

Full Text of Speech by Comrade Losovsky.

Comrades; the situation in the German Party at the present time is very serious and those decisions which we will adopt now, will, undoubtedly, have an international significance. In this sense, we can agree with what has been said by Comrade Clara Zetkin in the beginning of the session, when she proposed to postpone the consideration of this question. But just because the decision which we must adopt has a great international significance, it is just the reason why it must be taken as quickly as possible. And now the answer must be given to those questions which are raised at the present time by the growing activity of the Right faction in the C. P. G.

For politically inexperienced people it would appear, that the struggle within the German Communist Party has as its starting point the moral considerations of the Wittorf case, etc. But it is quite clear for everyone that the Hamburg incident was only a pretext, upon which various elements, not only within the Party, but chiefly in the Central Committee seized. And only after the Presidium of the Comintern adopted a political decision on this question, only then it became clear that the Hamburg incident is only a petty pretext used by the Rights. Because, in reality, on account of the fact that in Hamburg there were misappropriated 1800 marks — an event of the greatest historic importance — it could not in any degree follow that the decisions of the VI. Congress are incorrect, that the programme of the Comintern is unacceptable and that the entire Comintern holds an incorrect line. It is quite apparent that this entire staging of the Hamburg case on a national wide scale in Germany and then an attempt to carry the Hamburg case into the entire Comintern was nothing more nor less than a strategic manoeuvre. We have to deal now with serious political differences, we have to deal now with serious disagreements and for this reason all these petty matters have a very small significance.

The external form of those documents, about which Comrade Serra spoke condescendingly, also do not have a great significance in the present case. Comrade Serra undoubtedly has a very refined literary taste and he could write these documents in a much better way but we do not argue with Comrade Serra about the literary form, but about the content, and if Comrade Serra desires that the content of the letter should be written in a somewhat better style, not a single member of the Presidium would argue against it. But his talent of literary style was directed, in this case, towards writing a document of a different political content, and this is unacceptable. For this reason Comrade Serra, we shall argue with you, not about the form but regarding the essence of the documents, regarding the essence of a split existing in the C. P. G.

I would like to dwell here chiefly on the differences and disagreements in the sphere of the trade union tactics, because in this question fundamental differences have been reflected, regarding the method of winning over the masses, i. e., that fundamental question which has always occupied the attention of the C. I. And if in a few words, we shall define in what consists the essence, the roots of the differences, then we must state that they consist of the following: The factional struggle on the part of the Rights sharpened, beginning with that very moment, when the Comintern and the Profintern decided to sharpen the struggle against social democracy, and the moment when the Comintern and Profintern decided to sharpen the struggle against trade union bureaucrats, at the IX. Plenum of the E. C. of the C. I., at the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., at the VI. Congress of the Comintern. From this moment the Right faction within the C. P. G. has definitely shaped its political line and advanced a new platform. In this lies the root of the differences and I wish that Comrade Serra would give an answer to this question. Because, in reality, all the differences within the C. P. G. revolve in the sphere of the attitude towards the social democracy. The question of our attitude towards the methods of winning over the masses and the attitude of our Party toward social-democracy and the trade union bureaucracy is reflected in the trade union questions and the problem of the strike committee. If we take this basic problem and ask ourselves what position is taken at the present time by the Right faction within the German Communist Party in relation to this fundamental question — whether it was necessary to sharpen the struggle against the social democracy — yes, or no, — what do

the Rights say in regard to this question? They say the following: the Comintern and the Profintern (they say so word for word) have purposely invented some sort of a change in the character of social-democracy and of the trade union bureaucracy in order to create counter-arguments and to carry out its own tactic. This is actually written in that number of "Against the Current", which does not particularly beautify the German Right faction and those who defend it.

