

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 9. No. 49

12th September 1929

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

Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Full Report.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Kuusinen and Manuilsky.

The Comintern and the New Revolutionary Upsurge.

Speech of Comrade MOLOTOV in the 11th Session.

The Main Feature of the Development of the Communist International.

Comrades.

Unfortunately, I have not been able to follow all the discussions at the Plenum of the Executive Committee. I will therefore not touch on the speeches of the various speakers, but will deal only with a few fundamental questions.

I will begin by speaking on the main feature in the development of the Communist International after the VI. Congress.

We know that immediately after the VI. Congress strife started around the fundamental decisions of the Congress in the ranks of the Communist International. In a number of Sections — Germany, Czechoslovakia, U. S. A., U. S. S. R. — struggle for the fundamental line of the VI. Congress was very sharp indeed. The declaration of the VI. Congress that at present "the main line of deviations is to the Right from the correct political position" was fully confirmed. Struggle against the Right and the conciliators who attacked the very foundations of the decisions of the VI. Congress, was in the past period the central question in the Communist International. This struggle was not limited to individual parties. The struggle against the Right and the conciliators assumed an international character. The sharpness of this struggle, the measure of its seriousness and determination, can serve to a great extent as a criterion of the development of the Communist Parties and

of their growth. The development of the Communist Parties in the recent period shows that wherever the struggle assumed a clear, intense and consistent character, we have to do with the most Bolshevised Parties which indicate the real growth of the Communist Parties. This confirms again and again the fact that only through ruthless struggle against Right opportunists, can Communist Parties properly occupy the frontal positions of the revolutionary proletariat and prepare energetically, consciously and in an organised manner for the coming revolutionary events. That is why struggle against the Right and the conciliators was the main feature in the development of the Communist International in this period.

As you know, the VI. Congress summed up the struggle against Trotskyism on an international scale. When the Trotskyist opposition in the C. P. S. U. (B.) was smashed, Trotskyist groups abroad became mere appendages of social-democracy. Trotsky's attacks on the U. S. S. R. and the Comintern in the foremost organs of the imperialist bourgeoisie ("Daily Express") are a convincing proof that the process of the renegade degeneration of Trotskyism is complete. It was possible for a few Trotskyist elements to remain in the Communist Parties after the VI. Congress, but their subsequent expulsion did not arouse any particular interest (example: Spector in Canada). On the other hand, the struggle of the Comintern against overt and

covert Right opportunists has assumed enormous importance. This struggle developed very rapidly, although it was difficult to foresee it at the time of the VI. Congress. It became inevitable in view of the position taken up immediately after the VI. Congress by Right and conciliatory elements in the Communist Parties.

These elements attacked the main line of the decisions of the VI. Congress. They disagreed with the Comintern in the estimation of the present stage of capitalist stabilisation, in the estimation of the so-called "third period" in the development of the general capitalist crisis after the imperialist world war. We need not speak, in this connection, of "Right" elements such as Brandler and Thalheimer who, having become avowed renegades, have placed themselves outside the ranks of the Comintern. Their estimation of the position of capitalism coincides in the main with the estimation of the social-democrats who laud "the recuperation" of the capitalist order. It is practically on this estimation that the position of the Right is based in all the Communist Parties, but in reality, the conciliators are following the same path. Instead of admitting that the present period means inevitably via the further development of contradictions in the capitalist stabilisation to a further shattering of the capitalist stabilisation and to a sharp accentuation of the general capitalist crisis" (VI. Congress), the conciliators are in reality identifying themselves with the social-democratic theory of "recuperation" of capitalism. Differences in regard to this fundamental question show that two opposite lines exist: the line of the Comintern and the line of the Right opportunists. Out of these two opposite lines arise two opposite estimations of the development of the contemporary labour movement and the role of social-democracy, and consequently, two opposite estimations of the fundamental tasks of the Communist Parties. These two lines inevitably lead to two opposite tactics. Therefore, struggle against Right and conciliatory elements in the Comintern is, in the given period, the central question. Hence, struggle against these bourgeois influences on the working class which are the most dangerous in the present circumstances, struggle against social-democratic relics in the ranks of the Communist Parties.

How embittered the Right- and conciliatory elements in the Comintern attacked the main line of the VI. Congress pointed out, by me, will be seen from a few examples. I will deal, in this connection, with the political position of Comrades Humbert-Droz, Serra and the group of German conciliators (E. Meyer, Ewert and others). Very characteristic was Comrade Humbert-Droz' speech in the Polit Secretariat of the E. C. C. I. end of November 1928. Comrade Humbert-Droz said:

"The VI. World Congress has practically condemned the general vague formulation — rotten, unstable, etc. stabilisation — because it does not in fact say anything definite about stabilisation. Comrades, have a look at the theses of the VI. World Congress. You will not find there any of the words just mentioned by me."

This is how Comrade Humbert-Droz presented the matter the day after the VI. Congress of the Comintern. And yet, Comrade Humbert-Droz declaration is certainly contrary to facts. One might even think that he has not read the theses of the VI. Congress, because he was bound to come across the passage that the present period means "further shattering of the capitalist stabilisation". However, in spite of the fact that Comrade Humbert-Droz has of course read the theses of the VI. Congress, he did not notice this declaration of the Congress. More than that. Under the pretext of defending the line of the VI. Congress, Comrade Humbert-Droz developed a point of view opposed to this line. This can be seen by the following. When speaking of the economic struggles which are developing in the capitalist countries, Comrade Humbert-Droz asserted:

"These big fights are developing not in a situation when bourgeois economy is decaying, not in a period when the State power of capitalism is declining. On the contrary, they take place in a period when bourgeois economy and State power have been strengthened*)."

Thus, according to Humbert-Droz, instead of the shattering of capitalist stabilisation, we are supposed to witness "streng-

* Underlined by me. V. M.

thening of bourgeois economy and State power". Where is the fundamental difference between this philosophy and the democratic dictum of the "recuperation" of capitalism? In case, it is self-evident that there is a radical difference between Comrade Humbert-Droz' position and the line of the VI. Congress.

Comrade Serra, sets himself even more frankly against the Comintern. In his report to the C. C. C. P. of Italy, March 1929, he gave the following estimation of capitalist stabilisation in Germany:

"To say, as the German comrades are saying, that the stabilisation of the German bourgeoisie is rotten, is not to amount to shutting one's eyes to facts."

Serra made a fierce attack on the German comrades. It is only a pity that his arguments show that he is shutting his eyes to what is going on in the revolutionary proletarian camp. Being naive, he has not noticed that this strong belief in the consolidation of capitalism makes him the victim of bourgeois illusions and can mean only transition to the social-reformist camp. Serra's whole report to the C. C. of the Italian Communist Party shows that its author is no longer a conciliator, as we recently thought, but an out-and-out Right views differ radically from those of the Comintern.

Special importance attaches to the position of the group of conciliators in the German Communist Party. This group repeats in various forms what Humbert-Droz and Serra are saying. At the November Plenum of the C. C. C. P. G., Comrade Ewert proposed to delete from the resolution of the Plenum the words that capitalist stabilisation is becoming more and more rotten and insecure. In November, in the Polit Secretariat of the E. C. C. I., Comrade Meyer said:

"How can Comrade Thalmann say that stabilisation in 1928 is more rotten and insecure than in 1926? This is obviously an argument against the decisions of the VI. Congress in regard to the third period."

Again, as we see, the well-known refrains about capitalist stabilisation. How tedious this repetition by the conciliators of one and the same sentence about the inadmissibility of describing the present stabilisation as rotten and insecure. I have to give you one more quotation from the collective declaration of the German conciliators where, following in Humbert-Droz' footsteps, they proclaim the consolidation of the economic positions and the political power of the bourgeoisie. This is what we read in the platform of Comrades Ewert, Eberlein, Dietrich, Becker, Schröder, Schumann and Kurt published in December 1928 in the German "International":

"The majority of the C. C. sees the war in China as preparation of war against the U. S. S. R., the Left orientation of the proletariat etc., but the other side of the process which causes accentuation of contradictions, 'rapid development of economy', i. e. economic consolidation of the present basis of the relative stabilisation and, consequently, also of the political power of the bourgeoisie, it does not want to see..."

Thus, so-called "conciliators" are evidently singing in unison with social-democracy. The meaning of their attitude is a shamefaced admission of the alleged "recuperation" of capitalism. Sometimes, this is called "reconstruction" of capitalism, as one can speak of the reconstruction of an economic system which has entered upon the stage of accentuated crisis. And all this, if you please, is represented to be the true line of the VI. Congress of the Comintern!

