

XII PLENUM, E.C.C.I.  
XV ANNIVERSARY, OCTOBER

SPECIAL  
DOUBLE  
NUMBER

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



October 1st, 1932

VOLUME IX

**COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL** No. 17-18

TWENTY CENTS  
CONTENTS  
OVERLEAF

# CONTENTS

Number 17-18

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,  
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

## REPORTS AND SPEECHES TO XII PLENUM, E.C.C.I.

1. NOTIFICATION RE THE XII PLENUM OF THE E.C.C.I.  
*(See page 575)*
  
  2. A PLENUM OF PREPARATION FOR DIRECT BATTLES  
FOR POWER, FOR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE  
PROLETARIAT  
*(See page 575)*
  
  3. THE U.S.S.R. AND THE WORLD PROLETARIAT  
(FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OCTOBER REVOLUTION)  
D. Z. MANUILSKY  
*(See page 583)*
  
  4. ON THE END OF CAPITALIST STABILISATION  
D. Z. MANUILSKY  
*(See page 600)*
  
  5. THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN IN  
THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES  
HARRY POLLITT  
*(See page 612)*
  
  6. THE WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF  
FRANCE AND GERMANY AND THE TASKS OF THE  
COMMUNISTS IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT  
O. PIATNITSKY  
*(See page 622)*
  
  7. SOCIAL-FASCISM IN JAPAN  
AKI  
*(See page 635)*
- 
-

## NOTIFICATION RE THE XII PLENUM OF THE E.C.C.I.

**T**HE XII Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International took place in Moscow at the beginning of September.

The following reports were considered by the XII Plenum:

1. Report of Comrade Kuusinen on the international situation and the tasks of the sections of the Communist International.

2. Report of Comrade Thälmann (C.P. Germany) on the lessons of economic strikes and the struggle of the unemployed; also joint reports by Comrade Lenski (C.P. Poland) and Comrade Gottwald (C.P. Czecho-Slovakia) on the strike movement and the struggle of the unemployed in Poland and Czecho-Slovakia.

3. Report of Comrade Okano (C.P. Japan) on the tasks of Communists in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention, in connection with the war which has commenced in the Far East.

4. Report by Comrade Manuilsky on Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. in connection with the completion of the First Five Year Plan and the proposed fundamental principles of the Second Five Year Plan.

The Plenum received information from Comrade Bela Kun on the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of the death of Karl Marx (March 13, 1933) and instructed the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. to prepare and carry on a mass campaign to popularise Marxism-Leninism in connection with this anniversary.

The Plenum elected supplementary members to the Presidium and endorsed the financial report of the E.C.C.I.

All the decisions of the Plenum were unanimous.

The theses, resolutions and decisions of the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. are being published simultaneously with the present statement.

POLIT-SECRETARIAT OF THE E.C.C.I.

## A PLENUM OF PREPARATION FOR DIRECT BATTLES FOR POWER, FOR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

(The XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

**T**HE theses of the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. on the international situation state that "the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism is proceeding with enormous strides which are carrying this crisis to a *new stage*, that a "definite change" is evident in the development of the general crisis of capitalism, that "*the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism has come*," that "a directly-revolutionary situation has not arisen in the most important and decisive capitalist countries," but that "what is taking place at the present moment is the *transition* to a new round of big clashes between classes and between states, a new round of wars and revolutions."

What are the *new* features in the international situation compared with the situation that prevailed at the time of the XI Plenum, which enabled the XI Plenum of the Comintern to advance the remarkably important and very significant thesis of the end of the partial stabilisation of capitalism.

One new feature is that "in certain extremely

important key-points the antagonistic forces are already becoming unleashed for the conflict."\*

Another new feature is that "in the relation of forces between the Socialist and capitalist worlds there has taken place a tremendous change." The U.S.S.R. has finally consolidated its Socialist position and the Second Five-Year Plan provides for the final liquidation of classes. At the same time, at the other pole, the economic crisis has become so extremely acute that even outside the Communist camp, the masses are beginning to become convinced that the rule of decaying monopolist capital now "makes it extremely difficult for the economic crisis to be solved in the period usual for capital by means of free competition" and that these tremendous difficulties, in view of the growth of the revolutionary upsurge, are now "driving the bourgeoisie along the path of the violent solution of antagonisms both at home and on the international arena."

\*All the words given in quotation marks are taken from the thesis and resolutions of the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I., unless otherwise stated.

Another new feature is the unprecedented sharpening of antagonisms between the predatory imperialists, so that these antagonisms are now more acute than they were on the eve of 1914. The Young Plan has broken down. The Versailles system is in a state of crisis. Germany, vanquished by imperialism, demands equality in armaments. On this basis, the antagonisms between Germany and France and also between Germany and Poland over the Prussian Corridor and Danzig, are becoming more acute. The seizure of Manchuria by Japan which was the "beginning of a new world imperialist war" destroyed the former agreement between the U.S.A., Japan and England on the distribution of spheres of influence in China. The Washington Agreement has broken down. A military conflict is maturing between the U.S.A. and Japan. A wave of chauvinism and nationalism is sweeping through the whole capitalist world. "A new imperialist war has become a direct danger."

Another new feature is that with Japan's seizure of Manchuria, the preparations for intervention against the U.S.S.R. "have entered a new phase." The centre of military intervention has shifted to Manchuria, which, by the efforts of Japanese imperialism supported by France has been converted into a jumping-off ground for an attack on the U.S.S.R. *The danger of direct intervention hovered and still hovers over the U.S.S.R.*

Another new feature is that the crisis in the so-called "era of bourgeois democracy" is entering a new stage, as is shown by the establishment of "a form of the Fascist dictatorship in Germany."

Another new feature is that "the further strengthening of political reaction and the Fascisation of the state" not only fails to consolidate the rule of the bourgeoisie, but on the contrary is accompanied by "a contraction of the basis of bourgeois rule and disintegrations in it of fissures and manifestations." "In countries where the Fascist dictatorship existed before the world economic crisis, a process of disintegration of Fascism is observed as a consequence of the growing revolutionary upsurge (Poland, Jugo-Slavia, Italy)" and in the countries where the Fascisation of the state is now rising to a higher stage, as in Germany, friction and conflicts are also arising and becoming acute in the camp of the ruling bourgeoisie behind the screen of the Fascist dictatorship. The Papen-Schleicher government is a definite form of the Fascist dictatorship for which the path was prepared by Social-Democracy and the Party of the Centre, and which was established with the help of the Reichswehr, the "Steel Helmets" and the

National Socialists. It is the Fascist dictatorship of the magnates of finance capital, acting in close alliance with the agrarians and with the Reichswehr Militarists. But right from the very start this close alliance began to show serious fissures. A struggle is going on between the heavy industry of the Rhine and Westphalia, and the Chemical Combine, which is comparatively much less affected by the crisis. A struggle is going on between these two and the South German Agrarians. This internal squabbling in the camp of the bourgeoisie found expression in the dissolution of the Reichstag. The elements of disintegration are even more apparent in the mass movement of the national Fascists, which is being washed away on two sides—on the one hand, the bourgeoisie cannot make up their minds to allow Hitler to take power so as not to compromise its reserves, and Hitler, who not long ago was calling for a march on Berlin, is carrying out the will of heavy industry and the Papen Government, which subsidise him. On the other hand, in some of the detachments of the Fascist "storm troops" there is growing dissatisfaction with the big capitalist policy of Hitler, in other detachments there is dissatisfaction with his "legalism," and they are beginning to mutiny against the Hitlerite leadership. At the same time, the heterogeneous Fascist movement which was forged as and still is a sharp weapon for the counter-revolutionary offensive of the bourgeoisie is being affected by elements of disintegration which are weakening the bourgeois dictatorship. "The further development or breakdown of this dictatorship depends on the revolutionary struggle of the working class against Fascism in all its forms."

A very symptomatic feature of the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism is the new process which has arisen in the ranks of Social-Democracy as a result of the undermining of the position of the aristocracy of labour on the one hand, and the growth of the revolutionary upsurge on the other hand. "The mass influence of the Social-Fascists in almost all countries has declined, but the manœuvres adopted by them are all the more energetic and varied," as for example: heading strikes for the purpose of beheading them; in some cases they even declare demonstrative general strikes; their fake struggle against Fascism, for peace in defence of the U.S.S.R.; the resignation of the British I.L.P. from the Labour Party, the talk of the Seine Federation of the French Socialist Party about a united anti-war front with the Comintern and the R.I.L.U., etc.

In addition to these manœuvres in which the "left" Social-Democrats especially excel, Social-

Democracy as a whole in reality supports and ideologically covers up the modern parasitic crisis policy of the financial oligarchy and its increased war preparations. They conceal the policy of state subsidies to bankrupt capitalist enterprises at the expense of the toiling masses in the name of "state capitalism," and the leaders of the Second International even defend the arch-reactionary projects of forced labour, and conceal this with mendacious talk about establishing "Socialism" under the bourgeois state and by its hands. This combination of the vilest reactionary policy with far-reaching "left" demagoguery by Social-Fascism is extremely symptomatic for the end of the stabilisation of capitalism.

*But the chief, the most fundamental feature characterising the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism and its direct cause is the degree of development and the spread of the revolutionary mass upsurge and the forms which this is taking at the present time.*

In his speech at the Plenum,\* Comrade Manuilsky dealt in detail with those *new* features of modern conditions which characterise the end of the stabilisation of capitalism. We should direct our attention most particularly to the character of the present revolutionary upsurge.

"In China there is at present a revolutionary situation." The Soviet movement is developing there. The heroic Chinese Red Army has already repulsed four Kuomintang campaigns against it and is now driving back the fifth. Simultaneously, a mass upsurge of the anti-imperialist struggle is going on in China. "In the near future Japan may find itself in the circumstances of revolutionary crisis." Revolution is taking place in Spain and at the present time the mass movement is seething and showing tendencies to develop into an armed revolt of the people. Poland is "closely approaching a revolutionary crisis." There, "a wave of mass strikes, numerous militant popular actions and the rise of the new wave of national revolutionary struggles" are sweeping the country. Comrade Lensky characterised the situation in Poland in his speech† as follows:—

"A widespread strike movement in conjunction with other acute forms, is now the fundamental link of the revolutionary upsurge. This link has enabled our Party to pull the whole chain of mass struggles. . . . A new period of political strikes interwoven with economic strikes is commencing. And this is now the main feature of the development of the proletarian movement in Poland. It is true that this inter-weaving is still weak . . . but the fundamental tendency which is making its way to the front *puts the question of the mass revolutionary strike on the order of the day, as a*

weapon for the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle of the toiling millions."

While thus showing how Poland is "closely approaching a revolutionary crisis," Comrade Manuilsky at the same time correctly emphasised:

*"However, there can be no doubt that the key-point of the extremely uneven growth of the international proletarian revolution is Germany."*

Recently Fascism has grown in Germany more rapidly than the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. But our German Communist Party has succeeded in developing anti-Fascist defence corps on the basis of a broad, united front from below, in which a considerable number of our comrades have displayed remarkable heroism, and as a result of which our Party obtained 5,300,000 votes at the elections. The heroism displayed by our Party cadres in Germany was proved a year earlier by the fact that 18,000 Red candidates were put forward at the elections for the factory committees in response to the Party's appeal in spite of victimisation and tremendous unemployment. That our German Party is lagging behind, however, is proved by the fact that it has been unable to develop a strike movement in reply to the Emergency Decrees. This, in addition to the insufficient initiative shown, was the cause of the fact that, on July 20th, when the Fascist coup took place in Prussia, the call for a general strike which was properly issued by our Party met with no response, in spite of the favourable situation. But our German Communist Party has fully realised its weakness and at the present time a wave of strikes is sweeping over Germany, although they are still comparatively small. The path of the German revolution is not a smooth one. The struggle there will be desperate, because great forces are concentrated on both sides of the barricade. But under the leadership of our Party the German proletariat is already beginning to pass from defence to the counter-offensive. That is why a revolutionary crisis is rapidly approaching in Germany.

In Czecho-Slovakia the wave of the strike movement is rapidly rising. There, a general strike of miners took place in North Bohemia, and a revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants is in progress in Carpathian Ukraine. In Belgium, a miners' strike broke out unexpectedly. In Great Britain the strike of the sailors in the navy broke out in the autumn of 1931, an event unparalleled in British history, which was accompanied by great demonstrations of workers, and now a strike movement has burst out in Lancashire. In France, big strikes occurred in the north. In Holland, the strike at Tvent. In France, our Party achieved great successes in its agitation, in the struggle against the air manœuvres, in the preparations for the

\*See page 600.—Ed.

†See No. 19 (1932) "C.I."

Amsterdam Anti-War Congress, in the agitation in connection with the Gorgulov trial, etc. But our French Party is still very weak in its struggle for the everyday interests of the workers, and has not yet completely eliminated anarcho-syndicalist ideas. Therefore, the movement is still weak in an organisational sense. "In India and the Latin-American countries the development of the revolutionary crisis is delayed above all by the poor organisation of the proletariat and the immaturity of the Communist Parties."

The revolutionary crisis is growing unevenly, but everywhere there is a growth of the revolutionary upsurge. The uneven development of the revolutionary movement and the fact that even such countries as France, Great Britain and the U.S.A. are lagging behind does not mean that the revolution must wait for those who are behind, must keep pace with the slowest, as the opportunists think. Uneven development is the law of imperialism. Comrade Stalin long ago spoke of this law as follows:

"The further development of the world revolution will most likely proceed not by maturing equally in all imperialist countries, but by some countries getting ahead of others, by the imperialist chain breaking first of all at certain of its weakest links."

A characteristic feature of the end of partial stabilisation is the revolutionary form and the intensity of the strike movement which is now sweeping the whole capitalist world, and its combination with political mass actions. The theses on the international situation advance a postulate which those "leftists," who are now concealing their opportunist passivity by sneering at strikes in support of partial demands, would do well to ponder over. The theses state: "*Under the conditions of the end of capitalist stabilisation and the extreme narrowing of the material basis of reformism, the struggle for the elementary needs of the masses brings them into conflict with the very foundations of capitalism.*" It is this that gives the present strike movement the features which were noted in the other resolution of the XII Plenum, which says:

"The economic struggle of the proletariat is assuming more and more a revolutionary character, and combining in many cases with the various elements and forms of political actions is at the present stage in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries, the *fundamental link* for leading the masses to the forthcoming big revolutionary battles."

The strike movement of the workers is rousing a strong response among the broad masses of the toiling population, owing to its extent and its militant character (clashes with the police, the gendarmes and the troops); it is rousing their sympathy for the fighting proletariat; it is giving an impetus to the development of the revolutionary movement of the peasants (Poland) and is

attracting a fairly extensive section of the urban petty-bourgeoisie to the side of the proletariat (Poland, Czecho-Slovakia).

Under the conditions of the end of capitalist stabilisation, small economic strikes frequently grow into *mass* economic and political strikes. The question of the mass political strike was raised at the X Plenum of the E.C.C.I. But for a long time this slogan hung in the air. It is now far easier to carry it into effect because the working masses in some countries have already been prepared for it by general economic strikes and a number of political strikes.

It would be absolutely wrong and opportunistic to regard the present growth of the revolutionary upsurge *only* as a spontaneous process. The rapid growth of the influence of the Communist Parties has been especially characteristic and especially noteworthy in the past year. The membership of the Communist Parties is rapidly rising, the number of votes obtained by Communists at elections is rapidly increasing, and, what is particularly important, *the organisational rôle of the Communist Parties has begun to grow appreciably.* The numerical strength of the sections of the Comintern, not counting the C.P.S.U., has practically doubled in the course of a single year, from 550,000 to 914,000. Still more rapid has been the increase in the number of votes cast for Communists at elections. In Germany for the three months, April 24 to July 21, the number of votes given for the Communist Party increased almost by a million and in the Reichstag elections, when the Party had to fight under most difficult conditions and was under threat of suppression, it polled 5,300,000 votes. In Bulgaria, our Party has already won over the majority of the working class and a considerable section of the peasants. In Sophia, it received a relative majority of votes at the municipal elections and an absolute majority of seats. In Greece, our Party gained many victories in the elections, etc.

As we have already mentioned, far more important is the fact that some of our Parties, during the last year, have successfully come forward in the rôle of *leaders of the developing mass movement.* In regard to China, Comrade Van-Ming explained at the Plenum amidst thunders of applause that the successes of the Chinese Communist Party are measured not merely by the increase in the membership, but by the rapid growth in the number of divisions in the Red Army and the victories obtained by it on the battlefield. The Red Army of the Chinese Soviets already consists of twenty-six army corps in addition to fifteen independent divisions of local garrisons and mass military organisations and

also a well-armed G.P.U. The successes of our small but heroic Japanese Communist Party are of an especially specific character. Under the conditions of Japan's war against China, our Party courageously put forward defeatist slogans and led the militant activity of the workers, peasants, soldiers and students, in spite of the military and police terror. This is a new and unprecedented phenomenon in the history of the wars of Japanese imperialism.

In the majority of capitalist countries where there is not yet a revolutionary situation but where the prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis are maturing, and where there is no war, the measure of the success of the Communist Parties is their leading rôle in mass activity. We have already noted the great success of the German Communist Party in its anti-Fascist campaign organised on the basis of the united front from below. We should especially note the heroic mass self-defence work in Altona. But the most distinctive and promising examples are those Communist Parties which have undermined the influence of the Social-Democratic Party and reformist trade unions and which for the first time are heading and successfully leading mass strikes, and raising them to a higher level. *In this respect, our Polish Communist Party undoubtedly holds first place. It has not only contrived to take advantage of a very favourable situation to obtain the leadership of a number of big strikes developed by itself or developed by the Social-Fascist Polish Socialist Party for demagogic reasons, but it has also developed great work in the Polish villages where the elements of the agrarian revolution are already maturing. In this sense our Party in Czecho-Slovakia has also obtained great success in leading the general strike in Brucks. Even our little Belgian Party, by taking an active part in the general miners' strike, succeeded in increasing its influence among the masses to such an extent during the short time the strike lasted that it doubled its membership and increased the circulation of its paper sevenfold.*

Of course, if we leave out of account the Ruhr strike in Germany and the strike of the Berlin metal workers in 1930-31, these are only the *first successes* in obtaining the leadership of the mass movement on the basis of the capable application of the tactics of the united front from below. If we compare these successes with the possibilities which exist and the enormous tasks which now face our Party, these successes must be regarded as unsatisfactory. Up to the present, we have not yet taken root in the *big* factories where the decisive masses of the industrial proletariat are

concentrated. We have not yet succeeded in converting these enterprises into "fortresses of Communism." In the reformist trade unions also our work is still extremely weak. We must not allow ourselves to become dizzy with success, because certain of our Communist Parties, for example, the American Communist Party, are now showing some improvement. But there can be no doubt that a certain change and a *big change*, has taken place in this respect during the past year. And it would be just as opportunistic to deny this great advance as it would be to rest on our laurels—Comrade Piatnitsky illustrated this advance extremely vividly at the XII Plenum. Referring to the speech delivered by a Czecho-Slovakian comrade, he said: "Compare his speech at the XI Plenum with his speech at this Plenum. Can the two speeches even be compared? In this matter it is life itself which is speaking." And with regard to the speech of an English comrade, he said: "Formerly, it was we who talked and he who listened (and not only he), but now it is he who is speaking and we who are listening with satisfaction. . . ." The conditions which we have described and which are summed up in the words: "the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism" caused the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. "to raise with the greatest sharpness the question of the fulfilment of the *fundamental* task of the Communist Parties at the present time: *The preparation of the working class and the exploited masses in the course of the economic and political struggle for the forthcoming fights for power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.*" The theses of the XII Plenum emphasised that this fundamental task—the preparation for the fight for power—will be decided "*in the course of the economic and political struggle.*" And this idea is repeated time after time in the theses. In connection with the task of winning over the majority of the working class, the theses say:

"The main link which the Communist Parties must seize upon in solving this problem, is the struggle for the everyday economic and political interests of the broad masses, against increasing poverty, against oppression, violence and terror . . . only by relying on the everyday interests of the masses can the Communist Parties defend and strengthen the position of the working class, and lead it up to ever higher forms of struggle and to decisive battles for the dictatorship of the proletariat. When the proper conditions exist, the preparation and calling of a *mass political strike* is one of the most essential and immediate links in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat."

In conclusion, in connection with the fierce offensive of the counter-revolution and the preparations for intervention, the theses say:

"The sections of the C.I. must answer this challenge of the world bourgeoisie by intensifying to the utmost their Bolshevik work, by hastening the revolutionisation

of the broad masses, developing and leading the class struggles of the toilers on the basis of the united front from below, by leading the working class to mass political strikes, etc."

Is it a new idea in the Communist International to carry on a "struggle for the everyday economic and political interests of the broad masses" and "to develop and lead the class fights of the toilers"? No, this idea is not new. But it was a new idea when the Plenum in putting forward the preparation of the proletariat for decisive struggles for power as the main task at the present time, emphasised in its resolutions, and it was emphasised in the speeches of many of the delegates from various countries, that *at the present stage the chief link in the preparations is the development and organisation of the economic and political struggles, which are interwoven, and raising them to the higher level of the mass political strikes, subordinating our propaganda to this aim.*

From the very beginning of the third post-war period, in view of the sharpening of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism, the Comintern advanced the slogan "class against class," and, at the same time, the slogan of the "independent leadership of class fights." However, our Party's successes in the independent leadership of class fights for a number of years were very small indeed. Therefore, in 1930, at the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the reporter of the Russian delegation in the E.C.C.I. raised this question in his concluding remarks with great sharpness and clearness. He said:

"The facts show that in a number of countries our Parties have learned quite well how to organise the mass political actions and demonstrations of the workers. However, in the leadership of class battles, commencing with economic strikes, the successes of the Communist Parties are still insignificant. But, the organisation of class battles under the leadership of the Communist Parties is the *basic task* of the present period. Formerly, the work of the Communist Parties consisted mainly of *agitation and propaganda*, but now the centre of gravity has shifted to the *organisation of class battles* under Communist leadership. Only on this basis, on the basis of the Bolshevik organisation of strike struggles and other forms of class struggles against attacking capital, can (and must) the Communist Parties win authority among, and the confidence of, the workers for Communist leadership in the whole of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat."

This was said in 1930. But little progress was made after this. A great deal was said, but very little was done in this sphere. This is noted in the thesis of the Plenum:

"There must be determined dissociation from right opportunist 'tailism' and from 'left' opportunist subjectivism which wishes to substitute for the necessary difficult work of the Bolshevik education and the mobilisation of the masses: empty phrases about developing

revolutionary struggles; instead of the real development of these fights."

Is there any reason to expect that the necessary decisive change in this matter will take place in the sections of the Comintern after the Plenum? Yes, there is every reason to expect this, because, now a *new* situation has arisen, because the end of partial capitalist stabilisation has arrived, because "only a short period remains for the maturing of the revolutionary crisis," because, at present, "it is necessary, without losing a minute, to *strengthen and accelerate* Bolshevik mass work for winning over the majority of the working class." We see that in some Parties, (e.g., the Polish and Czecho-Slovakian Parties) a considerable *advance* has already taken place in this respect.

For the very reason that the whole situation has greatly changed during the past year, and especially because our Parties have gained a certain amount of experience since the 11th Plenum, these tactical slogans met with a ready response at the XII Plenum, and the whole attention of the Plenum was concentrated on them.

The Plenum concretely discussed how to lead the working masses in the factories up to a strike so that the working masses themselves realised that this was the only way out, and how to organise the broad united front from below under the leadership of the Communist Party when conducting a strike. The Plenum discussed how to combine economic battles with political battles. Even now, economic strikes, which very frequently lead to conflicts with the police and the gendarmes, give an impetus to the organisation of political demonstrations of sympathy, or political protest demonstrations. On the other hand, the Plenum especially in connection with Germany, where the strike movement up to the present time has lagged behind political activity, discussed how it was possible to make political activity the starting point for a strike movement. Speaking of the well-conducted campaign of the united front of struggle against the Fascists in Germany, Comrade Piatnitsky put forward, among other things, the following task:

"We must extend and consolidate the united front of the workers which commenced in the streets in fights with the National-Socialists, by transferring it to the factories, inside the reformist trade unions, and the labour exchanges among the unemployed."

In this same connection, Comrade Knorin said:

"Half the industrial proletariat of Germany, and this half is the revolutionary half, have been thrown onto the streets. The streets, as well as the factories, have become an important location for the united front. We must combine the struggle in the streets with the struggle in the factories. The streets must help to rouse the factories; street clashes and demonstrations must help to develop strikes, must be combined with strikes."

The Plenum discussed how partial economic and political battles are to be raised to a higher stage when preparing mass political strikes. Comrade Thaelmann said in his concluding remarks :

"We must pass from agitation and propaganda to the genuine development of mass actions and fights. The mass strike and the political general strike must be regarded as the chief and most important weapons of struggle at the present stage."

The Plenum discussed how we should now subordinate our agitation and propaganda to the organisation of mass activity and class fights. In the proposal of the French delegation regarding the methods of putting the decisions of the XII Plenum into practice, we read, among other things, the following :

"In this situation, in order to stand at the head of the mass movement, in order to lead it and organise it, in order to hinder the policy of war and armed intervention in the U.S.S.R. pursued by French imperialism, the French Communist Party must focus its attention on the problem of partial demands, must formulate in every case the minimum economic and political demands of the workers, peasants and all the exploited so as to win the confidence of the masses, to draw them into the struggle and progressively to raise these partial battles (strikes, unemployed demonstrations, peasant activity, etc.) to the level of big revolutionary battles. This calls for a determined change in the work of the Unitary Trade Unions, in the work of the parliamentary fractions and the municipal fractions, and in the work of the mass organisations under the influence of the Party."

Further on, it says :

"'Humanite' and the provincial press up to the present have been chiefly weapons for agitation. They, especially 'Humanite,' must now become the organisers of the mass movement."

Finally, the Plenum discussed what organisational tasks arise from this tactical line.

It is evident that this tactical line under the conditions of a rapidly growing revolutionary upsurge can and must have a powerful effect on the work of the Parties and on their achievements. Our Parties at present are suffering from fluctuating membership and from the weakness of our cells in the factories, especially the big factories. One of the chief causes of this weakness lies in the fact that the cells merely hold meetings and discussions, and that the workers who are not satisfied with this, do not wish to be thrown out of work in the midst of widespread unemployment, merely for the sake of this. There is no doubt that when our factory cells receive a fighting lead, the Communist workers willingly join them without fearing to make the sacrifice.

Our Parties are suffering from the weakness of their work in the reformist trade unions. There is no doubt that when the principal tactical line of organising class fights is really applied, our Parties will be compelled to penetrate more deeply

into the reformist trade unions and other mass organisations.

The line for the direct organisation of class fights will greatly facilitate our struggle against Social-Democracy, because it is easiest to expose them to the masses in the process of the fights, that is, if we do not drop into right opportunist errors and forget that Social-Democracy is the chief social buttress of the bourgeoisie, or into "left" opportunist errors and identify the Social-Democratic workers with their leaders, and the Social-Democrats with the Fascists.

The fundamental tactical line of the direct organisation of partial class struggles, and the raising of them to a higher level under the present conditions of revolutionary upsurge is the basis of and the shortest path to the fulfilment of our strategic tasks—the winning over of the majority of the working class and the attraction of allies to the side of the revolutionary proletariat, i.e., the masses of toilers and the exploited. But, in order to carry out this tactical turn, there must be certain prerequisites, above all, a capable manner of approach to the masses. Comrades Kuusinen and Gottwald spoke of these necessary prerequisites in detail in their reports.

These prerequisites are formulated as follows in the thesis of the XII Plenum :

"The successful accomplishment of this task requires that every Communist Party shall establish, extend and strengthen permanent and intimate contacts with the majority of workers, wherever workers may be found. For this it is first of all necessary : (a) to organise on a sound basis constant Bolshevik work among non-Communist workers in the factories, in the reformist and other trade unions, and among the unemployed, and to systematically expose the treachery of the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders, and to win over the workers who have come under the influence of the Fascists ; (b) to defend the everyday interests of the workers, to be able to respond to every attack of the class enemy, always putting forward concrete slogans as will effectively mobilise the masses for struggle ; to systematically pursue the policy of the united front from below, to establish an alliance between the proletariat and the small farmers, to draw into the struggle the office workers and exploited sections of the urban petty-bourgeoisie under the leadership of the proletariat ; (c) to strengthen the Communist Party itself, by training cadres, who are closely connected with the masses and trusted by them."

The Plenum paid especially great attention to the tactics of the united front from below. The Czecho-Slovakian and German comrades spoke in great detail of this, on the basis of the extremely rich experiences which they had already accumulated. The question of how to win the Social-Democratic and non-Party workers on the widest scale for the united front of the class struggle, while avoiding right opportunist and "left" sectarian mistakes and not hiding the face of our Party, and while exposing the Social-

Democratic leaders in the process of the struggle, and *raising the struggle to a higher stage*, was dealt with in a most concrete manner in the discussion and was summarised in the concluding remarks of Comrades Gottwald and Thälmann.\* These summaries of the discussion, which contained the richest concrete material, must be well studied by the broadest circles of our Party activists.

In view of the fundamental task of the present time—the preparation of the working class for the forthcoming decisive struggle for power—the Plenum advanced a number of important tasks of an *organisational character*. Among these tasks we should take special notice of the “avoidance of *super-centralism*, naked domineering, the overloading of the central apparatus, and stripping the forces of the local and lower Party organisations. The idea behind this presentation of the question of “super-centralism” is as follows: as the revolutionary crisis rapidly matures, and as the Fascist and police terror and the danger of war increases, the situation may change with great rapidity, so that responsible decisions in the localities will have to be made very quickly. It is quite possible in these conditions that not only will our Parties be temporarily cut off from the leadership of the Comintern, but the local organisations may be temporarily cut off from the Party centres. Under these conditions, the Parties will be able to function properly and avoid the danger of being too late only if the local and lower Party organisations are given the right to *revolutionary initiative* to the widest extent, and if they have sufficient cadres capable of displaying revolutionary initiative correctly.

Touching on the tasks of the individual sections, the Plenum paid *particular* attention to two Parties—the German and French Parties. This was due entirely to the fundamental task of the present time—the preparation of the proletariat for the forthcoming struggles for power. Our German Communist Party is the largest and strongest and most influential of all the Parties in capitalist countries. Germany may very soon enter the zone of revolutionary crisis in view of the extreme intensity of internal class antagonisms in that country, and in view of the fact that it is the weakest link in the chain of the imperialist powers. Revolution in Germany will be of decisive importance for the world revolution.

