

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 10 No. 33

17th July 1930

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berlin C 25, Bartelstrasse 1/5, III. Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered post: International Press Correspondence, Berlin C 25, Bartelstrasse 1/5, III. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Berlin. Telephone: Berolina 1169 and 2886

CONTENTS

Politics		Economics	
G. Peri: Replies to Briand's Memorandum	595	William Rust: The British Bourgeoisie Abandoning Free Trade	604
W. Rust: British Labour Government Endeavouring to Cripple "Daily Worker"	596	Guido Zamis: Closing Down of Factories in Austria The Situation in the British Metal Industry	605 606
Gustav Sobottka: The Mining Disaster in Upper Silesia. — A Terrible Indictment of Capitalist Society	597	Book Reviews	
The Labour Movement		Hermann Duncker: N. Bukharin: "The Economic Theory of the Leisure Class"	607
S. Horia: Strike Struggles in Rumania	597	XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.	
E. F.: The Attack on the Lancashire Cotton Workers	598	J. Stalin: Political Report of the C.C. to the XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. (Conclusion) II. and III.	608
A. Rocard: The Offensive of the Bourgeoisie against the Standard of Living of the Belgian Workers	599	J. Stalin: Concluding Speech	616
1st of August: International Fighting Day against Imperialist War		Resolution on the Report of the C.C.	618
F. Heckert: Why We are Celebrating the 1st of August	600	Proletarian Women's Movement	
Heinrich Oswald: The Interventionist Policy of the Reformist Co-operative Leaders	601	G. Bark: Women's Co-operative Organisations and the Struggle against War	622
In the International		Vera Novak: Military Training of Women in Yugoslavia	623
Seventh Congress of the C.P. of America	602	Rosa Bloch: Whose Lead Will Working Women Follow?	624
E. Grube: Bolshevist Concentration in Holland	603		

Report of the Activities of the Delegation of the C. P. S. U. in the E. C. C. I.

By V. Molotov.

Text of Speech delivered at the XVI. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

Comrades, The stage of the development of the communist world movement which has been passed through since the XV. Party Congress is of extreme importance. The reason for this is the profound changes which have taken place in the political and economic development of the capitalist States on the one hand and of the Soviet Union on the other.

The economic crisis developing in the capitalist countries is leading to the collapse of the capitalist stabilisation. This crisis has now become international in character. It is growing on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism, and is intensifying this with a powerful impetus. The development of the economic crisis is leading in some countries to the transformation of this crisis into a political crisis.

The growing crisis in world capitalism is bringing with it the aggravation of all the antagonisms in the capitalist system.

In the sphere of international relations, the antagonisms between the capitalist countries are becoming increasingly

acute. The struggle for the world hegemony has reached a hitherto unheard of point of tension. Besides these antagonisms between the imperialist countries on the one hand, on the other we see the relations more and more strained between these imperialist countries and the colonies and dependent countries. This applies especially to India and China.

At the same time the antagonisms are becoming acuter within the capitalist countries themselves. One expression of this is the growing Fascisation of the bourgeois states. Social democracy simultaneously proceeds rapidly on its way to social Fascism.

At the same time the antagonisms are becoming acuter changing in the capitalist countries. The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is assuming more and more the form of a counter-offensive. The growth of the elements of the fresh revolutionary upsurge is an irrefutable fact. All this involves changes in the tactics of the Communist Parties.

All this transfers the work of the Communist Parties and the Comintern to quite new conditions. All this requires the adaptation of the work of the Communist Parties to the new tasks of the **revolutionary struggle**.

The world economic crisis in the bourgeois countries on the one hand, and the victorious construction of socialism in the Soviet Union on the other, increases as never before the importance of the **role of the Soviet Union** as international revolutionary factor. The growing decay of capitalist stabilisation, and the growing advance of the socialist economy of the Soviet Union, show the broad masses of the working class of all countries, and the oppressed peoples of the colonies, the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism. The successes gained in the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union are a call to battle for the victory of socialism.

The Comintern has long since formed its estimate of these fundamental facts of international economic and political development. The decisions of the VI. World Congress are of special importance in this regard. These give an analysis of international development and its perspectives which has subsequently been justified by events. These decisions have been applied by the Communist International in its struggle against all manner of opportunist tendencies, especially in the struggle against the Right deviation in the Communist Parties. The importance of this struggle is now clear to the broad masses of the proletariat, and events prove definitely that nothing but the consistent struggle for the Leninist policy of the Comintern can enable the Communist movement to mobilise the working masses, to an ever increasing extent, under the banner of the revolutionary struggle for the overthrowing of the capitalist yoke.

I proceed to the fundamental questions confronting the Communist International.

I. The Growth of the Crisis of World Capitalism and the Line of the Comintern.

1. The World Economic Crisis.

I shall begin with the question of the world economic crisis.

Comrade Stalin, in the political report of the C.C., has already given an adequate analysis of this crisis. I must only add a few remarks.

In America, on the eve of the crisis so to speak, the well known book of the Hoover Commission was published: "The latest changes in the economy of the United States." In this book every aspect of the economic development of the United States is dealt with, and a general estimate made of the perspectives of economic development in America. In this book, issued by the president of the United States, Hoover, the idea is never mooted anywhere that a profound crisis is impending in the United States. Instead of this we read: "We have an unlimited field before us . . . We have new needs which, in proportion as they are satisfied, will again open unending paths for new ones." More than this, this book even denies the possibility of a crisis. We read:

"At one time the stagnation of the course of development of production and demand was one of the characteristic features of the economic process. This process was irregular and incalculable beforehand. Over-production alternated with a stagnation of production, enabling demand to catch up again. During the seven years of our examination (the period between 1922 and 1929. V. M.) the balance between supply and demand was apparent." ("The latest changes in the economy of the United States", Vol. 1. p. 15. The quotations are re-translated.)

We see that Mr. Hoover and his economic committee looked confidently into the future, hoping definitely that North American capitalism has before it an "unlimited field" of development, that the leaders of the politics of the United States have ensured the "balance of production and consumption" and overcome the "stagnation of the course of development of supply and demand", that is, that they are secure from fresh crises. And almost the next day after the publication of this book the first symptoms of the approaching crisis showed themselves in America. The

beginning of the crisis in the United States is calculated from the Exchange crash in New York in October, but signs of declining economic prosperity were observable earlier. As early as July the decline commenced in the United States; and at the same time in Germany. Since this time the crisis has spread, and has become a world economic crisis.

One of the clearest signs of this process is the decline in foreign trade. The foreign trade of 48 countries, taken together, has declined by 9.6 per cent in the first quarter of 1930 as compared with the corresponding period last year. The great capitalist countries have been hardest hit by this decline. Here the decline of foreign trade (April 1930 compared with April 1929) has been as follows (in percentages):

	Imports	Exports
United States	25	22
Germany	29	21
Great Britain	19	23
France	11	15

The present crisis is one of **over-production**. This means that the production of capitalist industry cannot find adequate markets. Therefore the growth of production has ceased, or production has even diminished, in a number of countries. Thus for instance the index figures of industry have fallen off as follows (first quarter of 1930 compared with the corresponding period last year): in Germany by 7.8 per cent, in the United States by 11 per cent, in Poland by 16.7 per cent. For Great Britain the figures have remained almost unaltered, growing by only 0.5 per cent; only in France the advance has been 4.8 per cent.

Can it be asserted that capitalism has rapidly developed in the post-war period? No, this cannot be maintained. With the exception of the United States and France, the production figures have scarcely risen above the pre-war level. If we consider Europe apart from the Soviet Union, we find that in the most important branches of industry (raw materials, coal, oil, metals, chemicals, foods), the pre-war level was only exceeded by 9 per cent by 1927. That is to say, the growth of industry has been entirely insignificant of late years in Europe, especially when we take into account the increase of population.

It is of further importance to ascertain whether capitalism fully utilises the production apparatus at its disposal. According to the calculations of our economists of the State Planning Commission of the Soviet Union, the existing international apparatus of production could perform at least double the work it does. As a matter of fact, at least one third of the production apparatus is left unused by capitalism, and cannot be used by it. In spite of this, we have a serious world economic crisis.

The industrial crisis in the capitalist countries coincides with the crises in the agrarian countries. The crisis in **agriculture** is due to the great drop in the prices of agricultural products. Even before the present economic crisis a considerable decline in the prices of the most important agricultural products was observable: cotton, jute, wool, silk, rubber, vegetable fats, as also wheat, rice, potatoes, sugar, coffee, tea, and cocoa. This decline has been rendered more acute by the falling off of the industrial demand for raw materials, and by the worsening of the situation of the working class.

Stupendous obstacles have stood in the way of the development of agriculture in the capitalist countries. How can the cultivation of food plants develop when the demand per head of the population for wheat and rice is declining? In 1928 the demand for wheat and rice per head of the population declined, in comparison with before the war, in Great Britain by 10 per cent, in the United States by 13 per cent, in Germany by 18 per cent, etc. On the other hand, the production of other agricultural products is hampered more and more by the sinking demand brought about by the conditions obtaining in the capitalist countries. The world's sugar production exceeded the world's consumption by an average of 1.8 million tons in the period 1923/24 till 1927/28. The world's output of tea has risen by 20 per cent in comparison with before the war, but consumption by only 4 per cent. During the last two years the world's coffee production has exceeded consumption on an average by one and a half times yearly, etc. This has

led to wheat and maize being used as fuel in various parts of the United States, in order to increase prices. In Brazil enormous quantities of coffee have been thrown into the sea. And attempts are being made to arrive at agreements restricting the production of various products. Even before the world economic crisis, the agricultural crisis in the capitalist countries caused agriculture to limit the use of fertilisers. The bourgeois economist Werner Sombart declares that "the whole tractor question brings about negative results for agriculture" (small peasant farming in Germany is referred to).

The long-drawn agrarian crisis, and the resultant impoverishment of the peasant masses, have greatly contributed to the causes of the world economic crisis. This again reduces the demand for agricultural raw materials in consequence of the declining production, and thus aggravates the agricultural crisis in its turn. In this way the industrial crisis is linked up with the agricultural crisis, and enormous obstacles arise in the way of the development of the productive forces of the capitalist countries.

It is characteristic that the present economic crisis was not preceded by a general boom of industry (as in the period before the war). During the period 1928/29 increased economic prosperity was only observable in the United States, France, Sweden, Belgium, and Holland. A brief revival was experienced by industry in Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Italy. In the agrarian countries there have been depressions and crises. The present crisis has seized upon most of the capitalist countries, and is even beginning to affect France.

At the same time we see every sign that the crisis will be a prolonged one. The optimistic forecasts of the rapid close of the crisis have ceased to appear. The enormous growth of capitalist monopolies during the last few years has not by any means served to organise capitalist economy as totality. On the contrary, the circumstance that the crisis is developing under the conditions of monopolist capitalism is prolonging and deepening it.

As a matter of fact, of late years the concentration of capital has proceeded rapidly. I shall confine myself here to a few facts only. In the United States the greatest capitalist monopolies have amalgamated of late years. Some of these hold key positions in the world's markets. One example of this is the international motor-car industry, whose enormous output originates to the extent of two thirds from only two capitalist monopolies, Ford and General Motors. The formation of great capitalist monopolies is growing with equal rapidity in Germany. According to recently published statistics, the greatest undertakings with a capital of five million marks and more form 0.5 per cent of the total number of undertakings, and 41 per cent of the total value of the undertakings. Their total capital amounts to 19,800 million marks. During the last 3 years the capital owned by these giant enterprises has grown by 4,400 million marks, or 50 per cent of the total growth of capital in Germany. Another example. The leader of the French radicals, Daladier, complained in Parliament, in an address to his petty bourgeois constituents, that two to three hundred families in France have the greatest branches of industry — metallurgy, naphtha, etc., in their hands.

The power of the capitalist monopolies in the present stage of the development of the crisis is evidenced in the maintenance of high monopolist prices for their products.

In Germany, for instance, we observe during the crisis a considerable lessening of the so-called free prices, whilst the high prices for the products of the trusts are maintained. On the other hand the reduction of the wholesale prices does not reach the consumer, and it is only in very rare cases that a reduction of the subsistence index figures can be recorded. Monopolist capital wages an obstinate struggle for the maintenance of prices, and under present circumstances this contributes to the prolongation of the crisis. Monopolist capital is striving to thrust the burdens of the crisis upon other branches of industry, upon the small farmers, upon the workers, etc., and the consequence is that ever greater obstacles arise in the way of escape from the crisis.

Marxism teaches that in times of crisis the antagonisms between the social nature of labour and capitalist appropriation of it lead to the sharpest of conflicts between the two antagonistic forces (Eagels). The greed of profit drives the capitalists to increase production, but the low standard of living of the overwhelming majority of the masses of the population in the capitalist countries is an insurmountable hindrance to the rapid development of the productive forces of capitalist

economy. The material conditions of the lives of the working class and the masses of the population are kept down at a very low level by capitalism, thereby limiting the possibilities of the development of industry under the rule of capitalism. This poverty, this limited consumption of the masses, becomes especially conspicuous in periods in which the growth of production has out-distanced to a greater extent than usual the low level of the consumption of the masses. Capitalism gives no solution of this contradiction between the possibilities of the growth of capitalist production with its advanced technics, and the low level of living forced upon the broad masses of the people, nor can it give this solution.

I must deal somewhat more in detail with the question of the **standard of living** of the masses of the workers in the capitalist countries. I quote a few figures. In the most powerful capitalist country, England, the real wages of the workers, under the conditions of increased exploitation, amounted at the end of last year to 95.2 per cent*) of the level of 1914. In Germany, according to the statements of bourgeois economists (for instance Sternberg) the wage level is lower than before the war. According to the calculations of the well known statistician Kuczynsky, the wages of the German workers decreased by 13.6 per cent in the second half of 1929 alone. The employment figures tell an especially eloquent tale of the position of the working masses in the capitalist countries. The considerable increase of unemployment during the last few months is a characteristic phenomenon in most capitalist countries. The number of unemployed has swelled to frightful figures. In the United States there are already 6 to 7 million unemployed, in Germany 5 million, in Great Britain more than 2 million. In the capitalist countries there are even more workers on short time. In Poland every second worker is either out of work or on short time. And so forth. Most important of all is the fact that prospects do not point to a reduction of the unemployed army, but to its increase. Only recently the social democrats still sang hymns in praise of capitalist rationalisation. Only recently the leader of the German trade unions, Mr. Leipart, declared:

"We have always, especially in our struggle for shorter working hours, demanded that the employers should make use of technical progress, that they should improve and modernise the organisation of the undertakings. Therefore we have approved of it, and have agreed to the sacrifices which the working class must bear as result of temporary unemployment." (From Leipart's speech at the Hamburg Congress of the General German Trade Union Federation. Ed.)

Now the German social democrats are sounding the retreat. Even the "Vorwärts" (28th May 1930) declares that one of the leading causes of growing unemployment is the excessive rate of the rationalisation of German production. In this manner this same rationalisation, which should serve to develop industry in Germany, becomes one of the main causes of the intensification of the crisis and of the increase of unemployment.

But capitalism has already entered the phase of **general crisis**, upon whose basis the present crisis too is developing. Since the imperialist war, and especially since the victory of the proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union, a new stage in the development of capitalism has set in, the stage of the general crisis. The capitalist world exists no longer as homogeneous whole. The existence and consolidation of the economic base of the Soviet Union undermine the roots of world capitalism. On the other hand the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies and dependent countries is undermining at the same time the capitalist system. Meanwhile the imperialists are taking increased interest in the colonial markets. Great Britain, for instance, received from its investments abroad, in 1928, an income of about — in round figures — 5600 million roubles. This sum includes 2850 million roubles interest, 1400 million dividends, and 1350 million sea freights.**) The shrinkage of the markets, and the lack of prospect that these will widen, plunge capitalism into increasing difficulties. The frightful and ever growing unemployment is one of the clearest signs of the developing general crisis of capitalism. It has become chronic, and evinces only one tendency, the tendency to grow further.

*) Including the unemployed.

**) "Daily Telegraph", 9th May 1930, according to the statements of the League of Nations.

All this leads to the growth of the elements of decay and parasitism in capitalism. In order to show the strengthening of these elements, I may give one example. I refer to the structure of the labour market. The figures with reference to Great Britain show that in the last five years (1924 till 1929) the number of workers employed in the productive branches of British economy is not only not increasing, but is actually declining. In five years this category of workers has dwindled from 9,157,000 to 9,004,000, that is, by 153,000. On the other hand, the number employed in the non-productive branches of British economy has increased from 2,351,000 to 3,090,000, or by 739,000. The same process is going on in the United States. In the book above mentioned: „The latest changes in the economy of the United States”, it is stated that in the post-war period in America the number of persons employed in non-productive professions has increased whilst the number employed in productive work has decreased. In the mining industry, for instance, and the industry working up its products, the number of workers employed dropped from 12,400,000 to 11,883,000, that is, by 517,000, in the period from 1920 to 1927. At the same time the number of commercial employees increased by 1,408,000, that of the employees in hotels, restaurants, and places of amusement by 575,000, that of the cinema workers, artists, musicians, etc, by 190,000, etc. The fact of the decline of the figures referring to the productive workers and the growth of the non-productive cadres demonstrates the complete incapacity of the capitalist system to develop the forces of production. These figures are a clear proof of the growing general crisis of capitalism.

2. The Line of the Communist International and the Struggle against the Right.

What was the estimate formed by the Communist International of the development of capitalism in the period preceding the world economic crisis, and in how far has this estimate corresponded to the subsequent facts? It is easily proved that the Communist International made at the time an analysis of the development of capitalism which has been fully confirmed by the facts of the world economic crisis.

As early as the 15th Party Congress Comrade Stalin, in the political report of the Central Committee, gave the following estimate of the perspectives of the development of capitalism:

“Out of the stabilisation itself, out of the fact that production is increasing, that trade is increasing, that technical progress and the possibilities of production are growing, whilst the world's markets, the limits of these markets and of the spheres of influence of the individual imperialist groups, remain more or less the same, — it is precisely out of all this that the profoundest and acutest crisis of world capitalism is arising, pregnant with fresh wars, and threatening the existence of every stabilisation.

Out of the partial stabilisation arises the intensification of the crisis of capitalism, and the growing crisis shakes the stabilisation; these are the dialectics of the development of capitalism at the present historical moment.”

These points of Comrade Stalin's report were made the basis of both the decisions of the Party and of the Communist International. They were further developed in the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern. The VI. Congress made an analysis of what is known as the “third period” of the post-war development of capitalism, and stressed the inevitability of the further shattering of capitalist stabilisation and of an even greater intensification of the general crisis of capitalism.

This characterisation of the third period was as follows:

“The **third** period, in which the economy of capitalism and almost simultaneously the economy of the Soviet Union exceed the pre-war level (beginning of what is known as the “reconstruction period”, the further growth of socialist forms of economy on the basis of modern technics). For the capitalist world this is a period of the rapid development of technics, of the increased development of the cartels, trusts, and the tendencies towards state capitalism. At the same time it is a period of the highest development of the contradictions contained in the world's economics, a development advancing in forms determined beforehand by the whole course hitherto taken by the general crisis of capitalism (dwindling markets,

Soviet Union, colonial movement, growth, of the inner antagonisms of imperialism). This third period, in which the contradiction between the growth of the forces of production and the narrowing down of markets has become peculiarly acute, leads inevitably to a fresh phase of wars against the Soviet Union, national liberation wars against imperialism, interventions on the part of imperialism, gigantic class struggles. This period, in which all international antagonisms (the antagonisms between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union, the military occupation of Northern China as the commencement of the dividing up of China, and the struggles of the capitalists among themselves, etc.) become acuter, in which the inner antagonisms of the capitalist countries are greatly aggravated (the process of the development towards the Left of the working masses, the acuter class struggle, **the movements in the colonies**—China, India, Egypt, and Syria) inevitably leads through a further development of the contradictions of the capitalist stabilisation to a further shattering of capitalist stabilisation and to an acuter aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism.”

This estimate of the perspectives of the development of capitalism has been fully and completely confirmed by the subsequent facts of the advancing world economic crisis. It must be pointed out that the Right elements in the Comintern opposed to this estimate their own line. The Right endeavoured to patch together the growing contradictions; that is to say, their attitude implied at bottom the denial of the inevitability of the decline of capitalist stabilisation under present conditions. The most distinguished representative of this standpoint was Comrade Bukharin. A comparison of the first draft of the theses drawn up by Comrade Bukharin for the VI. World Congress with the resolution as finally carried affords immediate proof that Comrade Bukharin's views were precisely these. At that time Comrade Bukharin was the ideologist of the Right elements in the Comintern, those who approached ever more closely to social-democratic conceptions regarding the consolidation of capitalist stabilisation, that is, who in actual fact came very near to the Hilferding's theory of the “recovery” of capitalism.

The struggle in the ranks of the Comintern against the views of the Right deviators in this basic question was of great fundamental and practical importance. This struggle was the more necessary as in a number of Communist Parties the Right elements—as events soon showed—played a great rôle, and their continued influence upon the Sections of the Comintern would have been bound to lead to the disruption of the Communist Parties.

I give a few examples characterising the standpoint of the Right elements in the Comintern.

The then leaders of the American Communist Party, **Lovestone** and **Pepper**, who later joined the ranks of the renegades of communism, preached the theory of the “exceptional position” of American imperialism, which they alleged to stand outside of the developing general crisis of capitalism. They proceeded from the standpoint that American capitalism was in the epoch of a hitherto unheard growth of its economic power (Pepper), that in the United States a “second industrial revolution” was proceeding (Lovestone). Lovestone wrote (retranslated):

“The crisis in the coal, oil, and textile districts of the United States is not a sign of the beginning decay of American imperialism. All these are temporary crises, which can be overcome by the process of the further development of rationalisation, and consequently bear witness only to the great strength and growth of American capitalism. Here lies the fundamental difference between the different branches of industry in the United States and the crisis in most of the branches of production in Great Britain and Italy.”

Lovestone and Pepper failed to see the growing inner antagonisms of capitalist development in the United States. They perceived only the growth of external antagonisms. This is, however, a characteristic feature of the right deviation. Even after the beginning of the acute crisis in the United States this same Lovestone wrote in his renegade organ (retranslated):

“The Wall Street panic is not the result of the weakening of American economics, but an expression of

the actual power of American capitalist economics", etc. ("Revolutionary Age". 15th November 1929.)

Thus Lovestone bowed down to American capitalism. It is scarcely necessary to say that the Comintern had to purge itself of such elements, which are alien to the proletariat.

Another example of this kowtowing to the forces of capitalism is the attitude of the Right renegades in Sweden, where their leader, **Kilbom**, wrote in September of last year:

"For Swedish capitalism golden days have come again . . . and it would be a deliberate or unconscious deception of the workers to tell them that in Sweden the capitalist system is shaken, that an economic crisis is impending . . . (The emphasis is mine. W. M.)"

Finally, there was one man who expressed the opinion, at the Unitary Trade Union Conference in France last autumn, that capitalism may look forward to an undisturbed development which may last without struggles or crises for 30 to 40 years. Were we not to purge the ranks of the Comintern from such rotten, opportunist elements, we should fail to combat the elements of disintegration in the Communist Parties. Hence the struggle against the Right elements has been one of the most important prerequisites preparing the Comintern for the correct estimate of the perspectives of the struggle, and therewith facilitating the mobilisation of the working masses around the banner of the Comintern.

The Right elements merely repeated Hilferding's song of "organised capitalism". Comrade Bukharin contributed in particular to spreading this ideology in the ranks of the Comintern. After the 6th Congress he published an article in which we read: "The problems of the markets, of the prices, of competition, of the crises, are becoming more and more problems of world economics, and are replaced within the country itself by the problem of organisation." ("Prawda", 26th May 1929.) This declaration on Bukharin's part caused even the social democratic press to make the following remark:

"Bukharin, in his estimate of the organisational and economic consequences of monopolist capitalism, goes considerably further than the social democratic and bourgeois theoreticians. For instance neither Hilferding in his well known address at the party congress at Kiel, nor Sombart, have maintained that under highly developed capitalism the decisive categories of the capitalist system of economy (prices, markets, competition) will be supplanted by organisation." ("Kampf", December 1929.)

And finally it must be observed that up to the present

Comrade Bukharin has not yet disavowed his social opportunist theory of "organised capitalism".

Whilst emphasising the necessity of recognising the growing insecurity of the capitalist system, we must not fall into the other extreme. Some "Left" errors of the past are very instructive in this respect. In this connection we must recall some of Trotsky's declarations of a few years ago. Trotsky maintained more than once that "since the imperialist war no further development of the productive forces in Europe is possible. (L. Trotsky. "Europe and America". 1926), that Europe's fate is solely "absolute stagnation and decay". (L. Trotsky. "Five Years of the Comintern".) This did not, however, prevent Trotsky from becoming the bard of American "prosperity" later on. As a matter of fact, his assertion that America would "put Europe on rations" was merely a peculiar variation on the theory of "exception", which then became the firmest principle of the renegades in the American Communist Party. Here again Trotsky smuggled in an essentially opportunist line, hostile to the Comintern, beneath the cloak of "Left" phrases.

For the rest, Bukharin has understood very well, on more than one occasion, to bring "Left" and Right views into "harmony" with one another. Thus in his "Economics of the transformation period" he wrote of capitalism that from now onwards no regeneration of industry is possible, and yet at the same time he left a back door open, in this work and other writings, for "organised capitalism". The example clearly evidences Bukharin's eclecticism.

The course of development of the world economic crisis is sweeping away the illusions of the Right on "organised capitalism". The economic crisis enormously intensifies all the antagonisms of capitalism. In some countries the pre conditions are arising for the conversion of the economic crisis into a political one. Among the masses of the workers

the consciousness is maturing of the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, of the struggle for socialism. The achievements of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union arouse the enthusiasm of the class conscious elements of the proletariat of all countries, and point out at the same time the sole path towards the irrevocable solution of the antagonisms of capitalism.

II. The Crisis and the Aggravation of International Contradictions.

1. The Contradictions in the Camp of the Imperialists.

I now pass on to the question of the aggravation of international antagonisms. Still during the war Lenin, in his analysis of imperialism, pointed out that the territorial division of the world, the distribution of the colonies, is already concluded, and the economic division of the world by means of the international cartels is beginning. The imperialist war was a war for the re-division of the world. After the war the struggle of the international monopolies for the markets, the raw material markets, and the markets for capital investments, set in again with renewed violence.

During the war the tendency towards the organisation of international capitalist monopolies became much stronger. American imperialism showed special energy in this direction. The tendency has penetrated into various branches of economics, not only in the colonies and dependent countries, but in the countries of Europe (Germany for instance). In spite of the antagonisms between Germany and France the number of Franco-German monopolist combines is increasing. By the end of last year over 40 such Franco-German associations had come into existence (in the smelting industry, chemical industry, etc.).

At the same time the struggle for the markets leads to protectionism, that is, to the protection of the home markets from foreign capital, resulting in a still more violent struggle for the foreign markets (selling, raw materials, capital investments).

The present crisis drives the capitalist countries with special violence to protectionism. The growth of protectionist tendencies is everywhere observable. This means is resorted to by not only the capitalist countries of secondary rank, but by the great Powers. It is noteworthy that America has been the first country to raise the protective tariffs. Recently it resolved upon the raising of the duties on the products of agriculture, non-ferrous metals, and the products of the chemical industry. The rise in the duties is 30 to 35%. Although this measure on the part of the United States evoked the protest of 34 Powers interested in the American markets, and although thousands of American economists considered the measure to be inadvisable, the raised tariff was passed. The answer given by the other countries has been counter-measures of the same kind. Canada, France, and other Powers have already introduced higher customs duties.

In England the protectionist movement is especially widespread. In the Conservative Party, a considerable group has been formed under the leadership of the "Press kings" Lords Beaverbrook and Rothermere. These agitate for the creation of a customs union barricading the British Empire, with its dominions and colonies, from the capitalist outer world by means of a barbed wire fence of tariffs. The protectionist movement among the Conservatives is winning more and more adherents, even in the ranks of the other parties.

The most powerful capitalist country of the continent, France, is too developing along the lines of super-protectionism. The idea of a "Pan-Europe", that is, of an alliance of the capitalist Powers of Europe with France as central point politically against the Soviet Union, is beginning to make practical progress in the form of preparations for the formation of a European tariff union. France is anxious to make Europe its market and its outlet for capital investment. With this object it is making increasingly obstinate propaganda for the idea of the European tariff union.

