (Great Applause.)

Comrade EBERLEIN (Germany):

The Communist Party of Germany and the entire German working class are following with the greatest interest and enthusiasm the course of China's revolutionary development. When we discuss here the problems of the Chinese revolution, we must also outline the present tasks confronting the workers in the various countries, which tasks, as a result of imperialist development and of intervention in China, are an essential part of Chinese events.

The attitude of German imperialism, of the German Government towards China, has undergone considerable vacillation in the past two years. At one time, when the German bourgeoisie suffered humiliation as a result of the world war, the pressure of the Versailles Peace Treaty, it attempted to carry out a certain political orientation towards the East, and also a different attitude towards China than is the case today. When the German

bourgeoisie made a complete swing toward the West, the German Government assumed an altogether different attitude towards China, an attitude which conforms to the whole present foreign policy of the German bourgeoisie.

We believe that the Chinese people do not entertain any too great sympathy for the German bourgeoisie and the German Government. They will surely remember the time when the idiot, Wilhelm II., made his Boxer Rebellion speech about the "Huns in China" toward whom no mercy was to be shown. But it was at this time that there arose those special "rights", those privileges extorted by the imperialist states of that time. Germany had to renounce part of these privileges under the Versailles Peace Treaty, and after Versailles the German Government had to renounce the rest of its privileges on signing the trade agreement with China in 1924, since this agreement was concluded on the basis of the equal rights formula. By this agreement there were also abrogated the other privileges, such as consular courts etc., which still remained under the Versailles Treaty. This attitude arose from the situation in which the German Government found itself at that time, and from the fact that the German bourgeoisie did not yet see any prospects of joining the imperialist powers and realising its own imperialist tendencies.

But after the change in the foreign policy of the German Government, particularly after the Washington Conference which took up the Chinese problem, the German Government, though not invited to this Conference subsequently accepted the Washington Decisions. By doing this, the German Government repudiated the promises it made in the Trade Agreement, and once more resumed all old privileges obtained during the Boxer Rebellion, except those forfeited under the Versailles Treaty. Thus the complete vacillation of the German Government came to a head, and the attempts to enter into treaty relations with China were broken off.

It is characteristic that upon the German Government's declaration at that time, the Social Democratic Party in Germany did not issue a single word of protest against the resumption of the old privileges. On the contrary, instead of carrying on, together with the entire working class, the struggle against these measures, the German Social Democracy supported the Government's imperialist efforts; it directed its entire hatred and its whole agitation against Soviet Russia, the first workers' and peasants' State, which had renounced all its special privileges which also dated from the time of the Boxer Rebellion.

At that time China issued a strong protest against the treachery of the German Government. But the measures adopted since show more and more that the old imperialist tendencies of the German bourgeoisie are beginning to expand anew. Naturally, the measures of the imperialists in China differ in form today from the times of the Boxer Rebellion. Though it is by no means out of the question, it is nevertheless improbable that the imperialist powers will carry out a military intervention in China at present. But this is not necessary. The imperialists' penetration of China expresses itself today above all in the imperialist powers' most forceful support of the capitalist ambitions and interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie itself. They support the big bourgeoisie and the big landowners, but particularly the Chinese military lords by subventions, instructors, arms, munitions, money, etc. on a large scale. Here too, Germany is no exception. Several weeks ago in Berlin the Ministry of Defence signed an agreement with agents of Chang-Tso-Lin according to which 40,000 rifles belonging to the Reichswehr are to be delivered to Chang-Tso-Lin.

These are the new methods employed by the imperialists today. In this respect, the German bourgeoisie differs in no way from the capitalists and imperialists of other countries. I should like to emphasise this, especially, because today we see emigration of merchants, the agents of imperialism, from Germany to China. On their return these agents of German imperialism issue statements to the German press claiming that they are received in China with open arms, indeed, that no merchant is so beloved in China as the German merchant.

We must tell our Chinese comrades that if there really existed such an illusion among the Chinese people, it would be profoundly false and dangerous. We can assure our Chinese brothers that the German imperialists, the German business

men are vultures just like the British, French and American business men; and that they will skin the Chinese population alive, just like the others.

The "Frankfurter Zeitung" wrote a few days ago that it is the task of the German Government, to adopt a peaceful attitude towards the Canton Government, that the German Government must have an attitude different from that of the British and American Governments, since by friendly negotiation and a peaceful attitude there will be the best chances of giving the German business men the possibility to sell goods in China, and thus beat the British and Americans on the Chinese market.

These are the aims and aspirations of the German bourgeoisie in China. There is no doubt that when the German bourgeoisie will establish, extend and entrench its imperialist tendencies in China, it will exploit, oppress, and torture the Chinese population with the same brutality and savagery as the others. The German business man sells medicine in China, but at the same time he sells poison gas to Great Britain which is used to fight down the Chinese population. And on the next day, the German business man is ready to sell arms and ammunition to the Chinese bourgeoisie, as well as to sell products of the chemical industry for the civil war in their own country. Business is business!

The German working class is following developments in China with the greatest interest. The treatment of events and problems of the Chinese revolution in our press reveals only a small part of its interest. In the course of the past year, our Communist Party organised tremendous mass meetings and demonstrations in support of the Chinese revolution.

But we believe that the most effective support we can render the Chinese fighting proletariat is for us, for the Communist Party of Germany, to mobilise, organise and lead forward the workers into the struggle against the bourgeoisie of our own country. We believe that in this struggle in which we are ready to work day and night, we shall best help the Chinese proletariat in its grave situation.

Comrade PETROFF (Soviet Union):

Comrades, the national revolution in China is developing under conditions which make it essentially different from the classic bourgeois revolutions — those of the west European countries, (at the end of the last century) as well as from the 1905 revolution in Russia.

At present, the Chinese revolution is following two main paths: one path is the development of the workers' and peasants' movement, the general rise in the national emancipation movement in China; the second path is the direct offensive of the Canton Army and the National Peoples' Army. The Chinese revolution possesses an army able to fight; that is a tremendous advantage, a source of strength for the Chinese revolution. The Chinese Communists have the possibility of directly influencing organised military forces in so far as they work in the armies, participate in the Kuomintang and occupy certain commanding posts in the armies.

Comrades, wherein consists the power of China's revolutionary army? Not so much in the numerical preponderance of bayonets as in the important political fact that the revolutionary army of China is carrying national emancipation to the Chinese people on the point of its bayonets. In addition, the revolutionary armies of China have the unique quality of being able to demoralise, to disintegrate the forces of the enemy. The Communist Party must increase its work in the armies, it must give this work its greatest attention; it must not shy at the most strenuous efforts to obtain a firm foothold in the armies, to entrench its influence there, to educate the armies to political consciousness and to prevent their becoming pliant tools in the hands of individual militarists. The influence of the Communist Party and of the Kuomintang must be strengthened in the Canton Army and in the Peoples' Armies.

An extremely important characteristic of the national revolution in China is the semi-colonial position of the country. The imperialists enjoy such privileges in China that the foreign

settlements or concessions, as they are called, constitute in reality a state within a state.

Another extremely important characteristic of the Chinese revolution is the fact that since the Chinese revolution of 1911, which failed because of treachery, there has been a steady disintegration of the central state apparatus and a strengthening of the Chinese military system. Actually since the revolution of 1911 there has been no unified China; it is broken up, split up into numerous parts. The Chinese militaristic system, which to this very day is the dominant social-political force in a considerable part of China, is continually growing stronger. Imperialism is applying in China the method of "divide and conquer". It is splitting China into single provinces, each of which is an autonomous political organism. The various imperialist powers aim to split up China politically because a unified revolutionary China is dangerous for them. For the realisation of their methods of domination, for the oppression of the working masses they require a country which is broken up, which is split into the smallest possible parts.

Revolutionary Canton has achieved great successes in unifying revolutionary China. Since the policy of the imperialists is extremely flexible, it may be assumed that after the unification of a considerable part of China has become an unchangeable fact, they will recognise the Canton Government de facto in order to drag it into the channel of their own policy, in order to divert Canton from the revolutionary anti-imperialist path. There is no doubt that such a danger exists. Nevertheless, we hope that China will not enter the path of bourgeois capitalist development, but will be able to proceed along the non-capitalist path which leads to the construction of socialism.

One of the achievements on the road to this goal is the maintenance of the national revolutionary united front. With regard to this policy there are several incorrect tendencies in the Chinese Communist Party. Several comrades exaggerate the meaning of the national revolutionary united front; they understand it to mean a renunciation of independent demands. For fear of frightening and antagonising the middle and petty-bourgeoisie, such comrades are sometimes inclined to hold back the labour movement. On the other hand we see in the Chinese Communist Party also other points of view: that the national revolution in China is over, the Kuomintang Party has completed its historic role and that the only revolutionary factor now is the Chinese Communist Party. Naturally, this point of view is also false. One is the under-estimation of the movement and the other is an over-estimation of the possibilities of the Communist Party in the present period. On this ground there arise such moods for example, as those which impel the Peking North Committee to demand that Communists leave the Kuomintang. Unfortunately comrades, this absolutely false proposal has found a sympathetic echo also in the ranks of our own C. P. S. U. We maintain that this is an extremely injurious and false capitulation conception, a defeatist idea which must be turned down.

The Kuomintang is not only a bloc between the working class, peasantry and the handicraft and commercial bourgeoisie, but at the same time it is a form which enables the Chinese working class and the Chinese Communists to influence the petty-bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeoisie cannot play an independent historical role. The struggle which is going on within the Kuomintang between the Right and Left wings is a reflection of the relations in class forces. The Right wing which is seeking to establish the hegemony of the capitalist class of China, favours an understanding with the imperialists and a break with the Communists. If the Chinese C. P. should follow the advice of the Russian Opposition and should leave the Kuomintang this would be grist for the mill of the Right wing of the Kuomintang.

Therefore, the C. C. of the C. P. of China was absolutely correct in rejecting this defeatist proposal of surrender. The maintenance of the national revolutionary united front is a matter of absolute necessity at the present historical stage of development of the Chinese revolution. Nevertheless, we must agree on a correct understanding of this national united front. Although class differentiation in China has not progressed very far, nevertheless, certain differences are noticeable in the ranks of the Chinese bourgeoisie; a considerable part of the middle bourgeoisie which has close connections with foreign capital, a considerable part of the landowners and a section of the gentry have already gone over to the imperialists; these elements fear the development of the

revolutionary movement in their own country. For that reason it is wrong to issue the united front slogan in the rural districts. There can be no talk of a united front in the rural districts since of necessity the class struggle between the peasants and landowners is developing there.

We must create a national-revolutionary bloc of all forces which tend towards a determined struggle against imperialist exploitation and against the oppression of the Chinese imperialists. In this connection, the Chinese revolution, in view of the favourable international situation in which it is developing, has great possibilities. In the proximity of China to the Soviet Union, the great distance of the country from the chief centres of imperialist power, from the centre of world capitalism, we have the first and most far reaching condition for a favourable development of the Chinese revolution. Also the crisis through which world capitalism is passing as a result of the world war, the development of the labour movement in the West, furthermore such events as for example the heroic struggle of the British miners, the sharpening struggle of the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial peoples, the revolts in Syria, Morocco and Indonesia — the Chinese revolution is tremendously supported by all these facts.

One of the most important tasks is to guarantee the hegemony of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution. The more the revolution advances, the greater, the more leading is the role which the working class gains in the Chinese revolutionary movement. Such events as last year's strike in Shanghai, as the strike in Hongkong which lasted for 16 months and only recently ended, show that the working class not only feels itself an independent political force, but also that it is beginning to gain great respect among the petty-bourgeois masses and the peasantry, that it is gradually moving to the forefront of the Chinese revolution.

The Chinese proletariat, with an organised Communist Party at its head, will be capable of sweeping along with it and leading broad masses of the millions of Chinese peasants and petty-bourgeoisie. At this point it should be said that the Chinese Communist Party has recently achieved great successes: it has its own leaders, its own cadres, it is leader of the masses. The activity of the Communist Party has been greatly extended and has assumed stable organisational forms. Its numerical strength is not yet great, it has only 13,000 members, nevertheless its political influence in the Kuomintang and in the rural districts extends considerably beyond its numerical strength. In this respect we may draw an analogy with our British Communist Party whose actual influence also is greater than its numerical strength. The peasant section of the Chinese Communist Party is not big, nevertheless, the Communist Party carries on an ever growing work among the peasantry.