As for the French Communist Party, it occupies an extremely responsible post, since French imperialism is the most aggressive imperialism in Europe and the main organiser and inspirer of intervention in the U.S.S.R. That is why the

Plenum paid particular attention to the preparations of these two Parties. That is why Comrade Piatnitsky devoted the greater part of his speech to a detailed analysis of the work of these two Parties, naturally arriving at different estimates of their respective achievements, their shortcomings and the methods of overcoming these weaknesses. That is why Comrade Lenski analysed the situation in Germany, and Comrade Knorin analysed the work of the German Party. Comrade Thälmann, and all the German delegates discussed this in great detail. The French delegates at the Plenum drew up detailed instructions as to how the decisions of the XII Plenum were to be applied in France.

The agenda of the Plenum included the question of the war in the Far East and the tasks of Communists in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention. In pointing out the concrete tasks of the various sections in this struggle and in the defence of the U.S.S.R. the Plenum at the same time pointed out what the Parties have left undone in this sphere:

“While recognising the undoubtedly favourable results in the work of the C.P. in imperialist and colonial countries in the matter of mobilising the masses against imperialist war and against preparations for military intervention, the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. declares that the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries have not been able by their revolutionary actions, to prevent the transport of troops to China and military supplies to Japan, that they have not been able to rouse the broad working masses employed in munition factories and in transport for the struggle, that the mass anti-war campaign has developed slowly, partly because of an opportunist under-estimation of the war in the Far East and also because of a leftist-fatalistic, frivolous attitude to the war. The XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. calls particular attention to the impermissible weakness of the contacts of the C.P.’s with the principal munition factories, with the chief ports and with the key-points on the railroads, and also to the fact that the work of the Communist Parties and the Y.C.L. in the army, the navy and the special Fascist semi-military organisations is in an intolerably neglected condition.”

In conclusion, the Plenum heard a report, delivered by Comrade Manuisky in the name of the Russian delegation, on the subject of: “The U.S.S.R. and the World Proletariat.” See overleaf. Comrade Manuisky himself summed up the fundamental idea of his report in the following words:

“On this background (of capitalist decline and reaction—Editor), the achievements in the development of the land of proletarian dictatorship during the last few years stand out with particular clearness; these achievements *have to an enormous extent fostered the revolutionary upsurge of the working class*. . . . This is the significance and the idea behind the report on the achievements of the First Five-Year Plan and the perspectives of the Second Five-Year Plan. The significance of the fulfilment of the First Five-Year Plan lies in the fact that we have created a powerful material basis for the world proletarian revolution, that the

\*See No. 19 (1932) “C.I.”

relative importance of the smallest Communist Parties will tremendously grow as a result of this victory of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R.; that the proletariat in the capitalist countries, by relying on this firm support, will find it easier to destroy their own bourgeoisie, to overthrow capitalism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat as the condition for the success of Socialism. *And though the rôle of the First Five-Year Plan in causing the workers of capitalist countries to turn towards Communism has been enormous, the rôle of the Second Five-Year Plan must and will be decisive.*"

In describing how the C.P.S.U. is marching from victory to victory, overcoming the numerous difficulties in its path, Comrade Manuilsky spoke in detail of the rôle of its leader:

"In the minds of the toilers of our country, and of the world proletariat, the whole period of Socialist construction and its victory in the U.S.S.R. is linked up with the name of Comrade Stalin. On the basis of the law of the uneven development of imperialism, he worked out and carried into operation the Leninist teaching of the building up of Socialism in a single country. In this Stalinist position, which is understood by the whole of the Comintern, the task of preparing the international proletariat for the new round of wars and revolutions is actually being carried out and fulfilled."

By mobilising the sections of the Comintern in preparation for decisive fights, the XII Plenum reminded them of the necessity under such conditions of strengthening iron discipline more than ever before, and to carry on more than has been done hitherto the determined struggle against

right opportunism, and conciliation towards it, as the chief danger, and against every kind of "left" sectarianism. It condemned the right tendencies of certain Parties which were formulated in the platform of Humbert Droz. It likewise condemned the numerous manifestations of sectarianism which especially affect our American Party, and the anarcho-sindicalist tendencies in the Spanish Communist Party. It exposed and branded the attempts to unite all the fragments of the various oppositions under the unprincipled ideological leadership of the renegade Trotsky (Poland).

Comrade Ercoli, who closed the Plenum of preparation for decisive struggles, made a short and concise résumé of its work.

The XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. gave a clear estimate of the present international situation, characterising it as the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, and clearly indicated the fighting tasks of the sections of the Comintern at the present extremely responsible moment.

Our sections, "without losing a minute, must strengthen and accelerate their Bolshevik mass work for winning over the majority of the working class, for raising the revolutionary activity of the working class," because "a very short period remains before the maturing of the revolutionary crisis."

## THE U.S.S.R. AND THE WORLD PROLETARIAT (FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OCTOBER REVOLUTION)

THE MAIN FACTS OF WORLD HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE.

AS we know, our epoch of war and proletarian revolutions is characterised by the fact that the struggle between the two systems—the dying world of capitalism and the rising world of socialism—is becoming the key point of world politics and world economy. In the light of this struggle the political parties, their programmes, their methods of leading the masses, their words and their deeds are tested. Political doctrines pass from the sphere of demagogic promises into actual practice, which the masses perceive by their concrete experience. It is precisely the present universal crisis in the world of capitalism and the successes of Socialist construction in the first land of proletarian dictatorship which open up for the proletarian masses a wide field for observation, reflection, the weighing of facts and for making political deductions. The masses are now passing through a great political school, but they are passing through it by peculiar paths, corresponding to their "national" conditions. One of the tasks of this

Plenum is to assist the toiling masses of all capitalist countries to give form to the doubt which is rising in their minds about traditional "common sense," to compel them to ponder all the historical events of the post-war epoch.

This period has been inexhaustibly rich in experience, comrades. There is not only the experience of the proletarian revolution in Russia in 1917, but also the experience of revolution in Austria and Germany, the experience of so-called "democratic socialism" in all its varieties—political democracy, industrial democracy, constructive socialism; the experience of coalition and the experience of labour governments without coalitions, the experience of the so-called winning of the majority by legal, parliamentary methods, and the experience of dictatorship. Whatever country you look at provides a great lesson for the world proletariat.

Take for example U.S.A., the most classical land of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the form of

bourgeois democracy, where the bourgeoisie govern without even requiring the services of their scabby social-democracy. The bourgeoisie of the U.S.A. prided themselves on the fact that the U.S.A. was the incarnation of reason, justice and the eternity of the capitalist system, that all their experience refuted the socialist ravings of the European fantasts, that the U.S.A. had no social problem, that it was not only the land of the highest profits, but also of the highest wages, that in the U.S.A. every European emigrant, like Napoleon's soldiers, had a millionaire's baton in his knapsack, that there was not, is not and will never be a class struggle in the U.S.A., that the U.S.A. had eternal prosperity. Who, even among the most shameless apologists of capitalism, would dare to repeat these assertions, which have been refuted by the whole course of events of the world crisis, in the United States to-day, in this land where the working-class in actual fact is absolutely deprived of rights?

Or take Great Britain, this living example of the bankruptcy of the idea of the prosperity of a country pursuing an imperialist, predatory policy. Precisely at this time, when the bourgeoisie of all capitalist countries, and Japan especially, are calling for a way out of the crisis by means of war, by seizing new territories, by enslaving new peoples, the experience of Great Britain shouts to the toiling masses of all countries against this panacea with which the ruling classes still fool the masses. Great Britain has carried on war, it has seized and plundered hundreds of millions of foreign peoples, has subjected whole continents, but this has not saved her from decay, which commenced long before the present world crisis. But the experience of Great Britain is also the experience of two labour (sic!) governments, the governments of Mr. MacDonald, who, unlike us Soviet Bolsheviks, the advocates of proletarian dictatorship, put into practice his "programme of constructive socialism." We will say nothing about the first Labour Government; it is sufficient to recall the work of Mr. MacDonald's last Labour Government to realise what this programme means: an attack along the whole front on the wages of the British working-class, the reduction of the unemployment dole, the crushing of strikes, air bombardments and gallows in India, and the open desertion of the most prominent leaders of the so-called Labour Party to the camp of the Conservatives.

And do we not get an instructive lesson from the post-war politics of the biggest Party in the Second International, the German Social-Democratic Party? The German Social-Democrats rose to power on the revolutionary wave of 1918. For years they had fooled the workers with promises to bring about socialism by democratic methods. They demanded the greatest sacrifices from the masses for the sake of

the triumph of the "democratic" method. In practice their whole policy was food and drink for fascism. For years they had been paving the way for it piecemeal by their policy of the "lesser evil" until they finally surrendered all power to it without the slightest attempt at resistance. French social-democracy regarded the Versailles system as the "natural right" of French imperialism to exploit Germany, the whole of Central and Eastern Europe and their colonies, a guarantee of a privileged position for the upper circles of the French labour aristocracy. As a matter of fact, we see the complete bankruptcy of the Versailles system, and of the Dawes and Young Plans, and the collapse of the legend about the impossibility of an economic crisis in France.

Let us next take fascism, the spread of which in the capitalist States indicates that there are large masses who still believe in the possibility of finding a way out of the present crisis along capitalist lines. But has not fascism, which has celebrated its tenth anniversary in Italy, brought in its trail, in addition to bloody persecution, unprecedented destitution for the masses? Has not unbridled reaction in Yugo-Slavia, Bulgaria and Hungary, in Spain prior to the overthrow of Primo de Rivera's military dictatorship, shown the millions of workers and peasants of Europe what fascism brings them when it is victorious? Finally, no unimportant lesson is to be drawn from Spain with regard to the anarchist and the anarcho-sindicalist leadership of the working-class in the Revolution. In words the anarchists in that country appeared as enemies of the bourgeois State, but both in words and in deeds they were the enemies of the revolutionary methods of the proletarian dictatorship. And this is why their leadership led the heroic working-class of Spain from defeat to defeat—they disarmed the workers both politically and organisationally and put them at the mercy of the Spanish counter-revolution. Such are only a few of the facts of the development of a few of the capitalist countries.

In the main, these facts can be summed up as being: an extended attack upon the working-class, fascism, war. On this background the achievements in the development of the land of proletarian dictatorship during the last few years stand out with particular clearness. These events have, to an enormous extent, fostered the revolutionary upsurge of the working-class. To-day the delegation of the C.P.S.U. in the Comintern desires to present these facts to the XIIth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

This is the significance and the idea behind the report on the achievements of the first Five-Year Plan and the perspectives of the second Five-Year Plan. Despite the fact that the fourth and final year has not yet ended, we are able to state with conviction to-day that in the main the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R., under the leadership of the C.P.S.U., will fulfil the

Five-Year Plan in four years, that only the successful fulfilment of the first Five-Year Plan enables the C.P.S.U. to map out for the second Five-Year Plan such truly stupendous tasks as **THE COMPLETE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE WHOLE OF NATIONAL ECONOMY, RAISING THE STANDARDS OF THE TOILERS THREE-FOLD AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CLASSLESS, SOCIALIST SOCIETY.** It is no easy task to build a classless society, a society in which all will be engaged in socialist labour; to do this in conditions of savage capitalist encirclement! It is no easy task to build this society in the historical period when millions in the capitalist world, as the result of the crisis, are being squeezed out of the process of production, are being declassed, doomed to destitution, to starvation, and extermination, when the class gulf in the camp of capitalism is becoming wider and deeper, when the social contrasts are growing ever sharper.

All our tremendous achievements in the economic and social and political fields may be summed up as follow:—

As the result of fulfilling in the main the first Five-Year Plan, a powerful industrial basis for socialism has been laid in the U.S.S.R. Not only have we ceased to be an agrarian country, we have ceased to be a land of small industry, which is a characteristic feature of all the backward colonial and semi-colonial countries. The share that large industry contributes to the national income has increased during the last four years from 27 per cent. to 35 per cent. We have now our own engineering industry, the output of which in 1931 amounted to almost 5 billion roubles. The output of iron and steel has almost doubled compared with pre-war output. We have created a second metallurgical base in the East (Urals-Kuzbas). We have re-equipped all our industries on the most up-to-date technical basis. Moreover, 75 per cent. of the equipment of our industries has been renewed during the period of the first Five-Year Plan. We have set up a number of new branches of industry which never before existed in this country. We are becoming a land of tractors, a land of automobile transport, a land of chemistry, a land that can build blooming mills, powerful turbine-generators, diesels, oil cracking plants, etc. We are changing the energetics base of our national economy, and we are uniting this base both for industry and agriculture.

Secondly, having become a land of heavy industry and heavy engineering, putting into operation the first blast furnaces at Magnitogorsk and Stalinsk, such enormous enterprises as the Sverdlovsk Engineering Works, our gigantic automobile and tractor plants at Nizhni-Novgorod, Stalingrad, Kharkov, and the A.M.O. works in Moscow, the ball-bearing plant, having built the Dniepr Dam and having laid

the basis for providing our industries with raw materials (cotton in Central Asia, Azerbaidjan and Ukraine, synthetic rubber, etc.), we as a result of the first Five-Year Plan have taken a decisive step towards attaining our economic independence. The Leninist Electrification Plan, known as GOELRO, the plan to which Lenin attached particular importance, was fulfilled and surpassed as early as 1931.

Thirdly, by carrying out the first Five-Year Plan, we have solved the problem of the reconstruction of the basic funds of our industry, and yet the whole capitalist world prophesied that we should break down in solving this task, that we can only live as a spendthrift inheritor, at the expense of the resources left us by the old order.

Fourthly, as regards agriculture, we have laid an unshakable foundation for the mechanisation of agriculture. By 1934-35 the existing productive possibilities guarantee the completion of the mechanisation of agriculture, which is the technical economic basis for consolidating the old and securing further successes in collectivisation of agriculture in the U.S.S.R. We have created the largest scale agricultural industry in the world, and we are therefore able not only to mechanise as in America, but also to apply chemistry to agriculture as in Germany. We have carried out the agrarian revolution, in the possibility of which, not only the capitalist world and its social-fascist hangers-on, but also the panic-mongers and opportunists in our own midst did not believe. Having organised more than 60 per cent. of the peasant farms in collective farms, having now whole regions completely collectivised, having put an end to the class differentiation in the countryside, we have abolished the age-long scourge of agrarian over-population, which in the past, under Tsarism created a vast army of unemployed, and enabled the capitalists to keep the standards of life of the working-class in old Russia down to the verge of starvation and extinction.

But, comrades, our achievements are not merely confined simply to the growth of industry and agriculture. Among our achievements we must mention firstly, the raising of the material and cultural standard of the toiling masses. I am not speaking only of the fact that wages here are continually rising, that from 1928 to 1932 wages in all branches of national economy have risen on the average by 62 per cent. The general budget of our national economy increased from 11 billion roubles in 1928 to 26 billion roubles in 1932. I am speaking of the fact that we have no unemployment, that the number of factory and office workers from 1928 to 1932 has almost doubled, reaching a total of 21 millions, that the material and cultural requirements of the masses are constantly rising, that the outlay for social insurance, for cultural services, education, medical service, etc., has doubled during these four years,

reaching an average of 200 roubles per worker in 1932. House building is developing in our industrial districts (from 1923 to 1931 we provided houses for 3 million workers, and in 1932 alone a further 3 million workers will be provided with house accommodation). New industrial centres are being built, public dining-rooms are being developed and already provide for 35 per cent. of the population. Opportunities have been created for every worker to improve his qualifications, the doors of our universities are wide open for the children of workers and peasants. There is a great increase in the number of clubs, reading rooms, parks of culture and rest. Feverish work is going on for the improvement of working-class districts and suburbs where the working-class population predominate. Sanitary conditions are continually improving, rest homes and workers' sanatoria are increasing in numbers.

Secondly, there is the development of the broadest proletarian democracy which is the very spirit of the regime of the proletarian dictatorship. Through the soviets, through the trade unions and the factory committees, millions of our toiling population have been drawn into the administration of the country, of industry and of agriculture.

Thirdly, we have consolidated our achievements in the sphere of national policy, in the matter of establishing equality and the brotherhood of the nations inhabiting the U.S.S.R., by providing a material and economic basis for the national policy of the Soviet Government, i.e., socialist industrialisation of the remote regions of the country and by providing such a planned distribution of the development of productive forces that will enable the nation that has been most backward in the past to overtake economically and culturally the foremost industrial districts in the country in the shortest possible time.

Further, as a result of the first Five-Year Plan, enormous social and political changes have taken place in the country, which have enormously strengthened the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. and which are laying a granite social class foundation for the edifice of socialism which is being built. During the past Five-Year Plan (carried out in four years), we have continued the work started by the October Revolution. We have liquidated the kulaks as a class in the districts of complete collectivisation and we have caused the middle peasants (now collective farmers) to take an irrevocable stand on the side of socialism, and become a firm bulwark of the Soviet State. We have enlarged the proletarian base of the Soviet State by drawing millions of new proletarians into industry, especially in the formerly backward regions.

All these achievements have enabled us to solve irrevocably the question of "who will conquer" in the internal arena in favour of socialism. Having entered upon the period of socialism, having com-

pleted the foundation of socialist economy, and having firmly entrenched ourselves on the socialist path, we are able by the living experience of our great work to prove to the millions of toilers in the capitalist countries the advantages of the socialist system of economy compared with the capitalist system.

The significance of the fulfilment of the first Five-Year Plan, comrades, lies in that we have provided a powerful material base for the world proletarian revolution, that the relative importance of even the smallest of our Communist Parties grows tremendously as a result of the victory of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R., that the proletariat in capitalist countries, relying on this firm support, will be able more easily to destroy their bourgeoisie, to overthrow capitalism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat as the condition for winning socialism.

Finally, we have achieved these decisive successes of world historical importance in the course of a tireless struggle within the Communist Party against the Right deviation as the chief danger and against the "Left" deviation, which fosters it, on the basis of carrying out the correct general line of the Party.

The rôle of our Party and its Leninist Central Committee in attaining all these successes has been tremendous. Our Party, led by the Leninist Central Committee, was the initiator of the first Five-Year Plan, the inspirer of the high socialist tempo and rejected the proposal of the right wingers for a "two-year plan," ruthlessly crushed the theory advanced by the opportunist disbelievers about the "declining curve."\* The Party and its Leninist Central Committee roused millions of toilers to action, for the struggle to fulfil the Five-Year Plan, acted everywhere as agitators, propagandists and organisers for the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan. In the struggle for the Five-Year Plan our Party and its Leninist Central Committee still further extended and strengthened its deep-rooted connections with the broad masses of toilers, who, on their own initiative, and under the leadership of the Party, put forward, and in the main have carried out, the slogan of "The Five-Year Plan in Four Years." Historical truth obliges us to mention here the rôle of the man under whose firm and tried leadership the Party and its Central Committee marched through the difficult mountain pass after the death of Comrade Lenin. (Loud applause.) It is all the more necessary to mention this for the reason that soon we will celebrate the Fifteenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, and a little later the Tenth Anniversary of the death of Comrade Lenin, which was a severe and irreplaceable loss for us, for the working-class of our country, and for the proletariat and toilers of the whole world.

Comrade Stalin, the true comrade-in-arms and

\* i.e., the theory that the rate of increase of production in the U.S.S.R. would diminish.

best disciple of Comrade Lenin, led the Party, the working-class, and the entire country over all the dangers that we encountered during the past decade, to surmount all the difficulties which stood in our way. (Loud applause.) Never yet has our Party been so firmly consolidated and united as it is now under the leadership of Comrade Stalin. The entire work of strengthening the internal and international position of the U.S.S.R., the whole of the stupendous work of socialist construction carried out during the past ten years in the conditions of capitalist encirclement which demanded the greatest Leninist firmness and flexibility, combined with steel-like determination, bears the direct impress of the mind, the will and the actions of Stalin.

Marx and Engels gave to the international proletariat the theory of scientific socialism—Marxism, and on the basis of an analysis of the laws of capitalist development and of the development of the class struggle, revealed the historic mission of the working-class as the grave-digger of capitalism and the inevitability of the dictatorship of the proletariat by means of which the working-class, after breaking the resistance of the exploiters, and leading the oppressed masses of the whole people, will organise planned socialist industry and prepare the ground for classless socialist society.

Lenin further developed the teachings of Marx and Engels for the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, analysed the problems of monopolist capitalism, the proletarian dictatorship, the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, the rôle of the national-colonial revolutions, the Party and the problem of the successful construction of socialism in the period of the proletarian dictatorship, and gave to the world proletariat the experience of the first proletarian revolution and the first proletarian dictatorship in the world, leading them through the most dangerous and difficult years of ruin caused by the imperialist and civil wars and of intervention, and at the same time laid firm foundations for the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. The great name of Lenin is linked with Leninism as Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

In the minds of the toilers of our country and of the international proletariat the whole period of socialist construction and its victory in the U.S.S.R. is linked up with the name of Comrade Stalin. On the basis of the law of the uneven development of imperialism, he worked out and carried into operation the Leninist teachings on the building up of socialism in a single country. In this Stalinist position, which is understood by the whole of the Communist International, the task of preparing the international proletariat for a new round of wars and revolutions is actually being carried out. Under the leadership of Lenin, the C.P.S.U. defeated Menshevism, which

stood in the path of the proletarian revolution in Russia; under the leadership of Stalin, in the period of socialist construction, a decisive blow was struck at the Menshevism of our epoch which sometimes appears in the form of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and sometimes in the form of the Right opportunist deviation.

In the struggle against these deviations, Stalin not only successfully defended Marxism-Leninism from Trotskyist and Right opportunist distortions. In his reports, speeches and articles he developed the teachings of Marx and Lenin and adapted them to the first phase of Communism. (Socialism.) Stalin's articles, such as *The Year of Great Change*, his speeches as the one delivered at the Conference of Agrarian Marxists, or the one delivered at the Conference of Business Managers on the mastery of technique, Stalin's Six Points\*—are not only directives for our Party, not only historical landmarks of our achievements and victories, they are documents of tremendous theoretical importance for the whole of the Comintern, documents whose significance is not confined to our country, or to our times.

And, comrades, those who, because of our temporary difficulties fail to see these fundamental facts in the development of two opposite worlds, those who, impressed by these difficulties, are inclined to belittle the successes achieved in the U.S.S.R., in fact fraternise with the class enemy and are slipping to the other side of the barricade. For instance, can we forget that we have saved about 100 billion roubles since the end of the imperialist and civil wars and have invested this sum in the restoration and reconstruction of our national economy (in 1932 alone we are investing over 20 billion roubles in the socialised sector)? Can we leave out of account the fact that owing to collectivisation we succeeded in 1930 and 1931 in extending the sown area of our fields by 17 million hectares, i.e., that in one or two years we travelled a road which took the U.S.A. fifteen years and Canada twenty years to travel? Is not the fact that in spite of a big crop failure last year, we succeeded this year in reaching last year's sown area, although we did not quite fulfil the plan for this year, proof of the strength of our socialist organisation of economy? Or the fact that we collected about 1½ billion poods of grain last year? How remote this is from those 285 million poods of which Comrade Lenin so triumphantly informed the Third Congress of the Comintern!

#### SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITALIST ENCIRCLEMENT.

The significance of these successes is all the greater because they were achieved by the C.P.S.U.

\*See Stalin: "Task of the Workers." "New Conditions, New Tasks." Ed.

after overcoming a number of difficulties which were inherent in internal and international conditions.

First of all, a most serious obstacle to the success of our socialist construction was the extremely low level of productive forces which the U.S.S.R. inherited from the old capitalist system. Whereas in highly-developed capitalist countries the obsolete private capitalist relations are the obstacle to the further development of productive forces, the position in our country was exactly the reverse. We had a low level of productive forces which all the time restricted the development of high socialist relations. As we know, the Mensheviks drew the conclusion from this contradiction that neither a proletarian revolution nor socialism was possible in the U.S.S.R. Lenin, in his notes on Sukhanov, brilliantly refuted this argument of international social democracy, if it can be described as an argument, with the question: Why cannot a country, exhausted and ruined by three years of imperialist war, just overthrow the power of the landlords and capitalists and then, on new, free and clear ground, set out to overtake economically, the foremost capitalist countries?

Comrades, we need only think a moment to realise what would have happened to our country at the present time of the world crisis if, in 1917, it had followed the line of the Mensheviks and had not overthrown capitalism. It would have become a colony of world capitalism like India or China. Its fragile economic organism would have fallen to pieces under the blows of the world crisis. It would have been the first European country to compensate at the expense of its own ruin world capital for the losses it is suffering by the present crisis and the toilers of India, China, Indo-China, and the other colonies of world imperialism should seriously think of the example of Russia, which, through the proletarian revolution, has taken the path towards socialist industrialisation.

But this contradiction between socialist relations and the low level of our productive forces was the chief source of our difficulties. The liquidation of this contradiction was the main task of the first Five-Year Plan. The breaches that occur from time to time in the fulfilment of the industrial and financial plan, the inadequate increase in the efficiency of labour, due to the fluctuation of labour power in the factories, sometimes to inability to handle complicated machines, poor labour discipline, tendencies towards wage hogging, the low quality of our products, inadequate reduction of scrapped work, our organisational difficulties in the State farms, and especially in the collective farms, accompanied by individualist relapses (e.g., the reduction of the number of cattle during the first period of the organisational construction of collective farms, careless and inefficient cultivation of the fields leading to a drop in the yield, a slight non-fulfilment of the sowing plan this year),

all this in the long run is due to the main contradiction which we are eliminating in the process of socialist industry. All this is the dark heritage of the past, cultivated by the centuries of the capitalist and feudal systems of old Tsarist Russia, and is being broken down by the proletarian dictatorship with the firm hand of the revolutionary transformer.

The routine, inertness, Asiatic quietism, the "terrible force of habit of millions" established by centuries, has been fearlessly broken down by the proletarian power in the U.S.S.R. Without having had any important "industrial culture" in the past, it has opened up the tundras, deserts and steppes, has conquered new industries such as the chemical industry (producing nitrates, potassium, superphosphates), non-ferrous metal industry (copper, nickel, tin, aluminium), tractor and automobile building, engineering (blooming mills, oil cracking mills, complicated machines and tools, heavy engineering).

I cannot refrain at this juncture from recalling the shameful part international social-democracy has played and the struggle it has waged against socialist industrialisation. It has continuously defended the capitalist-feudal heritage of the past in all its forms as against the socialist industrialisation carried out by the C.P.S.U. It vilified industrialisation, it qualified the technical revolution in agriculture as mere bluff, it prophesied the collapse of collectivisation, it depicted the Machine and Tractor Stations, these strongholds of socialist reconstruction of the countryside, as Arakcheyev settlements.\* It defended kulak wage-hogging as against the new socialist attitude towards labour, socialist competition and the shock-brigade movement. It indiscriminately took under its protecting wing the liquidated kulak, the unemployed priest and traditional Russian backwardness. And in the same way as contemporary monopolist capitalism supports all the reactionary feudal institutions in the colonies (India, the countries of Latin America) in order to preserve the capitalist system as a whole, so contemporary social-democracy, in order to save its position among the masses of workers in the capitalist countries who are becoming radicalised by the world crisis and also as a result of the achievements of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., comes out in relation to the U.S.S.R. as the champion of capitalist-feudal obscurantism and social retrogression. This example alone illustrates the terrible strained conditions of capitalist encirclement in which our Party has carried out its first Five-Year Plan.

Frequently this irreconcilable struggle between two systems is forgotten, there are tendencies to consider the so-called "breathing space" as some-

\* Arakcheyev: a Minister under Alexander I. who organised farm colonies of soldiers, in which strict military discipline was maintained.—Ed.

thing more than the temporary equilibrium of forces of which Lenin spoke. Actually we never had a breathing space in the sense of a safe, calm situation for socialist construction.

Never in history has any country in the world had to build its economy in an atmosphere so highly charged with the class hatred of the bourgeoisie, with continual plots, intrigues, "legal" and illegal wrecking activities, systematically alternating with hostile campaigns, as the U.S.S.R. has had to do. We have not plundered other peoples as Great Britain has done, we have not waged wars as Germany and France have done, we have levied no contributions on anyone, we have received no long-term loans for the purpose of developing our economy. We have built up our economy for the toilers, but only with the efforts and resources of the toilers of our union. If we have traded with the capitalist world during these years the capitalist world has received much profit from this trade. If we have received technical aid we paid for the "instruction" a hundred-fold. If we have received equipment from abroad we paid cash for it; we have had no moratorium on credits, as Germany has had. And, moreover, never for a moment has the threat of war ceased to hang over the toilers of our union.

Finally, when characterising the conditions under which the Five-Year Plan was carried out in four years, we must not forget the fact that the two last and decisive years of the Five-Year Plan (the third and the fourth) coincided with the time when the world crisis was at its height. Of course, our economy does not suffer from crises, and this is one of the chief features that distinguishes it from capitalist economy. But on one section of our front in the sphere of foreign trade, we came in contact with the capitalist world which is deeply infected with crisis. Our country exported grain, lumber, flax, and raw materials, and was inevitably affected by the catastrophic fall of world prices for agricultural raw materials. At the same time, we paid trustified industry prices for machinery and equipment imported from abroad (and don't forget that our machinery imports in 1931 comprised 24 per cent. of the world imports of machinery), and these prices did not fluctuate to the same extent as the prices of other goods. Therefore, we were the losers in the foreign trade turnover. And while taking advantage of this situation, the capitalist world still had the effrontery to accuse the U.S.S.R. of dumping.

#### SOCIALIST INDUSTRIALISATION AND THE PROLETARIAN MASSES ABROAD.

And if, despite all these unfavourable circumstances, the C.P.S.U. has successfully attained the object it set itself, it is only because the realisation of the Five-Year Plan in four years was the cause not only of the few million members of our Party,

but was the cause of the vast masses of the toilers of our country. The strength of our Five-Year Plan lies in that it was detailed, corrected, augmented and, what is most important, carried out by the broad masses, who put forward counter-plans, broadly developed the shock work movement and socialist competition; it lies in the fact that the Five-Year Plan became the socialist school for the masses, an instrument for stimulating the greatest self-activity and initiative of the masses.