These examples show clearly on what was based the attack on the line of the VI. Congress. We can see by these examples that Right opportunists have carried on since the VI. Congress a stubborn struggle against the line of that Congress under the cloak of defence of its decisions. The position taken up by so-called "conciliators" has been completely exposed. Struggle for the political line of the VI. Congress was bound to be determined struggle against the Right and the conciliators who are hobbling in their wake.

It is clear now that the decisions of the VI. Congress are extremely important. These decisions contain a correct scientific analysis of the present stage of the growing capitalist

sis and, at the same time, a clear prognosis of the development of the international revolutionary movement. And this is the basis for determining the practical tasks of the Communist Parties and the Comintern as a whole. Only on the basis of the estimation given by the VI. Congress of the economic and political development throughout the world, were the Communist Parties able to define correctly the character of the economic struggles of the working class, to expose the role of imperial-democracy including its "Left" wing, to determine their tactical tasks in the new situation and to develop the struggle for the purging of the ranks of the Comintern from opportunist rottenness.

But we must take into consideration that Right-opportunist tendencies do not only come from, so to speak, "avowed" Right and conciliatory elements. They penetrate also by other means. An example of this is Comrade Varga.

His speech and written amendments were already strongly opposed at the Plenum. I will deal only with two fundamental amendments of his: 1. re the reparations problem and 2. re the standard of living of the working class.

In regard to the reparations problem in connection with the Young-Plan, Comrade Varga proposed an amendment which, among other things, contains the following statement:

"The accentuation of imperialist contradictions which not one of the main imperialist powers thinks it at present expedient to solve by means of war, makes necessary an attempt at temporarily bridging over these contradictions in regard to the reparations question."

And then, the statement at the end of this amendment:

"As imperialist contradictions become more acute, the problem of reparations will once more assume an accentuated form."

One cannot help wondering how a participant in the present Plenum could arrive at such palpably opportunist conclusions in regard to reparations. Firstly, according to Comrade Varga, "not one of the main imperialist powers thinks it at present expedient to solve by means of war" the accentuated imperialist contradictions. Comrade Varga asserts this, although the facts say just the opposite. Everyone knows that the danger of another imperialist war is growing from day to day. This should also be known to Comrade Varga, but we get just the opposite in his "amendment". Secondly, Comrade Varga has gone to the length of saying that the Young-Plan means temporarily bridging over these (imperialist) contradictions. But if the Young-Plan could temporarily bridge imperialist contradictions, in the estimation of imperialism, truth would be not on the side of Communism, but on the side of social-reformism. Comrade Varga chimes in, in this case, with the social-democrats, he denies that precisely as the result of the carrying through of the Young-Plan of reparations, a further accentuation of internal contradictions (above all in Germany itself) and also of contradictions between the capitalist States (America-

Great-Britain, the Anglo-French bloc and Germany) is inevitable. Thirdly, according to Comrade Varga, the reparations problem will once more assume an accentuated form only "as imperialist contradictions become more acute". But this is quite reformist; it seems that imperialist contradictions are temporarily bridged over and their accentuation will come in some dim future, bringing with it also an accentuation of the reparations problem. Comrade Varga has relegated the accentuation of the reparations problem to the dim and distant future, displaying exceptional faith in the plans and capacities of Mr. Young and such like people. Such views are akin to reformist illusions and have nothing in common with the views of the Comintern. By his amendments, Comrade Varga wanted to "correct" the Comintern, but as we can see by all that was said, if he be not "corrected" himself, Comrade Varga will not find himself in a Communist position.

Just as opportunist is his amendment re the standard of living of the working class. Comrade Varga proposes instead of the words: "capitalist stabilisation is lowering its (of the working class) standard of living", the words: "decreasing its share in its own production." Comrade Varga's statistical-economic arguments in favour of his amendment, are, to say the least, not serious. What he wanted to prove is in substance, that the general position of the working class gets worse without a lowering of its standard of living. But these proofs are quite unconvincing and obviously contradictory. His declaration in the second speech at this Plenum, that he does not assert that the standard of living of the working class is rising, shows only how confused his ideas are in regard to this question. And yet, in the report and in the discussions, enough arguments and facts were given which cannot be refuted by any of Comrade Varga's sophisms, who denies the fact of the lowering of the standard of living of the working class under the conditions created by capitalist rationalisation. But the objective meaning of this denial is an endeavour to give capitalism a favourable complexion, inclination to agree with the apologists of capitalism from the social-reformist camp.

One more remark in regard to Comrade Varga. Comrade Varga defends his position stubbornly. He spoke twice at this Plenum in defence of his amendment. However, it is not enough to say that Comrade Varga is wrong in substance, for by trying to drag back the Plenum to questions already examined, explained and finally decided by the Comintern, he is playing here, so to speak, a reactionary role. This at the time when the Plenum is confronted with important new questions, I think it will be as well to concentrate our attention on the new revolutionary tasks which have arisen before the Comintern.

But in this respect, we shall have to learn not from Comrade Varga but from the practice of the revolutionary struggle of the workers against capitalism and its lackeys in the reformist camp. Attempts are made to drag us back, but we must holdly march on towards the new revolutionary tasks of the Comintern.

2. The New After the VI. Congress.

Let us take now the main question — what is the new after the VI. Congress of the Comintern? The Comintern's answer to this question must lay down the fundamental tasks of the Communist Parties for the immediate future.

The draft resolution which the Plenum is to consider, gives this answer. It contains the following statement:

"What is new since the VI. World Congress is the obvious swing to the left of the international working class and the development of another revival of the revolutionary labour movement."

This statement from the draft resolution must be taken together with what is said in the corresponding part of the decisions of the VI. Congress. The VI. Congress said that owing to the ever-increasing disorganisation of the capitalist stabilisation and the growing accentuation of the general capitalist crisis "the general swing to the Left of the working class is progressing in the European countries". My quotation from the draft resolution says already something more. It says, firstly, that the swing to the Left of the international working class is already obvious and, secondly, that we witness "the

development of another revival of the revolutionary labour movement". While the first statement indicates the general background of the development of the international labour movement, the second gives already a definite characteristic of that which is new as well as important in the present development. The main thing is evidently what the Comintern can and must say at the present juncture about the development of a new revolutionary wave.

Before dealing with facts descriptive of the new revolutionary revival, I want to deal with the so-called "third period" in connection with the question of the new revival.

We have hitherto heard in our ranks purely scholastic arguments concerning the third period.

As you know, in the economic sphere the third period means that capitalism has exceeded the pre-war level, that in a number of industries and countries a rapid growth of technique and rationalisation of production is going on. That cartels and trusts are growing, and also tendencies towards state capitalism. Simultaneously, we witness the accentuation of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism, contradictions within

the capitalist countries and contradictions between imperialist states, contradictions between the latter and the colonial countries and, finally, contradictions between the imperialist camp and the country of socialist construction. All this means accentuation of the general capitalist crisis. But what can the accentuation of the capitalist crisis and the increasing shattering of capitalist stabilisation mean? It can only mean one thing, that within capitalism itself are growing the forces which will explode capitalist stabilisation. The scholastic side of the arguments about the third period consists in the attempt to separate this period in the development of the post-war capitalist crisis by some sort of a wall from the period of collapse of capitalist stabilisation, the period of a new revival of the international proletarian revolution. I want to say that just as there was no Chinese wall between the preceding periods of development of post-war capitalism, the "third period" is not separated by any wall from a direct revolutionary situation. The VI. Congress had every reason to speak of the third period in spite of the fact that the biggest capitalist country — Great Britain — has not yet reached the pre-war level, whereas one of the characteristic features of this period is that capitalist economics have exceeded the pre-war level. Also, we cannot help seeing considerable difference in the development of the capitalist crisis and, in this connection, a difference in the development of the new revolutionary revival in the individual countries. However, we can and must say that the fundamental facts in the international development after the VI. Congress show clearly that there is a revival of the revolutionary labour movement, and that this revival is spreading. Only pedants, not capable of understanding the revolutionary dialectics of social development, can look for strict delimitation lines dividing one period of development from another, dividing especially the so-called "third period" from the period of the directly revolutionary situation. In reality, we witness in the third period the development of another revolutionary revival which, at an opportune moment, is bound to develop — as it unexpectedly and by some outside impulse — into a directly revolutionary situation. It is for this reason that the fact of the Comintern drawing attention to the development of another revolutionary revival must be borne in mind by the Communist Parties.