With regard to the organising of the Young Communist League, the Communist Party has also done great work. The Y. C. L. of China has grown considerably in numbers and is a very active force on many fields of work. The C. P. of China must direct its attention to raising the political level of the youth, to organise the entire working youth, and also to organise the Chinese students around the working youth.

What are the perspectives of the Chinese revolution? Two ways are open before us. The first way is the way of classical bourgeois capitalist development. This danger is not yet precluded. It is possible that after the victory of the Canton Government has strengthened its Right wing, the bourgeoisie there will play a greater role and will reach an agreement with the imperialists. In this respect China is threatened with a Turkish, a Kemalist development. Nevertheless, it is more probable that the Chinese revolution will follow the path of non-capitalist development, the path leading toward the construction of a Socialist society in China.

Upon what do we base this optimistic prognosis? The fact that the national revolution in China is above all directed against imperialism, against enslavement to international capitalism, the fact that the native bourgeoisie is weak, enables us to assume that the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, with the drawing in of a small handicraft and commercial bourgeoisie, is quite possible. In this direction great and promising perspectives confront the Chinese revolution to-day. Still the main pre-requisite for the victory of the Chinese revolution is the guarantee of proletarian hegemony in the national revolutionary bloc, in the national liberation

movement. So far the proletariat has not yet attained this hegemony, and, in general, the attainment of this hegemony is a historical process requiring a certain amount of time. But if this hegemony of the working class is guaranteed, the Chinese revolution will triumph and it will not only shake off the imperialist enslavement and oppression of the Chinese imperialists, but will create a revolutionary, anti-imperialist government of revolutionary China, which, in alliance with the growing revolutionary movement, with the workers' revolutionary movement of the West-European working class, in alliance with the Soviet Union, will hasten towards the ultimate goal — Socialism.

Comrade DORIOT (France):

We are in agreement with the perspectives as laid down in comrade Bukharin's report. We understand very well that the Chinese revolution can follow one of two ways: a bourgeois way or, under the leadership of the Chinese proletariat, that way which has been kept in view as a second hypothesis. We believe that the proletariat will understand how to follow this second path and we are convinced that the C. I. will make every effort so that the Chinese revolution shall not lose its national revolutionary character.

We know that the whole force of the C. I. should be concentrated so that the Chinese revolution will carry out, thoroughly and to the end, the struggle against all imperialists who are today plundering China; and we know that the struggle will be waged for the destruction of the foundations of feudalism which still exist in China as well as the bourgeois militarists who still hold sway there.

The greatest task today consists in preventing the forces capable of fighting for the second task which I have just mentioned, from dropping out of the struggle prematurely. The great task in China consists in not losing prematurely those elements which can lead the struggle against the imperialists and Chinese militarists, in order to destroy the foundations of feudalism in China. With these thoughts in mind, the French Party has already taken its stand against the divergent opinion expressed in the Comintern, namely, the proposal which was made on various sides that the Communist Party of China should leave the Kuomintang. In our Central Committee there was no vacillation whatsoever on this question. Everyone understood that to have the Communist Party of China leave the Kuomintang in the present situation would mean to diminish its chances of work and activity in the revolutionary crisis in China. This would mean about the following: the Chinese revolution would be shifted to the bourgeois path instead of the path we want it to follow. For these reasons we very energetically and decisively rejected the point of view maintained by the opposition.

But comrades, the tasks of the Chinese revolution are tremendously facilitated if the Communist Party of China continues to organise the proletariat as it has been doing during the last year.

We also believe that the Communist Party of China is today still too weak and that it must increase the number of its members.

It is already being said that the Party has famous traditions, its own cadres, its own leaders. All this is very good, but it must also recruit considerable masses into its ranks.

I should now like to speak on the dangers of intervention. The French comrades listened yesterday with great interest to Comrade Manuisky's speech; it was full of statistics about the question of the Pacific Ocean.

We do not agree with comrade Manuisky when he describes the possibility of military intervention in China as a slight one.

When he described the present situation as unfavourable for the intervention of the imperialists in China, we believe that he under-estimates the imperialists' opportunities of intervening in China.

First of all I should like to make a remark. At present, the British, American and Japanese imperialists are intervening, in an indirect but very effective way, in that they are supporting the reactionary generals not only with money, but with weapons and ammunition.

When the Chinese revolution faces such foes who furnish cannons and munitions, the strength of these foes should not be under-estimated.

As a matter of fact we have already had intervention of the imperialist forces.

There is already a direct intervention. We must not underestimate the fact that a part of the British Fleet has sailed up the Yangtse River.

The fact that France, which hitherto has not mixed into China's internal struggles, has now followed the British example and sent a squadron, is further a proof of the intervention of foreign imperialists.

If the Chinese revolution should follow a bourgeois way, I believe that the possibility of military intervention would be reduced. Why? The imperialist powers would then concentrate on direct political intervention, financial intervention; in reality the bourgeois revolution will not be based on the fundamental struggle against imperialism, and the imperialists will be able to get what they want.

If, however, the revolution should follow the course that we desire, if the imperialists should be beaten in China, do you believe that they will simply leave all these riches which they have only recently accumulated there, that they will simply surrender the concessions which they have held for a century? I believe not.

A great danger lies in an under-estimation of the role of the imperialists in China, a danger which we feel because we work among the workers who have an interest in the question of intervention. At this Plenum from this tribune it was said: in China everything will go well — we do not see any possibility of intervention — the contradictions among the imperialist powers in the sharing of these concessions are such that they will not be able to unite.

This is all very nice, certainly. Nevertheless at this moment British cruisers are lying in Chinese harbours. What would be the direct results of such talk among the workers of the West? They will say to themselves: "The Chinese revolution is itself strong enough to be able to smash all intervention; and besides the imperialists have no desire to intervene". Why are we continually struggling against our own Government in order to prevent them from intervening in China? I believe it is correct to declare that the danger of intervention does exist and that the entire proletariat of the West must fight against this danger. All the forces of the proletariat of the West must be mobilised to prevent military intervention in China. I believe that we should once more issue the slogan: "Hands off China!"

I should like to say a few words about the slogans which, in our opinion, are best adapted to mobilising the workers at present, so that they can express their solidarity with the Chinese revolutionaries. I believe that this is an important question, but the comrades here have rather neglected it. We have discussed the tasks of the Communist Party of China, the tasks of the Comintern in China, but we must also discuss the tasks of the Comintern outside of China, in the countries of the West. What slogans must be issued so that the workers can find a rallying point in support of the Chinese revolution? I believe that the first slogan must be: "Hands off China!" — "Against Intervention in China" — "Withdrawal of the Warships now stationed in China". These slogans must be issued by the French and British Parties.

In addition we have another slogan for which we must fight, the slogan of the recognition of the Revolutionary Government by the imperialist governments. I know that several imperialist governments have shown a tendency to recognise the Revolutionary Government, nevertheless I believe that we must constantly demand the recognition of the Revolutionary Government. Comrades, several years were required until the Russian Revolution was recognised, but the slogan "Recognition of the Soviet Government" was one of the most popular among the toiling masses in France and in other countries, especially in Great Britain. I believe that for China this is a slogan with which we can best mobilise the masses for a solidarity movement in favour of the Chinese revolution.

There is another task for the Parties directly involved in the possibility of the intervention of their own imperialists in

China: Comrade Petrov has emphasised that the work of demoralisation and propaganda must be carried on energetically in the armies of the reactionary generals in China. I say more: at this time we must energetically carry on systematic propaganda and demoralisation work among the troops and the fleets of Great Britain and France, which are at present stationed in China and in the colonies.

Finally, all parties in other countries which have colonies in the vicinity of China must establish connections with our Chinese comrades and launch a campaign of propaganda, agitation, and action for the Chinese revolution.

Comrades, I have great hopes that all the parties in the Comintern will devote themselves to this work so that the imperialists of all countries will not be able to attack the Chinese revolution, so that the Chinese revolution can be victorious (Applause).

Comrade ROY (India):

Comrades, the Chinese question is certainly the most important question before this Plenum and it involves a series of very important and complicated problems.

Since the Shanghai events of May 1925, the Chinese Revolution has entered into the acutest and most highly developed stage. The revolution of 1911 overthrew the feudal monarchy and laid the foundation for the building up of a new China. The 1911 revolution did not proceed in a straight line. Although the feudal monarchy was destroyed and a democratic republic was established nominally, real democracy was not introduced into the country. Power still remained in the hands of the feudal military class and foreign imperialism remained the dominant political power of the country.

During the war, there was even an attempt to undo this very limited result of the Revolution of 1911. It was the attempt to restore the monarchy, an attempt which was backed by Japanese imperialism. This attempt was frustrated partly by the recrudescence of the revolutionary movement inside the country, and partly owing to the opposition of American and British imperialism, which naturally did not want a monarchy to be established in China under the protection of Japanese imperialism. This stage, which might be called the stage of Japanese orientation, was succeeded by the stage of American orientation, which lasted during the latter part of the world war and the years immediately following.

In this period of American orientation the Chinese nationalists looked upon America as the friend of Chinese liberation, but this hope was destroyed after Versailles and as a result of the Washington Conference.

The depression that followed the collapse of American orientation was succeeded by the revolutionary period of the Chinese nationalist movement, the period that began in the great boycott movement of 1920 and eventually left its impression on the mass revolutionary movement, the beginning of which was marked by the Shanghai events. Since the Shanghai strike of May 1925, the Chinese revolution has developed almost in a spectacular way. To be sure, during this period also the development of the revolutionary forces has not been uninterrupted and in a continually rising line, the revolution has gone forward, although in a zig-zag line and in the face of tremendous difficulties which it had to overcome.

The victorious advance of the Chinese Revolution has culminated in the triumphant march of the Nationalist Army to wards the North. This has forced a change upon imperialist policy, which should not be overlooked.

As you all know there has been talk of recognition of the Canton Government by Japan, England and the United States. The new imperialist policy has assumed most interesting forms in the case of America. These forms show how extremely dangerous American imperialism is for the Chinese Revolution. American imperialism is trying to recover the moral prestige it enjoyed in China during the period of American orientation of the Chinese nationalist movement. American imperialism wants to introduce in China a liberal, humane imperialism in the place of the old brutal and greedy imperialism; that is, America

wants to kill China not with bombs and machine-guns, but with kindness. We have to be very careful with such a friend.

This new orientation of imperialism has very close and dangerous connection with the forces inside the Chinese nationalist movement. Looked at from this point of view, we can be in a position to solve the problem of the motive forces behind the Chinese Revolution. Obviously this new strategy of American imperialism is meant to break the unity of the anti-imperialist front.

Now, which section of the Chinese population are likely to fall for these new temptations? The burden of imperialist exploitation does not fall uniformly on all portions of the population. To some parts of the population it is only a negative burden, and to some parts it is a positive burden. The imperialist policy of hindering the development of the economic resources of the country deprives the native bourgeoisie of the right to exploit the native labour power. From this point of view, the native bourgeoisie is opposed to imperialism. On the other hand, on whom falls the positive exploitation? On the working class, on the producing masses, the mass that produces value for imperialism.

From this it is very clear that the antagonism between imperialism and the majority of the population is irreconcilable, it must lead to the fight to a finish one way or the other. But the antagonism which is based on the negative exploitation can be reconciled, and the policy of imperialism in China at this time is to find a possible *modus vivendi* with a section of the Chinese bourgeoisie. If the national bourgeoisie determine the progress and tactics of the revolution it will be sabotaged and weakened as a consequence of this new policy of imperialism. Therefore, it is very clear that when we talk about the united anti-imperialist front we have to keep the big bourgeoisie out of account.