And if, to-day, at a time when capitalism is affected by the greatest crisis it has ever experienced in its history, in recording the successes of the Communist Parties we are compelled to admit that the overwhelming majority of the workers have not yet turned towards Communism, that they still waver in some countries between social-democracy and fascism, it shows that the experience of the C.P.S.U. and the U.S.S.R. has not yet brought about a complete revolution in the minds of these millions. For us members of the C.P.S.U. it means that we must fight still more strenuously, still more determinedly for success, in order to consolidate, to organise the proletarian masses around the Communist International. And if *the first Five-Year Plan played a tremendous part in turning the workers in the capitalist countries towards Communism, the role of the second Five-Year Plan must become, and will be, decisive.*

What elements of our great experience in socialist construction are generally recognised by these broad proletarian masses—mark you, not the Communist vanguard—but precisely those masses who are only just looking around, cautiously feeling their way and slowly drawing nearer to Communism? This question is of great practical importance for the sections of the Comintern. The correct reply to this will enable the Communists in the capitalist countries to organise agitation around the U.S.S.R. properly.

Undoubtedly, in addition to the chief gain of the October Revolution, the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and the establishment of the power of the workers, a gain that has particularly impressed the minds of the broad toiling masses of all countries, we must ascribe first place to our successful *socialist industrialisation.*

Social-democracy cannot dissuade the working class from recognising this. It is difficult to hide from the working-class of the world, to lie about and gloss over facts like these; only three or four years ago the U.S.S.R. occupied fourth and fifth place in the world's output of iron and steel, and now comes forward to second place, immediately after the U.S.A.; that the U.S.S.R. fulfilled the Five-Year Plan for oil in two-and-a-half years; that the Five-Year Plan for machine construction was already surpassed in 1931; that by creating gigantic tractor

works the U.S.S.R. has insured for herself at the end of the second Five-Year Plan traction power amounting to 15 million h.p. for agriculture; that by the end of the first Five-Year Plan the U.S.S.R. will have increased the capacity of her electric stations to 5½ million kilowatts, with an output of electric power equal to 17 billion units, i.e., eight and nine times more than was consumed by pre-revolutionary Russia. These facts speak for themselves better than hundreds of books and speeches.

Even if the U.S.S.R. has not fulfilled the programme that was drawn up for the chemical industry, despite the starting of such enterprises as Berezniki, the workers in the capitalist countries know that the Soviet working-class has to build its chemical industry on empty wastes, that it has neither cadres nor experience, nor its own chemical equipment, that the strict secrecy of chemical processes maintained by the capitalist States compels the U.S.S.R. to find ways of its own to give the country a chemical industry.

Do you remember, comrades, the sensation that was created throughout the whole of the capitalist world by the publication of the main outlines for the second Five-Year Plan adopted by our Seventeenth Party Conference? That plan provides for 22 million tons of pig iron, 250 million tons of coal, 80-90 million tons of oil, 65 million tons of peat—our peat industry is now working hard to mechanise its output; it provides for 100 billion units of electric energy, 30,000 kilometres of new railways; it provides for new canals, such as the Volga-Moscow Canal, work on which has already been started; increased productivity of labour by 120-140 per cent. reduced costs of production by 30-35 per cent.—in a word, it provides for a threefold increase in production compared with 1932.

And this is no fantastic plan. It has been verified by persons of experience and knowledge, and it is still being verified at numerous conferences, such as conferences on the distribution of productive forces, on electrification, transport, national education, etc.—and it will certainly be carried out. The new metallurgical works, now under construction, will alone, when working at full capacity, provide as much as 20 million tons of pig iron; already, despite the seasonal interruptions in the output of pig iron, the productive capacity of our furnaces amounts to 20,000 tons a day. The new mine construction which we have widely developed ensures for 1935 already up to 150 million tons of coal. By a decision of the Central Committee of our Party, and of the Council of People's Commissars, the foundations are being laid for three new powerful electric power stations on the Volga and the Kama, which are to cater for the old and new industrial

districts of the Volga. Finally, at Kamyshina, we are laying the foundations for a huge dam and electric power station, the projected capacity of which will amount to one-half of the present total electric energy of the country, which is to serve as a source of power for the artificial irrigation for the whole of the Trans-Volga, which will convert this region, which is periodically stricken by drought, into a most important wheat basis for the U.S.S.R., with an annual output of 300-400 million poods of wheat. In order to realise the significance of these gigantic undertakings, equal to three Dnieprostroys, one must realise what a terrible scourge drought in our country has been for the peasant masses. Every three or four years such districts as the Trans-Volga, Kazakhstan, the steppe region of the Ukraine, were periodically stricken with drought. According to approximate estimates, during eleven years (from 1921 to 1931) our country lost as a result of drought about 2½ million poods of grain, which together with the losses in cattle, amount to a financial loss calculated at 4½ million roubles. The enormous investment of many millions of roubles for the development of agriculture in the Volga district alone is the best reply the Soviet Union can give to the "theories" advanced by the social-fascist scoundrels to the effect that "primitive accumulation" is taking place in the U.S.S.R. at the expense of agriculture.

But these are not our only investments in agriculture. For instance, in the second Five-Year Plan our agricultural machinery industry is to supply agriculture with machinery to the value of 9 to 10 billion roubles, i.e., a sum four times larger than the value of the machinery now in use in agriculture. Our tractors, which at the present time number about 150,000, by the end of the second Five-Year Plan will increase to 700,000 to 750,000. Our automobiles, which serve agriculture, will amount to 750,000. Finally, in place of the approximate 2,000 machine tractor stations that we have to-day, we will have about 6½ to 6 thousand stations with an aggregate power equal to an average textile mill, and the value of the mechanical equipment of each of these stations will be 3 million roubles. This programme, however, is not a song of the remote future, part of this programme is already being carried out. And these achievements in the socialist industrialisation of the U.S.S.R. cannot but demonstrate to the broad masses in the capitalist countries the powerful impetus that the productive forces will receive when they are liberated from the chains of capitalism.

Socialist industrialisation, however, does not strike the workers of the capitalist countries from the purely technical aspects; they judge it by the results it brings for the Soviet working-class. The U.S.S.R. is the only country where there is no unemployment, the bony hand of which is now

\*See "The Second Five Year Plan."

strangling millions of people throughout the entire capitalist world. Everyone in the U.S.S.R. can find work. Here, the right to labour is the same as the right to be born, the right to live, to choose a free companion in life, to go to the theatre, to enjoy the beauties of nature. In the U.S.S.R. all forms of social insurance are continually increasing. When going to bed or getting up, there is no need to think of that terrible "rainy day." Here labour is "a matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of valour, a matter of heroism." It is respected in the U.S.S.R. more than money or aristocratic birth is respected in the capitalist world. Every able-bodied member of a worker's family is engaged in production. Factory kitchens are springing up, because the workers' wives are becoming the fellow workers of their husbands in the factories. The old petty-bourgeois life is disappearing, and the new life of socialism is being created. Nowhere is so much thought given to children as in the U.S.S.R. Nowhere is there such a complete emancipation of personality as in this land of severe proletarian dictatorship, nowhere is there such a realisation of human dignity, of workers' freedom, of rights as a citizen of the Republic of Labour, as in the U.S.S.R., which denies "freedom" to the bourgeoisie to exploit, plunder and strangle the economically enslaved.

The workers in capitalist countries, who in their countries experience the very opposite of this, cannot but feel moved at the majesty of this land of socialist construction. They cannot but be fired by the stupendous cultural revolution that is taking place in this former land of illiteracy, where in the third year of the Five-Year Plan, those able to read and write already represented more than 81 per cent. of the population. Among the peasant women already 50 per cent. were literate. It is only in the U.S.S.R. that science, art, and culture are for the toilers. The entire land of the toilers, under the proletarian dictatorship, has grown in stature by several heads. The intellectual level of the masses has grown, they have advanced from their own midst tens of thousands of talented organisers for new socialist economy. In 1932 the total circulation of newspapers reached 40 millions, i.e., ten times as much as in Tsarist Russia. In 1932 there were 80 millions receiving various forms of education, half the entire population. In universities alone, in 1931, about 400,000 students were being educated, while in the technicums there were 860,000—and in all educational institutions the overwhelming majority of the students are sons and daughters of workers and collective farmers. Take the unprecedented growth of national culture, now that it is freed from oppression. Or the growth and development of genuine workers and collective farm democracy, realising itself to be the master of the country. The Soviet

Government is the cheapest Government in the world for the masses! Do not all of these facts bring about a change in the sentiments of the broad masses of toilers in capitalist countries towards the U.S.S.R.?

#### SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND THE DIFFICULTIES OF GROWTH.

But doubts begin to arise in the minds of the social-democratic workers in capitalist countries when they hear of the difficulties of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. And this is where the despicable rôle of international social-democracy is made plain. During the whole of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., the social-democrats have fed like parasites in their counter-revolutionary agitation against the U.S.S.R. and on our difficulties. Deprive them of our difficulties and they appear before the masses naked as lepers.

Like the tempting spirit of the Bible they whisper to the worker in the capitalist desert: "Dost thou believe in this Bolshevik socialism? Enough! Where is the equality of consumption?"

"But this is only the first phase of Communism (socialism)," says our class-conscious worker, "when bourgeois right has been liquidated only with regard to the means of production, but is still in operation with regard to the distribution of the products of labour."

"But the worker does not receive the full product of his labour in the U.S.S.R."

"Well, even in the final phase of socialism deductions will be made from the product of the labour of the worker to cover depreciation, for the further extension of production, for social insurance, etc."

"How can it be avoided then in the country which, thanks to your social-democratic treachery, is building socialism alone for the time being, in the face of the furious resistance of your world, of the whole capitalist world?"

"But in the U.S.S.R. there is not enough meat, fats, clothes, boots; there is a card system of rationing there are reserved stores for the workers, the marauders of the private market continue to operate."

"Yes, there is a shortage of things," say the proletarians of the U.S.S.R., "because socialism has increased the requirements of the toiling population of 150 million who in the past dragged out miserable and wretched lives, lived amidst filth and vermin, etc., ate grass in famine years, died from epidemics. Before the war we made 25 million pairs of boots a year and now we make 80 million, i.e., three times as many, and still there is not enough, because our peasants no longer want to wear bark shoes, because the nomad tribesmen of yesterday, the Kirghis, now work in a factory, and now justly demand a house with electric light, a bath, soap,

working garments, factory-made boots. The standard of life of the formerly privileged classes and groups has fallen. The relics of the old bourgeoisie and their hangers-on, the intelligentsia, the Government officials, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the ex-traders, the owners of small workshops, etc., have a lower standard than they formerly enjoyed, but we have improved the standard of life of the main strata of the toilers of the 108 nationalities which inhabit the U.S.S.R., and which the old system tried to convert into human manure for the benefit of Russian imperialism.

"There is a shortage of things because we have to economise on the light industry so as to build up heavy industry as the basis of our economic independence and as a material guarantee against military surprises. There is a shortage because the population in this country is increasing at a faster rate than in any country in the capitalist world. The birth-rate is rising, and this is the first sign of an improvement in the material conditions of the masses. At present we cannot feed, clothe and shoe the whole of the toiling population in this enormous country, provide them with sanitoriums, rest homes, decent dining-rooms to the extent we would like; we cannot yet do away with queues because we have not enough clothes, boots, fats and meat. Hence, the class principle of distribution. Hence, the card system of rationing, the reserved stores for the workers of our chief industrial centres and the chief branches of industry—things which will be abolished by the second Five-Year Plan.

"But if the capitalist system which you social-democrats support, introduced the ration system in order to help carry on the imperialist war, and you, despised reptiles, called it war socialism, has not the class which is waging a desperate class war against the whole of the capitalist world and against the 'terrible habits of the millions,' within the country, the right to introduce temporary restrictions to help strengthen the cause of socialism and the cause of the world revolution?

"You complain that here and there in the crevices of the new system marauders of the private market are still to be found. But we have the apparatus of the class dictatorship of the proletariat to deal with the marauders of the market. We are now enforcing the death penalty against marauders of collective property, but we are sure that the social-democrats will take these very marauders under their protecting wing just as they took the priests, the wreckers, the counter-revolutionary plotters and all the most bitter enemies of socialism.

"But in the U.S.S.R.," say the social-democrats, "in view of the difficulties arising in connection with the construction of socialism, the present generation has to make sacrifices for the benefit of future generations."

But can socialism in the U.S.S.R. keep going merely on the sacrifices of the working-class, can it continue to call forth the enthusiasm of the millions if there is no material basis for such an upsurge and such enthusiasm among the masses?

To think that our young generation of workers and peasants which is growing up amidst the conditions of the greatest revolution in the world, of the most extensive proletarian democracy, which has not experienced capitalism or the Tsarist régime, to think that this generation with its growing political, material and cultural requirements will accept socialism only in the form of sacrifices and deprivation, is sheer lunacy. The heroic struggle of this generation for the happiness of future generations, its advance under the flag of service to the interests of the world proletarian revolution, is not the detached romantic asceticism of the intelligentsia, but an all-embracing synthesis of the great social ideal with the immediate material interests of the masses. Therefore, it is for this very reason that social-democracy and all the General Staffs in the world have been unable to crush the proletarian revolution and to prevent socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.

The chief blame for the sacrifices which the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. is compelled to make must rest chiefly on the shoulders of social-democracy, which, in capitalist countries, has betrayed the ultimate aims and the temporary interests of the working-class. And yet it has the effrontery to talk about sacrifices; 10 millions killed, 19 millions wounded and crippled, 30 millions dead from epidemics and famine during the world imperialist war, the destruction of productive forces of the warring Governments to the amount of 200 billion dollars, the sharp reduction in the consumption of the masses during the world crisis, the halving of wages, the indescribable starvation and degeneration which is going on in the colonies, India, China, and the Latin-American countries, 5 million unemployed, not counting their families, the increase of suicides of whole families of workers, the terrible infant mortality, i.e., a second war without battles—these are some of the sacrifices which the working-class has made and is still making for the salvation of capitalism and which the social-democrats justify and call on the workers to continue!

Social-democracy says to the masses: The Bolsheviks claim that the second Five-Year Plan will bring about the complete reconstruction of national economy in the U.S.S.R., but at the present the output of coal in the Donbas is declining and there are serious difficulties in iron and steel production and in transport. They are promising to increase the consumption per head of the population two or three-fold during the second Five-Year Plan, but in the Ukraine they have not sown enough because of

the loss of horses. During the second Five-Year Plan they want to build classless society. But how does this square with the latest decree which gives the right to trade to collective farms, to individual collective farmers and to individual peasants?

Yes, comrades, we still have difficulties to contend against and will have in the immediate future, but, as Comrade Stalin emphasised at the XVI. Congress\* of our Party, these difficulties are difficulties of growth, i.e., difficulties which contain within themselves the elements for overcoming them. For example, the *tempo* of our industrialisation comes up against backwardness and lack of culture, against the absence of trained cadres but industrialisation itself provides the means for overcoming this evil. Take another example—the mechanisation of agriculture, an auxiliary phenomenon of which was the drop in the number of horses. But mechanisation itself is the key to the liquidation of the effects of the horse shortage. Our difficulties are of a different kind from the difficulties of capitalism which is moving to destruction and therefore contains within itself the elements of further decay and disintegration.

Those who wish to understand our difficulties, not as class enemies, but as friends of the toilers, like Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, and others, first of all take into account the concrete international and internal situation in which socialist construction is going on in the U.S.S.R.

The question of which stage of socialism has been reached in the U.S.S.R. is of decisive importance for the understanding of our difficulties and for our practical policy in the construction of socialism. Do not forget, comrades, that we are only at the beginning of the first phase of Communism, that we have only just entered the period of socialism. Our system still bears many "birthmarks" of the transition period, which are a feature not only of the present stage of socialism, but will not disappear entirely until the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. has built up complete socialist society and arrives at the second phase of Communism when the ruling principle will be "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Do not forget that we have not yet socialised all the means of production. About one-third of our farms are still individual peasant farms, and we have still to convince these individual peasants by practice, by concrete experience, of the advantages of the collective form of farming over the individual form. Another peculiar feature of our stage of socialism is the fact that in agriculture, except for the State farms and the machine tractor stations, a considerable part of the means of production does not belong to society as a whole (the State), but is the collective property of the population of each collective farm. Do not forget that the principle we apply in the

distribution of goods is "according to the amount of labour performed." It is the kulaks, the wage-hogs and slackers who demand "equal" distribution and consumption. Do not forget that we still have the commodity-money form of circulation which, however, radically differs from the commodity-money form of capitalism. This is the system of the last stage of NEP,\* it will continue throughout the whole period of the first phase of Communism and even in classless society it will become more and more a means of socialist accounting, control and distribution. Do not forget that we are strongly developing Soviet trading because we have not yet achieved the direct socialist exchange of products. We have payment by results, financial control. Do not forget that we shall enter classless society only with the completion of the second Five-Year Plan, that we are marching along the path of socialist construction in the midst of severe class struggle, that the struggle for a socialist attitude to labour, as one of the forms of the class struggle, will continue even after the liquidation of classes, as a prolonged and stubborn struggle for the "socialist remoulding of the mind of man." Do not forget that surrounded by capitalism as we are, the liquidated classes, which formally have submitted to the new system, will attempt to smash it by all means in their power, quietly, by inconspicuous sabotage, by wage-grabbing, by slacking at work, by bureaucracy, pilfering, profiteering, etc.

And those who fail to appreciate the concrete social-economic and political conditions under which we are constructing socialism in the U.S.S.R., will wander away from the general line of the Party. In the sphere of collective farm policy they will substitute bureaucratic administration for mass work among the peasant collective farmers. They will regard collective farm property as State property, and not as the collective property of the farmers. On distributing the harvest in the collective farms they will widely apply the equalisation method on the principle "distribution according to size of the family." They will have fantastic ideas about forming agrarian-industrial combines. In the sphere of socialist industrialisation and circulation they will ignore the last stage of NEP, which is still essential for us—business accounting, financial control, the regime of economy, etc.

And these "left" distortions interfere, and will in the future hamper the Party in fulfilling the important task of increasing the efficiency of labour and the problem connected with this—reducing cost of production and increasing equality. the organisational-economic strengthening of the collective farms and the improvement of supplies for the toilers of our country.

These "left" distortions also foster Right oppor-

\*Modern Books, Ltd. 2/6, 1/6.

\* New Economic Policy.—Ed.

tunism which is the chief danger, opportunism which is trying to drag us in the direction of restoring capitalism and its methods of economy (drift, conniving at kulak tendencies, the dissipation of social property, etc.). It is true that since it was taught a lesson not long ago right-opportunism does not dare to come out openly with its platform. It dreams quietly about slowing down the rate of industrialisation, about returning to the previous stages of NEP, the revising of the collectivisation policy. Our Bolshevik Party, which grew up and became steeled in the struggle against opportunism, will strike mercilessly at it in future, even if it comes out without a platform and in the form of vague, amorphous sentiment.

#### THE MAIN TASKS OF CURRENT POLICY.

What are the ways and means by which we can overcome our present difficulties? The Party has already received the answer to this question. It received it in the form of the six conditions of Comrade Stalin. The historic significance of these conditions lies in the fact that Comrade Stalin did not merely propose them for the current situation, but as guidance for the Party and the working-class which holds good for the whole historical period of the construction of socialism. In them the working-class of our country, and of capitalist countries, found the reply to the question as to what was the concrete content of the present stage of socialism. To fight against "equalisation," against "depersonalisation," and for business accounting—are these tasks for one month, for one season, for one year? These are the tasks that correspond to the basic principles of Marx and Lenin regarding the first phase of Communism, and the fulfilment of these tasks will take up the whole, or nearly the whole, of the first phase of Communism. By putting these tasks before us, Comrade Stalin put a check on those who had already jumped from the concrete, historical conditions of the beginning of the first phase of Communism, and who in their practical policy reflected the illusion that it was possible to achieve the EQUALITY of the second phase of Communism, direct socialist exchange of products, right at the present day, at the beginning of the first phase of Communism.

Or take the problems of the organisation of labour, labour power and skilled cadres—problems which have to be solved by our Party in completely new conditions—are these merely problems of the present day? No! They are problems of a whole historic period. And the task of our Party, trade union, and business organisations, is to apply concretely in their work the points of Comrade Stalin under the conditions actually prevailing on every sector of the economic front. This is the essence of concrete leadership, the absence of which fre-

quently gives rise to such great difficulties. Concrete leadership presupposes a series of measures based on a calculation of the growing demands which the masses make on the new system, great initiative on the part of the lower economic units, a certain decentralisation of the economic organisations within the framework of the general plan, liberating our economic system from useless forms of bureaucratic centralism (we have already begun to divide our chief commissariats and economic institutions into smaller units), and the application from top to bottom of the system of individual responsibility for given tasks, and above all, the adoption of business accounting and financial control.

It must be frankly stated that we have not yet applied business accounting and financial control. With regard to these, we still have in operation many relics of war Communism, fostered from time to time by ideological leaps into the second phase of Communism. We must introduce business accounting into all branches of our economy. For example, in practice we must enforce material responsibility (financial) for the factory which is to blame for disorganising the work of another factory. Let us suppose that a textile factory stops working five or six times in a day because the electric power station did not supply current, the station must pay the loss incurred and must itself demand compensation for loss from the organisation which supplied poor quality peat and thus caused frequent stoppages at the power station.

But at the same time the Party must strike hard at everyone who, on the pretext of introducing business accounting, drags in the commercial methods of the first years of NEP, and calls for the restoration of "freedom of trade" and the free market. A correct application of the methods of business accounting in the present stage of socialism presupposes a stern régime of economy, and this means that we must keep the expenditure on our new constructions within the limits of the estimates, that we must definitely fix the order in which they are to be built, avoid unproductive expenditures in the factories, avoid having superfluous people on central government supply, it means carefully handling complicated tools and machines—it means further the establishment of firm financial discipline, putting an end to the contemptuous attitude that some adopt towards the Soviet rouble, to accumulate necessary reserves which will enable the enterprises to meet contingent difficulties.

Business accounting is the surest way to increase the efficiency of labour and to improve the quality of our products, to strengthen the collective farms organisationally and economically, and consequently to improve supplies for the broad masses. Of course, we do not want a caricature of business accounting; but we need business accounting as the

basic element of the plan, and applied to every machine group, every machine, and every worker, to the collective farm, the brigade and the individual collective farmer.

In 1919, Lenin said that "the efficiency of labour in the long run is the most important and the chief thing necessary for the victory of the new social order." Socialism will conquer because it shows a higher productivity of labour than capitalism can show. But the productivity of labour is determined by two factors—firstly, the level of technique, which includes the question of the equipment of our factories, the ability to operate complicated machines and tools, the training of skilled cadres for our industry, the proper organisation of labour in the factories, etc. To ensure this condition—the raising of the productivity of labour—our Party has done, and is still doing, a great deal. It has reconstructed all our factories. Such factories as the "AMO" which has grown from the small automobile shop owned by Riabushinsky, into a giant, are far from being an exception. Every year it trains thousands of young Soviet engineers, who have already become prominent such as Kartashov in the Donbas, Kapelushnikov in Baku, excellent workers whose qualifications far exceed those of the best specialists in capitalist industry.

Secondly, the productivity of labour is determined by a factor of a social-political character, namely by the socialist attitude to labour. This opens up an enormous field for a prolonged, stubborn, revolutionary educational effort for the "socialist remoulding of the mind of man." This is one of the chief tasks of the second Five-Year Plan. Socialist competition and shock-brigade methods have raised the socialist attitude of our working-class to labour to a tremendous height; 70 per cent. of the workers in the factories are now engaged in shock-brigade and socialist competition. They have developed also in the collective farms and are transforming the mentality of yesterday's individual farmer into that of collectivism. Socialist competition and shock-brigade work represent, on a par with the heroism of the civil war, the finest and brightest page in the history of our revolution.

But it would be wrong to think that since socialist competition and shock-brigade work have strongly developed, we have already remoulded the minds of our toiling population in the spirit of socialism. The psychology of the masses cannot make dizzy leaps towards complete Communism if the material conditions of human life have not yet emerged from the first phases of Communism. If we, members of the C.P.S.U., the party of the social revolution and of socialism, cannot yet say that we are Communists in the sense of the second phase of Communism, then what can we expect of the non-Party workers and the mass of collective farmers? The bulk of our

proletariat represents a new stratum of the proletariat; the overwhelming majority of our industrial workers have only recently come from the country. The old stratum of the proletariat which has been in industry for years, is a very thin stratum, while the new stratum from the villages bring with them the sentiments of yesterday's small owner with which they are still imbued. And if we observe the process, how socialist competition, shock-brigade work and the work of our Party and trade unions turns these raw village masses into a new type of man and woman we shall see an amazing picture of the renaissance of human psychology under the new material conditions of socialism. But these are still far from being the Communists of complete socialist society.

But still more difficult processes of the reconstruction of the human mind are taking place and will take place in the collective farms. In the year of the great change, the masses of middle peasants definitely turned in the direction of socialism. But we must know how to firmly consolidate these masses in the collective farms, to reorganise them under conditions which are new to them, to give them a new orientation, to re-educate them. And this is a very difficult task which may give us many a headache yet. In pursuing its policy our Party takes all these difficulties in the matter of the socialist re-education of the masses into account. Therefore, while greatly developing the new socialist stimuli, our Party does not neglect to use the stimulus of personal interest, either in socialist industry or in collective farm practice. Hence, in our wages policy, we employ the system of wage scales, we have introduced piece-work, wages depend on the quality of the work performed, etc.

It is well known that we are also experiencing difficulties in supplying the toiling masses. What measures are our Party taking at the present time to overcome these difficulties? Firstly, the rapid rate of industrialisation is the best method of overcoming the commodity shortage and of satisfying the growing demands of the toiling masses. In addition to increasing the sown area in the second Five-Year Plan to 160 million hectares, the extensive development of collective vegetable farms and State cattle ranches—which in the main have already overcome the difficulties of the organisational period and have brought their stock of sheep to 4½ millions, horned cattle to 2½ millions, and pigs to 1 million—in addition to more extensively developing light industry than previously, our Party in the last few months has introduced two important measures—the development of collective farm trading and the development of the production of articles for immediate consumption in the big factories (the chief rôle in which is played by the newly-organised scrap utilisation departments of factories especially in the

metal industry, for the manufacture of goods of general utility for the villages). And as these measures are not only calculated to improve supplies for town and country, but are the main lever for the organisational and economic strengthening of the collective farms, I shall have to deal with them in greater detail.

The decrees recently passed by the Soviet Government on collective farm trading are the economic and political continuation of the six conditions of Comrade Stalin, forming with them a complete system of measures calculated to secure a further rapid advance to socialism in our country and which rest on a combination of the stimuli of both social and individual interests in accordance with the stage of socialism through which we are passing.

The bourgeois and social-democratic Press interpreted these decrees as marking the beginning of a return to the first period of NEP. Can this collective farm trading be compared with the first period of NEP? Of course not. The socialist sector now occupies the predominating position in the economics of our country, the arena of socialist accounting, control and regulation has been widely extended, the apparatus of Soviet State and co-operative trading in spite of all its defects handles practically the whole commodity turnover of the country, the kulaks have been liquidated as a class in the districts where complete collectivisation has been established and a great blow has thus been struck at the parasitic elements, the strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship has given the Soviet Government great power in the struggle against speculators and traders. Only apologists of capitalism can deliberately spread the opinion that this is a step back from collectivisation, a return to NEP of the first period, the abandonment by the Party of the construction of classless society.

At the beginning of NEP, Lenin, in reply to a question put to him by the English newspaper correspondent, Arthur Ransome, as to whether NEP would not lead to the dictatorship of the middle man on the market as the result of "free trading," quite reasonably answered: "How can that happen when production is in our hands and not in the hands of the middle man?" Now we can say more. Now we hold the predominant position in the market. What new positions can private capitalists seize in the villages if the land and the means of production (implements, tractor power) are socialised, if the machine-tractor stations are gradually helping to transfer the present *artel*\* form of the collectivisation of agricultural implements to the higher stage of being an undertaking of the socialist type, not differing from the factory? The orchard and garden, private animal stock (cows, sheep, chickens), the share of the farm produce received by the

collective farmer on the basis of the number of days he has worked, all remain the private property of the collective farmers, but all these are merely elements of the personal fund of consumption of the collective farmer and his family. They are not means of production, ownership of which would create the conditions for the exploitation of man by man. If the consumption fund be compared with wages, because collectivisation is not entirely the same as the relationships that exist in a socialist factory, and a collective farmer is still not entirely the same as a proletarian, nevertheless, this personal consumption fund of the collective farm family, realised through the market, cannot, on the other hand, be identified with small commodity farming. Although economically the market relations of the unsocialised part of a collective farm resemble those of small commodity farming, the social relations of the collective farm, however, are approximate to those of the socialist factory. To fail to see the dialectics of collective farming is to make a number of mistakes in practical collective farm policy. This means, to regard collective farm trading, not as the perfectly natural function of the *artel* form of the collective farms, but as a concession to "petty bourgeois" anarchy. But the theory of "concessions," i.e., statements that collective farm trading is a concession, a retreat, reflects in practice those excesses in collective farm practice which foster equalisation and depersonalisation, leading to the absolute disruption of some collective farms.

Why do we fight against equalisation in wages in the socialist factory? Why do we employ the stimulus of the personal interest of the worker in order to raise his output, and pay wages according to results? Why is it that in enterprises of the consistently socialist type, i.e., higher forms than that of collective farms, we permit piece-work? And why is it that sometimes in our practical work in the collective farms, in the lower *artel* form, we have gone to such a length of bureaucratic distortions with this equalisation in payment and lack of personal responsibility that we hinder both the social and the individual stimulus to labour? When our Party, on the initiative of Comrade Stalin, corrected this pernicious practice and, not in the least degree changing the basis of our collective farming policy, by means of the new decree simply directed the entire attention of the Party and Soviet apparatus to the correct Leninist-Stalin application of this policy, the bourgeoisie and their social-fascist hangers-on raised a howl that we were returning to the NEP, that we were making "concessions" to elementary forces, etc. What is meant by a struggle against the equalising tendency and lack of personal responsibility in collective farming? It means an increased fund for the personal consumption of the collective farmer and his family, here, too, making use

\* Co-operative.—Ed.

of the incentive of personal interest, through the market, it is true, but a market which is directed, which is regulated by the proletarian state, a market which serves the interests of socialist construction, or, what is the same thing under the proletarian dictatorship, which serves to raise the standard of living of the toiling masses. But did our Party ever deny or entirely replace the socialist stimulus by the stimulus of personal interest in the collective farms? The very *artel* form of the collective farm is the best combination of personal and social stimuli, because we are now only at the beginning of the first phase of Communism (socialism) and we chose this form of socialised agriculture and not the agricultural commune.