In general, Comrades, the Comintern opposition has acquired such a habit: as soon as they begin to go out of the Comintern, they proceed to issue an organ "Against the Current". Such was the case in France, and is now taking place in Germany. They want to utilise the historic example of Lenin in 1914 when he issued the slogan against the chauvinist current in the working class. Against what current do they go? They go against the Communist current and for this reason their organ should be called: "Against the Communist Current". This will be clear. There is no use aping. There is no use taking up banners which have no relation to the deeds of this faction and which cannot in any degree cover that opportunism and that openly social-democratic, thoroughly decayed spirit with which are permeated absolutely all writings of this German opposition.

Let us return to the essence of the argument. And so the Comintern and the Profintern have purposely invented changes in the character of social-democracy and in its policy in order to find justification for their tactic. In a number of this organ "Against the Current" they quote the fundamental resolutions of the Comintern and Profintern dealing with the characterisation of the present Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy, namely the merging together with the apparatus of the bourgeois state, the participation in the suppression by the police of the strike movements and so on. And about this characteristic they say: "Here, this characteristic, given by the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. represents an excessive exaggeration". Not simply an exaggeration but an excessive exaggeration. And further: "did not Noske betray the workers in 1919, was the social democracy of ten years ago better? It would seem that out of the fact that the social-democracy was the same as at the present time, it would have been necessary to make the conclusions regarding the sharpening of the struggle against the social-democracy before. But they advance all this not for the purpose of defending the line of the Comintern but in order to find a loophole in order to prove that no changes took place, that everything remains as of old, that the Amsterdam trade union bureaucrats carry out the economic struggle, that the Amsterdamers did not go over from political to economic strike breaking, that the merging together with the apparatus of the bourgeois state, did not take place, that those changes about which the resolutions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and the VI. Congress of the Comintern speak, did not take place. And if it is so, then, according to their opinion, it is necessary to leave everything as of old, as it was in the old times.

But comrades, what old times do they want? In this organ "Against the Current", in three numbers in succession, they charge the Comintern and the C. P. G. that the Comintern and the Profintern, on certain questions, changed their old position or adopted new formulations regarding our tactic, which differs from the position taken by the III. Congress of the Comintern and the II. Congress of the Profintern, etc. Consequently, it seems that we create such a situation: that we are calling the Congresses of the Comintern and of the Profintern in order to repeat that which has been already said before. Because, if we did not make at the Congresses of the Comintern and the Profintern conclusions out of the new developments which arose in the international, inter-state, and inter-class relationships, then it would not be necessary to call the congresses.

But, comrades, what are they referring to, what are they chiefly emphasising? They have several fundamental striking points. And these several fundamental points they are concentrating around the question of our trade union policy. But it is necessary to see that all the other questions revolve around the question of the trade union policy. I am dealing only with the question of the trade union policy and with those weak spots which they found in the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and the decisions of the VI. Congress of the C. I.