Foreign imperialism cannot hold its position in another country unless one section of the native population support it. Imperialism must have a social basis in the colony. As long as there is not a very broad revolutionary mass movement, it is possible for imperialism to stand on a very narrow base. But now the base of the revolutionary movement in China is enormously broadened; so imperialism, in order to hold its position in China, must also broaden its base proportionately. Naturally, they have to go to that class of native society whose antagonism against imperialism is not irreconcilable, they will seek to broaden the social base by making allies of a certain section of the bourgeoisie. During this period of acute revolutionary development this process has been going on inside the nationalist forces. A section of the bourgeoisie has moved further and further away from the revolution, and in proportion as the revolutionary forces (the proletariat, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie) become more and more revolutionary, the upper strata of the bourgeoisie will move more and more away from the revolution to the extent of making a united front with the imperialists against revolutionary China. This is the situation, and in view of this situation we have to solve the problem of the united anti-imperialist front.

Now, comrades, there is one more point which is also a vital question that has been raised by the Chinese Revolution. That is the agrarian question. The overwhelming majority of the population are the peasants. Consequently any revolutionary fight against imperialism and for the democratisation of the country must depend on the active participation of the peasantry in this fight. The Chinese Revolution in the immediate stages must primarily be an agrarian revolution. In order to mobilise the peasantry and draw them into this united anti-imperialist front, the Communist Party, as well as the Kuomintang, must have an agrarian programme; but in formulating this agrarian programme the basic question has not been touched upon. The programme is formulated only as a programme of action, of immediate demands. For our work among the peasantry, and for our winning of the peasantry over to the side of the revolution, it is necessary to have a programme of action and of immediate demands. But, unless the programme is very clearly laid down, there will always be the danger of opportunist deviations. While formulating an agrarian programme for the Chinese Revolution we must not forget that the question of an agrarian revolution shall be very clearly put. There is the question of the nationalisation of land, the confiscation of big

landowners, estates. These questions cannot be avoided. They must be put clearly and answered in the negative or in the positive. The central point of the agrarian programme of the Chinese Revolution must be the nationalisation of land.

If it is true that the anti-imperialist campaign in China is being organised under the hegemony of the proletariat, if this hegemony of the proletariat is to be strengthened, if the success of the Chinese Revolution depends on the ability of the proletariat to exercise this hegemony, we cannot but admit that the leadership of the peasantry must be in the hands of the proletariat. The Communist Party, the Party of the proletariat, must be the instrument through which this leadership will be exercised. This is apart from the tactical approach to the problem. Various intermediary organisation forms may have to be found in order, first, to establish this leadership, and then to exercise the leadership effectively. But this is also a question which has to be cleared up — the Chinese peasantry in the present stage of the social development will be and can be led in the revolutionary fight against imperialism only under the leadership of the proletariat.

There is no question of an immediate Socialist revolution in China or of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the question is whether the revolution which has for its immediate object the establishment of a democratic government will have to take a uniform line of development no matter in what period of history it takes place. The bourgeois democratic revolution in China which is taking place in 1926 will follow the same line of development as the democratic revolution of Europe in the middle of the 19th century. The revolution for the democratisation of China is taking place in the period of the decline of bourgeois democracy, the decline of capitalism. To-day capitalism is a force of counter-revolution on a world scale. Imperialism is trying to create new bases in the colonies and semi-colonial countries as a method of stabilising its position. The Chinese Revolution as an integral part of the world revolution is a menace to the attempted capitalist stabilisation.

Consequently, the theory that the Chinese Revolution, because it is a democratic revolution, must develop under the hegemony, or even under the partial leadership, of the bourgeoisie is false. This being so, the peasantry, which constitutes the overwhelming majority of the nationalist forces must be led by the working class. If the Communist Party, owing to its present numerical weakness, relative smallness in comparison to the vast population of China, is not yet able to discharge creditably this aspect of its activities, this is no reason to believe that we must seek a new leadership for the Chinese peasantry. The Chinese proletariat, under the Chinese Communist Party, will learn how to lead the peasants in the fight against imperialism for the democratisation of the country. The Chinese proletariat, led by the Communist Party in Co-operation with the revolutionary proletariat of the Western countries, will be the dominating factor in the struggle for national freedom, will overthrow imperialism, will democratise the country and establish a democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, which democratic dictatorship will immediately lead up to the struggle against capitalism and for the establishment of Socialism in China.

Comrade SCHAOL-LI-TSE (Kuomintang):

Comrades, the problem of the Chinese revolution in our time is so important, and the role as well as the significance of the Chinese revolutionary movement for the world revolution is so great, that it has occupied the serious attention of the Enlarged Executive of the C. I., of the delegates of all Communist parties. I have not had a chance to read Comrade Tan-Pin-San's written report but I approve of the opinions which Comrade Tan-Pin-San expressed here yesterday evening. Comrade Tan-Pin-San closed his report with the following words: "The Communists must earnestly support the struggle for the National-revolutionary liberation of China". In the name of the Kuomintang I reply to Comrade Tan-Pin-San that the earnest and friendly co-operation of the Kuomintang with the Communist Party of China is the guarantee for the victory of the National Revolution. (Applause.)

More than that, insofar as the victorious National Revolution of China leads to the strengthening and extension of the

revolutionary front of the world proletariat, insofar must the Kuomintang march not only hand in hand with the Communist Party of China, but also with all the oppressed peoples and with the revolutionary workers of the entire world.

In his report Comrade Bukharin outlined the possibility of two perspectives of development in China. One of these perspectives is that following the victory of the National Revolution in China, China may avoid the stage of capitalist development. This thesis co-incides with the ideas of the leader of the Kuomintang — Sun-Yat-Sen.

Sun-Yat-Sen, who foresaw the inevitable misery and ruin of the toiling masses in the course of the capitalist development, believed that the development of China could be directed into revolutionary channels and that the stage of capitalist development could be avoided. Sun-Yat-Sen's Socialism consisted in this, and in this lay that fundamental path which Sun-Yat-Sen considered absolutely necessary in the solution of the question of economic reconstruction after the seizure of power by the Chinese people.

For the development of industry there are two prerequisites: first, a domestic market; second, raw material. China has both of these requisites. After the victory of the National Revolution and the liberation of China from the yoke of imperialism and the remnants of militarism, industry will, without doubt, develop at a rapid rate. The chief obstacles which China will face lie in the fact that the means of production are very weakly developed, while on the other hand, the population has not yet developed sufficient purchasing power. It is therefore necessary to improve the living conditions of the workers and peasants, not only for their own sake, but also for the sake of raising the industry of the country. With a relatively developed purchasing power of the 300 million peasants and thirty million workers, plus a relatively developed technique, Socialist construction in China is absolutely possible and necessary.

Sun-Yat-Sen's fundamental principle consists of the necessity of beginning socialist construction as far as is possible under given development of a historical situation. Sun-Yat-Sen's nationalism consists in the thesis that in the present stage of the revolution, first China must be freed from the Manchu dynasty and from the imperialist yoke; then it should develop into a self-governing State, simultaneously recognising the right to self-determination of all smaller nationalities. Sun-Yat-Sen's democracy consisted in the thesis of destroying all political oppression, in the theses of democratic re-organisation and the transference of State power into the hands of the people. Sun-Yat-Sen believed that the bourgeoisie in the West hypocritically veiled its oppression of the people under the pretence of democracy, under democratic slogans. He insisted that China should be governed by a revolutionary Party which will unite all oppressed sections, and that only those sections, which were formerly oppressed should enjoy full freedom. Sun-Yat-Sen's last principle, Socialism — consisted in the thesis of destroying all relations of economic inequality among the classes of the Chinese people, that is, in the equalisation of ownership of land as well as the limitation of private capital. Sun-Yat-Sen maintained this thesis: Socialism is Communism. Sun-Yat-Sen was not only not content with the first Chinese revolution which substituted one power for another, but he was likewise not satisfied with the bourgeois revolutions in the West because they were not consistent and did not carry the revolution through to the end.

Comrades, it is well-known that since the revolution of 1911 there has been no Manchu dynasty and no despotism in China. The Kuomintang directs its efforts towards preventing that after the national revolution in China there should not be established a bourgeois State such as exist at present in all countries except the Soviet Union. The Kuomintang unites all revolutionary forces for the struggle against imperialism. But the social basis of the Kuomintang has always been formed by the oppressed masses. If the Kuomintang formerly consisted of so-called secret leagues for the protection of the interests of the peasants, today, after its reorganisation in 1923, the Kuomintang is on the way to becoming a mass Party. In the process of its development and growth the Kuomintang will overcome all bureaucratic and intellectual deviations as well as the deviation of those elements which vacillate between the revolution and the counter-revolution. The Kuomintang to-day openly and in a correct manner fight for the interests of the workers and peasants; it has recognised that the national revolution in China can be victorious only when it is

actually supported by the workers and peasants. The improvement in the conditions of the masses of workers such as the carrying out of the agrarian reforms are, according to the Kuomintang manifesto, one of the main tasks of the Kuomintang.

At present over 80 per cent of the Canton organisation of the Kuomintang are peasants. The percentage of peasants in the membership of the Kuomintang organisation in the province of Chunan is the same. This fact shows that the Kuomintang has really begun to fight for the interests of the workers and peasants. In his book on Socialism Sun-Yat-Sen states that the land must belong to the peasants who work it. Comrade Tschan-Kei-Tschi declared in his speech before the members of the Kuomintang Party that the Chinese revolution would be unthinkable if it was not able to solve correctly the agrarian — that is, the peasant — question.

Comrades, the agrarian question receives the chief attention of the Kuomintang Party. How shall the agrarian reform be carried out in China? It seems to me that the Enlarged Executive will give us suggestions and general lines in this question. But it must be kept in mind that all proposals in the question of agrarian reforms must be kept within the limits of reality. It is absolutely necessary to improve the living conditions of the peasants and to draw in the broad masses into revolutionary struggle and co-operation in the government. This circumstance will also be taken up in our agrarian programme. What concrete measures has the Kuomintang taken in this direction? The last Plenum of the Kuomintang clearly and distinctly favoured a 25 per cent reduction of rents and the immediate formation of peasant committees whose task should be the protection of the interests of the broad masses of peasants, etc.

The victories recently won were achieved only as a result of the sympathy and support of the masses of peasants. The security of this victory would be impossible without realising the practical demands of the peasants and without realising Sun-Yat-Sen's thesis that the armed forces should be on the side of the people, that they must be a popular force i. e. that the people must rule with the aid of the army. In the course of its thirty years' struggle the Kuomintang always strove to obtain the support of military forces.

There is for us no doubt whatsoever that no revolution can triumph without armed force. This experience is particularly confirmed by the situation in China. The overthrow of the Manchu dynasty by the Revolution of 1905 was achieved mainly through military force. The fact that the Kuomintang bases itself particularly on military forces seems to me not to be wrong at all; at the same time it must be pointed out that the former method of carrying out this policy was erroneous and false. This false method was corrected in 1925. And if at present we have certain successes and achievements in the Chinese revolution it is precisely because our work in the revolutionary army has improved, because the armed forces no longer are ignored by the masses of people, but have become a real support, a real force of the people itself. In these areas which have been occupied by the national revolutionary armies, the people have been guaranteed the possibility of fighting for their interests; on the other hand the people also influence the army and drive it forward along the revolutionary path. It is the task of the Kuomintang to carry out the ideas of its leader Sun-Yat-Sen, i. e. to make the army the armed power of the people.

For the purpose of carrying out the revolutionary policy of the Kuomintang, it is necessary to play against one another the existing contradictions among the various groups of imperialists as well as the various militaristic groups in China, without forgetting the main task, i. e. the complete destruction of imperialism and militarism. I can assure you that the Kuomintang will fulfil this task.

The basic prerequisites for the victory of the national revolutionary movement in China is the united front of all oppressed sections. It seems to me that this is important for the Kuomintang as well as for the national revolutionary parties of other countries, which also face the task of liberating the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism and militarism. A united front of the oppressed sections is important not only for the Chinese revolution, but also for the revolutionary Parties of the entire world. The Chinese Revolution will either be victorious as the united front of all revolutionary elements, or it will not triumph at all; but we are convinced that the Kuomintang, under

the leadership of the Communist Party and of the Comintern, will fulfil its historic role. (Applause.)

Comrade TJO-CHUN (Corea):

I should like to call the attention of the Enlarged Executive, and especially of the Chinese comrades, to the fact that **Japanese imperialism** is one of the most dangerous and perhaps the most dangerous enemy of the Chinese Revolution. During the world war, the Japanese imperialists, who knew how to make capital out of the internecine struggle of the great imperialist powers, began to realise their plans prepared long in advance for the conquest of China and the establishment of their rule throughout the entire Far East — a goal for which they have been working incessantly for many years.