Meanwhile the capitalist great Powers—America, England, France—are developing along the line of super-protectionism. The others, too, do not want to fall behind. The protectionist movement is growing both in Germany and in Italy, and in the other capitalist States. All this is leading to an excessive aggravation of international antagonisms.

The decisive antagonism in the camp of imperialism is the struggle for the world hegemony being fought between

the **United States and England.** In this struggle the United States are increasingly successful in conquering the economic positions, supplanting even England in the markets of her own colonies and dominions. In this direction the United States have been eminently successful of late years. In view of the world economic crisis, the extension of American exports is more threatening than ever, whilst England's exports have not yet even regained the pre-war level (80%). The significance of this threat to England is realised when we remember that an increase of American industrial export by one per cent would be equal to the total exports made by England to all the countries of South America.

America does not confine itself to strengthening its economic positions in the world's markets. It is preparing along the whole front against England. In the Kellogg Pact we see its endeavour to make the question of the coming imperialist war dependent on its will. At the recent London Naval Conference America emphasised the principle of the equality of its and the English navy, taking therewith a resolute step towards the further undermining of England's world hegemony. Today England can no longer build on the preponderance of her fleet. And this is of special importance for England in view of the tremendous extent and the scattered position of her dominions and colonies. How acute the struggle between England and the United States has become may be seen from the fact that the American imperialists, in the interests of the struggle against England, are continually flirting with the national movement in the English colonies. Thus of late some of the organs of the American press have staged an agitation against English imperialism in India! All this leads to such an intense aggravation of the antagonisms in the struggle for the world hegemony, that the danger of a new imperialist war is obviously increased. The imperialist press refers quite openly to this. Such a candid publicist of American imperialism as L. Denny declares straightforwardly (retranslated):

"Nobody with a knowledge of the facts can maintain that the talk of shake hands across the seas, or of the truce in the sphere of naval armaments, can push into the background the danger of an open war, which history shows to be invariably involved in such economic wars. In the world of to-day, which is becoming ever narrower, there is no room for two such great hostile empires, filled with the lust of conquest, as Great Britain and America. Either Great Britain voluntarily recognises the hegemony of America, or this hegemony will be established in bloody battles." (L. Denny: "America conquers Britain".)

The knotty points of the international antagonisms in Europe are increased by the "Young Plan". The victorious countries, headed by France and England, are seeking to build up their prosperity on this plan. According to this plan, Germany has to pay 2000 million marks yearly for the next few years in reparations, and besides this 1,600 million marks interest on the foreign capital invested in Germany in accordance with the Young Plan. The author of the plan, Young, expresses himself on the plan as follows (retranslated):

"Well, time will show, if the burden imposed is too heavy for Germany. It is true that when fixing the sum to be paid by Germany, the countries participating in the drawing up of the Paris plan, added the amounts which they owe to the United States, with the addition of about 50% on this sum." (From Young's speech at the University of California, 24th May 1930.)

The attempt of the victorious countries to thrust the burden of such enormous payments onto the shoulders of the toilers of Germany cannot come to a good end. The execution of the Young Plan means not only more strained relations than ever between the victors and the vanquished, but greatly aggravates the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Those who build the prosperity of capitalist Europe on the foundation of this plan are slipping into the abyss.

Finally, mention must be made of the increasingly strained relations even in the camp of the victors. I refer especially to the relations between France and Italy. Both countries are feverishly arming, and have shown particular anxiety of late with regard to the safeguarding of their frontiers.

After the exhaustive report given by Comrade Stalin,

I need not deal in detail with the question of the relations between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. The economic crisis inevitably entails an enhanced tendency to attack the Soviet Union. Besides the factors strengthening the international position of the Soviet Union (support given the Union by the international proletariat, economic rise of the Union, etc.), we accord due attention to such facts as the Fascisation of the governments in the countries adjacent to the Soviet Union, Finland and Rumania, and such facts as the declaration of the French general Gourault in Rumania, that the Rumanian army must be prepared for aggressive action.

The growing intensification of international antagonisms involves the increased danger of a fresh imperialist war and of a raid upon the Soviet Union. The fact is worthy of attention that of late the League of Nations has secretly been taking practical measures towards bringing the coming war under its guidance. The English economist Keynes recently stressed in the press the importance of those measures being worked out at the present time by the League of Nations for the financing of the coming war. From Keynes' articles it may be gathered that at the present time the League of Nations is working on a motion for the granting of loans by the League to countries which the League of Nations recognises to be attacked. By means of a special organisation of the financing of the coming war on the part of the imperialist great Powers, the League of Nations is striving to get into its own hands that is, into the hands of Anglo-French imperialism, the decision as to which is the aggressive party. It is clear, that the League of Nations will count among the aggressors that country against which the imperialist Powers playing the chief rôle in the League of Nations are anxious to begin war.

Inasmuch as the focus of the international antagonisms in the camp of imperialism is the war between Great Britain and the United States for the world hegemony, the new imperialist war is bound to assume an even more emphatic world character. The war of 1914/18 was chiefly a **European war.** The new imperialist war now in course of preparation will be a world war to a much greater extent, for England's influence, and that of the United States, extend to every continent.

The Communist International is devoting the utmost attention to the question of a fresh imperialist war. The Comintern has been mobilising, and continues to mobilise, the broad proletarian masses for the war against war.

2. The Antagonisms between the Imperialist Countries and the Colonies.

The world economic crisis leads to an extreme aggravation of the antagonisms between the **imperialist countries** on the one side and the **colonies** and dependent countries on the other. In view of the vast dimensions which the revolutionary movement has already assumed in the colonies, this involves a threat against the rule of imperialism. The revolutionary movement in the colonies reaches to Indo-China and Africa, to Haiti and the Philippines, to Nicaragua and Palestine. The suppression of the colonies by imperialism not only fails to diminish, but becomes increasingly intolerable. In many colonies variations of actual slavery still exist. The "civilising" rôle of imperialism does not prevent the maintenance of this infamy of past times even in an age in which the Soviet Union shows the peoples of the whole world an example of a real liberation of the nationalities, and of the fraternal cooperation of the workers of all nations in the work of building up socialism. Meanwhile socialists of the Albert Thomas type submit to the League of Nations suggestions for the abolition of "compulsory labour", declaring at the same time, however, that these cannot be realised at once, being a "matter of generations". Up to the present, there has been a lack of organisation and leadership of the workers and peasants fighting in the colonies against imperialism; this is required for the consolidation of the revolutionary movement there. Considerable success may be recorded in this direction during the last few years.

In this connection we may deal with the situation in India and China.

In **India** the revolutionary movement has assumed enormous dimensions of late. The profound economic crisis,

tionary flame in the country. The world economic crisis deepens the agrarian crisis in India. This again throws great obstacles in the way of the development of Indian industry. The rule of English imperialism is based on the maintenance of the reactionary remnants of feudalism in the Indian village, and signifies the double exploitation of the working masses: by British imperialism and by the Indian bourgeoisie and feudal lords themselves. This rule has already left ineradicable bloody traces behind it. Official data show that in the first 25 years of the twentieth century alone 80 million human beings died of starvation in India. It is easily comprehensible that in India the anti-imperialist movement is fed by the extreme discontent of the masses of the people. This discontent finds expression in the growing revolutionary movement. During the last few years the strike movement has swelled enormously in India, and has assumed a definitely revolutionary character. In 1928 507,000 took part in these strikes, in 1929 531,000. Mass organisations of the workers have sprung up, as many as one hundred thousand workers are already members of the Red trade unions. In the proletarian centres the strikes are accompanied by mighty revolutionary demonstrations and frequent collisions with the police. But the revolutionary movement has reached not only the proletarian centres. The recent insurrection in the North West, in Peschawar, joined by a part of the native troops, shows that fresh strata of the population are constantly being drawn into the movement. The nature and force of the movement may be seen from the following declaration by a member of the Indian Congress: "It is worthy of special attention that of the 66 killed at Peschawar, not one was wounded in the back."

The growth of the revolutionary movement has forced the Indian bourgeois nationalists to make fresh manoeuvres for misleading the masses. The Indian liberals of the Gandhi and Nehru type (senior and junior) are endeavouring to stifle the rise of the revolutionary movement, to lead it into the channel of moderate bourgeois reforms, without touching the foundations of feudalism. The oppositional manoeuvres against British imperialism, forced on these leaders by the pressure of the masses, as for instance the "campaign" against the salt monopoly, etc, have assumed a character by no means liberal where the masses have taken part in them. The revolutionary upsurge in India has already found expression, on many occasions, in powerful revolutionary actions of many thousand fighters. Peaceful demonstration is becoming more and more a thing of the past. But the organisational status of the working class, and still more of the peasants, is however still too weak. Up to the present no Communist Party has been formed in India, but the elements for its formation are growing from day to day. It is clear, that such people as Roy, who defend the policy of a bloc with the national bourgeoisie, and who have already deserted into the camp of the Right renegades, have not been capable of organising a Communist Party in India. The leaders of the Indian proletariat are coming forward in the course of the revolutionary events, in the struggle for the hegemony of the working class in the revolutionary movement. Thousands of steadfast revolutionary fighters are emerging from the revolutionary mass organisations and from the growing Youth associations. The communist organisation of India will come into being amidst the growing struggle, and its heroic representatives will be mercilessly delivered over into the hands of class justice by English imperialism and by the Indian national bourgeoisie. Only the Communist Party can be the leader of the victorious movement of the proletariat in India against British imperialism and against the bourgeois feudal classes within the country.

In **China** a fresh revolutionary upsurge has developed of late. The pessimists, and those of little faith among the opportunists of every description, who prophesied the end of the Chinese revolution, are defeated by facts. Bourgeois-feudal reaction has not solved one problem of the Chinese revolution, nor could it do so. The securing of China's national independence has not made the slightest advance. On the contrary, the generals' war tearing China to pieces, the war of the bourgeois-feudal cliques, backed up by the imperialist powers struggling for the Chinese markets, is spreading even further. The decisive question continues to be the solution of the agrarian problem, the expropriation of the large estates and of all landlords, the abolition of the relics

of feudalism, of the enormous taxation, and of the usurious rents, in the village. The industrial crisis in China, too, has become much more acute. For years China has not been able to emerge from the severe general economic crisis.

The revolutionary movement in China is growing both in the industrial centres and in the village. The number of strikers reached 400,000 in 1928, 750,000 in 1929. In spite of the cruel repression of the Kuomintang government, the Communist Party has consolidated its influence among the working masses. It possesses approximately 60,000 members organised in the trade unions, it increases the publication of revolutionary literature, and issues various illegal communist papers. In the village the situation of the peasants is increasingly serious. For three years famine has ruled over the vast territory of China. This year we count 57 million starving people. The pressure of the tributes to the feudal lords, the enormous taxes imposed by the Kuomintang government, prepare the soil for the extreme discontent among the peasant masses. The revolutionary movement in the village has spread to numerous regions. According to the latest data, 241 districts out of 636 are under the influence of the revolutionary movement and of the Red Army. The Chinese Red Army is composed of 14 corps, and numbers over 60,000 men. Besides this there are Red partisan divisions. The news which has reached us of late, especially since the conference of the representatives from the Soviet districts, regarding a Soviet government of the workers and peasants of China, is extremely probable. Supported by the districts under the influence of the Red Army: the Soviets in China can communicate with the great industrial centres, and form a Soviet government of the workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party. Such a government is the sole one capable of leading China onto a fresh path, the path of liberation from the impoverishment and the death by starvation of millions, from economic decay, from oppression at the hands of the bourgeois feudal cliques and the imperialists. Our young Communist Party is gaining strength in the course of the revolutionary upsurge in China, and is becoming the actual leader of the revolutionary freedom movement among the masses of the workers and peasants. China can and will attain its freedom only under the banner of the Soviets, and under the leadership of the Communist Party.

I now pass on to the question of the aggravation of the antagonisms within the capitalist countries.

(To be concluded.)

POLITICS

Replies to Briand's Memorandum.

By G. Peri (Paris).

The Chancellories of Europe are not displaying any undue haste in replying to Briand's Memorandum on a United States of Europe.

It will be remembered that it was **Fascist Spain** that was the first to reply.

Holland wished to be second on the list of correspondents of the French Foreign Minister. At the same time it should not be forgotten that only a few days before announcing their approval of Briand's proposal, the Hague Government submitted a Naval Programme, which provides for the construction within a period of ten years of 3 cruisers, 12 torpedo-boats, 20 submarines, and 2 submarines with equipment for mine-laying etc. According to the calculations of the Dutch minister, **Decker**, the Dutch naval budget will thereby amount to 120 million guilders, apart from the costs of its upkeep.

According to the statements of the Dutch Government, these ships will have the task of protecting the petroleum ports in Indonesia and in the West Indies.

Other replies have also arrived at the Quai d'Orsay, namely from **Poland, Rumania, Austria and Italy**. The com-

ments of the press on the other side of the Rhine already permit one to form an idea of what Germany's answer will be. On the other hand, it would appear that Downing Street does not feel at all inclined to show any haste in making known its standpoint. Nevertheless, it is said that Henderson will send a Note to Paris in the course of the week. Be that as it may, the Notes which have been received up to the present can be divided roughly into two categories.

On the one side are those states which have derived advantage from the division of Europe in 1919; on the other side are the states which feel that they have been placed in a disadvantageous position by the post-war treaties. To the first category there belong the allies of France, in the first place Poland and the States of the Little Entente. Poland has been enriched by the acquisition of a part of Upper-Silesia. In order to place Poland in a favourable position, a piece of German territory has been dismembered in the most absurd manner. Polish Imperialism not only intends to retain this heritage, but, as is known, dreams of extending its territorial possessions, and its aims at expansion in an easterly direction are well known in France. Thus the Pan-European League has a meaning for this first category only if the situation created by the Treaty of Versailles remains intact.

The same applies to Rumanian Imperialism. For Rumanian Imperialism it is essential to consolidate its rule in those areas which the treaties have accorded it and of which it holds possession by means of violence. Pan-Europe! Pan-Europe! sing the choir of ministers of the Gigolo Prince who has been raised to the throne of Rumania, but on condition, of course, that the bayonets of the Rumanian army and the revolvers of the Siguranza guarantee the „security“ of Bessarabia. As regards the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, they argue in a similar fashion.

Against these states there stand the discontented states, those which maintain that they have been unfairly treated in the distribution of the booty and those which maintain that they have been plundered and dismembered by the treaties. „There are“, proclaims the Austrian Chancellor, Herr Schober, „political problems of the first rank, which must be solved in a new European spirit according to the principle of the complete equality of rights of all peoples“.

A similar tone will be heard when the politicians in Sofia and Budapest give their replies.

Italy has placed itself at the head of these discontented states. It, too, is demanding, in the name of the equality of both victors and vanquished, a revision of the treaties concluded in 1919. It is true, Italy's reply, which has been drawn up by the astutest jurists at the Foreign Ministry, touches other problems. Thus it shows great concern for the inclusion of Turkey — with which Italy is united by a political friendship — in the Pan-European family. It also expresses some concern regarding its relations to the United States, and makes veiled reproaches against the originators of this pact of desiring to create an anti-American coalition, while the main demand involves a revision of the treaties.

Pan-Europe is agreed to, but on condition that the Pan-European Union permits and promotes a redistribution of the world.

The German reply deserves special mention. It is characterised in the first place by its vagueness and ambiguity. It reflects the various intrigues carried on by French and Italian diplomacy in Berlin. There is to be seen in it the readiness of the German bourgeoisie to join the western anti-Soviet front, as well as the disappointment which this fatal orientation has evoked among the German people.

The most pronounced feature is the servility of German Imperialism, its desire to achieve its own aims by serving as a mercenary in the anti-Soviet army.

The replies give rise to other considerations. But their study is very instructive. Concealed behind the conventional diplomatic language, one discerns the warring aims and desires of the European imperialists. They confirm better than any other document the correctness of the Communist thesis of the threatening nearness of serious conflicts and of the necessity to strengthen the proletarian united front of the international fight against war.

British Labour Government Endeavouring to Cripple "Daily Worker".

By W. Rust (London).

** The trial of the Managing Board of the "Daily Worker" for alleged contempt of court was heard on Tuesday the 16th July, when the defendants, Comrades Priestley, Patterson and Ward, were sentenced to nine months, six months and five months imprisonment respectively. The court also imposed a fine of £200 on the printers of the "Daily Worker" and ordered them to pay £25 costs.

This attack by the Labour Government on the organ of the British Communist Party was launched three weeks before International Red Day. The comrades charged were legally advised that no legal defence could be made in the case, and that no lawyer would even undertake the defence for fear of incurring the hostility of the judges and wrecking his career.

The "said paragraphs" referred to by the Public Prosecutor were taken from the leading article which appeared in the "Daily Worker" on July 8th, dealing with the sentence of 18 months hard labour imposed on a comrade, who had been found guilty of distributing revolutionary leaflets to the soldiers.

The revolutionary leaflet was issued to the soldiers by the Communist Soldiers group, and dealt with the heroic struggle of the Indian masses against British imperialism. The following sections were read out in Court during the trial:

"Must we do the foul work which the Indian soldiers have so heroically refused, and murder the masses fighting for bread and national freedom? No, a thousand times, no. The fight of the Indian workers and peasants is our fight, too. The capitalists who have battered on the misery and want of the Indian coolies, and who wish to continue to do so, are our enemies, too.

"They have kept us and our kin in poverty. . . They forced us into their armed forces through unemployment. When they have finished using us for their foul work against their colonial slaves and the workers at home they will throw us to starvation again.

„Our course is clear. If the Imperialist Labour Government sends us to India, and calls on us to shoot down the heroic Indian workers and peasants, we must refuse. . .

"Our guns must be turned against our real enemy, the thieving, robbing British ruling class, and its lackey, the 'Labour' Government. Don't shoot the heroic workers and peasants of India. . ."

These sections of the leaflet were reproduced in the „Daily Worker" as part of the report of the proceedings.

It will be noted that the Labour Government launched the attack on the "Daily Worker" and Communist Party not on the basis of a direct charge of sedition, as is the usual practice, but on the charge of "contempt of court and lowering the authority of the Judge".

The Labour Government comes forward in order to maintain the prestige of the capitalist law courts against the revolutionary propaganda of the working class, and to uphold the authority of a judge, who has been long known as one of the most vicious anti-working class adornments of the legal benches.

Mr. Justice Rigby Swift's chief claim to attention in the eyes of the working class is that he is the judge who tried the 12 Communist leaders in 1925 on the charge of "seditious conspiracy". In that trial he offered a number of the prisoners their freedom if they would undertake to give up Communism. When they refused to surrender their opinions he sent them to prison for six months.

He is known to cotton workers as a member of the board appointed last summer by the Labour Government to arbitrate, in collaboration with C. T. Cramp and A. G. Walkden, on the workers' wages. He, with the trade union leaders, awarded a reduction of 6¼%. Mr. Justice Swift is himself an ex-Conservative M. P. and the son of a lawyer.

This attempt of the Labour Government to cripple the first revolutionary daily newspaper in Great Britain, will arouse a volume of protest and vigorous resistance in the ranks of the working class. During the last few days the determined campaign on behalf of the paper has resulted in a big increase in its fighting fund, and an increase in circulation.

These improvements were a result of the political campaign conducted by the Communist Party, which frankly placed be-

fore the readers of the paper its critical financial position, and the possible reduction from six pages to four pages. The readers have whole-heartedly responded to the determined efforts now being made by the Communist Party to maintain the six-page paper, and the attack of the Labour Government will spur on the workers to rally ever more determinedly around it.

The Mining Disaster in Upper Silesia — A Terrible Indictment of Capitalist Society.

By Gustav Sobottka (Berlin).

On the 9th July a terrible mining disaster occurred in the **Wenzeslaus Pit** near **Neurode** in **Upper Silesia**. Of the 210 miners who were in the pit, only 59 — and these for the greater part seriously injured — could be rescued. 151 are dead, 49 of whom, up to July 13th, were still in the pit and could not be reached. The mining catastrophe is the worst that has occurred in recent years in Germany. In 1923, 112 miners were killed in an explosion which occurred in the **Heinitz Pit** in Upper Silesia. In February 1925, 136 miners were killed as a result of an explosion in the "**Minister Stein**" Pit. Now there are no less than 151 who have met their death in the disaster in **Neurode**.

The **Neurode** mining works are situated on the edge of the **Upper Silesian** coalfields. The coal in this region gives off large quantities of carbonic acid gas when being hewn. Special safety measures are therefore ordered so as to prevent the miners from being asphyxiated in the event of an outbreak of carbonic acid gas. Thus, in these pits the coal must not be loosened by means of pneumatic borers or other machinery. The loosening of the coal must be done only by means of shot-firing. During the shot-firing the miners must be withdrawn from the mine workings and remain in chambers specially built for this purpose. Only after the shot-firing, and when the gas has been sucked away and there no longer exists any danger may the miners proceed to work on the loosened coal.

At the **Wenzeslaus Pit**, at which this terrible disaster occurred, these safety regulations were **not** observed. Here in the last few months over 700 miners were dismissed, while those who were still kept on had to produce the same quantity of coal as formerly. Their piecework rates and wages were therefore reduced. In order to obtain more coal, the mine management ordered that instead of shot-firing, boring machines should be used. As a result of the fact that with the aid of the boring machines, huge quantities of coal were loosened at once, the outrush of carbonic acid was so tremendous that it shattered practically the whole pit, and the gas asphyxiated all those who had not been killed by the explosion.

There already exists not the least doubt that the responsibility for this catastrophe lies with the mine management, which defied the safety regulations. But also the government mine inspectors, whose task it is to see that all the safety regulations are observed, also bear a great share of the responsibility for the disaster. For months they have allowed human lives to be played with, in spite of the fact that the workers repeatedly called attention to the great dangers.

In the village of **Hausdorf**, the scene of the disaster, over half the miners have been killed. There are only two families in this village who have not lost somebody in the disaster.

This catastrophe is only an accompanying phenomenon of the conditions in the **German** mines generally. In order to overcome the general economic crisis and to win new markets for the sale of their coal, the mineowners are doing everything to cheapen production. Speeding up and wage-cutting, as well as disregard of the most elementary safety measures, are the means which they employ in the most brutal manner. This policy naturally leads to increased accidents and to such disasters as we have witnessed in the **Wenzeslaus** pit.

On Sunday the 13th of July there took place the burial of the bodies of the 102 miners which have already been recovered from the pit. In order to prevent a great participation on the part of the workers, the coffins containing the corpses were conveyed by night to the cemetery and lowered in mass graves. The funeral itself took place the following morning at 8 o'clock.

In spite of the fact that every attempt was made to maintain silence as long as possible regarding the time of the funeral, delegations of workers with wreaths, to which great red streamers were attached, arrived from all parts of **Germany**.

From the **Ruhr** district several pits sent deputations with wreaths; the revolutionary trade union opposition of the **Ruhr** miners and the district committee of the **C. P.** of **Germany** in **Silesia** also had wreaths placed on the graves of the victims. Wreaths were also placed on the graves by the **Central Committee** of the **Communist Party** of **Germany** and the national committee of the revolutionary trade union opposition.

Great indignation prevails in all the coal fields as a result of the terrible mining disaster. The miners are demanding the punishment of the guilty and the improvement of safety measures for the protection of the mine workers. At a meeting of surviving miners held on the day following the disaster, a resolution was adopted demanding the arrest of the mine managers.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Strike Struggles in Rumania.

By S. Horia, (Bucharest.)

The coup d'état in **Rumania**, in spite of the parade of the **National Assembly**, was the last step to the setting up of an open military fascist dictatorship with **King Carol** at the head. **King Carol** is declaring openly and solemnly almost every day that "a king must remain within the framework of the **Constitution** and of **Parliamentarism**"; that he is for the "complete freedom of the press" and even for "freedom of demonstration" and that he "forbids" the sending of the military and gendarmerie against demonstrators.

Almost at the same time as these solemn words were being pronounced there rang out the rifle-shots of the troops and gendarmerie against striking textile workers in **Buhusch**, for the greater part working women and children. The troops and gendarmerie attacked the textile workers with fixed bayonets, with the result that over 50 working men and women, and children were seriously wounded. At the same time the military occupied the **Reschitza** works, and machine guns, directed against the strikers, were placed at the gates of every workshop.

A new wave of revolutionary fervour is observable in **Rumania**. On the 2nd of June 750 workers of the machine departments of the **Reschitza** works went on strike against the murderous capitalist rationalisation, against wage cuts and wholesale discharges. The social fascist trade union bureaucracy endeavoured, by means of various manoeuvres and threats, to throttle the strike in the interest of the capitalists. They induced the workers to agree to the sending of a delegation, the leader of which was the government commissioner **Tigareanu**, for the purpose of negotiating with the central management of the **Reschitza** works in **Bucharest**. The trade union bureaucracy thereby enabled the local management in **Reschitza**, to carry out, with the help of the military and gendarmerie, the bloody attack on the workers for the purpose of compelling them unconditionally to resume work. As this well-prepared attack proved in vain in face of the determined resistance of the fighting workers, the social-fascist delegation in **Bucharest** concluded a "victorious" agreement with the capitalists. The **Central** management undertook, on paper, to reengage the dismissed workers, to discharge the strike-breakers and to settle the wages question through a commission, on which the management and the social-fascist bureaucrats are to be equally represented. The workers returned to work. The discharged workers were **not**, however, reengaged, nor were the strike-breakers dismissed; on the contrary, the management and the social fascists purged the factory of the "unruly" elements, and piecework rates were reduced by a further 30 to 40 per cent. Thereupon, on the 28th of June, 6000 workers of the **Reschitza** works, against the will of the social fascist traitors, declared a general strike in order to enforce their demands.

In the textile factory in **Buhusch**, at which over 4000 workers are employed, the workers went on strike at the end of **December** last under the slogan: for the eight-hour day and for increased wages! The strike, however, ended in a defeat for the workers, thanks to the treachery of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy. The negotiations regarding the wages were to begin on the 1st of **April**. But instead of wages being raised, the employers, with the aid of the social-fascists, reduced them

by 40 to 60 per cent. On the 6th of June, however, the workers entered on a fresh strike. In the Ministry of Labour the Management of the Buhusch textile factory openly offered the social fascists 700,000 Lei for the "extension" of the reformist trade unions, if they on their part would promise to see to it that the workers returned to work. In spite of all the promises and threats of the social fascist bureaucrats and deputies, the working men and women and young workers refused to be misled and continued the fight. Thereupon martial law was proclaimed in Buhusch. On the 17th of June the strike pickets were attacked by the military, and at the same time a mass meeting of strikers was broken up by the troops. The next day the workers living in the adjoining village of Zenesti, who marched in a body to the factory to demonstrate, were held up by soldiers, who were given the order to fire. The soldiers, however, refused to obey the orders of their officers and fired in the air. Thereupon the officers and non-commissioned officers attacked the demonstrators, consisting for the most part of women and children, with drawn sabres and fixed bayonets. Following denunciations by the social fascists, who gave the names of the Communist functionaries to the fascist civil and military authorities, hundreds of workers were arrested, turned out of their homes and expelled from Buhusch.

In this way the heroic mass strike of the 4000 textile workers in Buhusch was bloodily crushed by the murderous triple alliance of the capitalists, the fascist State apparatus and the social fascists.

In the last few weeks economic struggles have broken out in all parts of Rumania. In spite of the tremendous aggravation of the economic crisis and the increasing unemployment, the new strike wave in Rumania is becoming more and more powerful. In the Jiul Valley (coal area), in the Pruhovec Valley (oil field), in the Mures valley and in Bukovina (timber industry and forestry), new and gigantic class collisions are immediately approaching. In connection with the mass strikes in Buhusch and Reschitza, the Communist Party of Rumania called for the organisation of protest and solidarity strikes against the blood bath in Buhusch and for the defence of the heroic mass struggle of the 6000 workers of the Reschitza works. In connection with these actions the Communist Party is organising economic strikes in the whole country, linking them up with the daily needs of the workers, and gathering all its forces in order to develop them into powerful political mass strikes and mass demonstrations against the fascist dictatorship and against social fascism. The Communist Party of Rumania is connecting these strikes with the preparations for the 5th Congress of the R.I.L.U. and with the 1st of August campaign i. e., with the fight against the danger of imperialist war, against the armaments of the Little Entente, against the formation of a Balkan Federation of the bourgeoisie directed against the Soviet Union.

The Attack on the Lancashire Cotton Workers.

The Report of the Graham Committee.

By E. F. Manchester.

Last year the Cotton Bosses attacked the wages of the Cotton Workers demanding a 12½% wage reduction. After a severe struggle the Employers, the Labour Government and the Trade Union Leaders succeeded in getting the 500,000 cotton workers back to work, and enforced a wage cut of 6¼% by means of the Arbitration Award.

The wage reduction solved none of the problems facing the industry, the decline has continued until now the position is catastrophic.

The Cotton workers are facing an attack which will develop into a mighty struggle besides which the struggle of last year will pale into insignificance.

This time the driving force is Finance Capital. The growth of combines has quickened recently. The Lancashire Cotton Corporation will soon control 10 million spindles, i. e. one third to one-fourth of the spindles in the American section, and is financed by the Bank of England. Another important development in the Egyptian Section was the scheme for a pool recently accepted by a body of influential Master Spinners. This proposal for a pool depends on securing the adhesion of 90% of the 20 million spindles in the Egyptian Section. The **Graham Report** makes it clear that the Labour

Government will lead the drive to amalgamate the whole of the industry in combines and link the various sections up. The recently formed Bankers' Industrial Development Company Ltd. is to provide the finance.

The fusion of Bank Capital with Industrial Capital is important in this industry as it plays a big part in National Economy. Textiles come first in value in British Exports, Cotton Goods and yarn alone from 1921 to 1926 making up 25% of the total value of all British Exports.

The Report shows the Industry in a catastrophic position. Before the Imperialist War the Lancashire Cotton Industry held a predominant position in the markets of the world, holding in value about two-thirds of the export trade of the world. While the world consumption of Cotton goods has increased, Lancashire now exports in Yardage less than two-thirds of what it did in 1910-1913.

The Board of Trade figures show the position vividly:

Cotton Exports.	Total Trade. (Millions of £.)
January 1928.	13.3
January 1929.	12.5
January 1930.	10.5
May 1930.	8.2.

Exports are decisive as 75% of the goods produced are for export trade. This results in 25% of the looms being idle, and the rest running at 75% capacity, while 40% of the Cotton Workers are unemployed.

The report's proposals are similar to those of the Coal Mines Bill. Combines in all sections, production to be concentrated in the best and most up to date concerns, here a fierce rationalisation drive is to be conducted. The form the rationalisation drive will take will be modified to suit the various sections of the industry. Ring Spinning in place of Mule Spinning and the use of the short-stapled Indian Cotton is recommended along with high draft spinning machinery and high draft winding machinery. This means speeding up, displacement of adult and male labour, lower wages (Ring spinning practically requires only unskilled labour) and a tremendous displacement of labour. In the weaving section Automatic looms will be introduced and the two shift system but more extensively, because less capital is required with the more loom system. That this means the smashing of the piece pricelist is recognised by the report. "The lists of weaving piece price lists, which were established in elaboration many years ago, it might be found that there would be substantial advantages in their re-consideration with a view to the establishment of greater flexibility and possibility to an agreement upon a new basis more satisfactory to both sides."

This statement is of the greatest importance as around the more loom issue the struggle is centring. In Burnley, the centre of the weaving section, the 8 loom system has run for over a year as an "experiment" on a percentage of the looms in 8 mills. The introduction of the 8 loom system actually smashes the piece price list. In Burnley, at one of these mills, after a weaver had run 8 looms for a number of weeks he was taken off and the 8 looms divided between two 4 loom weavers who received 23/5d per week for running 4 looms a full week, while the average wage for running 4 looms for a full week is 37/- per week, this is a reduction of 13/7d per week. Not a 6¼% wage cut this time but 40%.

The report definitely states that "it is confident that the operatives and the employers will consider the measures essential to the recovery of the trade." "If any section proves recalcitrant, we think it necessary to place on record our considered view that it would be the duty of his Majesty's Government themselves to consider inviting Parliament to confer upon them any necessary powers."

While this has reference to the small employers some of whom will resist the Banks, it is primarily directed against the workers.

The Report is an important part of the attack on the workers. The employers have demanded. "That the system of running more looms per weaver be extended to all the districts in the country." The chief Trades Union concerned met at the end of June and while stating "that there is a growing feeling that changes of some form or another are inevitable" deferred any reply until the publication of the Report. Now the big attack is to be launched and every effort made by the united forces of the Cotton Bosses, the Labour Government and the Union Leaders to delude the

Cotton Workers into accepting the more looms system without a struggle. An extensive propaganda is being conducted for the acceptance of the report which the Government claims will make the employers bring their industry up to date, from which prosperity and high wages will follow.

However, recent events show the mood of the workers. After the big struggle last year, the weavers in 13 of the local Associations forced the Union leaders to take a ballot which gave a 2 to 1 majority for demanding a 25% increase in wages. This ballot the union leaders openly flouted. A series of strikes have taken place this year in various towns. At the **Dunlop Mill** after the Arbitration Award there were partial strikes of the Night Doublers. At **Barrowford** the weavers came out against the 10 loom system; at **Burnley** they were on strike against the 6 loom system and the attack on the piece price list, in **Reddish** the Spinners came out against victimisation and speeding up, and in **Blackburn** a strike occurred against bad material and a wage cut.

In Burnley the fight has been led by the Communist Party to get strike Action in the mills where the 8 looms are being run as an "experiment". A big fight has been conducted inside the Weavers Union. Meetings of the Union are held quarterly and at the February meeting a march of over two hundred was led by Communists to the Union Meeting to demand that the 8 loom system be stopped. During the struggle of the Woollen Workers the Textile bosses marked time and the Party failed to bring the Cotton Workers into action along with the Yorkshire strikers. Since the end of the Woollen struggle the fight has intensified. **Councils of Action** have been set up in **Blackburn** and in **Todmorden**. In Burnley at the quarterly meeting in July a large number of workers turned up. The Bureaucrats refused to allow the 8 looms question to be discussed. This led to signatures being collected by the Communists for a requisition meeting and over 200 being secured. At the requisition meeting some 1300 weavers turned up and were unable to get inside their own building, the Communists then gave the call for the meeting to be held at the Co-op Hall and here a Council of Action was formed. The activity of a group of pseudo-lefts and opportunists, the mistakes of Communist Party members led to this being limited to union members and to a strong tendency to directing the fight in trying to make the Union leaders fight.

The drive is to form Councils of Action in every town, these to campaign for All-in Mill Committees of Action, and Committees of Action at the Labour Exchanges. Special Mill sheets and Bulletins along with Mill Papers are being issued. The General slogans under which the Cotton Workers will go forward to battle are **against the Graham report. Prepare for strike action. Against mass dismissals and Speeding up. For the 25% increase in wages. For a Guaranteed minimum wage for all Cotton Workers. For the 7 hour day.**

The Graham Report is important for all British workers and particularly all Lancashire workers, where industries depend on one another, and where attacks are pending in all important sections, particularly mining and engineering. The struggle for their own immediate demands and the formation of organs of struggle must be linked with the struggle of the Cotton workers, the experience of the Yorkshire strike, the Role of the Councils of Action and Strike Committees and the W.I.R. explained to all workers. In this way this year will see big class battles in Lancashire under the leadership of the organs of struggle affiliated to the Minority Movement.

The Offensive of the Bourgeoisie against the Standard of Living of the Belgian Workers.

By A. Rocard.

It was to be foreseen that the Belgian employers, in view of the threatening economic crisis, would make an attempt to cast the whole burden of their country on to the working class. We are now witnessing the first attacks.

According to official statistics, in the **textile industry** and in the **glass industry**, every tenth insured worker is unemployed. Short-time is being worked in many factories, and all workers still in work are becoming acquainted with the consequences of the intensified rationalisation. In the textile industry each worker has to tend an increasing number of looms, and in the **glass works** the labour process is becoming more and more mechanised.

In the **smelting industry**, where there is little unemployment for the time being, the offensive began with the doing away of the allowance of two francs per day, received by the best paid workers, on account of high prices. The reformist leaders succeeded in breaking the resistance of the workers by refusing to carry on a fight along the whole front against the wage reduction, and leaving the "defence" of the workers to the district unions. The employers were thereby enabled to "make good" the abolition of the extra-allowance for high prices by "raising wages" by 1.75 per cent., which in reality means a reduction of wages. In Ghent, however, 5000 workers followed the slogan of the C.P. and went on strike; but at a strike meeting, and against a strong minority, they accepted a "wage increase" of 2 per cent. In the **mining industry**, which is most severely hit by the crisis, the offensive has set in most ruthlessly. At the same time, in this industry cooperation between the reformist leaders and the employers is carried on most openly. At the present time there are 1,500,000 tons of coal at the pit heads. These stocks are rapidly increasing to 2 million tons, a figure never before reached in Belgium.

But even if with the approach of Winter the market for household coal will increase, the situation as a whole cannot change as three quarters of the production is reckoned for industrial consumption. Wages in the mining industry are fixed by a tariff agreement concluded in 1926, under which they are regulated in accordance with the official retail trade index and the price of coal delivered to the State railways. Thus we see the pains which the reformist leaders have taken in order to ensure to the mineowners "reasonable" profits.

An official investigation of the situation of the miners in the year 1927 gave the following figures regarding wages:

Dailywages	1927	1913
Underground workers	48.50 Frs.	45.27
All workers	44.36	40.34

According to the above, therefore, wages today are about 10 per cent higher than pre-war wages. If, however one takes into account the greater output per worker and the increased exploitation, it is seen that they are in reality under the 1913 level. Thanks to the almost complete mechanisation of coal mining, the output of 3.16 tons per day in the year 1913 increased to 4.45 tons in the year 1929 — an increase of 44 per cent.

In spite of the present market difficulties, which have existed for some months, the price of coal has hardly declined at all compared with last year, thanks to a cartel formed a year ago.

The profits of the mining companies reflect this favourable price formation and the policy of reducing wages pursued by the reformist leaders. The balance sheets of 55 mining companies which have been published since the commencement of the present year show profits amounting to over 220 million francs on a paid up capital of 9,15 million francs, i. e. a profit of 25 per cent.

In face of the situation the mineowners, in the midst of the centenary celebrations of the independence of Belgium announced their intention to reduce wages by 5 per cent. At first there was great excitement in reformist circles. On the 27th of April an extraordinary Congress protested "most energetically against the claims of the employers, and decided to oppose with the greatest determination all attempts to reduce wages." The reformist leaders, however, gradually let fall their masks.

They began first by recognising the principle of wage reduction, and finally, at the beginning of July, accepted it as a fact.

But the discontent of the workers had to be taken into account, and, adopting an oft-tried tactic, the reformist leaders diverted the fight to the question of pensions for old miners, negotiations regarding which are now proceeding in Parliament.

They called a 24-hour strike for the 30th of June, and, whilst in Parliament a trifling increase of pensions for some hundred workers was decided on, 160,000 miners had their wages reduced by 5 per cent.

It is quite obvious that the Belgian employers will not rest satisfied with these first attacks on the standard of living of the workers. The economic position, both on a national and international scale, is becoming continually worse and is impelling the employers to intensify their offensive. It will be the task of the C.P. of Belgium to adopt energetic measures in order to defend the immediate demands of the workers and by this means become a mass party.

1st August: International Fighting Day Against War

Why We are Celebrating the 1st of August.

By F. Heckert.

The Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions are preparing for **August 1st, the international fighting day against war**. Why is this necessary? Is there any danger of war? Are not all the leading Statesmen of the capitalist countries in favour of peace?

But if this is so, why did the **German** Minister for Defence, Herr Gröner, jump up nervously when his colleague, Herr Wirth, declared that the question should be raised, whether, in view of the general need and the economic crisis some saving should be made in the military budget? Why have the government of the **French Republic** spent 1,500 million gold francs on concrete works and latest guns on the Alpine frontier and in Corsica? Why did there take place in **England** on the 1st July great air-manoeuvres at which 198 aeroplanes demonstrated before 300,000 spectators how quickly a fortified pirates' nest can be destroyed with bombs? Why was a similar demonstration carried out in **Italy** on an "Arab village" specially erected for the purpose?

Perhaps someone will say that it is only a joke when the "**Times**" reports that in the neighbourhood of Peshawar 5000 heavy bombs were dropped from English aircraft on the native villages, or when the same thing happens in Indo-China or Nicaragua? Perhaps these are only trifling incidents arranged just to amuse the public during the silly season!

The newspapers of the **II. International** are full of talk about peace; but it is a well-known fact that in the capitalist States the pacifist talk and asseverations of the will to peace on the part of the capitalist statesmen are part and parcel of the war preparations. Sometimes, however, the fog lifts, and then we get a glimpse of what is really taking place. At the celebrated **Naval Disarmament Conference** at London, the **Italo-French** antagonism was quite plainly revealed. The delegates had hardly returned from London, when **Mussolini** interpreted all the peace talk of the Conference in the following words:

"Words are very fine, but rifles, machine guns, ships, aircraft and cannons are something still finer; for right without might is an empty word, and Macchiavelli said that the prophets without weapons perish."

Naturally there are people who say, **Mussolini** is only a crazy fascist, who takes any notice of him? But what did the social democrat **Otto Hörsing**, the **President of the Reichsbanner** say, at a demonstration in Magdeburg, not long after **Mussolini** had been singing the praises of weapons?

"The international labour market, before all the **German**, will take a decided turn for the better, when **Bolshevism** is abolished. Here lies the root of all the evil. The people of **Russia**, numbering hundreds of millions, represent the great mass of buyers which world industry lacks. Therefore, it is the task of all the civilised countries, and not the least of **Germany**, immediately and with all means to create possibilities of work; to revive the home market in order that economy can recover and the finances be restored. It is only thereby that we shall be able to maintain the cultural progress of the 20th century. But cultural progress will not be maintained so long as **Bolshevism** withdraws hundreds of million of men from the world market and from world culture."

Does that not plainly indicate the direction in which the war tempest will break loose? We read in the **Simon Report** that **England** must firmly retain in its hands the outer defence of **India** against the enemy on the **Northern Frontier**. Here also the direction is plainly indicated. Or let us take the case of the return of king **Carol of Rumania**, the man who is in the pay of the **French** war industry, and who is provided with military instructors. Or take the case of the fascist upheaval in **Finland**, which has placed the old enemy of Soviet **Russia**, **Svinhufud**, at the head of the government, while at the same time a furious terror is raging against the **Finnish**

Communists with the object of exterminating them. Or **Pilsudski**, who does not even permit the **Sejm** to meet, in order that not the slightest light should be shed on the dark doings of his militarists. Are all these merely chance occurrences?

The capitalists are preparing to redistribute the world. The colonial peoples and **Bolshevik Russia** are to be the objects, the bear, so to speak, whose skin is to be divided. But why are the capitalist powers arming against each other? They know that it is one thing to kill the bear, and another thing to divide the booty among themselves. Have not the capitalists had enough of the last war? Does not war contain in its womb the proletarian revolution? Who would deny the dangers it represents to the capitalists? But what other way remains open to them? An unprecedented economic crisis is sweeping the capitalist world; it is from that they are seeking a way of escape.

The way of escape indicated by **Hörsing**, and which all capitalist Powers wish to take, is becoming less unthinkable every year. The carrying out of the **Five-Year Plan** of the **Soviet Union** will give to this country of the proletariat not only a gigantic power, but must inevitably increase the crisis in the capitalist countries. The example of socialist construction is showing to the proletarians and the oppressed peoples of the world that the capitalist world order is not the last word of wisdom. They are beginning to make comparisons: in the capitalist world difficulties are increasing; there is growing misery in the colonies; increased brutality on the part of the oppressors — in the **Soviet Union**, however, there is to be seen a tremendous development of all the creative forces, increase of the general well-being. Will not that promote the revolutionary situation? Therefore, the present crisis does not tend to check the capitalist war policy but is a mobilising factor, the capitalists fear that they will be too late, and therefore are feverishly arming in spite of all the dangers which war brings with it.

Many capitalists know too that war is a profitable business. At present capitalist economy is in a rather bad way. The rationalised factories are without orders, the State treasuries are low, there is an agrarian crisis everywhere, the market is too narrow, there are 20 million unemployed, who have to be maintained instead of their yielding surplus value. Would not the 20 million be good cannon-fodder? By employing them on the battlefield would it not be possible to kill two birds with one stone, i. e., to get rid of the surplus mouths and to earn a lot of money at the same time? These are considerations which are engaging the minds of the capitalist statesmen. Did not the **German** Minister for Justice, Herr **Bredt** say, it would be a good thing if 20 million people were to disappear in **Germany** over night?

But before the new war can be launched the capitalists need money; they must defend with all means their competitive capacity on the world market. Hence the offensive against the working class, the wage cuts, the murderous exploitation in the factories, the unheard-of terror. The workers are to be thoroughly cowed; their misery is to be increased to such an extent that they will even be ready for war, no matter against whom. **War is to appear to the masses as a way of escape from misery.**

In the capitalist countries there are millions of unemployed workers receiving no relief whatever. Millions of other workers are in constant fear that they will be turned out of the rationalised factories to join the army of starving out-of-works. High prices are squeezing the last penny out of the workers. In **Germany**, workers who leave their work on their own accord are to be deprived of unemployment benefit for eight weeks. They are to be rendered incapable of protesting by means of strikes against the reduced wages imposed by the arbitration commissions. To strike against the arbitration awards or against the tariff treaties, which have been concluded behind the back of the workers, is considered a violation of the law and is to be treated as such. By means of laws for the defence of the Republic, police regulations and

fascistisation of the State power, the voice of the revolutionary portion of the world proletariat is to be silenced. Then the capitalists believe that the time will have come when the battle cry can be sounded: Bolshevism is the root of all evil! Down with Bolshevism, in order that unemployment may disappear from the world market and world culture flourish again. Down with Bolshevism in order that Asia may become quiet again. Down with India, down with Arabia, down with Indo-China, down with China. The market must be ours in order that you, the suffering workers, may have work again.

The employers' offensive is therefore closely connected with the war preparations. All revolutionary workers must therefore make ready in order, by means of the counter-offensive of the workers, to break the employers' offensive and to combat the war danger. It is in this sense that the workers of every country must prepare for August 1st, International anti-War Day.

The Interventionist Policy of the Reformist Co-operative Leaders.

By Heinrich Oswald.

The maturing world crisis of capitalism is sharpening the struggle of the imperialist powers for markets and colonies and is calling forth the direct danger of another imperialist war and attack on the Soviet Union.

The accentuation of the struggle of the imperialists and social fascists against the Soviet Union has had its repercussion in the anti-Soviet campaign of the reformist co-operators which was given a great impetus lately.

The reformist co-operative bureaucrats are associating themselves more and more frankly with the policy of intervention, and are placing at its service the consumers co-operatives, the co-operative apparatus, the press, etc.

The reformist co-operative press is carrying on a systematic campaign against the USSR, trying to discredit the first Workers' State in the world in the eyes of the workers of the Western countries, and to create an atmosphere hostile to the Soviet power.

The German co-op bureaucrats are at the head of the campaign of the reformist co-operation against the USSR. The Hamburg leading circles carry on a constant purely social fascist campaign of incitement and slander. Here is, as an example, one of the recent statements of the leader of the German Central Union of Consumers Co-operative Societies, Herr Kasch:

"We still hold the view that one of Germany's greatest achievements in the world war was the destruction of the Czarist knout regime in Russia. Unfortunately, starving Germany could not prevent the substitution of this accursed regime by the no less accursed bolshevik regime" ("Konsumgenossenschaftliche Rundschau").

The German co-operative social fascists go even further. Their official organ is bringing forward a plan for another intervention against the USSR, and is "analysing" the necessary premises for it. ("Konsumgenossenschaftliche Rundschau", May 3, 1930.)

The policy of the Swiss co-operative leaders which is an anti-proletarian policy, finds vent also in an accentuation of their attacks on the first Workers' State. In the columns of the official organ of the Swiss co-operatives, "Schweizer Konsumverein" articles are published which aim at discrediting the Soviet social order in the eyes of the workers.

Another method is also used for the same purpose. On the basis of personal "observations", statements are made directed, as all social fascist statements, towards representing the Soviet order as bankrupt.

The organ of the French Socialist Party "Le Peuple" publishes an account of the report of Foucault, a member of the French co-operative delegation in the USSR. The Norwegian co-operator Svenson, a social democrat, has published in the social democratic "Arbeiderbladet" an interview full of attacks on the USSR. Both these accounts are full of distortions of the real facts and pure inventions borrowed from the White Guard and social fascist press.

There is no doubt whatever that Foucault and Svenson, when making their lying statements, were obeying the orders of their social democratic parties and their organs.

The social fascists have also other methods for the struggle against the USSR. The social fascist press publishes also accounts of visits of the lackeys of the bourgeoisie to Soviet Russia, alleged to be based on personal "observations", which are however, written by people who have never been to the USSR. For instance, a certain M. Hubermont has published in "Le Peuple", organ of the Belgian Socialist Party, an article on the visit of the French co-operative delegation to Soviet Russia, making it appear as if he had been a member of this delegation. Hubermont is quoting from the report of the delegation, distorting certain passages. For instance, he says that in Leningrad there are 35,000 co-operative employees to 240,000 members, i. e. one employee to every seven co-operative members. "In what other country could one find such an inflated bureaucracy!", exclaims Hubermont. The fact is that the Leningrad co-operatives have 875,000 members and are catering not only for members, but for nearly the whole population. Thus, to every co-operative shop assistant (over on-half of the employees of the Leningrad co-operatives are engaged in production) there are 55 members, and the actual number of people catered for, reckoning non-members and travellers, is 120-150. In the Belgian co-operation — in Hubermont's own country — there are 62 members to every employee. Hubermont also says that the average wage in the USSR, is 50 roubles a month, whereas the report of the French delegation mentions 70 roubles (for 1928). In 1929, the average wage of industrial workers in the USSR, was 84 roubles. Comparing the real wage of a Moscow worker with the real wage of a Berlin worker, the official French report comes to the conclusion that the Moscow wage is 20% higher than the Berlin wage. On this Hubermont keeps silent of course, and tries to prove that the real wage of a Soviet worker is extremely low, giving prices for patent leather shoes.

These odious social fascist slanders wind up with a call to rise against the Soviet Power.

"It is on it (on the Soviet working class) that we place our hopes," writes Hubermont, "on the workers who are secretly creating solidarity funds in the factories, on that silent opposition which the whole oppressed population offers to the bolshevik terror; on the revolutionary forces which one fine day will sweep away what Rosa Luxemburg called the dictatorship of a clique, and will establish a regime of freedom and workers' democracy which will help them to forget the incredible bureaucratic abnormality of the proletarian dictatorship".

Comments are needless. It is characteristic that Hubermont's article was also published in the "neutral" cooperative "Konsum. Rundschau".

One could give no end of such examples which show up the interventionist policy of the reformist co-op bureaucrats, but we think that what we have already said is enough to give an idea of the real character of the contemporary reformist co-operators.

The revolutionary opposition in all consumers societies must expose before the eyes of the masses the anti-proletarian, imperialist policy of the reformist co-operative leaders and must urge the millions of members to fight energetically reformism in the co-operative movement, demanding that the co-operatives should form part of the revolutionary front against the preparation, of an imperialist war and for the defence of the USSR.

Notice!

Change of Address

From the 21st July next the address of the International Press Correspondence and of the "Inprecorr" Telegraph Agency will be:

Lindenstrasse 71-72, III. Berlin SW 68.

From the same date the new telephone numbers will be: Dönhoff 2856 and 2857.

We request that all manuscripts, newspapers, letters and remittances be sent to the new address.

International Press Correspondence
"Inprecorr." Telegraph Agency.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Seventh Congress of the C. P. of America.

Unlike the last congress of the United States Communist Party, which was organised from a fractionalist point of view and aimed at mobilising the Party against the policy of the Communist International, the Seventh Congress of the C. P. which was opened on June 21st was under the flag of complete political unity on the basis of the C. I. policy. 102 delegates were present with decisive votes and 220 with advisory votes. Greetings were read from the various groups of class war prisoners in Atlanta, El Centro etc., including the Foster, Minor, Amter group. Messages of greeting were also read from the Communist Parties of Germany, Mexico, Canada and Cuba.

Comrade Bedacht made the report on behalf of the Central Committee and dealt with the period since the last congress. He showed how the previous leadership of the Party had disobeyed the instructions of the Communist International with regard to ending the fractional struggle and the bolshevisation of the Party. The previous leadership had adopted the opportunist theory that American capitalism occupied an exceptional position in the world economic system, thus underestimating the internal contradictions of capitalism. The Lovestone-Pepper leadership paralysed the revolutionary forces of the Party by attempting to substitute the policy of the international right-wing for the policy of the C. I.

Bedacht then described how the open letter of the C. I. cleared the air and showed the Party how to perform its tasks in the third period. Bedacht then described the international situation and the situation of the United States, the world economic crisis, the growing class struggles and the growing revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. He analysed the contradictions of imperialism and in particular the Anglo-American rivalry, which he declared must inevitably lead to war. A special part of Bedacht's report was devoted to the danger of war and the bolshevist methods of fighting against it. Dealing with the economic crisis in the U. S. he pointed out that the American bourgeoisie first of all denied the existence of the crisis altogether, then promised to liquidate it in 60 days, and then produced a programme of all-round wage cuts. The American Federation of Labor was the direct agent and co-operator of the bourgeoisie, and the American Socialist Party was rapidly developing into a bourgeois party. On the other hand, the radicalisation of the masses was rapidly increasing. Unemployment was growing, as also was the strike movement. In this situation the chief task of the Party was to increase its mass work and concentrate on the factories.

Immediately afterwards it was announced that 16,000 miners in Pennsylvania had gone on strike under the leadership of a strike committee against rationalisation. The secretary of the National Union of Miners and all the delegates from Pennsylvania immediately left the Congress in order to return and lead the strike of the miners on the spot.

The report on the mass work of the Communist Party and in particular the work for the organisation of the workers in the coming struggles was delivered by comrade Earl Browder.

Comrade Browder declared that the chief task of the Congress was to prepare the party to perform its task as the organiser and leader of the economic struggles of the workers. The most important fact in the world to-day was the economic crisis. Production in the U. S. had fallen by 20% and compared with last year there was twice the number of unemployed in the United States. Browder then compared this black situation in the capitalist countries with the progress being made in the Soviet Union for the building up of Socialism.

Referring to the struggle of the colonial peoples, Browder declared that the Communist International was the only organisation which supported the colonial revolution. The workers of the United States should support the revolution in Latin-America, Cuba and Haiti. He then dealt with the danger of war by the capitalist countries against the Soviet Union (Whalens forgeries, the Berlin Tchervonetz forgeries, the Kutiepov campaign, etc.) and the danger of war between the

capitalist powers (Anglo-American antagonism, Franco-Italian antagonism etc.).

The economic crisis would not produce the revolution, declared Browder, but it would produce the objective conditions for the revolution, and it would be the task of the Communist International and its sections to lead the workers of the world to revolution and victory. The capitalist class saw the only way out of the crisis in wage reductions, further mass dismissals and in further intensive rationalisation. The capitalists were receiving the support of the American Federation of Labor and the American so-called Socialist Party, and of course, the renegades of communism, Lovestone and his group.

Hundreds of communist officials and leaders were already in capitalist gaols in New York, California, New Jersey, Georgia, North Carolina and other States. The capitalists were particularly furious with the Communist Party because it dared to organise the Negro workers against a double oppression, racial and social, and for equal rights.

The most important tasks of the Party at the moment were; mobilisation of the masses for the unemployed workers congress in Chicago, to lead the struggle of the unemployed for support or work, to lead the struggle of the employed workers against wage-cuts, to organise strikes against the speed-up system, to develop the economic struggles of the workers into political struggles, to create revolutionary labor unions, to form workers committees in the factories, to work inside the A.F. of L. with a view to forming a united front from below, to mobilise the workers and poor farmers for the coming elections, to organise a campaign for the support of the revolutionary movement in China, India, Latin-America and the other colonial and semi-colonial countries, to organise the mass struggle against the danger of war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, to make the Communist Party the undisputed leader of the working class both politically and economically, to strengthen and consolidate the bolshevist relations with the Communist International, to prepare the American workers for the revolutionary class struggle under communist leadership.

After the speech of comrade Earl Browder, the chairman of the congress, the American Negro, Comrade Ford, read further telegrams of greeting to the congress.

After the Party Congress had accepted the reports of the C. C. and the C. C. C., it entered on the discussion. The discussion centred round the question of the estimation of the present crisis in the United States.

Comrade Stewart Smith, a delegate from the C. P. of Canada, developed the theory according to which the present crisis does not constitute a cyclic crisis.

Sam Don maintained the view that the present crisis is a cyclic crisis of the "third period", and argued against that portion of the C. C. report which referred to the liquidation of the crisis. Comrade Sam Don declared:

"Can one speak of a liquidation of the present crisis? The more the bourgeoisie attempts to liquidate the consequences of the crisis, the more profound the latter becomes."

A participant in the Congress subjected these theories of Comrades Smith and Don to a severe criticism, calling them "Left" theories. The speaker emphasised the necessity of a struggle against the Right and Left tendencies, pointing out that in the present period the most important task of the Communist Party is to organise the masses, to improve mass work, to organise the revolutionary trade unions, create factory committees etc.

Comrade Stewart Smith recognised his error in denying the cyclic character of the crisis, but declared that the theses of the C. C. do not sufficiently emphasise the connection of this crisis with the world economic crisis and the revolutionary situation resulting from it.

Comrades Overdad, secretary of the United Metal Workers' Union, Johnstone, collaborator in the Trade Union Unity League and Ben Gold, leader of the garment workers' union, dealt in their speeches with the policy of the Party in the trade union movement.

Comrade Karl Reeve, Minneapolis, reported that the Trotskyists in the State of Minnesota are collaborating with the reformists and the members of the American Federation of Labour.

Comrade Anna Burlak, who had just been released from prison on bail, greeted the Congress on behalf of six workers, charged with "mutiny" in Atlanta (Georgia).

The speaker for the C.C.C. reported that since the VI. Party Congress of the C.P.U.S.A. 398 members have been expelled from the Party: 202 on account of their adherence to the Lovestone fraction, 27 on account of Right deviations, 3 as Trotskyists, 81 on account of breaches of discipline, 14 on account of White chauvinism towards Negroes etc.

Comrade Bedacht, before summing up the discussion, read to the Congress, a letter from the Right renegade Gitlow, who had been expelled, in which he demanded the admission of a delegation from the Lovestone group to the Congress in order to demand the immediate and unconditional readmission of this group into the Party. This letter evoked general laughter from the delegates.

In summing up the discussion, Comrade Bedacht emphasised the perspective of fiercer struggles of the working class, even if the crisis should become less acute. He recorded the successful development of the revolutionary Trade Union Unity League, an improvement in the organisation of Negro workers, of the young workers and working women, as well as a development of the Party press. Comrade Bedacht recommended the Party Congress to apply to the Comintern with the request to readmit Bittelmann into the ranks of the C.P.U.S.A., as the latter had abandoned his fractional activity since the last Party Congress.

Comrade James Ford gave the report on the Negro question, and declared that the Party, after liquidating the fractional groups, had achieved considerable successes in the work among the Negroes. The C.I. and the R.I.L.U. are rendering considerable assistance to the Party in this work. The speaker declared that with the growing number of fascist attacks upon and lynching of Negroes the fighting mood of the Negro masses is growing. The Party must issue the slogan of self-determination of the Negroes. The Negro question is most closely linked up with the emancipation struggle of the toilers in India, China, Africa and in other colonies. The organisation of the Negro masses is one of the most important tasks of the C.P.U.S.A.

After the discussion on the agrarian question, comrade Bill Dunne reported on the work for the preparation of the 1st August campaign.

At the proposal of Comrade Bedacht it was unanimously decided to send a telegram of greetings to the XVI congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Congress closed on the evening of the 25th June with the election of the new Central Committee which has 25 members, 16 of whom are workers, 4 of whom are Negro workers, and one of whom is a working woman. 18 of the 25 members of the new Central Committee were unanimously elected.

Comrade Browder made the closing speech and declared that the congress had marked a turning point in the history of the Party. The Congress closed with the singing of the "Internationale".

Following the Congress the new Central Committee held a session and elected a Political Bureau consisting of 11 persons. 2 of its members are at present at work in factories, but they will immediately take up their work as members of the Political Bureau as many of the members are at present in prison.

Bolshevist Concentration in Holland.

On the Dissolution of the Wijnkoop Group.

By E. Grube (Berlin).

The campaign which the Comintern and the C. P. of Holland conducted on the occasion of the dissolution of the Wijnkoop group is very instructive for all Sections of the C. I. How such a campaign for winning the workers of such groups should not be conducted is shown by the example of our Dutch Section. The leadership of the Wijnkoop group published at the end of May a declaration in which it expressed the desire to be reaccepted into the Communist International. In support of this application it declared that the criticism of the policy of the C.P.H. contained in the Open Letter from the Comintern created the possibility of discussion and the basis for the re-entrance of this group into the C. P. H. Wijnkoop attempted to

create the impression that in the past not he himself, but the C.P.H. was responsible for the fact that the Wijnkoop group has remained outside of the Communist International. The fact is, however, that the VI. World Congress declared that the proposal of the Wijnkoop group to the Communist International to restore the unity of the Communist movement in Holland constitutes an impudent attempt to deceive the workers of Holland. The VI. World Congress pointed out with all clearness that the unity of the Communist movement in Holland consists in the existence of the C. P. H. (Section of the Communist International). All workers who recognise the discipline and the decisions of the Comintern are called upon to join the C. P. H. The expulsion of Wijnkoop and his followers was confirmed.

In his organ "Kommunistische Gids" Wijnkoop declared his agreement with the contents of the Open Letter. He only repudiated the statements made regarding his group and his policy. He deliberately avoided enlightening his followers in regard to the serious mistakes he had committed. His wrong policy in the trade union question, where he wrongly interpreted the Communist united front tactics and refused to collaborate with the then revolutionary trade unions of the N.A.S. (Netherlands workers secretariat) and demanded their dissolution, has caused great damage to the revolutionary movement of Holland. In the question of the formation of a government, when he offered to form a joint government with the social democrats; in the colonial question, in which he shared the opinions of the Austro-Marxists; in the question of the preparation, instigation and independent leadership of economic struggles, i. e. in all main questions of revolutionary policy, he adopted the position of the opportunists.

Instead of organising a wide-scale campaign and to show the working class, on the basis of the whole political development, the correctness of the analysis and the decisions of the Comintern and the political bankruptcy of the Wijnkoop group, the Party leadership of the C. P. of Holland restricted itself to press polemics, in which it declared the whole action to be a manoeuvre. It submitted to the leadership of the Wijnkoop group the following conditions, which do not fully correspond to the political situation and to the general line of the Comintern:

- a) that the members of the Wijnkoop group immediately enter the local groups of the C. P. H.
- b) that the whole apparatus, all property and debts of the Wijnkoop group and its local branches be transferred into the hands of the C. P. H.
- c) that "Kommunistische Gids" ceases to appear after 1st July;
- d) that meetings of the local branches of the Wijnkoop group be organised by the secretariat of the C. P. H., the Wijnkoop group and the local branches;
- e) at these meetings, where a representative of the Comintern should be present if possible, the members of the Wijnkoop group are immediately to enter the C. P. H.;
- f) With regard to the readmission of D. J. Wijnkoop, G. van Burink, J. Brommert and J. Hoogcarpsel, a decision of the Comintern itself is necessary.

Apart from the fact that these conditions tend to represent the Wijnkoop group as an independent organisation and an equal factor, they are also politically too weak. After an agreement between the Comintern and the Party leadership of Holland the organisation of the campaign was laid down. At great public meetings the political importance of the dissolution of the Wijnkoop group was pointed out in connection with the concrete political questions. Great discussions ensued at all the meetings in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Groningen, Wijnshoten, Heerenveen, Hengelo and Utrecht. Followers of the Wijnkoop group attempted to justify the policy of their leaders. After the discussion and the concluding speeches of the representatives of the Comintern and of the C. P. H. the political resolution submitted by the C. P. H. was everywhere adopted either by a great majority or unanimously. This resolution declares that experience has confirmed the correctness of the policy of the Comintern and the political bankruptcy of the renegade groups Brandler-Thalheimer (Germany), Lovestone (America), Hais (Czechoslovakia), Kilboom (Sweden). At the same time the resolution characterised the political bankruptcy of the Wijnkoop leadership. Whilst all the speakers in the discussion agreed with the political line of the resolution, the followers of Wijnkoop usually opposed that portion of the

resolution which characterises the political bankruptcy of their leadership. On the other hand, they emphatically rejected the political position of the Brandler people and did not wish to be identified with them. These speakers, who expressed the opinions of the revolutionary dock workers of Rotterdam and of the agricultural workers of Friesland and who had hitherto followed Wijnkoop, are for the greater part proletarian elements. Their speeches show how grave are the mistakes of the leadership of the Wijnkoop group which for years had kept these proletarians away from the Comintern.

The political importance of the dissolution of the Wijnkoop group and the entrance of its members into the C.P.H. has been better understood by our political opponents than by many of our members. The social democratic and bourgeois papers are attempting, by means of an increased campaign of calumny, to carry confusion into the ranks of the members of the C.P.H. and of the Wijnkoop followers. And just like the bourgeois-social democratic united front, Brandier also is writing in his paper "Gegen den Strom" on the capitulation of the Wijnkoop group. Just like the bourgeoisie, he designates the carrying out of the political line of the Comintern on the occasion of the dissolution of the Wijnkoop group as self-humiliation.

After the carrying out of the first campaign, in which nearly all the Wijnkoop workers voted for the political line of the Comintern, the result of the second campaign was no longer in doubt. At the so-called liquidation meetings, which were held under the leadership of the Comintern, almost everywhere entrance into the C.P.H. was unanimously decided upon. **Thus the dissolution of the group has taken place.** If now some leading functionaries of the former Wijnkoop group are attempting to carry on their old group fractionism, the proletarian revolutionary workers will soon put a stop to such actions. **Their attempt at some meetings to bring the Party leadership of the C.P.H. into opposition to the Comintern, has already failed. The Comintern welcomes every worker who enters its ranks in order to fight for the aims of the revolution. But there is no doubt that it will ruthlessly crush any attempt to maintain a fraction and group ideology.**

If the most prominent leaders of the former Wijnkoop group, Wijnkoop, Brommert, van Burink, Hoogcarpsel submit a declaration in which they recognise their serious political mistakes and confirm the correctness of the policy of the Comintern, it is a further proof, that all the groups which separate from the Comintern are doomed to political bankruptcy. The Executive which expelled Wijnkoop will have to decide on the readmittance of these four leading functionaries.

After the admission of the members of the former Wijnkoop group into the Party it is now necessary to solve the tasks confronting the Party in joint revolutionary work.

In the present situation, when the effects of the world economic crises are also plainly visible in Holland, the bourgeoisie and their lackeys, the social demoyrats, are exerting all their efforts in order to prevent the consolidation of the revolutionary front. The Dutch bourgeoisie is demanding, as in other countries, a reduction of wages. The reformist leaders are rendering it faithful assistance in this action.

The government submitted a naval bill according to which a further 120 million Gulden are earmarked for naval construction. This extension of the fleet the Dutch bourgeoisie seeks to justify by urging the necessity of protecting Indonesia and the naphtha wells of Deterding in the West Indies. That means, that the bourgeoisie is preparing to crush the emancipation struggle of the Indonesian colonial slaves and of the anti-imperialist struggle of the toilers. Also in the imperialist war against the Soviet Union the Dutch bourgeoisie intends to play its part.

The C.P.H. must give the right answer, by completely abandoning its sectarian attitude. The basis for the development of a revolutionary mass party is now given. This demands: enhanced work in the mass organisations, in the trade unions, sport and cultural organisations, increased work in the factories, creation of the red trade union opposition among the agricultural workers and unemployed, correct preparation of the R.I.L.U. Congress, more attention to revolutionary work among the proletarian women and youths, the recruiting of thousands of new members for the Party and subscribers to the Communist press as the first pre-conditions in order to be able to fulfil the tasks confronting the Dutch proletariat and its leading Party.

ECONOMICS

British Bourgeoisie Abandoning Free Trade.

By William Rust (London).

Something like a political bombshell was exploded in Great Britain when the leading bankers published the following manifesto:

"It is resolved that urgent measures for the promotion of inter-imperial trade are needed to secure and extend the market for British products, both at home and through the export trade.

"Bitter experience has taught Great Britain that the hopes expressed four years ago in a plea for the removal of the restrictions upon European trade have failed to be realised.

"The restrictions have been materially increased, and the sale of surplus foreign products in the British market have steadily grown.

"While we retain the hope of an ultimate extension of the area of free trade throughout the world, we believe that the immediate step for securing goods lies in reciprocal trade agreements between the nations constituting the British Empire.

„As a condition of securing these agreements, Great Britain must retain her open market for all Empire products, **while being prepared to impose duties on all imports from all other countries.**"

This manifesto is signed by a formidable list of bankers headed by McKenna of the Midland Bank and ex-Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer. Among the signatures are to be found the chairman of four of the big banks belonging to the famous "Big Five" group.

This resolution can be said to be of historical importance for it marks the definite abandonment of Free Trade principles on the part of the British ruling class and the adoption of protectionist principles, the building of a high tariff wall round the Empire and the imposition of duties on imports including food-stuffs.

The British bourgeoisie has long hesitated before taking the plunge into tariffs and they are still far from united on this policy as the emphatic declaration of the shipowners in favour of Free Trade shows. Moreover, the interests of many big manufacturers will be adversely affected by a tariff policy and their opposition is voiced through the leaders of the Liberal Party.

In a speech strongly condemning the Bankers' manifesto the Liberal leader, **Sir Herbert Samuel**, stated:

"All imports are to be liable to taxation, including food and raw materials. We import twice as much from foreign nations as from the Empire. The result of such taxation inevitably must be a rise in the price of food and raw materials.

"When people spoke of Empire countries they were accustomed to think only of the Dominions, but it was a surprising fact that out of the population of the Empire three out of four were Indians. When they were considering any trade arrangements with the Empire the position of India occupied the foremost place.

"Did these bankers anticipate that they would be able to persuade Bombay millowners to allow free importation of Lancashire cottons by an offer to India of a preference to Assam tea growers, Indian jute, or other raw materials produced in India? And it was clear from the declarations of Dominion Prime Ministers that it was impossible to expect the Dominions to surrender their industries."

This change in fiscal policy is of course essentially a move to intensify the exploitation of the colonies and to drive America out of the Empire markets. It is a policy which whilst in no way overcoming the economic crisis in British Empire, will also inevitably sharpen the Anglo-American struggle for the markets of the world.

Foreign comment on the bankers manifesto is decidedly hostile:

"It is a policy which, if carried out, may seriously affect the United States, as the British Empire and all its ports take about 40 per cent. of our exports and furnish us with about 30 per cent., of our imports" declares the "New York Tribune".

The "Berliner Tageblatt" expresses the views of the German capitalists when it states that "at the best the practical consequences will be very unpleasant for Europe and may become dangerous".

The note is clear. The adoption of protectionist principles by the British capitalists will make the struggle for markets even more bitter. For this struggle there is only one outcome — imperialist war.

The bankers, however, will not be dismayed by this hostility for have they not got the wholehearted backing of the social-fascist General Council of the Trades Union Congress?

The **General Council** recently issued a report favouring treating the Empire as an "economic group" and cautiously advising that consideration be given to a change of fiscal policy. This report was drawn up in conjunction with the Federation of British Industries and was a culmination of the notorious Mondist negotiations.

Not to be left in the cold **G. D. H. Cole**, the leading social-fascist economist, hastens to assure the bankers that he is a convert to Protection and that:

"Through a misunderstanding the Labour movement (read bureaucracy) has in the past been on the side of Free Trade, but it will not be found there much longer."

Whilst it is certain that the new fiscal policy will not be carried through by the Labour Government without considerable heartburning (food taxes is not a popular election cry) and internal dissension, yet it is equally certain that the Labour Government will beat the drum of "Empire Economic Unity" as vociferously as its Tory colleagues and that under the guidance of J. H. Thomas the Imperial Conference in September will mark the change over from Free Trade to Protectionism.

This proposed change in fiscal policy is intimately connected with the growing rationalisation drive, the development of which is very markedly shown by the publication of the Report of the **Clynes Commission** on the cotton industry. The essential feature of the proposals put forward is the intensification of the labour. The proposals are:

- 1) Introduction of automatic looms.
- 2) Abolition of single shifts and introduction of continuous working.
- 3) High draft spinning machinery and high-speed winding machinery.

Together with these proposals go the other usual propositions of finance capital: large scale amalgamations and the provision of the necessary loans from the banks.

These proposals, when carried out will still further add to the vast number of unemployed. Recent material published by the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Labour show very clearly that rationalisation has already resulted in a big increase in the number of unemployed and intensified the exploitation of labour.

An examination of ten important groups of industries, including mining, textiles, shipping and metal, and covering 50 per cent of the total number of insured persons shows that in the first quarter of the current year these industries were producing about 11 per cent more but employing 8 per cent fewer workers than in 1924.

Over the five years covered by the official figures of employment and production, the output of the workers per head has increased by no less than 21%. A year previously the corresponding figure was about 18%.

In all groups of industries other than that comprising food, drink and tobacco, this characteristic of a marked increase in productivity per head of persons employed, has made itself felt over the past five years. In coal mines and quarries the expansion in this factor has amounted to 34%. In this case it is also necessary to take into account the effect of the increase in working hours in 1926, which affected about 900,000 workers in the coal industry and involved an average expansion of 4½ hours in the working week.

This is the only instance in which an increase in production per head can be in part attributed to an increase in working hours.

In the iron and steel industry the increased productivity per worker has amounted over the past five years to 45.4%. In the other groups this increase in production per head over the past five years has been as follows: non-ferrous metals, 22%, engineering and ship building 23.7%, textiles 4.1%, chemicals 6.5%, leather, boots and shoes 19%.

These remarkable figures illustrating the growth of per capita productivity have had a marked effect on employment. In mining and quarrying the increase of 34% in per capita output has been accompanied by a **three fold increase in the number of workers unemployed.**

Capitalist rationalisation has permanently increased the number of unemployed in Great Britain.

Closing Down of Factories in Austria.

By Guido Zamis (Vienna).

The Austrian working class has been seriously affected by the closing down of the biggest undertaking in the country, the **Donawitz Iron Works of the Alpine Montan Gesellschaft**. This gigantic works, the only one in the country which can compare with the big undertakings of the heavy industry of the imperialist great Powers, was still employing 9,000 workers at the commencement of last winter. Since then there have been continual limitations of production, so that at the time of the closing down of the works not more than half that number were employed in the undertaking. And now the gigantic furnaces and the workshops, which were only recently rebuilt and equipped with the most modern machinery, have been lying idle for three weeks. The reason is the lack of orders. As, however, the management reckon with a continuation of the crisis, they have already announced that a further 600 workers are to be dismissed.

The closing down of the Donawitz works, however, is only an incident in the **decay of industry in Austria**. Let us endeavour to give a brief survey, of the general situation.

First, with regard to the **mining and smelting industry**. In May last the **Bleiberger Bergwerks Union in Carinthia** introduced a great restriction of production. Out of 1,600 workers 400 were dismissed. The discharged workers, who received such incredibly low wages that they were compelled, in addition to their arduous work underground, to rent and cultivate small allotments in order to be able to live at all, were given the advice to emigrate, as there is no prospect of their getting even casual work in agriculture.

The **Mitterberger Kupfer A.G. in Salzburg** has also restricted its production and completely closed down the smelting works, where 120 workers were employed. The same applies to the **Magnesit works in Styria**.

In the **metal industry** we have the following picture. The **Steg locomotive and engineering works in Vienna** have been completely closed down as a result of the collapse of the Bodencredit Anstalt. For the same reason the old **Sigl Locomotive Works**, one of the last of the big undertakings in Wiener Neustadt, employing 240 workers and clerks, was closed down during the last few days. The same fate threatens 460 workers employed in the **Krauss Locomotive works in Linz**. **Rothchild**, who has taken over the industrial concerns belonging to the Bodencredit Anstalt, is concentrating the building of locomotives in the Floridsdorf factory in Vienna. The **Leobersdorfer motor factory** is expected to close down before long, and there is talk of the **Austro-Fiat automobile factory** being removed to Hungary. The steel works have reduced their staffs by 30 per cent. It is well known that the famous Styrian and Austrian scythe-making industry, owing to the loss of its market to the Soviet Union, has been so badly hit that the best part of the workers engaged in this industry are forced to emigrate.

The great **automobile works in Steyr** form an apparent exception. This undertaking was also hit by the collapse of the Bodencredit Anstalt, but is to recommence work in the near future. But under what conditions! **Average wage cuts of 8 per cent**, at a time when the index of food prices is rising and just before the new duties on food and the raising of all taxes on articles of mass consumption come into force. The workers have to agree to the rights of the factory councils being restricted and, even before the coming into force of the corresponding provisions of the anti-terror law, to abandon the practice of having their trade union contributions deducted at the pay office. The resumption of the production of motor lorries in Strya is, therefore, only an apparent exception to the

general limitation of production in Austria, because it is probable that many other undertakings, before setting their factories going again, are only waiting for the moment when the workers, broken by hunger, will be ready to accept similar or even worse conditions. Moreover, in Steyr only 500 workers are to be engaged in the immediate future, and not until October is the staff be brought up to its former number of 4000. That is, however, only a vague prospect; and who can guarantee that, in the meantime, discharges may not take place in the Daimler works, which likewise belong to the Rothschild concern.

The textile industry presents a particularly gloomy picture. The collapse of the Bodencredit Anstalt has involved the liquidation of the so-called **Mautner Concern**. This had as a result that a whole number of weaving and spinning mills not only had to be temporarily closed but completely abandoned, that is to say, the sales organisation was dissolved, the machines sold abroad and only the factory walls and the workers are left behind. These last, in such small localities as Marienthal, Günzeldorf, Trattenbach etc., which possess not more than one factory, have not the least prospect of finding any other occupation. They are condemned to slow death by starvation.

In addition, the following undertakings have been closed down in the last few months: **Trumau-Marienthal cotton spinning and weaving works** employing 1,200 workers and clerks; **Erlacher textile industry A.G.**; **Vereinigte Textile industry A.G.**, with weaving and spinning mills in Günselsdorf, Neunkirchen, Trattenbach, Brunn am Gebirge, Sollenau and the textile factory Ebensee and the **Pottenstein cotton spinning works**; **Vigogne Spinning Works A.G.** (Tribuswinkel); **Nagler & Opler**, textile factory in Weigelsdorf; **Neunkirchen calico printing works**, **Wilhelmsburg thread factory**; **United Dyers, Möllersdorf**; **Spitzen industry A.G. in Viehofen and Urschendorf**. All these are concerns employing 200 to 300 workers.

In addition, in the past week the **St. Pölten artificial silk factory**, which in March last still employed 2600 workers, was closed down for 3 months.

The shoe and leather industry is only working to 25 per cent of its capacity.

We here conclude the still very incomplete list, which does not include the great number of small and middle undertakings which have gone bankrupt recently. The result is a tremendous unemployment, which has remained stationary even in Summer. In the second half of the month of June, for example, the number of unemployed workers in Vienna, in receipt of benefit declined by only 1192. At the end of June the number of unemployed registered at the Labour Exchanges in Vienna amounted to 72,762, which is 18,142 higher than at the same period last year, in spite of the great number of workers who have been deprived of benefit.

This almost stationary unemployment in Summer means that the seasonally employed building industry is not in a position to make up for the shortage of work caused by the closing down of factories. What, however, will be the situation in Winter, when the building trade will be at a standstill? **Austria will then have a record in unemployment such as Europe as not yet witnessed.**

On this background there is taking place the intensification of the class antagonism in Austria; here we see the reasons for the setting up of a fascist dictatorship, on the one hand, and for the revolutionisation of the workers, on the other hand.

The Situation in the British Metal Industry.

By Joe Scott (London).

For a period of two or three years, trade generally has been maintained, in the metal industry. The employment of workers has been fairly regular in most districts. This can be attributed to the following reasons:

1. That as a result of rationalisation in other industries, it has given cause for a certain amount of tools, equipment and machinery to be manufactured, thereby providing work and compensating losses in other directions.

2. That intense production has gone on in the motor industry in an endeavour to preserve the home market from imported cars, and to get a good cheap surplus for playing on foreign markets in competition, particularly with the USA.

3. The establishment of "new" industries in the South of England, notably cinematograph and "talkie" apparatus, gramophone and radio has helped to fill in and makes an addition

to the above. Unemployment figures up to December last have been as low (and in some periods lower) than pre-war, notably in London.

4. An additional amount of ship-repairing has been done in the ports of London and Bristol, this arising from the better equipment of ships and changing over in the burning of fuel.

This situation is rapidly changing, as a glance at the rising unemployment figures during the last three months will show. Many district Union officials of the Amalgamated Engineering Union who have for months reported trade as good or fair, are now reporting "falling off in trade", "not any sign of trade picking up", "there seems a rise in unemployment amongst our members".

The figures of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, which has a membership of over 220,000 are an indication of this:

January 1930 . . .	13,644	unemployed . . .	6.54 per cent
May 1930 . . .	17,535	unemployed . . .	8.38 per cent

Also the figures given in the Ministry of Labour Gazette for May 1930 show the same process. The following tables show the numbers and percentages of insured workpeople unemployed at the 20th April, 1930, and the increase or decrease as compared with the month, and the year before.

	Engineering		Percentage	
	Number unemployed	of employed	April 1930	April 1929
General Engineering . . .	86,321	14.7	13.8	9.1
Electrical Engineering . .	5,546	6.6	6.0	4.9
Marine Engineering	7,466	12.8	11.8	10.4
Constructional Engineering	4,248	15.0	15.5	12.3
Motor Vehicles, Cycles and Aircraft	22,920	9.3	9.8	5.2
Total . . .	126,501	12.6	12.0	8.0

Iron and Steel Manufacture

The percentage of insured workpeople unemployed, including those temporarily stopped, as indicated by the number of unemployment books lodged at Employment Exchanges, was 30.9 at 28th of April 1930, as compared with 26.1 at 24th March 1930, and 18.3 at 22nd April, 1929.

Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing

Number unemployed April, 1930	Increase compared with April 1929			
	%	number	%	number
55,528	27.2	221	0.2	9,346

This shows that the engineering employers will actually prepare now to attack wages and conditions. During the last six years negotiations have been proceeding between the employers and unions for increased wages, but at the last Conference the Unions suggested submitting the case to arbitration. This the employers decided to agree to, and the Unions approached the Labour Government to set up a Court of Enquiry similar to that of cotton and iron and steel trades enquiry.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union's National Committee rejected a resolution condemning this action, so therefore the policy is now endorsed by the largest Union concerned.

The most important issue just now is that of "manning machines". The employers drive is to classify machines, semi- or unskilled, and drop the rate of wages accordingly. This is a particular issue in Manchester and Lancashire generally.

There is little doubt that the "boom" period in the metal industry has now passed and that unemployment will become more rampant, and that we can expect attacks by the employers, first on general working conditions through rationalisation, and secondly on wages and piece prices. The situation is favourable for the Minority Movement provided the correct tactics are adopted. With the disillusionment of the workers arising out of the way in which the wages question, particularly, has been dealt with, there will be a great falling away from the unions. The Minority Movement must therefore conduct an intensified fight to obtain a hold inside the unions and also to extend its influence in the factories.

BOOK REVIEWS

N. Bukharin: "The Economic Theory of the Leisure Class"

By Hermann Duncker (Berlin).

Marx gave to the total presentation of his economic theory the sub-title: "The Critique of Political Economic". He developed his own system in a penetrating examination of the shortcomings and limitations of bourgeois Economy, and this in its completest form, i. e. the classical school of political economy (Adam Smith and David Ricardo).

After Marx's death Marxism practically confined itself to popularising the economic fundamental teachings of Marx and defending them against the various bourgeois attacks. The "Critique of Political Economy" that is the further development of bourgeois economic doctrines, came to occupy quite a second place. Even the works of some former Marxists such as Hilferding, Eckstein, Parvus, Boudin and others, which were directed specially against the Austrian exponent of bourgeois political economy, against the lion of anti-Marxism, Böhm-Bawerk, were restricted right from the outset by their purely apologetic character.

Thus Bukharin's work, "The Economic Theory of the Leisure Class", which was written in 1914, published in Russian in 1919, and has since appeared in English,* is a very valuable extension and deepening of these older Marxist criticisms of Böhm-Bawerk. Bukharin subjects this celebrated bourgeois theory to a most thorough criticism. He dissolves the system from within by exposing, step by step, the faulty logic, false reasoning and absurdities of Böhm-Bawerk's positive theory. Thus, not only is Böhm-Bawerk's attack on Marx repelled (as has been done by others before Bukharin), but by demonstrating the fundamentally false structure of Böhm-Bawerk's system itself, the correctness of Marxist economy is confirmed. For Böhm-Bawerk furnishes the exact antithesis to Marx. And this very antithesis is revealed as impossible and ridiculous.

The theory of value and surplus value forms the nucleus of the whole of economic science — that is the only point on which Marx and Böhm-Bawerk agree. But for Marx, the exchange value of a commodity arises from the (to the purchaser and consumer) objectively given social character of production, and this in its specially historical form of commodity production. For Böhm-Bawerk, on the other hand, value is determined by the purely subjective valuation of an article on the part of the consumer.

"The following sociological bases of economic science are characteristic of Marxism: recognition of the priority of society over the individual; recognition of the historical, temporary nature of any social structure; and finally, recognition of the dominant part played by production. The Austrian School, on the other hand, is characterised by extreme individualism in methodology, by an unhistorical point of view, and by its taking consumption as its point of departure (Bukharin, page 36).

Thus Böhm-Bawerk — he is the great master of the Austrian School — embodies a complete antithesis to the ideology of the proletariat (Bukharin, page 32). The Böhm-Bawerk ideology, as Bukharin clearly shows, is the political economy of the Rentier whose "sphere of activities" is the sphere of consumption, of the one-time factory owner who has become a mere parasitic shareholder and is thus removed from the sphere of production. The coupon-clipping Rentier is thereby at the same time estranged from real social life. He is therefore a pronounced individualist, for individualism has always been the moral philosophy of the bourgeoisie: Every man for himself, and God for us all! For this bourgeois world there must not be any historical change. Such phenomena as profit, interest on capital, etc., are regarded by it as eternal attributes of human society.

Bukharin shows how, out of the economic conditions there develops the economic consciousness, i. e. the political economy of the Rentier. From the actual conditions of life of the bour-

geoisie he explains their idealised forms in the political "economy" of Böhm-Bawerk, which is rightly described by him as "the scientific weapon of the international Rentier" (Page 34), and which therefore merits the critical study which Bukharin devotes to it. Even today after Böhm-Bawerk's death, anti-marxist economy still follows mainly the ideas of the Austrian School.

What, however, is the celebrated theory of marginal utility, which Böhm-Bawerk laid down as the foundation of his economic theories? A psychological playing with ideas, which in the best case can only explain the valuation of a stock of goods which cannot be increased and for which there exists no possibility of exchange. It should be further added that Böhm-Bawerk only succeeds in maintaining his subjective theory of value by smuggling into his solution of the problem the objective price, which is something he is unable to explain.

For Böhm-Bawerk the problem of value is only the bridge to the theory of profit. He represents profit as being an absolute phenomenon of all economic life. For in the world of Böhm-Bawerk profit has nothing to do with exploitation! And therefore the scientific rentier makes the deduction that, any employment of means of production — which, of course, right from pre-historic times have always been "capital" — means a profitable "roundabout way", a "sacrifice of time". Means of production such as labour are future goods, as they are only converted into consumable goods in a definite future. But the Rentier estimates the present higher than the future. The difference between the estimation of the value of such present "future goods" and of the future "present goods" derived from them is profit. One always buys means of production and Labour "cheap", as one has thereby secured the future "increase of value".

Bukharin follows Böhm-Bawerk like a bloodhound through his labyrinth of sophistry in order to demonstrate the nonsensical character of this structure. A truly tedious job! But it had to be undertaken in order to expose for all time the hollowness of the most celebrated bourgeois attempt to justify profit.

The appearance of this work in English is to be particularly welcomed as being a valuable addition to the Marxist literature accessible to English and American workers, and the publishers have done well in including it in their "Marxist Library" Series. The book calls for a certain amount of practice in deciphering economic abstractions. But those who enjoy a game of mental chess will follow with increasing interest the way in which the Marxist skilfully places the bourgeois savant in check at every move and utterly routs him. In comparing the fundamental teachings of the classical school of bourgeois Economy with the work of Böhm-Bawerk, however, one is reminded of the well known words of Engels: "The nearer the Economists approach the present, the farther they depart from honesty."

TO OUR READERS!

The montly 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 dollars for three months, 3.50 dollars for six months and 6 dollars for one year.

*) International Publishers, New York. Price 2.50 Dollar.

XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Political Report of the Central Committee to the XVI. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

By J. Stalin.

Text of Address delivered on 27th June 1930 (Conclusion).

C. Agricultural tasks.

1. The problem of **livestock breeding and technical plants**. Now that we have essentially solved the grain problem, we can proceed to the work of simultaneously solving the livestock breeding problem — at the moment a vital question — and the problem of technical plants. In solving these problems we must pursue the same path as in the solution of the grain problem, that is, we must gradually reorganise the technical and economic basis of the present small peasant system of livestock breeding and cultivation of technical plants by means of the organisation of Soviet and collective farms, the fulcrums of our policy. "Cattle breeding", "sheep breeding", "pig breeding", "dairy trust", plus collective livestock breeding undertakings. The existing Soviet and collective agricultural undertakings engaged in the cultivation of technical plants are the starting points of the solution of this problem.

2. The problem of the **further development of the Soviet and collective farms**. It need scarcely be emphasised that for our advancement in the village this problem is of **paramount importance**. Now even the blind must see that among the peasantry a mighty and decisive turn from the old to the new has taken place; from enslavement under the kulak to the free life of the collectives. There is no going back to the old. The kulak system is condemned to extinction, and will disappear. Only one way remains open, the way of the collective farm; and this way is no longer unknown and untried. It has been tried and tested by the peasants themselves in a thousand ways. Tried and judged as something new, something bringing the peasants liberation from enslavement under the kulaks, from want and ignorance. This is the fundamental point of our achievements.

How will the movement in the village develop further? The Soviet farms, our most powerful aid in the reorganisation of the structure of the village, will march at the head. They will be followed by the numerous collective farms furthering the new movement in the villages. The collaboration of the two systems creates the conditions for the complete collectivisation of every part of the Soviet Union.

One of the most remarkable achievements of the collective farming movement is the fact that it has already produced thousands of peasant **organisers** and tens of thousands of **agitators**. We, the qualified Bolsheviks, are no longer alone; the peasants on the collective farms, the tens of thousands of peasant organisers and agitators for the cause of the collective farming movement, now bear forward the banner of collectivisation. They are splendid agitators for the collective farms, for they find arguments in favour of collectivisation which are comprehensible and acceptable to other peasants, arguments which would never occur to us, the qualified Bolsheviks, even in a dream.

Here and there we hear of the necessity of abandoning the policy of entire collectivisation. There are signs that adherents of this "idea" are to be found even in our Party. But only those who have, consciously or unconsciously, joined with the enemies of communism can speak thus. The method of entire collectivisation is that necessary method without which the carrying out of the Five-Year Plan of collectivisation in every district of the Soviet Union is impossible. How can we renounce this method without betraying communism, without committing treason against the interests of the workers and peasants? This does not of course mean that in the work of the collective farms everything is bound to run "normally" and as if "oiled". There will always be ups and downs in the collective undertakings. There will be high and low tides. But this cannot and must not confuse the adherents of the

collective farming movement. Still less can it be regarded as a serious hindrance to the mighty development of the collective farming movement. A movement as sound as the collective farming movement undoubtedly will attain its goal in the end, in spite of the various obstacles and difficulties.

It is our task to prepare our forces and to make everything ready for the further advancement of the collective farming movement.

3. The problem of the close **rapprochement of the apparatus to the districts and villages**. There can be no doubt that we should not have mastered the stupendous task of reorganising agriculture and in developing the collective farming movement had we not adopted the system of division into rayons. The enlargement of the departments and their conversion into districts, the abolition of the gubernias and their conversion into smaller units, and finally the divisioning of districts as direct bases of the Central-Committee — this is the general picture of the rayon system. The aim of the rayon system is to bring the Party, Soviet and economic-co-operative apparatus into closer touch with the district and the village in order to create the possibility of solving in good time the acute questions of agriculture, its improvement and reconstruction.

I repeat that the rayon system has thus been able to bring great benefit to our reconstruction work.

But has everything been done to ensure real and actual contact between the apparatus and the village? No, everything has not yet been done. At the present moment the centre of gravity of the collective farming movement has been transferred to the district organisations. Here all the threads of this movement and of all other economic activities in the village, whether from the co-operatives, the Soviets, the credit and supplies services, run together. Have the district organisations enough helpers to enable them to carry out all this multifarious work? What is to be done? What steps can be taken to make good this lack and to supply the district organisation, in every sphere of our activities, with the necessary number of collaborators? For this purpose at least two things are necessary: Firstly the abolition of the sub-divisions (applause), which form a useless dividing barrier between department and district, enabling the workers thus released at the cost of the sub-divisions to reinforce the collaborators in the district organisations. Secondly, the immediate contact of district organisation and the department (department committee, central committee of the federal republic). This means the completion of the rayon organisation, the rapprochement of the apparatus to the districts and villages.

The suggestion of the abolition of the sub-divisions has been met with applause here. Certainly the sub-divisions must be liquidated. But it would be a mistake to assume that this necessity justifies us in abusing the sub-divisions, as some comrades have done in the columns of the "Pravda". It must not be forgotten that these divisions have performed much work and played a great historical rôle in their time. (Applause.) I am of the opinion that it would be an error to abolish them too hastily. The Central Committee has adopted a decision upon the question. But it does not mean that this decision is to be put into force at once. This abolition will obviously have to be preceded by the necessary preparatory work.

D. Tasks in the Transport Service.

Finally — the **problem of transport**. There is no need to waste many words on the enormous importance of the transport service for our whole national economy. And not only

for national economy! It is a well known fact that for the defence of the country the transport service is of the most serious importance. In spite of the great importance of the transport service, the reconstruction of this branch of our economics lags behind the general tempo of development. Is it necessary to point out that under these circumstances we run the danger of our transport service becoming a "weak spot" in our national economy, hindering our advance? Is it not time to put an end to this state of affairs?

Our river shipping traffic is in a particularly bad condition. It is a fact that on the Volga shipping has only attained to 60 percent of its prewar standard, on the Dniepr only

40 percent! These are the only "achievements" which our river shipping can record. Great achievements! Is it not time to put an end to this disgrace? (A voice: "It is time!")

It is our task to tackle the transport question as Bolsheviks, and to ensure that at last it makes actual progress.

These are the immediate tasks of the Party. What is required for their performance?

Above all, of paramount importance is the continuation of the offensive along the whole front against the capitalist elements, until the end: this is the central point and the basis of our policy at the present moment. (Applause).

III. The Party.

I now pass on to the question of the Party.

Earlier in my speech I spoke of the advantages of the Soviet economic system as compared with the capitalist system. I spoke of the enormous possibilities which our system offers us in the struggle for the complete victory of Socialism. I reminded you that without these possibilities, and without making full use of them, we should not have been able to attain the successes which have distinguished the period just past.

But now the question arises: has the Party shown itself capable of making full use of the possibilities given it by the Soviet system; has it not permitted these possibilities to lie unused, and thereby prevented the working class from fully and completely developing its revolutionary power; has it shown itself capable of extracting from these possibilities all that there is to be extracted for the purpose of tackling the work of socialist reconstruction along the whole front?

The Soviet system ensures enormous possibilities for the complete victory of Socialism. But the possibility is not yet the reality. In order to convert the possibility into actuality, a number of conditions must be fulfilled, and here the line of the Party and its correct pursuance play a by no means insignificant rôle.

A few examples may be given.

The right opportunists are of the opinion that the N. E. P. assures for us the victory of Socialism; hence there is no need to be anxious to promote the tempo of industrialisation, the development of the Soviet farms and collective agricultural undertakings, etc., since the victory is assured in any case, in the natural course of events, so to speak. It need not be emphasised that this is a wrong and foolish idea. To maintain this is to negate the rôle played by the Party in the building up of Socialism, the responsibility of the Party for this building up. Lenin did not by any means say that the N. E. P. guarantees us the victory. All that Lenin said was that "the N. E. P. certainly secures for us the possibility, economically and politically, of laying the foundations of socialist economy". But the possibility is not yet the reality. If the possibility is to be converted into reality, it is of first importance that the theory of the natural course of events be shaken off, our national economy reconstructed, and a determined offensive taken up against the capitalist elements in town and country.

The Right opportunists are further of the opinion that our system does not involve a split between the peasantry and the working class, and therefore it is unnecessary to ensure that a correct line of policy be laid down with respect to the social groups in the village. In any case the kulak will grow into Socialism, and the alliance between the workers and peasants will be secured in the natural course of events. This is an equally wrong and foolish idea. Those who maintain this fail to grasp that the policy of the Party, the more so that it is a Party which has the power in its hands, here forms the decisive factor determining the fate of the alliance between the workers and peasants. Lenin regarded the danger of a split between the working class and the peasantry as by no means impossible. Lenin said that "such a split is not necessarily involved in our social structure", but that should "serious class differences of opinion arise between these two classes, then the split will be unavoidable". In this connection Lenin was of the opinion that:

"It is the main task of our C. C. and of our C. C. C.,

and also of our Party as a whole, to follow with close attention the circumstances out of which the split may arise, and to prevent it; for the fate of our republic will ultimately depend on whether the peasant masses will follow the working masses and remain true to the alliance, or whether they will permit the 'Nepmen', that is, the real bourgeoisie, to separate and split them from the workers."

Consequently, a split between the working class and the peasantry is not impossible, but it is not absolutely necessary, since our system affords the possibility of avoiding this split, and of consolidating the alliance between the workers and peasants. What is now required in order to convert this possibility into reality? In order to realise the possibility of avoiding the split, the roots of capitalism must be torn up by means of the organisation of collective and Soviet farms, and we must advance from the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulak to the policy of liquidating the kulak as class.

We see that we must distinguish sharply between the possibilities contained in our system, and the utilisation of these possibilities, their conversion into reality.

Cases may occur in which the possibilities of victory exist, but the Party fails to observe them or to utilise them properly, so that instead of a victory we may experience a defeat.

The same question arises again and again: Has the Party proved capable of fully utilising the possibilities and advantages created by the Soviet system; has it done everything that can be done for the realisation of these possibilities, to the end that the maximum of success may be assured for our work of reconstruction?

In other words: Have the Party and its Central Committee guided the building up of socialism properly during the period just past?

What is necessary for the correct guidance of the Party under the present circumstances?

Apart from everything else, the correct guidance of the Party requires above all that the line of the Party is the right one, that the masses recognise the rightness of the Party line, that the Party does not confine itself to working out a general line, but superintends the carrying out of the line from day to day, that the Party carries on a determined struggle against the deviations from the general line and against a conciliatory attitude towards these deviations, and that the Party, in this struggle against the deviations, strengthens the unity of its own ranks and forges an iron discipline.

What have the Party and its Central Committee done towards the realisation of these prerequisites?

1. The Questions of the Guidance of the Building Up of Socialism.

a) The factor decisive for the standpoint of the Party at the present juncture is the transition from the offensive of Socialism on separate sectors of the economic front to the attack along the whole front, both in the field of industry and in agriculture. The 14th Party Congress was principally a Party Congress of industrialisation. The 15th Party Congress was principally a Congress of collectivisation. It was a preparation for the general attack. The period preceding the 16th Party Congress has differed from the stages already passed through in being a period of general offensive of socialism along the whole front, a period of intensified socialist con-

struction both in industry and in agriculture. The 16th Party Congress is a Congress of the **full offensive** of socialism on the **whole front** of the liquidation of the kulak as class and of the realisation of complete collectivisation.

This, summed up briefly, is the essence of the general line of our Party.

Is this line correct?

Yes, it is correct. Facts show that the general line of our Party is the only correct line. (Applause.)

Its correctness is shown by the successes and achievements which we have attained on the front of socialist reconstruction. It would never have been possible, and is still not possible, that the decisive victory won by the Party during the recent period on the front of socialist construction in town and country could be the result of a mistaken policy. Nothing but a correct general line could have gained such a victory for us.

It is shown by the howls of rage raised against the Party of late by our class enemies, the capitalists and their press, the pope and the various bishops, the social democrats and the "Russian" Mensheviks of the Abramovitsch and Dan type. The capitalists and their lackeys revile our Party, — therefore the general line of our Party is correct. (Applause.)

It is shown by the fate of Trotzkyism, well known to all. The gentlemen of the Trotzkyist camp babbled about the "degeneration" of the Soviet power, about "Thermidor", about the "inevitable victory" of Trotzkyism, and so forth. And what really happened? The decline and end of Trotzkyism. One section of the Trotzkyists has broken with Trotzkyism and has admitted, in the numerous declarations made by its representatives, that the Party has been right; these have certified the counter-revolutionary nature of Trotzkyism. The other section of the Trotzkyists has actually degenerated into typically petty bourgeois counter-revolutionists to such an extent that it has actually become a news service of the capitalist press for the affairs of the C. P. S. U. The Soviet power, on the other hand, supposed to be "degenerating" (or to have already degenerated) continues to enjoy the best of health, and is building up Socialism, thereby successfully cutting the ground from beneath the feet of the capitalist elements of our country and their petty bourgeois imitators.

It is shown by the fate, also known to all, of the Right opportunists. They wailed and lamented over the "ruined" Party line, over the "probable catastrophe" in the Soviet Union, over the necessity of "saving" the country from the Party and its leaders, etc. And what has actually happened? The Party has attained great success on every front of socialist construction, whilst the group of the Right, so anxious to "save" the country, but then obliged to admit the erroneousness of their views, are now stranded.

It is shown by the growing revolutionary activity of the working classes and the peasantry, the active support given the Party by the millions of the working masses, and finally by the unprecedented working enthusiasm of the workers and of the peasants on the collective farms, making a profound impression on the foes and friends of our country. I need make no special reference to such signs of the growing confidence in the Party as the application for membership made by whole factories and departments of undertakings, the increase in the membership of the Party by more than 600,000 between the 15th and 16th Party Congresses, and the admission of 200,000 new members to the Party in the first quarter of this year alone. What else does all this show but that the masses recognise the policy pursued by our Party to be the right one, and are ready to support it?

It must be admitted that these facts would not exist if the general line of the Party were not the only right line.

b) The Party cannot confine itself to working out the general line. Besides this it must test daily the carrying out of the general line in actual practice. It must guide the realisation of the general line by improving and perfecting, during the progress of the work, the plans being executed for the advancement of economic reconstruction, and by correcting and avoiding errors.

How has the Central Committee of our Party fulfilled this task?

The work of the C. C. in this direction has consisted chiefly in the correction and preciser determination of the Five-Year

Plan, with the object of increasing the pace and shortening terms, and in the checking of the accomplishment of the tasks set the economic organisations.

I append a few of the fundamental decisions of the Central Committee, correcting the Five-Year Plan with respect to increased tempo and shortened terms.

Smelting industry: The Five-Year Plan lays down an increase in the output of pig iron to reach 10,000 million tons by the last year. The decision of the C. C. regards this standards as insufficient, and lays down that by the last year of the Five-Year Plan the production of pig iron is to reach 17,000 million tons.

Tractor building: The Five-Year Plan lays down that the manufacture of tractors must reach the number of 55,000 by the last year of the Plan. The decision of the C. C. finds this inadequate, and lays down the number of tractors to be manufactured in the last year of the Plan at 170,000.

The same applies to **motor-car building**. Here the original plan envisaged the building of 100,000 lorries and passenger cars in the last year of the Five-Year Plan. The present decision lays down a production of 200,000.

We observe the same phenomenon in the **non-iron industry** (coloured metals), where the figures of the Five-Year Plan have been increased by more than 100%, and in the manufacture of **agricultural machinery**, where again an increase of more than 100% is laid down.

I need not refer in detail to the **combines**, which were not envisaged in the Five-Year Plan at all, but which are now planned in the last year of the Plan at a figure of at least 40,000.

Soviet farms: The Five-Year Plan envisages an increase of the area under cultivation up to 5 million hectares in the last year. The decision of the C. C. regards this as insufficient, and considers that by the end of the Five-Year Plan the area cultivated by the Soviet farms must reach 18 million hectares.

Collective farms: The Five-Year Plan lays down an increase of the cultivated area up to 20 million hectares by the last year. The decision of the C. C. regards this figure as obviously too low (it has already been exceeded this year), and considers that by the end of the Five-Years the collectivisation of the Soviet Union must be practically completed, and that by that time the area cultivated by the collective farms must comprehend nine-tenths of the total cultivated area of the Soviet Union, at present tilled by the individual peasant farms. (Applause.)

And so forth.

This gives an idea of the essentials of the leadership of the C. C. in the realisation of the general line of the Party, of the organisation of the building up of socialism on the system of planned economy.

It may be objected that such fundamental alterations in the figures of the Five-Year Plan on the part of the C. C. violate the principle of planned economy, and diminish the authority of the organs of our planned economy. But it is only hopeless bureaucrats who can bring forward this argument. To us Bolsheviks the Five-Year Plan is not something fixed and settled for ever. To us the Five-Year Plan is the same as any other plan, accepted as being approximate, but which must be more precisely defined, altered, and perfected in accordance with the experience gained on the spot in putting the plan into practice. No Five-Year Plan can take into account all the possibilities lying dormant in the depths of our system, and only brought to light in the process of work, in the course of the realisation of the plan in the works and factories, collective and Soviet farms, districts, etc. Only bureaucrats can believe that the work of planning economics is **finished** with the drawing up of the Plan. The drawing up of the plan is only the **beginning of planned economy**. The real guidance of economy on planned lines does not begin until after the plan has been drawn up, after trials have been made on the spot, and during the course of the realisation, revision, and preciser definition of the Plan.

Therefore the C. C. and the C. C. C., conjointly with the planned economic organs of the Soviet Union, consider it necessary to correct and improve the Five-Year Plan in accordance with the experience gained, and to increase the

tempo of reconstruction and to shorten the terms within which certain aims are to be reached.

At the VIII. Soviet Congress, during the discussion of the ten-year plan of the State Electrification Commission, Lenin made the following observations on the principle of planned economy and planned economic directives:

"Our programme of the Party cannot remain only a programme of the Party. It must become the programme of our economic reconstruction, otherwise it is worth nothing even as Party programme. It must be supplemented by a second programme of the Party, by a working plan for the restoration of the whole of our national economy and its raising to the level of modern technics. . . . We must come to accepting a definite programme. This will of course be an approximate programme. This programme of the Party will not be so unalterable as our real programme, which can only be altered at the Party Congresses. No. This programme will be improved, worked out, perfected, and altered every day, in every workshop, in every village community. . . . The experience yielded by science, and by the daily work in the workshops, must be utilised in our unwearying efforts to fulfil the plan before the time fixed, so that the masses may see that by means of experience we may shorten the long period dividing us from the complete restoration of industry. This depends upon us. Let us improve our economy in every workshop, in every depot, in every field of work! Then we shall shorten the terms. And we shall shorten them." Vol. 17. p. p. 423/27. Russian.)

It will be seen that the C.C., in altering and improving the Five-Year Plan, in shortening the terms and accelerating the tempo, has followed the path indicated by Lenin.

What are the possibilities upon which the C.C. has relied in accelerating the speed and shortening the terms for the execution of the Five-Year Plan? These possibilities are the reserves lying dormant in the depths of our system, and only revealed in the course of the work; the possibilities which have been given us by the period of reconstruction. The C.C. is of the opinion that the reconstruction of the technical basis of industry and agriculture, given the socialist organisation of production, opens up such possibilities of accelerated tempo as no capitalist country may even dream of.

It is solely this circumstance which makes it possible to explain why our socialist industry has more than doubled its production in the last three years, and why, production in 1930/31 will show an increase of 47 per Cent as compared with the current year, the extent of this increase alone being equal to the total production of large scale industry before the war.

It is solely this circumstance which makes it possible to explain the fact that the development of the Soviet farms has exceeded the Plan within three years, that of the collective farms within two.

There exists a theory that a high speed of development is only permissible in the restoration period, whilst the transition to the reconstruction period must be accompanied by a sharp reduction of speed from year to year. This theory is designated the theory of the descending curve". It is a theory for the justification of our backwardness. It has nothing in common with Marxism or with Leninism. It is a bourgeois theory, calculated to anchor our country fast in its backwardness. Of the people who have, or have had, relations to our Party, it is only the Trotzkyists, and perhaps the Right, who represent and propagate this theory.

Among the Trotzkyists the idea prevails that they are representatives of over-industrialisation. This view is, however, only partially correct.

It is only correct in so far as the close of the restoration period comes in question, at which juncture the Trotzkyists certainly did advance fantastic over-industrialisation ideas. But with respect to the reconstruction period the Trotzkyists, viewed from the standpoint of our tempo, are the most extreme minimumists and lamentable capitulators. (Laughter, applause.) The Trotzkyists, in their declarations and platforms, make no statistical statements with respect to our tempo, but confine themselves to general chatter on the subject. But one document exists in which the Trotzkyists state in figures their views of the tempo of the development of state industry. I refer to the report of the "Special Conference for the Restoration of Basic Capital" in state industry,

based on the principles of Trotzkyism. It may be of interest to devote a few words to this document, which was issued 1925/26. It is of interest for the reason that in this document the Trotzkyist schedule of the descending curve meets with complete defeat.

According to this document, the amounts to be invested in state industry were to be as follows: 1926/27 1543 million roubles, 1927/28 1490 million roubles, 1928/29 1320 million roubles, 1929/30 1060 million roubles (on the basis of the prices obtaining in 1926/27).

That is the picture from the viewpoint of the descending Trotzkyist curve.

What amounts have we actually invested? De facto we have invested the following sums in state industry: 1926/27 1065 million roubles, 1927/28 1304 million roubles, 1928/29 1819 million roubles, and 1929/30 4775 million roubles (on the basis of the prices obtaining in 1926/27).

That is the picture shown by the ascending Bolshevik curve.

According to this document, the production of state industry was to increase in 1926/27 by 31.6 per Cent, 1927/28 by 22.9 per Cent, 1928/29 by 15.5 per Cent, and 1929/30 by 15 per Cent.

That is the picture shown by the descending Trotzkyist curve.

What have we attained in reality? In actual fact the growth of state industry has been as follows: 1926/27 19.7 per Cent, 1927/28 26.3 per Cent, 1928/29 24.3 per Cent, 1929/30 32 per Cent; in 1930/31 it will reach 47 per Cent.

That is the picture shown by the ascending Bolshevik curve.

As you know, Trotzky advanced this capitulative theory of the descending curve particularly in his book "Towards Socialism or Capitalism". Here he states in so many words that since "before the war the expansion of industry consisted mainly of the building of new plant", and "at the present time the expansion consists to a much greater extent in the utilisation of the old plant and undertakings", "it is only natural that with the close of the process of restoration the co-efficient of growth is bound to sink considerably". He suggests that "during the next few years the co-efficients of industrial growth be increased to not only double, but triple the 6 per Cent of before the war, if not more".

Three times 6 per Cent of annual industrial growth! How much does that amount to? A total of 18 per Cent yearly. In the eyes of the Trotzkyists 18 per Cent yearly is therefore the maximum growth of state industrial production under the conditions of accelerated development created by planned economics in the period of reconstruction—that maximum towards which we are to strive as an ideal. Let us compare this chandler-shop wisdom of the Trotzkyists with the actual growth of production in the last three years (1927/28 26.3 per Cent, 1928/29 24.3 per Cent and 1929/30 32 per Cent). Let us compare the philosophy of capitulation of the Trotzkyists with the 47 per Cent increase shown by the control figures of the State Planning Commission for 1930/31, exceeding the most rapid of increase of production during the restoration period—and we shall gain a clear conception of the entirely reactionary character of the Trotzkyist theory of the "descending curve", the whole profundity of the Trotzkyist lack of faith in the possibilities of the reconstruction period.

This is the reason why the Trotzkyists are now lamenting over the "excessive" Bolshevik tempo in the development of industry and of the collective farms.

This is the reason why to-day it is no longer possible to differentiate the Trotzkyists from our Right opportunists.

It is self-evident that without destroying the Trotzkyist-Right-opportunist theory of the "descending curve", we should not have been able to carry out either a really planned system of economy or to increase the tempo and shorten the terms. In order to guide the realisation of the general line, to correct and improve the Five-Year Plan of reconstruction, to increase the tempo, and to guard against errors in the work of reconstruction, it was first of all necessary to shatter and liquidate the reactionary theory of the "descending curve".

As I have already stated, the C.C. has acted on these lines.

2. Questions of the Leadership in Inner Party Affairs.

It might be assumed that the work of guiding the building up of Socialism, of carrying out the general line in the Party, has proceeded quietly and without friction, without struggle and effort. But this is not so, comrades. In actual fact the work has been carried on amidst the struggle against the inner Party difficulties, amidst the struggle against all manner of deviations from Leninism, both in the sphere of general policy and in the national question. Our Party does not live and move in empty space. It lives and moves in the midst of daily life, and is influenced by its surroundings. And in our case these surroundings consist, as you know, of various classes and social groups. We have taken up the intensified offensive against the capitalist elements, we have made great headway with our socialised industry, we have exerted our utmost forces in the development of the Soviet and collective farms. Such advances as these are not without their effect on the exploiting classes. As a rule they are accompanied by the ruin of the disappearing classes, by the ruin of the kulak in the village, by the limitation of the field of activity of the petty bourgeois strata of the towns. It is quite understandable that all this is bound to arouse a sharper class struggle, a greater resistance to the policy of the Soviet power on the part of the declining classes. It would be ridiculous to suppose that the resistance of these classes does not find its reflection, in one way or another, in the ranks of our Party. And as a matter of fact it is reflected in our Party. The reflection of the resistance of the classes on the verge of extinction is to be seen precisely in the various deviations from the Leninist line observable in the ranks of the Party.

Can we carry on a successful struggle against the class enemy without fighting simultaneously against the deviations in our Party, and without overcoming these deviations? We cannot, for the reason that it is impossible to take up the real struggle against the class enemy so long as that enemy's viewpoint is still reflected in our own ranks, and so long as we have people in our rear who have no faith in our cause, and who are endeavouring in every possible way to hamper our efforts to advance.

Hence the irreconcilable struggle against the deviations from the Leninist line is the most urgent task of the Party.

Why is the Right deviation the chief danger in the Party at the present time? Because this deviation reflects the kulak danger, and at the present moment, the moment of the developed offensive and of the uprooting of capitalism, the kulak danger is the greatest danger threatening the country.

What must the C.C. do in order to overcome the Right deviation, to remove the last traces of the "Left" deviation, and to clear the path for the maximum concentration of the Party around the Leninist line?

a) First of all the last remnants of Trotskyism, the last remnants of Trotskyist theory, must be cleared out of the Party. We have long since shattered the Trotskyist group as opposition, and swept it out of the Party. Now the Trotskyist group represents an anti-proletarian and anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary group, industriously keeping the bourgeoisie informed as to the affairs of the Party. The Party has not yet been quite cleared of the last residue of Trotskyist theory, of Trotskyism. First of all, therefore, this last residue must be cleared away.

What is the essential character of Trotskyism? The essence of Trotskyism lies above all in its denial of the possibility of building up Socialism in the Soviet Union with the forces of the working class and the peasantry. What does this mean? It means that unless we before long receive the aid of the victorious world revolution, we shall be obliged to capitulate to the bourgeoisie, and to make room for a bourgeois-democratic republic. Here we are faced with a bourgeois denial of the possibility of building up Socialism in our country, a denial veiled in "revolutionary" phrases on the victory of the world revolution. Are such views calculated to arouse the millions of the working masses to work, to socialist competition, to the mass movement of the shock troops, to the intensified offensive against the capitalist elements? It is clear that they are not. It would be foolish to assume that our working class, which has passed through three revolutions, would permit itself to be won over for the mass movement of the shock troops, or be filled with enthusiasm for work, if all this is but to manure the soil for

capitalism. Our working class is not putting its shoulder to the wheel for the sake of capitalism, but to the end that capitalism may be finally exterminated and Socialism established in the Soviet Union. If you deprive the working class of its conviction of the possibility of building up Socialism, you cut from under its feet the very basis of socialist competition, of working energy, of the shock troops.

Hence the conclusion: In order to win over the workers for intensified work, and for the shock troops, and in order to organise the developed offensive, it is of first importance that the bourgeois theory of Trotskyism—the theory of the impossibility of building up Socialism in our country—be finally buried.

Secondly, it is part of the essential character of Trotskyism that it denies the possibility of inducing the decisive masses of the peasantry to participate in the work of building up Socialism in the village. What does this mean? It means that the working class is unable to draw the peasantry along with it in bringing over the individual peasant farms to the collective system, so that unless the world revolution comes to the aid of the working class, the peasantry will restore the old bourgeois order. Here we have a bourgeois denial of the power and possibility of the proletarian dictatorship to win over the peasants to Socialism, a denial concealed behind the mask of "revolutionary" phrases on the victory of the world revolution. Can such views as these bring the peasantry into the collective farming movement, or organise the liquidation of the kulak as a class? It is clear that they cannot.

Hence the conclusion: In order to organise the collective farming movement and to liquidate the kulak, it is of first importance to bury the bourgeois theory advanced by Trotskyism, that it is impossible to include the masses of the working peasantry in Socialism.

Finally, it is part of the essential character of Trotskyism that it denies the necessity of an iron discipline in the Party, and maintains the necessity of forming the Trotskyist party. According to Trotskyist conceptions, the C.P.S.U. should not be a united and firmly-welded fighting Party, but a loose assemblage of groups and fractions, each with its own centres, its own press, etc. And what does this mean? It means the proclamation of the freedom of political fractions in the Party. It means that the freedom to form political groupings within the Party must be followed by the freedom of political parties in the country, that is, by bourgeois democracy. Here we have an assertion of the right to form fractional groups in the Party, involving the permission to form political parties in the land of the proletarian dictatorship; this is concealed behind the phraseology of the "inner Party democracy" and of the "improvement of the regime". Trotskyism is not capable of comprehending that the freedom of fractional squabbles is not inner Party democracy, but that the open self-criticism promoted by the Party, and the tremendous activity of the Party masses, form a very real and genuine inner Party democracy. Can such views of the Party secure that iron discipline in the Party, that iron unity in the Party, which is necessary for the successful struggle against the class enemy? It is clear that they cannot.

Hence the conclusion: In order to ensure the iron unity and proletarian discipline of the Party, it is first of all necessary to bury the organisational theory of Trotskyism.

The essential character of Trotskyism is, actual capitulatory attitude as **content**, "Left" phraseology and adventurous "revolutionary" gestures as **form**, concealing and camouflaging the capitulatory content.

The inconsistency of Trotskyism mirrors the inconsistent position of the impoverished petty bourgeoisie, which cannot bear the "regime" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and endeavours either to spring over "immediately" into Socialism and to avoid ruin (hence **adventurism** and **hysteria** in politics), or, where this is impossible, to make every concession to capitalism (hence the **capitulatory** policy).

This inconsistency in Trotskyism explains the fact that as a rule Trotskyism crowns its "raging" sham attacks upon the Right deviations by forming a bloc with these as capitulators without masks.

What are these "Left" derailings observable in the Party in the field of the collective farming movement? These represent a certain attempt, though an unconscious one, to revive among us in actual practice the traditions of Trotskyism, the Trotskyist attitude towards the middle peasant. They are the result of that error of policy which Lenin named

"over-administration". This means that some of our comrades, carried away by the successes of the collective farming movement, have tacked the work of building up the collectives not so much as builders, but as administrators, and thereby permitted a number of serious errors to creep in.

There are some people in our Party who believe that the "Left" sectarians should not have been called to order. These are of the opinion that our Party workers should not have been offended and their enthusiasm damped, even where this enthusiasm led to errors. This is nonsense, comrades. People who can speak like this are only people anxious to swim with the stream. These same people will never be able to follow the Leninist line; they will never be able to swim against the current when the situation demands it, when the interests of the Party require it. These are follow-in-the-wake politicians, not Leninists. That the Party has been successful in leading so many comrades back to the right path, that it has been successful in correcting the errors and attaining successes, is due to precisely the fact that it has gone determinedly against the current in the interests of the realisation of the general line. And this is Leninism in actual practice, Leninism in leadership.

And therefore I believe that unless we had overcome the "Left" derailings we should not have been able to attain our present successes in the collective farming movement.

This is the actual practice of the struggle against the last remnants of Trotzkyism and against relapses into Trotzkyism.

The matter is somewhat different in the question of Right opportunism, which is led, or has been led, by Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky.

It cannot be said of the Right that they fail to recognise the possibility of building up Socialism in the Soviet Union. No, this they recognise, and in this they differ from the Trotzkyists. But it is the misfortune of the Right opportunists that whilst they admit the possibility of building up Socialism in one country, they refuse to recognise the ways and means of struggle without which the building up of Socialism is impossible. They refuse to recognise that the all-round development of industry is the key to the reorganisation of our whole national economy on the basis of Socialism. They refuse to recognise the irreconcilable class struggle against the capitalist elements and the intensified offensive against capitalism. They do not grasp that all these ways and means represent that system of measures without which it is impossible to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and to build up Socialism in our country. They believe that Socialism can be built up secretly, in the natural course of events, without class struggle, without an offensive against the capitalist elements. They believe that the capitalist elements will either die out unnoticeably by themselves, or will grow into Socialism. And as such historical miracles do not happen, the result is that in actual fact the Right opportunists are slipping into an attitude denying the possibility of building up Socialism in our country.

It cannot be said of the Right opportunists, again, that they deny the possibility of drawing the decisive masses of the peasantry into the task of the building up of Socialism in the village. No, they recognise this. And here again they differ from the Trotzkyists. But whilst formally recognising this possibility, they reject those ways and means without which the drawing of the peasantry in the work of building up of Socialism is impossible. They will not admit that the Soviet and collective farms form the decisive means, the "great road" leading the decisive masses of the peasantry to the building up of Socialism. They will not admit that unless the policy of liquidating the kulak as a class is carried out, the reorganisation of the village on the basis of Socialism is impossible. They believe that the village can be shunted onto the track of Socialism, secretly, without class war, solely by means of the buying and selling co-operatives; for they are convinced that the kulak will grow into Socialism of himself. They believe that at the present juncture the point of the greatest importance is not the accelerated pace in the development of industry, and not the collective and Soviet farms, but the "release" of the elementary forces of the market, the "liberation" of the market and the liberation of the individual farm, including the capitalist elements of the village, from their "fetters". But since the kulak cannot grow into Socialism, and the "liberation" of the market signifies the arming of the kulak and the disarming of the working class,

it results that the Right opportunists adopt a standpoint denying the possibility of inducing the participation of the decisive masses of the peasantry in the building up of Socialism.

This explains, at bottom, the fact that the Right generally conclude their cockfights against the Trotzkyists by forming a bloc with them behind the scenes.

The fundamental evil of Right opportunism is the fact that it breaks with the Leninist conception of the class war, and sinks down to the level of petty bourgeois liberalism.

There can be no doubt that the victory of the Right deviation in our Party would mean the complete disarmament of the working class, the arming of the capitalist elements in the village, and increased prospects for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The Right opportunists do not adopt the standpoint that they should form another party, and here again they differ from the Trotzkyists. The leaders of the Right opportunists have openly admitted their errors and capitulated to the Party. But it would be foolish to suppose from this that Right opportunism is therefore dead and buried. Its strength is not to be measured by this factor. The strength of Right opportunism is the strength of the petty bourgeois element, in the fury of the assault on the Party on the part of the capitalist elements in general and the kulak in particular. And it is just for this reason—the fact that the Right deviation mirrors the resistance of the disappearing classes—that at the present moment it is the greatest danger in the Party. Therefore the Party considers a resolute and irreconcilable struggle against the Right deviation to be necessary.

There can be no doubt that without a resolute struggle against the Right deviation, and without the isolation of its leading elements, we should not have achieved the mobilisation of the powers of the Party and the working class, the mobilisation of the forces of the poor and middle peasantry, for the developed offensive of Socialism, for the organisation of our Soviet and collective farms, for the reconstruction of our heavy industry, and for the liquidation of the kulaks as a class.

That is the position with regard to the "Left" and right deviations in the Party.

It is our task to continue the irreconcilable fight on two fronts, against the "Left", representing petty bourgeois radicalism, and against the Right, representing petty bourgeois liberalism.

It is our task to continue the irreconcilable struggle against those conciliatory elements in the Party which fail to grasp the necessity of the determined struggle on two fronts, or feign not to grasp this necessity.

b) The survey of the struggle going on in our Party against the deviations would be incomplete without a reference to the deviations existing in the Party on the national question. I refer firstly to the deviation in the direction of Greater Russian chauvinism, and secondly to the deviation in the direction of local nationalism. These deviations are not so conspicuous and intrusive as the "Left" or Right deviations. They may be termed creeping deviations. This does not, however, mean that they do not exist. No, they exist, and—what is the main thing—they are growing. There can be no doubt of this. There can be no doubt, for the reason that the whole atmosphere of the intensified class struggle is bound to lead to a certain increase of national friction, finding its echo in the Party. Therefore, the true countenance of these deviations must be revealed and shown in its true light.

What is the nature of the deviation in the direction of Greater Russian chauvinism under our present conditions?

Essentially this chauvinism consists of the endeavour to evade the national differences of language, of culture, of habits of life, to prepare the liquidation of the national federal republics and territories; of the endeavour to override the principle of equal national rights, and to utilise the policy of the Party for the nationalisation of the apparatus, the press, the schools, and the other state and public organisations.

The opportunists of this type, taking as starting point the factor that when Socialism has won the victory the nations will have to join together and merge their mother tongues in one uniform common speech, consider that the time has now come to liquidate the national differences, and to abandon the policy of supporting the development of the national culture of the peoples hitherto held in bondage.

They refer to Lenin, citing him wrongly, sometimes even distorting his words and calumniating him. Lenin said that

under Socialism the interests of the nationalities will become mutual, — does this not mean, say the opportunists, that it is time to clear away the national republics and territories in the interests of . . . internationalism? Lenin; when polemising in 1913 against the members of the "federations", said that the slogan of national culture is a bourgeois slogan, — does this not mean, it is argued, that it is time to clear away the national culture of the peoples of the Soviet Union in the interests of . . . internationalism? Lenin said that under Socialism national vassalage and national barriers will be abolished, does this not mean, it is urged, that it is time to do away with the policy according consideration to the national peculiarities of the peoples, and to go forward to the policy of assimilation in the interests of . . . internationalism? And so forth.

There can be no doubt that this deviation in the national question, hiding as it does behind the mask of internationalism and the name of Lenin, is the most subtle and, therefore, the most dangerous species of Greater Russian nationalism.

In the first place, Lenin never said that the national differences will have to disappear and the national languages merge into one uniform language within the bounds of one state **before the victory of socialism on a world scale**. On the contrary, Lenin stated precisely the opposite, that "the national and state differences among the peoples and countries . . . will continue to exist for a very very long time even after the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a world scale". (Vol. 17. p. 178. Russian.) How can Lenin be appealed to and yet such a definite statement be ignored?

It is true that a one-time Marxist, now a renegade and reformist, Mr. Kautsky, maintains precisely the contrary of what Lenin taught us. He maintains, in opposition to Lenin, that the victory of the proletarian revolution in a united Austro-German state in the middle of last century would have led to the rise of a common German language and the Germanising of the Czechs, as only the strength of that which had freed itself from the fetters of deception, only the strength of modern culture, which the Germans brought with them, would have made the **backward Czech petty bourgeois, peasants, and proletarians**, (to whom their stunted nationality could give nothing) into Germans without any forced Germanisation. (Preface to Marx's "Revolution and Counter-revolution".) Such a "conception" as this is quite in keeping with Kautsky's social chauvinism. I combated these views of Kautsky's in 1925 in my lecture at the university for the peoples of the East. Is it possible for us Marxists, who intend to remain internationalists to the end, that this anti-Marxist scribbling of a German chauvinist who has lost all sense of proportion can be of any importance? Who is right, Kautsky or Lenin? If Kautsky is right, how can we explain the fact that such comparatively backward nationalities as the White Russians and the Ukrainians, nearer related to the Great Russians than the Czechs to the Germans, have not been Russified as result of the victory of the proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union, but have, on the contrary, awakened to new life and have developed as independent nations? How can we explain why such nationalities as the Turkmenes, Kirgises, Usbeks, and Tadshikes (not to speak of the Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanians, etc.), in spite of their backwardness, have not only not been Russified in consequence of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, but have, on the contrary, awakened to new life, and developed as independent nations? Is it not clear that our worthy opportunists, in their hunt for a pseudo-internationalism, have fallen into Kautskyian social chauvinism? Is it not clear that they, in striving for one common language on the territory of one state, the Soviet Union, are in reality striving for the restoration of the **privileges of the former ruling language, the Great Russian?** What then becomes of internationalism?

Secondly, Lenin never said that the abolition of national enslavement and the unification of the interests of the nationalities was equivalent to the abolition of national differences. We have done away with national oppression. We have abolished the national privileges and established equality of national rights. We have destroyed the state frontiers in the old sense of the word, the toll-houses and customs offices once dividing the peoples of the Soviet Union. We have established the unity of the economic and political interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

But does this mean that we have abolished all national differences: the national languages, cultures, habits and

customs, etc.? It is clear that it does not mean this. But if the national differences are maintained — language, culture, habits of living, etc. — is it then not clear that the demand for the abolition of the national republics and territories in the present historical period is reactionary, and opposed to the interests of the dictatorship of the proletariat? Do our opportunists not grasp that to abolish the national republics and territories at this juncture would mean depriving the masses of the peoples in the Soviet Union of the possibility of education in their **mother tongue**, of having their own schools, courts of justice, administration, and other public organisations and institutions, in their **own language**; that it would mean robbing them of the possibility of participation in the work of building up Socialism? Is it not clear that our opportunists, hunting for a pseudo-internationalism, have fallen into the hands of the reactionary Great Russian chauvinists, and have completely forgotten the slogan of the cultural revolution in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which applies equally to the whole of the peoples of the Soviet Union, both for the Great Russians and the non-Great-Russians.

Thirdly, Lenin never said that the slogan of the development of national culture **under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat** was a reactionary slogan. On the contrary, Lenin invariably advocated that the peoples of the Soviet Union should be aided to develop their national culture. It was under the leadership of Lenin, and of no-one else, that at the X. Party Congress the resolution on the national question was drawn up and passed, in which we read:

"It is the task of the Party to **help** the working masses of the non-Great-Russian peoples to overtake advanced central Russia; to **help** them: a) to develop and consolidate the Soviet system of state on their own territory, in forms adapted to the national habits and customs of these peoples; b) to develop and consolidate the powers of the courts of justice, the administrative and economic organs using the native language, and of the native organs familiar with the mentality and habits of life of the native population! c) to develop their press and schools, theatres, clubs, and educational and cultural institutions generally in their mother tongue; d) to organise and develop a comprehensive network of courses of instruction and schools, in their native language, for general education and for vocational instruction."

Is it not clear that Lenin fully and definitely approved the slogan of the necessity of developing national culture **under the conditions given by the dictatorship of the proletariat?**

Is it not clear that the rejection of the slogan of national culture under the proletarian dictatorship involves the rejection of the necessity of the cultural advancement of the non-Great-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, of the necessity of general compulsory education for these peoples, and means abandoning them to mental enslavement under reactionary nationalists?

Lenin actually did designate the slogan of national culture **under the rule of the bourgeoisie** as a reactionary slogan. Could this be otherwise? What is national culture under the rule of the national bourgeoisie? This culture, **bourgeois** in content and national in form, has for its object the poisoning of the masses by means of nationalism, and the firmer establishment of the rule of the bourgeoisie. What is national culture under the dictatorship of the proletariat? This culture, **socialist** in content and national in form, has for its object the education of the masses in the spirit of internationalism, and to establish more firmly the dictatorship of the proletariat. How can these two fundamentally differing trends be combined without violating Marxism? Is it not clear that Lenin, when combating the slogan of national culture under the bourgeois regime, aimed his blows at the **bourgeois content** and not at the national form? It would be foolish to suppose that Lenin regarded socialist culture without any **national factor**, without this or that national form. The members of the "Federation" did attribute this nonsense to Lenin for a time. It is however a well known fact that Lenin protested vigorously in his works against this slander, and dissociated himself from such nonsense. Is it possible that our worthy opportunists are going to follow in the footsteps of the "federation"?

After all this has been said, what is left of the arguments of our opportunists? Nothing but a juggling with the banner of internationalism and a calumny of Lenin.

Those who deviate in the direction of Great Russian chauvinism are greatly mistaken when they believe that the

period of the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union is a period of the decay and liquidation of national cultures. The reality is exactly the contrary. In actual fact the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union is a period in which national culture — socialist in content and national in form — **flourishes**. The followers of this deviation obviously do not grasp that a national culture is bound to develop **with fresh power** with the introduction and establishment of general compulsory education in the mother language. They do not grasp that the backward nationalities can be made to take part in the building up of the socialist structure only by means of the development of their national culture. They do not grasp that here precisely the basis of Leninist policy lies in the aid and **support** given to the peoples of the Soviet Union in the development of their national cultures.

It may appear remarkable that we, who are believers in the **merging** of national cultures in one culture uniform in form and content, and with one common language, should at the same time be advocates of the **highest development** of national cultures at the present moment, during the period of the proletarian dictatorship. But there is nothing remarkable about it. The national cultures must be given the opportunity of developing and advancing, of revealing their powers, in order first to create the conditions for unification in one uniform culture with one common language. That these cultures, national in form and socialist in content, should be developed to the full under the conditions given by the proletarian dictatorship in one country, to the end that they may merge in one unified socialist (in form and content) culture with one common language after the proletariat has been victorious all over the world, and after Socialism has become established in the habits of life of the people — it is precisely here that we find the dialectics of the Leninist method of dealing with the question of national culture.

It might be asserted that such a view of the question is "contradictory". But have we not the same "contradiction" in the question of the state? We are in favour of the withering away of the state. At the same time we further the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the strongest and mightiest state power which has ever existed. The highest development of state power for preparing the conditions for the extinction of state power, this is the Marxist formula. This is contradictory? Yes indeed, it is contradictory. But this contradiction has its basis in real life, and is a true reflection of Marxist dialectics.

Or let us take the Leninist method of dealing with the question of the right of nations to self-determination, including separation. Lenin often reduced the thesis of national self-determination to a simple formula: "Separation in the interests of unification." Consider this: Separation for unification. It sounds like a paradox. But again this "contradictory" formula mirrors that living truth of Marxist dialectics which enables the Bolsheviks to storm the most inaccessible fortresses in the territory of the national question.

The same must be said of the formula of national culture: Highest development of the national cultures (and languages) in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, for the purpose of preparing the conditions for their dying out and unification in one uniform socialist culture (with a common language) in the period of the victory of Socialism all over the world.

Those who fail to grasp this peculiarity and "contradiction" of our period of transition, these dialectics of the historical process, are lost to Marxism.

It is the misfortune of our opportunists that they do not comprehend Marxist dialectics and do not want to comprehend them.

That is how the matter stands with regard to the deviation towards Greater Russian chauvinism.

It is not difficult to understand that this deviation reflects the endeavours of the disappearing class of the former ruling Great Russian nation to regain their lost privileges.

Hence the danger of Greater Russian chauvinism is the chief danger threatening the Party in the national question.

What is the nature of the deviation towards local nationalism? This consists of the endeavour to shut out the outer world and remain within national confines; to conceal the class antagonisms within the nation itself, to safeguard against

Greater Russian chauvinism by means of turning aside from the common work of building up Socialism; the endeavour not to see anything which brings the working masses of the nationalities of the Soviet closer to one another, and to see only that which can separate them.

The deviation towards local nationalism reflects the discontent felt by the disappearing classes of the once oppressed nations with the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and their endeavour to hold themselves apart in their own national state, and to establish their own class rule there.

The danger of this deviation lies in its breeding bourgeois nationalism, in its weakening the unity of the working peoples of the Soviet Union, and playing into the hands of the interventionists.

This is the essence of the deviation towards local nationalism.

It is the task of the Party to combat this deviation determinedly, and to secure the necessary conditions for the internationalist education of the working masses of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

These then are the deviations in our Party, the "Left" and Right deviations in the sphere of general politics, the deviations in the national question.

That is our inner Party situation.

Now that our Party has emerged victorious from the struggle for the general line, and the Leninist line of the Party has triumphed along the whole front, many are inclined to forget those difficulties which the various opportunists occasioned us in the course of our work. And more than this, there are some comrades of a Philistine trend who still believe that we could have managed without the struggle against the opportunists. It need not be said that these comrades are greatly mistaken. It is only necessary to cast a glance backwards at the heroic deeds of the Trotzkyists and Right opportunists, to recollect the history of the struggle against the deviations in the period just past, in order to realise the complete hollowness and uselessness of these Philistine attitudes in the Party. There can be no doubt that we should not have attained those successes of which our Party is so justly proud, had we not curbed the opportunists and defeated them in open combat.

Our Party has grown and become stronger in the struggle against the deviations from the Leninist line. In this struggle it has forged the more firmly the Leninist unity of its own ranks. Nobody any longer disputes the fact that the Party has never gathered so closely around its C. C. as to-day. All are compelled to acknowledge that to-day the Party is more united and firmly welded than ever before, and that the 16th Party Congress is one of the few Congresses of our Party at which there is no united opposition capable of opposing its own line to the general line of the Party.

To what does the Party owe its undisputed achievements? They are due to the fact that in its struggle against the deviations it has invariably pursued a policy based on **principles**, and has never descended to combinations behind the scenes, or to diplomatic bargaining.

Lenin told us that the policy based on principles is the **sole** right policy. We have emerged as victors from the struggle against the deviations for the reason that we have consistently and sincerely followed this trust bequeathed to us by Lenin. (Applause.)

Comrades, I now come to the conclusion of my address.

What is the general conclusion to be drawn?

During the period just past we have been able to record decided successes on every front of socialist construction. We have attained these successes because we have proved able to hold aloft Lenin's great banner. If we intend to be victorious, we must continue to hold aloft Lenin's banner, and we must keep it clean. (Applause.)

This is the general conclusion which we must draw.

Under Lenin's banner we won the victory in the struggle for the October revolution.

Under Lenin's banner we have attained decisive successes in the struggle for the victory of the building up of Socialism.

Under this same banner the proletarian revolution will be victorious all over the world.

Long live Leninism! (Enthusiastic and prolonged applause. Ovation in the whole hall.)

Comrade Stalin's Concluding Speech on the Discussion on the Report of the Central Committee.

Comrades, After the discussion on the report of the activities of the C. C., and after all that has occurred here in connection with the attitude of the one-time leaders of the Right opposition, there is little left for me to say.

At the beginning of my address I observed that the XVI. Party Congress is one of the few Party Congresses in the history of our Party at which there has been no united opposition capable of opposing its own line to the line of the Party. As you see, this has proved true. Not only has there been no united opposition at our Party Congress, but there have not even been small groups, or individual comrades, who have found it necessary to declare from this tribune that the Party line is not correct. It is clear that the line of our Party is the sole correct one, and its correctness has been shown so plainly and irrefutably that even the former leaders of the Right opposition have found it necessary to emphasise in their speeches that the whole policy of the Party is correct.

After this there is obviously no need for me to dwell on the correctness of the assertions contained in the report on the activities of the C. C. There is no need, for the line of the Party, being self-evidently right, requires no further defence at this Congress. And that I make a concluding speech at all, under these circumstances, is because it is nonetheless not superfluous for me to reply briefly to questions which comrades have written down and handed in to the Presidium, and to add a few words in regard to the speeches of the former leaders of the Right opposition.

A great part of the questions refer to matters of secondary importance: Why was nothing said in the reports about horse-breeding, and is it not possible for me to mention it in my concluding words (Laughter); why was there no report in the speeches on dwelling-house construction, and is it not possible to refer to it in my concluding speech; why is nothing said about the electrification of agriculture, and cannot it be referred to in the concluding speech, and so on and so forth.

To all these comrades I must reply that I could not deal in my report with every question of economics; and not only could not, but had no right to do so. For I have no right to encroach upon the territory of Comrades Kuybyshev and Yakovlev, whose speeches will inform you regarding the concrete problems of industry and agriculture. Indeed were the report of the C. C. to deal with every question, what would be left for the speakers to say about industry, agriculture, etc? (A voice: Hear, hear.)

With regard to the question-slip on the electrification of industry, it must be observed in particular that the writer of this slip commits several errors. He maintains that we have already reached the stage of "complete electrification" of agriculture; that the People's Commissariat for Agriculture is not permitting this matter to develop; that Lenin expected something different, etc. All this is not true, comrades. We cannot assert that we have already reached the stage of "complete electrification" of agriculture. Had we already attained to the complete electrification of agriculture, then we should already have 10 to 15 rayons with electrified agricultural production. All that we have already reached the stage of "complete electrification" is that electrification in our country has reached the experimental stage. Lenin, too, regarded the matter from this aspect when he spurred on the experiments in the direction of the electrification of agriculture. Some comrades believe that the tractor is already out-of-date, and that the time has come to pass on from the tractor to the electrification of agriculture. This is of course nonsense and moonshine. Such comrades must be combated, and are combated by the People's Commissariat for Agriculture. Hence, the dissatisfaction of the writer of this note with the People's Commissariat for Agriculture cannot be regarded as justified.

A second group of questions refers of the national question. One of the questions compares my treatment of this question in my address at the XVI. Party Congress with the treatment I accorded it in my speech at the Eastern University in 1925, and finds a certain lack of clearness demanding explanation. You argued at that time, states the note, against the theory (Kausky)

of the merging of national languages and the formation of a common language during the period of Socialism (in one country); now in your speech at the XVI. Party Congress you declare the communists are believers in the merging of national cultures and national languages in one uniform culture with one common language (in the period of the victory of Socialism on a world scale). Is there not a want of clearness here?

I believe that there is no unclearness and no contradiction here. In 1925 I argued against Kautsky's national chauvinist theory, according to which the victory of the proletarian revolution in the middle of the last century in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy would have led to the amalgamation of the nations in one united German nation with a uniform German language, and to the Germanising of the Czechs. I opposed this theory, for it is an anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theory, and I supported my arguments by facts from the life of our country, after the victory of Socialism, refuting this theory. I still oppose this theory, as may be seen from my report at the XVI. Party Congress. I oppose it, for the reason that a theory advocating the merging of all nations — of the Soviet Union let us say — into one uniform Great Russian nation with a uniform Great Russian language, is a national chauvinist, anti-Leninist theory, contradicting the fundamental theses of Leninism, which teach that during the coming period the national differences cannot disappear, but must continue to exist for a long time, even after the victory of the proletarian revolution on a world scale. As to the future perspectives of national culture and national languages, I defended, and continue to defend, the Leninist standpoint that during the period of the victory of Socialism on a world scale, when Socialism becomes strong and becomes a part of life, the national languages will be bound inevitably to merge into a uniform language, which will of course be neither Great Russian nor German, but something new. This I declared definitely in my address at the XVI. Congress.

What is unclear here, and what requires special explanation? Obviously the writers of this question are not quite clear on two points. First of all, they are not clear on the fact that we in the Soviet Union have entered on the period of Socialism, and yet, although we have entered on this period, we can by no means record that the nations are dying out among us — on the contrary, they are developing and flourishing. Have we actually entered on the period of Socialism? As a rule our period is named the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism. It was named the transition period in 1918, at the time when Lenin first characterised this period in his famous pamphlet: "The Next Tasks of the Soviet Power", and divided our economic life into five categories. It is called the transition period at the present time, in 1930, at a time when some of these categories have become obsolete, whilst one of these categories, precisely the new category in the sphere of industry and agriculture, is growing and developing with unheard of rapidity. Can it be asserted that these two transition periods are the same, that they do not differ fundamentally from one another? It is clear that this cannot be asserted. In what state were our economics in 1918? Shattered industry, workers spending their time making pipe-lighters, collective and Soviet farms entirely lacking as mass system, the "new" bourgeoisie growing in the towns, the kulak in the village. And what have we now? A socialist industry, restored and in course of reconstruction, a widespread system of Soviet and collective farms, covering more than 40% of the total sown area of the Soviet Union in the summer sowings alone, a "new" bourgeoisie dying out in the towns, the kulaks dying out in the village.

That was a transition period, and this is a transition period; and yet the two are as fundamentally different as chalk and cheese, and yet nobody can deny that we are now standing on the threshold of the liquidation of the last capitalist class playing a serious rôle, the kulak class. It is clear that we are already out of the transition period in the old sense of the word, and have entered the period of direct and developed socialist reconstruction along the whole front. It is clear that we have already entered the period of Socialism, for the socialist

sector now holds all the levers of our whole national economy in its hands, although we are still far from the completion of the socialist structure, and from the abolition of class differences. And yet the national languages not only do not die out and merge in one common language, but on the contrary, the national cultures and national languages develop and flourish. It is clear that the theory of the dying out of the national languages and their merging into one uniform language within the confines of one state, in the period of developed socialist reconstruction, in the period of Socialism in one country, is a wrong, anti-Marxist, and anti-Leninist theory.

Secondly, the writers of the question are not clear on the point that the question of the dying out of the national languages, and of their merging in one uniform language, is not an internal question of one state, not a question of the victory of Socialism in one country, but an international question, a question of the victory of Socialism on an international scale. The writers of this question have not grasped that the victory of Socialism in one country must not be confused with the victory of Socialism on an international scale. It was not for nothing that Lenin said that the national differences will continue to exist for a long time, even after the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat on an international scale. Besides this, still another circumstance must be taken into account, coming in question for a number of the peoples of the Soviet Union. There is a Ukraine within the Soviet Union, but there is another Ukraine belonging to other states. There is a White Russia within the Soviet Union, but there is another White Russia belonging to other states. Do you suppose that the question of the Ukrainian and White Russian languages can be answered without taking these peculiar circumstances into consideration? Take further the nationalities of the Soviet Union living on its Southern frontier, from Azerbaijan to Kasakstan and the Burjak Mongolia. These are all in the same position as Ukraine and White Russia. The special conditions under which these peoples are developing must obviously be taken into account. Is it not clear that all these and similar questions, connected with the problem of the national cultures and national languages, cannot be solved within the confines of one state, within the confines of the Soviet Union.

This is how the matter stands in regard to the question of the nationalities in general, and of the points raised by the question put to us here in particular.

I should now like to pass on to the problem of the former leaders of the Right opposition.

What does the Party Congress demand of the former leaders of the Right opposition? Repentance perhaps? Most certainly not! Our Party, and the Party Congress of our Party, never demands anything of our comrades which could humiliate them. The Party Congress demands of the former leaders of the Right opposition three things: 1. that they face the fact that an abyss yawns between the line of the Party and the line which they defend; the fact that the line which they defend leads objectively, not to the victory of Socialism, but to the victory of capitalism. (Voices: Hear, hear.) 2. that they condemn this line as anti-Leninist, and dissociate themselves from it, openly and sincerely (Voices: Hear, hear.); 3. that they place themselves in our ranks, and fight with us against each and every Right deviation (Voices: Hear, hear. Loud applause).

This is what the Congress demands of the former leaders of the Right opposition.

Do these demands involve anything degrading from people who wish to remain Bolsheviks?

It is clear that there can be nothing degrading in these demands. Every Bolshevik, every real revolutionist, every Party member with any self-respect, will comprehend that he can only advance, can only gain in the eyes of the Party, when he openly and sincerely acknowledges the clear and indisputable facts.

Hence I am of the opinion that Comrade Tomsky's utterances about being banished into the desert of Gobi, and being forced to live on locusts and wild honey, are nothing but the empty phrases of a provincial debating society, and have nothing to do with the dignity of a revolutionist. (Laughter, Applause.)

It may be asked why the Congress submits afresh these demands to the former leaders of the Right opposition? Were these demands to the former leader of the Right opposition? Were these demands not made to them at the November Plenum of the C. C. in 1929? Did not the former leaders of the Right

opposition agree to these demands at that time, renounce their line, admit its erroneousness, and promise to fight for the correct line of the Party? To be sure, all this is true. What then is the present question? The question is that they have not kept their promises; that they have not fulfilled, and are not fulfilling, the obligations which they undertook seven months ago. (Voices: True!) Comrade Uglanow was perfectly right when he declared in his speech that they have failed to fulfil the obligations which they undertook at the November Plenum of the C. C.

This is the source of the mistrust which they have encountered at this Congress.

This is the reason why the Congress renews its demands.

Comrades Rykow, Tomsky, and Uglanow have complained here that the Party Congress has shown mistrust towards them. But who is to blame for this? They themselves are to blame; people who do not fulfil their obligations cannot expect trust.

Were the former leaders of the Right opposition given the opportunity, had they the possibility of fulfilling their promises, and drawing a line through their past? To be sure they had. But what have they done in these seven months towards utilising these opportunities and possibilities? Nothing!

Comrade Rykow recently attended the Ural Party Conference. Here he had the best of opportunities of making good his errors. And what happened? Instead of breaking openly and resolutely with his vacillations, he began a pantomime and manoeuvring. The Ural Conference was naturally obliged to oppose him. Now compare the speech made by Comrade Rykow at the Ural Conference with his speech at the XVI. Party Congress. A wide chasm separates the two speeches. There pantomime and manoeuvre, struggle with the Ural Conference. Here he strives openly and loudly to admit his errors, endeavours to break with the Right opposition, and promises to aid the Party in its struggle against the deviations. Whence this difference? How is it to be explained? The obvious explanation is the threatening situation of the former leaders of the Right opposition in the Party. Hence it is not to be wondered at that the Party Congress has had the distinct impression that there is nothing to be done with these people without exercising pressure upon them. (General laughter, continued applause.)

Has Comrade Uglanow had the opportunity of fulfilling the promises which he made to the November Plenum of the C. C. Yes, he has had this. I refer to the super-party conference in the "Moselectric", at which he spoke recently. And what happened? Instead of speaking as a Bolshevik should, he began to attack the line of the Party. It need not be said that met with energetic opposition from the works nucleus. Now compare this speech with his declaration, published today in the "Pravda". A wide chasm separates this speech from this declaration. How is this change to be explained? By that same threatening situation which has arisen for the former leaders of the Right opposition. Is there anything to be wondered at that the Party has learnt a certain lesson from this — that nothing is to be gained from these people without putting pressure on them?

Or Comrade Tomsky for instance. Recently he was in Tiflis at the Trans-Caucasian Party Conference. Here he had the opportunity of making good his errors. And what happened? He spoke of the Soviet farms, of the collective farms, of the co-operatives, of the cultural revolution, and of everything imaginable, but not of the main matter — he did not devote one word to his opportunist work in the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. This is what he calls fulfilling the promises made the Party! He wished to cheat the Party, and has forgotten that each one of us is under the observation of millions of eyes, and that here nobody can cheat. Compare his speech at Tiflis with his attitude at this Party Congress, where he has openly and directly acknowledged his opportunist errors as leader of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. Again the chasm between the two speeches. How is this difference to be explained? By that same dangerous position which has arisen for the former leaders of the Right opposition. Is it then a matter of wonder that the Party Congress has endeavoured to exercise pressure on these comrades, to the end that they may be induced to fulfil their obligations? (Laughter and applause.)

This is the source of the mistrust which these comrades still encounter in the Party.

What is the explanation of this more than remarkable behaviour on the part of the former leaders of the Right opposition?

What is the explanation of the fact that they have not made one single attempt, during the period just past, to fulfil their obligations of their own free will, without external pressure?

The explanation lies chiefly in two circumstances.

Firstly, they have not been quite convinced of the correctness of the Party line, and have been quietly continuing their fractional work, awaiting time and good counsel and the opportunity to come forward openly against the Party. They have met together in their fractional meetings and have discussed Party matters, generally resolving: Let us wait till spring, perhaps the Party will suffer defeat in the spring sowings — then we can advance as we should. But the spring brought them nothing, for the spring sowing was successful. Again they resolved: Let us wait till autumn, perhaps the Party will suffer defeat in the grain supply question, and we can attack the C. C. But autumn too brought them nothing. And since spring and autumn occur every year, the former leaders of the Right opposition have set their hopes alternately on the spring and the autumn. (General laughter all over the hall.)

It need not be said that whilst waiting from one season to another for a favourable moment for an attack on the Party, they have not been able to keep their promises.

Finally, the second cause. This second cause is that the former leaders of the Right opposition do not understand our Bolshevik tempo, have no faith in this tempo, and accept nothing which exceeds the confines of a gradual self-development. Anything beyond this, our Bolshevik tempo, our resolutely followed path of development during the reconstruction period, the aggravation of the class struggle and the consequences of this aggravation — all this awakens in them only anxiety, confusion, alarm, and terror. It is therefore comprehensible that they shrink from everything connected with the sharpened slogans of our Party. They suffer from that same disease which afflicted the hero of Tchekov's tale of the teacher of the Greek language, Byelikov, the man in the glass case. You remember Tchekov's story of "The man in the glass case"? This hero never went out without galoshes, a quilted lined coat, and umbrella, in hot or cold weather. "Excuse me, but why do you wear galoshes and a thick overcoat in July, in this heat?", Byelikov was asked. "To be prepared for everything" replied Byelikov, "Something may happen; perhaps there will be a sudden frost, and what then?" (general laughter, Applause). He detested anything new as if it were a pestilence; hated anything exceeding the bounds of ordinary daily life. A new restaurant was opened. Byelikov felt alarmed a once; to be sure a restaurant has its advantages, but it is to be hoped that nothing happens. A dramatic club was organised, a reading room opened, and Byelikov had his misgivings again: A dramatic club, a new reading room — why all this? Take care that nothing happens. (General laughter.)

The same must be said of the former leaders of the Right opposition. Do you remember the history of the subordination of the Technical Colleges to the economic authorities? We wanted to subordinate only two Technical Colleges to the Supreme National Economic Council; apparently only a small matter. But we encountered inexorable resistance from the Right. Two Technical Colleges under the Supreme National Economic Council? Whatever for? Is it not better to wait? Take care that nothing happens. And now the whole of our Technical Colleges are under the superintendence of the economic authorities, and nothing has happened — we still survive.

Or for instance, the question of the extraordinary measures against the kulaks. Do you remember the fits of hysterics into which the Right opposition fell in this connection? Extraordinary measures against the kulaks? What for? Is it not better to pursue a liberal policy towards the kulaks? Take care that nothing happens. And now we are carrying out the policy of the liquidation of the kulak as class, a policy in comparison with which the extraordinary measures against the kulaks were a mere trifle. And nothing has happened — we are still alive. Or for instance, the question of the collective and Soviet farms. Soviet and collective farms? What for? Are we in such a hurry? Take care that nothing happens with these Soviet and collective farms? And so on in the same strain.

This fear of anything new, this lack of ability to approach

new questions, this terror that "something may happen", these are the characteristic features of the man under the glass case; and they prevent the leaders of the Right opposition from really being united with the Party.

These characteristics of the man in the glass case assume especially ridiculous forms among the Right when difficulties arise, when the smallest clouds appear on the horizon. As soon as any hindrance or difficulty appears, they are seized with fear — something is sure to happen! If a blackbeetle begins to scramble behind the wall somewhere, and cannot find its way out, they draw back in affright, fall into a state of horror, and begin to wail over the collapse of the Soviet Union. (General laughter.)

We pacify them and endeavour to convince them that no danger lies there, that after all it is only blackbeetle, of which they have no need to be afraid. But they continue to weep. How do you mean a blackbeetle? That is not a blackbeetle but thousands of wild beasts; that is not a blackbeetle but the abyss, the death of the Soviet Power. And Bukharin, on this occasion, writes theses and sends them to the C. C., maintaining that the attempts of the C. C. has led the country into an abyss, that the Soviet Power will really perish, if not at once, at least in a few months. Rykow endorses Bukharin's theses, but says at the same time that he has serious differences of opinion with Bukharin to the effect that, it is true the Soviet Power is perishing, but in his opinion it will take place not in a month but in a month and two days. (Laughter.) Tomsky joins Bukharin and Rykow, but protests against it being impossible to do without theses, without documents, for which one is held responsible afterwards: "How often have I said to you, do what you like, but do not leave any documents, any traces behind you". (Loud laughter in the whole hall, prolonged applause.) It is true, afterwards, after a year, when it has become clear to every blockhead that the blackbeetle is not dangerous, the Right deviators begin to recover and even fall to boasting. They declare that they are not afraid of any blackbeetles, and moreover, that this blackbeetle is a very small one, and at its last gasp. (Laughter.) But that is a year after. In the meantime, one has to be bothered with these people.

These, comrades, are the circumstances which prevent the leaders of the Right opposition from approaching nearer to the core of the Party leadership and merging with it.

By what means can that be remedied?

There is only one means. They must finally break with their past; they must completely disarm and they must unite with the C. C. of our Party in its fight for the Bolshevik tempo of development, in its fight against the Right deviation.

There is no other means.

If the former leaders of the Right opposition can do this — well and good. If not, then they make themselves responsible for the consequences. (Prolonged ovation in the whole hall. All sing the "International".)

Resolution on the Report of the Central Committee.

(Full Text)

(Unanimously Adopted.)

The XVI. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. fully approves the political line and the activity of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

The period dealt with in the report was a turning period both for the capitalist countries and for the Soviet Union. For the Soviet Union it meant the transition from the period of restoration to the period of reconstruction and the gigantic development of socialist construction; in the capitalist countries a turn took place towards economic decline.

The Party Congress records with satisfaction that the correct Leninist policy of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. has led to the further consolidation of the international power of the Soviet Union, to gigantic successes in the sphere of the socialist industrialisation of the country, to the consolidation of the brotherly collaboration of the peoples of the Soviet Union on the basis of the Leninist nationality policy; to the fulfilment and surpassing of the programme of the first two years of the Five-Year Plan and to a decisive turn of the middle peasant masses to Socialism, which enabled the Party to proceed from the slogan of restricting and ousting the kulaks to the slogan of liquidating the kulaks as a class on the basis of one hundred per cent collectivisation.

I.

The Party Congress declares that the facts of the period under review fully confirm the estimation of the international situation given by the C. C., which is characterised by the further and increased shattering of partial stabilisation of capitalism, by the accentuation of all the contradictions of the capitalist system, by the growing danger of new imperialist wars, by the worsening of the position of the working class and of the toiling mass in the whole capitalist world, by the fascistisation of the bourgeois-democratic States and the conversion of social democracy into a direct tool for suppressing the working class.

The clearest expression of the exceedingly critical position of capitalism was the American economic crisis, which has developed into a world economic crisis. This crisis which opened up the period of new bitter fights for the redistribution of the world, increased capitalist rationalisation at the cost of the workers and the exploitation of the colonial countries by their imperialist slave-holders, shatters in the most obvious manner the social-democratic theory of "organised capitalism" which was taken up by the Right opportunists, and announces the approaching end of the partial stabilisation of capitalism.

This crisis strengthens the revolutionary upsurge in the capitalist and colonial countries and will inevitably grow into a political crisis in a whole number of countries.

The developing revolutionary upsurge is expressed in the growth and accentuation of the economic struggles and in their development into political fights; in the successful application of the tactics of independent strike leadership by the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions; in the unemployed movement in almost all capitalist countries; in a number of revolutionary actions in the colonies; in the revolutionary fight of the Chinese peasantry and the organisation of the Red Army against the bourgeois counter-revolution of the Kuomintang; in the maturing of the national revolutionary fight against imperialism in India, Indo-China, Indonesia, Africa and in the strengthening of the Communist Parties of Europe, America and China and their purging of rotten opportunist elements.

The Party Congress records with satisfaction the extremely important role of the C. P. S. U. and of its C. C. in the Bolshevisation of the Sections of the C. I. and their purging of opportunist elements.

Simultaneously with the accentuation of all contradictions of the imperialist system, there is proceeding an **accentuation of the antagonisms between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world surrounding it.**

The hatred of the international bourgeoisie against the only State of the proletarian dictatorship and its revolutionising influence is revealed by the attempts to organise an economic blockade, the fight against Soviet exports, the religious campaign, the furious campaign of calumny on the part of the bourgeois and social-democratic press and the increased preparations for war against the Soviet Union.

In the Anti-Soviet campaign a special role is played by the **social-democracy, which is becoming more and more fascist** and which, together with the most reactionary bourgeois groups, usually comes forward in this campaign as the ring leaders, while the "Left" and Right renegades of Communism are acting more and more openly as the prompters of social democracy. But the growing economic power of the Soviet Union, which is increasing for the bourgeoisie the danger and risk of an intervention against the Soviet Union, before all in the present situation of crisis and of the developing revolutionary upsurge, compels some groups of the bourgeoisie to proceed on the path of developing and consolidating economic relations with the Soviet Union.

The strengthening of the international position of power of the Soviet Union was the result of the correct foreign policy carried out by the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. It is only thanks to this policy that the Soviet government succeeded in maintaining peace, which is the most important precondition for the international authority of the Soviet Union. The consistent and firm policy of the Soviet government led to the resumption of diplomatic relations with Great Britain and to the liquidation of the conflict on the Chinese-Eastern Railway kindled by international imperialism.

The Party Congress instructs the C. C. to conduct also in the future a firm and determined policy of peace and of **consolidation of brotherly connection and solidarity of the workers and toilers of the Soviet Union with the workers and toilers of the capitalist countries and colonies.**

The Party Congress considers it necessary to develop further the economic relations of the Soviet Union with the capitalist surroundings on the basis of the unconditional maintenance of the **Foreign Trade monopoly**, as well as of the far-reaching utilisation of the technics of the advanced capitalist countries for the acceleration of the industrialisation of the Soviet Union, and emphasise the great importance of the Bolshevik tempo in the socialist industrialisation of the country for the purpose of securing the **economic independence of the Soviet Union** and of repelling all interventionist attempts of international imperialism.

The Party Congress records with satisfaction that our Red Army has again shown its strength and fighting capacity and urgently points to the necessity of concentrating the attention of the Party upon the consolidation of the **defensive power of the Soviet Union**, upon the strength and the fighting capacity of the Red Army, the navy and the air fleet and for this purpose to mobilise to a still greater extent all the forces of the working class and of the poor and middle peasant masses.

II.

In the period under report the Soviet Union has entered on a period of **gigantic development of socialist construction.** The correct Leninist policy of the C. C. has ensured the powerful upsurge of socialist industry and evoked a tremendous enhancement of working enthusiasm in the working masses, which enabled the Party to set itself the task of realising the Five-Year Plan in four years. The pace of socialist construction achieved by the Party enables the Soviet Union to catch up and even surpass in regard to technical-economics the advanced capitalist countries in the shortest historical time.

The rapid rate of industrialisation created the basis for the **socialist reconstruction of agriculture.** The Soviet grain farms are to supply already this year more than one hundred million poods of grain for the market. The Five-Year Plan for the establishment of collective farms has been surpassed in the current economic year. The collective farms are to supply already this year more than 500 million poods of grain for the market. In spite of the assertions of Right opportunists, prompted by panicky apprehension, regarding the degradation of agriculture, the Party has in the main successfully solved the grain problem on the basis of the leading role of socialist industry, the merging of the small, backward and scattered farms into collective farms and the assistance given to the small and middle peasant farms. The area under grain cultivation surpassed this year for the first time the pre-war level. A considerable extension of the area of cultivation of technical plants was achieved. The Party is now approaching the solution of the problem of cattle-breeding. The gigantic rate of socialist industrialisation of the country is accompanied by a considerable numerical **growth of the working class**, by a raising of the material and cultural level, an increase of the real wages, the transition to the seven-hour day, the introduction of the five-day uninterrupted week and a sharp decline in unemployment. The complete carrying through of the economic division (rayon system) of the country essentially accelerates the industrialisation of hitherto backward districts, frontier districts and of the national republics, creating there new industrial and proletarian centres and facilitating the more correct and purposeful distribution of industry and agriculture over the whole territory of the Soviet Union.

These successes have been achieved by the Party in the struggle with and by surmounting the difficulties standing in the way of socialist construction. In contrast to the capitalist countries, these were difficulties of growth and not of decline. These difficulties arise from the fact that we have fundamentally to reconstruct industry and agriculture, by changing their economic basis and equipping them with up-to-date technics. This task is particularly difficult in regard to agriculture, where the reconstruction of the technical basis must be accompanied by the reconstruction of the social-economic structure of agriculture, by the merging of the small and smallest scattered farms into collective farms and by the extermination of the roots of capitalism. The difficulties of work for the socialist reconstruction of industry and agri-

culture are increased by the fierce resistance of the kulaks, the bourgeois intelligentsia and the bureaucratic elements of the State apparatus (acts of sabotage).

The main preconditions for the successful and most rapid overcoming of these difficulties are the accelerated tempo of socialist construction and the developing attack upon the capitalist elements along the whole front. Every slowing down of the tempo in favour of the capitalist-kulak elements and every weakening of the attack on them would mean in reality not a mitigation of the difficulties but their deepening, and a strengthening of the positions of the class enemies of the proletarian dictatorship.

The capitulatory attitude of the Right opportunists in regard to a slowing down of the industrialisation tempo is in reality dictated by the interests of the kulak-capitalist groups and leads to the restoration of capitalism.

The Party and the working class have ruthlessly repudiated, and will also in future repudiate the opportunist capitulation theory of the Rights, which in reality means a **betrayal of the interests of the working class**.

The Party Congress instructs the C. C. to concentrate the efforts of the Party, in the further work for the socialist industrialisation of the Soviet Union, upon the realisation of the following main tasks:

1. Enhanced development of **heavy industry** as the main basis of socialist construction (iron and non-iron metals, generation of electricity, fuel, construction of machines, chemical production) creation of a new, powerful centre of coal-mining and of the metal industry in the shape of the industrial combine of the Ural-Kusnetz basin.

2. Development and reconstruction of **transport**, before all of the railway and waterway transport, which are the decidedly "weak spots" of socialist economy.

3. Enhanced development of the industrial branches producing articles of **mass consumption** (light industry), and at the same time development of the raw material basis.

4. Increase of **exports** by the enhanced development of a number of branches of industry and agriculture working for export.

5. Unconditional fulfilment of the industrial and financial plans, strict adherence to the aims laid down by the plan of **lowering the prime costs and raising the quality** of products, more determined and more systematic carrying through of rationalisation, struggle against waste of material and losses in production, raising of **labour productivity** and liquidation of defects still prevailing in a number of branches.

6. Enhanced development of the **mechanisation and tractorisation of agriculture**, fulfilment of the Five-Year plan of Soviet farms in three years, creation of a firm basis of machines and tractors for the complete collectivisation of the peasant farms in the whole of the Soviet Union.

7. Accelerated carrying out of the measures for the reconstruction and development of **cattle-breeding**, as well as for the development of the food industry on the basis of the corresponding branches of agriculture.

8. Realisation of the envisaged **raising of real wages**, improvement of the activity of the supply apparatus, before all in the sphere of the co-operatives.

Of particular importance is the problem, envisaged by the C. C. in its whole extent, of the **leading cadres of economists and technicians**, which is becoming the central problem of socialist construction. The further realisation of the Bolshevik tempo of the socialist industrialisation of the country can be guaranteed only with the further mobilisation of the forces of the whole Party and of the working class for the solution of the tasks of preparing new cadres from the working class.

III.

The rapid rate of socialist industrialisation of the country, which was realised by the C. C. on the basis of the directives of the XV. Party Congress, brings about a thorough change in the class relations within the country. These changes are characterised before all by the rapid numerical growth of the working class, by the **strengthening of its leading role** in regard to the poor and middle peasantry. **The economic alliance (Smytchka) between the working class and the main masses of the peasantry has acquired a character based mainly upon the production relations.** The policy of the Party and of its

C. C. has ensured the successful transference of the backward and scattered small peasant farms onto the lines of socialist big undertakings in agriculture, the development of **complete collectivisation and the going over to the practical realisation of the slogan: "liquidation of the kulak as a class!"** During the period under review the role of private capital has greatly declined, its further ousting is proceeding. The planned-regulating role of the Soviet State is determinedly strengthened in the whole of the economy of the country and is embracing, to an increasing extent, not only industry but also agriculture. The task set by Lenin of converting the "Russia of the N. E. P." into the "Socialist Russia" is about to be realised.

The growth of socialist construction and the increased attack upon the capitalist elements are bound to bring about an **accentuation of the class struggle in the country** on the part of the kulak-capitalist elements, as well as attempts at desperate resistance on their part. The Party has broken the counter-revolutionary sabotage and the resistance of the kulaks by basing itself upon the growing activity of the agricultural workers and of the poor peasant masses of the village, and by strengthening the alliance with the middle peasants; it carried out successfully the campaign for acquiring grain and collected a considerable reserve fund of grain. **The determined turn of the middle peasant masses to socialism** as a result of the correct policy of the Party found clearest expression in the powerful collective farm movement which seized millions of peasant farms at the end of 1929 and created **new relations of class forces in the country** by converting the middle peasant who entered the collective farm into a buttress of the Soviet Power, by creating all the preconditions for substituting the grain production of the kulaks by the production of the Soviet and collective farms, and by enabling the Party to go over **from the slogan of restricting and squeezing out the kulak to the slogan of liquidating the kulak as a class on the basis of complete collectivisation.** The Party Congress emphasises the enormous historical importance of this slogan, which means the attack by the working class on the last **support of capitalist exploitation in the country.**

The Party Congress considers the directives of the C. C. of 5th January regarding the collectivisation tempo, as well as the measures connected with it for the liquidation of the kulak as a class in the different districts and provinces of the Soviet Union on the basis of the firm alliance with the middle peasants, to be correct.

The Party Congress, however, states that a whole number of district and local organisations grossly violated the directives of the C. C. (decisions of 5th of January, article by Comrade Stalin: "The Year of the Great Turn") by aiming at the collectivisation of their districts in the course of the Spring campaign of 1930 (whilst in the decisions of the C. C. two to three years are contemplated). This attitude was particularly inadmissible and harmful in regard to the grain-importing districts and the backward national Republics.

Such an incorrect and harmful attitude was inevitably bound to lead to substituting the Leninist policy in regard to the middle peasants by the policy of administrative pressure, which is absolutely hostile to Leninism.

The timely, firm and determined instructions of the C. C. in a whole number of decisions and in articles by Comrade Stalin stemmed the wave of exaggerations and compelled the stubborn exaggerators to return to the position of Leninism.

The Party Congress emphatically rejects the calumnious declaration of the Right deviators and "Left" exaggerators, according to which the correction of the anti-middle peasant exaggerations means a retreat by the Party from its general line.

The Party Congress completely approves the decision of the C. C. regarding the **privileges granted to the collective farms**, which will considerably promote the collective farms, as well as the successful carrying out of the seed campaign in which the collective farm sector played the decisive role.

The Party must continue the pitiless struggle against the "Left" anti-middle peasant exaggerations, which today more than ever play into the hands of the kulaks and of the Right opportunists.

The Right opportunists, who decisively came forward against the collectivisation, attempt to make use of the difficulties of the collective farm movement and of the anti-

middle peasant exaggerations in order to launch new attacks upon the Central Committee and its policy. There was to be seen recently a fresh attack of the bankrupt Right opportunists, who attempted to discredit the whole work of the Party for the collectivisation and the measures connected with it for the liquidation of the kulak, thereby preaching the theory of automatic development of the collective farm movement and a liquidatory attitude to the main slogans of the Party at the present period of socialist construction — the slogans of complete collectivisation and of the liquidation of the kulak as a class.

The Party has crushed the Right opportunists and achieved great success in the collective farm movement. The Party will also in the future annihilate all the attempts of the Right opportunists to undermine the collective farm movement or to make use of the difficulties of the collective farm construction for their purposes.

Decisive importance for the work of the Party attaches at present to the task of the further inclusion of the poor and middle peasant farms in the collective farms on the basis of voluntariness, the problem of **organising the work in the collective farms**, the distribution of the harvest within the collective farm, the raising of the cultural level of the masses on the collective farms, the overcoming of the petty-bourgeois vacillations within the collective farms and the all-round **strengthening of the collective farms** as a basis of support of socialist construction in the village.

The Party, by issuing the slogan in its whole practical work in the village to support itself upon the collective farm members, determinedly fights against all tendencies to ignore or underestimate the poor and middle peasant individual farms. It must render assistance to these farms, promote the independent organisation of the village poor in the Soviets, in the co-operatives and in the lower links of the collective farm movement, conduct a broad-scaled agitation among the peasants with individual farms and draw them into the collective farms.

IV.

The gigantic successes of the Party in the sphere of the construction of Socialism in industry and in agriculture were only possible on the basis of the **enormous activity of the working class** and of the toiling masses following it, which found expression in the broad development of socialist competition and the shock-brigade movement among the workers, in the reorganisation of work undertaken by all organs of the proletarian dictatorship, of the Party, trade union, Soviet and co-operative organisations under the slogan of the **mobilisation of the masses for the Bolshevik tempo of socialist reconstruction of the country**, for the overcoming of all difficulties, for the turn of the trade unions to production, and of the Soviets to the establishment of collective farms.

In the carrying out of the reorganisation of the work of the trade unions the Party encountered the resistance of the former leadership of the Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions, which represented within the trade union apparatus the opportunist, trade unionist moods of the non-political attitude, of separation from the Party and from socialist construction, and which attempted to create in the trade union movement a point of support for the Right opportunist elements in their struggle against the general line of the Party and its Leninist Central Committee.

The Party Congress completely approves the measures carried out by the C. C. for the **consolidation of the Leninist-Bolshevik leadership of the trade union movement**. The Party and the new leadership of the Central Council of the Soviet trade unions are confronted by the task of continuing and completing the turn of the trade unions to production, to active participation in the construction of socialist economy, to the overcoming of the petty-bourgeois vacillations within some backward strata of the working class, by closely linking up this whole work with an increased activity for improving the supply of necessary articles to the working class, for the protection of labour, for struggle against bureaucratism in the State, economic and co-operative apparatus.

The most important task of the Party and of the trade unions is to raise the movement of socialist competition and of the shock brigades to a higher level, really to convert this

movement into a school of class education of the working masses, to improve the leadership of this movement, to draw all Communists and Young Communists in the factories into the socialist competition and the shock brigades in the shortest possible time, to raise the labour qualification of the Communists, to transfer Party and trade union work to the factory departments and sub-departments.

The XVI. Party Congress quite correctly placed in the foreground as one of the most important problems of the reconstruction period the problem of the **cultural revolution**. The rate of development of cultural construction in the country is, however, quite inadequate. The Party Congress draws attention to the necessity of its enhancement. The carrying out of the general obligation to attend the elementary schools, and the liquidation of illiteracy must become fighting tasks of the Party in the next period. The Party must consolidate and enhance the successes achieved in the sphere of emancipating the masses from the reactionary influence of religion. The Party Congress records a considerable growth and qualitative improvement of the press as organ of mass mobilisation for socialist construction, and instructs the C. C. to adopt measures for the further improvement of the press and the enhancement of its role in the development of socialist attack.

The accentuation of the class struggle in the country was bound to lead to a revival of the anti-Soviet elements in the State apparatus.

The Party Congress approves all the measures of the C. C. and C. C. C. for purging and improving the State apparatus, **whereby it considers it necessary to enhance the struggle against all varieties of bureaucratism** on the basis of self-criticism, of a more extensive promotion of workers to leading positions, on the basis of the preparation of cadres for all organs of the proletarian dictatorship and on the basis of the development of new forms of drawing masses of workers into the administration of the State (further improvement of the activity of the Soviets etc.).

The Party Congress records with satisfaction the further **numerical and qualitative** growth of the Party, the considerable improvement of its social composition, the increased influx of factory workers into the Party (application of whole departments and factories for membership of the Party), the raising of the ideological level of the Party cadres and of the broad Party masses, and the raising of the quality of Party work, the further strengthening of inner Party democracy, the successful development of proletarian self-criticism in all links of the Party, the successful carrying out of the purging of the Party from alien, disintegrating elements who have crept in.

Nevertheless the ideological-political level of a considerable portion of the Party cadres is still inadequate, as is proved by the numerous facts of anti-middle peasant exaggerations. It is urgently necessary to consolidate and prepare the Party cadres, before all for the village. The growth of the Party in the organisations and factories is still inadequate. It is necessary to strengthen the work for the attraction of the workers (before all of workers in the big factories) into the Party.

In spite of the growing role of women and youths in production, work among these strata has not yet received adequate attention. Also the work among women in the village is weak, as was clearly proved in carrying out collectivisation. The Party Congress renders it incumbent on all Party, trade union, Soviet and other organisations to enhance their work for the mobilisation of the broad masses of toiling women, before all in the village, for the development of socialist construction. The Party Congress records the successes in the work of the Young Communist League with regard to the development of socialist competition and the shockbrigade movement, and is of the opinion that the growing importance of the youth and of the organisations of the Y. C. L. and of the pioneers require an increased attention and assistance on the part of the Party organisations.

Self-criticism as a daily organic method of Party work is not sufficiently developed in all organisations. There are still cases of exertion of pressure and of a distortion of self-criticism to be registered. A determined struggle must be conducted against facts of this kind, with a simultaneous development of Bolshevik self-criticism for raising the ideological level and the Bolshevik training of the Party cadres and of the Party

masses, for exposing the distortions of the Party line by opportunism in practice, and for further developing inner Party democracy.

The process of the socialist reconstruction of the village, which is being broadly developed, sets us the task of consolidating the **village Party organisations**. The quantitative and qualitative consolidation of these organisations, the creation of strong Party nuclei in the Soviet farms and collective farms, the conversion of the Soviet and collective farms into points of support of Party work in the village, the drawing of the agricultural workers, of the poorest peasants and of the best members of the collective farms into the Party, the raising of the work among the village poor, the women and the youth on the collective farms to the required level is becoming a necessary precondition for the successful work of the Party for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

The Party Congress fully confirms the decision of the C. C. on the **abolition of the districts** (okrug) and the strengthening of the rayons as main link of socialist construction in the village, which must lead to a determined rapprochement of the Party and Soviet apparatus to the village, to the collective farms and to the masses. This measure is of extreme importance for the consolidation of the Party organisations in the village as well as for the improvement and consolidation of the relations of the C. C. and of the districts to the local institutions and organisations.

The Party Congress instructs the C. C. to carry out all practical measures in connection with the liquidation of the districts and the strengthening of the rayons.

V.

Thanks to the firm carrying out of the general line of the Party, thanks to the pitiless and determined struggle on two fronts—against Trotskyism and the conciliatory tendencies towards it, and against the Right deviation as the main danger of the present stage and the conciliatory attitude towards the Right deviation—the Party achieved enormous successes in socialist construction.

Only the fight on two fronts led to the complete exposure of Trotskyism, which had sunk completely to the counter-revolutionary positions of Menshevism. Conciliatory tendencies towards Trotskyism still exist in the Party which before all finds expression in the underestimation of the alliance of the working class with the middle peasantry. The Party will also in the future conduct a determined struggle against these tendencies.

After the Party had shattered Trotskyism, it encountered new symptoms of opportunism in the shape of the Right deviation (Bukharin group). The Right deviation opposed its openly opportunist line to the general line of the Party. The line of the Right-wingers leads to capitulation to the kulak-capitalist elements in the country. The realisation of the line of the Right-wingers, who are objectively agents of the kulaks, would have meant the collapse of the construction of Socialism and the restoration of capitalism in our country. In the period of the developing attack upon the capitalist elements, the Right deviation was and remains the main danger in the Party.

The Party Congress completely approves the measures of the C. C. of the Party adopted in the struggle against Trotskyism and the Right deviation, measures which guarantee the real maintenance of unity of the Party, the carrying out of the general line and the consolidation of the Party on the basis of Leninism. The Party Congress draws the attention of the whole Party to the fact the opportunists of all shades, and before all the Rights, are making a new manoeuvre, expressed in the formal recognition of their mistakes and in the formal approval of the general line of the Party, without however confirming this recognition by means of work and struggle for the general line, which in reality only means the transition from the open fight against the Party to a concealed fight, or waiting for a more favourable moment in order to proceed to new attacks against the Party.

The Party must declare ruthless fight against this double-game and deceit, and demand from all those who recognise their mistakes an active defence of the general line of the Party in order to prove the sincerity of their recognition. The non-fulfilment of this demand must involve the most determined organisational measures.

The Party Congress declares the views of the Right opposition to be incompatible with membership of the C. P. S. U.

In connection with the accentuation of the class struggle in the country, the Party Congress states that within the ranks of the Party there is being revealed a revival of **national deviations** in the direction of „Great Power“ and local chauvinism.

The main danger in the present period is the „**Great Power“ deviation** which attempts to revise the basis of Lenin's national policy, and the efforts (concealed under the flag of internationalism) of the dying classes of the formerly ruling Great Russian nation to recover their lost privileges.

Simultaneously there is revealed a deviation to local chauvinism, which weakens the unity of the peoples of the Soviet Union and plays into the hands of intervention.

The Party must increase the fight against both deviations in the national question and the conciliatory tendencies towards them by simultaneously drawing attention to the practical carrying out of Lenin's national policy, by doing away with the elements of national inequality and broadly developing the culture of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The XVI. Party Congress is of the opinion that the C. C. of our Party, which is welding together the ranks of the Leninists for the new historical struggles, must also in the future **ruthlessly repel all attempts to shake and to undermine the iron Party discipline and the unity of the Party.**

The XVI. Party Congress instructs the C. C. of the Party to secure also in the future the **Bolshevist fighting rates** of socialist construction, to carry out the actual **realisation of the Five-Year Plan in four years** and unwaveringly bring about the **liquidation of the kulak as a class** on the basis of **complete collectivisation** in the whole of the Soviet Union.

The Party Congress expresses the unshakable conviction that the C. P. S. U., which is welding millions of workers and collective farm members under the banner of Leninism and breaking the resistance of the class enemy, will lead the masses to an **enhanced socialist offensive** and secure the **complete victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union.**

The Party Congress expresses the unshakable conviction that the C. P. S. U., which is strengthening the power of the Soviet Union and consolidating the brotherly alliance with the workers and toilers of the capitalist and colonial countries, guarantees the **strengthening of the Soviet Union** as the impregnable stronghold of the international proletarian revolution.

Long live the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union!
Long live the victory of the international proletarian revolution!

PROLETARIAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Women's Co-operative Organisations and the Struggle against war.

By G. Bark.

“The Guild is fighting passionately for peace, its aim is full and final disarmament of the whole world.” So writes the leader of the International Women's Co-Operative Guild, **Emmi Freundlich**, in one of her numerous articles devoted to the forthcoming **Vienna Conference of the International Women's Co-Operative Guild** (“Arbeiter-Zeitung”, 22. 4. 30). But what does this “fight” really look like? If we peruse the numerous resolutions of the Guild, if we recall how the guild has carried out these resolutions, we will understand that the Guild is a typical petty bourgeois pacifist organisation. The leaders of the Guild, together with all the petty bourgeois co-operators, keep reiterating in all sorts of forms that “co-operation in peace”, that “through co-operation a peaceful commonwealth will be established”, etc., endeavouring at the same time to conceal from the workers that war is a constant companion of imperialism, that fighting war means fighting capitalism, that only in a socialist society there will be no wars.

The years which have passed since the war of 1914-18, have shown that the **Social Democrats** who are now sitting in parliaments and governments are pursuing a policy of armament and energetic preparation of another imperialist war in the interests of their national bourgeoisie. But while the position of the II. International with regard to the **Chinese revolution**,

the revolutionary movement in **India**, the construction of socialism in the **USSR**, etc., are a clear vindication of the imperialist policy, and obvious encouragement to the imperialists, the International Women's Guild, headed by the social democrats, cannot yet make up its mind to become a frank apologist of imperialism, but in reality, is adding grist to the mill of imperialism.

The conference of the International Guild in 1924 passed a resolution declaring that "it severely condemns war which goes against co-operative ideas and everything which is dear to mothers." The conference urges all women to co-ordinate the organised efforts of women consumers and citizens, in order to establish peace among peoples." In Britain, for instance, about **four million** working women are organised in the co-operative movement, but does this weaken the least bit the armament race **between Britain and the United States**, which is making the danger of war more imminent, or does it lessen the exploitation of **300 million** Indian workers by the British imperialists, which rouses these millions to fight Great Britain. All this co-operative twaddle disperses like smoke in the light of the most elementary facts.

At the conference of the International Guild in **Stockholm** (1927), the question of war against war was brought up at the instance of the Soviet delegation. A resolution was passed by a considerable majority, pointing out that the co-operated women "are convinced that the only safe guarantee of general peace is full and general disarmament", and calling upon the National Guilds to cooperate with other organisations pursuing the same aim.

The measure of the sincerity of the International Guild with regard to the struggle for peace is, if nothing else, the fact that at the Stockholm Conference the president of the Guild, the social democrat **Freundlich**, interrupted the speech of the woman delegate of the **USSR**, and would not allow its translation, a speech which divulged the real causes of imperialist wars, exposed the pacifist character of the Guild and urged energetic revolutionary struggle against capitalism and imperialism which create wars. Hitherto the Guild, in its endeavour to secure peace, has limited itself to addresses to the **League of Nations** which is an association of imperialist governments which are already making political and ideological preparations for another world slaughter. The proposals of the International Guild regarding the establishment of peace ministries in the Cabinets, which are pursuing a war policy, the call to disarm addressed to the militarist governments, only divert the masses from the real struggle for peace, because they foster illusions regarding the paths which lead to peace. **The organisations which resort to these methods are, objectively, playing into the hands of the militarists, are supporting the war policy.**" This was said at the conference by the representative of the cooperated women of the **USSR**; she called upon the working women in the capitalist countries to take an active part in the struggle against the war in China, the blockade of the **USSR**, and the capitalist offensive which aims at weakening the worker's power to resist the imperialist policy.

In the three years which have passed since the Stockholm Conference, threatening clouds gathered many a time on the horizon, the imperialists had already succeeded in provoking war on the Soviet Chinese frontier, they were shedding the blood of the rebellious workers and peasants of **India**, **Indo-China** and other colonial and semi-colonial countries, and the Guild appealed to the League of Nations, to the very same imperialist Governments. The Guild spoke in defence of the Soviet general disarmament proposals, but it did not use these proposals for the mobilisation of the masses against the imperialist governments, it limited itself to sending copies of resolutions, passed by the national guilds in favour of the Soviet proposals, to the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

In 1929, the Committee of the Guild passed a resolution "expressing **regret**" (!?) that, in spite of the Kellogg Pact, armament continues, and proposed to sign at a special conference the agreement re gradual disarmament. In **September 1929**, yet another resolution was sent to the Council of the League of Nations "demanding" support for all proposals directed towards disarmament.

This is, in fact, what the "struggle for peace" of these petty-bourgeois women leaders of the women's cooperative organisations looks like. This is how the women members of cooperatives are mobilised for the fight against imperialism and imperialist wars. The Conference to be held in **Vienna**, in August, will also discuss the peace question. The women representa-

tives of Soviet cooperation in the International Guild will place before this conference a resolution which exposes the real causes of imperialist wars:

"The maturing world crisis of capitalism is sharpening the fight of the imperialist powers for markets and colonies and is fraught with the danger of an imperialist war in the near future, and also with the danger of an attack on the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

The resolution concludes with Lenin's words:

"But what will proletarian women do against this (imperialism)? Only curse any kind of war and all militarism, only demand disarmament? Never will the women of an oppressed class which is truly revolutionary, get reconciled to such a shameful role. They will say to their sons:

"You will soon grow up. You will be given a rifle. Take it and learn properly the art of war. This art is necessary to the proletarians — not to aim your shots at your brothers, the workers of other countries, as this is done in the present war and as you are advised to do by the traitors to Socialism —, but to fight the bourgeoisie of your own country, in order to put an end to exploitation, destitution and wars, not by means of pious resolutions, but through victory over the bourgeoisie and its disarmament."

Military Training of Women in Yugoslavia.

By Vera Novak (Zagreb).

Whilst formerly the Yugoslavian bourgeoisie contented themselves with working on the women ideologically by means of various bourgeois cultural, humanitarian and religious women's associations for their imperialist purposes, they are now going over to the **open military education and training of women**. This change in the work among the women is a part of the general efforts at fascistisation and militarisation being made by the military-fascist dictatorship, a part of its endeavours to extend its social basis and to create mass organisations upon which it can rely with full confidence in the event of civil war and also in the coming imperialist war and in the attack on the Soviet Union.

The way to the present methods of work of the bourgeoisie among the masses of women, whose importance in the coming big class conflicts the Yugoslavian bourgeoisie fully realise, led, and still leads, from the above-mentioned women's associations via the holding of courses in needle-work and in housekeeping, at which is continually impressed on the minds of the women the necessity of fulfilling their "sacred duty to the nation", to large-scale propaganda among the women for the "peaceful" policy of the military-fascist dictatorship, for "concern for the poor neglected children in the Soviet Union" and appeals for freeing the Russian women, who are treated "like slaves", from the claws of Bolshevism.

Military education commences already with the little girls in the elementary schools. The **gymnastic exercises** are adapted to the programme of the fascist "Sokol (Falcon) of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia", and, according to the education act introduced by the fascist dictatorship, are to be conducted by **officers**. Outside of the schools the school girls are organised in the "**Red Cross**", an association which was created "to keep up the heart and morale in the fights for obtaining a position of power", and in the **Girl Guides**. They are called "bees", and right from their tenderest years they are trained "to love their king and country", instructed in **First Aid** and the **erection of field telephones** (during the Summer Holiday Camp) and made used to camp life.

The second stage of the military education leads to the above-mentioned "knightly" Sokol gymnastic organisation, the chief member of which is the crown prince. In the central organisation there is a **leader of the women's department** appointed by the **War Minister**; the central organisation, set up by the War Minister, appoints the women leaders of the different districts, and the district organisation appoint the leaders of the local groups. These women leaders are for the greater part recruited from the ranks of the learned professions: women professors, teachers and doctors.

In the "Sokol", along with sport and physical-culture, instruction is also given in **military service**. The Women are taught to **fence** with the **rapier** and **dagger**, and instructed in **First Aid**. The tendentious character of this training is

clearly seen from the fact that the "Sokol" is the fascist militia of the ruling dictatorial regime.

Finally, in the military garrisons, **groups of riflemen** are organised, who carry out their musketry training under the leadership of military persons. At the shooting competitions the district commander or his deputy distributes the badges to the winners.

These women rifle groups are not very numerous at present, and consist almost exclusively of women from the "upper class". But they are none the less dangerous for all that. The feminist women's movement in Yugoslavia also began with a small group of intellectuals, and today it already has a network of various sister organisations extending over the whole country, by which it has a fairly firm foothold, especially in the villages. Much more dangerous, however, is the fascist "Sokol", which aims mainly at getting hold of the youth and in whose ranks, in addition to a great number of young clerks and office employees, young women workers are to be found.

The social fascists, who give the prevailing bloody regime all-round, active support, of course do not do anything to oppose the activities of the bourgeois feminists. They thereby help the military-fascist dictatorship in the work among the women and render impossible the setting up of a united front of the workers, peasants and toiling masses of the suppressed nations under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat.

It is only the **Communist Party** which shows the proletarian women and toiling masses their position in the class struggle. In fulfilling its most important task—the winning of the majority of the working class—the C. P. of Yugoslavia must devote more attention to work among the women and do away with the tendency, still very prevalent in the ranks of the Party and especially in the Young Communist League, to underestimate the importance of this work.

Whose Lead Will Working Women Follow?

By Rosa Bloch.

The annual conference of the International Women's Co-operative Guild to be held in **August**, will discuss and "decide" among other questions, also the question of what the "**mother of the future**" must be. On this question, the conference will have to examine and discuss two reports, one placed before it and defended by women reformists and the other by women Communists.

The fundamental idea underlying Madame Nechaskova's report is — that the "mother of the future", i. e. the working woman can choose her own "career", i. e. she can either become an industrial worker (a proletarian), or she can devote herself entirely to the bringing up of her children, to her husband and household. But as in the capitalist countries the earnings of a working family are very insignificant owing to the growing unemployment and the steady worsening of the position of the working class, Madame Nechaskova proposes that a working class mother should be placed in conditions which will allow her to relinquish productive labour and to be only a housewife "getting regular subsidies" (who is to pay these subsidies, and how they are to be obtained, Madame Nechaskova does not indicate) "remunerating her labour and her cares and sufferings in connection with the bearing and bringing up of children. She must be relieved of the necessity of selling her labour"

What does the slogan "back to the family" really mean at the present juncture? This slogan, which advocates the return of the proletarian mother from the factory to her family, her husband and children and her kitchen is endeavouring to create in the minds of workmen, under the cloak of "warmth and comfort", animosity towards women working at the bench. This through and through reactionary slogan weakens the united ranks of the struggling proletariat through the isolation of working women from the general struggle of the proletariat.

In the report of the women reformists, this point of view is propounded not naively and from the Christian standpoint. In their actions and propaganda the women reformists follow consistently the line of lackeys of capitalism and traitors to the interests of the working class, a line directed towards help and service to the capitalist system.

With regard to woman labour in industry Lenin says:

"Drawing women and youngsters into the process of production is in itself a progressive phenomenon"

"The endeavour to forbid entirely women and youth labour in industry, or support for the patriarchal social order which excludes such labour, would be reactionary and utopian."

Before Lenin, Marx and Engels wrote in the same strain on this subject.

The small concessions, the crumbs thrown to the proletarian women from the table at which capitalism and reformism are feasting, the philanthropic measures which are supposed to enable mothers to stay at home giving themselves up to their "family vocation", cannot turn back the wheel of the economic process which, under the conditions of contemporary capitalism draws women irresistibly into industry. This is a fact well known also to the reformists, but they are deliberately fostering illusions and deceiving the workers, in order to put obstacles in the way of the struggle of the working class for its emancipation.

Communists and all class conscious working men and women, when discussing the question what the future of mothers should be, have only one answer to give, the correctness of which is confirmed by the whole history of the development of the labour movement. The road to women's emancipation is not their return from industry to their family, kitchen and children, this emancipation is bound up with the revolutionary struggle of the working class for the establishment of a new society where there will be no exploitation of man by man, where working women will be, politically and economically, men's equals.

The process of associating women with industry is a progressive process, which draws women into the general class struggle of the proletariat. On the other hand, not only working women, but the whole proletariat, all the workers must fight for the improvement of the position of proletarian mothers. This fight must be in the direction of obtaining equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, introduction of the 7-hour day and two-months leave for women workers before and after confinement, with the retention of their full wages at the expense of the enterprise. We must fight the dismissal of pregnant women workers. We must insist on the organisation on a large scale of institutions for the protection of motherhood and childhood (consultation rooms, creches, kindergartens, and playgrounds) at the expense of the employers and the State, so as to enable women workers to use them free of charge during their working hours.

Madame Nechaskova has much to say in her theses about the child's need of the loving and gentle care of the mother. But is this loving and gentle care guaranteed to the child in working class families, even when the mother does not go out to work? Aren't working men's wives affected by starvation, taxes and oppression of all kinds, isn't it the fate of working men's wives to see their children shot down by bourgeois and social fascist governments?

The fundamental principle underlying the provisions of the Soviet Government for the protection of motherhood and childhood is: to make life easier for workingmen's wives and women workers who are mothers. By a series of measures in regard to feeding, medical help and education, the State comes to the assistance of the growing generation, freeing hereby women from family cares. But this does not mean that the child is taken away from its mother. Her leisure hours the mother can devote to her child and does so. The whole system (leave in connection with confinement, laws for the protection of motherhood, children's institutions, cultural-educational work, etc., care of mother and child) is constructed so that the "mother of the future" shall be a fullfledged builder of her own country, of her own society where man does not subjugate man, where no encouragement is given to the maternity instinct, as an instinct, where a healthy maternity feeling is fostered, where children grow and are brought up as the future builders of a new socialist society. For such a "mother of the future" we must fight, and this fight is part of the general fight for the overthrow of the capitalist order and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In serried ranks, the proletarian women of all countries will follow the Communist Party in this fight.