I am coming now to facts characteristic of the new revival. There are plenty of such facts. I will enumerate only the most important: the gigantic conflict (lockout and strike) in the Ruhr, the general strike in Lodz, the militant strike of tens of thousands of cotton operatives in North France, the agricultural labourers' strike in Czechoslovakia, unprecedented in regard to perseverance, the general cotton operatives strike in Bombay. These big conflicts in the various countries were not of an isolated character, their background was the ever-developing economic struggle of the working class in these countries and in a number of others. Suffice it to say that there were over 100 strikes every month in France since the beginning of 1929. The united front of employers' organisations, reformist unions and the bourgeois authorities which opposes the working class, lends this economic struggle a political character. Incidents such as the May barricades in Berlin, the armed resistance of the Pabvanitzky workers to the police, viewed in connection with the demonstrations and strikes in various countries, show that the economic struggles of the toiling masses tend to assume higher forms of revolutionary struggle. Just as the general strike in Bombay indicates development of the revolutionary movement in India, the May barricades in the working class districts of Berlin indicate the development of the revolutionary movement in Europe, and above all, in Germany. It is in this connection that we must consider the success of the Communist Party at the recent factory committee elections in Germany. One must also take into consideration that in a number of countries — Poland, the Balkans — there is revolutionary ferment among the peasants. In this connection, I would like to point out that up to 70,000 peasants participated in the May Day demonstrations in various parts of Poland, and did so under revolutionary slogans.

In view of all these facts which bear witness of a revolutionary revival, we must ask ourselves what constitutes the nature of this revival. In this connection, we must try to understand the peculiarity of the revolutionary revival in the labour movement at the present juncture.

This revival is of course connected with the growing capitalist crisis and the accentuation of the fundamental contra-

dictions of the capitalist system. This brings with it worsening of the position of the proletariat, growing capitalist oppression of the toiling rural masses, increased oppression on the part of imperialism in the colonies. The worsening of the position of masses of workers is bound to be an incentive to revolutionary struggle against capitalism. The peculiarity of the present situation is — that the accentuation of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism and the worsening of the position of masses resulting from it, is taking place at the time when socialist economic reconstruction in the U.S.S.R. has been given an unprecedented impetus. This fact is of enormous world importance. Transition to the period of reconstruction in the U.S.S.R. means further accentuation of the fundamental contradiction of the contemporary epoch, the contradiction between fundamentally opposed and irreconcilable systems; the system of declining capitalism and the system of ascending socialism. There is no doubt whatever that the revolutionary revival in the labour movement of the capitalist countries is closely connected with the growth and socialist economic reconstruction in the Soviet Union. It seems to me that this point has not been sufficiently taken into consideration at the Plenum. I will therefore deal with it in greater detail later on. But I must already draw attention to the fact that the impetus which has been given lately to socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. imparts a special character to the revolutionary revival in the international labour movement.

The present revival has an international character. In spite of diversity of degree and character, there is every reason to say, on the strength of facts from the labour movement in the biggest capitalist countries, that the revival is of an international character.

One can ask, when did this revival begin? A serious analysis of this question is certainly of considerable importance, but it is useless to speculate amateurishly as to the day and month when the revival started. Here are a few explanations which will help to answer this question. We can record that already the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. (February 1928) realised the necessity of a change in the tactic of the biggest European Parties (France, Britain) owing to the swing to the Left which the labour movement in Europe had taken. It is also from this viewpoint that the fundamental decisions of the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U. in the beginning of last year were made. Finally, already the VI. Congress of the Comintern pointed out that the specific feature of all economic collisions between capital and labour was their "unusual sharpness" and that "every strike is assuming a political, i. e. a general class character", that "the resistance of the working class which has already recovered from the serious defeats of the preceding period, is growing" (the italics are mine, V. M.). But even the VI. Congress did not speak about a new revolutionary revival. It is only this Plenum of the E.C.C.I. which — basing itself on the enormous number of recent facts — can and certainly must categorically declare that a revolutionary revival is developing.

It goes without saying that this revival is taking different forms in the different countries. We witness its clearest forms in such European countries as Germany, Poland and France. To them must be added India where the revival of the revolutionary movement is gradually developing into revolution. It was correctly pointed out in the discussion that the analysis of the revolutionary revival in these European countries and in India deserves careful attention on the part of the Comintern. This, however, does not mean that questions connected with the revival of the labour movement in Britain, the U.S.A. and other countries, can be relegated in the background.

We must now turn our attention to the attempts made in our ranks to question the fact of the revolutionary revival. Such efforts are being made by the Right-conciliatory opportunists. Their favourite argument is: how can one speak of a revolutionary revival now, in 1929, considering that we did not speak about it 3 years ago, at the time of the General Strike in Britain and the high tide of the Chinese revolution? That it is wrong to put the question in this manner, is obvious. It would be a serious error to deny the revolutionary importance to the whole labour movement of facts such as the general strike in Britain and the Chinese revolution in 1926-27, or even the well-known insurrection in Vienna. More than that, without

these facts we would not have the rapid development of events such as we witness now. The general strike in Britain, as well as the Chinese revolution have greatly helped to undermine capitalist stabilisation. They played the role of a powerful battering-ram in regard to capitalist stabilisation. But in the then situation, these events were characteristic only of individual countries (Britain, China). They found no echo in the other countries. Now, we have a different situation.

Now the situation is such that in all the chief capitalist countries of Europe events are taking place which mark the development of a revolutionary revival which is characteristic not only of this or that country, but certainly of a number of important countries in Europe and outside Europe.

It is too early to speak of the development of another revolutionary wave in China. But even there, the situation is far from being quiet. On the contrary, there is constant revolutionary ferment. The revolutionary forces of town and country are certainly growing. Although it is too early to speak of a new revolutionary wave in China, it would be nothing short of contemptible liberal short-sightedness to deny the growth of class contradictions in China and the fact that premises are being created for another revolutionary wave. But of particular importance now is the development in India where the revolutionary movement is getting hold of ever-growing numbers of workers and, partly, of peasants. Moreover, the development of the revolutionary movement in India is of enormous revolutionary importance for the whole East, and, particularly, for China and the revolutionary movement there.

At present, there is nothing as important to the international labour movement as the general strike in Britain was a few years ago. However, this general strike remained isolated, on the whole, it did not directly develop into a revolutionary situa-

tion even in Britain. On the other hand, the economic and political struggles of the working class which are developing now in Germany, Poland, France, Czechoslovakia and other European countries, as well as in America and Asia, show that the revolutionary revival on an international scale is a fact. Therefore, only Philistine conciliators in our ranks can deny that we are rapidly approaching events of greater magnitude than the British general strike in 1926.

All what has been said here shows that it is incumbent on the Communist Parties to get ready for big revolutionary events, for new revolutionary struggles of great magnitude. We must raise the sense of responsibility in the ranks of our Parties before the working class in regard to the mobilisation of the revolutionary forces for new big class struggles. Much depends on the Communist Parties, as the organised vanguard of the proletariat, in regard to converting the present economic struggles into a revolutionary struggle for power, for conquest of the proletarian dictatorship.

It is in this sense that the May incidents in Berlin are of exceptional importance. The May Days in Berlin represent a turning point in the class struggle in Germany, they give an impetus to the revolutionary labour movement in Germany. As it is said in our resolution, "they show that there is a tendency in the economic movement of the proletarian masses to develop into higher forms of revolutionary struggle". These events have given prominence to the fundamental problem of revolutionary revival, namely, the problem of higher forms of revolutionary struggle, not only as far as the German workers, but the whole international proletariat is concerned. This problem has become now the actual problem of the proletarian movement. Those who deny this, are not revolutionaries, not Communists, but rotten, pitiable reformists. (Applause.)

3. The Revolutionary Revival and Our Tasks.

It is now clear in what connection we must consider our practical tasks.

The main task of the Communist Parties is conquest of the majority of the working class. This task must receive special attention under present circumstances, when we are witnessing a revolutionary revival. We must categorically declare that conquest of the majority of the proletariat implies conquest of the leading role in the labour movement by the Communist Parties. Not unless in every action of the workers, in every strike and demonstration and in every factory committee election campaign, the Communist Parties are able to enter the ranks of the proletarian vanguard and to rally around themselves the mass of the workers, will they be able to secure the leading role in the labour movement. Only stubborn struggle for the leading role in all the actions of the masses, will guarantee to the Communist Parties support by the working class, and this is our main task.