"The conditions are not yet ripe for agricultural communes as the PREVAILING form, in which not only production but distribution also is socialised."\*

The basic line laid down by Comrade Stalin still holds good.

And when certain people advise us to give up the new social stimulus and rely only on the individual stimulus of the peasants for the purpose of raising the level of agriculture, we cannot describe these counsellors otherwise than as the mouthpiece of the kulaks. We never rejected the personal stimulus of the collective farmer. But the increased emphasis which is now being put on the individual stimulus has a different political meaning. Behind the talk of restoring individualist stimuli there is hidden a cowardly attempt to revise the policy of collectivisation.

As we know, the whole of bourgeois political economy has been built up on the idea that no society can exist without the individualist principle of personal interest, that socialism is impossible for the very reason that it destroys this "fundamental of fundamentals" of capitalist society. Not only our system, but monopolist capitalism itself, has proved the reverse.

Impersonality, the crushing of all individuality the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus due to the growth of unproductive expenditure, that which Schmalenbach called the "bonds of business"—this is the direction of the development of monopolist capitalism.

And now, when the individualistic stimulus is passing through such fundamental perturbations in the capitalist world, we in the land of socialism are advised to return to it. And what does a return ENTIRELY to the stimulus of personal interest mean in agriculture except a return from collectivisation to small commodity farming. Moreover, why should the stimulus of personal interest be interpreted to mean exclusively wage-hogging, the striving of the collective farmers to sell the whole of the marketable part of their crop on the private

market at speculative prices, the restoration of the "personal" work of the collective farmer and his family on a separate, exclusive, isolated part of land, with the help of primitive implements of labour, a horse and plough?

And is not the advantage of large-scale production over small production, the replacement of the barbarous peasant form of hand labour by the work of machines and the resulting enormous increase in the productivity of this labour, the shortening of the busy seasons in farming, the freeing of peasant hands from extra work, the penetration of electricity into the villages, the introduction of artificial irrigation, which are possible only on a "collective" basis and which abolish the age-long worry of the peasant concerning rain, does not all this serve as a "stimulus of personal interest" for the peasant in the collective form of farming?

How otherwise can we explain the overfulfilment of the Five-Year Plan of collectivisation which took place in the U.S.S.R. in 1929, the unquestionable historic fact that the middle peasants, not to speak of the poor peasants, irrevocably turned in the direction of socialism in the "year of great change," joining in solid ranks the collective farms and forming whole regions of complete collectivisation?

What idealist motives, and what ideal measures of organisation could have compelled millions of peasants who had lost the stimulus of personal interest, year after year, to plough and sow, to reap and mow, to plough up summer fallow, to sow in the autumn when the fields are almost like swamps? Why did the stimulus of personal interest of the collective farmer, which acted in combination with the new social stimulus in 1929, more or less correctly, fail to act in 1932? Is it merely a seasonal stimulus? Furthermore, why does it act fairly well at the present time in the middle Volga, where, in spite of the drought last year, the sowing plan was fulfilled, the harvest was gathered in good time, or in the Moscow region, which has carried out all the agricultural campaigns of the last few years not at all badly, but for some reason this unfortunate stimulus breaks down in the Ukraine. One would think that this stimulus is subject to local variation. And this local variation exists not only in whole regions but in separate districts in that region and even in one and the same district, in individual collective farms. We can find two collective farms in one and the same district, where in one the stimulus fails to act, as in the Ukrainian, while in the other it acts as effectively as in the middle Volga and the Moscow region. It is quite obvious that the question is not one of "stimuli," but of the organisation of the collective farm, that talk about stimuli is an attempt to throw the responsibility for organisational impotence and inability on to objective causes, to turn away from the difficulties of organisational tasks, to choose the easiest path.

\* Stalin: *Dizzy with Success*.

The task of organisationally and economically strengthening the collective farms is now the main link which we must seize in order to pull the whole chain of tasks for raising the agriculture of our country. Without this it will be impossible to raise agriculture. We cannot improve the harvests by elimination of weeds, winter fallowing for crops like beet, we cannot restore and extend individual and collective cattle-raising, dairy farming, chicken farming, vegetable gardening, fruit growing, etc., if we do not increase the profitability of the collective farms. And this in turn presupposes the proper organisation of labour in the collective farms based on a combination of social and personal stimuli, the introduction of piece-work in the collective farms, the ruthless elimination of equalisation in wages and lack of responsibility which foster loafing on the job, careful supervision and control over the quality of the work, proper registration of this work and a sensible and economic division of labour among the brigades. This also presupposes reducing so-called capital construction in the collective farms to the limits of actual necessity, the ruthless cutting down of all kinds of management expenses, the organisation of all kinds of supplementary handicraft work in addition to field work.

We shall not advance a single step forward in raising agriculture unless we increase the profitability of the working day. Millions of collective farmers must become convinced by personal experience of the greater economic advantages collective farming brings them compared with individual farming. It is not a matter of words and speeches and agitation, but a matter of facts which speak for themselves and convince the collective masses.

Finally, the problem of the organisational and economical strengthening of the collective farms is connected with the development of the Soviet goods turnover. Collective farm trading will receive a great impetus if, in exchange for the products of agriculture and stock rearing in the villages, a stream of manufactured goods for general use flows from the towns. We must not forget that our *smytchka*\* with the villages, which, above all, is of a productive character, does not exclude consumption. Our Party and the Soviet Government are now taking energetic measures to develop the manufacture of articles of general use by a supplementary mobilisation of commodity resources.

Such are the measures by which the C.P.S.U. is strengthening the cause of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

THE PATH OF THE U.S.S.R. IS THE PATH OF  
REVOLUTION AND VICTORY.

When Lenin left us he said: "Ten or twenty years of proper relations with the peasants and victory is assured, even if the proletarian revolutions, which

are growing, should be delayed." Under conditions when the proletarian revolution in other countries is being delayed, we treasure this behest of Lenin like the apple of our eye. The relations of the proletariat to the peasants in the U.S.S.R. have already become not merely an alliance, not merely a *smytchka* as we called these relations in 1929. Thanks to collectivisation they have become something more. The position now is not merely that class interests coincide: they have grown into the unity of class interests based on the unity of the social system.

The proletariat of the U.S.S.R., under the leadership of the C.P.S.U., secured the victory of socialism with the support of the world proletariat, but for the time being, without the practical help of the world proletarian revolution.

But the cause of socialism would make immeasurably greater progress in the U.S.S.R. if we got help from your side in the form of a proletarian revolution.

The world proletariat must know that its belatedness in the matter of the world proletarian revolution has created many additional difficulties for us. The fact that our proletariat was the first to break through the imperialist front without support from the proletarian revolution in other countries made this work particularly difficult, much more difficult than it will be for the workers of those countries which, in the approaching second round of revolutions and wars, will take the path of the proletarian revolution.

It is true that in the struggle for the proletarian revolution in your countries you will encounter many additional difficulties that did not exist for us Russians on the eve of the October Revolution. But you have many advantages which we had not when we marched to the October Revolution.

It is true that your capitalism is more firmly established than Russian capitalism was in 1917, but your proletariat is much more numerous and much stronger than ours was. It is true that your bourgeoisie is cleverer and has learned many lessons from the October Revolution, but it is also the task of the Communist Parties to learn from the experience of the October Revolution, so as to be more strongly armed against a cunning, deceptive and clever enemy.

It is true that we Bolsheviks were helped by the war, but you are being helped by the world crisis.

It is true that we were saved by the enormous width of our territory, but in your rear you have the enormous *place d'armes* of the proletarian revolution and socialism in the U.S.S.R.

It is true that social-democracy is stronger in your countries than it was in the U.S.S.R., but if you have not been able to undermine the influence of social-democracy in spite of the world war, the proletarian revolution in the U.S.S.R., the revolutions

\* Bond.—Ed.

in the Central Empires\* and the world crisis, the fault is yours.

It is true that fascism has come across the path of the proletarian revolution in your countries, which was not the *case with us*, but the appearance and growth of fascism are due to the over-ripeness of capitalism and the belatedness of the proletarian revolution.

At the Second Congress of the Comintern, we said that the proletarian struggle for power in capitalist countries would be more difficult than here. But, comrades, certain changes have taken place since then. The U.S.S.R. has victoriously fulfilled the first Five-Year Plan and is entering into the second. By this it renders enormous assistance to the world proletariat in the struggle for power. The country that next takes the path of proletarian revolution after the U.S.S.R. will have behind it, not the Socialist Republic of 1920 in the period of war Communism, but a socialist, industrialised country, which has completed a Five-Year Plan. We rushed into the fight alone in the sense that we had behind us neither a victorious proletarian revolution nor a country which was victoriously building socialism. We had no ready-made models of practical socialism. You have an invincible fortress—a socialist country with a firm industrial basis. Our experience of the various stages of our revolution will help you to avoid many difficulties in the sphere of relations with the peasants, NEP, collectivisation, the management of socialised industry, etc. We took a road hitherto untrodden by human feet. You will march along a beaten path. For you the construction of socialism will be many times easier than it was for us, because you will inherit from the past a higher level of productive forces than the October Revolution inherited. And if we were able to obtain our tremendous successes, in spite of the difficulties we had to overcome day after day

\* *i.e.*, Austria and Germany in 1918.—Ed.

owing to the low level of productive forces we inherited, then what unprecedented rates of development and expansion will you achieve when your productive forces are put on a socialist basis?

The experience of our first Five-Year Plan and the prospects of the second, tell the workers in capitalist countries who still fear the cost of revolution and the difficulties of constructing socialism that in 1918-19, after the end of the World War, you feared the cost of revolution, but during the past fifteen years you have suffered greater loss by preserving the obsolete capitalist system. And will it be only fifteen years? You were afraid that revolution and civil war would destroy productive forces, but the world crisis of capitalism has destroyed them to a far larger extent than revolution would have done. You were afraid of the convulsions which might be caused by the proletarian revolution—unemployment, depreciation of currency, fierce class struggles, bloody war; but capitalism has put you into a zone of tremendous convulsions, fascism, war, the undermining of the material basis of existence of millions of human beings. You dreamt of "stabilised capitalism," but the relative, decayed capitalist stabilisation which was established after the first round of revolution and wars has come to an end. You were afraid of the difficulties of socialist construction, but capitalism has compelled you to share with it all the sufferings of its own death agony—the closing of factories, the failure of banks, unemployment, and the loss of the savings of small depositors, wage-cuts, the reduction and even the abolition of social insurance, the increase of exploitation. Proletarians, comrades, you must choose between capitalism and socialism, between reaction and revolution, between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of your own class. There is no other way. And we have no doubt as to the choice which the working-class of the world will make. It will choose the path of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., the path of revolution and victory!

(Continued from page 636.)

of course, must under no circumstances duplicate its work. The Communists within the trade union and peasant organisations must learn to pursue a true Communist line in them. They must co-ordinate the struggle for the daily demands with the basic political slogans, subordinating their work to the tasks of the struggle for the power. The Japanese Communist Party which is heroic-

ally leading the struggle against the imperialist war and the bourgeois-police monarchy, will then succeed in solving the problems confronting it, undermining the mass base of the Social-Democracy in the labour movement, winning a majority of the working class, and securing the development of mass battles for a revolutionary solution of the war and economic crisis.

# ON THE END OF CAPITALIST STABILISATION

SPEECH BY COMRADE MANUILSKY.

## *The New Features in the International Situation.*

**T**HE most important and newest problem in the thesis submitted to the Plenum, the approach of which Comrade Stalin signalled some time ago, is the question of *the end of capitalist stabilisation*. One can say, without exaggeration, that this is the most significant thing that has been said by the Comintern since the end of the first round of wars and revolutions. This fact will determine the policy of the Comintern for the next years to come. Because of the swift change of events, which occurs as a result of the end of capitalist stabilisation, we shall have to re-orientate the Communist Parties in accordance with the change in the surrounding conditions.

The end of capitalist stabilisation means a sharp change in the international situation (the breakdown of the Dawes Plan, the Young Plan of Reparations, of the Washington Agreement and an unprecedented sharpening of antagonisms between the imperialist robbers) as well as of the inner class relationships in the capitalist countries (the pauperisation of the toiling masses, their enslavement by finance capital to a greater degree, the growth of Fascism and the upsurge of the revolutionary struggle on the basis of the sharpened class struggle). It also means a change in the attitude of the imperialist powers to the colonies (a furious onslaught upon the colonies, war in China, mass executions in India, Indo-China, and the answer to that—the upsurge of the national-revolutionary movement in the colonies). Finally, there is the change in the attitude of the imperialist robbers to the U.S.S.R. (the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the period of Socialism and its progress in the construction of Socialist society, which rouses the furious hatred of the capitalist world and which also proves that the "respite" given to the Soviet Union is coming to an end).

The significance of this cannot be weakened by the fact that the process which brought about the end of capitalist stabilisation is not yet completed, that the operation of all the basic contradictions of capitalism develops unevenly in different countries. Such countries as the U.S.A., France, China or India are equally witnessing the end of capitalist stabilisation, although the depth of the class movement, the degree of class antagonisms, as well as the international situation of each of these countries is altogether different.

The end of capitalist stabilisation—is a fact not of local, but of international significance. From

it we shall have to make tactical conclusions of an international character. But Comrade Kuusinen was right in warning us, in his report, against treating these tactical conclusions too lightly, without taking the peculiarities of different countries, and the uneven development of revolutionary processes into account.

This cannot be mitigated even by the fact that the end of capitalist stabilisation does not mean that to-morrow we shall have the crash of the Versailles Treaty. We are only at the beginning of this crash. As of old, Germany and Austria are still being choked; as of old, the Versailles frontiers are still being guarded; as of old, French imperialism surrounds itself with a chain of vassals— allies (Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania, Jugo-Slavia). Around this Versailles system (reparations, frontiers, armaments) there is now developing an unprecedented struggle which is speeding up the end of capitalist stabilisation.

This fact of world-wide significance is not altered though the end of capitalist stabilisation is accompanied by the Communist Parties lagging behind the objective conditions. This lagging behind only retards the collapse of capitalism, and the process of transforming the end of capitalist stabilisation into a revolutionary crisis. Because of this situation, there will be a definite lapse of time between the end of capitalist stabilisation and the revolutionary crisis in the most important imperialist countries. The length of this time, discounting the objective conditions, will depend upon the activity of the Communist Parties. However, no matter how great the activity of the Communist Parties will be, the transformation of the end of capitalist stabilisation into a revolutionary crisis will develop unevenly in different countries.

We have very little reason to imagine that this short space of time which represents the transition to the second round of wars and revolutions is a sort of "fourth period" which will lead to a "fifth period" of general revolutionary crisis. At the VI Congress we characterised the "third period" as the sharpening of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism which is inevitably leading the capitalist world to a second round of wars and revolutions. It is, however, the end of capitalist stabilisation which makes up, so to say, the "soul" of the third period.

"This third period, reads the resolution of the VI Congress, in which the contradiction between the growth of the productive forces and the contraction of markets become particularly

accentuated; is inevitably giving rise to fresh series of imperialist wars: among the imperialist states themselves; wars of the imperialist states against the U.S.S.R.; wars of national liberation against imperialism and imperialist intervention and to gigantic class battles. The intensification of all *international antagonisms* (antagonisms between the capitalist States and the U.S.S.R., the military occupation of Northern China—which is the beginning of the partition of China—the mutual struggles between the imperialists, etc.), the intensification of the *internal antagonisms* in capitalist countries (the swing to the left of the masses of the working class, growing acuteness of the class struggle), and the wide development of *colonial movements* (China, India and Syria) which are taking place in this period, will inevitably lead, — through the further development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation,—to capitalist stabilisation becoming still more precarious and to the severe intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. . . .”

“Hence, the maturing of a new series of gigantic military conflicts, of wars of intervention against the U.S.S.R. and the intervention now proceeding at full pace in China. Therefore, the development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation inevitably leads, in the final analysis, to the present growing into a period of gigantic cataclysms.”

There was a time when certain comrades were inclined to accept various powerful strikes and demonstrations as events which overlap the boundaries of the third period. At the X Plenum already, voices were heard asking whether it is not high time to transfer the world revolutionary movement to the “fourth class.” The comrades who put this question did not understand the revolutionary character of the third period. We had to decisively combat this playing at periods, which served as a substitute for the serious revolutionary evaluation of events; we had to fight against hollow-sounding schemes, which say nothing, and have no relation to the international and class situation. To present the end of capitalist stabilisation as a sort of special period without wars and revolutions, is to portray this period as the natural decay of the capitalist system, while the working class is completely passive. This means to portray the fate of monopoly capitalism like that of ancient Greece or Rome—the decomposition of a socio-political system, without any action on the part of the class which is to push this system into the abyss.

But if we cannot foretell the day and determine the exact duration of the period of transition of the end of capitalist stabilisation to the zone of revolution and wars, we are also unable to accept

fatalistically, beforehand, that this period of the decay of capitalism will be of very long duration. The answer to this question belongs, above all, to the working class.

The problem of the end of capitalist stabilisation is also of tremendous significance because it decides the question of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism. The new point on this question in our thesis is that the general world crisis of capitalism is approaching a new stage of development. How will this new stage of the general crisis of capitalism present itself? What will be its content? Precisely—the new round of wars and revolutions. In order to understand this new development of the general crisis of capitalism we must have a clear and concrete idea of what the socio-political consequences of the end of capitalist stabilisation will be.

#### THE GROWTH OF THE CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM.

World capitalist economy has never represented a harmonious unit. But even the relative unity of the world capitalist economy which existed before the world war, was destroyed by the proletarian revolution in Russia, which split world economy into two altogether different worlds. The rise of Socialist economy in the U.S.S.R. was the most important cause of the general world crisis of capitalism. But the present economic crisis has caused further damage to world capitalist economy. *It has disintegrated this economy into its national-state parts.*

The period that has elapsed between the XI and XII Plenums was characterised by the fact that the disintegration of world economy into small parts reached very large proportions. A wave of so-called “economic nationalism” (the development of protectionism, prohibition of export of currency, tariff wars, import quotas, preference, etc.), has swept the capitalist world. This tendency towards economic isolation (autarchy) has begun to develop at a furious rate. The capitalist world resembles a sinking “Titanic,” where everyone tries to save himself, and at the expense of his neighbour. This is the economic basis of the wave of nationalism, the growth of which has been pointed out in the thesis of the XII Plenum, and which is connected, in the most intimate manner with the development of Fascism. This is one of the manifestations of the end of capitalist stabilisation which raises the general crisis of capitalism to a new stage.

But the growing wave of nationalistic sentiment not only fosters Fascism; it gives rise to a war mentality in the capitalist world. To-day, more than the eve of 1914, the capitalist world

resembles a powder magazine. Only the underground passages of this magazine have been changed. To the old contradictions of Europe, there are now added the antagonisms of the Pacific. The end of the era of capitalist stabilisation in the Pacific not only means a war against China, and a threat of war against the U.S.S.R.; it also means a growing conflict between Japan and the United States. The Washington five-power treaty is already scrapped; the era of world conflicts in the Pacific, which includes the sum total of European conflicts on the Mediterranean and Atlantic, is the herald of a terrible and unprecedented world war which will bring all the continents of the globe into action.

This maturing world war is being wedged into the complicated system of colonial movements, into the heated internal relations of the capitalist countries which reek with social conflicts.

All these contradictions of capitalism are manifesting themselves on a wider scale. And while the first round of wars and revolutions primarily bore a European character, the second round will bring the toilers of the whole world into this conflict. Such events as the strained relations between Germany and Poland over the Danzig corridor, war in China, the brandishing of weapons in Japan and the United States, and finally, the openly-expressed plans for an attack on the U.S.S.R. from the west and the east—all these new aspects are closely bound up with the end of capitalist stabilisation.

Is it an accident—that in addition to Germany and Poland, Japan and China are now becoming key positions in the world revolutionary movement? It is towards these countries that the gaze of the international proletariat is now directed. This is the political synthesis of Balkanised Europe and the tightening of the knot of antagonisms in the Pacific.

Germany is the country which has the strongest mass Communist Party, the country which stands nearer to the proletarian revolution than all other advanced capitalist countries. A revolution in Germany means a revolution in the whole of Central and Eastern Europe. This would mean the creation of a mighty revolutionary fist against the rest of the capitalist world which would give decisive superiority to the land of the proletarian dictatorship over the rest of the capitalist world. Germany is the main link in the Versailles Treaty. Its economic system is more shattered than that of any of the other big capitalist countries. Of all the capitalist countries Germany has the sharpest internal class struggles, it is the open wound of Europe (the German question, after the U.S.S.R. is the

most troublesome problem to the capitalist world), it is the struggle of an advanced capitalist country, against the domination of imperialism.

Poland, the country where the workers' and peasants' movement has fighting revolutionary traditions, is the bridge to the proletarian revolution in Germany. Poland is at the same time the capitalist outpost against the U.S.S.R. It is also the fist of world imperialism (particularly France) which is preparing a war against the First Workers' Republic. Poland is the gendarme of reactionary Fascism in Eastern Europe, at the same time it is a land in decline, revealing the bankruptcy of Fascism.

Alongside of these two countries there is China, which plays a most important rôle in undermining capitalist stabilisation. China is the nerve-centre of the antagonisms among the most powerful capitalist countries in the Pacific; it is developing all the antagonistic conflicts between Japan and the United States. With its revolution, it is rousing the peoples of Indo-China, India, Philippines, the Malay Islands and other colonies. It is the centre of instability of the whole colonial system of world imperialism which reaches on the East, through Mongolia to the Soviet Union and China with its tremendous Soviet territory—and unconquerable Red Army. Remember that since the XI Plenum the Kuomintang has undertaken three offensives (altogether four) against the Soviet territory of China and all these were repelled by the victorious Red Army. This was an historical test of the possibility of applying the Soviet system, not only to China, but in general to the colonial peoples. In this struggle, millions "voted with arms in their hands" for the Soviet government in China. Since the XI Plenum, the national revolutionary movement in China, because of the Japanese invasion, has reached unprecedented heights, leaving the revolutionary wave which we witnessed in 1925-27 far behind in its sweep. This anti-Japanese movement was really a movement of all the Chinese workers.

And are these facts less indicative of the end of capitalist stabilisation than the decrease in production, etc.?

Finally, Japan is a country which is undermining capitalist stabilisation not only with the depreciation of currency, but with her war—her aggressive policy in the Far East dictated by her desire to rule over all Asia, and, to rule the Asiatic waters of the Pacific, with the aid of her strong navy. Besides the war and the raging military-Fascist reaction, capitalist stabilisation is also being undermined by the growing revolutionary crisis in Japan.

## SHARPENING CLASS STRUGGLES AND THE GROWTH OF FASCISM.

Secondly, the end of capitalist stabilisation means the sharpening of class struggle, and the growth of Fascism. As the usual formula of our thesis and resolutions, this, of course, does not represent anything new. But the degree of Fascisation of the capitalist countries, in this new stage of development, will be different from what it has been hitherto. What is taking place in Germany now is an example of the path which will be taken by all capitalist countries, unless the militant, revolutionary actions of the proletariat, or proletarian revolution retard the process, or put an end to it. If we are to speak seriously about the end of capitalist stabilisation, we must also point out that so-called bourgeois democracy is also experiencing a sharp crisis, which is leading to its political death-agony. The development of the crisis of bourgeois democracy will be determined by two factors; the growth of the revolutionary upsurge, and the development of Fascism.

Hitherto we have said that the bourgeoisie governs with the help of its two wings — the Social-Democracy and Fascist Party. The period of capitalist stabilisation was characterised by the fact that the bourgeoisie utilised Social-Democracy as its main weapon (coalition governments, and Social-Democratic governments). The end of capitalist stabilisation increases the specific gravity of Fascism in capitalist government administrations. It would be premature to say that Social-Democracy has already become an inmate of a home for the aged, maintained for past services, but at the same time, we must not think that the end of capitalist stabilisation is not altering the position of Social-Democracy in the system of capitalist governments.

Nor must Fascism, particularly during the end of capitalist stabilisation, be represented as a one-sided process of the growth of reaction. Civil war parties are not organised if there is no one to fight, if the elements of this war do not exist in reality. It is silly to think that the development of Fascism will grow if absolute passivity reigns in the camp of the proletariat. That is true of separate countries, and of international relations. First of all, Fascism, being a product of the decay of capitalism, as Comrade Kuusinen correctly pointed out, is itself subject to decay. Even in the rising curve of German Fascism, we already observe elements of its decline. Secondly, the end of capitalist stabilisation is characterised by the fact that those Fascist dictatorships which had established themselves in the period of capitalist stabilisation

(Jugo-Slavia, Poland, Italy) are now under the blows of the revolutionary mass upsurge. It would be wrong then, in the conditions of the new phase of the general crisis of capitalism, to depict the development of Fascism in the form of a rising curve only. There will be curves going in the opposite direction also. These will represent the elements of the revolutionary upsurge and of the growing revolutionary crisis.

Our thesis characterises the present situation as a struggle of antagonistic forces, in some places very intense, and in some more restrained. This struggle of antagonistic forces represents the maturing of the elements of revolution and counter-revolution which are inherent in the present unstable situation. Marx was fully justified in saying: "The Party of revolution rallies the party of reaction."

Fascism, as a political party, is as unstable as the whole present situation. As a product of the decay of capitalism, it reveals symptoms of decay even in moments of its greatest upsurge: and if many years were required for the defeat of Social-Democracy, the defeat of Fascism in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, will be achieved in a much shorter period.

But Fascism does not decay automatically. It will not collapse, unless it is pushed. Not a single class, not a single régime falls, as Lenin correctly pointed out, unless it is pushed over.

At the XI Plenum we had to combat the under-estimation of Fascism (the theory of the general offensive, the theory that we have barred the way of Fascism, that Fascism represents the defence of capitalism, that it is only a product of decay—theories created by Comrade Neuman, in Germany). Now, however, at the moment of the end of capitalist stabilisation, a new danger arises—the under-estimation of Fascism as an element of the decay of capitalism, and the treatment of the Fascist dictatorship as the consolidating factor in the class domination of the bourgeoisie. It has already been correctly pointed out here, that it is impossible to compare Fascism during the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, with Fascism at the beginning of capitalist stabilisation. Who will now assert that a government led by "Reichs-Chancellor" Hitler would succeed in leading capitalism out of a blind alley and in re-establishing capitalist stabilisation? That is why the clever, cunning, German bourgeoisie therefore does not allow Hitler to take power, for it fears to compromise its reserve forces; it fears that the Hitlerites will make the internal situation in Germany still more complicated, will create an extremely strained international atmosphere, and speed up the outbreak of the revolutionary crisis in Germany.

It must not be forgotten that Germany is not a semi-agrarian country like Italy or Poland. Germany is a country with a mighty proletariat, among whom the memory of the proletarian revolution of 1918 (though unsuccessful) still lives. Germany is a country with a strong Communist Party, with a strong proletarian revolutionary tradition and a long history of class struggle. The government of Papen-Schleicher will not succeed in 'putting a Fascist muzzle on these masses, or crucifying them on the Fascist Swastika.

Thirdly, it must not be forgotten that Hitler's accession to power in Germany would create a different international situation than, for instance, the accession of Mussolini or Pilsudski. Hitler's accession to power would mean a sharpening of the contradictions of the Versailles Treaty, and unprecedentedly strained relations in Europe, which would speed up the growing revolutionary crisis in its central section—Germany.

This is true not only of Germany. Fascism, in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, is also a source of international adventurism and of sharp armed conflicts. Imagine for a moment what Europe would look like in the international sense if it were to become Fascist. It would present a picture of bristling bayonets, charged guns, crawling tanks—a welter of war. This would correspond very little to the ideal of capitalist stabilisation. And that, of course, is not accidental.

Fascism, at the end of capitalist stabilisation, more and more displays the symptoms of the further decay of capitalism. This does not mean, however, that the elements of terrorist dictatorship will not develop any further. It is this, in fact, which we have not said at the XI Plenum, and which we must point out at the XII Plenum. But this situation compels the bourgeoisie to manoeuvre, with the aid of Fascism, before the wide masses. In Finland and Germany we see a bourgeoisie which has established a Fascist dictatorship, but deliberately covers it up. Meanwhile, we see that the bourgeoisie is holding the Lapuaski and Hitler gangs in reserve as a weapon of terrorist pressure upon the masses whom they want to compel to accept the present phase of Fascist dictatorship.

Our government is not yet a Fascist government—says the bourgeoisie to the masses—but if you don't accept this government, we shall give way to Hitler.

But what does the Fascist dictatorship with its reserve, a sample of which we see in Germany, represent? We cannot, of course, say that the government of Papen-Schleicher, and that of

Brüning are one and the same; but even the government of Papen-Schleicher is not the final form of the Fascist dictatorship. And is it possible in general to have a complete form of Fascist dictatorship of the type of Italian Fascism, under the present unstable conditions, when capitalist stabilisation has come to an end? On the other hand, we cannot say that because Fascism in Italy, after it came to power, temporarily permitted the existence of a workers' press (*Avanti*), of workers' organisations—trade unions, and even permitted the Communist Party to exist semi-legally, it therefore ceased to be a Fascist dictatorship. And, because it suppressed the labour movement several months afterwards, that it was not a Fascist dictatorship in the first month of its accession to power.

We think that we already have a Fascist dictatorship in Germany, but whether Hitler comes into power, or the Papen-Schleicher régime continues, depends on a whole series of internal and international conditions. In the first place, it depends upon the activity of the working class, whether the Party will be able to organise a united anti-Fascist front and unite the widest masses of the German proletariat around its slogans. It would be a mistake, however, to transform the work of the Plenum into academic debate, instead of analysing the situation of the German proletariat, and the problems which confront it in connection with the struggle against German Fascism, which has grown considerably since the XI Plenum.