First of all I was exceedingly pleased by Comrade Serra, who studied, with pencil in his hand, the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and quoted certain parts which he thought, justified his line. Comrade Serra, during the course of half an hour, has tried to prove here that it is necessary to work in the reformist unions. Please notice, that every time when in the Communist International in the sphere of the trade union work an opportunistic error is contemplated, there begins a counter-attack with the cry: Do not leave the trade unions, do not split the trade unions, etc. This, comrades, is a very clever strategic manoeuvre but in view of the fact that in the Profintern and in the Comintern we have repeatedly seen it, it is impossible to fool us. We argue with them not on the question as to whether it is necessary to work in the trade unions, but on the question how to work, what to do there and how to conduct the struggle with the reformists. And it is not necessary to come to the Comintern and to quote the resolutions proposed by us and to speak about the necessity of work in the trade unions. With such manoeuvres you will not confuse anyone, except yourself. The question consists in determining how to work in the trade unions, what to do in the trade unions, what work to carry on and how to sharpen our struggle against the social-democracy and against the reformist trade union bureaucracy. I ask Comrade Serra, if in his opinion, it is accidental that the opposition within the C. P. G. has grown up at the time when the C. I. decided to sharpen the struggle against the social-democracy? Is it accidental, in your opinion? Do you think that it is an accident that the Right opposition finally took definite form at the time when we carried out a number of decisions to the effect that the Party must fight for an independent leadership in the economic struggles? Do you think that this is accidental? No! Here are manifested those social-democratic remnants, that social-democratic ideology which still has its influence on a number of Communist functionaries in Germany. This is not an accident. Such a coincidence should have compelled such leading comrades as Comrade Serra and others to think. But let us go further. What do they propose in opposition to that which is being done by the Communist Party? They say "The bankruptcy of the Party line, which means the line of the Comintern and the Profintern, was with particular clearness shown in the Ruhr conflict. In the Ruhr the Party has suffered a defeat and here the new position of the Profintern and the Comintern has also suffered a defeat. Look, is it true or not? What are the fundamental changes which have taken place in economics? If the resolutions declaring that we have, particularly in Germany, great successes of the capitalist rationalisation, signed by Comrade Serra and others are true, and it is undoubtedly true, then I confirm that the capitalist stabilisation signifies a change in the structure of the masses of the workers employed in production. It means that the number of the highly qualified workers will become smaller, it means the drawing in of the new cadres of the untrained and women proletariat. It means that millions of new workers who play a decisive role in production, are drawn into industries and that the Party which bears the name of the revolutionary Party not in vain, but which is actually revolutionary, must now pay attention to these new millions of the unskilled workers and women who are handling all the production machines, under the supervision of a very small number of skilled workers. And if the Party will not do this, then such a Party is unworthy to be called a revolutionary, a Communist Party. Such a change in the structure of the working class — is an entirely new process which has taken place in the economics of capitalist society, the new phenomena which were taken into account by the Comintern and the Profintern. This, Comrade Serra, must be seen. But, Comrade Serra does not see it and he gets tangled up in a forest of three trees repeating one and the same thing and failing to see that new problems, in the sense of the new methods of action, are confronting us in order that we may be able to set in motion new broad masses of the workers whom it is necessary to lead into a struggle both against the bourgeoisie and against the social-democracy. And out of this grow absolutely all the sins, not only of the Right faction in Germany, but also all the sins in the arguments of Comrade Serra. And truly, what does the right faction say? First of all, they state that the very fact that the Party appeals to the unorganised, the very fact that the unorganised were drawn into the strike committees is the violation of our tactic, is the violation of our line and that this tears away the organised from the unorganised.

What kind of a Party would we be, if in this lockout, where 60,000 organised and 118,000 unorganised were locked out, we did not appeal to the two-thirds of the proletarians who are unorganised? We would then resemble the same scoundrelly social-democrats who, from the height of their social democratic machine, look down upon the unorganised workers, upon this "common trash". We would prove that we did not understand the new processes which are taking place, had we not appealed to this two-thirds of the proletarians, had we not attempted to draw them into the struggle, had we not organised them into the strike committees and did not draw them towards us in order to mobilise them against the social-democratic reformist apparatus of the trade unions. I am asking you — what is there in this that is uncommunist, what is here that is unrevolutionary, what goes here against the line of the Comintern?

Comrade Serra, if he will stop to think, will say of course that he is not entirely in agreement with the Rights, then he will say that he is entirely not in agreement, and if he will think a little bit more then, perhaps he will sharply come out against them. Because that line which has been taken at the present time by the Right faction of the C. P. G. has in view not only to work within the trade unions, — about this there is no quarrel, — but to await that moment when we will be able to win over the reformist apparatus. They have in view not to strive at the present time for an independent leadership of the struggle, not to strive that the Party should carry on these struggles through the strike committees, but to await that moment, when the trade union apparatus will be in our hands and we will be able through the trade union apparatus to carry on the strikes. I confirm that this is the most common social-democratic cretinism, which has absolutely nothing in common with Leninism and with the entire line of the Comintern.

But let us go further. Let us take that which they write. They say: (comrades, I will not quote although I have a whole pile of these quotations) — the Party which now appealed to the unorganised is turned into the Party of the unorganised. And word by word, the "Vorwärts" writes the very same thing. You can find there verbatim quotation from the organ of the Right Communists: "Against the Current". The "Vorwärts" writes: "The Communist Party of Germany is turning into a Party of the unorganised". You understand that on this question "Vorwärts" took the same position as the Right Communists for the very reason that we, in organising the unorganised, have struck a blow at the most painful and more sensitive part of the reformists. The "Vorwärts" understood this, and the Right faction of the C. P. G. did not understand it. But Comrade Serra is a member of the Political Secretariat and he should understand it. He must understand that if we succeeded in leading, let us say, 118,000, or one third of that number, — about the numbers I will not argue, — this is the business of the German comrades — but whether it is 118,000 or one half of that, — I am asking you, is it not a gigantic gain for the Party, if we were successful in leading tens of thousands of the unorganised? I think that such attacks of the Right faction against our appeal to the unorganised, against the drawing them into the strike committees, against our attempts to play a leading role in the economic struggles is a thoroughly anti-Communist position. They reply: Here in the resolution of the III. Congress of the Comintern, it is stated that the Party does not independently lead the struggles, that it must lead through the trade unions. Just think of it, the people who call themselves Communists are quoting the resolution of the Comintern Congress of 1921 and saying that in these resolutions it is stated that it is necessary to lead the struggles not directly but through the trade unions. Regarding what did we speak, when we wrote this resolution? We did not state that the Party must itself lead, but that it must lead through the non-Party revolutionary organs, whether they will be called strike committees, committees against the lockout, the trade unions, etc. But what must be done if the reformist trade union apparatus does not want to carry on the strike? It is clear that we must seek other means of unifying the working masses for the strike. To understand the resolution in such a formal manner and to speculate with the resolution to argue against our playing the leading role in the economic struggle, by leading them through the non-Party organisation, — this, in the true sense of the word, is a play upon ignorance. And this is being done by the Right faction within the C. P. G.

But there is something still worse. And this worse thing will now illustrate to you. A gigantic conflict is taking place

The forces of the Party are not very great in Germany and in the Ruhr the Party is not particularly strong. This we know. Under the pressure of the Comintern and the Profintern the Party sends scores of men in order to assist the organisation of the organised, to create committees, in order to counter-act the pressure of the manufacturers. What is being done at such a moment by the Rights? They are sending their people not in order to assist the Party in organising the struggle, but in order to come out at the meetings and to prove that the Party is carrying on an incorrect line. What is written in the organ "Against the Current" which came out in the very heat of the lockout in Germany? There it is written that the line which has been carried out by the Party is the Left liquidatorism, that this is a double-meaning tactic, that this is a policy of adventure, that this is a false destructive path, and in conclusion it states that: what the Party is doing in the Ruhr is not revolutionary but counter-revolutionary. Did you hear, comrades, that is the way it is written: That what has been done by the Party in the Ruhr, is — counter-revolutionary.

This is written in the organ "Against the Current". (A voice: This is written by Enderle.)

I do not know the name of this "Communist", but that he is not a Communist is very clear. I am asking you — in the heat of the struggle, at the time of the lockout, in the organ which is created against the Party, in the organ which is called "Against the Communist Current", in this organ there is a statement that the Party carried on a counter-revolutionary policy. I am asking you: if the C. P. G. is carrying on a counter-revolutionary policy, then such "revolutionists" have nothing to do in this Party and this is the worst kind of strike-breaking, because this is a blow in the back of the Communist Party, when these people come out during the struggle and state that the Party is carrying on a counter-revolutionary policy. I ask Comrade Serra, can we agree with this and does he think that these people can be convinced to the contrary. If Comrade Serra wants to convince them, then why didn't he do it before? If Comrade Humbert-Droz can convince them, than so much the better! But do not forget that they were not convinced either by the decisions of the Congress of the Profintern or by the decisions of the Congress of the C. I. Can it be, that if you will give them time of a few months then it will be possible to convince them. They have a social-democratic formulation and a social-democratic line and in the future only life will convince them.

I will cite a few quotations from this remarkable number "Against the Current", it is really monstrous. This is written by the so-called local correspondents without a signature, from the editorial board:

"The meetings in the Ruhr took place with an insignificant attendance of the workers. The Communists have against them a consolidated front of the workers."

Here is what is written in this organ. We get the following, in the Ruhr the Communists have against themselves the workers. Not a consolidated front of the manufacturers and the social-democracy but a consolidated front of the proletariat. And further, it ironically and humorously relates that at a certain factory there are five thousand workers and only five men came to the meeting. This is a most dastardly and unheard of mockery at what actually took place in the Ruhr. We have information not only from the local Communists, but also from some of our Russian comrades who were in the Ruhr, and we know that in reality the new tactic of the workers has raised to action new strata of tens of thousands of workers. Even if not 118,000, but only 40—30 thousand, but does it mean that we have a united front of the workers against us. And do you know how one of the articles which is printed in "Against the Current" ends? It ends in this way:

"One experiences a sense of shame when one sees the tactic of the Party in the Ruhr and its attempt to organise the unorganised, etc."

Of course, comrades, I know that Comrade Serra is a very good-hearted man and so on, but there is a limit to everything. How can you permit that the members of the Party, being within the Party, should have on the matter of such an important conflict a diametrically contrary opinion. The Party thinks that it is carrying on a revolutionary policy; the Comintern thinks that it is carrying on a revolutionary policy; we suppose that the

Profintern is carrying on a correct line. And now the comrades come and say that this line is counter-revolutionary. Well, comrades, what do you think, — can you seriously assume that here we can limit ourselves to a purely ideological action? Undoubtedly you went much further than you yourselves expected. And what conclusion does this organ make? It concludes that on account of the line of the Party in the Ruhr, the influence of the Party, the role of the Party in the struggle of the workers in the Ruhr district was never so insignificant as at the present time. I will not quote a number of other passages from the same documents where it is stated that the Party gives false information to the Press, that the reports of the Press to the effect that thousands of workers are attending meetings is a conscious deception of the working class and so on. All this is written. But comrades, do not think that this is written only by the people from the "Against the Current". The same thing is also being written by Maslow's followers. They write word for word, verbatim, the very same thing. "The confidence of the workers is particularly strongly undermined by the Hamburg events, particularly in view of the fact that the opposition in the trade union has suffered a complete collapse." This Trapichkin, an eye-witness from the Maslow organ, writes the very same thing and relates the very same thing although he pretends to estimate the position of the Party from the so-called Left. The Party does not dare to advance the slogan of the strike committee, the Party lost influence, the workers do not come to the meetings, etc. Comrades, I ask you, how is it necessary to act when we have such a situation, where the Party is straining all its forces, when the Party is carrying on the most serious struggles, which are supported by the Comintern, the struggles which the Comintern and Profintern consider as the carrying out and the application of the line of the VI. Congress of the Comintern, — what attitude can we have toward those members of the Party who occupy such a position as the Right Communists in Germany?

Now, Comrade Serra, instead of discussing in what measure all this is permissible, occupies himself with an entirely different question. He looks in an entirely different direction. He does not see that the entire conception of the Rights goes against the Comintern. He fails to see it. But he considers that at the present time, the course of the Party is on the whole ultra-Left, that the Party has an insignificant influence in the trade unions, or as he expresses it, that the Party does not carry on trade union work. At the same time, as an example of the fact that the Party works poorly in the trade unions, he cites that at the last Congress of the A. D. G. B. they had three delegates and that secondly the reformists work well and that the number of members of the A. D. G. B. has increased by 400—500,000 men.

Comrade Serra, who went through the school of the Italian trade unions and knows the methods of the Italian reformists and the fascists, knows how the entire local organisations were barred from the congresses, when they elected Left delegates. The same thing is being done, and even with greater success, in Germany. He cannot help knowing that the following is applied in Germany: As soon as a local branch is won over then it is immediately dissolved and a Commissar is sent there. He knows that when at the congress of the A. D. G. B. in Berlin Communist Delegates were elected, that their credentials were annulled. And instead of observing under what conditions our comrades are compelled to work, and against what a great apparatus it is necessary to struggle, and instead of observing how great is the influence of the Party in the masses and among the members of the trade unions, instead of that he measures the influence of the Party at the top. Of course the higher we go the smaller is the influence of the Communists. Of course, they are entirely absent in the A. D. G. B. and they are also entirely absent in the Central Committee of various unions. Does it mean that we have no influence there? No, it does not mean that, we have there great influence. How is it then that you do not pay attention to this, how can you blame the Party for such things? And, on the other hand, Comrade Serra puts it to the credit of the German reformists that their trade unions have grown by 450—500,000. Comrade Serra does not take into account the fact that the growth in the membership of the Trade Unions took place as a result of the fact that in the course of three years we have carried on a persistent agitation among the workers in Germany to join the trade unions. We overcame the senseless policy of Ruth

Fischer, but this does not mean that having overcome this policy, we must go along the line of the social democracy, i. e., to agree with that malicious anti-Communist line which expresses itself in the slogan "Zwingt die Bonzen" (Force the reformists). This conception maintained by the Right Communists in Germany, would condemn the Party to an eternal delivery of revolutionary speeches without any kind of revolutionary deeds. He who rejects the attempt of an independent leadership of the struggle, will never wrest the leadership from the hands of the social-democracy. He who does not see the unorganised, will never understand why it is necessary to struggle with the social-democracy.

Instead of condemning this incorrect formulation, Comrade Serra, in quoting a number of documents, tried to prove that it is necessary to work within the trade unions (this is — America for the Profintern). And he was also attempting to prove that the Profintern resolution has some good paragraphs. In the resolution of the Profintern there is a special sub-division regarding the strike committees. Are you in agreement with it or not? Do you agree that it is necessary to struggle for an independent leadership of the trade unions, that it is necessary to draw the unorganised into the strike committees? And if you agree, then why do you not come out against those who are disrupting this work, who are acting against it? Why do you not come out against it? I think that Comrade Serra wanted to find some sort of a middle line. He wanted to preserve some sort of an equilibrium. But comrades, there were created very unstable equilibriums, much more unstable, than the capitalist stabilisation. With all its instability the capitalist stabilisation is nevertheless much more stable than that position which was defended here by Comrade Serra. He could not make both ends meet. Why? Because, instead of seeking that which is the main danger in the leadership in Germany, he sought individual errors. If we go to the Ruhr and see what work took place there, then it is possible to find there many weaknesses and many shortcomings which it is necessary to correct in that or the other resolution. There are these or the other errors but is it in this that the centre of gravity of the question lies? Where is the main enemy in Germany? The VI. Congress of the C. I. stated: The main enemy — is the Right danger. And where is the main enemy as Comrade Serra puts it? He considers that in Germany the main enemy — is a certain exaggeration in the formulations which he quoted. Pardon me, but it is impossible not to see that which is virtually staring into the eyes of everyone. You do not see that in Germany we have a newly formed Party. Perhaps not a big party, but it never will be big. Is it accidental that in the organ "The Unity" (Einheit) there are articles by Thalheimer and Brandler and those of a large number of social-democrats. I quoted in my report at the Congress the speech of the social-democrat Benevick who says the same thing as the Rights. We have a block of the Left Social-Democracy and of the Right Communists, a block which is being formed within our Party for the struggle against the Comintern. For the struggle against the Profintern, Comrade Serra, instead of fighting this danger and of stating definitely that we must put an end to this, instead of that he comes and relates that the letters of the Comintern are very poorly written, that they are on the level of some kind of a provincial judge.