In this connection, considerable importance attaches to the discussion of the new Communist tactic in the economic struggle at this Plenum. This tactic was to a great extent already outlined by the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U. A year after this Congress, we can already speak of considerable experience in the application of this tactic. When summing up now this experience, the Executive Committee must pay special attention to strike tactics and strike leadership and, above all, to work among the unorganised. This includes also struggles against the expulsion of Communists from reformist trade unions, establishment, under certain conditions, of revolutionary trade unions, establishment, in enterprises, of bodies of revolutionary representatives elected by the workers, and work in factory councils. Finally, this includes also the general question of new forms for the application of the proletarian united front tactic, as well as a question which is assuming more and more importance, namely, that of linking up the economic struggle of the workers with the fundamental class tasks of the proletariat.

We can already record considerable success in the carrying through of these new tasks. Maximum importance attaches to the experience of the workers of Germany, France and Poland, i. e. the countries which are now in the forefront of the revolutionary revival.

We have here already a test of the new tactic, and many examples of new forms in the organisation of the working class. This experience must be verified, and also extended and intensified, it must become the property of the entire international proletariat. We can on no account limit now our practical tasks to so-called "tried" methods, forgetting that a new situation demands new methods, new forms of struggle, new organisations, new ways in getting hold of the masses. To forget this, is tantamount to forgetting the main thing with regard to winning the majority of the working class for Communism.

I will not dwell on all these questions which are connected with our practical tasks in the organisation of the economic struggle of the working class. I will limit myself to emphasising the exceptional importance of the united front tactic in its new forms, in its correct application from below. Now more than ever before, the tactic of agreements with reformists, of coalitions between revolutionary and reformist organisations, is unacceptable and harmful. All the more necessary is it to emphasise the importance of the struggle for Communist leadership in the mass actions of the proletariat. Only energetic participation of Communists as the most advanced workers in every mass demonstration of the proletariat, only active support of every mass action of the working class, combined with ruthless struggle against the social reformists, and especially their "Left" wing, can create the premises for the conquest of the decisive sections of the working class by Communism. Only by such tactics, by making use of all the new forms and methods for the organisation of the working class, will the Communist Parties be able to bring over to their side the majority of the working class and to march at its head in the struggle for power and for proletarian dictatorship.

Here one must say something about the role of political mass strikes in the present period.

The capitalist offensive against the working class has been meeting lately with ever-growing resistance on the part of the proletariat. The economic struggle of the workers is in some cases no longer a defensive struggle, it is assuming a counter-offensive character, and is at times a regular offensive. The bloc of employers' organisations and reformist trade unions which collaborates with the bourgeois State apparatus, is an incentive to the workers to take up new forms of struggle,

it leads to the conversion of economic struggle into political. However, these demonstrations against the capitalists and their reformist lackeys are still of a disjointed character. Hence, our duty to give a uniform direction to the growing activity of the masses and to lead it into the channel of general proletarian class struggle. At the present juncture, the political mass strike can be such a channel. The problem of the political mass strike is the decisive problem of all Communist Parties in the immediate future. This is precisely the new, the fundamental and the most characteristic in the tactical tasks of the Communist Parties at the present juncture. This means that we are getting very near the new and highest forms of class struggle.

We cannot yet say that we are on the eve of a proletarian insurrection. But it would be unpardonable short-sightedness not to remember that the new revolutionary wave is not separated by a Chinese wall from a directly revolutionary situation. We cannot waste time speculating where and when exactly, in what country and at what particular moment, we will reach a directly revolutionary situation. In this case too, prophesying is not the business of Communists. But we would not be Communists, if we did not understand that the present revolutionary wave can develop, at a definite stage — and certainly not in the dim and distant future — into a revolutionary explosion, into the highest form of revolutionary struggle. But this makes incumbent on us to find a revolutionary slogan

4. The Struggle against Social Democracy and Social Fascism.

Under present conditions the question of more energetic struggle against Social Democracy assumes special importance. Communist Parties cannot afford to ignore the struggle against Social Democracy and, above all, against its "Left" wing, which is betraying the working class in a more subtle way than the Right. There can be no struggle for the conquest of the working class by Communism without ruthless and consistent struggle against social reformism. Struggle against Social Democracy, and especially against its "Left" wing, is particularly important now because Social Democracy is degenerating more and more into social fascism.

The latter question deserves special attention.

It seems to me, that at this Plenum the discussion about fascism and, especially, about social fascism was rather academic in some cases. It goes without saying that a serious study of the history, nature and character of Fascism, the stages of its contemporary development and, especially, a serious study of the gradual degeneration of Social Democracy into social fascism, is of considerable importance to the Comintern. But it does not follow that in studying the question of Fascism, the Plenum of the Executive Committee must be converted into something like a meeting of academicians. The fundamental part of this question has been studied and expressed by the Comintern, for instance, in the decisions of the VI. Congress and in the Comintern Programme. In the present period of revolutionary revival, our main task consists in deciding on the methods of struggle against Fascism and Social Democracy which is degenerating into Fascism, to be adopted by the Communist Parties. I think that this Plenum should concentrate its attention on this task.

The workers are lately encountering more and more fascist methods on the part of the Social-Democrats. The anti-labour and frankly counter-revolutionary tactics of Social-Democracy, as demonstrated by the police-socialists of the Zörgiebel type on May Day in Berlin, show clearly the nature of social fascism. The lessons of Social-Democratic police brutality, such as witnessed in Berlin on May 1st and 2nd, and the fact that this brutality has the support of all social-reformist organisations, cannot be lost on the proletarian masses. The social-fascist character of Social Democracy is clearly indicated in the slogans brought forward now by the Social-Democratic leaders. Everyone knows that at the last Party Congress, Wels, one of the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, brought forward the slogan of fascist dictatorship, for struggle against the revolutionary proletariat. We see that Social Democracy is frankly taking up new positions, is degenerating more and more into avowed social-fascism. The role of social fascism consists in

capable of coordinating the disjointed actions of the masses into a general revolutionary class action of the proletariat. In the present stage of development, such a slogan is the political mass-strike. We could not bring forward this slogan if we did not find ourselves in a decidedly revolutionary situation. Under present conditions, this slogan throws light on all fundamental practical tasks, on our whole tactic at the given moment.

Lenin always attached enormous importance to the workers' strike movement. He laid special stress on the role of the strike movement during the period of the revolution of 1905 as well as later, during the revolutionary wave of 1912—14. He repeatedly explained not only the importance of combining and intertwining economic and political strikes, but especially — using the revolution of 1905 as an example — the importance of "combining two of the most powerful means of this (revolutionary) struggle — political mass strikes and armed insurrection." (Lenin, "The History of the Dictatorship").

By bringing forward the slogan of the political mass strike we are marching towards the highest forms of the revolutionary struggle of the working class. The practical success of this slogan will mean that the revolutionary wave is developing into the highest forms of revolutionary struggle. With the slogan of the political mass struggle we are meeting half way decisive revolutionary battles, the proletarian revolution, the direct struggle for power. (Applause.)

creating — through the Social-Democratic organisations and reformist trade unions — certain mass support for Fascism against the working class and against the proletarian revolution. The bourgeoisie is endeavouring to make use of social fascism in order to paralyse the proletarian mass struggle against fascism, in order to paralyse the struggle of the workers against the bourgeois dictatorship. This means that in the present revolutionary situation the struggle against social fascism, especially against its infamous Left wing which is deceiving the working class by its subtle methods, is of paramount importance.

But the fascist degeneration of Social Democracy is certainly not uniform in all countries, as shown by two examples: the German Social Democracy and the British Labour Party. We know that the MacDonald Government has not yet been long enough in office to show its true character to the workers. Its social fascist character will be divulged gradually, by its measures against the workers and the proletarian revolution and for the preparation of another imperialist war, another attack on the U.S.S.R. In view of the revolutionary character of the present situation, exposure of the true class character of the MacDonald Government will be more rapid than usual. Under these conditions the policy of the Labour Government which means support for capitalist rationalisation and, consequently, increased pressure on the working class, will rapidly show its outspoken bourgeois and imperialist character. The MacDonald Government, which has no parliamentary majority, is now in power by the grace of the bourgeois parties. It has already shown how anxiously it is looking for support not only from the Liberals but also from the Tories. The imperialist bourgeoisie gives this support because the "Labour Government" carries out loyally the will of British imperialism. The self-exposure of the MacDonald Government would be even more rapid if it could depend on its own majority in parliament. In this connection, we can only regret that the "Labour Party" does not possess such a parliamentary majority.