#### THE END OF THE PERIOD OF SOCIAL REFORMS.

The third point in the end of capitalist stabilisation is that it marks the end of the period of social reforms, the undermining of the position of the aristocracy of labour, a new standard of living for the working class in the midst of a ruined peasantry, a ruined petty-bourgeoisie; in other words, the mass proletarianisation of the broad masses of the toilers. We cannot represent the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism as a purely economic process; we must also take into consideration the socio-political consequences of the economic changes. Otherwise we shall not understand the dialectics of the sharpening of the class struggle; or Fascism, or the revolutionary upsurge of the masses. This is the key to the proletarian revolution. This is the reason why the Communists should now, more than ever, concentrate their attention on the every-day needs of the masses, rouse the masses for the struggle for the most elementary economic demands. Particularly now, when Social-Democracy and

the reformists, swimming in the waters of capitalist ideology, defend capitalism by arguing that it is powerless to give new reforms, to improve the condition of the working class, and that because of the world crisis is compelled to reduce wages. It is precisely at this time that we Communists should present our militant policy of fighting for the partial demands of the working class. We must, with greater energy than ever, expose Social-Democracy, which, under the cloak of verbal radicalism, demoralises the workers and cultivates passivity and capitulation. It is the economic needs of the masses which is the fundamental basis for the transformation of the revolutionary upsurge into a revolutionary crisis.

One must be mad to think that the working class of the New Hemisphere and Europe, which, whatever may be said, has decades of experience of fighting for its standards of living, and organisational traditions, will allow itself, without protest, to be transformed into a slave class bereft of rights, satisfied with that standard of living which was typical for the workers at the dawn of capitalism. The working class still harbours illusions of the possibility of a return to normal times of capitalist stabilisation: it regards the present situation as being temporary. Here and there, the most backward elements among the unemployed workers believe that a war, or some sort of a legendary Third Empire, will give them work. But the end of capitalist stabilisation will open their eyes. The prospect of great struggles is not an invention of the Communists; to-day it is becoming a reality; to-morrow, it will thrust the capitalist world into the abyss.

At this Plenum we must call upon the Communists of all countries to wage a ruthless struggle against the theory of identifying the end of social reforms with the end of the struggle for the partial demands of the working class. The end of social reforms means that the bourgeoisie will no longer be able to mend and patch capitalism, and make it more acceptable to the masses; but this does not mean that the working classes cannot fight successfully for its partial demands, and that the fight for the partial demands is merely revolutionary gymnastics, and nothing more. The revolutionary significance of the struggle for partial demands assumes tremendous proportions in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation. Every fight of this sort is a breach in the capitalist system. The struggles for partial demands to-day, are different from the struggles previously waged by a Social-Democracy for "social reforms" which helped to entrench and consolidate capitalism. At the present time, every movement for the partial demands of the workers brings the workers into

closer contact with the realities of capitalist existence and contains within itself tremendous revolutionary possibilities. To-day, out of the smallest encounter, out of the most elementary local movement, a tremendous revolutionary movement of national significance arises. Those who do not see the revolutionary side of this struggle for partial demands fall into the pre-war position of Social-Democracy on the question of "social reforms."

#### THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION.

Then there is the fourth point—the rôle of the Soviet Union in the approach of the end of capitalist stabilisation. The end of capitalist stabilisation is characterised not only by the fact that capitalism has fallen from its position of relative stabilisation, but also by the fact that the Soviet Union is uninterruptedly marching forward. These two diametrically opposed lines of development, deepening the abyss between the two contradictory worlds, sharpening the contradictions between them, transfers the question still more sharply and decisively: "Who—Whom\* to the international arena."

#### THE REVOLUTIONARY UMSURGE.

Finally, there is the revolutionary upsurge. Capitalist stabilisation, as is well known, was ushered in as a result of three main factors: the economic factor,—the restoration of the pre-war level of world economy (stabilisation of currency, capitalist rationalisation and some diminution in the divergence between the prices of manufactured goods and agricultural produce — the so-called "scissors"); the international factor:—the agreement among the imperialists to exploit Germany (the Dawes Plan) China, the colonies and the "stabilisation" of relations with the U.S.S.R.; the political factor: — the temporary suppression by the bourgeoisie of the revolutionary movement in Central Europe and the repulse by the world bourgeoisie of the first post-war attack of the world proletariat. We particularly stress the last factor. This is a subjective factor. The collapse of capitalist stabilisation could not be only a result of objective factors: world economic crisis (the growth of Fascism and war) and the break-down of the established alignment of forces in the international arena. It also occurred as a result of class struggles in every capitalist country, extended, so to say, to the international arena in the form of a revolutionary movement of all peoples against imperialist oppression.

\* In Russian: "Kto Kovo"—who-whom. The famous formulation of Lenin meaning—Ed whether Socialism will beat Capitalism or vice versa.—Ed.

Not only has the development of the world economic crisis during the last three years sharpened class antagonisms, but the extension of the class struggle, has, in its turn, been a most important factor in sharpening and deepening the world economic crisis. It is sufficient to remember what influence the movement in the British Navy had on the fall of the English pound. Such events as the revolutionary upsurge in China with its 400,000,000 population, which brought about the establishment of Soviet rule in one-seventh of the territory of China, the tremendous anti-Japanese movement which has broken through all the barriers of Kuomintang terror, the revolutionary upsurge in India during the past year, which found expression in the growth of the civil disobedience into nascent rebellion, the five and a half million Communist votes in the very heart of Europe — Germany, the revolutionary struggles in Spain, the wave of strikes in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, United States, the textile and miners' strikes in France, the miners' strike in Belgium, the present Lancashire strike, have played, and are now playing a tremendous rôle in ending capitalist stabilisation, and sharpening all its economic and political consequences.

Take, for instance, the latest events in France in connection with the air manœuvres on the eastern frontier, and the charged atmosphere in which the whole capitalist world now finds itself — these are indicative of something, are they not?

Take the unity between the revolutionary peasantry and the revolutionary working class movement in a number of capitalist countries; in such countries like Bulgaria, which have lived through a wave of bloody white dictatorship; it has brought about an unprecedented growth in the influence of our Communist Party among the peasant masses — this is also indicative of the growing world revolutionary upsurge.

It is doubtful whether we can say already that between the XI and XII Plenums a new stage of the revolutionary upsurge was reached. But there is no doubt, as Comrade Kuusinen pointed out, that since the XI Plenum the world revolutionary movement has not gone backward, but forward.

We cannot interpret the thesis on point 1 to mean that because certain additional difficulties have arisen in the process of the maturing of the revolutionary crisis in Germany, this means that the world revolutionary upsurge is sliding downwards like a sleigh on a Russian toboggan road. The end of capitalist stabilisation has merely increased the disproportion between the insufficient upswing of the world revolutionary movement and the objective conditions. And this disproportion has diminished the significance of the fact

that almost everywhere our Communist Parties, with the exception of the United States and France, have grown numerically and widened their influence. But this growth and widening of the influence of the Communist Party is very inadequate compared with the existing possibilities. But what influence will the end of capitalist stabilisation have on the development of the revolutionary upsurge? Undoubtedly, it will, in the near future, give rise to a new stage in which, in those countries which are at present in the general stage of revolutionary upsurge, this upsurge will develop into a revolutionary crisis, while in those countries in which the elements of the revolutionary crisis are already mature, a revolutionary situation will arise. We see the first symptoms of this process in Japan, for example, where side by side with the elements of Fascism and war, the elements of a revolutionary crisis are also maturing.

Two principles, like Ormuzd and Ariman, will confront each other in the shape of two classes, advocating two opposite ways out of the general crisis of capitalism, and contending against each other; war and Fascism on the one hand, revolution — on the other.

Whether it will be the lot of the working masses to suffer through the further development of Fascism and wars, before they accomplish the proletarian revolution depends primarily upon the Communist Parties, for at present there is no other power on earth that can mobilise the working masses, unite them around its militant slogans, organise them into class organisations, and lead them in the fight to destroy Fascism and overthrow capitalism.

Theoretically speaking, we cannot exclude from the development of events the possibility that in separate capitalist countries Fascism and war will precede the proletarian revolution, while in others they will develop parallel to it; but we shall most decisively combat the fatalistic idea, which has penetrated certain links in the Communist Parties which take it for granted, beforehand, that this course of historical events is inevitable. According to this fatalistic concept the historic work of preparing the proletarian revolution will be carried out for us by war and Fascism, that war and Fascism will undermine and destroy the influence of Social-Democracy, which is the main obstacle on the path of the proletarian revolution — that in the meantime there is no need for us to engage in economic struggles and take the risk of being thrown out of the factories, or to fight against Fascism, because according to this theory, Fascism is an inevitable stage in the development of capitalism; that the sooner Fascism comes into power, the sooner will it

spend itself and become bankrupt, and finally, that the Fascist masses will come over to our side spontaneously.

Reliance on spontaneity represents the second phase of this concept. At the present time, in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, this theory represents the gravest danger for us. It demoralises the working class, and creates an ideology of "tailism"\* and passivity. It lulls the vigilance of the masses, and together with the policy of "the lesser evil" it paves the way for Fascism coming into power unobserved. This is a profoundly Right wing opportunist ideology, an ideology of capitulation, a doctrine of impotence, fear and consternation. The absence of strikes in Germany at the present time, the fact that our struggle against Fascism is lagging behind the rate at which Fascism is growing, then, must be ascribed, in addition to the corrupting work of Social-Democracy, to those who are spreading opinions of this kind. The fact that the Communist Party of Germany did not, on the 20th of July, react sufficiently quickly to the "coup d'etat" of the Papen government, the fact that it developed its action like a too cumbersome machine, the speed of which did not correspond to the speed of events, must also be regarded as a reflection of these moods. But, comrades, I think I shall express the opinion of the Plenum in declaring that the Comintern wholly and entirely supports the leadership of the German Party which is confronted by tremendous tasks and which has to work under very difficult conditions. (Applause). The Comintern has, and always will, fight against those disruptive measures taken by certain elements who are trying to create strife in the ranks of the active Party members, instead of exerting every effort to help the Party leadership to carry out the responsible tasks that confront the Communist Party of Germany.

But comrades, the whole Plenum wants an answer to the question as to why in Germany, where the Communist Party is, next to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the largest Party in the Comintern, there are so few economic strikes. Strikes occur in Spain, in Poland and in Czecho-Slovakia, but there are very few strikes in Germany. This question is a very acute one in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation. First of all, we must note that in Germany there are a number of specific difficulties in developing strike struggles, which do not exist in other countries.

Secondly, we must bear in mind that lately, the German proletariat has been more and more fre-

quently resorting to separate political strikes; thirdly, that the German working masses employ other means of struggle, as, for instance, the street, particularly in their fight against Fascism. But all this does not exhaust the question. It is said that the strikes in Germany are hindered because of the difficult international situation of that country. Influenced by Social-Democratic propaganda, the working class still believes that it is its duty to save capitalist Germany, which was defeated in the imperialist war, from the terrific pressure of world imperialism (primarily of France). The preaching of national unity and "common sacrifices" is fostered by the Versailles Treaty, because that treaty not only creates the elements of a revolutionary crisis, but also creates supplementary obstacles to the maturing of these elements. Furthermore, it is said that a strong Social-Democracy, and the strong reformist trade unions are obstacles to the development of strikes; it has been said that to this must be added the illusions that are still entertained on the possibility of a return to capitalist stabilisation, if the country is not subjected to shocks in the form of outbreaks of class struggle. It has been said that the widespread victimisation exercised by the employers, which puts the workers in danger of being thrown out of their employment, plays a tremendous rôle in Germany, even more than in other countries. All this is true. But we, as revolutionary politicians, should not only see these difficulties, but understand the new and wide possibilities for economic struggles which arise, and will yet arise, with the end of capitalist stabilisation.

The fact that capitalism has already spent itself in regard to social reforms, that the capitalist governments are more and more throwing off their social responsibilities to the toilers, and becoming more and more openly organs of political oppression, the fact that finance capital in all its ramifications is becoming monstrously inter-dependent and interwoven with the apparatus of the state, of course, creates a number of obstacles to the development of strikes. All these traits of monopoly capital in the period of its general crisis were already maturing in the womb of capitalist stabilisation. Now, however, in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, they are further stimulated. Social-Democracy says to the masses: the bourgeoisie declares itself bankrupt, it cannot increase your wages, it cannot pay for social insurance, its government cannot fulfil any social functions; hence it is useless engaging in the economic struggle, it is useless fighting for economic demands because the chances for success in these struggles are diminishing. Separate sections of

\* The speaker used the Russian term "Khvostism," from the word "khvost," meaning tail, i.e., dragging at the tail end of the movement instead of leading it.—Ed.

the proletariat which throw themselves into the struggle are powerless in the face of monopoly capital and will be beaten one by one. Therefore, says Social-Democracy, it is necessary to capitulate,—and to wait for a more decisive struggle—add the Right wing and “Left” opportunists.

The theory that strikes are impossible in the period of economic crisis, is to-day growing into the theory that partial struggles are impossible in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation. But if there are no economic struggles, then the conditions for a decisive struggle for the proletarian dictatorship have not yet matured, if partial political struggles are broken against the armour of the capitalist government which has grown to monstrous proportions, then the only thing left to do is to regard war and Fascism as our allies.

Our most important task is to overcome these moods, which are so dangerous to the cause of the proletarian revolution. If the proletariat were to reject strikes, as a method of struggle, it would disarm itself completely in the face of the capitalist offensive; it would give capitalism a free hand in dealing with the standard of living of the working masses. It is said that struggles are hard, but why do our Polish and Spanish comrades, in countries where there are smaller Communist Parties and a “poorer” capitalism, carry on successful struggles and not only prevent wage cuts, but even gain increases in wages?

Let us assume that there are a number of specific difficulties which hinder the development of the strike struggle—but then it is the duty of the Party to utilise other forms of struggle in leading the masses into economic and political mass fights. In this struggle the proletariat will learn how to utilise stronger measures to compel its enemies to retreat until it has learned to use the strongest of all measures — the proletarian revolution.

We must particularly emphasise the fact that economic struggles in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation develop into political struggles much more quickly than they did before, and that economic strikes become closely interwoven with political strikes. In the near future we shall have to put the question of mass political strikes in a different way. As the proletariat gains experience in the struggle, it will convince itself that without such a concentrated blow, it will be impossible to break the resistance of the class enemy. And this method of struggle is already beginning to be adopted by the masses. That is precisely why Social-Democracy, aware of the sentiments of the masses, is playing with the slogan of a general strike. We must learn

to distinguish the true will of the masses, from these manoeuvres of Social-Democracy, otherwise we will leave the masses in the power of the demagogic Social-Democrats.

We must tear this weapon out of the hands of Social-Democracy, by placing the question of preparing and carrying out mass political strikes before the wide forum of the working class, who are now learning from experience, that Social-Democracy is only fooling them with its lofty slogans. We must remember that in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, the mass political strike will become one of the most important and effective weapons in the struggle of the working class. In advancing the slogan of the political mass strike, Communists must take into account the concrete conditions required for its realisation, so that the slogan of mass political strike shall not remain hanging in the air, as has happened more than once in the work of our Communist Parties. But when we raise the question of proletarian dictatorship, or of the mass political struggle, does that mean that we must treat our everyday work in strengthening our connections with the masses contemptuously? This everyday work is the only way by which we can guarantee that our struggle for proletarian dictatorship, our preparation and organisation of the mass political strike, will not be transformed into an empty and meaningless revolutionary phrase.

The whole Plenum listened with great interest to that part of Comrade Kuusinen's report in which he pointed out how enormously *important it was for the Communist Parties to establish closer ties with the masses*. Everyone of us in this hall felt, that this is the thing the majority of the Communist Parties lack. This is the key to the successful solution of the problem of mobilising and organising the masses, on the basis of the defence of immediate demands, in our everyday work, and of leading them in the cause of economic and political battles to the decisive struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

It is impossible to speak about a revolutionary upsurge without being in the very midst of the working class, without knowing its needs and formulating its basic demands in concrete and clear slogans. Although our French comrades, for instance, draw up very radical theses, at their congresses, about the revolutionary upsurge; that does not yet mean that we are making headway in the work of establishing closer connections with the masses in France. This part of Comrade Kuusinen's report is significant because it attacked the Right and “Left” wing verbosity which we have not as yet overcome, and which tries to cover up the absence of real mass work.

It attacked the theory of spontaneity by means of which some sections of the Comintern are trying to dodge the important tasks of mobilising and organising the masses. There is not a question about which so much has been written as this one, but we have not yet made up for lost ground in this field of mass work.

The task of winning the masses was put before the Communists already at the Third Congress of the Comintern. And it is no wonder that our lagging behind compels the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, to concentrate the attention of the Communist Parties on the decisions of the first three Congresses, which formulated very clearly to the Communist Parties that were then being organised, their tasks of winning over the masses. But does that mean that we identify the present political situation of the Communist Parties with the period which they were in during the First, Second and Third Congresses? Does that mean that there is a gulf between our thesis regarding the end of capitalist stabilisation, and the task which they impose — the task of winning the masses into which the wide perspective of the world revolutionary movement has disappeared; and that its place has been taken by the tactics of fighting exclusively for everyday demands? Those who think that by raising the question of fighting to win the masses, and of mobilising, organising and preparing them militantly for the decisive struggles for the proletarian dictatorship, we are withdrawing the question of revolutionary perspective, are sadly mistaken. Understand, that if after the numerous resolutions that have been passed by six World Congresses and eleven Plenums, we have not yet carried out the decisions of the first three Congresses, then it is our duty to state this to all the sections of the Communist International. But is not our characterisation of the present situation as the end of capitalist stabilisation the most important revolutionary perspective which, with the present relation of forces, we can give to the Communist movement? It is precisely this perspective that causes us to raise the question of proletarian dictatorship in a new way in the period now opening before us. Our propaganda and agitation for the slogan of the proletarian dictatorship will grow more and more into a slogan of action of the wide masses who, around their everyday demands, are rising for struggle for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The elements of pure propaganda will move somewhat into the background. We shall also have to approach the slogans of the transition period differently. To-day we do not put forward such slogans anywhere, but the development of

events may put this question before the Comintern in individual capitalist countries to-morrow. Such slogans as the confiscation of reserves of food and objects of prime necessity by militant representative organs of the working class to be supplied to the needy masses of the unemployed population, or to capture closed up factories and begin to operate them with the forces of the workers, etc., may become particularly real. When speaking to-day about what is apparently very modest spade work, the everyday mass work, we must visualise at the same time the possibility of spontaneous outbursts of mass movements. If, in the period of partial stabilisation of capitalism we saw such movements as the protest movement against the execution of Sacco and Venzetti, the June Days in Vienna, as the English General Strike which shook the capitalist system in England to its very foundation, what may we expect now, when the capitalist world has entered the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation. Just think what the capitalist world would look like now, if a real, mass Bolshevik Party had been at the head of the General Strike in England, instead of the treacherous General Council. If we are to speak of a gap in the revolutionary perspective, then we must say that our weak connections with the masses caused a gap between the powerful revolutionary movements which have arisen, and their poor results. When we want to fill these gaps, we are told that we are losing our revolutionary perspective, and attempts are made to substitute reliance on spontaneity for the latter. And yet, we would be very bad revolutionaries if we did not take the spontaneous movement into account. Probably a number of our sections will have to fight for the leadership of such elemental movements, not under the organisational and political conditions that we would like, but under those which history will create. Theoretically speaking, it is possible that we shall have to fight to win the majority of the working class in the midst of great revolutionary outbursts, as in Spain. And since the Plenum thesis covers only the next year and a half or two years, the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation, we must foresee all possibilities and orientate the Sections of the Comintern in that direction.

#### SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY.

The last question: What effect will the end of capitalist stabilisation have on Social-Democracy? What changes are taking place in the ranks of Social-Democracy in this new period? In order to understand these changes we must first of all answer the question,—what has been the basis of the influence of Social-Democracy up till now?

Social-Democracy was supported by a thin layer of the labour aristocracy which widened in the period when Social-Democracy became merged with the State, and of the shattering of capitalist stabilisation, by drawing into its ranks wider layers of government, trade union, municipal and co-operative bureaucrats. The end of capitalist stabilisation undermines the economic base of the labour aristocracy. The Fascist bands who want to get near to the government pie are squeezing the Social-Democrats out of their fat jobs.

After the crisis which was brought about by the World War and the October Revolution, Social-Democracy consolidated its position as a party of capitalist stabilisation. The end of capitalist stabilisation undermines its base.

After 1914 Social-Democracy played with Pacifism, and made a lot of noise about the League of Nations, it tried to prove that capitalism can guarantee peace during the reign of "democracy." The war in the Far East, the danger of onslaught upon the U.S.S.R., the entire present pre-war situation has robbed the Social-Democrats of the weapon with which they fool the masses who fear war. Social-Democracy defended democracy — Fascism took that away from it too. It based itself on social reforms—capitalism took that possibility away; it kept its position by spreading the fear of upheavals, amidst those layers of the working class who are still infected with petty bourgeois ideas. But capitalism entered a period of the most difficult upheavals, dragging after itself millions of people, including the Social-Democrats.

These are the causes that determine the present transformation of Social-Democracy. This transformation, like all processes of a social-political order, cannot be presented in a purely mechanical manner. They must not be portrayed as though occurring at the same time and in the same way on a world scale. In different countries this process will occur differently, according to the degree of the intensity of the crisis, class struggle, the growth of Fascism, radicalisation of the masses, etc. But, fundamentally, this process of transformation of Social-Democracy will be reduced to the following two types; (a) one part of Social-Democracy represented by MacDonald, Thomas, Snowden, etc., will openly go into the camp of reaction; (b) the second part will vacillate under the pressure of the masses, and try to prevent the masses from going over to Communism (the English Independent Labour Party, the Seidewitz—Rosenfeld Group), — the basic nucleus of Social-Democracy, which has a left wing, and will once again try to side-track the radicalisation of the working class, by putting

forward a series of radically sounding slogans. In the most important capitalist countries, we already see this type of manœuvring on the part of Social-Democracy. This is the new feature in the development of Social-Democracy, brought about by the end of capitalist stabilisation.

The four most important features of the manœuvres of the Social-Democrats are as follow:—

*First manœuvre*: Social-Democracy, which for decades has posed as the party of social reform, suddenly announces itself as the party of Socialism, striving for the final goal of the working class movement, Socialism. Of course, this Socialism is democratic, and is to be achieved without a proletarian revolution. On the contrary, it is to be accomplished by carrying through within the framework of capitalism "a programme of nationalisation." Social-Democracy tries to confuse the minds of the workers with this manœuvre, and fool them with projects of socialisation as they did in 1918-19. It is this circumstance that dictates to us Communists the necessity of putting the question of proletarian dictatorship very clearly before the masses. This is, at present, the main link in our struggle against Social-Democracy, which we must tug on. Our slogans in the present stage of development, must therefore be very distinct, and leave no doubt whatever as to their content. Social-Democracy already formally accepts a whole series of our militant slogans, of course, squeezing the revolutionary content out of them. In some places they raise the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government, in other places, the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. There is no doubt that they will also utilise the slogan of proletarian democracy. Therefore our old militant slogan of the proletarian dictatorship, the slogan of power, must be put forward clearly in the struggle against the demagoguery which the Social-Democrats are raising around the question of Socialism.

*The Second Manœuvre*: Social-Democracy is now playing at "opposition" to the bourgeois government. If Wels now declares that German Social-Democracy, after having considered (notice, not spontaneously, but after having considered it) the question, came to the conclusion that capitalism has spent itself, and that Socialism is now on the order of the day; then Vandervelde makes the statement that a return to the policy of coalition is no longer possible. Social-Democracy makes the struggle against itself more complicated with such demagogic statements; it sows the illusion among the masses that Social-Fascism will turn, face about, and adopt class politics. And this makes it neces-

sary for our Parties, not simply to agitate about the deceit and treachery of the Social-Democratic leaders, but to utilise the mood of the Social-Democratic workers against the bourgeois government to develop it into real action, in the process of which, the masses would learn from their own experience the value of the pseudo-opposition of the Social-Democratic leaders.

This situation can also give rise to the following question among certain Communists. As a result of this; and of the growth of Fascism, will not Social-Democracy cease to be the main social support of the bourgeoisie, If we could imagine such a paradoxical situation, *viz.*, that we have destroyed Social-Democracy, while Fascism is on the upgrade, we would, of course, have to re-examine our old Leninist thesis of Social-Democracy as the main social support of the bourgeoisie. But if this happened in Germany, for example, there would be neither Fascism nor capitalism there. If Social-Democracy did not exercise influence in the ranks of the working class, the world would look differently to-day.

It has been said that we cannot regard Social-Democracy in Italy as the main social support of the bourgeoisie. Well, and who gave power to Italian Fascism? On whose shoulders did it rise in Germany? Who hinders the struggle of the working masses against Fascist terror in all the capitalist countries? To be the main social support means to hinder the struggle of the only revolutionary class that is fighting against the bourgeois dictatorship in all its forms.

Second question: Will not the process of Fascisation of Social-Democracy be retarded in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation? On the contrary. It will go on even further, just as it went on in those countries where Social-Democracy did not directly participate in the government. A party which supports capitalism even in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation cannot help becoming more Fascist. M. Blum (in France) has not participated in a coalition government; but he has defended, and will defend, capitalism no worse than Noske, in fact he will do it better, more cleverly, more flexibly. The Fascisation of Social-Democracy means the increase in its fury against the vanguard of the revolutionary working class, against the Communist Parties, against the U.S.S.R. Who would say that Social-Democracy's frantic hatred of the Party of proletarian revolution, of the U.S.S.R. has diminished in the period of the end of capitalist stabilisation?

*Third Manœuvre:* Social-Democracy plays with the idea of the unity of the working class. In the face of the furious capitalist offensive, the growth of reaction and Fascism, the beginning

of a new round of wars and the menace of a new world war, the masses feel the necessity for the unity of the working class—a unity which assures the success of struggle for emancipation. One can foresee that Social-Democracy will seize upon this slogan of the masses, squeeze the revolutionary content out of it and reduce it to sentimental verbosity about the evil of splits, the evil of impatience, etc. We Communists must take the initiative in this mass movement into our hands, and show the sincerity of our desires for real class unity of the working masses. We must expose the rôle Social-Democracy has played and is playing, that it is preparing to politically disarm the working class in the face of its class enemy. We must show how it has systematically split the ranks of the proletariat to help the capitalist offensive. We must show the masses by experience that only the Communists defend the unity of the working class on the basis of class politics and the class struggle.

And finally, *the fourth manœuvre:* The demagogic slogans Social-Democracy has raised around the general strike — of which we have already spoken and will not consider here in detail

#### CONCLUSIONS.

To sum up: The end of capitalist stabilisation, which is a composite part of the third period, signifies a new round of wars and revolutions as the social-political expression of the new stage in the development in the general crisis of capitalism. The end of capitalist stabilisation is already expressing itself in the wars that are going on now, or are maturing in various forms of reactions and Fascism, the growth of the revolutionary upsurge everywhere, the maturing of a revolutionary crisis in a number of capitalist countries, and in the change in the relations between the capitalist countries and the U.S.S.R. which is the base of the world proletarian movement. As a result of the end of capitalist stabilisation it is necessary to introduce a number of extensions into our tactics in regard to Fascism, the struggle for the partial demands of the working class, transition slogans, mass political strikes, the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the tasks of the Communist Parties in regard to Social-Democracy. Without for a moment abandoning our wide revolutionary perspective, steering our course in the direction of tremendous mass movements, the Communist Parties must concentrate all their forces on *Bolshevik mass work*, as a condition for the winning over of the majority of the working class, and for a successful struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

We must liquidate the lagging of the Communist Parties behind the favourable objective possibilities and not console ourselves with the fact that, fortunately for us, capitalism is lagging behind even more than we are. The present situation gives us a great deal, but much is demanded of us. We don't know under what cir-

cumstances the next Plenum will foregather, but we do know that it will gather in a situation that will be more tense for the bourgeoisie than the present. Do all those present here realise this; do they know the duties that are imposed on the parties they represent? It's up to you, comrades!

## THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN IN THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES

SPEECH BY COM. H. POLLITT.

COMRADES, in spite of the desperate efforts of the British capitalist class to find a way out of the crisis, the outstanding feature of the situation in England to-day is not an alleviation of the crisis, but a steady deepening and this in spite of the fact that a revolution is taking place in the fiscal policy of England, expressed in the traditional free trade country embarking upon the system of tariffs. And now the temporary gains which the change in fiscal policy and the going off the gold standard undoubtedly brought to a certain section of industry last autumn have disappeared. The position in basic industries is steadily getting worse. The Ottawa Conference not only revealed the growing disintegration in the Empire, but it has also considerably sharpened the conflicting interests between various groups of British capitalists and its meaning for the British workers as a whole is a tremendous increase in the cost of living.

What have been some of the social consequences of the crisis in Britain? Even Government figures have to admit an unemployed army of three million. If we take into account the hundreds of thousands of workers who are no longer registered unemployed, we have in England an unemployed army of 3½ million. In 1920 the average earnings of a miner were £5 1s. 6d., whereas to-day they are £1 15s. 10d. For a building worker they were £5 2s. 6d., to-day they are £3 12s. 6d. For a railway porter £3 12s., to-day they are £2 6s. In 1920 the average earnings of a woman weaver in Lancashire were £1 9s. 6d., to-day they are 11s. 4d. This tremendous fall in wages, in spite of the growing resistance of the workers to-day, has demonstrated to the workers better than any theory could have done that wage reductions do not bring back the old conditions.

In many big industrial centres which were formerly looked upon as beehives of industry and prosperity, such as Glasgow, Sheffield, Open-

shaw, etc., there are tremendous factories, not a single worker is employed to-day. In many principal mining towns not one worker is employed.

Another important factor which sometimes in our propaganda we did not make sufficient use of, is the deliberate destruction of the factories, which is now being carried through on instructions of the banks to limit competition, and the further fact of the complete rationalisation of British industry which the banks are aiming at.

For example, in the last twelve months, twelve big shipbuilding yards closed down, seventy-one berths have been destroyed, and in one case, a shipyard, which in 1920 was laid down with every phase of labour-saving machinery, since then has not constructed a single ship, and the machinery has been burned and sold for scrap iron. In one of the biggest combines in Manchester before the war, and which recently employed 7,500 workers, to-day there is employed only 500 workers. In 1920 the directors of this firm constructed a new factory which was filled with the latest type of heavy engineering machinery, amongst which at that time was considered to be the finest set of electrical turbine engines in the country. That machinery never produced a single thing. It is now being sold for scrap iron.