The notorious ultimatum of May 7th, 1915, this day is the famous day of China's national humiliation which the Japanese imperialists issued to China, contained the demand that China should submit its entire political and economic life to Japanese imperialism. But this did not yet satisfy the appetite of Japanese imperialism. The Revolution in Russia, and its weaknesses in the first years after the October uprising, gave Japanese imperialism an opportunity to carry out its maximum programme, which planned for the eventual acquisition of Siberia. That was the culminating point of the annexation efforts of Japanese imperialism. Shortly afterward Japanese imperialism had to retreat in the Far East under the blows of the victorious partisan fighters and of the Red Army. The Soviet power was established there despite the fact that Japan most actively supported Admiral Koltchak and all other counter-revolutionary Generals.

The Washington Conference gave a new blow to Japanese imperialism — but from the other side. At this Conference, the United States took a highly hostile attitude towards Japan, and forced Great Britain to give up the Anglo-Japanese alliance and to curb considerably its appetite in China.

Despite its failures, however, Japanese imperialism did not give up the development of its economic and particularly its political positions in North China and in Manchuria. **Chang-Tso-Lin** developed into the most loyal tool of Japanese imperialism; neither Wu-Pei-Fu, serving British imperialism, nor Sun-Chuan-Fang serving American imperialism, could compare with him.

The defeat of Go-Sun-Ling at Mukden, which was followed by the retreat of the People's Armies, was the result of the direct and active intervention of Japan. Although Go-Sun-Ling made all possible promises to Japan that he would do nothing against Japanese interests in Manchuria, the Japanese imperialists did not hesitate at armed intervention, in order to maintain **Chang-Tso-Lin's** domination in North Manchuria.

Japan can not at any price tolerate the victory of the revolution in North China; as far as it lies in its power, it will never tolerate it, because such a victory would lead to very severe and serious consequences for Japanese imperialism.

It must not be forgotten that **Korea** is the weakest link in the chain of Japanese imperialism. On March 1st, 1919, the masses of Korea, without distinction as to class, expressed their full hatred against Japanese imperialism which, to use Lenin's expression, oppresses Korea with incredible brutality and Asiatic barbarity. For many years, the toiling masses of Korea have been carrying on vigorous and unequal struggle against the Japanese imperialists, who exercise in Korea a terror unprecedented for its brutality and who employ the most barbarous methods in the struggle against the revolutionary movement. The Japanese imperialists have established a regular system of provocation, torture and terror.

The June events in Korea have shown that the **young Korean Communist Party** and **Y. C. L.**, who are forced to work under incredibly difficult conditions, knew how to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary mass movement.

Of especially great significance for the rise of the national revolutionary movement in Korea are those victories which the Chinese revolutionary armies have won over the reactionary Chinese Generals. The struggle of the Chinese people against the imperialists and particularly against Japanese imperialism, has evoked the liveliest sympathy and the highest enthusiasm among the broad masses of Korea.

The Japanese imperialists understand very well that the victory of the Revolution in North China, and especially in Manchuria, mean the beginning of the end of their domination in Korea. That is the reason why Japan is doing everything in its power to make a victory of the Chinese Revolution in North China impossible. At present Japanese imperialism seeks to take advantage of the complete destruction of Wu-Pei-Fu, as well as the considerable weakening of British imperialism in China, for the purpose of advancing its own interests and to entrench itself in North China and even in Central China. The victory of Canton over Mukden means a serious defeat for Japanese imperialism and threatens Japan with the loss of Korea. At the same time, there is in Japan itself a wide revolutionary movement among the workers and peasants. It can therefore be said that the loss of Mukden and the defeat of Chang-Tso-Lin is a question of life or death for Japanese imperialism in the sense that it stands or falls with Mukden and Chang-Tso-Lin. The Chinese revolution must seriously prepare for the struggle against Chang-Tso-Lin and must keep in view the fact that he is backed by Japan, which will not hesitate to intervene openly against the Chinese revolution.

In the struggle against Japanese imperialism, the Chinese revolution can count not only on the active support of the revolutionary movement in Japan, but also on the active support of the Korean people, above all of the Korean Communist Party and the Korean Young Communist League, which stand at the head of the Korean national revolutionary movement and are ready to attack Japanese imperialism from the rear and thereby facilitate the victory of the Chinese revolution. (Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Thirteenth Session.

Moscow, December 2nd, Evening.

Comrade Kolarov (Chairman), opened the session at 7,45

p. m. and gave the floor to Comrade Tan Ping-Schan, for his concluding speech.

Concluding Speech of Comrade Tan-Ping-Shan on the Situation in China.

Comrades, after the extensive discussion on the Chinese question I should like to emphasise a few important points in my closing words, and to summarise the views of the comrades who participated in the discussion. I should like to say that the **chief task** which now confronts us is to find out how we can **consolidate the victories we have won, and how we can gain further successes.** Thanks to the military victories of the Canton troops all the revolutionary forces in China concentrate themselves while the forces of reaction fall more and more into splinters from day to day. In order to maintain our victory we must, as far as possible, develop the workers' and peasants' movement of China, and we must rally the support of the world proletariat. Hence I consider that the slogan proposed by the French comrade, **Doriot**, is correct: **Mass pressure on the government at home to prevent military intervention by the imperialists, to bring about the annulment of the unequal treaties, and official recognition of the Canton Government as the National Government.**

The present position of China is such that it is subject to militarist intervention on the part of the imperialists. In order to forge their intrigues, in order to carry out their intervention, the imperialists can either organise a direct action or else support the militarists and all the other reactionary elements (the merchants' militia, the so-called Paper Tiger of 1924) and the bandits that are spread throughout China, in order thereby not only to check the Chinese revolution but also to instigate a new imperialist war.

As to the **trend of the Chinese revolution** we know that there is room for two possibilities: that the national revolution can come under the leadership either of the bourgeoisie or of the proletariat. The moment has now come when the proletariat must come to grips with the bourgeoisie for hegemony in the leadership of the national revolution. In order to be able to note this tendency and correctly appraise it, we must first correctly appraise the forces of the **bourgeoisie**, as well as our own strength.

In China capitalism has already developed to a certain extent, but the bourgeoisie is still very weak. Nevertheless they have already begun to participate in the National Government after the occupation of Hankow and Wuchang by the Canton troops. Why has the bourgeoisie joined in the national struggle just at this time? Because the Chinese bourgeoisie today still suffers under the pressure of foreign capital, and because they know that the war, which is raging uninterruptedly between the Chinese military cliques, objectively hinders the development of Chinese capitalism, and hence, also the development of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Also for the reason that of late the bourgeoisie is becoming more class-conscious, because it sees that the labour movement has developed so rapidly recently that the possibility exists that the leadership of the national revolution will be captured by the proletariat. Therefore the bourgeoisie is forced to enter the national struggle in order to seize the leadership for itself.

But the bourgeoisie is still **weak.** Why? Because the forces of the bourgeoisie are not concentrated. They are not concentrated: 1. because of the antagonism between Chinese and foreign capital, the latter still predominating; 2. because of the antagonism between various groups of the Chinese bourgeoisie, between the industrial and trading capitalists of China; and 3. because of the differences between foreign capitalists, between the American, British and Japanese, each of whom endeavours to capture the Chinese market for his own capital and commodities. These contradictions are still exceptionally great

and, objectively, prevent the unification of the forces of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie is still weak because its political attitude is not consistent, and thereby it forfeits the support and confidence of the masses of the people. In the Shanghai events, the workers, merchants and students formulated seventeen demands against the imperialists, whereupon the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce (the Shanghai **big bourgeoisie**) countered these with thirteen demands representing only the interests of their own class, thereby betraying the interests of the entire nation.

The Chinese bourgeoisie is unable to win the broad masses of peasantry for the very reason that the young Chinese bourgeoisie has sprung chiefly from the landowners, or has direct or indirect relations with them. The class struggle on the countryside between landowners and peasant masses is very sharp. There is, consequently, a conflict between the peasantry and the bourgeoisie. For this reason it is impossible for the bourgeoisie to win the peasantry.

While the bourgeoisie is weak, it is nevertheless of **importance** in the national revolution because, first of all, it is economically tied up with the **middle and petty bourgeoisie.** For this reason, by making certain concessions to this petty bourgeoisie, it can win over the urban petty and middle bourgeoisie to its side. Secondly, it can also win the **troops**, which can go either with the bourgeoisie or with the worker and peasant classes, which can be either revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. The Chinese bourgeoisie has the chance of exploiting the Chinese troops, who are recruited especially from among unemployed and impoverished peasants.

In view of the weak development of Chinese capitalism the Chinese proletariat is also weak. But it is concentrated and centralised, it has sturdy, solid organisations. The political slogans issued by the Chinese proletariat represent the **interests not only of their own class, but also, at all times, the interests of the national revolution.** The Chinese proletariat therefore enjoys the complete support and trust of the masses of the people. The Chinese proletariat is able to win over the peasantry to its side, to advance jointly with the rural masses. In every struggle in Kwantung, the workers and peasants always proceed jointly, they stand shoulder to shoulder in the front ranks against the counter-revolution, and for this reason we can maintain that the Chinese revolution can be consistently and victoriously carried out only under the leadership of the Chinese proletariat.

But if one says that the proletariat has already captured the leadership of the revolution, the hegemony, this is not a fact but an exaggeration. We must capture the hegemony of the revolution, and this by means of a joint battle-front with the peasantry, with all revolutionary and petty bourgeois elements, in order thereby to establish a revolutionary anti-imperialist government which will represent the interests of the whole nation, and which will wage the final struggle against imperialism. This government must be under the leadership of the proletariat. It must be in such a position as to be able to develop the power of the broadest masses. It must be able to defend specially the interests of the broad peasantry. And even this is not enough. We must in addition be more firmly united than heretofore with the **Workers' and Peasants' Republic**, with the U. S. S. R. and with the world proletariat, in order thereby to be in a position to organise a united battle front against

imperialism. Only in this way is the victory of the Chinese revolution assured.

We need lose no words concerning the weightiness of the peasant question in the present situation in China. We might merely mention a few "incidentals" that illustrate the force, the power of the broad peasant strata in China. In Kwanung, every struggle waged by the national government against the native reactionary generals, always found the peasant masses in the front ranks. At that time when the grim struggle took place between the Canton Government and General Chen Chun-ming, the peasant masses already began to attack the reactionary troops from the rear, before the Canton troops had even arrived. There is, e.g. a high-way from the Canton troops along this road and only when the forces of the Canton Government were already in front of the enemies' camp was their presence discovered. Nothing was left for the foe but to take to his heels.

A great deal has been said about the so-called "League of Red Lances". Many say that these Red Lances are a sort of bandits. This is not true. They are armed, organised peasants who are uninterruptedly fighting the local generals in North China, particularly in the provinces of Honan, Shantung, and Chihli. Thus in Shantung province, 3,000 members of this League were slaughtered by the cannons and machine guns of General Chang Chung-chang, and in the province of Honan, more than 10,000 by Wu Pei-fu after he had employed these peasants to destroy the Second National Army. This League of Red Lances once occupied a county town in Honan province for seven days without calling forth any disorders among the masses.

We may say that this League of Red Lances is an armed force organised by the peasant masses themselves. Our Chinese Party must devote the greatest attention to it, in order to direct it, politically and organisationally, as an important factor for the destruction of the militarists.

That the Chinese peasants, like the peasants in other countries, need land, is self-understood. Yet there are many Chinese comrades who think that at least for the present, it is not necessary to deal with the agrarian question in China. We must record that in China there is a great number of landowners. The poor peasants, who have from one to ten moo (1 moo = $\frac{1}{16}$ dessiatin), constitute 40% of the total rural population, but they have only one-sixth of the total arable land. On the other hand the category with over 100 moo and up to 1,000 and 10,000 holds 43% of the total, even though they constitute only 5% of the whole rural population. We thus have a very big difference between rich and poor peasants.