One more remark about the "Labour Government" in Great Britain.

The success of the Labour Party at the general election is to a certain extent due also to the errors of the Communist Party. Several comrades who spoke here, correctly remarked that the Labour Party made capital at the general election out of the erroneous decisions re support for MacDonald's Party passed at the last Congress of the British Communist Party. The enormous difficulties encountered in the struggle against the old reformist traditions among the British workers have repeatedly driven our Party into vague and inconsistent tactics in regard to British social-reformism. This wobbling in our

has considerably benefited the **MacDonalds, Hendersons, Snowdens** and others. It seems that the British Communist Party has not yet outlived these vacillations. All the reason for us to declare most emphatically that only consistent application of the new tactic under the slogan "class against class" can raise — though not at once — the prestige of the British Communist Party in the British labour movement. The more determined our application of this tactic, the more rapid and complete will be the exposure of the MacDonald Government, and with it, the vindication of the cor-

rectness of this tactic, especially if it be applied with the necessary consistency and ruthlessness in regard to social fascism.

What has been said about those parties of the II. International which are now in power, is descriptive of the real role of Social Democracy at the present juncture. This role is that of henchman of imperialism, of tool of fascism. In fact, social democracy is degenerating more and more into social fascism. In the period of revolutionary revival, Social Democracy becomes definitely a component part of the bloc of the counter-revolutionary forces of the bourgeoisie.

5. The Situation in the Communist Parties.

I will deal now with the fundamental features of the development of the Communist Parties after the VI. Congress.

I said already at the beginning of my speech that the main reason for the development of the Communist International in the period was the struggle against the Right and the conciliators. That this struggle assumed a decidedly international character and became very sharp, is of course not accidental. In the period of revolutionary revival, this is one of the chief reasons for successful struggle by the proletariat. This is the case when all the weak and rotten spots in the organism of the Communist Parties are revealed with remarkable clearness. Of course, we must not imagine that we have already succeeded in discovering and exposing all that is rotten and opportunist in the Communist movement. However, the purging of the Comintern from opportunist rot has made considerable progress.

I want to give a few facts in this connection.

I will begin with the composition of the Executive Committee itself. The growth of the Communist International was accompanied by purging of the Communist ranks from all hangers-on, from incorrigible opportunists. After the VI. Congress, this process was very rapid. In less than a year a number of members of the Executive Committee were driven out only from the ranks of the Executive Committee, but even from the ranks of the Comintern. They include not only the **skyite renegade Spector** (Canada), but even such renegades as **Lovestone** (America) and **Jilek** (Czechoslovakia). The expulsion of these and other (**Brandler, Thalheimer**) incorrigible opportunists is to the advantage of the Comintern. If the German Party had Brandlers and Thalheimers in its ranks, it would be unable to do justice to its revolutionary tasks in the present situation. Marching side by side with avowed renegades, and allowing the masses for the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, is incompatible. If the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had in its ranks people such as Hais, Neurath and Jilek, it could not march in the forefront of the revolutionary proletariat. These people are decidedly heading for Social Democracy and are unfit for the revolutionary struggle.

The cleansing of the Comintern ranks from these degenerate and avowed renegades is the premise for the further development and consolidation of the Comintern. It is achieved by replacing such leaders by new leaders, especially from the ranks of the workers who have gone through the school of the struggle, that our Parties can become real leaders of the working class.

The Comintern paid special attention to the situation in the American Communist Party.

A special E. C. C. I. delegation was sent to the last Congress of this Party. Subsequently, a commission of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. worked several weeks in Moscow and made a careful study of the situation in the American Party. During the work of this commission, it became clear that the Executive Committee of the Party, headed by Lovestone, is not capable of leading the Party through the line of the Comintern. This Executive Committee finds itself in an exceptional position. By this theory of American exclusiveness, Lovestone & Co. endeavoured to pursue their infamous pro-American imperialist policy. Lovestone's behaviour in the American Commission showed clearly that he has most at heart the interests of his rotten faction. He is not a leader of the Communist Party, but a stranger in our ranks capable of any political trickery, of downright betrayal of the Comintern. The Presidium of the E. C. C. I.

effected a radical renovation of the Executive of the American Communist Party, creating thereby premises for a truly Bolshevik growth of the Party and consolidation of its authority among the workers. This example shows that in the years of capitalist stabilisation elements have penetrated into our ranks whose expulsion from the Comintern and substitution by new leaders connected with the masses, is bound to place the Parties on a sounder basis and promote their success. In the face of this, what are we to say about those who lament about the "disintegration" which is supposed to be going on in the ranks of the Comintern?

Radical change of leadership has also taken place in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

Here the semi-reformists (**Hais, Jilek, Neurath**) who for years concealed their true nature, have come out openly against the Party and the Comintern. Several Party leaders, together with the group of parliamentary deputies, began to infringe Party discipline, sabotage the economic struggle of the workers and to make common cause with the police against the workers, in order to get hold of the trade union apparatus. In spite of the difficulties which the Czechoslovakian Communist Party is experiencing in the present stage of its development, here too, getting rid of the semi-reformist elements at the Party helm can only strengthen the Party and raise its authority in the eyes of the masses. I think that after all this, we can appreciate at their right value, the hue and cry about "splits" and "secessions" in the Comintern!

We had to deal with a peculiar situation in the Polish Communist Party. Not so long ago, the inner-Party struggle in Poland assumed at times an unprincipled character. Moreover, both fractions were guilty of opportunism. Lately, the reformist tendencies of the leaders of the so-called "majority" developed considerably, especially in regard to the most important question for Poland, that of the attitude to the P. P. S. The last Plenum of the C. C. C. P. of Poland arrived at correct conclusions when it decided to effect a reshuffling in the leadership of the Polish Communist Party and to remove from the leading centre comrades (**Kostrzheva** and others) with decidedly opportunist tendencies. One can say now with certainty that the Polish Communist Party will achieve considerable and lasting successes in its Bolshevik development and in regard to extending its influence over the masses.

I must also say something about the situation in the Italian Communist Party.

As one can easily see, the question of struggle against the Right and the conciliators was not very clearly put there. The C. C. C. P. of Italy exhibited in this case considerable vacillation and, what I would like to call, weak-mindedness. The attitude of the C. C. C. to Comrade Serra is an example of this.

In March, the C. C. emphatically condemned Serra's line as hostile to the VI. Congress. In regard to this, the Italian comrades say now that already in March the C. C. condemned Serra's stand, but there is of course more justification to say that, unfortunately, the C. C. condemned Serra's line only in March. In any case, no matter how belated this decision, it was absolutely necessary. Although Serra showed himself to be an outright opportunist and Right, the C. C. continued even in March an utterly unaccountable, in the given case, flirtation with him. (Hear, hear!) At the March Plenum of the C. C., Comrade Serra declared his intention to resign from the Polit-Bureau. The C. C. did not only fail to forestall this step by a decision of its own, it even decided to retain him in the Polit-Bureau. After an emphatic condemnation of the political line of Serra,

this decision strikes one as illogical. One can see from the memorandum distributed by the Italian delegation at the Plenum by what the C. C. was guided when it made this decision. The Italian delegation points to 3 motives: firstly, the C. C. considers a resignation policy inadmissible in general; secondly, Serra promised not to make propaganda for his views and, thirdly, the C. C. wanted to tie Serra more firmly by Party discipline and control. In the given case, the inconsistency of all these motives is obvious. In regard to Serra who is openly hostile to the line of the Comintern, such a decision on the part of the C. C. was, of course, a gross error. One can only welcome the present stand of the C. C. C. P. I. which, as can be gathered from Comrade Ercoli's speech, has recognised the necessity of remedying this error and getting complete clarity in this question. One cannot help saying that it was a mistake on the part of the Italian Communist Party to have proposed at the VI. Congress Serra as its representative in the Executive Committee of the Comintern. In any case, in view of the decision of the Comintern to struggle against the Right, a line followed also by the C. C. C. P. I., a determined struggle against Right elements such as Serra, is absolutely necessary.

I will only say a few words about the situation in the **British Communist Party**. In regard to struggle against Right and conciliatory elements, we have not yet arrived at sufficient clarity in this Party. This was reflected in the composition of the leading organ of the Party, the Polit-Bureau of the C. C. Making the political line of the Comintern our point of departure, it is difficult to explain the fact that the most determined supporters of this line in the British Party were, for some reason or other, removed from the leading centre, whereas one should have, just on the strength of this line, the line of determined struggle against the Right and the conciliators, strengthened above all this leading centre. In the given circumstances, the main thing for the British Communist Party is — **firmness, determination and consistency** in regard to the political line.