The National Government came into power on an unprecedented majority, with the slogan of "work and wages," men and women, which undoubtedly succeeded in deceiving masses of workers into voting for the National Government at the last election.

It is now clear to all, as the last two by-elections showed, that disillusionment with the Government's policy has already set in; that the chief line they are trying to carry through is attacks on the working class and this is their line on an international scale.

Firstly, they carry through their programme of economies and cuts prepared by the Labour

Government. This is a significant fact which our Party, of course, is tireless in driving home to the working masses.

Now the National Government is preparing new cuts after carrying through the whole programme of the economy cuts—a programme that met with the fiercest resistance from that section of the working class no one ever thought would resist, namely, the sailors of the Atlantic Fleet in Invergordon last September. That historical incident in the history of the British navy is one that will have increasing repercussions in the coming autumn, when undoubtedly new attacks will be made on all sections of State employees. The mutiny of the Invergordon sailors forced the National Government to make concessions to the army, the police and the air force which cost millions of pounds. Reductions which the Government had been confident it would be able to put throughout without any resistance. Now the Government is preparing a new plan and aims to reduce State expenditure by £100,000,000 between September and next March, by reducing the benefits of the unemployed and reduced expenditure on all vital social services.

In foreign policy its whole line has been to intensify the basic antagonism of imperialism, namely, the Anglo-American antagonism. This is shown in the decision reached at the Lausanne Conference; it is seen in the line being prepared for the coming world economic conference. It is reflected in the policies pursued by the British Delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference; it has been seen more strongly at the Ottawa Conference. Immediately the Conference had begun, President Hoover made a speech which was a warning signal to Britain that America understood very well the whole of the war ambitions which Ottawa signified as far as American imperialism was concerned. While it is true that the whole line has been to intensify this old antagonism between England and America, the Ottawa Conference was especially directed against the Soviet Union. This has also been seen in the secret agreements made at Lausanne; in support for Japan in Manchuria. This was also reflected in the "gentlemen's agreement" arrived at between England and France, where it speaks of a certain policy in regard to European affairs and no one can have any doubt that this is simply the policy of Britain and France towards the U.S.S.R. It has been reflected in the large exports of munitions and war materials from Britain to Japan for the latter's predatory ambitions in Shanghai. Ottawa also showed an open attempt to create more effective war preparations even at the expense of certain sections of British manufacturers who are anxious to work

on orders for the Soviet Union. But, finally, in this aspect of foreign policy, Ottawa has not only shown the disintegration within the Empire itself. It means that the workers are going to have to pay more money for bread and meat and all forms of tinned foods they consume, unemployment will increase, and the Trade Agreement with the Soviet Union will probably be destroyed.

The policy in regard to India is one of brutal and ruthless repression. We have to-day a situation where more men and women are in prison in India than ever in the history of that country, and the latest decision of the Government in proposing a so-called solution of the communal question in India further divides and disunites the forces in India fighting against British imperialism.

But even a more significant development, more significant from the point of view of the drive being carried out by the National Government, namely, towards Ireland, is the fight against the Irish Free State.

This is not simply a question that it wants to force De Valera to pay the three million pounds due from Ireland to Britain every year, on account of a settlement made in regard to land some years ago; or to force De Valera to sign the oath of allegiance to King George, the underlying motive is to make the Irish people once and for all understand that the National Government will never allow Ireland to become an independent republic.

What is the position of the British working class in this situation? Is it a down-and-out working class; is there no fight and militancy in the British working class?

We have any number of facts to show the tremendous developments taking place, even though developing unevenly. First, is the fact of the policy of disaffiliation from the Labour Party of the I.L.P., a policy carried through under mass pressure, and this reflects the increasing disillusionment with the Labour Party on the part of vast sections of the working class.

The growing revolt of the trade union branches against the iron rule of the trade union officials; the mass pressure which has compelled leaders in unions like the engineers, railway clerks, electricians, etc., to reinstate expelled Communists who had been expelled by the union for periods of from one to three years. It is reflected in the character of the speeches and resolutions which have been made and adopted at a whole number of important trade union conferences, such as the engineers, railwaymen, etc., this year, where the leaders of the trade union movement have made demagogic speeches which is the reflection of the mass pres-

sure upon them and they are now endeavouring to canalise that mass pressure so as to keep the rebellious elements from coming into the revolutionary camp. The wave of radicalisation is also expressed in the growth of the anti-war sentiments, in the splendid and unprecedented attitude of trade union delegates at the anti-war conferences, in the election of seventy-one workers—dockers, engineers, miners—who were sent to the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress. It has been reflected in the mass unemployed demonstrations, particularly those of last autumn (October, November, December) where for the first time since 1926, the period of the general strike, hundreds of thousands of workers came out into the streets and demonstrated. This militancy and radicalisation has reflected itself during the past ten months in the various economic struggles that have taken place (10,000 weavers in Great Harwood, 10,000 dockers in London and Liverpool, 3,000 London Lightermen, 10,000 Lucas workers, and the strike of the 3,000 Leicester hosiery workers) and in the present strike of the 200,000 Lancashire weavers and the whole series of other strikes this year. In England we can therefore see a fighting working class, and although radicalisation is proceeding unevenly, we see deep and fundamental changes taking place which only the more sharply emphasise the weaknesses of our Party, the serious lagging behind of our Party and our isolation from the masses, which is the warning note to the whole Party to improve its methods of work so that we can give that leadership for united action to this growing mass movement that can only come from the Communist Party.

What has been the policy of the reformists during this period? It is absolutely true to declare that the Labour Party stands to-day very largely discredited in the eyes of the British working class, but it is undoubtedly making every effort to make a come-back. It does this by the use of demagoguery, by bringing forward of programmes disguised as Socialism. For example, for the coming Labour Party Conference in October, a whole series of resolutions have been prepared dealing with finance, land, industry, trade, etc., and the essence of all these resolutions is that the Labour Party, given a Government with a majority, will reorganise the whole of the economic life of England; that by a series of corporations representing the employers, the consumers and the workers, it will be possible in this common family to be able to constructively begin in England the planning of industry and trade. This is Labour Socialism, but a careful examination of the Labour Party's policy on every one of the questions they are dealing with, reveals

the fact that, stripped of its phraseology, its line is an anti-working class line, a capitalist line.

How cunningly and skilfully these left manoeuvres are to deceive the masses is seen on the question of the Means Test. It is true to say that nothing is so hated as the Means Test. The Labour Party, when it was the Government, was the Government which introduced the Means Test, and it won the recent bye-elections in Wakefield and Wednesbury, both important industrial centres, simply on the ground that it was fighting the Means Test, when, in reality, it was the father of the whole scheme.

The Trade Union Congress opens in Newcastle on September 5th. The chief programme before the Congress of the General Council is a programme which is described as public control and regulation of industry and trade, and the General Council leaders of the Trade Union Congress have worked out a complete scheme whereby every industry can be brought under public control, with each of these industries being run on the lines of a public corporation, and they will then give a square deal to the workers, employers and trade unions. They define the goal of organised labour as the following: That it is to make industry a public service functioning in the interests of the whole community and organised on a model scientific line, with the aim of securing the maximum welfare for the people, and they are asking the delegates to reaffirm this policy.

The Trade Union Congress talks about fighting the Means Test. It also talks about the necessity of having shorter hours, the necessity of a forty-hour working week, but while it talks like this it is putting into operation the splitting of the unemployment movement.

Now just a word or two about the I.L.P. It would be wrong to underestimate the decision of the I.L.P. to disaffiliate from the Labour Party. It was on the initiative of the I.L.P. that the Labour Party was formed, and it represents a tremendous change in the traditional attitude that a decision should now be carried through that the Party which formed the Labour Party should leave the Labour Party. This decision was carried through at a recent conference in Bradford, there being 241 votes for disaffiliation and 142 against disaffiliation.

This disaffiliation takes place at a time, not when Labour is a Government, and when the results of its policy as a Government are so obvious to the workers; it takes place at a time when the Labour Party is in so-called opposition to the National Government, and so deep is the disillusionment of the masses with the policy of Labour as an opposition, that the I.L.P. as the so-called left wing within the ranks of the Labour

Party, now senses this feeling down below and it puts the question of leaving the Labour Party in order to become an independent political force.

In the ranks of the I.L.P. there has been a split since this policy was carried through, and one section of the I.L.P., called the loyal section, is to remain affiliated to the Labour Party and it is undoubtedly carrying on a big campaign.

It would be wrong to underestimate to the slightest extent the importance of this decision.

It is interesting to know how the conference in Bradford was organised—the conference to carry out the policy of disaffiliation. The first business of the conference was to pay a tribute to the memory of the Hungarian comrades executed; secondly, to send a tribute to the prisoners at Meerut; and thirdly, to pay tribute to the leaders of the C.P.S.U. for services rendered to world Socialism.

After these three items had been got through, then the ordinary business of the conference took place. At the conference a whole plan for Socialist Britain was brought forward. There is everything in that plan, except how the revolution shall be achieved, and the main thing of the plan is that everything is there, and everything can be achieved without a revolution. This is described as being the revolutionary Socialist policy for Britain.

But when it comes to the policy of the I.L.P. on economic struggles—for example, the present cotton strike—this is what the I.L.P. has to say: “The I.L.P. must continue to encourage resistance to wage-cuts and the tyranny of the employers, but must also point out to the cotton workers that they are doomed by capitalism, and a thorough-going to Socialism is the only hope of the workers.”

There is in the I.L.P. a revolutionary policy group whose only line of action against war is to blow up the munition trains and ships lying in the docks. This is the kind of propaganda they have been bringing forward in London in speeches and articles, but the simple question of instructing their I.L.P. members who are members of trade unions to refuse to handle these munitions, to get a one-day strike or a ten-mniute protest strike has never been brought forward.

Just a few remarks in regard to the tasks of our Party in the united front movement. There are many dangers confronting the Party as far as carrying out the united front from below is concerned. The chief danger, of course, comes from the right, but despite this our biggest task is to wage relentless war on the sectarian elements in the Party. At the Plenum of our Central Committee, the following was stated regarding the united front:

“The supreme issue now confronting the workers is the struggle against imperialist war, the taking of the offensive against all war moves and the beating back of the starvation attack, which is part of the war offensive. Therefore, the urgent and imperative task before the Communist Party is the organisation of a broad united front of the working class and the mobilisation of all forces for a decisive advance of the entire Party.”

This was contained in the June resolution of the Plenum of our C.O.

How is the Party to carry out that task? How is the Party to mobilise its forces to carry out what it declares to be the most urgent and imperative task before the Party?

First, to overcome the sectarian tendencies which prevent us from carrying out the united front work and activity; secondly, to take the initiative for developing the united front activity and action to effect our end; thirdly, to convince our entire Party that the united front is not a phrase and fetish but only a concrete way in which the workers can fight against the capitalist offensive and develop a mass movement; fourthly, we must make a determined effort to win the rank and file of the I.L.P., at the same time to avoid creating the impression that there are no fundamental differences between our Party and the I.L.P.

We must also explain why the C.P. cannot drop the right of criticism when engaged in united front work.

Finally, on this question comes the question of the popularity of our language. The sooner we begin to understand how to say what we want to say in ordinary language, the more effective will the whole line of our propaganda become.

Now some remarks about economic struggles, our work in the trade unions and the question of the fight against unemployment.

In 1931 our Party participated in many economic struggles and made many mistakes which led to a complete distortion of the line of independent strike leadership and organisation. Comrade Kuusinen referred to some of them, particularly the South Wales example, where a self-appointed committee of about twenty Communists called itself the Central Strike Committee of South Wales. However, as a result of the criticism of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U., decisive changes were made and these are now being put into effect. In our experience this year we are now trying to find a way to apply independent leadership that has a mass character to it. The experience of a whole series of struggles this year have brought out the necessity of the utmost flexibility being utilised in order to be able to

win every bit of contact in developing the strike leadership. Some interesting factors have come out of an analysis of the strike struggles which we must take into consideration in formulating the correct slogans of the fight. One of the most interesting things in England, so far as economic struggles and the resistance of the workers is concerned, is the fact that on some aspects of rationalisation, the fight is more bitter than when it is a fight against wage-cuts. For instance, the magnificent fight of the Lucas workers was the fight against the Bedaux System. The London busmen's resistance, which will probably take the form of a strike in the end of September, is not primarily against the threatened wage-cut. The new rationalisation scheme for the railwaymen, which in nine months will put 30 per cent. of them on the streets, is what the railwaymen are mainly fighting against, and this fact of relentless opposition to rationalisation is very important. And in Lancashire to-day, although the wage-cut is playing an important part in the fight, the central feature is the resistance of the workers to the More-Loom System because the weavers understand that it will put 50 per cent. of them on the streets.

And if we understand this, then in formulating our slogans, they must always take into account this factor.

I will not give all the figures in regard to the progress of the economic struggles in England during the last two or three years, but just a few examples: There were 250 strikes from January to July, involving 150,000 workers, and 905,000 working days lost. This is not taking into consideration the new situation in Lancashire, and strikes in London at present.

One or two remarks in regard to experience in a few economic struggles. The Lucas strike was incorrectly referred to by Comrade Kuusinen, the real mistake not being brought out; but he may have the wrong information.

What was our mistake in the Lucas situation. It was of a two-fold character. First, our comrades began to argue as to whether to form a new union or not, instead of concentrating all their resources on building an organisation within the factory, within each department, and linking this up with a factory committee; the second mistake, made by the C.C., was in not building up the M.M. and in not recruiting members to its ranks during the course of the strike, but rather concentrating on the question of building factory contacts and a committee.

The basic mistake was the mistake of getting discussions and arguments going as to whether a new union should be built or not, instead of the mobilisation of all our energy for the building

up of factory, department and union organisations that would have formed a real mass revolutionary trade union opposition in the Lucas factory.

Take another strike—the London Lightermen. We had not a single contact with these men when the strike began. The question was how to get this contact. Finally, comrades were selected to go down and try to get some idea of what the lightermen's conditions were, to get the story written up in the "Daily Worker," and then try to get the "Daily Worker" among the strikers. This was done and the "Daily Worker" was sent to the chairman of one of the lightermen's locals and this man, who had never had any use for the paper before, took it to a meeting of 500 strikers, read the story to them and the strikers said: "That is the only paper which has told the truth about our fight." That gave us our first break. As a result of the interest aroused by that first story, we were then able to build up a big influence, and in two of the most important branches a special meeting was organised at which twenty lightermen joined our Party. In one of those branches we still have a big influence. But the important thing was the rôle that the "Daily Worker" began to play among a number of workers who had never heard of the paper before.

Now with regard to the strike of the Lancashire weavers. Our Party is very weak in the textile areas. This year some special concentration has been made on Burnley, which we looked upon as being the storm centre of any struggle which would take place in Lancashire. Some weeks ago we had nine Party members and eleven workers who were sympathetic to the Party in this town. Concentration had been made on the decisive mill, but we had not succeeded in getting new members into the Party from that factory. We did succeed, however, in widening the influence of the Party in that factory. However, eighteen weeks ago in a little place called Earby, the employers demanded another cut of 7½ per cent. Some 400 workers came out on strike. Our comrades went into that village and were received with definite hostility. Our comrades were told: "We want no Communist agitators here. The strike is being run by the union and it can be won by the union." After seven weeks, our comrades had so continued the struggle that they not only broke down all hostility against them, but were able to call out five other mills in this place. We succeeded in getting meetings of the strikers in each of these mills and in electing a rank and file strike committee from each one of the five mills in Earby. The strikers then asked for the use of the Weavers' Institute for a rank

and file strike meeting; the union officials said they could not have it; the comrades organised a march of all the strikers who forcibly took possession of the Weavers' Institute, and had it ever since. It was a little strike, but it was the first spark which set into a flame in Lancashire, where 200,000 workers are out at present for five weeks.

I will give another example. In Burnley the employers posted a notice of reduced wages; the union called a strike with the belief that the workers would not respond. Twenty per cent. of the workers there are unemployed; the Means Test has wrought havoc in every home there, and the union leaders thought that if there was no response, it would give them an excuse and mandate to sign a wage-cut agreement with the employers, with whom they were already negotiating. To their astonishment, and to the astonishment of the Party, every weaver in Burnley came out on strike, and in doing this, we can say that the decisive factor was undoubtedly played by the Party in organising, on the day before the strike, a meeting at which 5,000 Burnley weavers participated.

At this meeting the line was given as follows: the union leaders are calling you on strike; they do not believe that you will strike; we call upon all the weavers to strike in the mills and to mass-picket these mills. The next morning the comrades went on the picket lines, and one of the most important results was that all struck work, and these strikers approached our women comrades who were working in the mills and asked: which mills shall we go to picket? And for two days, under the leadership of our comrades, under the leadership of our Party—this is an undoubted fact—every mill in Burnley was picketed until every mill stopped.

This complete stoppage immediately brought a new situation throughout the whole Lancashire textile industry, and in every other textile town talk began to be heard of all being out together.

Subsequently a strike was called on August 27th and 200,000 of the weavers in Lancashire are now out on strike. By the end of this week scores of spinning mills will have to close down and that will make 100,000 spinners. In another three weeks 200,000 spinners are due for a wage-cut. If the spinners will now join the ranks of the weavers, that will be a power that nothing in Lancashire can defeat, and the job of the Party and the revolutionary opposition is to bring forward this slogan in the sharpest and most convincing manner possible in order to bring about such a position.

As the strike develops there is, of course, the danger of government intervention. We must be on our guard against this. We must utilise

all our influence in the union committees and particularly developing independent strike meetings and getting from these meetings provisional organisations that can lead to effective committees of action which in turn can lead to an all-Lancashire Conference of elected strikers from the meetings of the strikers themselves to appoint an authoritative independent strike leadership which is really representative of all the strikers. The Lancashire strike is one of the most important strikes which have taken place in England, the consequences of which will be felt throughout the entire country. Our small Party was able to collect £350 for the Lancashire strikers in the first three weeks. In one week it has also collected seven tons of foodstuffs from the workers in London and sent three motor lorries from London to Lancashire. This is arousing great enthusiasm from the workers along the whole lines of route from London to Lancashire.

Now I want to speak on some of the lessons which have resulted from these struggles.

First, we must continue to make war on the conception that independent leadership and united front activities can be separated, and make it clear that the independent leadership and activities we speak of is not the leadership and activities of a handful of Communists, but is the independent leadership and activities of the masses and not of a few Communists or supporters of the Minority Movement. And when once that conception can be got across to the entire Party and the M.M., then the whole line of methods of approach will undergo a whole change.

I want to bring forward a controversial point. I bring it forward, not to counterpose it in any way to work in the factories or to the objective we all have—the election of representative strike committees as a result of meetings in factories or mills—but I bring it for consideration out of the strike experiences. This point is the line of approach on the question of strike strategy.

What are the chief lessons of the boilermakers' strikes of 17 weeks, of the lightermen's strike of 7 weeks, of the miners' strike in South Wales, of the response of the London busmen; and what is the chief reason for the tremendous strike movement in Lancashire? In my opinion it is the under-estimation by our Party of the authority and importance of the trade union branches and the decisive rôle these trade union branches play in struggles.

If we have in Lancashire at present, as a result of activity in the mills and unions, on 4 of the 36 union committees, Communists or members of the revolutionary trade union opposition, we would be able to write a different story so far as that strike is concerned at present.

In South Wales there is the mining village, and the centre is the lodge. We talk to the miners in the pit. This is absolutely correct, and we must increase our work to get pit committees—the most cardinal principle must be factory organisation, but we must not be blinded to the fact that, while doing that, that miner with whom we are discussing the question of wages will say: What is the Lodge Committee going to do; and what is the Lodge Committee going to say? And unless we make a sharp turn in understanding the trade union branches and how to use them, we are going to neglect one of the most important methods to use, so far as carrying out strike activity is concerned.

I therefore hope that this question will be given the attention which it requires.

Now with regard to the question of work in the reformist unions. I would like to strongly support the thesis which gives added emphasis to this question and also the speeches of Comrades Kuusinen and Thaelmann where they dealt with it. Again I want to make it clear that I do not stress the decisive importance of this work in England from a trade union standpoint or from a viewpoint of being opposed to work in the factories, but from the experiences of life itself, because we hold the view that there can be no successful mass work in the factories independent of the mass work in the trade unions and vice versa.

Our policy must be to make the workers convinced that we want to make their union branches and committees powerful weapons in their fight when once they take them into their own hands. Wrong formulations on this question of the trade union movement which have given the impression that we are out to smash and disrupt the trade union movement have placed weapons in the hands of the Amsterdammers. Our task is to win the masses of the trade union members and speculations as to whether we can win the whole union or the branch only conceals the refusal to work in the reformist trade unions and prevents any work from being carried out in these unions. Objectively, this sort of speculation is merely capitulation to the trade union bureaucracy. We must realise that there are tens of thousands of workers in England and other countries who though not yet ready to join the Communist Party are ready to work and help carry out the policy of the revolutionary trade union opposition. And those workers have to be organised; they must be developed and made the basis of a mass revolutionary trade union opposition.

Regarding the question of work in the trade unions. We endeavoured to make an improve-

ment of work in this connection, and this is seen in the fact that in the last months we have been able to get 19 of our leading comrades in the engineers' union, who were expelled, reinstated, and a leading comrade in the Stevedores' Union reinstated and on the Executive Committee of that Union. Other examples of our trade union work can be seen in the fact that since January to the end of July of this year, 57 trade union branches passed resolutions and sent them to the "Daily Worker," protesting against the action of the Japanese in Shanghai, and this means that scores of others must have passed them and did not notify the papers; that 19 branches of the Engineers' Union protested against the attack on the Soviet Union made in their journal; it is seen in the fact that a delegation of 71 was sent to Amsterdam, principally trade unionists; and it is seen in the attendance of trade union branches now taking place in the united front trade union conference.

What are the weak sides? At the Newcastle Congress, opening on September 5th, out of 700 delegates, we have got only 4; at the recent miners' conference, we had 1 delegate; at the recent conference of railwaymen we had only 1; and it lies in the fact that in Lancashire we have not a single member on one union committee throughout the whole of the textile centre; it is seen in the fact too that in January of this year, when the question of work in the reformist unions was discussed, out of 81 of the leading comrades present, when they were asked how many were active in the trade unions, only 13 could show they were active, and if that is the situation on the top, we can have a good idea what it is like below, but figures indicate an improvement this year so far as work in the unions is concerned.

One or two words in connection with the revolutionary trade union opposition. Many sharp criticisms which are absolutely justified can be levelled at our Party for its neglect in developing the mass revolutionary trade union opposition, but what do we find in this respect? We find as a result of experiences that we cannot develop the Minority Movement in a strait jacket. Just one or two facts to prove this. In South Wales we have an unofficial union of the tinplate workers. This movement has the support of 62 branches and runs a monthly paper called the "Workers' Voice." In the engineers we have another unofficial movement which is known as the Members' Rights Movement. This movement has succeeded in getting our comrades reinstated. It is supported by 120 trade union branches and 4 area councils of the A.E.U. It also publishes a monthly paper called the "Monkey Wrench," which has a circulation of over

5,000. Among the London dockers, for the first time, we have established a London port workers' unity movement which is now rapidly developing. This movement publishes two monthly papers with a circulation of 900. With the busmen, the whole of the line that has been carried out, has been carried out by the busmen's militant groups and they have the support of 27 of the most important garages. 4,500 copies of the last issue of their paper were sold in 3 days in the garages and trade union branches. Among the printing workers militant groups have been established. This movement also has a monthly paper with a circulation of 3,000.

The lesson that we can see is that these movements are developing according to the concrete circumstances which face these particular types of workers in the respective industries, and, secondly, that the call of unity as expressed in so many of these names is bringing many sections of workers which have hitherto been outside our ranks nearer to us and the job now is to have the perspective for continuing the campaign to consolidate them wherever possible on a district and national basis. And we ought to be able to find some name which will be more suitable and applicable to English conditions.

One or two words on the fight against unemployment. Comrade Thaelmann said that in Germany the Prague resolution had practically been a dead letter. This is true also in Britain. In Britain we have an unemployed organisation with 386 branches and a dues paying membership of 50,000, but we have not yet been able to convince our comrades in this organisation, with all its possibilities, that it must become the fighting core for the carrying out of broad mass activities against unemployment and the development of broad unemployed councils. The thing which has held the unemployed organisation back from doing this is the fear that it will be liquidated. On the contrary, I contend that if the N.U.W.M. could have taken the initiative for the drive forward in carrying out the Prague resolution, it would have become a more powerful organisation than heretofore.

What is the weakest part of the fight against unemployment in Britain? It is the fact that, although we have the unemployed organisation of 50,000 paying members, it is largely an organisation of unemployed workers who have been unemployed for many years, and we have failed to draw into the organisation these hundreds of thousands of skilled and semi-skilled workers who have close ties with the trade union branches, who have been unemployed, for the first time in their lives, and are outside the influence and scope of our organisation.

The lessons of last autumn must be learned when demonstrations at which unemployed and employed workers participated took place we did not draw them in—but we still have good connections with workers inside the factories. This means we lost tremendous opportunities for making a fight against unemployment, not only a fight of the unemployed, but a fight of the whole working class movement, and particularly a fight of the trade union movement and a presentation of demands for the finding of work. Not only this aspect but every other gives the Party opportunities for bringing out its whole revolutionary lines.

One last point. I do not propose to speak in regard to the anti-war campaign because one of the other comrades will give a separate report on this on the special item on the agenda dealing with it, but I want only to say that, whilst the Party made many big improvements in the anti-war work, we did not succeed in stopping a single ship or munition train, nor did we succeed in getting one short protest strike.

The resolution of our C.C. Plenum in January gave the line for the Party's work in the immediate future for the strengthening of the mass movement of resistance and the overcoming of the Party isolation from the masses. The most important questions dealt with were the following :

First, the methods and tasks of carrying out revolutionary mass work.

Secondly, the necessity of combining our revolutionary political line and leadership with tireless detailed work in the factories, unions and exchanges, in relation to the concrete situation and issues.

Thirdly, from this work to develop a revolutionary mass organisation that would have its permanent expression in the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition.

Fourthly, as the red thread running through all this work, to build up the Party through continuous recruiting and the building up of the circulation of the "Daily Worker."

Four districts were chosen for concentration so as to carry out this resolution—London, South Wales, Lancashire and Glasgow. Further, every leading member of the Party was instructed to be attached to some factory cell and to some local Party organisation and the whole of this work was to be checked up and controlled by the District Committees and the Pol-Bureau. It is now possible to give an estimation of what has been done in the six months concentration period.

First, we can say that there has been a marked improvement in nearly every phase of the Party's work. Secondly, there has been better prepar-

ation and participation in local struggles and particularly in economic struggles. Thirdly, that the Anti-War Campaign and the winning of trade union support represents active achievement in that direction. Fourthly, definite results in increased influence in some factories and in some unions.

These results, comrades, are only small but they point the way for the whole Party and in this respect I would like to give particular experiences from these districts which show the work of this concentration. First, I want to take a miners' village in South Wales. Here we had a Party cell of four members. This cell had very little influence in the pit in the village but after the discussion of the resolution, the cell began to apply the line of that resolution to its work. It took up a number of questions in that particular pit and analysed them. It formulated demands. It took up questions which we had formerly considered beneath us. For instance, questions in regard to timber and another question in regard to piece work. It wrote all this up in an article which was published in the "Daily Worker" which was afterwards distributed among the miners in the pit. As a result of this first step the management was compelled to rectify grievances which had been outstanding for some considerable time. As a result of this concrete activity, two new members were recruited to the cell. The cell asked the "Daily Worker" to give them a whole page in the "Daily Worker" stating that they would supply the material for it if we would publish it. The "Daily" said that it would. 36 dozen copies of the issue which had this special page were sold. Our pit cell has now increased to 11 and we have bigger influence in this pit than we have had since the formation of the Party as far as this area is concerned.

Secondly, an example from Glasgow. We had no contact whatever among the Glasgow dockers in December. In fact definite hostility to our Party expressed itself. After discussion a new approach was made. The comrades were able to find out one or two grievances of the dockers in this particular place. Use was made of a letter sent by one of the dockers from Odessa. This was printed in thousands of copies. It caused a lot of excitement. At a special meeting of the dockers we had made some contact for the first time and recruited one or two members into our Party. As a result of that first meeting of 1,000 the dockers were not only able to take up some of the grievances on the Clyde, but they also elected a delegate to come to the U.S.S.R. This cell now issues a dock paper.

A further example from London, from a railway depot cell. This railway depot, where we

had a Party cell of 14, is very important for the transport of munitions. Within the last three months we succeeded in recruiting three new members. The cell had been able to take up a number of simple questions which a year ago every comrade in that cell would have felt were beneath his notice.

For instance, a broken window in a dining-room—an insignificant thing—still we took the question up. The matter was put right, and that led to other questions.

A comrade elected to a railway depot committee was able to utilise this to get grievances settled; a comrade running for a position got 405 votes, an increase of 100, the highest vote recorded in that depot; our factory paper started with a circulation of 200 but has increased in the last two months by 200; we were able to get a delegate to Amsterdam Congress and collected all expenses to send the delegate, and now we have a very big influence in one of the most important railway branches attached to that depot through which passes munitions from one of the biggest munition dumps ready for transmission abroad.

Perhaps to some Parties represented here this is insignificant, but to our Party they represent great improvements, and we must convince the Party that this can be done throughout the whole country providing the whole membership can be mobilised.

What are our weaknesses in the last six months? First, the Party has not increased its membership, but, on the contrary, it has failed to retain all the new members recruited at mass meetings. Out of this question has emerged an interesting point — where recruits have been gained from factory cells, we have not lost one member, but where recruited from big mass meetings, through insufficient attention to them, through a light-hearted attitude on their part in joining the Party, we have not been able to retain a large number that joined; thirdly, while the Party work in the economic struggles improved, we have not been able to build up the revolutionary trade union opposition.

The circulation of the Party paper has been static. These weaknesses represent a warning signal to the whole Party to orientate itself at the earliest possible moment. The reasons for this weakness are: only 25 per cent. of the Party members are actively carrying out the resolution: the majority remain in the old sectarian rut. There is the most urgent need for convincing the whole Party of the importance of taking up these concrete demands — what we call in England "small issues," and in taking them up, we must understand how to combine them with our revo-

lutionary line of propaganda, with the presentation of the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The whole Party does not yet understand this question of concrete daily work. This work alone is not going to advance the Party if it has with it no mass contact, no mass character, and we in the Party who are in contact with the masses know this.

This, roughly, is the outline of the January resolution, its achievements and reasons for our shortcomings.

Upon the next tasks of the Party. These are now the fight against imperialist war and armed intervention against the Soviet Union. Second, the fight against the National Government, intensified offensive, economic campaign, unemployed work, fight against the Means Test, social service cuts, and against repression in the colonies, and especially India and Ireland, and in connection with these countries, our Party has seriously lagged behind the requirements and the demands of the situation, because in England, so far as Ireland is concerned, in every important industrial centre there are tens of thousands of Irish workers whom we can win in the great imperialist fight against what is taking place in Ireland so far as the National Government is concerned at the present time.

The third task is the fight against the offensive of the employers as expressed in the attack against the textile workers, the bus and tube workers, the miners and the railwaymen.

Fourth, the urgent need for the development of a broad united front of the working class against hunger and war.

Fifthly, the development of revolutionary trade union opposition in the factories and unions

And sixthly, to use the same phrase again, the red stream that runs through the whole of these tasks is the recruiting for the Party in the cells and in the local unions, and the building up and

strengthening of the Party and the "Daily Worker."

Finally, comrades, in looking back over the progress of our Party since the XI Plenum we can state that the Party has made some progress, that with the help of the International we are breaking through the isolation which has for so long characterised the Communist Party of Great Britain. We are making the first beginnings of the turn. Why do we say this? Is it because we are in a self-satisfied mood? Of course not. We say it only to emphasise the possibilities which confront our Party if only these small beginnings can be taken up by the whole membership to show what the whole Party can do. Why must we speed up this work? Because during the next three months we are going to see in England the biggest attacks that have ever taken place. We are convinced that there will be the biggest mass movement than has ever occurred in the British working class movement. We must concentrate our efforts to win the leadership of this movement and avoid the mistakes which were proven by the bitter experiences of last autumn when we had the mass movement under our influence but were not able to lead it and to keep it. By profiting from these experiences, understanding the deadly urgency of the fight against hunger and war, our Party is pledging itself at the XII Plenum to carry out its heavy and responsible tasks with redoubled energy and to see that the line of the E.C.C.I. is carried out. We must profit by the mistakes and criticism of our Party which were revealed to us last December and I want to say while these are only first beginnings, they are beginnings of a permanent character and will give the International a guarantee and assurance that the Communist Party of Great Britain understands how to fulfil its duties in this hour of emergency.

## XIIth PLENUM LIBRARY

(Prices subject to alteration).

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Resolutions and Theses ... .. 2d.  | Workers ... .. 2d. 5cts.   |
| 2. The International Situation and the tasks of the sections of the Communist International ... .. 6d. 20cts.<br>(Report by O. Kuusinen)                                      | (Report by D. Z. Manuilsky, C.P.S.U.)  |
| 3. The Danger of Imperialist War and Military Intervention in connection with the War which has broken out in the Far East ... .. 3d. 10cts.<br>(Report by Okano. C.P. Japan) | 5. The C.P.s of France and Germany and the tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions ... .. 2d. 5cts.<br>(Report by O. Piatnitsky) |
| 4. The Soviet Union and the World's   | 6. Great Britain, Ireland and America ... 3d. 10cts.<br>(Speeches by Gusev, Pollitt, Troy and an American Comrade)                   |
|   | 7. XIIth Plenum Handbook (Propagandists' Guide to the decisions of the XII Plenum) ... .. 2d. 10cts.                                 |

# THE WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF FRANCE AND GERMANY AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

SPEECH BY COM. O. PIATNITSKY.

**I**N the period between the XI and the XII Plenums, the sections of the Comintern, and therefore the Comintern as a whole, achieved considerable successes, not only in regard to securing an increase of votes at elections and increase in the membership of revolutionary workers' and Communist organisations, but also in regard to leading economic struggles and revolutionary battles. Compared with the sweep of the revolutionary labour and peasant movements, however, and bearing in mind the unexampled betrayal of the interests of the working class by the Social-Democrats and the leaders of the reformist trade unions and other anti-revolutionary trade unions; having in mind also the strength of the capitalist attack upon all the gains of the workers, and the very standard of living of wide masses, compared with all this, we must say that all the sections of the Comintern are lagging very much behind the possibilities created by the industrial and agrarian crisis, and the whole situation which we describe as the end of stabilisation.

I will deal with only two sections in my remarks, the C.P. of France and the C.P. of Germany, and also several general questions affecting all sections.

## THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE.

Bearing in mind the importance of the problems confronting the C.P. of France, due to the significance which French imperialism has for the revolutionary labour and peasant movement of the whole world (for France is strangling Germany, her own colonies, is surrounding the U.S.S.R. with her vassals, — Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Poland,—with the aim of intervention, etc.), we must say that the C.P. of France has made no progress; on the contrary, it is lagging behind more than other sections. This does not contradict the fact that the C.P. of France has carried out a number of campaigns successfully — the struggle against the air manœuvres, the preparations for the Anti-War Congress, the campaign carried on by *Humanite* against the Whiteguards, etc. But the lagging behind of the C.P. of France is seen in the whole work of the Party and the Red trade unions, notwithstanding the constant assistance it has received from the Comintern and R.I.L.U.

From the middle of 1930, during the whole of

1931 and to the middle of 1932 the Presidium, the Political Secretariat and the Political Commission concerned themselves more with the problems of the C.P. of France than with those of any other section of the Comintern. I want to briefly enumerate the meetings we have had in the E.C.C.I. to discuss questions of the C.P. of France. March, 1930, — the meetings of the French Commission, which were attended by sixteen comrades; not only from the Centre but also from the districts. The result of these meetings was the extensive and detailed resolution adopted by the Presidium on June 16, 1930. I will have occasion to quote from this resolution. On August 30, there was another meeting, attended by leading comrades, at which the insurance campaign was discussed. The Communist Party of France nearly missed this campaign which centred around the Bill which provided for various forms of insurance for the workers (except for the unemployed). The socialists had introduced an Insurance Bill which provided for limited insurance, for which the working class had to pay, and the communists, instead of retaliating by introducing their own Insurance Bill containing communist demands in the sphere of insurance, not only failed to develop a big campaign in support of communist demands, but took up an attitude towards the Socialist Insurance Bill which we were unable to understand in a Communist Party, on so important a question affecting the workers. The C.P. of France opposed insurance, on the plea that the employers would transfer the cost of insurance to the workers in any case by raising the price of commodities.

The next meeting took place on November 20, 1930, at which the trade union question was discussed. In February, 1931, a meeting was held at which trade union unity was discussed. The initiative on this question was taken by the *minoritaires*,—a small reformist opposition in the Red trade unions. This group not only succeeded in winning over a number of Red trade union organisations, but caused demoralisation in the ranks of the Unitary General Federation of Labour (C.G.T.U.). Neither our Party, nor the trade unions were able to take up a correct position on this question. Instead of taking the initiative on the question of trade union unity, they proclaimed that unity was only possible

within the framework of the C.G.T.U., that they could not create a united trade union organisation with the traitors of the Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.); and failed to understand that they were creating difficulties in approaching the workers who still follow the lead of Jouhaux and Co. with statements of this kind. Our opponents took advantage of such statements. On this question we had to draft a document jointly with the French comrades and the C.G.T.U. One might have thought, that after this document was adopted and published, the C.G.T.U. would have taken the right road on the question of trade union unity. But the manner in which this document was commented on, in the press, and speeches of trade union officials, at meetings of the trade union organisations, showed that this was not so.

In April, 1931, during the XI Plenum, a very important meeting was held. Questions concerning the work of the Party and its leadership were discussed. Unfortunately these same questions have to be raised now, although a year and a half has since passed. In June, 1931, a meeting was held with delegates of the French Red Trade Unions. In July, the R.I.L.U. called the leaders of the minority here to discuss all the questions of principle on which they differed from the Red trade unions with them. The R.I.L.U. had to examine the whole of the tactics of the *minoritaires*, to explain the counter-revolutionary significance of their actions, and indicate the methods by which their fatal influence in the ranks of the Red trade union movement could be destroyed.

Later, in October, 1931, a meeting was held on the "group" of Barbe, Celor and Co., which had retarded the development of the C.P. of France for a number of years.

End of October,—another meeting prior to the Red Trade Union Congress.

Beginning of December, — at the time of the meeting of the Central Council of the R.I.L.U., Com. Monmousseau's report on the Congress of the C.G.T.U.

In 1932, at every meeting of the Political Commission, some question or other connected with France was discussed.

In January, 1932, a meeting took place to discuss the preparations for the VII Congress of the Party. After that, in the course of 1932, the Party Congress was discussed four times, then the elections, the election campaign, the work of the parliamentary fraction,—six times, the trade unions were discussed three times, work among the peasantry (the agrarian programme) was discussed twice, organisational work twice, questions concerning the Party leadership twice, the national question, non-party organisations, work among women, the municipal election campaign

and questions of agitation and propaganda. In the majority of cases, French comrades were present when these questions were discussed.

#### DEFECTS IN THE WORK OF THE C.P. OF FRANCE.

You see, therefore, that the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have devoted a great deal of attention to the French Party and Red trade unions; and this is not accidental. As I have said already, the rôle of the French Party at present is a very important one. In the resolutions and documents that were adopted, not only was criticism levelled against the mistakes of the Party, but they showed what to do; and how to do it. In the decisions of May-June, 1930 the following questions were dealt with: the immediate demands of the proletariat; opposition to the so-called "Lefts," who are of the opinion that the "fight for beefsteaks" is a thing of the past; for the proper conduct of mass work; for quickly removing the gap between the Party and the masses; for the correct application of the tactics of the united front and a correct approach to the socialist workers (against the formula that "all members of the Socialist Party, including the rank and file workers, are bloodhounds of the bourgeoisie"); against the Party bossing the trade unions; work among foreign workers.

The main points in the resolutions adopted, as a result of the work of the commissions, indicated the following unfavourable characteristics of the C.P. of France: decline in membership, fluctuation in membership; drop in the circulation of *Humanite*, incorrect work with the *Humanite* Defence Committees; opportunist, and particularly sectarian distortions of the tactics of the united front; the question of the immediate demands of the working class.

I consider it necessary to quote a passage from the resolution adopted on June 16, 1930. In this resolution we read the following:

"In view of the rise of unemployment and of the prospects of its growth in the future, the Party must immediately adopt measures to set up, through the medium of the unitary trade unions, unemployed committees or councils, for the purpose of maintaining constant contact between the employed and unemployed workers. The C.P. of France must fight strenuously in defence of the demands of the unemployed; unemployed insurance to be paid for by the state and the employers, providing for full pay to all industrial and agrarian proletarians, irrespective of nationality and without bureaucratic formalities. Very close attention must be paid to the defence of economic and political interests of immigrant and colonial workers. To counteract the efforts of the bourgeoisie,

the authorities, the socialists and the C.G.T. to stir up the French workers against the workers of foreign origin and to foment national strife (which actually did take place under the leadership of the socialists a year and a half later,—O.P.), etc., our Party must unite the French and foreign workers in a single indomitable *bloc* of class solidarity and joint struggle against the exploitation of States and their agents."

This resolution was solemnly adopted by the whole of the delegation of the C.P. of France present at the meeting. The C.P. of France solemnly signed a pledge to secure the following results by December 25, 1930: 55,000 members; 200,000 circulation for *Humanite* and 500,000 members of the Red trade unions. Had they carried out this pledge, I would not have to speak about the C.P. of France to-day. All the directives, the solemn promises undertaken by the French delegation which I have enumerated, and many other decisions of the organs of the E.C.C.I. and R.I.L.U. and the decisions of the Central Committee of the C.P. of France, remain on paper. The Party and the trade unions have not increased their membership; on the contrary, they have lost members. At the last elections the Party lost to the socialists,—listen to this, comrades,—220,000 votes. In 1928, the Socialist Party obtained 1,700,000 votes; at the last elections it obtained, at our expense,—1,900,000 votes. And the C.P. of France lost 71,000 votes to the renegade W.P.P.\* (Sellier and Co.). In 1932, the C.P. of France obtained 790,000 votes as against 1,067,000 obtained in 1928.

I cannot refrain from mentioning a characteristic fact. Before the elections we discussed the election programme and the election campaign with the French comrades here. All the comrades present, by no means unanimous in their work in leading the Party, were unanimous in stating that the Party was going to lose votes, and many votes, at the election. And it was in the belief that they were going to lose votes that they returned to fight for the workers' votes. They told us that they were going to lose from 400,000 to 500,000; and we said to them: don't dare come here without having obtained 1,500,000 votes.

They came here, not with 1,500,000 votes, it is true; but they showed a "gain" of 200,000 votes over their own expectations (laughter). Well, it is a gain. Two hundred thousand workers' votes are not to be sneezed at.

The Party has not waged a struggle against the Socialist Party and the W.P.P. in spite of the fact that the E.C.C.I. very urgently called the

\*Parti Ouvrier et Paysan — Workers' and Peasants' Party.—Ed.

attention of the Central Committee of the C.P. of France to the need for waging this struggle. I will quote you a short passage from the resolution which I have already quoted:

"Inadequate, weak, belated, slow and disjointed campaign to expose the renegade opportunists and the W.P.P. The correct organisational measures that were adopted in the struggle against the renegade opportunists were not properly and clearly explained to the members of the Party, and the masses of the workers, to enable all the workers to understand the necessity for such organisational measures. Generally speaking, there has been a lack of energetic, systematic and mass counter-attack against the united attack of the W.P.P., socialists, the C.G.T. and the government. At the same time *Humanite's* reply was weak and inadequate (failure to apply point 5 of the resolution of the Political Secretariat of March, 1930).

"The C.P. of France must thoroughly understand the great danger that threatens the working class in France from the socialists, W.P.P. and opportunists, who are conducting a wide campaign to again deceive the proletariat, and urban and rural toilers to consolidate the capitalist system and the bourgeois-imperialist régime."

One would think that the warning was sufficiently serious. Nearly two years have passed. The results can be seen from the elections.

France is still thoroughly imbued with parliamentarism; the wide masses still heed the deputies and their speeches. The C.P. of France had a small fraction, if I am not mistaken, ten members at first,—of whom, two were members of the Political Bureau. The Political Bureau paid no attention to the work of the fraction. What was the result? The Naval Estimates were passed unanimously.

You can imagine what effect this had upon the masses. Not a single one of our deputies was present in the Chamber when the vote on the Naval Estimates was taken. Our fraction did not oppose the Bill introduced by the socialists, which was directed against the foreign workers, and proposed that the number of foreign workers permitted to be employed in industry be limited to 10 per cent. of the total employed. Only two of our deputies were present in the Chamber when this Bill was discussed and voted upon. The socialists introduced a Women's Suffrage Bill in the Chamber. Our people did not react to this in any way. One deputy, who was present in the Chamber, abstained from voting. We discussed this matter in the leading body of the Comintern,

and of course, we could not but deal with this in a manner it deserved.

In 21 Departments in France, the Communist Party has majorities in 164 municipal councils. In these, we have a total of 2,373 municipal councillors. In 264 municipal councils we have minorities, with a total of 696 municipal councillors. In all countries the municipal councils play an important rôle; but this is particularly the case in France. There the municipal councils enjoy considerably more powers than those in any other country. Some municipal councils are working well; they have shown that they can do something for the workers, and that they can organise the working class. But generally in this respect, almost nothing is being done. Taken as a whole, the municipal councils, in the majority of cases, are not utilised by our Party for the purpose of extending their contacts with the masses. The fact that the municipal councils play an important rôle in France is shown by the work of the renegades who deserted us (the W.P.P.). How do they operate? They pay heed to the demands of the masses, formulate them in their proposals, and introduce them in the municipal councils. More than that; they sometimes formulate the demands of the Red trade unions, while our municipal councillors "sit around and flap their ears," as Comrade Doriot, a member of the Political Bureau, put it.

During 1929, 1930 and 1931, there were 3,210 strikes in France, which affected 1,994,000 workers. In the first six months of 1932 there were 391 strikes affecting 114,000 workers. Our Red trade unions led very few strikes. Either they entered the strikes late, sometimes a long time after the strikes had started, or, in other cases, they led these strikes very badly.

In 1931, out of 260 strikes, of which we have information, 37 were successful, 69 ended in a compromise and 109, *i.e.*, 50 per cent., failed. Did not these strikes fail because our Red trade unions were not able to approach strikes properly and lead them?

If we compare Poland and France we will find that conditions in Poland are much worse than in France. In Poland there are no well organised and strong Red trade unions as is the case in France. The terror is raging in Poland ever so much more than in France. Nevertheless, in Poland, the number of successful strikes led by the Communist Party is larger than in France. The workers in France have fought many strikes. In all the recent strikes the workers displayed stubbornness and persistence. Several strikes developed into big political events, with barricade fighting. The failure of so many strikes in France, is due in no small degree, to the fact that

the Red trade unions, which have a membership of about 300,000, are not able to expose the manoeuvres of the reformists and Social-Democrats, to establish the united front from below before and during strikes, etc.

How can our unions be expected to grow if they are unable to approach strikes properly?

I will quote a single fact. Last January there was a big movement among the miners in the Pas-de-Calais against wage cuts. In that district there are 180,000 miners; 15,000 belong to the Red unions and 60,000 to the reformist unions. But we have more pit delegates than the reformists; we have 60 and they have 48. We quite properly advanced the slogan: Prepare to strike on February 1. The reformists replied: We want a referendum. The question they put to the vote in the referendum was: Strike or negotiations? What should we have done? We should have said to the workers: We will take part in the referendum, but at the same time we must prepare for the strike and vote for a strike. Did we have an opportunity to expose the reformists? We did. They did not say what they wanted, what they were going to strive for, or why they wanted to negotiate. We could have said to the workers: If the reformist leaders are willing to call a strike they would say,—we will negotiate, but we will insist on all the workers' demands being met, we will fight to prevent the wage cut; since they do not say this, it shows that they want to compromise with the employers. Take part in the referendum and vote against the reformists! But we said, boycott the referendum. What was the result? The result was that 60,000 voted for negotiations. — for the negotiations formula was such an elastic one that it could be taken to mean anything— 2,000 voted for a strike and about 100,000 did not vote at all. How did our Red trade unions regard this result? They said: There you are, we have won a victory; after all; a large number of workers did not vote, that shows that we have influence. But the strike was disrupted. This matter was discussed at the Political Bureau. I must say here, to our shame, that the representative of the R.I.L.U. who was in France at that time, spoke in favour of the boycott. The Political Bureau discussed this question and endorsed the boycott. In spite of the fact that the tactics of the Red trade unions were wrong, the workers nevertheless, became convinced that they, the Red Unions, championed the interests of the workers, for, unlike the reformists, they wanted to fight.

The Red trade unions have pit and railway depot delegates elected by the workers. These delegates are full-time officials and they could be made very good use of. But they do about as

much as our municipal councillors, who sit around and flap their ears when questions affecting the workers are being discussed. No use is made of them. They could serve as organisers and agitators, and carry out the slogans and the line of our Party and Red trade unions.

Now about unemployment. I have already shown that we uttered a warning about unemployment long before it appeared in France by quoting to you the resolution of June 16, 1930. *Vie Ouvriere*, the organ of the C.G.T.U. states that, according to official statistics, the number of workers working short time in France on July 1, 1932, was 5,618,800, that is 51 per cent. of the total, and 2,300 were totally unemployed. Only a very small number of unemployed workers get any relief, I think 150,000 or 160,000. The rest receive nothing. France is spending colossal sums on armaments. The broad masses are opposed to war; they have demonstrated this. The Party could develop a broad campaign for unemployed insurance, for an increase in the number insured, etc. Very belatedly, the C.P. of France started a campaign and began to organise the unemployed; but the work has now come to a stop. And who, taking advantage of our inactivity, has begun to carry on work among the unemployed? Fakers and philanthropists.

I will read to you a statement published by *Vie Ouvriere* on April 8, 1932: In Montpellier the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. carried on no work among the unemployed, and the unemployed themselves (I emphasise, *themselves*) elected a committee, the leaders of which pursued a non-revolutionary, pernicious policy. There were representatives of the C.G.T.U. union on this committee, but they, instead of fighting for the leadership of the unemployed and politically exposing the bad leaders, began to rake up all sorts of scandals about their family life, and then resigned from the committee on the plea that it was disgusting to work with such leaders. Let us hope that this is an isolated case. I am afraid, however, that this is the way the work among the unemployed is often carried on.

#### THE LEADERSHIP OF THE C.P. OF FRANCE.

How can such a situation be accounted for? There are lots of people in the Party and trade union leadership, and they are quite able fellows. I will enumerate some of them: Thorez, Semard, Duclos, Marty, Ferrat, Monmousseau, Doriot, Cachin, Gitton and many others. Each of them separately does an enormous amount of work; but the results do not amount to much. Why? Because there is no collective leadership, no team work. The leadership of the C.P. of France puts you in mind of Krylov's fable about the swan,

the crab and the pike, all pulling in different directions. As a matter of fact, the C.P. of France has no centre to lead the Party organisations and all the Communists properly, no matter where they are working. Here is an example of this leadership. I will quote several passages from the speech Comrade Doriot delivered at the meeting of the Latin Countries Secretariat:

"While the overwhelming majority of the workers (railwaymen) demanded the introduction of the English week, the C.G.T.U. union opposed this. I then laid their pamphlet before the Political Bureau. I raised the question at a meeting of railwaymen, and the secretary of the union spoke for three quarters of an hour trying to prove that the proposal for an English week is a trap laid by the employers. How could the workers understand that, since the introduction of the English week was not to involve a reduction of wages?

"What did Sellier do at depot 18? He wrote a small pamphlet and sent it to all the railwaymen; he took four or five demands that had been rejected by the C.G.T.U. union and sent them to all the workers employed on the railways in preparation for the election. Is it surprising then, that after this all the railwaymen voted for Sellier?

"Cachin and I once attended a meeting of municipal workers that was called in connection with a reduction of wages. . . . The Union secretary delivered a speech in which he dealt with the U.S.S.R., the impending war and the radicalisation of the masses, and Cachin and I had to deal with the questions of conditions of labour, wages, etc. This scandalous state of affairs still exists. I know trade union secretaries who do not know the demands of the categories of workers whose interests they are supposed to defend."

And here is the last passage from his speech, which deals with the leadership in a very important region, the Paris Region. This is what a member of the Political Bureau says:

"There is no doubt that the leadership of the Paris Region is totally unsatisfactory. . . . Apart from Semard, it is like a 'coffin,' which does not utter ten words in a year."

And so on, in the same strain.

If anyone outside the leadership had expressed this criticism, one could understand it. But it was uttered by a member of the Political Bureau, Comrade Doriot. I am sure that he knew all this before he arrived here. He even says that he laid the pamphlet issued by the C.G.T.U. union against the 40-hour week, before the Political Bureau. Comrade Doriot, you are a member of the Political Bureau; are you not responsible for

this state of affairs? Why did you not raise this question on the Political Bureau? If the trade union is not handling so important a question as the English week, which affects hundreds of thousands of workers, properly, then it is the duty of the Political Bureau to take up the question and compel the Party fraction in the union, which is led by Party members, to change their tactics on this question. But what happens? The Party leadership finds fault with the Red trade unions on every petty question, frequently decides questions for them, sometimes speaks in their name in the press. But where is the Political Bureau when an important question affecting the interests of hundreds of thousands of workers arises, when it is necessary to rectify or cancel a decision which is harmful to the Red trade unions and the Party?

It is said that the Political Bureau took a decision on this question, but that decision was not carried out. But there are members of the leadership of the C.G.T.U. on the Political Bureau! You have to work in a district in which railwaymen and municipal workers live. The good decision of the Political Bureau should have been carried out. The fact that it was not carried out, shows that individual members and the whole leadership are working badly. It gives us a striking insight into the manner in which the leadership is working. When we say that the C.P. of France has not a good leadership,—and we said the same thing last year—the members of the Political Bureau take offence. They say: What do you mean, we have no leadership? Look how many days I have spent at meetings, how many days I have been here and there, etc. Of course, you put in a lot of work, and that is a good thing. But does leadership mean doing the work that the trade unions, the mass organisations, the local Party organisations should do? Of course not. That is not leadership, it is pettiness. Leadership means discussing big questions to give a lead to the Party, it means controlling the carrying out of this lead and giving instructions as to how it should be followed. It is not at all necessary for every member of the Political Bureau to journey to address meetings six times a week. Provide good material, draw up points for speakers. I think that in the districts there are comrades who are as good speakers as yourselves. You give the lead; react to all economic and political questions that affect the interests of the workers and all the toilers. I think it would be a good thing if, before they leave here, the French comrades had a talk with the Polish comrades to learn from them how they had recently managed to organise such good team work on their Political Bureau that they are able

to work well and achieve success. That would be very useful. Comrade Doriot says: A good decision was adopted, but it was not carried out. I can confirm the statement that your decisions remain paper decisions,

In March the Party Congress was held; not a bad Congress. Many proletarians were present, many spoke, and we thought that a turning point had been reached at last in the Communist Party of France. Unfortunately the decisions adopted at the Congress were soon forgotten. This, for example, is what we find in the materials of the Latin Countries Secretariat:

The election campaign caused the Congress to be entirely forgotten. The leadership of the Party had no information as to whether the Party organisations had discussed the decisions of the Congress. The decisions passed by the Plenum of the Central Committee held in the beginning of July have not been discussed by a single Regional Committee to this day. Similarly, to this day (end of August) there has not been anything in the Party press about the Congress of the Young Communist League.

Only very recently the *Cahiers du Bolchevisme* carried an advertisement asking for orders for a pamphlet containing the resolutions of the Congress. The resolutions of the Congress have not even been published in *Humanite*. The French comrades have an organ like *Humanite*, which plays a bigger rôle than any other newspaper in the Communist International except *Pravda*, but the Party does not use it as a means of informing, leading and giving instructions to the Party.

I will quote another fact taken from the materials of the Latin Countries Secretariat:

After the Japanese bombardment of Shanghai *Humanite* published the directives of the Central Committee without any comment. Three weeks later it was discovered that the Party organisations had not reacted in any way to those directives. So *Humanite* once again published the directives, and once again it failed to add a single line by way of comment or explanation.

One might think it was a private firm's advertisement. And on an important question like this too!

*Humanite* carried on an excellent campaign in connection with the Gorgulov case and the slanders concerning the alleged shootings on the Dnieper. The French workers immediately reacted to this campaign by increasing the circulation of the paper. In February, the paper had a circulation of 167,000; on May 6 and 7 the circulation rushed up to 269,000. That shows that it correctly felt the pulse of the wide masses of the workers. And when the campaign came to an end the circulation dropped almost to the level at

which it stood in February. That shows that the Party failed to consolidate the influence the newspaper had acquired during the Gorgulov campaign.

Can the Party lead without a press, and particularly a legal press? Of course not, especially the French Party, whose local organisations are very loose and whose organ has such a wide circulation. Of course it cannot. *Humanite* must become the Party's mouthpiece, it must reflect the life of the Party. And yet, it seems to be divorced from the Party and sometimes it breathes a spirit that the Political Bureau hardly wants. Read the last issue of *Humanite*, which was shown me to-day; it contains an article praising a speech delivered by Nichol, the Swiss "Left" Social-Democrat. *Humanite* writes about Nichol's speech at the Anti-War Congress in such a way that one would think that it almost marked a new era in Social-Democracy. And yet, this speech was delivered only for the purpose of deceiving the masses. Nichol is the leader of the Social-Democratic organisation in the French part of Switzerland (Geneva). He belongs to the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, which is affiliated to the II International. By his "Left" speeches, articles and manœuvres Nichol is preventing the creation of a strong Communist Party in Switzerland, in the Geneva district, and *Humanite* not only does not expose this but does not even treat the speech critically. Why? Because *Humanite* is divorced from the Party, because there are two quite separate centres in the C.P. of France: The Political Bureau and the Editorial Staff of *Humanite*. How many times has it been decided that a member of the Political Bureau be put on the editorial staff of *Humanite*? This, like many other decisions, has not been carried out.

In the majority of cases local Party committees exist merely on paper. They are not active. The only difference between our local Party committees and those of the Socialist Party is that during election campaigns the latter develop very considerable activity, they revive, while many of our local Party committees, during the last election campaign, put the whole burden of the work on the shoulders of the deputies.

In the report of Comrade Alloyer, the Organisation Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P. of France, for May, it is stated that in April, when the election campaign was at its height, fewer factory papers were issued than in previous months, particularly in the Paris Region. The extent to which the Party organisations were divorced from the campaign may be seen from the case of District No. 2 of the Paris Region, in which the campaign was conducted

entirely by Comrade Duclos and several other comrades from another district.

In a circular letter issued by the Paris Regional Committee of the C.P. of France on April 19, 1932, it is stated that the Party Committees did not guide the election campaign and that "the political guidance was given mainly by bodies other than the regular Party organisations, from the cells to the Bureau of the Regional Committee." That shows that we have not achieved in France, what we have recently achieved in other countries, where the Parties really perform miracles during election campaigns. The question therefore arises, what do the Party organisations do? Are there any local Party organisations?

#### DEDUCTIONS.

1. A collective, active leadership must be created in the C.P. of France and in the C.G.T.U. that works as a team.

2. Serious attention must be devoted to the creation of local Party and trade union organs to carry out the line of the Party and of the C.G.T.U. and be closely linked up with the masses through the medium of factory cells and factory sections of the trade unions. It goes without saying that first of all the composition of the Regional Committees, which will have to do all this, must be changed.

3. The methods of guiding the work of the Party fractions in the Chamber, in the municipal councils and in the workers' mass organisations must be changed, in accordance with the decisions of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on Communist fractions.

4. The methods of mass work must be changed.

5. Members must be boldly promoted to leading positions in the Party and in the trade unions.

6. The Editorial Staff of *Humanite* must consist of good Party men, strongly linking it with the Party leadership and making it the mouthpiece of the Party.

7. Measures must be taken to secure the fulfilment of the decisions of the organs of the E.C.C.I. and of the Party.

I have dealt with the French question eighteen months after the E.C.C.I. had exerted every effort to organise the leadership of the C.P. of France and to change the state it is in. The Party organisations of the C.P. of France are loose. The C.P. of France could win broad masses if it had good local Party organisations, if the Party cells displayed initiative, if the District Committees displayed initiative, if it had good Regional Committees, if it had an energetic Political Bureau that worked together and really led the Party. Can all this be acquired? Certainly it

can. But to do so the Plenum must say to the leading French comrades with all its authority: the present state of affairs in the Party must be brought to an end. We consider it advisable to put all this to the Plenum, so that it or the Presidium of the Plenum, may elect a commission to go into the questions connected with the state of affairs in the C.P. of France. It was not my task to enumerate the successes which the C.P. of France has achieved in the period between the XI and XII Plenums. That is for the French comrades.

#### THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY: SUCCESSES AND ACHIEVEMENTS.

The Communist Party of Germany has achieved numerous successes. The Party has a great power of attraction for the masses of the workers. During the past eighteen months the Party has made several hundred thousand new members. At the last elections it obtained, under very difficult and confusing conditions, 5,300,000 votes. The Party has displayed ability to re-group its forces and manœuvre. You know, for example, that the leadership of the Party opposed taking part in the referendum on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag. A number of the Party newspapers published leading articles opposing participation in that referendum. But when the Central Committee of the Party jointly with the Comintern arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to take an active part in the referendum, the German comrades, in the course of a few days, roused the whole Party. Not a single Party, except the C.P.S.U. could do that. That shows that the Communist Party of Germany is able to manœuvre. A large part of the membership consists of capable workers. A large section of the members of the Party is fighting heroically against the National-Socialists in the streets, and in this way is creating the possibility of establishing an anti-Fascist united front. At the last factory council elections the Party and the Red Trade Union Opposition was able to put up 18,000 candidates. In view of the mass unemployment and victimisation that prevail in Germany, these candidates were candidates for dismissal, for being thrown on to the streets. No other Communist Party in the capitalist countries could mobilise such a large number of members under such conditions.

The C.P. of Germany is compelled to work under very severe conditions. The Versailles system has given rise to incredible chauvinism. Unemployment, wage cuts, the ruin of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, the bankruptcy of banks from which the small depositors suffer most, the bankruptcy of cities, especially the

small ones, those with working class populations, etc.,—all this is attributed by the chauvinists to the Versailles system.

#### THE TACTICAL MISTAKES OF THE C.P. OF GERMANY.

The Social-Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions in Germany are the strongest, and more capable in manœuvring than any other in the world. Before the war, the Social-Democratic Party enjoyed great prestige among the masses, because it created strong, centralised trade unions, mass workers' organisations, waged the economic struggle, fought for reforms, and indeed, did win something for the masses. That this is so, is proved by the fact that it was able to commit all its acts of treachery during the war without, or almost without, suffering damage. The free unions committed their acts of treachery against the workers, jointly with the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party. Notwithstanding this, the membership of the free unions rose from 3,000,000 before the war to 9,000,000 immediately after the war. The Social-Democrats had the enormous majority in the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils and this enabled them to betray the revolution.

Only a small minority of the workers, only the revolutionary workers, realised that the revolution had been betrayed. But the overwhelming majority of the workers knew the other sides of the Social-Democratic Party, they knew what it had "given" them as a result of the revolution. They knew that as a result of the revolution the Social-Democrats were able to "secure" an eight-hour day, obligatory collective agreements, factory councils established by law, which supervise internal factory regulations and the dismissal of workers, social insurance, including unemployment insurance without workers' contributions, freedom of the press, assembly and association, guaranteed by the law. The wide masses of the German workers did not know, and many do not know now, that the Social-Democrats "gave" them, and "secured" from the bourgeoisie concessions, to save the capitalist system in Germany from the socialist revolution; for the October Revolution in Russia exercised enormous influence upon the revolutionary events of 1919-20. The Social-Democrats realised that the shooting of the leaders of the revolutionary workers alone, would not be sufficient to weaken the influence of the revolutionary workers of Berlin, Hamburg, Central Germany, the Ruhr and the Rhine, upon the mass of the workers who supported the slogans of the socialist revolution. Even now the wide masses of the workers do not know, that after the revolution, the Social-Democratic Party itself worsened all the social

legislation (introduced workers' contributions to the insurance funds, reduced unemployment benefits), suppressed revolutionary labour newspapers, dissolved revolutionary labour organisations, etc. And now it is helping to abolish collective wage agreements and all the gains of the German working class. The "free" unions are working hand in glove with the Social-Democratic Party, and are only able to retain their influence over the workers by paying out relief to their members. In 1930, income from membership dues in these unions amounted to 265,000,000 marks, out of which 110,000,000 marks were paid in relief to members, of which 77,000,000 marks were paid in unemployment relief. This was in addition to what the unemployed received from the state unemployment insurance fund.

The Communist Party of Germany has been the only Party that has fought against the *Notverordnungen*, i.e., the Emergency Decrees, but this struggle did not spread to the broad masses and this enabled the Social-Democrats, the free unions, and the "Nazis," who had an enormous press at their disposal, to hurl demagogic charges against the Communist Party to the effect that it was not fighting against the *Notverordnungen* (this is what the Social-Democratic Party declared in one of its manifestoes), or that the Communist Party of Germany was supporting the *Notverordnungen* government (this is what *Angriff* the organ of the "Nazis" wrote).

The Communist Party of Germany was unable to counteract the Social-Democrats and the "Nazis" with a widespread explanatory campaign among the broad strata of the workers and office employees. In the overwhelming majority of cases this struggle was an abstract struggle. Instead of popular explanation they used abuse: "Zoergicbel!" "Beat up the Fascists, wherever you meet them!" This had a very serious effect upon our influence on the masses of workers. Moreover, in spite of the fact that, taken as a whole, the line of the Communist Party of Germany was a correct one, tactical mistakes were committed.

When, in the autumn of 1929, Hugenberg declared the *Volksbegeren* (the collection of the necessary number of signatures required by law to authorise a referendum), against the Young Plan, this campaign was not taken seriously by our Party. All the parties were opposed to the referendum and in spite of that Hugenberg, and the "Nazis" (national-socialists, fascists) in December, 1929, received 5,800,000 votes. If you compare the number of votes obtained by both parties, the "Nazis" and the National Party in this referendum with the Reichstag elections

in 1928, you will see that in spite of the campaign waged by all the parties against the referendum, they received 600,000 votes more than in 1928. Moreover, they got the reputation of being the only defenders of Germany against the Young Plan.

What did our paper, the central organ of the Communist Party of Germany, write in connection with the call of the nationalists and fascists for signatures and votes against the Young Plan? On November 5, 1929, *Rote Fahne*, in a leading article entitled *Fascism's General Call* wrote as follows:

"Beat up the fascists, wherever you meet them!—This is our slogan which strikes terror into the hearts of the fascist scabs and the lackeys of Borzig. Beat up the fascists, wherever you meet them! That is the fighting slogan of the revolutionary proletariat. Only by open political mass struggle, only in the bolshevik way, can we smash fascism."

The fascists demagogically opposed the Young Plan; and we called for them to be beaten up. Could the petty-bourgeoisie be expected to understand this to mean anything else, than that we are the champions of the Young Plan? And it was not only the petty-bourgeoisie that understood it in this way. The victory of the "Nazis" in the Reichstag elections in 1930 can be partly explained by this mistake. Had not our Party, with the assistance of the E.C.C.I. proclaimed its programme of national and social emancipation, it would not have received so many votes, it would not have obtained such a victory, as it did in 1930.

Take another tactical blunder: "The Brüning government is the government of the fascist dictatorship. In a leading article in its issue of December 2, 1930, entitled *The Fascist Dictatorship*, *Rote Fahne* wrote:

"The semi-fascist Brüning government has taken a determined step on the road towards the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany. The fascist dictatorship is no longer a menace—it is a fact. We are living now in a fascist republic. The Brüning Cabinet has become a fascist dictatorship.

The E.C.C.I. took action on the very first article that appeared in the *Rote Fahne* and in the beginning of December, 1930, pointed out that:

"The estimation given in *Rote Fahne* of December 2 and 3 to the effect that a fascist dictatorship already exists in Germany is politically incorrect. The Emergency Decrees issued with the support of the Social-Democrats and the reformist trade unions against the toilers represent a step on the road to the establishment of the

fascist dictatorship, but is not yet a decisive step. That depends upon the power of resistance of the working class."

When the E.C.C.I. sent this message, comrades Thälmann and Neuman were on the road to Moscow, and so did not get it. Of course we showed it to them, as soon as they arrived. Comrade Neuman defended the point of view expressed in *Rote Fahne*. I do not know whether he wrote those articles in *Rote Fahne* or not. Comrade Thälmann did not agree at all with the formula given in *Rote Fahne*. In his article he referred to the initial form of the fascist dictatorship. We had to battle three days with Comrade Neuman to convince him that his point of view was wrong. We said: If this is the fascist dictatorship, and if its laws have not affected the standard of living of the working class, if the latter has not yet felt the weight of the Emergency Decrees, the workers might think that the *fascist dictatorship* is not as bad as it is painted by the communists. And if afterwards measures will be taken one after another to introduce the fascist dictatorship (and that is inevitable) will the working class believe our Party again? They will say: They shouted when there was no fascist dictatorship; they misled us; we did not know that worse was to come; now it has come and we are disarmed.

The incorrect estimation of the situation led to incorrect tactics. What were the tactics, at least, the tactics pursued by *Rote Fahne*? The fascists are the main danger, and the Social-Democrats are the main obstacle. This was at the time of the XI Plenum. In carrying out the campaign against the fascists, they entirely forgot the existence of Social-Democracy. After the XI Plenum, Social-Democracy was correctly described in the documents of the German Communist Party as the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie; but then they forgot the fascists. You must not take this in a literal sense; but during the elections the fight against the fascists was not waged as intensively, as it should have been. The Social-Democrats took advantage of this and pretended that they alone were fighting against fascism and that we preferred Hitler. This partly explains the results of the presidential elections in 1932 and the Prussian Landtag elections. The Party and the working class were misinformed. Even before the Prussian Landtag elections a report appeared in the newspapers, including the Social-Democratic newspapers, to the effect that the bourgeoisie desired to take advantage of the expiration of wage agreements affecting 5,000,000 workers, to reduce wages. We here discussed at length in what way we could retaliate to the Social-Democratic manœuvre,

expressed in the fact that on the eve of the Prussian Landtag elections they declared: We will fight against, and not permit any reductions in wages. We here, jointly with the representatives of the C.P. of Germany, very carefully drew up a manifesto, in the name of the Communist Party of Germany and the R.T.U.O. to all the workers, irrespective of politics, and to all organised workers, in which it was declared that the Communist Party supports every fight against wage cuts, and calls upon the workers to discuss the question in the factories and to elect bodies to organise the fight. We sent the draft of this manifesto, and waited until it was discussed by the organs of the Party and R.T.U.O. and published. We had to wait a long time. The manifesto was published only *after* the elections. If we bear in mind the response which this manifesto evoked among the wide masses, it will be clear that the Party lost a great deal by the fact that it did not publish this manifesto earlier, during the elections and even before the elections, because this was the first time, for a long time, that the workers in the factories reacted to a proposal coming from the Communist Party and eagerly discussed our proposal. This was stated to be the case by all the comrades who arrived here from Germany.

#### OMISSIONS IN THE PRACTICAL WORK OF THE C.P. OF GERMANY.

Omissions occurred in the practical activity of the Party in the process of carrying out adopted decisions. A great deal has been said, and many decisions adopted on work in the factories. After a decision adopted by the Central Committee of the German Party *Rote Fahne* created a furore about work in the factories. Every day huge announcements appeared in the paper to the effect that: "Comrade Neuman will address the workers at A.E.G.," "Comrade Remmele will address the workers at Siemens," "Comrade Heckert will address the workers in such and such a factory," etc. What were the results? All our supporters came to these meetings. The other workers did not come. Why? Quite simple. You cannot expect to win the workers with such drum and trumpet stuff as that, in a period of crisis; when every foreman can have his spies at the meeting, who will report to him all those who were there. The carrying out of the decisions about work in the factories was started with a great fuss, and very soon all this talk petered out. Meanwhile, the members of the Red factory councils were left to shift for themselves without any guidance. In the Plenum materials you will find the report of a working woman who is still employed in the Visag works.

At Visag's there are five Reds on the factory council, and six or seven reformists. This working woman tells a terrible story of how these members of the factory council (both reformists and our members) persecuted her—also a member of the council—for carrying out the line of the Party. They transferred her from department to department, and spread the devil knows what sort of rumours about her to discredit her and destroy the influence she had in the factory. She had acquired this influence by putting forward demands for towels, soap, overalls and things of that kind (Visag is a chemical works). The result was that these "Reds" on the factory council so discredited our Party, that the workers went over to the "Nazis." Do you think this is an isolated case? In very many cases our members of factory councils vote with the reformists in favour of discharging workers. Would it not have been better to reorganise these "Red" factory councils, disassociate ourselves from those who had obviously become reformists, and to help those that were really trying to do something instead of making all the noise and fuss? Now the workers say: The programme and tactics of the C.P. of Germany are all right, but in its practical work it does not differ from the reformist party.

The work in the reformist trade unions is scandalously neglected. The same thing applies to the unemployed. The R.T.U.O., the Red trade unions and the local Party organisations work badly. All this is due to the fact that the C.P. of Germany and the R.T.U.O. have not managed to organise a broad movement against Brüning's and Papen's Emergency Decrees.

A year ago, if you remember, the Danat Bank crashed. We here eagerly waited to see how our Party would react to this event. The petty-bourgeoisie were terribly frightened; they thought that inflation was coming, or had already come. They besieged the savings banks and the banks. Huge crowds filled the streets. In the factories, the working men and women asked themselves whether wages would be paid. One would think that, at such a moment, the Party would be roused, and give a lead. As a matter of fact, it did not react to this event at all. The only thing that happened was that Comrade Neuman addressed a meeting of active Party members in Berlin on Comrade Stalin's six points; and only at the end of the meeting did he refer to these events. How did the "Nazis" take advantage of this situation? They carried on their agitation in the queues and said: Do you see what the Versailles system, the Young Plan and the Dawes Plan have brought you to? All this is

the result of the Versailles system. But we took very little advantage of the situation.

Of course, we cannot compare the collapse of the Danat Bank with the events of the 20th of July. But the Party organisations and the Red trade unions reacted to both events in pretty much the same way. I will quote an official document: "*Rote Fahne* worker correspondents on the situation in the Berlin factories on July 20, 1932," published in *Parteiarbeiter* (Party Worker) of the C.P. of Germany of August, 1932:

*Siemens Werner.* A tool maker in workshop No. —, says: "I was on the watch to see whether any shop would start, and leave the factory in an organised manner, before knocking-off time. Our activists waited uninter- ruptedly at the window. . . ."

*AEG—Brunenstrasse.* "Feeling was in our favour. The whole factory would have stopped work, including the National-Socialists. Both the reformist members of the factory council were opposed to this, and argued that we must wait to see what the leaders decide. They said they could not agree to an unofficial strike. . . ."

*Osrum Works.* "The majority of workers have no confidence in any party. Concerning the Communists they say: They only talk, but don't do anything. We must exert every effort even if we have to make sacrifices, to get the workers to believe us."

*A.E.G. Transformer Works.* "July 20, 21, showed that we are a Party of agitation but not of organisation."

I will quote you one other official document. The Berlin Regional Conference of the C.P. of Germany discussed a report on the results of the elections and the events of July 20 and passed the following resolution:

"The main reasons for the unsatisfactory results of the elections are: (1) the partial retreat in the face of fascist terror in the factories and in the working class districts (for example, the unhindered dispersion of a workers' meeting by the fascists and the voluntary dispersion of a meeting in the central district); (2) the inactivity of the Party organisations on July 20 when it failed to immediately organise a mass action and mass strikes. In this was revealed the unsatisfactory nature of trade union work which enabled the trade union bureaucrats to prevent the strikes from being called; (3) inadequate application of the tactics of the united front in the factories, labour exchanges and working class districts, which particularly affected the results of the elections in various working class districts (Neukolln,

Wedding). In addition the proposal made by the Berlin Committee of the Social-Democratic Party to organise joint demonstrations helped to create illusions regarding the policy of the Social-Democratic Party and hampered initiative in developing united front actions in the factories, labour exchanges and working class districts; (4) *Inadequate work to rouse the initiative in the cells for the purpose of organising a united front against the fascists.* (Italics mine, O.P.).

The last point particularly is right, quite right. The initiative of the Party and trade union organisations in the factories was lacking. Had there been initiative, the outcome may have been entirely different. Not having received instructions from their leaders, some Social-Democrats and reformists in the factories were in favour of a fight, others wavered. Under these conditions, as the conference of *Rote Fahne* worker correspondents showed, had the Communists and the supporters of the R.T.U.O. and of the Red trade unions, in the factories, taken the initiative and downed tools with the slogans: Repeal the Emergency Decrees directed against the working class; repeal the legalisation of the fascist shock troops who are attacking the working class districts and beating up the workers; repeal the prohibition of meetings and demonstrations and suppression of the press, etc., they would have met with a tremendous response on the part of the workers of all political trends and of no party. Comrade Lensky, who was passing through Berlin on July 20 and rode through the streets on that day, told me that the people were on the streets but there were no leaders. At that moment there were neither police, nor troops on the streets. Incidents like the following occurred on that day: The police went up to the workers and said,— We will not do anything to you to-day. Had there been Party organisations with real initiative it would have been possible to organise demonstrations in various districts and streets. These demonstrations could then have spread to the factories and resulted in strikes.

The C.P. of Germany did quite right to propose to the German Federation of Trade Unions, and the Social-Democratic Party that a joint strike be declared. The Communist Party of Germany did quite right in calling for a strike. Many members of the Social-Democratic Party, members of the reformist trade unions, and German workers were convinced, by experience, that the Communist Party of Germany correctly defined the events and suggested correct methods of fighting, and that the hindrance to carrying out these methods was the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders. But the Party organis-

ations did not respond to the call for a strike. That is a fact,—they not only failed to respond in the Berlin-Brandenburg district; not a single organisation in any other district responded. This is a fact. Was this unexpected? *Ignoring the work in the factories, in the trade unions and the labour exchanges, sliding on the surface of mass work, abstract slogans and unpopular agitation, could not produce any other results.*

The united front. How is that established? On the streets. Owing to the fact that the "Nazis" indiscriminately beat Communists, Social-Democrats, reformists and even non-party workers, it was found possible to establish the united front. This is a very good united front. I have no objections to it. But it came to us from the side, as it were, not in the factories, not at the labour exchanges, or the trade unions. The fact that this united front was transferred to the factories is not due in most cases to our work, but to the indignation roused among the workers by the murders; on the day of the funeral, they organised the strike. That is what took place in a number of towns.

#### TASKS OF THE C.P. OF GERMANY.

Papen's government of the fascist dictatorship is trying to transfer all the burdens to the shoulders of the working class, and smash the Communist Party. That the C.P. of Germany may be able to successfully organise and lead the mighty impending battles of the German proletariat, it must liberate the workers and office employees from the influence of the Social-Democrats, reformist trade union bureaucracy and National-Socialists. To be able to do this it must:

1. Expand and consolidate the united front of the workers, which started in the streets, in the fight against the National-Socialists, and transfer it to the factories, into the reformist trade unions; and the labour exchanges, among the unemployed. This united front must be directed against the Social-Democrats and the trade union bureaucracy, and used in defence of the economic and political interests of the working class. *Unless the forces of the whole Party are reorganised to fulfil these tasks the necessary change will not be brought about.*

2. To guarantee genuine revolutionary leadership of this united front, it is necessary to mobilise all the revolutionary elements; members of the Party, of the Red trade unions, the R.T.U.O., Red Front Fighters' League, I.L.D., Red sports organisations, women's organisations, etc., in the factories, in the trade unions and labour exchanges, to give them a lead, instructions, and

place them under the constant guidance of the Party organisations.

3. To register all the members of the Party, of the R.T.U.O., Red trade unions, sport and other revolutionary organisations who are employed in the factories and organise them there into cells, R.T.U.O. groups, Red trade union groups, and groups of the other revolutionary organisations. For this purpose, it is necessary to review the composition of the street cells and remove all those who are employed in factories from them, — a matter which has been decided a score of times,—and to revise the composition of other organisations, having their base in residential districts but not in the factories.

4. To control the work of all members of Red factory councils. Cells and factory councils must openly dissociate themselves from all those who are not to be distinguished from the reformists in their work, so that the workers may see that the Party bears no responsibility for their reformist work.

Normal relationships must be established in the factories between the Party cells, Red members of factory councils, R.T.U.O. groups and sections of the Red trade unions. The competent Party Committees must render every assistance to the cells, particularly those in big enterprises and ensure them permanent guidance.

5. All Communists belonging to reformist, Catholic and Red trade unions must be registered, and formed into Communist fractions in all sections of these unions. *Communist fractions must also be established in the R.T.U.O.*

6. To bring about a decisive improvement in the mass work among the working men and working women in the factories, in the trade unions, and at the labour exchanges it must be given a concrete interesting content (deal with the smallest questions interesting separate groups of working men and working women, which are to be linked up with current political questions and the ultimate aims of the Party).

7. For this purpose super-centralism (*everything from the centre*) must be destroyed. *The greatest initiative of the cell and local, district, city, county and regional organisations of the Party must be widely developed.*

The Central Committee must pay strict attention to the work of instructing the Party organ-

isations, and organise constant supervision, not only of the fulfilment of decisions, but also of their work; as the leadership of all the links of the Party organisation, starting from the cells, to see whether they are successfully fulfilling their tasks.

8. The Central Committee, and the District Committees, must pay strict attention to the content and circulation of Party, trade union and factory papers. Real, not formal, guidance of these papers must be established.

This permanent guidance and control must be increased in regard to the illegal newspapers, magazines and pamphlets.

9. Strict attention must be paid to the work of the Young Communist League. The National-Socialist storm detachments contain a large number of young workers. The Party, the trade unions, and all the revolutionary mass organisations, particularly the German Y.C.L. must take all necessary measures, principally the method of waging an ideological struggle in the ranks of the storm detachments, to win these young workers away from the "Nazis."

10. The Party, from the cell to the Central Committee, must prepare for passing to an illegal condition, because the Papen fascist government may make a sudden attack upon the Party. This does not mean, of course, that the Party must go underground prematurely. On the contrary it must fight for its legal existence by every means in its power and organise mass resistance to attempts to smash, or suppress, the Party and the revolutionary organisations.

11. Finally, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany must promote tried members of the Party, who have shown their worth in practical work, to leading positions in all links of the Party on a wide scale.

All these measures must be carried out in the shortest possible time so that the Party organisations may be able to carry out the task of fighting against fascism, Social-Democracy, the trade union bureaucracy and the capitalist offensive, which confronts them, through the medium of Communist fractions in all mass workers organisations. By carrying out the measures enumerated, the Party will not only be able to declare a mass strike at the necessary moment, but also to translate it into real life.

# SOCIAL-FASCISM IN JAPAN

(Conclusion)

By AKI

Thus, the Social-Fascists had the audacity to dissolve all the organisations of the revolutionary opposition of Dseno representing 70 per cent. of the members (about 25,000 people). This police method could not but excite discontent, even among those prefectural organisations, which had been regarded by them as their invincible strongholds. For instance, in the Niigato prefecture (the most powerful bulwark of the Social-Democrats) the revolutionary opposition has now organised in its ranks twice as many members as those supporting the official leadership. A strong opposition has developed also in the prefectures of Akita, Saitama, etc., in short, in practically every prefecture in which there were none but supporters of the Social-Democratic leadership in the past.

Mcantime, the landless and poor Japanese peasant masses, shaking off the age-old yoke, are taking up the struggle for land. This is shown by the data on the growth of the number of peasant conflicts in recent years:

Years	Number of disputes	Number of tenants participating
1929	2,293	81,958
1930	2,109	58,565
1931	2,689	?

The peasant movements supported by the revolutionary workers, are everywhere culminating in bloody clashes with the armed detachments of the police and the reactionary organisations.

Lately, since the outbreak of the robber war, the peasantry have begun to make frequent raids on the police stations. Hundreds of unorganised and poorly-armed peasants participate in these raids. The number of peasant conflicts has also been growing.

In this situation the idea of the violent seizure of the lands (an agrarian revolution) is rapidly spreading among the toiling peasantry of Japan. The undisguised demagoguery of the Government about "aid" to the village, and the treacherous work of the Social-Fascists and Fascists will not succeed in diverting the Japanese peasantry from the path of agrarian revolution. In the process of the struggle the influence of the Communist Party and of the Revolutionary opposition of Dseno as well as the idea of a union between the workers and peasants are rapidly growing.

The conditions and prerequisites of the agrarian revolution in Japan are rapidly maturing. This movement, which is directed primarily against the parasitic landlord class of Japan, closely inter-

weaves with the struggle against the bourgeois-landlord bloc, the military-police monarchy and the yoke of monopolistic capital. Not only the landless peasantry, but also the smallholders and the toiling land owners are being drawn into the powerful revolutionary movement in the village. Under these conditions, the Japanese proletariat gains a solid foundation and an ally in the future worker-peasant revolution in the great masses of the village: the poor and middle peasants. There can be no doubt that we are face to face with a bloc between the working class and the toiling peasantry against the bloc of the bourgeoisie and landlords in Japan. To-day, when the great masses of the toiling peasants are being attracted to the movement, and the capitalists and landlords are attempting to divert the peasant unrest into the channel of the counter-revolution with the aid of their Fascist and Social-Fascist lackeys, the mass agitation of the Communists in the village for the confiscation of the landlords' estates without compensation (against the landlords), for the complete annulment of the indebtedness of the toiling peasantry (against usurious and monopolistic capital), for freeing the toiling peasantry of the military-police taxes (for a worker-peasant Government) plays a tremendous rôle.

The Communists to-day must urge the toiling peasants, in spite of the bourgeois-landlord and Social-Fascist slogans of "aid" to the village and a partial moratorium, "not to pay rent, debts and taxes, to resist the seizure of their land and property." To this end the Communists must organise peasant committees and a peasant self-defence against the landlords and judicial-police violence, and advocate an agrarian revolution.

The Japanese Communists have achieved several successes in their struggle against the Social-Fascists and Fascists. But this is still entirely insufficient in the present situation. The incorrect strategical line of the C.P. of Japan has played into the hands of the enemies in the past. The underestimation of the forces of the military-police monarchy and the too-simplified approach to every political event, from the point of view of the allegedly "Fascist dictatorship of finance capital," without a correct and concrete Leninist analysis of the relationship of the class forces in Japan, are features of this. This has also led to the underestimation of the importance of the agrarian revolution in the future revolution, and the land question, the forces and revolutionary rôle of the peasantry, particularly the middle peasants. The Japanese Communists are actively

rebuilding their strategical and tactical line in the spirit of the theses of the Comintern.

The second defect of the Japanese Communists in the struggle against the Social-Fascists is their inability to correctly apply the united front policy from below. The Japanese comrades urge in the press and on the platform the fight against the Social-Fascists in the united front from below, but this is insufficient. It is necessary to take the initiative into our own hands to carry out the united front policy. It is necessary to draw a line of distinction in deeds between the masses, and the Social-Democratic leaders, and the tactical manœuvres of the "left" and right Social-Fascists to create a united front of struggle. It is necessary to strike a blow at the most sensitive and vulnerable spots of the enemies, rather than follow in their wake. In reality, however, it frequently happens that our comrades establish their line of tactics only on those questions which are advanced by the Social-Democrats and, as a result, our organisations follow in the wake of the enemy. A striking illustration is provided by the struggle of the revolutionary opposition within Dseno, and the struggle against Rono Karabu. In this struggle the revolutionary movement of Japan has scored several victories. But, at the same time, this struggle also provides the Japanese Communists with very valuable experience. In the first case, the struggle flared up around the question of the obligatory support of Ronon Taishuto, which was prescribed by the leaders of Dseno (the National Peasant Union) from above. The revolutionary militants of this Union conducted an active struggle against the "left"-reformist leaders of the union, and gained the support of about two-thirds of the membership of this union. This was a great victory for the Party. At the same time, the basic distinction between the reformist and revolutionary wings lay in their attitude towards the agrarian revolution, the land question and the organisation of the peasant struggle. This aspect remained long in the shade, and was not stressed in the policy of the revolutionary wing. As a result the reformist leaders were not sufficiently exposed, and the broad unorganised masses of the peasantry were not attracted into the struggle. This mistake is now being corrected. In the second case, the Communists frequently limited themselves to general criticism of Rodo Kurabu and the manœuvres of the "left" reformists, while the main initiators of the organisation of the movement against Rodo Kurabu were the same "left" Social-Democrats. Despite the considerable growth of the influence of the revolutionary opposition, it cannot be said

that the united front policy has been applied very efficiently. On the contrary, as a result of losing the initiative, and failing to expose the "left" reformists, this latter being chiefly limited to words, instead of our concrete programme of the united front being opposed to the "lefts," the "left" reformists again succeeded in aligning a large number of workers with them. These examples should suffice to characterise the whole situation.

The third factor interfering with the broader development of the struggle against Social-Fascism on the part of the Communist Party is the weak, indefinite, and sometimes belated struggle against the Social-Democratic deviations within the revolutionary movement. The most characteristic example of this is provided by the economic tendencies which have lately been growing in the mass revolutionary organisations, and which expressed themselves in a weakening of the fight against the imperialist war and for the defence of the U.S.S.R., against the arbitrary rule of the military-police monarchy, for freedom of strikes, speech, press, and the right to organise on the part of the workers and peasants, etc., by the revolutionary trade unions and peasant organisations. The explanation given to this weakening of the struggle is approximately as follows: "Political demands should not be included in the programme of action of the trade unions," or "The struggle against war and police arbitrariness can be organised only by the Communist Party, while the peasant organisations must limit themselves to the struggle for economic demands." The comrades advocating such views do not understand that the war and the arbitrary police rule are directly related to the life of the masses, that the struggle against the war and arbitrary rule constitute the task, not only of the Communist Party, but also of all the revolutionary organisations led by the Party. The case of the agent-provocateur Ma . . . ra also gave the Party a valuable lesson, signalling the importance of responding to anti-Party deviations without any delay. These Social-Democratic deviations within the revolutionary movement are all the more dangerous now that the ruling classes and their Social-Fascist lackeys are strengthening the war preparations against China, and the U.S.S.R., and increasing the repressions not only against the revolutionary organisations, but against all forms of mass struggle.

The mass revolutionary organisations must not literally repeat what the Communist Party says,

*(Continued on page 599.)*