How can anyone say that the agrarian question is not acute in China? The agrarian question is now **more acute than ever before**, and if it is not solved at a proper time, the victory of the national revolution cannot be assured. We must formulate a political programme for the peasantry in order to give a basic solution of the agrarian question. At present we must raise a few definite demands and try to carry them out. Politically we must demand the participation of the peasantry in local government, the arming of the peasantry, etc. In North and South China, corrupt officials are ruling everywhere, they wield local power and of course always side with the landowners against the peasants. We must arm the peasantry because without arms the peasants cannot get anywhere, they cannot participate in local governments.

Economically we must, as I have already said before, try to solve the tax question, forbid exploitation by the usurers, etc. In the territory of the Canton Government we can now demand the confiscation of the estates of church, compradores,

military lords, and those big landowners who are openly fighting the revolutionary government.

But we absolutely must bring the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat. That is why the question of the labour movement is always the most important concern of our Party. The trade unions in China must be extended and developed on the largest possible scale. The Communist Party of China must lead the working class in its political and economic struggles, and must fight for the interests of the toiling masses. A uniform economic programme must be formulated for the labour movement in order to unify the movements in the various parts of China. The demands for a factory law, for a labour law, for the 8-hour day, must be realised as quickly as possible.

The Youth movement also plays an important role in the present struggles. Already in the famous movement of May 4th 1919, the young students appeared as the vanguard of the national revolution against imperialism. The fact also that the young students, who mostly spring from the middle and petty bourgeoisie, objectively drive forward the peasant movement on the countryside, gives the youth movement a particular importance. These youths participate in the political and economic struggles of their own class, as well as in the struggles of the national revolution.

In the course of the current battles of the Canton troops against Wu Pei-fu and the other military lords, the question of work among the troops becomes more acute every day. The Canton troops have captured certain provinces but these victories are not assured unless we correctly carry out the political work among the soldiers. We must do our utmost so that the movement of the masses keeps up with the military victories. In my last speech I did not mention the question of the youth movement, and the question of work among the troops, that is why I am supplementing my speech today.

The chief question for us is the question of the united revolutionary front, and the question of the relationship of the Communist Party to the Kuomintang. Comrade Chan-Li-tse said in his speech that the Kuomintang will work together with the Chinese Communist Party, with the U.S.S.R. and with all nations that recognise China as an equal. The Kuomintang will continue the anti-imperialist struggle and the struggle for the interests of the workers and peasants. Well, we are well satisfied with this declaration and we hope that the collaboration between the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, the U.S.S.R. and the world proletariat, as well as all oppressed nations, will become even closer and better than in the past. We hope that the demands of the peasant masses will be satisfied on the part of the Kuomintang as quickly as possible. Thereby the Kuomintang will be strengthened, the national government secured, and the victories already won will be consolidated. Only in this manner can we gain new victories and complete the national revolution.

We, the Chinese Communists, will do our best to organise a united nationalist revolutionary front in China, and in the near future, to lead it. The task of the Communist International, as formulated by comrade Bukharin, is to put into effect the alliance of the Chinese people, with the U.S.S.R., and the proletariat of Western Europe. We, the Chinese Communists, will do our best to contribute our part to the fulfilment of this task. (Applause.)

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

Next will be the report of Comrade Murphy on the III point on our agenda, "The British General Strike and its Lessons". Comrade Murphy has the floor. (Great applause.)

The Lessons of the English Strike.

Comrade MURPHY (England):

Comrades, the first words that I must say this evening before going to my report proper, must be with reference to the termination of the miners' lockout. Everyone here who has become acquainted with the terms upon which this dispute has ended, after so magnificent a struggle on the part of the miners, will join in declaring quite openly and frankly that the agreements which have been made in the districts can only be regarded as agreements made under duress, and can only remain intact just so long as the miners have not developed power enough to smash them. No one of us, under the circumstances existing in Britain can regard these agreements as worthy of anything other than to be completely shattered at the earliest possible date. I am quite confident that the admiration we have for the miners and for their women-folk who have joined them so magnificently in the struggle, will inspire us to render still further aid to them to the best of our ability. We helped them to fight against the imposition of slave conditions. We will help them to shatter these new fetters of slavery.

I have to report now upon the English situation with special reference to the General Strike and the miners' lockout, for these two together constitute the most profound and far reaching event in the history of Great Britain for a hundred years. On May 3, of this year, 4 million workers, with one accord, struck a mighty blow at the very foundations of the oldest imperialist country in the world. For nine hectic days their ranks were solid. Enthusiasm was growing — the will to extend and develop that struggle was spreading far and wide amongst the workers of other industries that had not been called into action. Suddenly, through treachery on the part of the leadership of the unions and the labour movement, the strike was called off and a million miners were left in the lurch to continue an isolated struggle lasting now for seven months despite the mighty array of State power and all the forces of class oppression mobilised against them.

Accompanying this mighty conflict of class forces, we have witnessed the farthest reaching advance of international solidarity action, led by the workers of the Soviet Union. We have been witness to a wholesale disturbance in world economy, and in the framework of British imperialism. We have been witness to far-reaching changes in class relations on an international scale. The importance and significance of this great event can hardly be over-estimated. So profound has been the effect upon every phase of the situation in Britain itself that we can now unhesitatingly say that the working class of Britain has definitely stepped out upon the path which leads to Social Revolution. Such an event constitutes a political event of world importance, it warrants our deepest study.

In presenting this report on behalf of the Executive Committee I do not intend to repeat in full the report on the thesis of the June Executive meeting when it summed up the British situation on the lessons of the British General Strike from May 3rd to 12th. In the Thesis which has been presented to the Enlarged Plenum we have confined ourselves as much as possible to supplementing the June thesis rather than going into a repetition of our work on that occasion.

At that time we established, first, that the general position of British economy in relation to world economy, may be characterised as that of a steady process of decline. We also stated that a most important component part of the general decline of British imperialism has been the acute crisis in the British mining industry. These conclusions have been completely verified by the events which have followed. Indeed, one of the most important features of the miners' struggle is the fact that it proceeds on the battle ground of the decline of the British Empire, a decline which has gone so far that the capitalist class of Britain are no longer able to make concessions to the workers and every conflict, even for the most elementary economic demands, is converted rapidly into a political struggle of first class importance.

Let us examine the effect of the strike and the lockout on British economy in general. In Comrade Bukharin's report a number of statistics were brought forward which show that Britain has lost her monopolistic position in world trade, that in the development process of the colonies and dominions Britain is rapidly losing ground to the United States.

The figures show that this feature is not confined to the British Empire, but extends to the whole of her world trade. But within the British Empire itself the process has strengthened what we call the centrifugal factors operating against the British Empire. I mean by that, the tendency for the elements of the British Empire to draw apart from the centre (Great Britain). I want to supplement the information which is conveyed in Comrade Bukharin's report in order that we may get a more complete measure of the extent and seriousness of the decline of Great Britain.

First of all let us examine the State expenditure as revealed in the national budget. In 1914 the national budget amounted to 72 million pounds. At the end of the War it rose to 1,000 millions. In 1926, after very many strenuous efforts to reduce the budget, it amounted still to 824 million pounds. The municipal budget in 1913 amounted to 71 millions, in 1925 it had risen to 160 millions. I want you to grasp the significance of these figures. They mean a rise of from 18 to 40% of the national income passing into the national exchequer and the exchequers of municipal authorities. How does this compare with the position of her greatest rival America? It is estimated that of the American national income only 10.5% goes into national expenditure in the form of taxation. Now while America can foresee a balanced budget in the immediate future, Great Britain has to face the fact that this year as a direct sequel to the 7 months lockout, there is already a deficit of 62 million pounds in the first 6 months of the year, and although it is usual for income to come in more rapidly during the latter part of the year, there is every prospect of a very substantial deficit in the national budget at the end of the year.

The position of the municipalities is equally bad from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie. No less than 60 unions of the local authorities have been forced from economic necessity to apply for loans for relief.

Turning from the national local finances to the effects on British industry in general, and especially, on the heavy industries already heavily hit by the crisis, Sir Robert Horn, a leader of the Federation of British Industries, in a speech agitating for the cutting of relief, declared that 11 shipyards on the Clyde in 1913 paid £ 17,000 in taxes for poor relief, but in 1925 the amount has risen to £ 61,000. In 1926 this amount will have considerably increased. What these 11 yards will have to pay as the present economic conditions continue can well be imagined. But he went still further to show the effect of the stoppage upon the economic life of the country. He went on to say that in Sheffield the poor rate was 2d. on the pound in 1913 but today in 1926 it has risen to 5/1d, — this meant an advance in the cost of steel production. When this is taken in relation to the intensified competition with foreign steel manufacturers, when we realise how narrow is the margin for competition, the serious effect of the stoppage upon steel production is obvious to all of us.

But the situation does not end here. Turning from taxation in general and its effect upon trade, let us examine the imports and exports. Here we shall find that imports are growing, exports declining. So much so, that even when all allowances have been made for what are called re-exports and invisible exports (earnings of shipping and returns of foreign investments), we find the situation described by the "Bankers' Magazine" as follows: Taking into account these invisible exports it comes to the conclusion that 5 months of the stoppage meant a total adverse balance of 44½ million pounds for the year and consequently, "We as a nation have been temporarily living beyond our means and have been drawing upon the rest of the world

for a proportion of our daily needs. At the same time in order to meet the bill we have, nationally and individually, had to draw upon our savings”.

Let us go still further. From an exporter of coal during these months, Britain has turned into an importer and in the process has dislocated her shipping traffic. Formerly she exported coal and used the vessels which went out with coal to bring back grain and foodstuffs. Now the ships are sailing out with ballast to bring back coal, thus necessitating extra charges, giving away all the advantages she had previously in the way of regulating freights; and she is unable to bring the foodstuffs as freely as hitherto while at the same time creating such a shortage in shipping that the freight rates soar to unprecedented heights.

When we take all these facts in relation to the story told by unemployment and the time lost in industrial disputes, it can be no exaggeration to say that the **General Strike and coal struggle has accentuated the general decline on a very large scale** and that it will continue to do so. Do not think for a moment that simply because the lockout has ended that this means an immediate readjustment of the market and immediate recovery. It must not be forgotten, as Joynson Hicks points out this week, that the orders for coal have been of such a character that they extend over a long period and even though the mines were working in full swing tomorrow morning, the import of coal into Britain will continue until at least February next. One can understand from this fact alone what a disrupting effect this situation will continue to have on British industry. Already we can hear outcries from industrial centres with regard to having too much coal on hand. When the mines get working fully and the imports continue to come in, we can see that there will be another crisis in the coal market during the next few months.

Now let us take the effect upon unemployment and see what these figures show. In 1921 when the last great lockout of the miners took place there were 1,500,000 unemployed. Since that time the figures of unemployment have not gone below a million, and today, apart from the miners, there are on the register 1,500,000 unemployed. When these figures are kept in mind and related to the tremendous dislocation caused by stoppages in industry we can take the measure of the great forces which are operating to undermine the position of the British industry. For example, in 1921 there were 86 million days lost in disputes. In 1926, up to the termination of the lockout, there were 165 to 170 million days lost as a result of the lockout and General Strike.

Nor can we take all these figures out of relation to the position of **British agriculture**, which continues to decline year by year. This is a feature of the general economic crisis of Britain. So when we visualise the adverse balance with regard to import and export trade simultaneously with a decline in agriculture, simultaneously with the eating into the financial reserves of the country, we can understand how serious is the position for British economy.

At the centre of this crisis stands the **coal crisis**. Ever since 1921 when the coal crisis flared up and produced a stoppage of three months duration, an open conflict between the miners and mineowners has only been avoided by a series of “accidents”. Coal exports, which formed a great proportion of British trade exports, have been continually declining in these years of the development of home production in other countries, increasing rivalry of Britain's competitors and the coming in of new fuels — especially oil. Britain has now lost almost completely the South American market as a result of the stoppage, and a large part of her European market has been taken over by Germany. America has increased her output of coal on a tremendous scale and has been wise enough to look well ahead and to involve Britain in purchasing her coal exports right into next year. She has displaced Britain in South America and has become a great exporter of coal to England.