In regard to the **French Communist Party**, I will limit myself to one general remark. Although history has assigned a frontal position to this Party in the Communist movement, one cannot say that in regard to struggle against the Right and the conciliators full clarity exists already in the Party. Here our task evidently consists in raising the struggle against the Right and the conciliators to the level it deserves, namely, that of principle. Only clearness as to principle and consistency in the struggle can guarantee the further growth of the Party and success in the struggle against opportunist deviations.

I will not speak about the situation in the other Communist Parties. But one has only to point to the Communist Party of

Sweden and its attempt to postpone the May Day demonstration owing to the inclemency of the weather, as well as its opportunist line in parliament, to realise that struggle against Right opportunists has not yet properly developed in some Communist Parties. And yet, the political situation is such that incorrect or even a not perfectly clear line in this question of disarmament of the proletarian vanguard on the eve of important revolutionary events.

At the present juncture, we must be particularly energetic in exposing our political weaknesses and organisational shortcomings. Comrade Piatnitzky gave in his speech many examples which speak of serious defects in the organisational work of Communist Parties. Comrade Piatnitzky's data refer to growth of Communist Parties, work of nuclei in factories and works, state departmental-propagandist work etc., require serious consideration. In the period of preparation for big revolutionary events, it is incumbent on the Communist Parties to consolidate and strengthen in every possible way their organisational positions. The political line of the Comintern, after many stages of development, has become the truly Leninist line of the international labour movement. The approaching revolutionary events will be a general test not only of our political line, but also of our organisational gains. In the meantime, already the May Day demonstrations in Berlin have shown that, even if the line and tactics of the Parties are correct, organisational defects are very much to the fore. This must be a lesson to all our Parties.

When summing up the struggle against the Right and opportunists, the Plenum must take into account the role of conciliators in the given circumstances. It goes without saying that the Right elements who not so long ago were still in the ranks of the Comintern, such as Brandier and Thalheimer, are already outside the Communist movement. On the other hand, so-called "conciliators" have, in all fundamental questions of the Communist movement, already identified themselves with the Right. After the expulsion of the Right liquidators, the conciliators became the centre of attraction of opportunist elements and are in fact playing the role of the Right. Therefore, the conditions brought forward in the resolution on which the conciliators can remain in the ranks of the Party, are minimum and absolutely necessary conditions. Those who can not dissociate themselves from the Right deviators, who do not carry out a real struggle against them and do not carry through the decisions of the Comintern, can no longer remain in the Comintern. This must be our guide in our attitude to the conciliators. Any attempt on their part to raise in our ranks the banner of opportunism, will be energetically resisted by the Comintern. Our slogan is — **smash the Right and opportunism.** (Applause)

6. The Soviet Union and the C. P. S. U. (b).

I am coming now to the situation in the U. S. S. R. The U. S. S. R. question too must be considered in close connection with the international revolutionary revival.

It is not accidental that the development of the new revolutionary wave throughout the world coincides with an unprecedented growth and development of socialist economic reconstruction in the U. S. S. R. The importance of the Soviet Union as a revolutionising factor in the international labour movement is a well-known fact. Since the U. S. S. R. has entered the period of reconstruction, and especially since the Soviet Union has begun to carry out the Five-Year Plan of "great works", the role of the U. S. S. R. as the international revolutionising factor has been given additional prominence. The impetus given to socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. has a powerful effect on the growth of the revolutionary forces throughout the world. In its turn, the Soviet Union gets more strength and firmness from this growth of international revolutionary forces. The Five-Year Plan of socialist construction is not only the basis of the U. S. S. R., but also the prop and pillar of the world proletarian revolution.

A few remarks about the Five-Year Plan itself.

We have already begun to carry out the Five-Year Plan. You know that the current economic year is the first year of the Five-Year Plan. Even sceptics are becoming convinced now that this Plan is not a scrap of paper. Realisation of the Five-Year Plan is something more than threefold increase of industrial

output compared with the pre-war period. This is by no means a dream of the Communists in power, but a very real Plan of socialist economic construction. More than that, one can already see that this is after all only a minimum Plan of socialist construction in the coming five years.

Only a few weeks have passed since the Party and its supreme organs of the Soviet power confirmed the Five-Year Plan. In the course of these weeks, a further study of the various parts of this Plan has been possible, and there is every reason to assert that in several very important spheres we will considerably exceed our projected tasks. I will give you several characteristic statistical data taken from the Supreme Economic Council.

I will begin with the heavy industry. In the mining industry, the Five-Year Plan provided for a 3.5-fold increase of production compared with the pre-war period, whereas a 4.6-fold increase is anticipated now. In the metallurgical industry, the anticipated increase is from 3.1 to 3.3 (in the coloured metallurgy from 3.4 to 4.4). Agricultural machinery, from 4.7 to 4.7 times. In the electro-technical industry, from 4.9 to 5.1. In the chemical industry from 4.6 to 5.1. In the primary dress of fibre, from 2.9 to 3.4 times.

As to the light industry, the increase is to be mainly in the following branches: paper, from 2.5 to 3.3 times; poligraphic, from 2 to 2.5; chemical, from 2.5 to 2.9; rubber, from 2.4 to 2.5 times.

It has become clear that the Five-Year Plan is particularly efficient in regard to branches which provide raw material for industry. This has caused the C. C., C. P. S. U. (b) and the respective Soviet organs to pay special attention to such branches of our national economy as cotton, timber and fisheries. These branches will be energetically developed, which will enable them to almost double their output compared with the considerable growth laid down in the Five-Year Plan. Thus, the Five-Year Plan is not only a very real plan but, as it comes more and more clear, a minimum Plan. This in its turn means that the development of socialist construction in the U. S. S. R., as the basis of the international proletarian revolution, is making gigantic strides.

But this does not mean that the U. S. S. R. has not to cope with enormous difficulties in the given period. On the contrary, the Soviet Union has entered now upon the most difficult stage of socialist construction — the stage of socialist reconstruction of small peasant farms. In this connection, it is clear why the struggle against the Right opportunists has assumed such importance in the C. P. S. U. (b). The carrying through of the general line of determined attack on the capitalist elements and socialist reconstruction of the most backward and difficult branch of economy — agriculture — meets at present in the ranks of the C. P. S. U. (b) with considerable vacillations. The Right and the conciliators in the ranks of the C. P. S. U. (b) have set against the Leninist line of the Party a liberal opportunist line. Of this line of the Right opportunists in the C. P. S. U. (b), the most frank exponent was again Serra.

We will have to devote now a little time to the liquidatory philosophy of Serra who blurted out what the Right in the C. P. S. U. (b) have in their minds, but are not in the habit of speaking out.

In his report addressed to the C. C. of the C. P. of Italy, Comrade Serra discusses also the policy of the C. P. S. U. (b). The Right, liquidatory character of his stand is shown in all its nakedness. Serra's frankness is a direct contrast to his philosophy which he evidently imbibes to a great extent from Right sources in the C. P. S. U. (b). Serra writes, or to be more correct, slavishly copies from one of our Rights, that agriculture in the "Soviet Union is threatened with degeneration". Contrary to the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. (b) which, it is alleged, "clutched at the illusion that the moment has already arrived to introduce thorough changes in the agricultural policy", Serra declares that "the XV. Congress left the ground of the XIV. Congress too soon". Then he goes on to say "one must appraise the decisions of the XV. Congress concerning the development of collective farms in the light of this erroneous estimation". Thus, that which is already becoming quite clear to the mass of poor and middle peasants in the Soviet Union, seems to Serra a dangerous "illusion". Serra's inferences are also of course entirely in the spirit of bourgeois liberalism.

His programme "Promotion of the prosperity of the countryside as a whole" (the italics are Serra's). It seems that people who are for "prosperity of the countryside as a whole", i. e. also for the prosperity of the kulak, still dare call themselves Communists. It seems that we had till quite recently people in our ranks who, as Serra goes on to say, think it necessary "that the minimum income of the kulak should become the average income of the mass of the peasantry" (the italics are Serra's). Such are the kulak dreams of Serra which give away completely the character of the Right tendency in the C. P. S. U. (b). Serra is really only borrowing someone else's tune of bourgeois-liberal theories. But does not, after all, the ideology of the Right opportunists approximate to bourgeois-liberal ideology.