Comrade Serra is a very experienced orator and an old political worker, and if he became so badly tangled up then this is, of course, due to the fact that he has a confused position. And if the position is confused then it is impossible to do anything good.

The last question is about the group of reconciliators which exists within the German Communist Party. Look how the situation is developing there. When the Comintern and the Party placed the emphasis on the ideological struggle, reconciliators stated that the struggle was necessary on two fronts, both against the Rights and against the Central Committee. At the

same time, chiefly against the Central Committee. When in the Party and in the Comintern the question arose about the expulsions, then the reconciliators counter-act this and say: No, not expulsion but an ideological struggle. At the same time, in order to prove that the ideological struggle is chiefly necessary, they are quoting the speech of Comrade Stalin at the last Plenum, — Comrade Stalin himself can refute them — and they say that Comrade Stalin places the emphasis on the ideological struggle against the Rights. But comrades, it is necessary to have even a little common sense, and I ask you, will any of the Rights in the C. P. S. U. (b) say that which has been said by the Rights in the "Against the Current"? And do you think that our Party even for one moment would wait with conclusions if anyone would say that the tactic of our Party is counter-revolutionary. It is necessary to understand we cannot take as a comparison that which has been stated by Comrade Stalin in relation to the Rights who are afraid to speak, who are only appealing with letters to the Central Committee, and even that in an isolated way. It is in relation to them that he said that it is necessary to place the emphasis on the ideological struggle and on the basis of that they propose in Germany also not to expel those who rebelled against the Party, and who have formed their own Party, jointly with the Left Social Democrats. What does this look like? Where is the logic? I think that this is a rotten position, and those of the comrades who hold this position cannot long retain it as it is dangerous for them.

Regarding the draft of these letters, — let us admit that in a literary sense they are not particularly good. I think that the Presidium of the Comintern will gladly accept all improvements in these letters which will be proposed by Comrade Serra, if they will not deviate from the line of the Comintern. — from these letters it can be seen that the Comintern draws a distinction between the Rights and the reconciliators. As far as the Rights are concerned, it may be stated that in the Comintern they are hanging on a very thin thread which is 99% torn. As far as the reconciliators are concerned, they are confronted with the problem — will they in the future continue to consider that the Rights are a "legal shading" within the Comintern? In one of the letters, namely in the closed letter, the Comintern proposes that you should say to the Central Committee of the C. P. G. that it is necessary to carry on a differentiated policy in relation to the rights and toward the reconciliators. One group openly rebelled against the Party, created a faction, and others are still tangled up, and for this reason a differentiated policy is necessary.

I ask Comrade Serra, is he in agreement with this or not? Apparently Comrade Serra is in agreement because he did not speak about this part of the Letter. But this cannot be seen from his position. That is the reason why it is necessary to tie together both ends. It is necessary to cast aside all petty matters, all formal questions, all superfluous matters which accumulated around these differences and to look at the essence of the question. The essence of the matter consists in an incorrect attitude of the Right faction towards the social-democracy in the overestimation of its influence, in the fear to come out against the reformist trade union bureaucrats, in a desire to submit, at any cost, to everything prescribed by the trade union bureaucrats and in the denial of the necessity to struggle for an independent leadership in economic struggle. This is the essence and this is the foundation. And that is the reason why the line of the Comintern and the line of the Right faction came to the cross roads, as it is related in one story — "As the ships on the ocean." In reality they are now outside of the Communist Party, because they are carrying on the struggle against it, and I think that the Comintern will draw the logical conclusions out of what is going on in Germany, if it will adopt the proposed drafts and will make clear that it is not permissible to create within the Communist Party a new Party in a bloc and jointly with the Left social-democrats.