Nevertheless none of these efforts could make up for the cessation of British coal production and at the present moment there is a definite world shortage of coal which has had the effect of increasing prices and raising freight rates everywhere. All of these things naturally have their repercussions on the economic life of other countries besides England. French prices

have been rising rapidly. Ruhr prices of anthracite coal went up 100%, Belgian domestic coal has risen 120%. In Poland there has been such a shortage of trucks that it is declared to be disastrous. In Italy there is such a shortage of trucks that many big works are finding it difficult to carry on. In America prices are rising steadily. So much for the economic background and the economic effects of these seven months of struggle.

In thus summing up the economic situation created by the coal strike which the bourgeoisie themselves estimate to have cost £ 500,000,000 we can record that British capitalism is now compelled to draw on its reserves — that it no longer has surplus capital for export. It is faced with a heavy burden of taxation in one form or another. It has an increasing indebtedness, it faces more severe competition from her rivals.

When we review these serious factors we must also ask, has there been no **counter-balancing factors** arising out of this situation? In answering, we have to record certain developments which show that British capitalists are not prepared to give up the ghost, even economically, without great efforts to recover. This is observed in the **growth of trustification**, one of the immediate effects of this great crisis. This is going on rapidly in the mining industry itself. Not reckoning the financial control which these companies exercise over other concerns. These are indications of the immediate effects in regard to trustification in the mining industry. That they have been thought of prior to the stoppage is seen in the Coal Commission report. It was hoped to see the small mining companies starved out and swallowed by the big ones as a result of the increasing difficulties in the mining industries.

In addition to this development, we have to record the **formation of big combines in the chemical industry** where a trust has been formed with a capital of £ 30,000,000. Then we have the **Lever Combination** with a capital of about £ 86,000,000, a trustification process in the motor industry, etc. so we witness an immediate strenuous effort on the part of the bourgeoisie in Britain to pull their forces together, to intensify the process of trustification. This is the immediate economic reaction in the capitalist ranks with regard to the coal stoppage.

Nevertheless, when these efforts are taken into account we still are driven to the conclusion that the crisis has not only carried Britain further down the decline, but it has **accentuated its difficulties in its relations with other countries and accentuated the rivalry between the powers**. We can say quite definitely that the immediate effect of the lockout of seven months duration has been to further accentuate the inequalities of the capitalist forces throughout Europe especially.

Let us consider how the stoppage has effected the **political situation**. In considering the changes which have taken place during the period under review the fact is clear that however the course of events of Great Britain's diplomacy may have gone, the internal situation of Great Britain has prohibited her from following up her diplomatic plans with any great force. Hence we have been witness to a considerable setback in her plans in a variety of directions. First of all her plan for a European bloc against America and her plans for the encirclement of the Soviet Union have, to say the least, not been very successful. That these objectives were in the minds of the British Government, in her great **Locarno scheme** — there is no doubt. These were frustrated at Geneva on the one hand when Brazil made her move under the pressure of America and on the other hand by France and Germany, who have grown more fraternal in their relations, witness the **Thoiry conversations** and the **steel combine project**. But if Britain was compelled to change her line in Europe and seek new positions with the aid of Italy, no less severe are the blows she had received in the Far East.

It is only a short time ago that Britain was striving with all her might to secure a **military intervention policy in China**. But Britain dare not enter into a war under such circumstances as existed at home in this period. With her steel industries at a standstill, with the output of coal at a standstill and transport dislocated, for Britain to pursue her policy of armed intervention to its logical end was practically an impossibility. Consequently, we can say that this **great struggle of the miners** has helped the Chinese revolution enormously. Historically speaking the **General Strike and Miners' lockout** have been the allies of the Chinese Revolution.

This is not the only setback which British imperialism has received during these months. Then the troubles with **Australia**

and South Africa need only be mentioned to complete the picture.

That Britain's weakness is apparent on all fronts is obvious from the proceedings of the British Empire Conference which opened in London in the midst of the coal dispute. There were two guests at this Conference who were not wanted, but who were ever present — first the miners and second America. The Ministers assembled there knew quite well that the longer the stoppage continued the worse would be the financial condition of Great Britain and the more they must look to the U.S.A. for assistance. How can Britain export capital when her balance shows a deficit? Lest it be thought that we are exaggerating the situation, permit me to quote Mr. Keynes who estimated that the bills for overseas investments during recent years are as follows: in 1924 123 million pounds were available; in 1925 85 million pounds, while from January to September 1926 the figure has fallen to 38 million pounds. He adds that at present we have no surplus for foreign investment and that we must reckon on a deficit of £ 21 million by the end of the year.

This state of affairs does not hold great promise to the colonies, and, as Mr. Bruce, the Premier of Australia, explained with regard to markets, that if Britain cannot fill the bill then they would have to look further afield. In regard to finance we know where their eyes turn, we are all familiar with the gold bug of America. We know also that Britain last year was compelled to place an embargo on the export of capital even to the colonies, so that Australia had to look to the United States for money. We are also aware that Great Britain has been unable this year to invest any money in Canada. Indeed it is stated that at the present time Britain has less money invested in Canada than before the war. In order to meet the present situation there has been an export of gold from British holdings in Australia to the United States. So long as this process continues it is difficult to see how the bonds of the Empire are going to be held tightly together. It appears as if America is untying these bonds very nicely.

In spite of all the facts I have brought before you with regard to British economic difficulties, we are witness to a very interesting contradiction — this is a contradiction between the prosperity of the banks, finance and certain finishing, mainly luxury, industries and on the other hand the intense depression of the basic industries, such as coal, steel and textiles. This phase is referred to in the London "Times" of the 21st of June. It says: "Taken as a whole this year's report of companies engaged in heavy industries are the worst since the collapse of post-armistice boom, and in many cases the worst in all the ups and downs of a long history. Yet the remaining industries, for us, are enjoying a very fair measure of prosperity and not a very few of them an exceptional amount of it."

There is an interesting explanation given for this phenomena, by Dr. Snow, lecturing before a statistical society. He analysed the situation as follows: That whereas in 1913 75% of our imports were balanced by our exports, only 66% of these imports were met by exports in 1925, the balance being affected by invisible exports, that is to say, the income from foreign investments, shipping and all kinds of commissions, etc. These have increased in relation to visible imports and in fact have increased absolutely. For 1913, they amounted to £339,000,000, in 1923 — £373,000,000 and in 1924—25 £429,000,000.

Dr. Snow says that

"while the tendency before the war was for exports to increase in importance as a means of paying off imports, today the tendency has been reversed. The change is of menacing significance, a significance that cannot be ignored".

It means that all this flourishing of the banks and of certain luxury industries, is due to the income derived from investments overseas, in the Dominions, the Colonies, etc. This rise, which is indicated as an absolute rise in the income, which is to a considerable extent hiding the fundamental seriousness of the economic situation in Britain, is due to the fact that for a number of years these investments have not been paying fully and now they have come to fruition. Hence the absolute rise of income from investments in the colonies, in the Dominions, etc. But even when these are taken into account we find

that this year, as a result of the stoppage, there is a big deficit in the national balance sheet, and an inability on the part of Great Britain — even from a financial point of view, to maintain her hold upon the colonies and of the Dominions especially, because of her inability to supply capital to these parts of the Empire.

To think that there is a possibility of Britain recovering by shifting her unemployed to the Dominions, as is indicated in the Imperial Conference is equally fatuous. This idea of exporting the great masses of the unemployed to the Dominions as a solution of the situation only needs a moment's consideration. What do the Dominions require to make migration there at all a workable proposition? The Dominions do not want the mass of unemployed that are in England, what they do want is immigrants with £ 400 of capital each. Well, I do not know any one of the unemployed who can get anywhere near that figure. So let us examine the situation in the Dominions and see how they feel about it. New Zealand for example:

"In all the cities, except perhaps in Wellington, which is undergoing a rapid extension of building in the labour situation there has been a worse state of unemployment than in 1921—1922. Meanwhile every steamer from Britain is bringing in masses of emigrants. It is true that the farming areas will absorb a certain proportion — but the British coming into New Zealand do not want to go on the farms.

They are replacing the native population in the industries" and this of course has caused dissatisfaction among the natives. So there is developing a feeling against Great Britain as a consequence of this proposal to unload the unemployed in New Zealand. That it is the same in Australia goes without saying. The possibility therefore of handing on the great mass of unemployed, these two million paupers, to the Dominions proves to be not so simple a solution of the economic difficulties in which Great Britain is today.

But not only are they failing with regard to their emigration schemes, but the dominions are developing their own self-assertive bourgeoisie. Australia is developing her own bourgeoisie, and very much so. Where before the war only 13% of Australia's debts were owed to Australians, this year Australian capital has so far developed on national lines, that 55% of the debts of Australia are internal debts to Australians, meaning a corresponding decrease in regard to Great Britain. Consequently it is not surprising that Mr. Bruce gets on his hind legs and speaks very frankly in regard to the financial and political aspects of Australia. When speaking of Australian relations to the British Empire and America he said on Nov. 11th in London:

"To us in Australia this friendship (with America) is of vital concern. We are particularly closely drawn towards our great sister democracy. Our constitution is based on hers. Our development has travelled along similar lines. Our problems are the same. America's traditional policy of non-interference in European affairs is one which finds echo in our country. And we feel that when America struck a blow for her own freedom at the end of the 18th century she struck a blow for all the British Dominions of today"...

Very tight bands are these that are binding the Empire together! After the defeat of Lord Byng in Canada the new government declared that he was not going to interfere with the domestic politics of Canada and the next week Canada appointed her own ambassador to Washington! We have only to add to these series of incidents the declarations and resolutions of the Imperial Conference published a few days ago. They openly proclaim the disintegration process which I have indicated here.

Summing up therefore the effects of the general strike and the miners' lockout upon the British Empire we can say: They have accentuated the centrifugal tendencies, destroyed financial unity, increased the contradictions in the economic fabric of the Empire and strengthened considerably the political tendency in the Dominions to look elsewhere for assistance. This struggle has strengthened also the foundation for unity between the working class of Britain and that of the Dominions,

the oppressed peoples of the colonies and those other countries to which British Imperialism aspires.

Now let us turn to an examination of the effect of the struggle upon the classes. Reaction of the General Strike and the miners' lockout on the bourgeoisie internationally can be summed up as follows: first of all there was reaction and open solidarity against the General Strike, but once they were of the opinion that the British bourgeoisie were not immediately to be thrown on the scrap-heap they began to take advantage of the situation. Britain's struggle became at once their opportunity and they seized it.

As for the **British bourgeoisie** we saw that immediately the trade unions were on the point of declaring the General Strike, all forms of democracy were scrapped, the Emergency Law was promulgated over the signature of the monarch. Parliament and all its subordinate bodies passed under the dictatorship. The call to King and Country became openly and unashamedly a call for the protection of property. The army, the navy, air forces, police, church and press were mobilised behind the Emergency Law. To these forces a large proportion of the petty-bourgeoisie rallied solidly against the workers. These were the outstanding features of the class relations at the outbreak of the General Strike.

All this we have studied very fully in our June thesis of the Executive Committee and so we need not dwell upon it too fully. The members of the **Liberal Party** declared their solidarity with the **Tory Government**. This solidarity was maintained until some weeks after the general strike was betrayed. The **Labour Party** leadership, the **General Council**, the **Parliamentary Labour Party** went with the General Strike, in order to betray it and denounce it. They even surrendered their parliamentary activities to the bourgeoisie. This resulted in the maintenance of a wide front of class solidarity against the workers when, had the labour forces taken up the lead of the Communist Party to force the government to resign and to compel it to face a general election, the solidarity of these forces would have been broken. But scared by the staging of a civil war setting by the government, the middle classes thought they were directly facing the issue of civil war, and in their fear they rallied to the government. Had the labour movement directed the strike towards forcing a **general election** they would have had the means not only to develop the strike situation but to bring many of the middle class elements to the side of the workers and away from the government.

The end of the General Strike did not mean the end of the Emergency Law nor the end of the dictatorship. The capitulation on the part of **Thomas, Purcell and Company** did not mean the capitulation of the government. The Emergency Powers continued right through the miners' struggle, making futile the paltry opposition of the labour forces in parliament and putting to scorn all talk of "good will between the classes". But the government began to lose its support. A factor in this change was the attitude of the government to the **church leaders**. Whatever may be said about the middle classes in England, they have a reverence for the church. When a section of the Liberals supported the churchmen, this process went a little further. We see this in the results in the by-elections which followed immediately after the General Strike. But this process of turning against the government culminated with the passing of the **8-hour law**. This event is the turning point in the fate of the government and the class solidarity which supported it. From disputing about the General Strike, the Labour forces led by **MacDonald**, who had been the allies of the government in the denunciation of the General Strike, had now to change their line of action. With the introduction of the 8-hour law they again became allies of the miners and were compelled to oppose the law. So also the Liberal forces led by **Lloyd George**. So instead of the Tory Government rallying the whole of the middle class forces, labour bureaucracy included, now the middle class forces, the labour bureaucracy and the Liberals turned against the government.

But although this process was proceeding rapidly into the ranks of the petty bourgeois forces, the Tory Party rapidly passed entirely under the domination of what are known as the "**Die-Hards**", whose programme includes, strengthening the powers of the House of Lords, emergency legislation against

trade unions, penalising of pickets, subjection of trade union ballots and accounts to government inspection, etc.; to disenfranchise the unemployed and the curtailment of the powers of municipalities. Remember, we have here **two million paupers** and they are proposing as a political manoeuvre against the working class to disenfranchise this large body of workers in order to prevent the normal operation of the Parliamentary system. The recent **municipal elections** of course, give them reason for alarm and show how great has been this change in the political outlook of the masses of the population. The gains of the Labour Party during the Municipal elections have been so great that they constitute almost a landslide.

But if this attack is important not less is that conveyed in the following from the "**Daily Mail**", directed at the municipal authorities where there is a Labour majority. This organ says: "The second point of the greatest importance is to give to the Home Secretary fuller authority over the various local police forces." This declaration along with the recent actions of the Home Secretary for maintaining order, makes it practically clear that the bourgeoisie in Britain has no intention whatever of being deprived of the control of the police force.

When the recruiting for the Organisation for maintenance of Supplies was begun by the Government in preparation for the strike, and during the strike, we were witness to a distinct class selection process, partly due to the reaction of the strike upon the middle classes and partly due to deliberate agitation of the Home Secretary. The **Fascists**, who up to now had played no very important independent role in the open, were absorbed by the O. M. S., and Police Magistrates openly advised the Fascists to join the police force, which, since the police strike of 1919 has been thoroughly cleansed of discontented elements, and subjected to a process of militarisation by the introduction of army elements guaranteed against internal propaganda. So grateful were the bourgeoisie for the service of the police in the general strike, that they raised a voluntary subscription in the "**Times**" newspaper amounting to £ 250,000. Throughout the General Strike and the miners' lockout, they have constituted the most militant forces of oppression. They constitute a definite class army — the advance guard of the standing army of the bourgeoisie. Imbued with Fascist ideology, and under military control and discipline, this police force constitutes as important a problem to the working class movement in Britain as the army and navy.

Summing up our observation on the effect of the long struggle on the bourgeoisie in Britain we can say that it shows a predominance of the "**Die-hard**" elements in the ranks of the Tories, a complete disintegration of the Liberal Party, an absorption of Fascist ideas simultaneous with the militarisation of the state forces and police; a drift of the middle class (especially the lower middle class) towards the Labour Party which steadily absorbs the Liberal Party membership.

Now let us turn to the effect of this dispute upon the labour movement. How did the labour forces react to the events of these seven months? You all know how the leaders sabotaged and betrayed the General Strike. Now let us see how they acted during the lockout. The German reformist press says:

"We are supporting the British coal miners' fight best by cutting off the markets for British capital. Only in this way will the British coal miners' strike be won. If we did not deprive British capital of its markets then the coal barons would have no fear of the strike and would let the strike run on without end."

Cheering, isn't it? This explains why eleven million tons of blackleg coal entered Britain between May and September. Then please listen to the friendly words of the "**Vorwaerts**" on **Cook**, the miners' leaders:

"Cook, by his policy of everything or nothing has gotten himself into a blind alley. He uses Moscow money and thereby makes himself dependent upon Moscow — which pays and dictates... For the Russian roubles which Cook brings them the British coalminers pay altogether too high interest. Therefore anyone who understands and sees things must have the courage to do everything possible to bring the movement to a speedy conclusion."

Therefore, anyone who understands and sees things must do everything possible to bring the movement to a speedy conclusion.

Talking of money investments, the **Amsterdam International** no doubt will get all the honours, for they say: "If we lend money to help the miners, they must pay interest".

The **Miners International** leadership was no better, indeed it was worse. With the reactionary **Hodges** at its head, it advocated wage reductions and longer hours for the British miners and has conducted an unparalleled campaign of vilification of the British Miners' leaders. The **Miners International** has been an instrument for the defeat of the British miners.

These actions are on a par with the **General Council of the Trade Union Congress** upon whose shoulders lies the full responsibility for an absolutely treacherous betrayal of the miners in the **General Strike**. It has conducted a campaign of sabotage of the miners throughout the seven months. We all know of their conduct at the **Paris and Berlin Conferences of the Anglo-Russian Committee**. We all know their conduct when they shamefully conducted the policies of **Baldwin** and refused to lift a finger in the aid of the miners. We can all remember how they sneered at the proposals of our Russian comrades. Now they have withdrawn the **Secretary and Chairman from the Anglo-Russian Committee**. What does that mean? It means that they are shattering the **Anglo-Russian Committee** and endeavouring to avoid responsibility for it. They are doing it on behalf of the mineowners and against the interests of the British working class, who as events will prove are against such an action. That is the meaning of their action at the present time.

Then I would draw your attention to the actions of the **International Co-operative Alliance**. We may as well put them all together while we are at it. The **International Co-operative Alliance** received correspondence from our Russian comrades asking that the **International Co-operative Alliance** render aid to the miners. It postponed consideration of this correspondence for months and then we witnessed the action of the British co-operative leaders who are of the same kidney as the **General Council**. They made a storm inside of the **Co-operative Alliance** meeting, opposing aid for the British miners, on the plea that if the British co-operatives think the miners need aid, they, the British co-operatives will propose it. The Russians must stop interfering with British affairs and leave this business entirely alone, which is considered to be completely a British affair. Such is the action of the **International Co-operative Alliance**.

But if this be the case with the leaders of the organisation, the same cannot be said of large numbers of the rank and file, both of the co-operatives and the reformist unions. Many local organisations have helped the miners in spite of their leaders. They have done it through many organisations, some directly, some through the **Workers' International Relief**. In some cases they succeeded in bringing pressure on the central organs of their unions to secure aid. Even the reactionary **American Federation of Labour** has had to take part in sending funds to help the British miners as a result of the pressure of the revolutionary workers in that organisation. But when all allowance is made for these efforts, the amount of financial assistance, of help of one form or another, little has been accomplished on an international scale.

Whatever may be the weaknesses of the **Communist International**, one thing stands out clearly to the workers of the world: the absolute unanimity of the call of the **Communist Parties for class solidarity** "Help the miners!" has been the first slogan of all the **Communist Parties**. The revolutionary workers of **China, of India, have out of their poverty sent their contributions to the miners' fund**. **Class war prisoners of Poland** have deprived themselves of the help given by relief organisations and passed it on to the miners. The **Passaic strikers of America** have also taken money out of their own funds in order to prove their solidarity with the British miners. But greater than all these is the colossal aid of the workers of the first **Workers' Republic**. There has been nothing like this in history. Such a sustained solidarity and aid as that of the Russian workers to the miners is a guarantee of the final victory of the workers on all fronts.

Comrades, we know and the great masses of all lands know full well whatever the filthy lying bourgeoisie may say either

through the voice of **Joynson Hicks** or the snarling beast, **Birkenhead**, that the magnificent aid of the workers of the **Soviet Union** to the miners and working class of **Great Britain**, was and is a voluntary aid given in the name of revolutionary working class solidarity. The trade unions of the **Soviet Union** not only drew the **Soviet Union** closer to the workers all over the world, they have advanced the cause of the **Red International of Labour Unions** of which they are a part and which has also conducted a campaign for aid and strengthened immensely the solidarity movement within the **Amsterdam International**.

When all this is recorded, however, and compared with what has been accomplished by the reformist unions, we still have to acknowledge our weaknesses. Although the Parties of the **International** have done much propaganda concerning the strike and the lockout, yet we have to face the fact that we have been unable to move the unions into action on any large scale. There have been a few instances — the actions of the **transport workers of France** and the **Hamburg dockers** stand out in isolation. The question must be faced frankly. Our **International Parties** have not yet dug deep roots into the trade unions. We have several large Parties numbering over 70,000 over 100,000 in membership. I find it very difficult to think that these Parties have conducted their work effectively inside the trade unions when he see how passive they have been in reacting to the experience which we have passed through, when we see that they have left the unions completely under the control of the **Social Democrats**.

Two tasks lie definitely before our Parties. We must understand that every large national dispute is now an international event of primary importance. We must strive to internationalise the struggles of our national life. We must extend, broaden and develop our trade union work and establish our influence in the transport unions and in the unions of the heavy industries. When we recollect that 11 million tons of blackleg coal have been shipped into Britain during the lockout, these lessons should be manifest and clear to everyone of us.

We must internationalise our work and take further steps in the direction of transforming the **Communist International** into an international Party.

Now let us turn to the British situation, in particular, and to the effect on the **British Labour movement**. There have been three important stages in the differentiation process following the **General Strike**. When the **General Strike** capitulated and the **Lefts** became **Rights**, the first differentiation took place. The **Miners' Federation, the Minority Movement and the Communist Party** remained on the **Left**. The rest went over to the bourgeoisie. The next important change took place in the passing of the 8-hour law. Then the **Labour Party and the Liberal Party** lined up objectively with the **Left forces against the Government**. The third stage arrived when the differentiation process deepened in the **Miners' Federation**, first by the rejection of the **Bishop's proposals** which had the support of the leaders, even **Cook**; second, when the **Miners' Conference** accepted the **Government terms**, third, when the miners proved themselves in advance of **Cook and the Bishops**; fourth, when the rank and file proved itself in advance of the **Government and the National Conference** by rejecting the proposals and mobilised around the policies of the **Communist Party and the Minority Movement**.

Of course, this rapid development in the advance of the **Communist Party and the Minority Movement** is not an isolated phenomenon. The greater the need of assistance to the miners, the more the **Labour bureaucracy** hardened itself against the masses and agitated against the strike. This gave an impetus to the profound developments which have been proceeding throughout the years of chronic crisis, since 1920. These years of crisis have shattered the main sections of the labour aristocracy. The coal strike has carried this process still further into what were known as the sheltered trades. The depression in the heavy industries is having its inexorable effect upon the railways. The four great railway companies of England show a reduction of over £4,000,000 of receipts in 1925 as compared with 1924. This year there is a reduction, due to the strike, of £25,000,000. There are 50,000 railwaymen unemployed today and during the last few years the railway workers had reductions totalling not less than £55,000,000. A similar story could be told of the transport workers and it is obvious that in all transport the economic basis of reformism is being rapidly

destroyed, but the more the masses have to struggle, the more the leaders of the bureaucracy become solidified and play the role of open allies of the bourgeoisie to prevent struggles or to betray them.

Nevertheless, whilst we have witnessed this we have also to observe the process which is operating in the opposite direction. It is on the basis of the movement among the masses that we witness a rapid growth of the Minority Movement, and the rise of an organised Left Wing in the Labour Party which for the first time appeared as an organised bloc at the recent Labour Party Conference. At the same time we are witness to a rapid growth of the membership of the Communist Party itself and also of its ally the Young Communist League.

The development of the Left Wing of the Labour Party is something which demands most earnest attention, for we are now witness not only to exclusion of Communists from the Labour Party, but to the expulsion of local mass organisations, local Labour Parties from the Labour Party. These local Labour forces which sympathise with Communists, which will pass Communist resolutions or resolutions of a Left Wing character, are now being expelled from the Labour Party. At least 13 Labour Parties have been expelled from the national body and the national body is attempting to create in these districts new Labour Parties rivalling those which have been expelled. This is a splitting movement amongst the masses, increasing the difficulties of the working class forces.

Here is a very interesting problem for the extended application of the united front policy. We have to urge not simply the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party but for the organisation of "Left" forces into a united bloc, including both those who remain in the Labour Party and those who are expelled, fighting under the hegemony and leadership of the Communist Party for the re-affiliation of the expelled local Labour Parties simultaneous with the fight for the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party. This is a wide mass action which the Communist Party itself can lead and extend.

Simultaneous with this attempt to split the forces of the workers, there proceeds the incorporation of the Liberals. As the Liberal Party disintegrates, the Labour Party strives to become not simply a Labour Party, with a labour programme, but a national "people's" party which will represent everything except a definite class policy on behalf of the workers.

But this process does not move forward without difficulties for the labour bureaucracy. These difficulties arise from the trade unions, which as yet are the source of the Labour Party revenue, and from the bulk of the membership who are faced with severe struggle to maintain their most elementary requirements. Nevertheless, at the present stage of development the consolidation of the trade union bureaucracy against all struggles enables the Labour Party to expand its influence and to combat the efforts to organise the masses for struggle and divert the masses' resentment into parliamentary reformism. In this the Independent Labour Party is playing an important role, ostensibly playing a radical part by talking of struggle for "a living wage", "Socialism in our time", etc. in order to keep the workers loyal to the Labour Party leadership, which is of I. L. P. composition. Actually it is playing a counter-revolutionary rôle and is the agent of the bourgeoisie. It works out an extensive industrial peace programme, including work in the co-operatives, as a means of peaceable transition towards Socialism.

But this is a very dangerous game, this using of revolutionary phrases by reformist hands, for many of the workers in the I. L. P. take the revolutionary phrases seriously and think that all of them are real slogans of struggle. Consequently, the Leftward movement is also a growing movement inside the Independent Labour Party itself and is a part of the wide Left movement within the Labour Party.

Several important facts can therefore be established concerning this process of differentiation within the Labour movement.

First, a movement of the masses towards the Labour Party

and an awakening of their political consciousness, witness the recent Municipal election results.

Second, the domination of this movement by the reformists.

Third, a broad-based movement of the masses towards the Left both in the trade unions and the Labour Party.

Fourth, a great growth in revolutionary consciousness especially by the masses of the Miners' Federation.

Fifth, the increasing hegemony of the Communist Party over the Leftward moving masses.

The whole of this process of the shifting of class forces, and of differentiation in the Labour movement, has gone on in the teeth of the aggressive policy of the Tory Government. The more fiercely the Government pursues this course the more certainly will it accentuate this process both quantitatively and qualitatively.

We are not only witnessing the development in the Left Wing of the Labour Party, which incorporates a Left Wing in the Independent Labour Party, but we witness also the growing strength of the Minority Movement in the trade unions. Nothing was more startling to the bourgeoisie and the labour bureaucracy than the part played by the Minority Movement in the General Strike and the miners' lockout. It startled them first of all with its preparations for the General Strike. They thought, after the General Strike, with the great defeat of the masses, that it would be very difficult for the Minority Movement to get a successful conference. Contrary to expectations we saw the annual conference of the Minority Movement get as large a number of delegates as it obtained in the special conferences before the General Strike. Here was a clear indication that the Minority Movement was not simply of an ephemeral character, but a development which had got its roots deep in the masses and was now playing an increasingly dominant part in the development of the trade unions.

What then are the perspectives which immediately open before us? There is not the least doubt that the Tory Government today is hated as much as the coalition government of 1922, and that a general election would bring a Labour Government, possibly with the aid of the Liberals. That such a prospect opens up big possibilities is obvious to every one of us. But there is another perspective which is really more immediate, for in one of his speeches, Joynson Hicks, as spokesman for the government, said:

"there will be the elections three years hence. I do not see why there should be one now. We do not resign and proceed with a general election merely for the utterings of some discontented elements".

The threat is obvious. The defeat of the miners will undoubtedly carry with it the defeat of every section of the working class. The Government may rush through with all urgency the policy to which the Scarborough Conference of the Tory Party committed it, with regard to the Trade Unions, the Political Levy, disfranchisement of the unemployed, strengthening of the House of Lords, etc., and force the most bitter conflicts and degradation upon the masses.

We know that the railway companies have been holding off for some months pending the finish of the miners' struggle for the introduction of the reduction of wages upon which the railway unions have already agreed. We are confident that, just as we were witness to an immediate flood of employers' demands for further reduction of wages and changes of conditions immediately after the General Strike, so we shall be witness to an attack upon the rest of the workers. The struggle is beset with the greatest difficulties. The unions are fettered by all kinds of agreements. The Miners' Federation itself is almost broken in pieces by the recent "terms of district settlement".

Largely upon the manner in which our Party in Britain and the Communist International faces this immediate perspective depends the future course of events. Let us not be under any illusion — the Communist Party and the Communist International are now a definite political factor in Britain operating at a time when the objective conditions are increasingly favourable for the growth of our power and influence. For this reason it is

necessary for us to take stock of the work of our Party in Britain during this period.

Our Party in Britain came through the General Strike with honours. The Communist International agreed on this, and so did large sections of the British workers. Since the General Strike, there are a number of outstanding achievements to our Party's credit. It has more than doubled its membership in a period of persecution wherein not less than 1,200 of its members were sent to prison for varying terms. It can record that in this membership it has had very few passers indeed. The Party has pulled its full strength and its recruits are drawn from the best elements of the proletariat.

This is a fact worth recording. Most of the workers who have joined are not fresh workers in the movement, but those who are active workers in the trade unions and in the British Labour movement and the co-operative movement. Further it has drawn into its ranks about 2,000 women workers who have played no small part in great mass actions of women workers in the miners' struggle. It has led the way in the organising of a Left Wing in the Labour Party. On all fronts, whether on the question of aid rendered either personally or in various organisations or in the conducting of a united front campaign wherein it exposed completely all the hypocrisy of the I. L. P., we can say that the British Party has succeeded. But its greatest achievement lies in its success within the Miners' Federation. No one denies that the recent determined rejection of the miners of the terms of capitulation was due to the intense campaign of the Communist Party and of the Minority Movement. Even the capitalist press declares that had it not been for our work in the Miners' Federation they could have achieved their victory much more easily. These are triumphs for the British Party and triumphs which we gladly record. Nevertheless, it was only to be expected that a Party operating amidst rapid growth and changes would make errors. Indeed, it was easier to make errors in these seven months than before the General Strike. Before the General Strike there was a general forward movement of the whole of the trade unions. But the rapidly changing situation after the General Strike has presented us with a far more difficult period. In this period our Party made mistakes, mistakes however which we can say are rapidly being corrected.

Many of them have already been corrected. Others are in the process of being corrected. For example, our Party (and I myself also, as I have already acknowledged at a meeting of the Presidium) made a mistake concerning the declarations of the Russian Trade Unions on the General Strike. We suggested that the fight should not be carried on in this way, that in order to save the Anglo-Russian Committee there should not be vigorous criticism of the English reformist trade unions by the Soviet unions. This was wrong.

I am glad to say our Party unanimously agrees that this was wrong. We also made an error which has also been acknowledged, that we failed in the early stages after the General Strike to clearly expose the role of the Left Wing capitulators. But on this point I will not dwell further. The mistakes you will find in the theses, but I want to direct attention to certain characteristic weaknesses which have not yet been fully overcome.

There is, I think, a slowness to appreciate political changes and second, a slowness to turn the struggle into political channels. For example, I have explained how on the passing of the 8-hour law, there was a complete shifting of social forces. And yet, a number of weeks passed — more than a month — before we put forward the slogans and began the campaigns which were necessary to meet this new situation. This movement of the political forces on the passing of the 8-hour law called for a prompt demand for the resignation of the Government and dissolution of parliament, for the repeal of the 8-hour law. They were hesitatingly put forward, dropped and later re-issued. But they ought not only have been put forward as demands, they ought to have characterised the whole campaign. There is no question of these demands being considered in contrast to the campaign for the embargo and levy. The latter are slogans for the development of the weapons of the labour movement. The former, the political objects of the struggle arising immediately from the government's new line of action. Lately the Party has developed this campaign. Nevertheless I draw attention to this slowness to adjust itself to the political requirements of the

situation so that we watch this weakness with increased attention and urge upon our Party the importance of bringing out the full political significance of the struggle, and to guard against the danger of conducting the struggle simply as a trade union struggle. Nevertheless, whilst noting these errors, we can say with confidence that our Party in Great Britain has in the main conducted a sound line of action which is attracting the masses in Great Britain.

As to the **Minority Movement**, I have already indicated the importance of this movement and the part which it has been playing. But I want to add an observation here in view of the importance of this movement in relation to the development of our Party. What is the principal weakness of the **Minority Movement**? I think we can say quite definitely that the weakness of the **Minority Movement** today lies in the fact that its influence has not been transformed into concrete organisation. It remains still a great influence rather than activity against reformist leaders, rather than an **organised effort** to change those leaders, replacing them with revolutionary leaders. The necessity to overcome this weakness is one of the principal tasks which we must emphasise in the immediate days ahead of us. When we concentrate our forces not only on exposing the Trade Union leaders by propaganda, agitation, analysis, etc., and follow up the development of campaigns by organised effort to definitely remove those responsible for betraying the workers, we shall continue to witness experiences such as we have witnessed in the Miners' struggle. Here we have seen over and over again the masses ahead of the leaders, nationally and locally and yet no change of leadership. And why? Simply because our influence and the influence of the **Minority Movement** has not been transformed into machinery of the **Minority Movement** through which could be conducted a systematic battle to remove this leadership.

Now what are the conclusions, our principal tasks? We have concluded as follows: That the unequal development of capitalist countries has been made more unequal; Britain's decline as world power has been accentuated, while the power and prestige of her rivals has been developed thus making for sharp developments in the struggle between the powers. We have witnessed the Labour and trade union bureaucracy, in Great Britain and internationally, becoming more and more consolidated as the active agents of the bourgeoisie for the Americanisation of Britain and Europe, for the internal resistance to the struggle of the workers who have moved toward the Left. Further we are witness to the great efforts on the part of the bourgeoisie to force through a greater concentration of industry. Therefore we have to say first of all, that our **international tasks under these circumstances are clearly to intensify the struggle for international unity of the trade unions, to concentrate the energy of the Parties on work inside the unions, in order to give them correct political direction.**

In Britain we can see that the reaction of this pressure upon the labour movement is bound: first, to drive the masses and large sections of the petty bourgeoisie to the Labour Party; second, to extend the process of differentiation of the Labour movement and drive large masses of the workers to the Left and to the Communist Party. The task of the Communist Party under these circumstances is to place itself at the head of the struggle of the masses, to prepare the workers for further war against the trade union bureaucracy; to develop a relentless policy of exposure of the reactionary labour leaders, revealing them to the masses as agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement; to concentrate this process upon the political tasks before the working class.

These are our conclusions, our prospects and our tasks.

We declare to the bourgeoisie, — carry on in your madness, you are torn asunder by your own contradictions.

We declare to the lackeys of the bourgeoisie MacDonald, Thomas, Purcell and the Amsterdam leaders — also carry on — seven months of ceaseless efforts of the masses in spite of your infamy and your treachery have proven that your days also are numbered, as are those of your masters.

To the miners of Britain we declare: — your defeat is not a defeat, but a retreat before more powerful foes; you, with

the working class, will regather your forces, secure a revolutionary leadership and rise again to conquer.

To the workers of the world we declare — that the seven months struggle of the workers against the oldest imperialist country has produced unheard of manifestations of working class solidarity; they have demonstrated the unstable character of capitalist stabilisation, the utter futility of reformism and the inescapability of the revolutionary tasks before the working class. They affirm in unmistakable language that the October Revolution of Russia was the first October and not the last. (Prolonged applause.)

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

The Presidium proposes a commission on the questions of the German Party to be composed as follows:

Chairman: **Bukharin.**

Vice-chairman: **Kuusinen.**

Secretary: **Doriot.**

Members: **Gallacher, Vondracek, Kilbom, Stalin, Bogutsky, Ercoli, Pepper, Nikolaevitch, Roy, Schatzkin.**

The proposal was adopted unanimously and the session thereupon adjourned.