Serra's line is incompatible with the line of the C. P. S. U. (b). Serra's line, as well as that of all Right opportunists, is the line of capitulation before the kulak. The line of our Party is the line of determined attack on the kulak. The gulf between the policy of capitulation before the capitalist elements and the policy of increased attack on them cannot be bridged over. They are two irreconcilably opposed lines.

Serra's outlook is the limited outlook of a petty-bourgeois. Though he spent several months in the U. S. S. R., no ray of light has reached his narrow outlook from the facts the number of which is growing from day to day in our country. I mean the facts of the steadily developing socialist reconstruction of the countryside. The growth of socialist elements in our agriculture is so rapid that even the Party could not foresee it 18 months ago.

at the XV. Congress. None of us could assume that only in the course of last year the number of collective farms would double. Moreover, the growth of collective farms is no less rapid this year. None of us thought 18 months ago that the organisation of big Soviet farms would be as rapid as it really is. We see that last year's grand plans are brushed aside as totally inadequate and that the plans which we are beginning to carry out, do not only exceed them but even the recently adopted Five-Year-Plan, opening up a vista of unprecedented (throughout the world) possibilities of agricultural production on a large scale. Here is an example. The Five-Year Plan provided for this year a sowing area of 1,600,000 hectares throughout the Soviet farms, whereas the actual sowing area covers 1,800,000 hectares. The Five-Year Plan provided for the next year a sowing area of 2,335,000 hectares, but one can already see that this area will exceed 3,100,000 hectares (applause). Throughout the socialist sector, the sowing area is this year more than double that of last year.

Apart from developing Soviet and collective farms, we have taken in hand a new big piece of work, organisation of so-called machinery-tractor centres. These centres which are equipped with the best agricultural machinery and tractors, are bound by agreements with the peasants to till their fields and gather in the harvest. Here, the big production of machinery organised by the State reaches the peasant farms directly. On the strength of voluntary agreements with groups of peasants and whole villages, the tractor centre tills the peasant fields and gathers in the harvest. The advantages of big agricultural production (better harvests, greater stability, etc.) are becoming so obvious to the peasant masses that the machinery-tractor centres have already established their authority and are encouraging the organisation of a whole network of collective farms around these centres. This paves the way to mass collectivisation of peasant farms, and we are learning by experience that co-operation between Soviet organs and peasant co-operatives produces the best effect in this domain. We have at present only a few machinery-tractor centres, but a plan has been drawn up and adopted for the establishment of up to 100 such centres in the course of the year. They will have to embrace by their work a sowing area of up to one and a half million hectares. This shows that the organisation of machinery-tractor centres is a big stride in the socialist reconstruction of the countryside.

Moreover, village soviets are adopting new forms of work for the development of agriculture. It is for the first time that village soviets are taking up properly the work of economic-industrial development. In this respect, the rapid development of contract methods in corn storing operations has played a very important role. Enough has been said about the meaning and importance of the contract method under present conditions, and I will therefore not dwell on it. I will merely emphasise some other methods in the reconstruction of agriculture on new lines.

Enormous importance attaches to the work carried on by the Party for the improvement of harvests. In this respect, of considerable importance were organisational forms such as passing at thousands of peasant meetings resolutions on the so-called agrominimum. Over 250,000 agro-representatives have been elected among the peasantry, to control the carrying through of the agro-minimum resolutions. These examples give only a general idea of the numerous and diverse measures taken by the Party, the Soviets and the co-operatives in the villages. These measures are mostly directed towards the development of individual peasant farms, but at the same time, they prepare the ground for mass collectivisation in the countryside. The success of collectivisation is based on co-ordination of the whole work carried on now in the countryside under the leadership of the Party.

We see already some practical results of the strenuous work for the development of agriculture. Facts give the lie to the silly talk of the Right about the degradation of agriculture. The autumn session of the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R. set the task of increasing this year the sowing area by 7%. This decision was made in November when nothing could already be done to prevent the curtailment of winter sowings by 3% as a result of early frost. But in spite of this curtailment of winter sowings, the general growth of sowing areas amounts this year to 6%, and this means that we have managed to increase the sowing areas by 6 million hectares. Moreover, one half of this increase is due to the

growth of the sowing area of the socialist sector. Such is the "degeneration" of agriculture about which Serra raised such a hue and cry.

One more remark. Only a few weeks ago the Right and the conciliators in our Party prophesied that we cannot get out of our bread difficulties without importing a considerable amount of corn. They proposed to snatch a hundred million gold roubles from the U. S. S. R. industrialisation and defence fund, they proposed a further reduction of the bread ration in our industrial centres. They raised a hue and cry about the threatening situation (for the Soviet power) in the countryside. All this turned out to be empty talk. The Party would not hear of the reduction of the gold fund which guarantees the import of industrial equipment and the defence of the country. The attempts to reduce the workers' bread rations were rejected. In answer to the counter-attacks of the kulaks, the Party gave an impetus to the mobilisation of the poor and middle peasantry for an attack on the kulak element. It is already clear that by a series of measures, above all, by giving an impetus to the corn storing campaign, by determined pressure on the kulak, we have secured the normal supply of the workers without recourse to import of corn. (Applause.)

We are certainly progressing in regard to the solution of the corn problem. The new experiment in the development of agriculture must be made use of on a much larger scale, in order to radically improve the supply of industrial centres with foodstuffs. The problem of organising the supply is now confronting us, and it is a big problem indeed.

When speaking of the Soviet Union, one cannot ignore such a fact as the present socialist competition. It is one of the most important developments in the U. S. S. R. Only 3 to 4 months ago, the competition problem was raised as an important problem of socialist construction. Already the socialist competition has got hold of enormous sections of the working class. Go to the factories and works, and you will see that this is so. Of course, not in every factory the competition is up to the mark. There are many shortcomings, many obstacles have not yet been overcome. However, the competition has already become the most important method in regard to raising labour discipline, reducing the cost of production and increasing output.

The first half of the current economic year is not marked by satisfactory results in regard to such an important matter as reduction of the cost of production. But it is characteristic that since the beginning of the development of the socialist competition, i. e. since April, a visible change has set in in this respect. A sign of this is the improvement in the carrying through of the industrial plan. To judge by the results of the competition in the first months — April—May — we may be sure that the main tasks of the industrial plan will be carried out this year, and probably even exceed it a little. Such is the first important result of the socialist competition experiment.

From being a special campaign, the socialist competition is developing more and more into an everyday question. This is precisely the guarantee of real success: the socialist competition is gradually getting hold of individual groups of workers, of departments, enterprises and even whole workers' districts. The competition system is finding its way also to the villages. It is applied in collective and Soviet farms. The competition is between Soviets and co-operatives in regard to raising agriculture to a higher level. Competition will play an important role there as a method of penetrating the village with socialism. The competition method must form an inseparable part of our economics. It is the Communist method of socialist construction, it is our method, it is the method of the U. S. S. R., the method of the C. P. S. U. (b).

The new tasks of socialist construction peremptorily demand a thorough change and re-organisation of the practice and methods of our economic, co-operative, trade union and Party organisations. Such re-organisation constitutes now our main practical task. Inseparably connected with it is the task of developing new cadres for all the branches of socialist construction. This is now the sharpest and most pressing problem.

If socialist construction is to be successful, our organs will have to radically improve their methods of work. The main obstacles to this are red tape, sloth and laissez faire which are

still to be found in our ranks. Without determined and consistent struggle against red tape in the work of our economic trade union and even Party organs, we will not be able to do justice to the tasks confronting us. The Party does its utmost to strengthen the struggle against bureaucracy, to give every possible encouragement to the initiative of the masses, to direct the energy of the working class towards organised and conscious struggle with the difficulties of socialist construction. On the basis of work for the socialist industrialisation of the country, on the basis of the development of socialist elements in agriculture and through successful struggle against the activities of hostile class elements, the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. is making progress with socialist construction under the leadership of the C. P. S. U. (b). This enhances the importance of the Soviet Union as revolutionising factor in the international labour movement, as a factor in the present revival of the international proletarian revolution.

In conclusion, I will deal briefly with the situation in our Party.

The main feature of the development of the C. P. S. U. (b) as well as of the whole Comintern was energetic struggle against the Right and the conciliators. This could not be otherwise in a Party which is in the foremost ranks of the International. We considered the struggle against the Right opportunists to be the most important premise of successful socialist construction and its accomplishment. The Party would and will have nothing to do with wobbling in regard to questions such as the rate of pace of industrialisation, development of socialist construction in the villages, attacks on the kulak and capitalist elements in general, in town and country.

We cannot help remembering that in our country there is still favourable ground for the growth of Right-opportunist moods. We live in a country where the petty-bourgeois element predominates in the population. Through numerous channels the pressure of capitalist and petty-bourgeois elements exercises its influence on some sections of Communists. Whenever the class struggle becomes more accentuated, this pressure of hostile social strata increases and is more noticeable. In the Party this takes the form of Right deviation. Struggle against the Right deviation was bound to become the main task of the Party at the present juncture. In the course of this struggle, the Party is growing ideologically stronger and is progressing towards higher forms of socialist construction.

The struggle against Trotskyism was of enormous importance to our Party. In this struggle our Party grew ideologically and became strong. At the XV. Congress, the Trotskyite opposition was not only ideologically exposed, but also morally defeated. Since then we have witnessed its final disintegration. By attacking the U. S. S. R. and the Comintern in the bourgeois press, Trotsky has become the direct agent of the imperialist bourgeoisie. His recent political friends have to break with him. New facts in the disintegration of the Trotskyite opposition show that the Trotsky group is rapidly dwindling.

In this connection, I must read to you a certain document. I mean Radek's declaration submitted a few days ago to the C. C. and C. C. C. This declaration was drawn up by Radek after a series of conversations with members of the C. C. and C. C. C. It begins by expressing his agreement with the general line of the Party and by announcing his dissociation from the opposition. There is reason to believe that this document will be signed not only by Radek, but also by Smilga and Preobrazhensky. It is therefore not drawn up in the name of Radek alone but in the name of the three of them. I will read you the main and concluding part of this declaration:

"The most important deduction we made from the policy of the C. C. of the Party was — that this policy is inevitably leading, at a definite stage, to sliding from proletarian dictatorship and the Leninist path to Thermidorian degeneration of the government and its policy and to the giving up of the gains of the October Revolution without a fight. Our most important accusation against the leadership of the Party was — that this leadership, though against its own will, contributes to such sliding, does not fight the elements of degeneration in the Party and its Right elements and will, when the economic crisis will have reached its climax, try to find a way out through a Right policy, through concessions to the kulak, relinquishment of

the monopoly of foreign trade and capitulation before world capitalism.

This attitude of ours in regard to the C. C. C. P. S. U. and its policy was erroneous, erroneous was therefore also the establishment of a separate fractional organisation and its sharp activity the like of which is unknown in the history of the Party (Secret printing works, November 7th, etc.).

The logic of factional struggle brought us to the stage when, exaggerating our differences with the C. C. which had arisen during the transition from the period of reconstruction to the period of construction, in regard to tempo of industrialisation, struggle against kulaks, Comintern questions, etc., we lost sight of the fact that the policy of the C. C. was and is a Leninist policy. Therefore, the XV. Party Congress was right in condemning our platform for such a stand.

On the strength of the aforesaid, we withdraw our signatures from the factional documents, declare our full solidarity into its ranks*.)

Although rather late in the day, Radek has admitted the wrongness of his line. "We lost sight of the fact" — says he — "that the policy of the C. C. was and is a Leninist policy." "Losing sight of such a fact", we have every right to consider a serious error. However, we cannot help welcoming such a clear declaration, as well as Radek's admission that the XV. Party Congress was right when it condemned the platform of the opposition for its erroneous stand.

Radek's document ~~puts an end to the struggle of the Party against the Trotskyites~~. After this declaration and after dissociation from Trotsky by a number of other prominent followers of

his, Trotsky has not even a small group of old Communists with him in the U. S. S. R. This is truly the climax of the disintegration of the Trotskyite opposition. Now Trotsky can only ally himself with counter-revolutionary elements.

The final disintegration of the Trotskyite group is bound to shed light on the meaning of the political line which denies the possibility of successful construction of socialism in our country. The inglorious end of opportunism which parades under "Left" phraseology, is obvious to all. This is one of the most instructive lessons of the history of the Trotskyite opposition.

The chief concern of the Party must be to overcome vacillations and purge its ranks from outright opportunists. The Right deviation means repudiation of the class struggle and, consequently, repudiation of Leninism, acceptance of bourgeois liberalism. Can there be any doubt that the Party which is at the head of the proletariat and which is engaged in a successful building up of Socialism, will offer as strong resistance to the Right-conciliatory elements as in the time of struggle against the Trotskyite opposition? Of course, there can be no doubt whatever on this point. Even if some elements in our Party give way to the pressure of alien class forces and come under petty-bourgeois influence, the Party as a whole is steadfastly developing its offensive against the capitalist elements, is driving out the latter from their positions and is shattering liberal illusions in the course of its progress. Not by repudiating the class struggle and its inevitable accentuation in the given period, but by a more energetic offensive against the capitalist elements, is the Party fulfilling its role of a real Leninist vanguard which is accomplishing its leadership by means of the successful construction of Socialism. This is what makes the C. P. S. U. (b) the foremost detachment of the Comintern.

7. The International Red Day.

Comrades, the revival of the international labour movement and Socialist construction in the Soviet Union are two intertwining inseparably connected phenomena. They are helping one another and, together, are guaranteeing the advent of a powerful new revolutionary wave. Both, the international revolutionary wave and the successful construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R., mean steady shattering of capitalist stabilisation. Consequently, each of these factors accentuates the problem which expresses one of the most acute contradictions in the imperialist system. This means that we witness a terrible accentuation of the danger of a new imperialist world and new intervention against the U. S. S. R. The VI. Congress drew the attention of the working class to the danger of another imperialist war. This danger is even more imminent now. In view of the present revolutionary revival, it is incumbent on us to mobilise the forces of the working class for the struggle against the growing danger of new imperialist wars and new imperialist interventions against the U. S. S. R.

It is in this connection, that we must consider the question of August 1st. We have chosen this date for the international demonstration of the working class against new imperialist wars in defence of the U. S. S. R. This demonstration will be a test of our fighting forces and will indicate to what extent we are prepared for the approaching new revolutionary struggles. It is characteristic that the Comintern is linking up this international demonstration with the struggle against imperialist wars, in defence of the U. S. S. R. This shows that at the present juncture the danger of imperialist wars and intervention against the U. S. S. R. by imperialism, is the main problem of world development. It is also characteristic that the Comintern has taken up the organisation of international proletarian demonstrations. Struggle against imperialism has entered upon a stage when the inadequacy of disconnected demonstrations in individual capitalist countries is becoming more and more evident. Internationalisation of the working class struggle is certainly essential. Finally, characteristic is the very fact of

the organisation of the International Red Day which certainly contains elements of a counter-offensive on the part of the working class on an international scale. It is also clear that the Red Day is attracting the attention not only of our friends in all countries; around the International Red Day are mobilised not only the fighting forces of the international proletariat, but also the forces of our class enemies. This indicates the enormous revolutionary importance of the International Red Day. The demonstration of August 1st is not an ordinary demonstration. This demonstration must be closely linked up with the whole economic and political struggle of the working class, with all its militant demonstrations against capitalism, fascism and social-democracy which is degenerating into fascism. To the Communist Parties, this is a serious test. To the international proletariat, this is a means of mobilising its fighting forces, a means of international co-ordination of the revolutionary demonstrations of the proletariat against imperialism. August 1st is one of the most important stages in the concentration of our forces and in their preparation for the coming decisive revolutionary battles.

* * *

Signs of revolutionary revival are the frequent economic struggles of the proletariat and the new demonstrative actions of the masses. The economic and political demonstrations of the working class are assuming a more and more stubborn and fighting character, they are getting hold of new sections of workers. In these struggles, the masses get their fighting education, in these struggles our Parties are getting steeled for their tasks, and their leaders undergo a final test. The wider the participation of the masses in these struggles, the more intensive the revolutionary influence of these demonstrations on the whole mass of workers, the more firm the position of the Communist Parties as revolutionary vanguard of the working class in all its actions and the more inured the leaders of our Parties become to their tasks in this revolutionary struggle, the more certain will be the new successes of the international proletarian revolution, the more rapid will be our transition from revolutionary revival to a new stage of the victorious proletarian revolution. (Applause.)

*.) This is not the final draft of the declaration published in the "Pravda" (July 13), but the text sent by Radek to the C. C. on July 6th.

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 sh.
Norway	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39, East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent. The subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager.