

The Communist International 1919–1943 Documents

Volume III 1929–1943

Edited by
Jane Degras

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
1919-1943
DOCUMENTS

VOLUME III

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1919—1943

DOCUMENTS

SELECTED AND EDITED BY

JANE DEGRAS

THREE VOLUMES

VOLUME III

1929 – 1943

*Originally issued under the auspices of the
Royal Institute of International Affairs*

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Published by
Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

All rights reserved

First edition	1965
New impression	1971

Transferred to Digital Printing 2007

The Royal Institute of International Affairs is an unofficial body which promotes the scientific study of international questions and does not express opinions of its own. The opinions expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the author.

ISBN 0 7146 1555 2 (hbk)

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may be apparent

PREFACE

THIS third and last volume of Communist International documents covers a period (1929-43) longer than the two previous volumes combined. Only one congress was held in the fifteen years after 1928, and the proceedings of the four plenary sessions of the Executive Committee were not published in full. Little of the correspondence between the Executive and the sections was made public. There was no public Comintern statement directly concerned with the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, the incorporation of Austria in Germany, the anti-Comintern pact, the Munich agreement, or the outbreak of war in 1939. Volume VI of the series *Iz istorii mezhdunarodnoi proletarskoi solidarnosti*, covering the years 1938-45, which has a total of 597 documents (in full or in part), includes four emanating from the Comintern, one of which is the resolution on its dissolution.

In the first six of the years covered here, known in the Comintern jargon of the time as 'the third period', the national parties, operating the 'class against class' policy introduced in 1928, found themselves in sharp conflict with the organized labour movement and increasingly isolated within their own countries. They had for the most part adopted the new policy only reluctantly, and with the loss of many of their more moderate leaders who were unwilling to break completely with the socialist movement in which they had grown up. Although largely dictated by the struggles within the CPSU which accompanied the decision to proceed to forced industrialization and collectivization, the policy was also the outcome of disappointment at the failure of the united front policy which preceded it, just as the united front policy itself implied a recognition of the unsoundness of the assumptions on which Comintern policy in the first two years of its existence was based.

It can indeed be argued that with the adoption of the united front policy the Comintern abandoned not only its original strategy but the very principles underlying its existence, formulated in the belief that other countries besides Russia were ripe for revolution. The miseries of the war, the disorientation following defeat and the collapse of empires, the hopes and illusions cherished by millions amidst the subsequent chaos and nourished by events in Russia, were reason enough for this belief. Nor was it only the bolsheviks who held it; the same miscalculation was made by many eminent statesmen of the time; the spectre of revolution haunted the Versailles peace conference.

Within the Comintern, the failure of the revolution to spread beyond

Russia's borders gave even greater prominence to the position of the bolsheviks, already too powerful for the health of an international body. The national party leaders, seeing that only the Russians had been successful, were, by and large, willing to obey advice and instructions coming from Moscow, and having once abandoned their independence, were never successful enough in their proclaimed task to regain it. Unable to establish their revolutionary reality in their own right, they could assume a borrowed legitimacy by attaching themselves as willing and devoted auxiliaries to a regime which seemed to embody their aspirations and could therefore command their loyalty. Those who disputed the instructions and rejected the advice either resigned or were expelled, but no secessionist group ever managed to establish and maintain a viable opposition party. Quite apart from the material and organizational support offered by Moscow to its chosen subordinates, it was the uncritical and emotional allegiance of the rank and file that condemned the secessionists to failure. Within the party they had been judged and sentenced, if not tried; outside it they were isolated.

As the original vision faded, and the communist parties reshaped their strategies, the Comintern lost any stable criterion by which to judge the 'correctness' of any particular policy. A policy became correct merely by virtue of being adopted, and a 'deviation' was no longer a departure from an accepted principle, but a label which could be applied as the occasion demanded; thus there could be 'left-right' deviations, 'opportunist-adventurist' deviations, and 'Trotskyist-Bukharinist' deviations. That these labels were endorsed by the sections indicates the decline in the quality and stature of their leaders. The humiliations to which they were subjected, and the ruthlessness with which they were discarded, reflected both the loss of the original impulse and the irrelevance of their policies to the situation in their countries. Even where it might be cogently argued that the policy was related more nearly to domestic conditions, as in the proposals to organize industry and the Army in Spain during the civil war, its effectiveness and appeal were undermined by the 'Russian style' of its application. This aspect of Comintern discipline is revealed most clearly—if least harmfully—in the repetitiveness and rigidity of the verbal formulations used in its literature, which give it its deadly dullness. Even slight departures from the approved form of words could be and were treated as deviations.

The change to 'class against class', however useful the Soviet leaders may have found it for their own domestic purposes, had a crippling effect on the Comintern sections because of its irrelevance to the situations facing them. Once having eliminated those leaders who were bound in one way or another to the defeated group within the USSR, the Russians no

longer needed to pay much attention to the International, preoccupied as they were with the 'revolution from above' at home and the immense strains and difficulties to which it gave rise. They assigned to work in the ECCI figures of second or third rank. Public statements declined rapidly and steadily in number, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Soviet leaders had lost interest in the Comintern long before they brought it to an end. Moreover, debate and persuasion, which would have required genuine intellectual capacities and might have put a severe strain on discipline, were no longer essential. Moscow's authority sufficed. This was shown most strikingly in the reversal of policy on the outbreak of war in 1939, which entailed the denial of everything the parties had been saying for the previous five years. Even more telling in this respect was the decision to dissolve the Comintern. This too was accepted without challenge; the dissolution can indeed be regarded as the most extreme expression of the control exercised by the Russians over the other parties.

If the 'class against class' policy was at best irrelevant, at worst, as in Germany, fatal, its successor, the popular front, was very much in harmony with Soviet interests at a time when Moscow was anxious to advance the cause of collective security and to gain allies against the threat from Nazi Germany. This aspect of Soviet policy has been extensively treated in a number of studies, and does not require elaboration here. Even more than previous policies, however, it marked a departure from principle. All allies and supporters were welcome, provided they were hostile to Hitler's government. Only 'renegades' were unwelcome (since heretics remain dangerous, while the heathen can be converted), on the ground that 'objectively' they acted as fascist agents. Otherwise, communists found no difficulty in sharing their activities with 'bourgeois liberals', 'progressive churchmen', 'honest conservatives', and even the 'reformists' whom they had earlier damned as traitors to the working class.

For the first time in their history, communist parties, freed from restraint and allowed, even encouraged, to shape their policies to suit the conditions in their countries, found a place for themselves in political life and made progress. To justify the reversal it was argued that at times the critical question of the day must take precedence over considerations of the long-term goal, that indeed the defeat of the Nazis, with whatever allies, was essential to the attainment of that goal. In fact, the long-term struggle—that is, the struggle to overthrow capitalism—took second place throughout the history of the Comintern to the struggle against the socialist parties, and on the same reasoning, that unless and until the communists defeated their socialist rivals and won for themselves the allegiance of the working classes, no successful revolution was possible. If it is thought that too much space is allocated in this volume to communist agitation against the

socialists, the fact is that this reflects the emphasis of the Comintern documents themselves.

The common belief that the International was little more than an unofficial agency of the Soviet Foreign Commissariat needs correcting. In the early years, when the parties believed in their independent revolutionary mission, the Foreign Commissar, Chicherin, was often annoyed and handicapped by Zinoviev's activities; in later years the Comintern and its sections were used in the interests of competing groups within the Russian Communist Party rather than of Soviet interests as such. Indeed, the 'third period' interlude might be regarded as positively injurious to the Soviet Union. Mentally immobilized in the irrelevant economic categories of class, hypnotized by the 1848 legacy of '*the* revolution' and '*the* reaction', incapable of recognizing the intensity of the nationalist appeal or the power of the fascist movement to captivate minds in spite of its irrationality, the communist leaders completely failed to understand the nature of the new phenomenon (although in a milder form it had triumphed in Italy), which they defined as the instrument of the extreme terrorist dictatorship of finance-capital. It was expediency, not theory, that dictated a change of policy. The 'analysis' of fascism remained as inept and misleading as before.

There is a growing literature on the Communist International and its constituent parties, but as yet no complete history of the organization. Granted that no fully documented and detailed account is possible without the use of the unpublished records of meetings of the Executive and its commissions, of the political secretariat and presidium, the material available is plentiful enough for an adequate study. Little that is useful has been published by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, the repository of Comintern archives; such articles and monographs as have from time to time appeared are stereotyped and uninformative. Mr. E. H. Carr's *History of Soviet Russia* deals comprehensively and brilliantly with Comintern activities in the early years, particularly as they interacted with Soviet foreign policy, but even when he has completed his task the story will not go beyond 1928. The late Franz Borkenau's *Communist International* is an indispensable introduction to the subject, mature in political insight and analysis, but it is a sketch, not a full-length portrait. Valuable contributions have been made by the study of individual parties, notably Mr. Rothschild's of the Bulgarian CP, Mr. Draper's of the American CP, and the numerous more specialized works on the Chinese party (all, incidentally, undertaken in the United States), while the amount of work that has been done on the Russian party itself is serious and comprehensive enough for any study of the international organization which it controlled. The

great gap here is a history of the German Communist Party (useful as Professor Flechtheim's short account is), for which much new material is now available at the Berlin Document Centre and among the micro-filmed German Archives in Washington.

It may be asked, is it worth while? What, after all, did the Comintern amount to? This is, I think, an irrelevant question. Its foundation was based on a misreading of conditions, its unheralded end was ignominious. In the twenty-four years between those two events it could claim no positive victory in the terms of its original aims, even if the virtual destruction of the socialist movement in continental Europe can be assigned in part to its account. But the Russian Revolution was an epochal event, and the history of the Comintern is inseparable from Soviet history. The question whether on balance its activities were useful to the Russian leaders cannot be answered with a simple yes or no; certainly Russia's relations with other countries were prejudiced by its existence, and it is possible that the bolsheviks might have retained the support of many of the socialist parties which they had won at the outset had the Comintern not spent so much of its energy and resources on the attempt to discredit them and diminish their hold on organized labour. But in the circumstances of Russia's internal political history a different policy was hardly to be expected.

* * * * *

In this volume more documents than in the earlier two are reproduced from an English text; it would of course have made the task of the editor much easier if this practice could have been used more widely, but this was found impracticable. (Reviews of the preceding volumes in this series appearing in Soviet historical journals suggested that the documents had been translated from the Russian or German in order to introduce distortions into the text.) The editors of the English-language versions of Comintern documents appear to have been in many cases both illiterate and ill-informed. Where names were wrongly spelt (e.g. Chevenel for Schevenels, Thorés for Thorez, Udegeest for Oudegeest) these could be corrected; minor grammatical errors and inappropriate punctuation could also be corrected, but where the English text was unintelligible or excessively clumsy, the document has been translated from the Russian, German, or French text. Even so, a good deal of extremely bad writing remains (this was, after all, the form in which Comintern publications and propaganda were made available to the English-speaking reader), substantiating the complaints frequently made within the Comintern itself that the language of the parties lacked popular appeal. This was not entirely the fault of the translators. The language of the earlier years, which had its share of genuine passion, had degenerated into one of platitudinous reiterations and mechanical violence (so that the withdrawal

of a labour permit from a Polish miner in France, a three-month prison sentence on a striker, and the execution of a rebel, were all described as 'unprecedented brutality and terror').

In deciding whether to use complete texts or extracts, I was guided primarily by the desire to avoid constant repetition and the inclusion of trivial details, such as the account of a strike given to support an argument or assertion. It was more difficult to determine where to draw the line, in the notes appended to the documents, between those matters which fall into the sphere of Comintern activities, and those which belong rather to the field of Soviet policy as such, or the inner history of the individual parties. After some hesitation I decided to exclude such events as the '*Auslieferung*' of German communist refugees in 1940, and, for the most part, the operations of Soviet agents in Spain during the civil war. If only for reasons of space it was not possible to correct in the notes the numerous mis-statements made in the documents—for example, on the attitude of Léon Blum to the arrest of communist deputies in France in 1939. These questions have, in any case, been competently dealt with in a number of studies. I have listed in the sources only those publications from which I took material for the annotations.

J. D.

November 1964

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
TABLE OF DOCUMENTS	xiii
DOCUMENTS	i
APPENDIX: THE ECCI	483
SOURCES	487
INDEX	489

TABLE OF DOCUMENTS

1929

8 February	Letter from the ECCI to the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party (extracts)	1
February	Letter from the ECCI to the sixth convention of the CP of the USA (extracts)	8
2 March	ECCI manifesto on the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Comintern (extracts)	16
March	ECCI manifesto on the revolutionary movement in India (extracts)	20
April	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	23
18 May	Statement of the West European Bureau of the ECCI on the conference of European communist parties in preparation for an international anti-war day (extracts)	26
7 June	Letter from the ECCI to the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the peasant question (extracts)	31
	The tenth plenary session of the ECCI	36
1 July	Theses of the tenth ECCI plenum on the international situation and the tasks of the Communist International (extracts)	39
July	Theses of the tenth ECCI plenum on the economic struggle and the tasks of communist parties (extracts)	52
July	Resolution of the tenth ECCI plenum on the international day of struggle against imperialist war (extracts)	64
July	Resolution of the tenth ECCI plenum on Bukharin (extracts)	67
July	ECCI manifesto on Mexico (extracts)	70
18 July	Comintern statement on the Chinese Eastern Railway dispute (extracts)	73
16 October	Resolution of the ECCI political secretariat on the insurrection movement in Arabistan (extracts)	76
26 October	Letter from the ECCI to the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party (extracts)	84
November	Letter from the ECCI to the eleventh congress of the CPGB (extracts)	89

1930

January	Resolution of the West European Bureau of the ECCI on the Japanese Communist Party (extracts)	95
6 February	Resolution of the West European Bureau of the ECCI on the forthcoming elections in Japan (extracts)	97
	Meeting of the enlarged presidium of the ECCI	98
February	Resolution of the enlarged presidium of the ECCI on the economic crisis and unemployment (extracts)	102
February	Resolution of the enlarged presidium of the ECCI on the fifth congress of the RILU (extracts)	109

<i>February</i>	Resolution of the enlarged presidium of the ECCI on the report of the CPSU (extracts)	110
<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	112
<i>June</i>	ECCI resolution on the Chinese question (extracts)	114
14 <i>September</i>	Telegram of congratulations from the ECCI to the central committee of the KPD on the election results	120
<i>October</i>	Material issued by the agitprop department of the ECCI on the thirteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	123
26 <i>October</i>	Resolution of the ECCI political secretariat on the Negro question in the United States (extracts)	124
16 <i>November</i>	Letter from the ECCI to the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party on Li Li-san's policy (extracts)	135
<i>December</i>	Circular letter on factory cells of the organization department of the ECCI endorsed by the political secretariat (extracts)	141

1931

	The eleventh plenary session of the ECCI	149
<i>April</i>	Theses of the eleventh ECCI plenum on the tasks of the Comintern sections in connexion with the deepening of the economic crisis and the development of the conditions making for a revolutionary crisis in a number of countries (extracts)	151
<i>April</i>	Resolution of the eleventh ECCI plenum on the danger of a war of intervention against the USSR (extracts)	164
26 <i>August</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium on the tasks of the Chinese Communist Party (extracts)	167
<i>September</i>	Appeal by the West European Bureau of the ECCI and the European Secretariat of the RILU on the Japanese invasion of Manchuria	176
6 <i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the fourteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	179

1932

<i>January</i>	Letter from the West European Bureau of the ECCI to the Spanish Communist Party (extracts)	180
<i>April</i>	Letter from the ECCI to central committees of Comintern sections on the state of membership (extracts)	187
<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	190
<i>May</i>	Theses of the West European Bureau of the ECCI on the situation in Japan and the tasks of the Japanese Communist Party (extracts)	192
<i>July</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium on the work of trade union fractions (extracts)	203
	The twelfth plenary session of the ECCI	208
<i>September</i>	Theses of the twelfth ECCI plenum on the international situation and the tasks of the Comintern sections (extracts)	210
<i>September</i>	Resolution of the twelfth ECCI plenum on the lessons of economic strikes and the struggle of the unemployed (extracts)	230

TABLE OF DOCUMENTS

xv

<i>September</i>	Resolution of the twelfth ECCI plenum on the war in the Far East and the tasks of communists in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention against the USSR (extracts)	238
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto to the workers, peasants, and communists of Spain (extracts)	244
4 <i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the fifteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	247

1933

5 <i>March</i>	ECCI statement on the German situation and on the united front	248
1 <i>April</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium on the situation in Germany	254
<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	263
17 <i>September</i>	Letter from the ECCI secretariat to the Independent Labour Party (extracts)	268
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the sixteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	273
	The thirteenth plenary session of the ECCI	280
<i>December</i>	Theses of the thirteenth ECCI plenum on fascism, the war danger, and the tasks of communist parties (extracts)	285

1934

3 <i>March</i>	Manifesto on the events in Austria issued by the ECCI, RILU, and YCI (extracts)	306
<i>March</i>	Theses of the agitprop department of the ECCI on the fifteenth anniversary of the foundation of the Communist International (extracts)	309
<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	326
10 <i>October</i>	ECCI proposal to the LSI for joint action in support of the Spanish workers	328
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the seventeenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	331

1935

22 <i>April</i>	ECCI statement on LSI rejection of joint May Day demonstrations	339
<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	341
	The seventh Comintern congress	346
1 <i>August</i>	Resolution of the seventh Comintern congress on the report of the ECCI (extracts)	350
20 <i>August</i>	Resolution of the seventh Comintern congress on fascism, working-class unity, and the tasks of the Comintern (extracts)	355
20 <i>August</i>	Resolution of the seventh Comintern congress on the danger of a new world war (extracts)	370
23 <i>September</i>	Telegram from the ECCI to the LSI secretariat on the danger of war in Abyssinia	378
5 <i>November</i>	ECCI statement on the attitude taken by the LSI executive (extracts)	379

1936

<i>January</i>	ECCI message to the eighth congress of the French Communist Party (extracts)	383
<i>April</i>	ECCI May Day manifesto (extracts)	385
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the nineteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	392
28 <i>December</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium on the activities of the Spanish Communist Party	396

1937

<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI (extracts)	400
8 <i>June</i>	Telegram from Dimitrov to the chairman of the LSI on help for Spain	409
21 <i>June</i>	Joint statement by representatives of the ECCI and the LSI Executive on help for Spain	410
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the twentieth anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	412

1938

<i>April</i>	ECCI May Day manifesto (extracts)	417
<i>July</i>	Greetings from the ECCI to the central committee of the Spanish Communist Party	423
<i>July</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium on the policy of the Chinese Communist Party (extracts)	425
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	427

1939

<i>April</i>	ECCI May Day manifesto (extracts)	434
<i>November</i>	ECCI manifesto on the 22nd anniversary of the Russian revolution (extracts)	439
<i>November</i>	Article by Dimitrov on the tasks of the working class in the war (extracts)	448
<i>December</i>	Greetings from the ECCI to Stalin on his 60th birthday (extracts)	459

1940

<i>April</i>	May Day manifesto of the ECCI	462
--------------	-------------------------------	-----

1942

<i>May</i>	May Day 1942	471
------------	--------------	-----

1943

15 <i>May</i>	Resolution of the ECCI presidium recommending the dissolution of the Communist International	476
10 <i>June</i>	Statement of the presidium of the ECCI on the dissolution of the Communist International	480

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

8 February 1929

Strategiya i Taktika Komintern, p. 221

[There were at this time in effect two communist movements in China; what remained of the old party, with a central committee working in illegal conditions in Shanghai and maintaining more or less constant communication with Moscow; and the communist movement in the Soviet areas, where Mao Tse-tung, Ho Lung, and Chu Teh had settled, with some other communist leaders, and organized their red armies. The central committee in Shanghai continued to insist on the importance of the urban centres, and to predict an early resurgence of the revolutionary tide there. Little attention was at first paid to the existence of what the central committee meeting of July 1929 referred to as 'certain soviet areas as well as the Red Army under the command of Chu and Mao'; their activities had suffered from 'a lack of positive direction from the central committee'. In April 1929 *Inprekorr* put the figure for the forces under Chu and Mao at 10,000, and said they were well equipped with modern weapons. The ECCI appears to have had very little information about what was happening in the parts of China where local soviets were established. In *Inprekorr* in July 1929 Strakhov (Tsiu Vito) wrote that in 'the so-called Soviet areas' the party was not consolidated; the figures claimed by Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh 'seem exaggerated to us, but it is notable that in those areas "small Soviet republics" were proclaimed a year ago and are still in existence'. He gave a CCP membership of 134,000 for the beginning of 1929, of whom only 5,000 were urban workers, and their contacts with the party were very weak.

The percentage of industrial workers in the CCP had fallen from 65 in 1927 to 9 at the end of 1928. A CCP circular, agreeing that 'activities in the village should not be ignored', nevertheless urged 'greater emphasis on urban activities'.

Trotsky complained of the lack of information about the Soviet areas in the Soviet press, but, like the ECCI, continued to attach overriding importance to the industrial workers: 'By losing its proletarian nucleus, the CCP ceases to be in conformity with its true historical destiny.' Only the proletarian vanguard was capable of capturing power. 'The greatest problem now is the renaissance of the CP as the organization of the vanguard of the proletariat.' He asserted that the membership of the trade unions controlled by the CCP had fallen from 2.8 million in 1927 to 60,000 in 1930. Piatnitsky reported that a membership of 40,000 was represented at a conference held in November 1929, but of these half were artisans. 'The CCP', he wrote, 'was threatened in 1928-9 with the danger of becoming a peasant party as regards its composition . . . and in the cities it almost lost touch with the broad masses of the workers. . . . Party organizations and red trade union functionaries discussed for a whole year whether it is possible and necessary to work in the yellow mass trade unions. . . . With the aid of the ECCI, the CCP recognized the necessity of wresting the trade union movement from the hands of the Kuomintangists and started to

work in the yellow mass trade unions.' Of the communist-controlled unions he said: 'The red trade unions recovered also.' *Problemy Kitaya* (no. 2) condemned the tendency among some communists to urge the liquidation of what remained of the red trade unions on the ground that nothing could be done without KMT permission. On the contrary, it was the job of the CCP to strengthen the illegal unions, to lead the spontaneous industrial struggle, to win over the masses in the yellow unions, and to create genuine rank-and-file organizations in the factories.

An ECCI resolution on work in the Chinese trade unions later in the year noted that the red unions were 'very weak' and said they had to be transformed into mass organizations to lead the reviving labour movement. Some of the 'yellow' and KMT unions 'have become broad mass labour organizations', and communists should work harder in them, but should help to form them only in certain conditions. 'We form these trade unions only because, and in so far as, they have large numbers in their ranks, and only for the purpose of capturing these masses.' Wherever objective conditions were favourable, red trade unions should be started, and factory committees organized as the basic unit of these unions. At the tenth ECCI plenum Tsiu Vito said there were many in the Chinese CP who were opposed to the formation of red unions, for fear of being charged with splitting the labour movement.

The Pan-Pacific trade union secretariat met in June 1929, attended by delegates from China, Japan, and the Philippines, to discuss the 'disruptive tactics of European reformists in Asia'. They were 'conspiring' through the ILO to destroy militant Asian trade unionism in order to keep wages down and hamper the struggle for independence. The introduction to the book from which the present text is taken (published in 1934) says of this period: 'A serious brake on the workers' movement in the new stage of the revolution was the creation of Kuomintang and yellow trade unions, led by every kind of "oppositional" group of reorganizers, followers of Chen Tu-hsiu, etc., playing in the labour movement of semi-colonial China the same role as the social-fascists and Amsterdam unions in Europe. Hence the point of the political struggle of the proletariat was bound to be directed in the first place against these KMT agents in the labour movement.'

An article in *Novy Vostok* on the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Comintern dealt with the position of the national bourgeoisie. 'The analysis of the relation of forces in colonial countries reveals clearly that the national bourgeoisie as a whole are at present playing a counter-revolutionary part. They are not marching at the head of the fight for national emancipation, for agrarian revolution, and for a democratic republic, as stages towards the socialist revolution'. But there were contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and the imperialists, and the proletariat should exploit these and expose the incapacity of the bourgeoisie to overcome them. The course of the Chinese revolution had shown that at the present stage the Chinese bourgeoisie had capitulated to imperialism and made common cause with the feudalists against the revolution.]

Having studied the report of your politbureau . . . we can state that

the new tactical line, adopted in accordance with the changed situation in China, . . . has by and large been mastered by the new CC, but is being carried through only in a very weak fashion by the party as a whole. As can be seen from your report and circular letters, there is still in the ranks of the party a certain confusion and disorganization which seriously hampers the development of its activity. . . .

The most essential job is to ward off the danger . . . that part of the party masses and sympathizing workers who during the period of rising revolution fought under CP leadership will, because of disappointment, lose the revolutionary perspective. In the present circumstances, extremely difficult for the revolutionary labour movement, this danger is very real. Disarray and depression after the defeat of the revolution in circumstances of crushing terror wear off only very slowly . . . for some of the faint-hearted the picture may easily appear more desolate than it actually is, may even suggest the hopeless annihilation of the revolutionary movement. On the other hand, the partial economic revival which is beginning in the country after the end of the civil war creates a certain basis for the illusion that an era of capitalist 'recovery' has begun, opening the road to peaceful political and economic development which will make any new rise of the revolutionary wave impossible or at least deflect it into indeterminate channels.

This leaves entirely out of account what a Marxist analysis shows, that the basic contradictions which generated the earlier wave of the Chinese revolution have not been resolved, nor can they be resolved by measures introduced by the ruling exploiting classes. . . .

The Kuomintang and the Nanking Government are trying to create among the people the illusion of a gradual peaceful liberation from the yoke of foreign imperialism. Nevertheless . . . England in the south and Japan in the north have recently extended their 'spheres of influence' and strengthened their commanding positions, so that, judging from the facts, it would be more correct to talk of the division of China and the consequent prospect of imperialist war and of civil war among the militarists than of the utopian liberation of China by 'diplomatic means'.

Of course the front of the imperialist powers in regard to China is not and cannot be solid. There is first of all the rivalry between the United States and the Anglo-Japanese bloc. If it were not for this, Japan would not have hesitated halfway at the time of its military expedition to the north, nor would England (and a number of other States) have promised China tariff autonomy and the annulment of the unequal treaties. That is a fact. But its importance should not be exaggerated.

It would be incorrect to assert, as is done in one of the CC's circular letters, that the 'basic policy' of the United States is 'directly opposed' to the policy of England and Japan. That is not true. United States policy in

China is just as imperialist as England's or Japan's. It differs in the means of applying that policy. The 'open door' principle does not reflect a tendency towards a policy of decolonization; it is a liberal mask which now, and possibly in the future too, can camouflage the imperialist policy of expansion pursued by the United States. . . . Relying on its economic power, the United States concentrates its attention on winning the commanding economic heights, on bringing the central Government into financial and diplomatic subjection, hoping by those means to compensate for the absence of territorial spheres of influence such as are held by England and Japan. . . .

The Chinese bourgeoisie are not in a position to conduct an independent national policy in regard to imperialism. They hope, by using the rivalries among the imperialist Powers, and with the support of the United States, to achieve significant successes in the matter of China's independent capitalist development. But that is an illusion. They can only win those 'rights' which correspond at any given moment with the aims of one great Power or another. . . . At the present moment there is no special American imperialist interest which would be adversely affected by a certain consolidation and strengthening of the central Government. On the contrary, this is even desirable as a guarantee of old foreign loans and of the proposed new ones. But every Chinese guarantee agreement on such loans only squeezes China more closely in the grip of colonial enslavement. . . .

It would be incorrect to assume that, having gone over to the camp of counter-revolution, the entire Chinese bourgeoisie have taken over *in toto* the policy of the old landlord-warlord Government of China. Because of the irreconcilable conflict of interests between the independent capitalist development of national industry, and the interests of imperialism, the national bourgeoisie cannot wholly abandon their national-reformist platform. But that very platform presupposes a policy of constant compromise with imperialism, which leads in practice to the capitulation of the national bourgeoisie to imperialism. . . .

It is the task of the communist party to expose the counter-revolutionary character of bourgeois national-reformism, and, mobilizing the broad masses of the working people and petty-bourgeoisie for irreconcilable anti-imperialist struggle, to liberate them from the influence of the national bourgeoisie, at the same time revealing the anti-revolutionary role of the KMT Government, which conceals its subservience to imperialism by verbal opposition to it. . . .

The task of uniting China and freeing it from imperialism is indissolubly bound up with the agrarian revolution and the destruction of all feudal survivals. But to accomplish this third great task of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China is an undertaking which can be carried through only by a government of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. . . .

Thus there is no doubt that the basic problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China are not only not solved, but are wholly insoluble by the Chinese bourgeoisie and KMT Government. All the talk about the possibility of a 'Kemalist' development in Chinese affairs is empty chatter. The basic contradictions are not being overcome; they are growing more acute, and this is bound to stimulate the process of ripening of a new general revolutionary crisis, broader and deeper than the earlier one. . . .

It is essential to prepare the party and the masses, in particular the proletarian masses, for the forthcoming struggle to overthrow the feudal-bourgeois bloc, to establish the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. If the communist party does not succeed in consolidating its own ranks in good time, in strengthening its influence over the industrial proletariat, reinforcing the leadership of the peasants' struggle by the organized proletariat, then when the revolutionary crisis breaks, it will not be able adequately to exploit the objectively revolutionary situation and ensure the victory of the revolution.

Over the past year the Chinese Communist Party was not able adequately to adapt its revolutionary work to the changing objective conditions, and this is still its greatest weakness. It was born and grew up in conditions of a revolutionary mass offensive . . . and open legal work. It was not prepared for underground work in conditions of atrocious terror. Thus the blows of the counter-revolution shook the party severely and produced a state of disorganization which has still to be overcome and which presents great difficulties. The unusually great weight of the intelligentsia in the active party cadres does not make this task any easier. . . . The first and basic task in the present period is to strengthen the illegal communist party, to reinforce its organizations and its authority and its dominant influence—the importance of which was at first underestimated by the legalists, who at first put on the brakes and then resisted and rejected this line.

The right danger is the more serious for the Chinese revolutionary movement as the ruling Kuomintang party is doing all it can to attract into its orbit large masses of the petty bourgeoisie and also the working class. With this end in view, while continuing its bloody repression of communists, it is proposing certain social reforms (shorter working day, profit sharing, etc.) . . . in the attempt to create the illusion that some so-called 'left-wing' KMT leaders wish to fight the reactionary feudalists and warlords, to defend the cause of national freedom against the imperialists, etc.

This fraudulent ruse can have no lasting influence on the masses, for the contrast between words and deeds is too striking. But for a certain time it may have some effect on them, and we should not underrate this danger.

In view of the present weakness of communist organizations and the difficulties of their work, the KMT, by making use of all the means afforded by the State apparatus, and with the support of the exploiting classes, may succeed for some time in leading part of the working masses by the nose. If even among the communists some voices (however few) are raised in favour of a capitulatory policy of dragging behind the KMT, then it is clear that outside the ranks of the communist party some working people are far from having outlived their illusions about KMT policy. . . .

The cases in the past year—not few in number—of members leaving the party (and there were even cases of voluntary self-denunciation to the KMT authorities) indicate the seriousness of the right danger in the party. But the danger is still greater outside the party, for example in the trade unions. It is absolutely essential to take a strong and determined line of struggle against petty-bourgeois vacillations in the party and among the masses, wherever and in whatever form they manifest themselves. . . .

The sixth congress of the CCP summoned the party to correct its 'left' deviations (putschism, military adventurism, individual terrorism) and its so-called 'Kuomintang-like' approach to the masses ('decrees'). As a result of objective conditions, putschist actions and military adventurism have to a large extent lost their basis over the past year, but it would be incorrect to assume that the 'left' illness has been entirely overcome in the party. . . .

All party members must realize that without deep and strong roots in the masses of the working class, without a broad organizational basis in the factories and trade unions, the party will not be in a position to play the leading part in the Chinese revolution. They must realize that the stronger the position they succeed in winning at the present time in the factories, the trade unions, the strike movement, the greater the forces they will be able to dispose of during the approaching class battles. On the eve of the sixth CCP congress, the CC noted that the number of revolutionary trade unions under communist influence had fallen from 734 in the Wuhan period to 81. . . . Since then the position has got worse as a result of unrelenting persecution, while the KMT unions have continued to grow. . . . It would be wholly incorrect to underrate the significance of this growth as a factor hampering the development of the revolutionary movement among the Chinese workers. By these means the ruling counter-revolutionary party is trying to create for itself among the working class a firm organizational foundation for its power and its policy, to make the union leadership a monopoly of its own agents, to terrorize and destroy the class trade unions. Against this KMT trade union fascism, communists must wage a vigorous, systematic, and stubborn struggle, both inside and outside the yellow unions.

As far as circumstances allow, every effort must be made to re-establish

and strengthen the revolutionary class trade unions. Illegality naturally creates great difficulties for these unions, and it is therefore important to find a legal cover for them, or to develop their organizations and activities in forms in which they can maintain in practice a semi-legal existence. . . . A firm basis for every union must be laid in the factories, under the leadership of the communist party cell. But the communist fractions (even those in the red unions) should not appear as such, if they do not wish to facilitate the work of the KMT spies. . . .

But it would be a crude error to think that strengthening the illegal and semi-legal revolutionary unions exhausted the trade union work of communists. It should not be forgotten that besides these unions there are mass legal yellow KMT unions. It is our task to penetrate these unions and win the masses away from the yellow leaders . . . and rally them around the conspirative communist fractions. In every dispute and strike it is necessary to expose the compromising and treacherous role of the yellow leaders, to mobilize the workers against the Kuomintang, against the nomination by the KMT of trade union officials, against KMT orders and intervention. . . . The workers must be convinced, from their own experience, that the KMT regime is a regime of oppression.

Only by such means can the KMT system of trade union fascism be undermined, and a firm basis for the revolutionary trade union movement be created even in the yellow unions. At the same time propaganda must be conducted against the League of Nations' Labour Office, against the Amsterdam International, against the convening of the Asian trade union congress in Calcutta by the Japanese reformists. . . .

The organizational state of the party, as it emerges from the CC documents, is wholly unsatisfactory. 'A large proportion of the urban cells are in a state of dissolution', says one of the CC circulars, 'and a substantial part of the industrial worker *aktiv* cannot find the party and so automatically drop out of our organization. The majority of active members have lost their jobs, have lost contact with the masses, are living at the party's expense. . . .' According to the politbureau's report 'the maximum number of industrial workers in the party does not exceed 4000'. . . .

Faced with this situation, the CC has issued a number of concrete and correct instructions: to concentrate attention primarily on industrial areas, large towns, and important occupational groups; to draw industrial workers into active party work. . . . The task now is to see that these instructions are really put into effect.

Among the tasks indicated by the CC two are of such importance for the CCP that we wish to emphasize them here. The first is the creation of production cells, and their correct operation. . . . There are at present very few such cells, and their number is diminishing; there are none or virtually none in the main industrial enterprises. . . .

The second task is to see to the ideological equipment of the party. For this it is necessary to undertake a serious study of Marxism. It should be borne in mind that without serious Marxist-Leninist theoretical preparations, not only of the leading party nucleus but also of propagandists and agitators, the party runs the risk of depriving itself of that essential ideological basis which alone will enable it to make the correct moves in changing situations and on complex political problems which are of great importance both for the party and for the course of the revolution.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI LETTER TO THE SIXTH CONVENTION
OF THE CP OF THE USA

February 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 12, p. 208, 1 *March 1929*

[The attempt made at the sixth Comintern congress to eliminate 'factionalism' in the American CP was unsuccessful. Previous divergences were exacerbated by the new policy of 'dual unionism', opposed by the group led by Pepper and Lovestone; Foster, who at first supported Pepper and Lovestone in their opposition, later changed sides. In Moscow Lovestone's group were regarded as supporters of Bukharin, and the ECCI therefore gave its support to their opponents, led by Browder and Bittelman. Under pressure from the ECCI, and in an attempt to avoid this charge, Lovestone's group introduced at the congress, held in the first week of March 1929, a resolution calling for Bukharin's dismissal from his Comintern post. They were supported by 95 of the 105 delegates. In addition to the present letter (which, though dated February, had in fact been received at the beginning of the year), a confidential letter on organizational questions had been sent by the ECCI. Dengel (KPD) and Pollitt (CPGB), acting for the ECCI, proposed Foster as secretary and asked that Lovestone and Bittelman be withdrawn from work in the United States and sent, together with Pepper, to Moscow. Ignoring these instructions, the congress gave the Lovestone supporters ten of the fourteen seats on the political committee.

After the congress a delegation of 10 members (ignoring the warnings of Pepper in the United States and of Roy in Berlin), went to Moscow and a special ECCI commission examined the question in April-May. It consisted of 12 members, of whom 8 were Russians, including Stalin and Molotov; the other 4 were Kuusinen, Bell, Kun, and Ulbricht. The commission's insistence on the reorganization of the political committee and on the presence of Lovestone and Bittelman in Moscow prompted the American delegation to issue a statement on 9 May that American communists would conclude from these proposals that 'the ECCI desires to destroy the central committee'. The 'open letter' to the American communists drafted by the commission on 12 May condemned both the majority and the minority as factionalists and right-wing deviators, particularly in their view that American capitalism occupied an 'exceptional' position which made the Comintern theses on the economic crisis and the radicalization

of the masses inapplicable to the United States. The majority had gambled dishonestly on the outcome of the struggle in the CPSU and had treated the ECCI representatives at their congress disgracefully. 'The American Communist Party is confronted now in all sharpness with the question of the danger of the political disintegration of the present leading cadres which threatens to undermine the whole work of the party.'

At the final meeting with the ECCI presidium on 14 May the Americans said such a letter would promote 'demoralization, disintegration, and chaos' in the United States. Stalin replied that the majority supported the Lovestone group in the belief that they supported the Comintern. 'There have been numerous cases in the history of the Comintern when its most popular leaders . . . found themselves isolated as soon as they raised the banner against the Comintern.' The presidium endorsed the letter, Gitlow (USA) voting against. Lovestone and his two most prominent supporters, Gitlow and Wolfe, were removed from their posts, and in New York the central committee, although consisting largely of Lovestone's former supporters, endorsed the ECCI's action unanimously, and instructed the American delegates in Moscow, of whom four, including Foster, Bedacht, and Bittelman, had already submitted to the ECCI, to accept it. On 4 June it announced that it condemned the theory of 'exceptionalism'. Later in the month Lovestone, Gitlow, and Wolfe were expelled from the CP/USA. Lovestone's appeal against expulsion was referred by the tenth ECCI plenum to the ICC; if he failed to appear before it (as in fact happened) his expulsion was to be considered as ratified. Pepper was expelled by the ICC in August for refusing to obey ECCI instructions. At the plenum Molotov reported the affair, saying that Lovestone's insistence on the 'special position' of the United States was concealed apologetics for United States imperialism; the ECCI had undertaken a 'radical renovation' of the United States central committee. Bedacht, on his return to the United States, said he had abandoned 'the monstrous idea that the Comintern plans to break up our Party because it determined to "break up" my faction. . . . I gradually began to understand that my very approach to the whole problem was in itself a proof of the correctness of the criticism of our leadership by the Communist International.'

In execution of the 'dual unionism' policy, the Trade Union Unity League (successor to the Trade Union Educational League) was founded at Cleveland, in August–September 1929, on the ground that the AFL was 'the agent of Wall Street and its State Department'. Lozovsky said the party had made a fetish of anti-dual-unionism. Foster was appointed general secretary; the meeting voted adherence to the RILU, the Pan-Pacific trade union secretariat, and the Latin American Labour Federation, and decided to send a workers' delegation to the USSR. At the tenth ECCI plenum Lozovsky said the unions were small, poorly organized, and ideologically weak.]

. . . From a propagandist organization, uniting chiefly immigrant workers and having an insignificant influence among the native workers, the Workers' (Communist) Party is now beginning to turn into a mass Party of political action guiding the political and economic actions of the most advanced and the most militant ranks of the American proletariat. . . .

However, the Party is now just making its first steps on the new path. It is now just on the threshold between the old and the new, it has not yet passed the turning-point. It has as yet done little to shift its base from the immigrants to the native Americans employed in the basic industries. It has done still less in relation to the millions of the Negro proletariat.

Meanwhile, the conditions which will impose enormous tasks on the Workers' Party of America, and will compel it to take the lead in gigantic class conflicts, are developing ever more rapidly. The aggressiveness of the United States in the struggle for markets and the most important sources of raw material throughout the world is growing swiftly. The election of Hoover as president means that American imperialism is resolutely embarking on a course which leads to colonial wars of occupation and to an extremely rapid accentuation of the struggle between the United States and its chief imperialist rival—Great Britain. American imperialism is striving for a monopolist position in world economy and politics and is becoming more and more involved in the universal crisis of capitalism and comes more and more into the orbit of the growing instability of world capitalism. . . .

The Workers' (Communist) Party is obviously still unprepared for the great class conflicts which will inevitably arise on the basis of the sharpening class relations in the United States. Its past still weighs upon its present. The relics of the previous period of its existence form the greatest obstacle in the path it has to travel before it successfully passes the turning-point and develops in the shortest possible time from a numerically small propagandist organization into a mass political party of the American working class.

This, however, is the task which the whole objective situation in the United States, the entire post-war development of American imperialism, places before the party. This is the chief, fundamental, and decisive task to which all other tasks must be entirely subordinated.

The Workers' (Communist) Party of America has been for many years an organization of foreign workers not much connected with the political life of the country. Owing to this immigrant exclusiveness two leading groups arose, took shape, and became consolidated within the party. For six years an almost uninterrupted struggle for supremacy in the party has been going on between them. The struggle was, in the main, not based on principle, and at times it assumed an unprincipled character. At times it assumed the appearance of a struggle based on principle, but in reality it was not entirely a struggle of principle; principles served chiefly to camouflage the struggle for supremacy in the party. Whenever the struggle between the groups was centred more on principles (the attitude towards the Labour Party, the question of trade union tactics), the differences could have been settled without a factional struggle.

The absence of substantial differences on points of principle between the combatant factions has been recorded many times by the ECCI as well as by the party itself. . . .

The majority has shown a tendency to underestimate the process of radicalization as well as the process of differentiation in the ranks of the working class, which finds its expression in the attempts to point out the conservatism of the American working class in a static form without giving a class analysis of the causes which underlie its backwardness and without a sufficient consideration of the further prospects of development of its political consciousness.

The minority, on the other hand, overestimates the degree of radicalization of the American working class at the present time. . . .

All the enumerated differences between the minority and majority could, if the factional struggle would cease, easily be overcome by means of self-criticism within the party.

At the same time the majority and minority commit the same mistake in their view of the relations between the American and world economic systems, although expressed in different forms, and both groups make different conclusions. This mistake lies in their wrong conception of the nature of the relationship between American and world economics and the underestimation of the increasing involving of American imperialism in the rapidly sharpening general crisis of capitalism. . . .

The failure to understand the close relations between American economy and the general crisis of capitalism leads the majority to a wrong estimation of the role of American capital in the stabilization of Europe, and to a misconception of the inevitable sharpening of the conflicts between the ever-more aggressive American imperialism and trustified Europe, which strives to free itself from the economic domination of the United States. It leads the minority to the conception that the coming crisis of American capitalism is called forth exclusively by its internal contradictions. . . .

The rapid development of American capitalism does not exempt the United States, or any other capitalist country, from the crisis; on the contrary it accentuates the general crisis of capitalism as a result of the extreme sharpening of all contradictions which it leads to. On the other hand a sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism is to be expected, not because American imperialism ceases to develop, but on the contrary, it is to be expected because American imperialism is developing and surpasses the other capitalist countries in its development, which leads to an extreme accentuation of all antagonisms.

The failure to understand the nature of the general crisis of American capitalism inevitably leads to a distortion of the entire revolutionary perspective outlined in the decisions of the sixth congress in connexion

with the third period. To consider American capitalism isolated from the sharply accentuated general crisis of capitalism means to overlook the general revolutionary crisis of capitalism which includes the economic crises in all capitalist countries, the imperialist struggle against the USSR and the rebelling colonies, the struggle among the imperialist countries themselves, as well as the class struggle of the proletariat in the various capitalist countries.

With regard to the fundamental question as to the nature of the contemporary general crisis of capitalism, the perspective of its accentuation, the further shattering of stabilization throughout the entire world economic system, the question of struggle against the right danger, which has of late become the chief and decisive issue in the Comintern, both the majority and the minority commit big errors which inevitably lead to a profound underrating of the revolutionary perspectives in Europe and especially in America.

The majority entirely ignores in its theses the resolution of the sixth congress (the point referring to the third period of post-war development) and the minority, while quoting that point, was unable to link it up with its own conclusions concerning the American crisis. The sixth convention of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America must decidedly rectify this mistake and pass resolutions on this most vital issue such as would be in full accord with the decisions of the sixth congress of the CI. This mistake of the majority is closely related to its great overestimation of the economic might and the powerful technical development of the United States. It is wrong to speak of a second industrial revolution as is done in the majority theses. . . . The slightest concession to the noisy advertisers of the growth of technique, the slightest vacillation, is an intolerable opportunist mistake.

A no less important shortcoming both in the majority and minority is the underestimation of the effect of the technical development and rationalization on the working class. Not only the majority theses which overestimate the significance of the tremendous technical development, but also the minority theses leave this aspect of rationalization in the shade and pay little attention to it.

The fact is that the great intensification of labour arising from technical development and capitalist rationalization expressed in the speeding up of the conveyor and the movement of machinery, in an extreme crowding of the working day, in a terrific speeding up of the workers by means of the bonus system which leads to the wearing out of the workers and their being thrown out of the factory sooner than was the case hitherto, and, finally, the absolute diminution of the number of workers in some industries, which gives rise to a tremendous growth of unemployment, are truly becoming the central problems of the entire American working class and thus acquiring the greatest political significance.

This new form of exploitation of the workers is based upon the increase of wages of a very small upper stratum and upon the lowering of the standard of living, which was low enough hitherto, for the vast majority of the working class (notwithstanding the statement of the majority theses to the contrary). . . .

Huge masses of American workers can be rallied to a struggle against the overstrain of labour and the monstrous growth of exploitation. The chief demands capable of uniting them in a common struggle are—(1) the seven-hour day and six hours for workers engaged in industries injurious to health and in underground work; (2) social insurance (in the case of sickness, injury, invalidity, and unemployment) at the cost of the employers and the State.

Extensive and persevering agitation for these demands throughout the entire period should be the main task of the party which must simultaneously proceed also with the organization of the unemployed. By fighting for this programme, the party can unite broad sections of the proletariat, educate them politically, strike deep roots in the midst of the American workers, and become a mass working-class party. The revolutionary unions, provided their organizations will be seriously prepared and their leaders carefully chosen, can be an extremely important lever in that work.

The struggle against the consequences of capitalist rationalization should be closely linked up with the struggle against the war danger. In this connexion, the party absolutely fails to see the enormous importance of this task and its decisive political significance. This entails an underestimation of the revolutionary perspectives. There is no doubt that the objective situation as well as the first successes of the party in leading mass conflicts provide a basis for a healthy discussion on points of principle within the party. But the existence of two crystallized leading groups is a decisive obstacle to embarking on this course.

So long as these two groups exist in the party, the possibility of an exchange of opinion on questions of principle within the party, and hence the further healthy ideological development of the party, is entirely excluded. To advance artificial differences of principle on questions concerning which no such differences exist would at the present time serve only and exclusively as a means of furthering the non-principled factional struggle. The deep-rooted unprincipled methods of factional struggle are becoming a great obstacle in the struggle against all deviations from the correct political line and hindering the development of self-criticism or leading to its factional distortion.

However, the decisions of the sixth congress of the Comintern on the struggle against deviation from the correct political position is of special importance to the Workers' (Communist) Party of America.

The ever-growing economic power and ever-increasing importance of American imperialism on the world arena, the specific method of economic and political oppression of the working class on the part of the bourgeoisie, who use the powerful apparatus of the AFL as an agency in the working class—all these conditions give rise to the most serious danger of the development of a strong right-wing tendency in the American party. The fact that both factions were guilty of right-wing errors is most significant and amply confirms the existence of the danger of the development of a right-wing tendency in the American party. The sixth congress has already pointed out in its resolutions a series of right-wing errors (the attitude towards the Socialist Party, inadequate work by the party in organizing the unorganized and the struggle of the Negroes, the insufficiently clear struggles against the murderous policy of the United States in Latin America), and recorded that 'these mistakes cannot, however, be ascribed exclusively to the majority leadership'. The mistakes committed since the sixth congress of the CI were also of a right character.

The appearance of Trotskyism in the United States can be explained by the fact that the Trotskyist opportunist doctrines on the question of the party and its structure, at the basis of which lies the 'principle' of unprincipled alliance with all and sundry right and 'left' groups and organizations fighting against the Comintern, seems to fit perfectly into the scheme of political struggle in the United States where lack of principle was always the underlying principle in the activities of all bourgeois parties. Nowhere, in no other country in the world, have we witnessed so easy and rapid formation of a bloc of the Trotskyists and the out-and-out right-wingers as in the United States, thus revealing at the very outset its social-democratic and anti-Comintern nature. The Right mistakes of the party helped the growth of Trotskyism in the United States.

Notwithstanding the presence of certain temporary premises for Trotskyism in the United States, the Trotskyist bloc there also is doomed to collapse. The main condition for this is a correct political line of the communist party based on clear principles aiming at the elimination and correction of right mistakes and a decisive fight against the right danger in the ranks of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America.

A successful struggle against both the out-and-out right, as well as against the 'left' Trotskyist deviations, has been hindered until now mainly by the intolerant and unprincipled faction struggle between the two leading groups. Each faction speculates on the mistakes of the other, concealing or underestimating meanwhile its own mistakes. Each faction hurls against the other accusations of alleged right and 'left' mistakes. Actual and imaginary errors are exaggerated for factional purposes and deviations are manufactured out of them.

For factional considerations, the minority of the CEC attacks the majority on some points more sharply than the Trotskyists who have been expelled from the party. In its turn the majority, also for factional reasons, resorts to absolutely intolerable manoeuvres (the invitation of the renegade Cannon to a meeting of the CEC, for example). Speculation on deviations (instead of combating them), and factional manufacturing of deviations, does not give the party a chance to discover the real mistakes and to establish the actual dimensions and the actual sources of the right (and also the 'left') danger.

The struggle against the right and 'left' dangers has to contend with factionalism in the Workers' (Communist) Party of America and cannot be developed in a truly bolshevik manner until this main hindrance is eliminated.

The CI several times requested the party in the most decisive manner to put an end to the factional struggle. The sixth plenum of the ECCI demanded from the party a 'complete and unconditional cessation of the factional struggle'. The American Commission during the eighth plenum confirmed that decision. The Political Secretariat of the ECCI declared in April 1928 that: 'it is the opinion of the ECCI that the main problem of the party in the field of organization is to kill all remnants of factionalism'. Finally the sixth congress decided that: 'the most important task confronting the party is to put an end to the factional strife, which is not based on any serious differences, and at the same time, to increase the recruiting of workers into the party and to give a definite stimulus to the promotion of workers to leading party posts'.

The existing factions must be resolutely and definitely liquidated. The factional struggle must be unconditionally stopped. Without this no mass communist party of the American proletariat can be organized.

This is the most urgent task of the party. The sixth convention of the Workers' Party must categorically prohibit any further factional struggle under threat of expulsion from the party, and lay the foundation of a normal party life, especially internal democracy, self-criticism and iron party discipline, based on the unconditional subordination of the minority to the majority and an unconditional recognition of the decisions of the Comintern. . . .

The party can become a mass proletarian party only on condition that it widens its base by creating its main strongholds in the ranks of the American workers, especially in the most important branches of industry, and also among the Negro workers, while at the same time retaining its positions among the revolutionary immigrant workers.

This course on the American workers and the decisive branches of industry must run through all activities of the party and must be laid down as the foundation of the organization of the unorganized, the

creation of new unions, the organization of the left wing in the old unions, 'laying thereby the basis for the actual realization of the slogan of creation of a wide Workers' Party from below'. (Resolution of the sixth congress of the CI.)

Four principal conditions are now essential in order that the party may definitely enter the path leading to its transformation into a mass communist party, four conditions, the decisive significance of which neither the majority, which is responsible for the leadership, nor the minority have understood. These conditions are:

1. A correct perspective in the analysis of the general crisis of capitalism and American imperialism which is a part of it.
 2. To place in the centre of the work of the party the daily needs of the American working class and especially (a) the demand for a seven-hour day and six hours for underground workers and those engaged in injurious trades, while exposing and waging a systematic struggle against the capitalist methods of rationalization directed towards intensifying the exploitation of the workers; (b) the demand for all forms of social insurance at the cost of the employers and the State.
 3. Freeing the party from its immigrant narrowness and seclusion and making the American workers its wide basis, paying due attention to work among the Negroes.
 4. Liquidation of factionalism and drawing workers into the leadership.
- The ECCI calls upon the sixth convention of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America to carry out these decisive tasks.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE COMINTERN

2 March 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 13, p. 223, 8 March 1929

[The ECCI marked the occasion with a meeting on 4 March addressed by Molotov, in which he said: 'The fight against capitalism is an impossibility if not accompanied by an implacable fight against social-reformism. The fight against the social-democrats is impossible without a systematic fight against the social-democratic tendencies in the communist parties themselves.' The agitprop department issued a series of theses—thirty-eight in all—surveying the main slogans of the congresses and executive meetings, and noting the defeat and degeneration of all opposition to the Comintern line. An accompanying article calculated that congresses and plenums had occupied 289 days, at which a total of 587 speakers had spoken 1,648 times. It was proposed by the ECCI that a campaign should be waged for the two months from 1 March to 1 May, and for this purpose thirty-four slogans were put out by the agitprop department, concentrating on the themes of the war danger, the treachery of social-

democracy and the national bourgeoisie, and the fight against the opportunists, the conciliators, and the Trotskyist liquidators.

At this time the CI reported that it had 55 sections (of which 6 were in the USSR), and 4 'sympathizing parties' (Iceland, Mongolia, Tannu Tuva, the Philippines); in addition to the YCI, it had also 10 'associated international organizations', the RILU, the International Peasant Council, the Red Sports International, the League Against Imperialism, Workers' International Relief, International Class War Prisoners' Aid, Friends of the USSR, Freethinking Proletarians, Union of War Veterans, and Tenants' League.]

Ten years ago the Communist International was born in the fire of the revolutionary struggle. As a consequence of the imperialist war, Europe had been turned into a heap of smoking ruins. Millions of men had been killed and wounded and the soldiers who had gone through the horrors and destruction of war returned home exhausted by hunger, cold, and disease, and in many cases mutilated. The eyes of the workers and the exploited masses all over the world were directed to the country of the proletarian dictatorship which had been born in the storm of the October Revolution.

The workers of Russia were the first to show by example how the workers should fight against imperialist war. The great October Revolution made a breach in the front of world imperialism and turned the imperialist war into a civil war in Russia, overthrew the power of capitalism, and set up the dictatorship of the proletariat in its stead. Under the direct influence of the October Revolution the revolutionary movement poured in a broad wave over the whole world. In Europe, Asia, America, and Africa oppressed classes and races revolted against their oppressors, the men responsible for the imperialist world slaughter.

The tragedy of the world proletariat at that time was that outside the frontiers of Soviet Russia there were no organized and experienced communist parties. The young communist organizations which did exist, had to contend with strong social-democratic parties which were allied with the bourgeoisie. In the moment of revolutionary crises, these social-democratic parties hurried to the aid of dying capitalism and placed themselves at the disposal of the bourgeoisie in order to crush the revolutionary workers by force of arms.

The Communist International was created in order to organize and lead the workers and the oppressed masses in the struggle against capitalism, to smash the social-democracy and to lead the workers of the world to victory under the banner of the World October. . . .

Ten years have passed since the Communist International was founded. Those ten years have been years of an unparalleled and heroic struggle on the part of the proletariat against capitalism. In those ten years the furious hatred of the exploiters and oppressors all over the world was directed

against the Communist International. In their struggle against the Communist International the imperialists and their social-democratic allies used, and still use, the most brutal and unscrupulous measures. There is nothing that the bourgeoisie have not tried in their struggle against the proletarian revolutionary movement and against the Communist International. Fascist terror, white terror, coalitions with the social-democrats against the working class, hymns of praise in favour of the glory and power of capitalism, hateful slanders against the Soviet Union and against the communist parties, forgeries and provocations, all these measures have been used and are still being used by the bourgeoisie in their struggle against the revolutionary movement.

All the efforts of the bourgeoisie, however, have proved unsuccessful. The Communist International continues to grow despite all difficulties and to win more and more the sympathies of the exploited and oppressed toilers all over the world.

The past ten years have exposed and destroyed the illusions concerning the stability of capitalism. In the years of the first imperialist war, the imperialists and their social-democratic allies told the whole world that the war was a war to end war and that its conclusion would bring about a purification of capitalism, an era of permanent peace, and the fraternization of the peoples. In reality, however, the war to end war presented us with the old contradictions more intensified than ever. The antagonisms between the imperialist countries are growing. The conditions for a new imperialist war are accumulating, particularly in connexion with the struggle between Great Britain and the United States for world hegemony. Armaments are greater than ever, and behind the scenes the diplomats are organizing new political-military agreements. The revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is growing. Unemployment is extending and the class struggle in the capitalist countries is intensifying. The Soviet Union is growing and strengthening and threatening the basis of world imperialism. Neither the League of Nations nor the lying pacifist propaganda of the social-democracy, neither the capitalist rationalization nor the attempts of the reformists to establish industrial peace, will be able to abolish the growing crisis of capitalism. Capitalism is approaching a new world war which must end in a catastrophe for capitalism. The first world war ended with the breakdown of the imperialist front and the establishment of the first proletarian dictatorship. A second imperialist world war and an intervention against the Soviet Union will give the system of world imperialism the last and final blow.

In its struggle against the growing revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie has found a loyal ally in the social-democracy. The last ten years have confirmed beyond all doubt the fact that the social-democracy has finally

broken with Marxism and developed into a bourgeois labour party which is appointed to maintain and consolidate the capitalist system. In the field of foreign politics the social-democracy operates with pacifist phrases, but in reality it is actively assisting in the preparation of new imperialist wars and the organization of a crusade against the first workers' State. At home the social-democracy assists capitalism in carrying out its rationalization and placing bonds upon the working class. Because of this we are able to observe the progressive process in which the working masses leave the social-democracy and, because of an ever increasing process of radicalization amongst the masses of the workers, their swing towards the Communist International. The Communist International is the only representative of Marxism and the only power which is capable of leading the proletariat in its struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.

The Communist International was born in the struggle against the reformist social-democracy. The communist parties in the capitalist countries grew and strengthened in the struggle against the social-democracy. In the fire of this struggle the communist parties have become the mass parties of the revolutionary proletariat, united in one Communist World Party.

The Communist International did not only grow and become strong in the struggle against the social-democracy, but it grew and developed also in the struggle against vacillations and confusion in its own ranks, in the struggle against right-wing deviations, i.e. deviations towards open opportunism, and against left-wing deviations, i.e. towards opportunism under a cloak of revolutionary phrases. The history of the internal development of the Communist International during the last ten years is the history of the liquidation of deviations and of conciliation towards them in its own ranks. The last ten years have shown that the systematic struggle against these deviations and, above all, against the right-wing deviation as the chief danger of the present period, is the indispensable method of bolshevizing the communist parties. Without this bolshevization the parties would be unable to rid themselves of the remnants of social-democratic traditions, unable to educate their members in the spirit of bolshevism and unable to produce real bolshevist party leaders capable of preparing the masses for the coming revolutionary struggles and leading them in the fight for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist International is celebrating its tenth anniversary at a moment when the antagonisms of capitalism all over the world are intensifying and the conditions for a new revolutionary period accumulating. In the capitalist countries the working masses are going over from the defence to the attack. In the colonial and semi-colonial countries a new wave of the revolutionary struggle is rising. In the Soviet Union the working class, supported by the village poor and in alliance with the broad masses of the

toiling peasants, is building up socialism in a struggle against world capitalism and against the capitalist elements in the Soviet Union itself. The forces of the world revolution are growing. The Communist International appeals to the workers of all countries and to the oppressed and exploited toilers all over the world to rally around its banner in a struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for world communism.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE REVOLUTIONARY
MOVEMENT IN INDIA

March 1929

Inprekorr, ix, 29, p. 649, 3 *April* 1929

[After the leftward turn in Russia, and the introduction of the 'class against class' slogan, Comintern policy towards the 'national bourgeoisie' became one of deep hostility, the equivalent in the colonial countries of the changed attitude towards socialist parties in the industrial countries; national bourgeoisie, reformist or not, and social-democrats, left or right, were working for imperialism; the Indian national bourgeoisie, aware of the danger of revolution, were anxious for an understanding with Britain, urging that the grant of greater powers to them would enable them to deal with that danger. It was on these grounds that Comintern support was withdrawn from the Workers' and Peasants' parties; the British Communist Party would have preferred support to be continued while an illegal communist party was organized which would in effect control the WPP. (In January 1929 four communists stood in the Bombay municipal elections as candidates of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, receiving together 12,500 votes out of an electorate of 600,000.) A meeting of the Indian communist leaders in March 1929 decided to make the position of the WPP the subject of the next meeting, but before this could be held many of them were arrested. They were eventually tried on charges of conspiracy at Meerut, and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. A communist-sponsored 'Meerut Prisoners' Defence Committee' was set up to campaign for their release. 'Among those who have agreed to associate themselves with the committee's work,' *Inprekorr* reported, 'are a handful of pseudo-left labour M.P.s—typified by J. Maxton and F. Brockway—and renegades like Cook.'

At the end of 1928 Ryan, an Australian member of the Pan-Pacific trade union secretariat of the RILU, set up in the spring of 1927 at a meeting in Hankow, had visited India to persuade the Trade Union Congress to affiliate, but without success. Johnstone, representing the League Against Imperialism, was successful in getting affiliation to that organization. In 1929 the Indian trade unions split, one section joining the Pan-Pacific secretariat, the other affiliating to the IFTU. The seventh congress *Materials* commended the work of the CPGB in connexion with Indian trade unions, and Indian and Chinese students in Britain.

The decolonization debate aired at the sixth Comintern congress was continued in the form of a polemic with Roy, who argued that the Comintern

underestimated the degree to which the Indian bourgeoisie were still revolutionary; their attitude would eventually change, but for the time being they were still a revolutionary force.

Roy had said that the Comintern called the Swarajists counter-revolutionary not because they were, but to justify its own errors in China. This was answered in an article in *Novy Vostok* which argued that Congress was a capitalist party anxious to make an alliance with imperialism, and equally anxious to suppress strikes and destroy the trade unions. Congress was thoroughly demoralized, and the workers and peasants were beginning to realize that it was fighting not for, but against independence. This explained the emergence of the Indian Independence League, which was 'an attempt by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie to create an instrument which would keep under bourgeois influence the classes in Indian society which are becoming revolutionary'. Behind a cloak of revolutionary phrases it would fight the labour movement. The workers and peasants should not be encouraged to join Congress, because this would delay their liberation from bourgeois influence, and make it more difficult for the proletariat to assume the hegemony of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, without which it could not be carried through. The working-class support still enjoyed by the reformists was due to the errors of the Indian communists and left-wing trade union leaders.

Inprekorr wrote of Gandhi that 'his reactionary dreams of protecting home industry and passive resistance will not bring the downfall of British imperialism', and of 'the petty-bourgeois intellectuals like the younger Nehru, the heroes of the Independence League', that they had 'surrendered to the liberals, and the liberals in India are the agents of British imperialism'.

An article in *Novy Vostok* on the tenth anniversary of the Comintern argued that if there were indeed a possibility of decolonization in India, the CI would have to admit the progressive role of imperialism in the colonies, and this of course was nonsense.

At the plenum in July 1929, Luhani, taking a totally different position from the one he held at the sixth congress, argued that Britain was determined to suppress industry in India; Roy's ideas were treachery to the Indian revolution; he was another edition of Nehru, but his greater European experience enabled him to conceal his programme of counter-revolution behind pseudo-left phrases. Shubin warned the plenum not to misread the Indian situation; the bourgeois press might blame everything on the communists, but the Comintern should not exaggerate their strength, and attribute every anti-British action to them. He asked how the Workers' and Peasants' parties were to be liquidated; this was happening more slowly than was desirable.

In his opening speech at the plenum Kuusinen spoke of the greater pressure being exerted by Britain against Indian industrialization and the growing impoverishment of the Indian peasantry. Roy, he said, disagreed with this ('I do not know if I can still call him comrade Roy'); in the 'Brandler renegade press' he was urging co-operation with the Swarajists. In the subsequent debate Musso (Indonesia) stated that Roy could no longer be called 'comrade'.

The central committee of the CPGB was clearly still unconvinced by the sixth congress debate. At the plenum they were attacked by Skrypnik for

having distributed among leading British communists the amendments they had proposed to the theses on the colonial question.

Lozovsky said that revolutionary events in India were maturing at such a rapid pace that it would be wrong to have any kind of agreement with the bourgeoisie, who were trying to throttle the labour movement. One reason for the failure to establish a communist party there was that for a long time the Comintern's only link with Indian communists was through Roy; he was a menshevik. Roy, the ECCI declared in December 1929, had 'placed himself outside the Comintern' by writing for the Brandler press.

An article by Manuilsky published shortly before the plenum noted that there was still no independent communist party in India.]

The soil of India is beginning to burn under the feet of English imperialism. The wave of strikes is rising higher. . . . The left-wing trade unions are growing fast and enjoy the resolute and militant support of the working masses. Mass workers' demonstrations in Bombay and Calcutta march under the banner of the fight for Soviets. . . .

The frightened imperialist robbers are replying by turning the executioner's axe on the Workers' and Peasants' parties, legal until now. Their editorial offices are destroyed, their leaders flung into jail. The Workers' and Peasants' parties do not belong to the Communist International. Since they are two-class parties, they could not join. But the rapid spread of their influence in town and country reflects the revolutionary awakening of the working masses, their will to organize for struggle. . . .

Brutal terror and base corruption have always been the means by which British imperialism rules. The present crisis of British imperialism makes it more difficult for the imperialist usurpers to employ their policy of hypocritical promises. Terror and naked force in all their forms are becoming more and more openly the keynote of their policy.

The plundering of the country's great natural wealth is English imperialism's chief source of power. On the stability of English rule in India depends the strength of English imperialism on the world stage. All English imperialism's plans for the coming world war are designed in the first place to keep India for its sole monopolist exploitation, without having to share the spoils with other imperialist robbers. India, subjugated and tortured to death, which is losing millions of its sons by starvation, must also supply cannon fodder for England's war.

The greater exploitation and violence in India are unleashing the revolution. . . . As the revolutionary wave rises the influence of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist fighting front is expanding and growing stronger. . . . The great lessons of Shanghai, Wuhan, and Canton were not given in vain. The slogan of Soviets is already inscribed on the banner of the Indian proletariat.

The agrarian revolution is the pivot of the Indian revolution. The

Indian peasants are slowly becoming convinced that with all the great sacrifices they have made they have been betrayed, defeated, and thrown into the blackest slavery because they trusted the politicians and leaders of the national bourgeoisie. . . .

The shameful and treacherous surrender of the bourgeois nationalist organizations to imperialism was a prelude to the new campaign of terror. Under the lash of the Simon Commission bourgeois nationalism abandoned the slogan of Indian independence with which it had earlier toyed. . . . English imperialism has not only forced the national-bourgeois opposition to its knees, but has also managed to get it to serve as cover for its own terrorism. The reformist trade union bureaucrats, who crawl alternately before bourgeois nationalism and English imperialism, in fact support the Government.

In India today the threads of the imperialist war now being planned are drawn together, but also the threads of the great proletarian revolutions and colonial revolts. The booty for which the world slaughter between the English and American robbers is being prepared includes, in the first place, India. Based on India, English imperialism is preparing the 'strategic advance' on the Soviet Union which has been its long cherished plan. But it is in India too that the roads of the expanding forces of world revolution meet, the roads that lead to the fight against imperialism. The advance of the Indian revolution will instil new life into the revolutionary movement of China, Indonesia, and Egypt, will sound the tocsin for all oppressed humanity. The day is drawing near when proletarian revolution and colonial revolt will in India fuse into one.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCI MAY DAY MANIFESTO

April 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 19, p. 383, 19 *April* 1929

[Comments in the communist press on the events leading to the fall of Amanullah in Afghanistan included the information that arms and money for the plot were supplied by T. E. Lawrence; Amanullah had survived ten years of British opposition because of Soviet friendship and the support of the rising bourgeoisie; Raskolnikov, on the other hand, wrote that Afghanistan had no bourgeoisie, not even commercial (all trade was in Indian hands). But there were 'young Afghans' inspired by Russia and India who supported Amanullah; Amanullah had introduced bourgeois reforms without a bourgeoisie to support him; their cost had fallen on the peasants, whom he had failed to win over by agrarian reform. Britain had taken advantage of this, and of the tribal divisions of the country.

An anti-fascist congress, organized by Münzenberg for the West European Bureau and presided over by Barbusse, met in Berlin in May 1929, and was attended by 300 delegates; the resolution it adopted explained fascism as

arising from the war and the post-war capitalist crises, the bankruptcy of the parliamentary system, the decay of bourgeois parties, the impoverishment of the petty-bourgeoisie, and the fear of social revolution; everywhere the reformists were clearing the road to fascism.]

. . . Just as on the eve of the war of 1914, there is again the smell of gunpowder in the air. Fascist reaction is raging, and capitalism is seeking to deprive the working class of its gains. The exploitation of the working class in this period of capitalist rationalization assumes a monstrous character. Millions of unemployed are filling the towns. The pauperization of the colonial peasantry assumes unprecedented dimensions. At the same time the wave of resistance on the part of the toilers is constantly rising. One class is arrayed against another. The movement of the proletariat and the oppressed colonial peoples is approaching a turning-point in history. Never has the treacherous character of the policy of the Second International been so obvious when the new revolutionary wave is rising. Never in history has a class been so cynically and systematically betrayed as the proletariat by the Second International during and after the war. The workers' idea of international brotherhood is replaced by the call for fratricidal struggle among the workers, the class struggle by co-operation with the bourgeoisie, the call for revolution by an active counter-revolutionary struggle against it, the task of overthrowing the capitalist order by efforts to rescue and strengthen it. The workers cannot take a single victorious revolutionary stride without stepping over the body of the Second International, without breaking its opposition to the labour movement, without realizing the full significance of the betrayal of the Second International. Workers and oppressed colonial peoples, the nefarious work of the international social-democracy after the war must be brought before your merciless judgment.

. . . By their very treachery, they even prepared the ground for a war for world hegemony between the United States and Great Britain which will be even more disastrous in its consequences. Armaments are growing, armies are being mechanized, the air, the seas, and the land are becoming theatres of war, just as was the case on the eve of 1914. The Pacific Ocean is about to become a bloody ocean. A catastrophe is coming compared with which the war of 1914-18 with its wholesale carnage will pale into insignificance. . . . If there is a force which will delay the outbreak of this world war, it is the fear of the ruling class that the workers will revolt, in addition to fear of the existence of the Soviet Union. To the oppressed of the world, the first labour republic is like a shining star surrounded by clouds of hatred on the part of the executioners of the toilers. The international bourgeoisie wants to wipe it off the face of the earth so as to have a free hand in the redivision of the world. The bayonets of its vassals—Poland, Rumania and the Baltic States—are directed against the USSR.

In order to smite the USSR in Central Asia, Great Britain organizes a coup d'état in Afghanistan.

The capitalist world prepares and organizes a war against the Soviet Union before any other war, because only by breaking the resistance of the toilers will it be able to start a new world war, for the existence of the Soviet Union constitutes a mortal danger to the capitalist world.

You were told that at the end of the war the nations will disarm. What a mockery these promises are in face of the facts before us! Under the cloak of pacifism and disarmament, the ruling classes, by depriving the toilers of arms and by arming the bourgeoisie, are systematically and persistently continuing to create a counter-revolutionary army, the chief task of which is to crush the revolt of the toilers at home. Today, Indian workers are being murdered with the arms of British volunteers in Bombay, yesterday British guns bombarded Chinese towns, tomorrow soldiers of the fascist Reichswehr will be sent to crush the revolt of the German workers. Only the blind do not see that the international bourgeoisie, by organising its fascist armies and irregular fascist detachments, is preparing for war, for the extermination of the revolutionary workers and the toilers of the colonies. The social-democrats, by lulling the vigilance of the working class with the help of pacifist prattle, ideologically disarm it in face of the bourgeoisie and deliberately drive the workers to complete and unconditional surrender. . . .

The accentuation of the class struggle leads with inexorable consistency all capitalist governments to civil-war methods in their dealings with the toilers. In Germany, France, Great Britain, United States, conditions of an open fascist dictatorship are maturing. Is that the idyll of post-war democracy with which the capitalist and social-democratic press was lulling the workers?

. . . The world is now entering upon the stage of colonial revolutions which, combined with the proletarian revolutionary movement of the West, will undermine the foundations of capitalist society. Although the new high tide is only beginning, in contradistinction to the revolutionary movements of the past, it is not merely of a European character, its tendency is to become a world movement. Ever-growing human reserves are being involved in the conflict on an ever wider international front. The next sharp crisis in the world economy may create a direct revolutionary situation in the immediate future in a number of advanced capitalist countries. If preceding economic crises were a menace to the capitalist system, the new crisis which has set in under conditions when all the contradictions of capitalism have reached their culminating point, when the activity of the toiling masses is growing, may become fatal to capitalism. The toilers will not be awed by capitalist stabilization which reveals ever more clearly its relative and temporary character, they will not wait

with folded arms for war, they will carry on a self-sacrificing struggle against war and capitalist rationalization. They are becoming more and more daring and determinate [determined] in the transition from the defensive to the offensive. Their contact with the Communist International will grow and increase in the international struggles confronting the working class and all toilers. The struggle of the Communist International against the Second International for these vast numbers of human beings will not be simply an ideological struggle within one class, but a struggle between two classes developing into civil war against the bourgeoisie whom the social-democrats are now serving. There is no other organization now so staunchly fighting at the head of the masses, so stalwartly defending their daily interests and the great final aims of their movement as the Communist International. Apart from it, there is no other force capable of uniting in one mighty stream the disjointed efforts of individual detachments of toilers in the various parts of the world. It is the bearer of the best traditions of the entire history of the revolutionary labour movement. Only under its leadership and in its ranks, will the workers triumph over capitalism.

EXTRACTS FROM A STATEMENT OF THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU
OF THE ECCI ON THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMUNIST
PARTIES IN PREPARATION FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ANTI-WAR
DAY

18 May 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 26, p. 557, 31 May 1929

[The Conference was held in accordance with a decision of the sixth Comintern congress 'to organize an international day against imperialist war'. It took place in Berlin; at the time it was said 'aus konspirativen Gründen' to have been held in Brussels.

Among the May Day theses for propagandists issued by the ECCI on 16 April, one (the twenty-fifth) stated:

'This year the proletarian vanguard will have to break through the barbed-wire barriers which the bourgeoisie have erected to prevent the May Day celebrations. Not only in fascist but also in so-called democratic countries the bourgeoisie and the social democrats are doing everything to stop the workers from pouring into the streets on May Day. . . . In these circumstances the task of organizing May Day celebrations is this year one with the task of organizing the struggle for the streets.'

It had been the custom in Berlin for the May Day demonstration to be held under the auspices of the trade unions, with political parties joining in. In this year the KPD decided to hold an independent demonstration as an outward symbol of its new policy. The Berlin police, fearing disturbances, prohibited all

demonstrations. When the KPD nevertheless held its demonstration, fighting broke out, in the course of which there were a number of casualties, some fatal (Pieck gave the figure of 24). The West European Bureau of the ECCI interpreted this as 'the devilish revenge' of social-democracy for their losses in the factory council elections; social-democracy had organized civil war against the proletariat, hoping to provoke the KPD into premature armed revolt. The KPD manifesto said this was an attempt to crush the workers' movement in preparation for an attack on the USSR.

There had obviously been opposition in the KPD to the party's call to build barricades in Berlin; the Berlin committee resolution said that 'any open or concealed repudiation of these fighters is a betrayal of the proletariat'. The KPD central committee resolution of August 1929, referring to these events, said that 'the party developed a correct, bolshevik, clear, and fighting policy towards the bourgeois republic; it stood up as the only organized mass force against social-fascism and the Reichsbanner, and stirred up broad masses of the workers against the bourgeois republic'.

The attack on the 'right opportunists' in the CI sections was the counterpart to the attack on the Bukharin group in the CPSU. In Czechoslovakia Jilek, Muna, Neurath, and others were expelled in June 1929; Serra (Rossi, Tasca) in the Italian CP (expelled in September 1929), and Humbert-Droz in the Swiss CP, were among the more prominent supporters of Bukharin, and publicly criticized the ECCI letter to the KPD of December 1928, the decisions of the fourth RILU congress, communist electoral tactics in France and Britain, and the Comintern attitude to social-democratic parties.

The struggle within the KPD between Thaelmann, supported by the ECCI, and the Brandler-Thalheimer group, supported by the 'conciliators' in the party, was by now virtually at an end. Brandler was publishing a periodical with the evocative title of *Gegen den Strom*. At the end of 1928 the CC of the KPD (with E. Meyer voting against) expelled Walcher, Frölich, Enderle and their supporters, and Brandler and Thalheimer, described in a letter from the KPD to the ECCI as 'enemies of the party', were expelled in January 1929 from the CPSU. Dealings of any kind with them were said to be 'incompatible with membership of the KPD'. In all ten members were expelled from the CC, and more than a hundred from district committees. In the following month Manuilsky replied to the criticism, apparently made in other parties, that the KPD was 'mechanically copying' what was happening in the CPSU; it was 'philistine' to see in the Comintern's attitude an attempt to 'lure' recruits for the majority view. Remmele wrote that the dispute was of importance for more than the KPD; it concerned the estimate of the degree of radicalization of the working class, the stability of capitalism, etc.; the right-wing group in the KPD had its counterparts in the Czech and French communist parties; there, and in other parties too, there were groups which underestimated the danger of war on the USSR.

The uneasiness in the KPD was caused not only by the expulsion of the old Spartakists, but also by the new trade union policy introduced after the fourth RILU congress. Although the official policy was to put up independent lists in factory-committee elections, a number of CP cells continued to operate joint

lists with the SPD. Piatnitsky wrote that 'there was not a single strike, not a single lockout, not a single conflict between labour and capital in which the trade unions did not take the side of capital', but admitted that the vote for the communist trade union opposition (RTUO) had declined; this he attributed to faulty or inadequate guidance from the KPD, and to a sectarian attitude to work in the reformist unions.

The twelfth KPD congress, from 5 to 10 May, was to have been held in Dresden but was transferred to Berlin. Semard attended for the ECCI. Social-democracy, he said, from being a supporter of imperialist war and war against the USSR, had now become its organizer; 'objectively', the same part was being played by the Brandlerites and the conciliators. Pieck said that not all communists recognized that the May Day events, because they were directed against the State power, were acts of political revolution; he called for the formation of every kind of committee—strike, action, defence, united front, factory—which, waging the battle for the streets, would provide the experience necessary for the successful armed struggle for power.

Ewert argued that it was un-Marxist to describe all the measures of oppression used by the bourgeois State against the proletariat as fascism, and all participation by social-democracy in those measures as social-fascism. The extreme left, represented by Merker, were opposed to all forms of collaboration even with rank-and-file social democrats—their differences could be settled only on the field of battle and before revolutionary tribunals. Referring to this debate at the sixteenth CPSU congress, Molotov said that Merker's position was defeatist; it meant abandoning the battle for the working class, but class-against-class tactics meant an irreconcilable struggle along the whole front against social-democracy and for communist, independent leadership.

Thaelmann, referring to the events of the previous autumn when he had for a time lost his position, said that some central committee members had failed to realize that unless the party were cleansed of opportunism it would be unable to tackle its new tasks. 'With the help of the ECCI the party masses had to put the KPD central committee right.' The cleansing was not yet complete, for the conciliators had taken over the role of the opportunists, denying that the SPD was becoming social-fascist, that the danger of war against the USSR was growing; they had urged joint meetings with the ADGB to celebrate May Day. He warned them that they would share the same fate as the right wing, and the warning was underlined by a joint statement in the same terms by the visiting delegates from eleven other European communist parties. Semard wrote later that the congress was 'a model for the struggle against opportunism and right deviations in all CI sections'. *Pravda*, reporting the congress, said the attitude of the conciliators disarmed the party in its fight against social-fascism. They were removed from the central committee at the congress.

At the tenth plenum Thaelmann reported that after the congress three conditions had been put to Ewert and the other conciliators; they had however refused to accept the first of them, which was to admit that their platform was fractional. Ewert and some others were expelled, but early in 1930 Ewert acknowledged his errors and condemned the views of Brandler and Bukharin; he was sent by the Comintern to Brazil.]

1. On 16 May there was held in Brussels a conference convened by the West European Bureau of the Comintern, in which representatives of thirteen of the most important communist parties of the European capitalist countries, among them being six illegal parties, as well as representatives of the Young Communist International and of the Red International of Labour Unions took part.

2. At the beginning of the conference a representative of the CC of the CP of Germany delivered an informatory report on the May events in Berlin, whereupon the conference decided to convey by means of an appeal its brotherly greetings of solidarity to the Berlin working class. The conference further demanded of all parties that they systematically continue the international campaign of enlightenment regarding the bloody terror of German social-fascism in the May days and further strengthen and extend the solidarity actions of the international proletariat for the struggle of the German workers against the repressive measures of the German bourgeoisie and of the social-fascists.

3. The chief question engaging the attention of the conference was the preparation of International Fighting Day against Imperialist War, the holding of which was decided by the sixth world congress of the Communist International in August last. Already in March of this year a conference in Berlin, which was attended by fourteen European communist parties, decided to fix the International Fighting Day for 1 August 1929.

A. After hearing the reports of all the parties represented, the conference recorded that the preparations for 1 August have everywhere been initiated and that the May demonstrations of the communist parties, especially the demonstrations of solidarity following upon the Berlin May events, in many European towns were already characterized by preparations for the International Fighting Day against war.

The conference pointed to the inadequate extent and the unsystematic character of preparatory work, and considered it necessary that the greatest activity of the parties be concentrated upon the carrying out of the anti-war campaign and that a complete mobilization of the whole membership from top to bottom be achieved.

The most important presumption for the successful carrying out of the anti-war campaign is the most ruthless overcoming and extermination of all right and conciliatory tendencies within the communist parties, as well as the passivity which exists in certain sections of the parties, which in reality is only the expression of the concealed, and therefore the more dangerous, opportunism of retreat and capitulation in face of new revolutionary fighting tasks. The success of the action is guaranteed only on condition that the parties clearly realise the enormous importance of the organization of this campaign and of the leading role of the communist advance-guard. . . .

B. The basis for the conduct of the anti-war campaign is furnished by the resolution of the sixth world congress of the Communist International on the Struggle against the Imperialist War, which ought to be made popular not only within the parties but beyond it in the whole working class, and whose Leninist directives ought to become a keen weapon of the proletariat in the fight against imperialist war. The new practical proposals for the carrying out of the campaign which were made at the conference, were summed up in instructions to the parties, of which we mention the following:

In view of the circumstance that the organization of the imperialist war against the Soviet Union has entered an immediately acute stage, which is clearly revealed by recent events, by the intensified campaign against Moscow on the part of the international bourgeoisie, as well as by the unconditional going over of Germany, under the ideological and organizational leadership of the social-democracy, to the anti-Soviet front, the chief aim of the campaign must be to mobilize the broadest masses of workers and all toilers for the defence of the Soviet Union. Connected therewith is the mobilization of the masses for communism, against social-fascism.

It is necessary, both in the preparation and in the carrying out of the International Fighting Day, to gather the broadest masses of the workers in the factories and in all proletarian mass organizations into a united front from below and to set up united front organs of these masses. In contradiction to the incitement of the international social-democracy regarding a 'bloody putsch' and an 'insurrection' of the communists, the appeal of the communist parties for the fighting day on 1 August is an appeal for political mass demonstrations of the working masses of all countries against the imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union. Cessation of work and mass demonstrations on 1 August must be the forms employed for the carrying out of this day. The fighting day of 1 August must be the expression and culmination of a systematic campaign, comprising the broad masses, against the danger of war, and at the same time the starting-point for the further mass struggles of the proletariat against the imperialist war and the imperialist system in general.

C. The parties are confronted with the following tasks in agitation, propaganda, and organization:

Sharpest struggle against social-democracy, exposing its role as organizers of the war against the Soviet Union, especially stigmatizing the 'left' social-democracy. Proof of the most rapid development of social-democracy towards social-fascism. Proof of the close connexion between the terror against the revolutionary organizations of the proletariat and the war preparations against the Soviet Union.

Intensified struggle against fascism, both against factory fascism and

against the fascist defence organizations. Demonstration of the necessity of a struggle against fascism and for the prevention of the imperialist war against the Soviet Union.

Sharp struggle against the pacifist illusions within the working class and against pacifist propaganda.

Inclusion of the toiling peasant masses and of the nationally suppressed masses into the revolutionary united front in the anti-war campaign.

In the carrying out of the whole campaign special attention must be devoted to the mobilization of the masses of the unorganized, the unemployed, as well as of the toiling emigrants.

Carrying out of a broad recruiting campaign for the party and for the red trade unions, for the revolutionary trade union opposition and the sympathizing organizations. . . .

Creation of revolutionary points of support in the war industries and at the centres of traffic (railways, navigation, transport, air transport, etc.); extension of the system of revolutionary functionaries in all factories. . . .

Systematic elucidation in the press of the communist parties of all the questions bound up with the preparation of war against the Soviet Union.

Making use of the parliamentary tribune for exposing the war preparations against the Soviet Union. . . .

D. All these measures must be applied and carried out by the parties from the central point of view of the struggle for the majority of the proletariat. They must pursue the special aim of exposing the petitions campaign of the Second International and the demonstrations on 4 August planned by the various social-democratic parties.

The organizational experiences which the communist parties will acquire in the process of the extension of the campaign must be the most important presumptions for the systematic development of the illegal work of the parties during imperialist war. . . .

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY ON THE PEASANT
QUESTION

7 June 1929

Strategiya i Taktika Komintern, p. 236

[The resolution of the July 1929 plenum of the CCP central committee said both that 'it is still a mistake to oppose rich peasants unconditionally', and that 'the class struggle . . . against the rich peasants should not be relaxed'. It also referred to 'the weak proletarian basis of the party the low political standard of party members, the inadequacy of worker cadres', and put 'the enlargement of the proletarian base' at the top of the list of party tasks.]

The need for a special letter is dictated in particular by the fact that

some leading comrades still permit serious errors in decisions on the peasant question. Thus the most recent documents and material we have received from the CC . . . show that many party members are not quite clear about the tactics which the party should apply in the present circumstances on the peasant question, not quite clear about the attitude which the proletariat should adopt to the different social strata in the Chinese village. This kind of question is doubly important for the Chinese CP; incorrect answers may have grave and wholly undesirable consequences. That is why we ask you with all seriousness to examine the peasant question again, taking account of what we say here. . . .

The severe and prolonged agricultural crisis makes it certain that the position of the basic peasant masses will get steadily worse, that their pauperization will continue. Chinese reaction is wholly unable to halt this process, to ameliorate the crisis. It is well known that any real and notable development of agricultural productive forces in China is possible only with the liquidation of every survival and remnant of the feudal relations in which the Chinese village is entangled and which act as a brake on the general economic growth of your country. It is also well known that in this respect Chinese reaction has had no success. And that is understandable. The dominant strata of the Chinese bourgeoisie are closely linked with the landlords, with the entire system of feudal exploitation. The landlord-bourgeois bloc represented by the Nanking Government has demonstrated that it has neither the capacity nor the desire to solve the agrarian question even in a half-hearted and partial way.

It is true that the Nanking Government is now preparing certain agrarian reforms. . . . But it is beyond doubt that these reforms will operate in a way that makes the position of the peasant masses worse than it is now. It is not difficult to foresee that the entire burden of the proposed new land tax will fall on the poor peasants. . . . Operations of this kind will completely destroy whatever illusions exist about the possibility of ameliorating the agricultural crisis and improving the conditions of the peasant masses so long as power is held by the bourgeois-landlord bloc.

But the worsening economic and political situation of the peasant masses against the background of spreading agricultural crisis will unquestionably intensify the class struggle in the Chinese village, will deepen and sharpen the conflicts between the peasant masses and the exploiting elements who sit on their backs, will create the conditions for a new and powerful surge of the peasant movement, will stimulate the growth of peasant organizations, will accelerate the pace at which the broad peasant masses become revolutionary. This sort of prospect is already being confirmed in the unceasing peasant disturbances taking place in different provinces of your country. . . .

Although a substantial number of these movements are led by reaction-

ary elements, this should by no means take the edge off party activity; on the contrary, it obliges the party to wage an even more determined struggle to conquer the leadership of these spontaneous, objectively revolutionary peasant movements for land and against the requisitions of the warlords.

We do not wish to be understood to mean that the facts we have adduced prove that there is already a powerful advance of the revolutionary wave, particularly the peasant movement. Such a conclusion would not correspond with the actual state of affairs. In noting these facts, we wish only to emphasize that the prospects before the Chinese Communist Party are extremely favourable for work among the exploited peasant masses. The party should take advantage of this situation to conduct propaganda for its agrarian programme, to re-establish the revolutionary peasant organizations, to prepare for the approaching revolutionary wave, to mobilize the masses under the banner of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism and Chinese reaction, to expose the Kuomintang, which condemns the overwhelming majority of the peasantry to extinction, poverty, and ruin in the interests of landlord rule.

But success in the struggle to win the peasant masses is impossible without a correct attitude to the different social strata in the village. And it is at this point that we must deal, first of all, with the question of the attitude to the kulak, since it is in this respect that the Chinese comrades have permitted the most substantial errors. The question is not a new one for the Chinese party; it was examined at the sixth CCP congress. At that time, analysing the relation of class forces in the country, the congress, in speaking of the alliance of the proletariat with the entire peasantry, singled out the kulak, who is playing, whether openly or implicitly, a partially counter-revolutionary role in the movement. The congress therefore came to the conclusion that the poor peasant was the proletariat's firm prop in the village, and the middle peasant its powerful ally. Why was it necessary to single out the kulak from among the peasantry as a whole? This question is still not clearly understood by many Chinese comrades. Mechanically taking over the Leninist formulation of the attitude of the working class to the peasantry in the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution, they continued to count the Chinese kulak among the allies of the proletariat.

The Leninist formula does indeed remain valid for China too, but Lenin never proposed an alliance with the kulak. In no circumstances is an alliance with the kulak permissible. The slogan of 'alliance with the kulaks' advanced in a number of Chinese party documents does not follow by any means from the Leninist formula. . . .

Agrarian overpopulation, the insecurity of the land tenure of the great mass of the peasants, permit the kulak, like the landlord, by imposing

crushing rents and charging usurious interest, to make great profits from his capital and his land. . . . And those Chinese comrades who put an opportunist interpretation on the Leninist formulation of the question of the alliance between proletariat and the entire peasantry, without taking account of the specific peculiarities of the Chinese kulak, are making a serious mistake, condemning the party to an incorrect line on a question that is of the utmost importance for the Chinese party. The mistake is the more significant as, since the defeat of the Chinese revolution, the kulak elements in the village are by and large going over to the side of reaction against the revolutionary struggle of the peasant masses. . . .

Hence the entire debate on the peasant question was conducted along incorrect lines. Instead of amending the inexact formulations of the sixth congress resolution, the comrades aggravated the error by trying to give a theoretical justification . . . for the need for an alliance between proletariat and kulak.

A mistake of this kind is a serious danger, particularly in the present circumstances of the revolutionary movement in China. Formerly, in the conditions of agrarian revolution, during the first powerful wave of the peasant movement, in conditions of open armed struggle against imperialism and Chinese reaction, with a powerful partisan movement, with numerous Soviet centres and our communist armies, it was understandable that we should be careful not to create additional difficulties in relation to the smallholding peasantry, including the richer among them; conflicts with them were relegated to the background in face of the extremely sharp struggle against imperialism and the landlord class. In those circumstances there was some reason for the slogan of 'not sharpening the struggle against the kulak', since all revolutionary forces had to be concentrated in the first place on dealing blows at the more serious and fundamental enemies of the Chinese revolution. But even at that time, in so far as the kulaks appeared on the side of reaction, the formula established grounds for incorrect tactics. At the present time, with the defeat of the revolution, when our organizations have to be built up anew, when footholds for exerting our influence have to be created once more, it is impossible to mobilize the peasant masses and the village poor without a determined and fearless struggle against every form of oppression and exploitation. It is absolutely impossible to strengthen our influence among the village poor unless we put forward class slogans, and this presupposes the leadership of the struggle of the broad masses of the agricultural proletariat and the village poor against oppression and exploitation by landlord and kulak. . . .

If it pursues the line of alliance with the kulak, or even if it only fails to intensify the struggle against the kulak, the communist party will be unable to take the lead in the class struggle of the village poor, it will dull

the edge of their activities, to the benefit of the exploiting kulak strata in the Chinese village.

What the party should, on the contrary, be doing, now more than ever before, is to expand the movement of the rural proletariat, organize the village poor. This task should be undertaken without 'side glances' at the kulak, without the fear that he will 'quit the revolution'. Such fears are completely incomprehensible in the present situation, when the Kuomintang, not unsuccessfully, is using the kulaks to exert pressure on the peasant movement.

The struggle of the peasant masses should be closely linked with the revolutionary struggle of the urban proletariat. On the other hand, our tactics in the village should be in harmony with the party's work to win the urban proletariat in its day by day economic struggles. It is not in the least compulsory to begin the peasant movement with a direct summons to carry out an agrarian revolution, with guerrilla warfare and insurrections. On the contrary, the situation in China today makes it the task of the party to exploit small and partial conflicts, to stir them up, to extend the daily struggle of the basic peasant masses against every form of exploitation, raising it to a higher political level. . . .

The organization of the agricultural proletariat, and the uniting of the village poor, are essential to the struggle for the leading role of the proletariat in relation to the basic peasant masses in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Work among agricultural labourers should therefore also be designed to draw them into the ranks of active fighters in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. The labourer is a landless peasant; he cannot and must not remain detached from the struggle of the entire peasantry for land and against feudal institutions. In this connexion it should not be forgotten that, although the peasant bourgeoisie and the kulak semi-landlords have become allies of Chinese reaction in respect to the peasant movement, the social basis and the chief pillar of the KMT and Chinese reaction in the village remain the landlords, the gentry, the tuchuns whose rule in the village has not been broken. . . .

To achieve proletarian hegemony in the bourgeois-democratic revolution requires the most determined struggle to win the middle peasant, to remove him from the influence of the bourgeoisie and the kulaks, to make clear to him the reactionary character of bourgeois national-reformism of all shades, from the Chiang Kai-shek to the Tang Pin-san variety, all alike hostile to the real interests of the oppressed peasant masses of China. . . .

To end our letter, we would like to give warning against wholly incorrect and purely Trotskyist conclusions about the socialist character of the Chinese revolution to which some comrades may come who put an erroneous interpretation on the analysis of the kulak given here. In giving

greater precision to the decisions of the sixth CCP congress on the attitude to the different social strata in the village, and in dropping the opportunist slogan 'alliance with the kulak', we do not waver in our analysis of the character of the coming stage of the Chinese revolution as the bourgeois-democratic stage. So long as the basic contradictions of the bourgeois-democratic stage remain unresolved (destruction of feudal-landlord agrarian relations, liquidation of the rule of foreign capital, destruction of the warlords, and the genuine unification of the country), so long does the bourgeois-democratic character of the revolution retain its validity, and this is true of the opening stage in the approaching revolutionary wave in China.

At the same time it must be pointed out that the uniting of the proletariat with the village poor and the consolidation of the leading role of the proletariat over the entire peasantry, which is already happening at the present stage of the liberation struggle, together with other circumstances, should in their turn have a favourable reaction on the speed with which the bourgeois-democratic stage develops into the socialist stage of the revolution.

THE TENTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE ECCI

[The tenth plenum was held from 3 to 19 July 1929. It was attended by 108 delegates (36 with voting rights) from thirty countries. There were six points on the agenda: the international situation and the tasks of the Comintern; the economic struggle and the tasks of the communist parties; the international day of struggle against imperialist war; the expulsion from the ECCI presidium of Bukharin, Gitlow, Serra, and Humbert-Droz; the expulsion from the ECCI of Jilek, Lovestone, and Spector; elections to the presidium. The plenum was primarily concerned with completing the change introduced a year earlier from the 'united front' to the 'class against class' policy, and with the complementary classification of social-democrats as social-fascists.

Before the opening of the plenum *Pravda* wrote that it had two tactical tasks in regard to social-democracy, 'which is already a component part of the fascist system'; to organize the united front from below, and to work out a policy for independent strike action in opposition to the social-fascists and trade union bureaucrats. When the plenum ended, it wrote that the radicalization of the masses since the sixth Comintern congress had gone so far that there was a danger of the Comintern limping behind. This made it more essential than ever to fight the right wing and conciliators, who were beginning to play within the communist parties the role of enemy agents. They looked to the corresponding elements in the CPSU as their leaders. In an article published just before the plenum Manuilsky wrote that the expulsions in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere showed that 'such firm bolshevik foundations have now been laid that all elements which attempt to split the communist movement must suffer shipwreck . . . there can be no communist movement outside the Comintern'.

To those who urged a return to the earlier united front tactics Manuilsky, in his first speech at the plenum, replied: 'We never thought of the united front as a formula valid for all times and countries. There was a time when we negotiated with the Second and Two-and-a-half Internationals, with the General Council [of the TUC] and Purcell. Now we are stronger and therefore use more aggressive methods in our struggle to win the majority of the working class.' He drew a parallel between the new tactics and the attitude to the peasants in the USSR. To object to the new tactics in the Comintern, to more vigorous attacks on social-democrats, was to object to the sharper policy against the kulaks. 'Whoever demands of us "the maintenance of all norms of revolutionary legality" in regard to the kulaks will also have to preach loyalty to the trade union bureaucracy.' To those who were uneasy about the virulence of the attack on socialist parties he replied that it was only over the corpse of social-democracy that the working class could wage its struggle against capitalism. An essential preliminary to that was the fight against the opportunists and conciliators in the communist parties themselves.

In the discussion Neumann said that the critics of the new line remained unconvinced that the situation was more revolutionary than it had been in, for example, 1926, when what was happening in China and Britain was far more revolutionary than anything happening in 1929. A member of the ECCI organization department reported that in some parts of Germany the local KPD committee had refused to distribute material embodying the new line. Ulbricht referred to the 'Bukharin-Humbert-Droz-Ewert-Serra group', who had continued the attempt they made at the sixth congress to get the Comintern on to an opportunist line; the conditions put to the conciliators had not been formulated sharply enough. Togliatti referred sadly to Serra's development from conciliation to revisionism. He had said that Soviet policy should have been to pay the peasants enough for what they produced; this was more important than tractors in getting a satisfactory output; he had denied that contradictions in the capitalist world were growing, and that the workers were becoming more radical; he had also denied that the development of socialist construction in the USSR gave rise to contradictions or called forth greater resistance from the remaining capitalist elements which necessitated a much sharper policy against them; Humbert-Droz had not abandoned his erroneous views—his silence at the plenum was very loud; the same conditions would have to be put to these right-wing critics as had been put to the conciliators in the KPD; in the CPSU the right danger threatened the proletarian dictatorship; the Five Year Plan was a plan to undermine capitalist stability; the revolutionary movements in Germany and India were a guarantee that the plan would be fulfilled; whoever hampered the revolutionary struggle outside the Soviet Union was an enemy of the Soviet Union; whoever hampered the fight against capitalist elements in the Soviet Union was an enemy of the proletarian revolution elsewhere.

The plenum decided to release Bukharin, Gitlow, Serra, and Humbert-Droz from all their posts and duties as members of the ECCI presidium, and expelled from the ECCI Jilek (Czechoslovakia), Lovestone, and Pepper, who had already been expelled by their respective parties. The expulsion of Spector,

Canadian representative on the ECCI, for Trotskyist propaganda, was endorsed. Garlandi, Gottwald, Randolph (USA), Gusev, and Amerigo Ledo (Latin America) were added to the presidium; Lenski was promoted from candidate to full membership, and Reimann (Czechoslovakia) was made candidate member.

Closing the session, Togliatti declared that they were now at the beginning of a new revolutionary surge; throughout the world the working masses were in movement. It was the job of the communist parties to capture the leadership of that movement.

The Agitprop department of the ECCI issued lengthy theses on the work of the plenum, emphasizing its 'exposure of the social-democratic rottenness which had accumulated within the ranks of the communist parties', reiterating the attacks on Bukharin, Meyer, Serra, Humbert-Droz, and Varga, and noting how much stronger the German and Czechoslovak parties had become since they got rid of their opportunist and conciliatory groups. Serra was expelled in September 1929 for failure to accept Comintern discipline.

Piatnitsky gave some membership figures, which showed that while the KPD had remained fairly stable in numbers since 1925 (though with a large membership turnover), the Czechoslovak party had fallen from 139,000 in 1925 to 81,500 in 1929, the French from 68,000 to 46,000 in the same period, and the CPGB from 10,700 in 1926 to 4,000.

The Comintern budget for 1928 showed an income of 1,482,000 rubles for 1928, of which 1,015,000 came from membership dues, and an expenditure of 1,445,000, of which administration accounted for 632,000 and publications for 711,000.

On the instructions of the plenum, the ECCI presidium sent a long 'open letter' to the members of the Swedish CP (there was a membership of 18,000, voting strength 150,000), criticizing the opportunist errors of its leaders; they had not assimilated the lessons of the ninth plenum and the sixth congress. 'The assertion that in a future war Sweden will remain neutral is nothing but a pseudo-fascist legend.' The Swedish bourgeoisie were becoming fascist, Swedish social-democracy social-fascist; this created new tasks for the Swedish CP, which must wage 'a life and death struggle' against social-democracy, with whom there could be 'no peaceful democratic coexistence'. The majority of the CC had failed to understand this (*inter alia*, they urged co-operation with the socialist party on practical questions like housing. As in England, the attack on the CC was organized through the Young Communist League). The CC at its meeting in June 1929 had defended its mistakes against the criticism of the ECCI delegation; the opportunist leaders would have to be replaced at a special party congress. At the plenum Flyg rejected the distorted account given of what had happened in the Swedish party, particularly the bitter attacks made by Ulbricht and Khitarov. Against the objections of ECCI representatives, the CC convened a congress for 15 November; this was overruled by the ECCI, which declared the majority (led by Kilbom, Samuelsen, and Flyg) deposed, and instructed the minority to act as the leadership of the party. Before the congress could take place, the party split, the majority seizing the press while the minority took possession of party headquarters. Of the members, 7,500 (accord-

ing to *Inprekorr*) remained with the Comintern, and 5,400 followed Kilbom. The congress then convened by the ECCI at the end of November 1929 was attended on its behalf by Dengel and an unnamed Russian.

In the Polish CP, too, there was strong opposition to the new line. Stefanski, said a resolution of its central committee, actually adopted the standpoint that there was a fundamental antagonism between fascism and the reformist parties in the ideological, political, and organizational sphere; in attacking parliamentary democracy, fascism was attacking the essential foundation of the socialist party, which was therefore genuinely resisting fascism. Stefanski's views were shared by Kostrzewa and Brand among the Polish CP leaders.

In Poland, Lenski said in the opening debate, many local communist organizations had agreed to united front proposals made by the Polish Socialist Party; this was the result of the position taken by Kostrzewa and Stefanski, that the fascists were a threat to the social-democrats, not their allies; Stefanski had recanted, and Kostrzewa had been removed from the central committee, but they still had a large following.

The commission of the plenum on the affairs of the Dutch CP (which was about to hold its national congress) noted that it had failed to make the necessary changes after the sixth Comintern congress on the pretext that there had been no marked change in the nature of the class struggle in Holland; that the social-democrats were still waging genuine industrial battles, and that the dispute with the renegades Wijnkoop and Sneevliet concerned questions of discipline, not principle; they were not agents of the Dutch bourgeoisie. The Dutch central committee also disagreed with the new trade union policy and paid little attention to the war danger. Despite representations by the ECCI political secretariat after the plenum, the Dutch central committee persisted in its opportunist errors. The congress was therefore urged to elect a new central committee (names were suggested) of those who unconditionally followed the Comintern line. In June 1930 the West European Bureau replied to a letter from the Wijnkoop group asking for readmission. They were told to dissolve their group, cease publishing their paper, and apply individually for readmission. These conditions were accepted.

Musso (Indonesia) urged the ECCI 'to do something concrete about Indonesia, so that we can be in a position to give our comrades there the correct directives'.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE TENTH ECCI PLENUM ON
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUN-
IST INTERNATIONAL

1 July 1929

Inprekorr, ix, 46, p. 973, 4 September 1929

[The theses were introduced by Kuusinen, dealing with the international situation, and Manuilsky, who spoke on the tasks of the Comintern. Kuusinen opened with an attack on Varga, who had in the presidium disputed the assertion that the 'technical revolution', or what the theses referred to as

rationalization and greater labour intensity, had lowered the worker's standard of life in absolute terms, and had suggested that the reparations conference (which produced the Young Plan) was an attempt to resolve imperialist contradictions. On the contrary, it would intensify Anglo-American rivalry (a conflict between these two Powers was drawing nearer), and Franco-German rivalry, and Germany's consequent search for markets, would aggravate the situation still further. The anti-Soviet theme in German foreign policy was now very marked; Germany, looking to the USSR for markets, would try to exert pressure on it by a blockade.

Molotov spoke of Varga's opportunist tendencies; he had said that none of the big Powers wanted to resolve their contradictions by means of war, and this explained the emergence of the Young Plan. On the contrary, the war danger was growing every day. 'If the Young Plan could resolve imperialist contradictions, even temporarily, then in the appraisal of imperialism not the communists but the social-democrats would be right.' The Young Plan would make imperialist contradictions, internal and external, more acute. Varga's suggested amendment to the theses on the worker's standard of living was an attempt 'to embellish capitalism' and to re-open questions already settled by the Comintern. The position of the working class was worsening, and the new revolutionary wave was rising; the parties must prepare for great events. Remmele asked what would happen to the concept of the third period if Varga were right? Kolarov added that the implication of Varga's ideas was that capitalism was so strong that the revolutionary crisis would be postponed for a long time. Replying to the attacks, Varga agreed that the position of the working class had deteriorated, but statistically the standard of the employed worker was not worse; he would re-examine the question; the disparity between productive capacity and sales indicated the approach of a crisis, as did the extent of stock-exchange gambling; it was already visible in agriculture and in international credit operations. He complained that the attack on him had become more bitter with each speaker; what had begun as an observation of disagreement had developed into a charge of revisionism; the worst kind of opportunist was the one who had reached certain conclusions from his studies but failed to express them out of fear that they would not fit in with the prevailing line and he would be accused of deviation. The adoption of the Young Plan was not the result of the collapse of the Dawes Plan; it had been done for reasons of foreign policy; Germany wanted the evacuation of the Rhineland, France wanted reparations. Germany was the weakest link in the anti-Soviet front, and the Young Plan was an attempt to bring it in more closely; the stronger Germany was, the further it withdrew from Rapallo. (At the twelfth KPD congress Thaelmann had said that Rapallo had become 'a scrap of paper'.)

After Varga had spoken, Molotov and Kuusinen repeated their criticism of his views. Kuusinen, in his first speech at the plenum, said there was a parallel development of the bourgeois State and social-democracy towards fascism as the class struggle became more acute; the social-democrats had the same aims and did the same work as the fascists, but behind a smokescreen. Following him, Manuilsky spoke of winning a working-class majority; this meant a political, not an arithmetical majority, in the sense of leadership of the mass

political struggle; the task was a topical and actual one for the communist parties of Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, and Poland; in other European countries and the United States the goal was a mass party; in the colonial and semi-colonial countries the parties were lagging behind the revolutionary movement, although the absence of social-democratic parties in any strength made their task easier. What stood in the way of winning a working-class majority was social-democracy and the opportunists and conciliators in the communist ranks who denied that social-democracy was becoming fascist, that the workers were becoming more radical, and that attention should be concentrated on the unorganized—the fact that they were not organized indicated the low level of their class consciousness.

Bela Kun, in an attempt to define fascism, explained that it was more than ‘merely bourgeois terror’; it was based on broad social strata—petty-bourgeoisie, declassed proletarian elements, the peasants, the intelligentsia who had been won over by social demagoguery. The disputes between fascism and social-democracy did not concern principles, but reflected different roads of development towards fascism; in the period of increasing capitalist instability, democracy could no longer safeguard the rule of the bourgeoisie, and once again the social-democrats were coming forward to save capitalism. It could not yet be said with certainty whether social-fascism was a distinct and final form of fascist development or whether, in countries like Germany, it was only a stage in that development.

Martynov (who before the plenum opened had written: ‘Our struggle with social-democracy will end in civil war’), thought that in the advanced industrial countries the counter-revolutionary role of the purely fascist organizations would be less important than that of the labour aristocracy, which was ‘the spearhead of the bourgeois counter-revolution’. (Reports in the communist press at this time of meetings of socialist parties and trade unions appeared under the rubric ‘In the Camp of our Enemies’, and in Germany young communists were urged to ‘chase the little Zörgiebels out of the playgrounds’.) Tsiu Vito said that in countries like China and India the petty-bourgeoisie (he referred by name to Nehru in this context) would play the same role as the left social-democrats in Europe and deceive the masses by radical speeches but in fact help the imperialists. There were right-wingers in the Chinese CP, he went on, who said that when Lenin was alive, he always used methods of persuasion; now the CI was treating the leaders of the KPD like children, and wanted to expel them—‘that isn’t leadership; the entire leadership is bankrupt’; they said not that the CI leadership was weak, but that there was no leadership at all; since Bukharin had left there was nobody of any standing in the Comintern. The Chinese CP, he added, also had its conciliators who thought the most important thing for that party was peace in its own ranks.

In the French, as in the British CP, there was widespread scepticism about the imminence of war against the Soviet Union, about the radicalization of the masses, and the expediency of the new trade union and electoral tactics. At a central committee meeting in February 1929 Doriot and Ferrat stated their disagreements with the new line, but said they would abide by the decisions of the forthcoming sixth CPF congress. Doriot in particular urged collaboration

with the Socialist Party and the CGT; he withdrew these proposals before the congress, where Semard and Frachon said his recantation was inadequate.

At the plenum Semard said Doriot was the centre of all conciliatory elements in the CPF, and would have to prove the sincerity of his recantation by work. The party had at first made the mistake, in appraising the Young Plan, of believing that it would ameliorate imperialist contradictions, but had later issued a statement saying that it would in fact accentuate these contradictions and intensify the class struggle in Germany and France.

In a series of articles on 'the "third period" of errors in the Comintern' (republished as a pamphlet), Trotsky argued that there was no evidence for the assertion that the workers were becoming more radical, either politically or in regard to strikes, and gave as illustration the steady decline in the membership of the French CP from 83,000 in 1925 to 35,000 in 1929, and of the CGTU from 475,000 in 1926 to 375,000 in 1928. Nor was the danger of war greater—the 'war danger' had been used by Stalin in 1927 as an argument for collaborating with the TUC, and was now being used as an argument for non-collaboration. In neither case was the policy correct.]

The plenum of the ECCI declares that the development of events since the sixth world congress fully and entirely confirms the analysis of the world economic and political situation made by the sixth congress, as well as the correctness of the line laid down by it for the international communist movement.

Despite the prophecies made by the social-democrats and echoed by the right wing and conciliatory elements, the stabilization of capitalism has not only become no firmer, but on the contrary, is becoming more and more undermined. The correctness of the estimation made by the sixth congress of the present third period of post-war capitalism is being ever more obviously demonstrated as a period of the increasing growth of the general crisis of capitalism and of the accelerated accentuation of the fundamental external and internal contradictions of imperialism leading inevitably to imperialist wars, to great class conflicts, to an era of development of a new upward swing of the revolutionary movement in the principal capitalist countries, to great anti-imperialist revolutions in colonial countries.

1. In the course of the ten years which have passed since the end of the World War, the bourgeoisie, with the direct and active assistance of the parties of the Second International, have systematically deceived the workers with the legend that the war of 1914-18 was the 'last' war. . . . In reality, however, at no time since the end of the war of 1914-18 has the menace of another imperialist world war been so great as at the present time. . . . The League of Nations, the instrument of British and French imperialism, is actively preparing this war. By rejecting the proposal of the USSR for real universal disarmament, the League of Nations exposed itself as an instrument in the preparation of war. Under the hypocritical

mask of 'outlawing war', the Kellogg Pact conceals the attempt of American imperialism to secure for itself the right and possibility finally to decide the question of the most favourable moment to begin the new war. . . .

At the same time, notwithstanding the rivalry and intense struggle within the imperialist camp, the fundamental world antagonism, the antagonism between the capitalist world and the USSR, as the two economic and political systems diametrically opposed to each other in principle, is becoming ever sharper. The attack of the imperialists on the USSR is the chief menace. This is proved by the new attempts to establish and widen the anti-Soviet military bloc, the feverish growth of armaments in the States bordering on the USSR (the reorganization of the Rumanian army, the feverish arming of Poland aided by the French General Staff, the reactionary revolt in Afghanistan aided by Great Britain, etc.), and the systematic provocation of conflicts with the USSR by raids on Soviet diplomatic agencies abroad. . . . All these preparations for new imperialist wars are being carried out with the active co-operation and full participation of the 'socialist parties', the 'left' wing of which play the most despicable part of screening these preparations with pacifist phrases.

2. At the same time, the hopes of the bourgeoisie for the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union, for its gradual subjection to the capitalist world, and its consequent conversion into a colony of international capital have proved to be all in vain. . . . The successful progress of the USSR along the road towards socialism is an important factor in the undermining of capitalist stabilization and in sharpening the general crisis of capitalism.

3. The attempts of the bourgeoisie to establish 'peace in industry' in the most important capitalist countries have also proved of no avail. . . . By still further increasing productive capacity, by eliminating millions of workers from the process of production, by intensifying still further the competition on the world market, capitalist rationalization is leading to the intensification of social conflicts. The whole burden of rationalization falls upon the shoulders of the working class, reduces its standard of living, and, as a result of the lengthening of the working day and the introduction of the conveyor system, leads to the exhaustion of labour to its extreme limit. All the social gains of the working class won in the course of decades of struggle, and particularly in the period of the revolutionary tide of 1918-20, have either been withdrawn or are in danger of being withdrawn. . . .

The position of the basic masses of the peasantry has certainly not only not improved, but on the contrary, the pauperization of the middle and poor peasants has considerably increased. The position of these sections of the rural population is made still worse by the ever growing agricultural crisis and the growth of reaction in all countries. The bankruptcy of the

notorious 'prosperity' slogan of the American bourgeoisie who in order to withstand European competition, are conducting a systematic attack on the standard of living of the American working class and multiplying the ranks of the unemployed (more than 3 million unemployed in the United States), is becoming more and more apparent. The conception of the conciliators that the inner contradictions in the capitalist countries are weakening and that it is possible to organize the internal market while preserving anarchy exclusively on the world market is refuted by the entire development of capitalism in recent years, and in reality means capitulation before the reformist ideology. . . .

In this situation of growing imperialist contradictions and sharpening of the class struggle, fascism becomes more and more the dominant method of bourgeois rule. In countries where there are strong social-democratic parties, fascism assumes the particular form of social-fascism, which to an ever-increasing extent serves the bourgeoisie as an instrument for the paralysing of the activity of the masses in the struggle against the regime of fascist dictatorship. By means of this monstrous system of political and economic oppression, the bourgeoisie, aided and abetted by international social-democracy, have been attempting to crush the revolutionary class movement of the proletariat for many years. But here also their calculations have proved to be wrong. The increasing militant activity of the working class, the rise of a new tide of the revolutionary labour movement, signalize the inevitable breakdown of this regime of unexampled exploitation and outrage against the toilers, which the international social-democracy cynically declared to be the era of 'flourishing democracy' and of capitalism growing into 'socialism'.

4. Nor have the bourgeoisie succeeded in suppressing the revolutionary movement in the colonies. The antagonism between imperialism and the colonial world is demonstrating itself more and more acutely in the important colonial and semi-colonial countries. After the temporary defeat of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants in China, the Chinese bourgeoisie, whose economic interests have become closely interwoven with finance capital of the various imperialist countries (United States, Great Britain, Japan) in alliance with feudal reactionaries, proved totally bankrupt in the matter of defending the independence of China, and have in fact passed over to the camp of the imperialist enemies of this independence. The internecine war now going on in China between the three militarist cliques, who are the instruments of the various imperialist governments, strikingly demonstrates that the interests of the ruling clique in China are diametrically opposed to the interests of the national unification of China. The unification of China and its liberation from the yoke of imperialism are inseparably linked up with the agrarian revolution and the eradication of all survivals of feudalism. But the fulfil-

ment of these fundamental tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution can be achieved only on the crest of a new powerful wave of the workers' and peasants' revolution headed by the working class. This revolutionary tide, the conditions for which are undoubtedly ripening, cannot fail to bring about the establishment of Soviets as the organs of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

At the present time a powerful revolutionary movement is developing in India. . . . The undisguised betrayal of the cause of national independence by the Indian bourgeoisie (the resolutions passed by the Swarajist Indian National Congress in favour of Dominion Status), and their active support of the bloody suppression of the workers on strike, expose the counter-revolutionary character of the Indian bourgeoisie. This signifies that the independence of India, the improvement of the conditions of the working class, and the solution of the agrarian problem, can be achieved only by means of the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants led by the proletariat in the struggle against British imperialism, the Indian feudal rulers, and Indian national capital. The tasks of the Indian revolution can only be solved through struggle for the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry under the banner of Soviets. . . .

5. The impotence of the bourgeoisie to find a way out of the ever more sharpening external and internal contradictions, the necessity to prepare for new imperialist wars, and to secure their rear by bringing the greatest possible pressure upon the working class as 'a means of extricating themselves' from the present situation; the inability of the bourgeoisie to carry out these tasks by their own efforts, without the aid of the social-democratic parties, and finally, the need to screen this policy under the mask of democracy and pacifism have led to the need of open co-operation between the bourgeoisie and the parties affiliated to the Second International. Hence, the accession to government of the social-democracy in Germany and of the Labour Party in Great Britain. The political mission of the Governments of MacDonald and Müller is to carry out the policy laid down by the bourgeoisie in home politics (the utmost pressure upon the working class, the double enslavement of the working class of Germany in connexion with reparations, rationalization in England) and in foreign politics (preparations for new wars and intensified oppression in the colonies). In Germany we have a new experiment of the largest party in the Second International, the German Social-Democratic Party, being in power. As a result of their own experiences the German workers are abandoning their illusions concerning the Social-Democratic Party. The Social-Democratic Party has revealed itself as the party which, on coming into office, has strangled the workers' strikes with the noose of compulsory arbitration, has helped the capitalists to declare lockouts and liquidate

the gains of the working class (eight-hour day, social insurance, etc.). By the construction of cruisers and by the adoption of its new militaristic programme, breaking with all the remnants of pre-war traditions of socialism, social-democracy is preparing the next war. The leading cadres of social-democracy and of the reformist trade unions, fulfilling the orders of the bourgeoisie, are now, through the mouth of Wels, threatening the German working class with open fascist dictatorship. Social-democracy prohibits May Day demonstrations. It shoots down unarmed workers during May Day demonstrations. It is the social-democracy who suppresses the labour press (*Rote Fahne*) and mass labour organizations, prepares the suppression of the CPG and organizes the crushing of the working class by fascist methods.

This is the road of the coalition policy of the social-democracy leading to social-fascism. These are the results of the governing activities of the biggest party of the Second International.

The entire policy of the Labour Party, particularly in the past few years, indicates that the MacDonald Government will proceed along the same path as that followed by German social-democracy as a government party. The MacDonald Government will brutally carry out capitalist rationalization, suppressing all and every strike movement. It will strangle the national revolutionary movement in the colonial countries particularly in India. It will conduct an aggressive imperialist policy of war, primarily against the USSR, camouflaging this policy with pacifist phraseology. No negotiations or even temporary agreements between the MacDonald Government and the USA will avert the inevitable armed conflict between the United States and Great Britain, but will in fact mark a stage in the preparations for that conflict in the same way as the attempts of the imperialist powers to reach an agreement on the eve of the World War of 1914-18 marked a stage in the preparations for that war. The widespread illusion among the British workers that the entry of the Labour Party into office signifies the coming of the working class to power will be shattered by the imperialistic and anti-labour policy of the MacDonald Government. The rapid political differentiation in the masses and their desertion of the bourgeois 'Labour Party' will begin only now. The more decisively the Communist Party of Great Britain will eradicate from its ranks all remnants of right opportunist deviations, will carry out the correct bolshevist policy, sharpening the fight of the workers against the so-called 'Labour' Government—the sooner the toiling masses of England will realize that the 'class against class' policy conducted by the Communist Party of Great Britain during the recent general election was the only correct policy and that this policy alone is hastening the liberation of the broad masses of the workers from parliamentary pacifist illusions and pointing out the correct road to the victory of the working class.

The plenum of the ECCI declares that the fact that the two largest parties of the Second International are now in office, amidst conditions of approaching war and the increasing impoverishment of the working class, creates the conditions for a profound crisis of social-democracy among the masses of the proletariat. This crisis is reflected in the acceleration of the process of radicalization among the broad masses and inevitably leads to the loss of the influence of social-democracy upon the broad masses and thereby creates favourable conditions for the winning over of the majority of the working class by the communist parties.

The plenum of the ECCI imposes on all the sections of the Communist International the obligation to intensify their fight against international social-democracy, which is the chief support of capitalism.

The plenum of the ECCI instructs all sections of the CI to pay special attention to an energetic struggle against the 'left' wing of social-democracy which retards the process of the disintegration of social-democracy by creating the illusion that it—the 'left' wing—represents an opposition to the policy of the leading social-democratic bodies, whereas as a matter of fact, it whole-heartedly supports the policy of social-fascism.

6. A new feature in the situation since the sixth world congress is the sharply marked radicalization of the international working class and the rising of the new tide of the revolutionary labour movement. . . . The capitalist offensive is now meeting with an increased resistance power of the working-class. Class battles are growing over from the bourgeois offensive to the proletarian counter-offensive, and partly to direct offensive struggles. . . .

7. On the background of the unfolding strike battles and the new revolutionary upsurge, the action of the Berlin proletariat on May Day acquires the very greatest significance. This struggle has not only revealed the fighting initiative of the German proletariat but also the strength of the influence of the Communist Party of Germany which, notwithstanding the prohibition of the demonstration by Zörgiebel and the reformist trade unions, succeeded in leading nearly 200,000 workers out into the street. The party has not retreated one step under the onslaught of the reaction, nor did it allow itself to be provoked by the bourgeoisie to an armed insurrection which in the then existing situation would have led to the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard and to the loss of its positions.

The Berlin May Days constitute a turning-point in the class struggle in Germany and accelerate the tempo of the revolutionary upward trend of the German working-class movement. Far from being a defeat of the German proletariat, as all defeatists and renegades assert, they were a demonstration of the success of the fighting tactics of the communist party, which fought relentlessly against the tail-end tendencies (khvostism) in its own ranks. The political significance of the May Day action of the

Berlin proletariat lies in the fact that it defeated the attempt of the bourgeoisie and of social-democracy to deprive the working class of its May Day festival, that it compelled the German bourgeoisie and their social-democracy to capitulate to the resistance of the working class on the question of prohibiting demonstrations, that it was reflected in the struggle for the right to the streets in other countries, and that it roused masses of the proletariat outside Germany to demonstrate their solidarity with the German proletariat by means of mass demonstrations. . . .

The plenum of the ECCI associates itself with the heroic proletariat of Berlin, the heroic defenders of the barricades of Neukölln and Wedding, and expresses its complete agreement with the tactical line carried out by the Communist Party of Germany during the May events in Berlin.

8. The new rising tide of the revolutionary labour movement and the coming into power of social-democracy in Germany and in Great Britain urgently confronts the Comintern and its sections with special acuteness with the task of decisively intensifying the struggle against social-democracy and especially against its 'left' wing as the most dangerous enemy of communism in the labour movement and the main obstacle to the growth of militant activities of the masses of the workers. In this connexion the central task of the Comintern in the sphere of inner-party policy has become the fight against opportunism which is a channel for bourgeois influence among the working class and for social-democratic tendencies in the communist movement. Unless the communist parties are purged of open as well as concealed opportunist elements, they will be unable successfully to advance along the road towards the fulfilment of the new tasks placed upon them by the intensification of the class struggle at this new stage of the labour movement.

The significance of this new stage in so far as the communist parties are concerned, lies in that it has helped to expose in the course of the unfolding class battles, the decaying opportunistic elements within it which played a strike-breaking role in these battles. This has confirmed the warning uttered by the sixth congress of the Comintern that the right-wing opportunist deviation was the most serious danger within the communist parties at the present time.

9. The plenum of the ECCI notes with satisfaction the growth of the influence of the Comintern in the past period, the organizational and ideological consolidation of its sections and the fact that they have purged themselves of the opportunistic elements (Brandler, Hais, Lovestone). The lamentations of the right-wing renegades about the alleged disintegration of the Comintern, which are echoed by the petty-bourgeois conciliators, merely prove how urgently necessary it was to purge the ranks of the communist movement in order to prevent the disintegrating work of the opportunist elements and secure the genuine bolshevization of the com-

munist parties. The most important results of this bolshevization obtained in a number of parties, principally in Germany, France, and Poland, are already apparent: the parties have been purged of opportunists, the fighting capacity of the parties has been increased, the parties have been brought nearer to the fulfilment of the tasks of leading the industrial and political struggles of the proletariat; new forces, which were politically moulded and grew up amidst conditions of increasing activity of the working class and in the fight against opportunism, have been brought to the front; there has been a growth of bolshevik discipline simultaneously with the more complete unfolding of inner party democracy and the leadership has become more working class in character. The plenum notes the consolidation of the communist parties on the basis of the political and tactical line laid down by the sixth congress. The plenum of the ECCI declares that the leadership of the Comintern as represented by the political secretariat and the presidium correctly carried out the decisions of the sixth congress, reacted in time to the most important political events, and successfully carried on the fight against the right deviators and the conciliators.

In order to create stronger guarantees for the carrying out of the decisions of the CI the plenum instructs the presidium to take measures for the strengthening of the apparatus of the ECCI by drawing into it new workers, capable of development, from the sections and by purging it of opportunist elements.

Under the guidance of the ECCI and on the basis of its Open Letter, the Communist Party of Germany ideologically and politically smashed the renegade Brandler-Thalheimer group and completely undermined its influence among the workers. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, actively assisted by the ECCI, quickly thwarted the despicable attempt of Hais & Co. to split the red trade union movement in Czechoslovakia and emerged ideologically and politically strengthened from the struggle against the liquidators. Guided by the ECCI, the Communist Party of America is successfully liquidating unprincipled factionalism and the disintegrating influence of the opportunist factional leaders upon the party cadres (Lovestone, Pepper).

A more intensive struggle against right deviations is necessary also in the communist parties of the colonial countries in which the opportunist elements are the carriers of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influence upon the proletariat and are hampering its independent struggle.

Fully and completely approving the decisions of the presidium of the ECCI on the American question, the decision on the German question, the Open Letter to the German Communist Party, the decision of the presidium of the ECCI on the Czechoslovak question, the plenum of the ECCI considers that the defence by individual members of right deviation

views which have been condemned by the Comintern as an anti-party tendency profoundly hostile to the interests of the proletarian revolutionary movement, is incompatible with membership of the communist party.

At the same time the plenum declares that conciliation, which appeared as cowardly opportunism screening avowed liquidation, has recently slipped over to the right-wing position on all the fundamental questions of the communist movement and has adopted the role of the right wingers within the Comintern. After the expulsion of the right-wing liquidators, the conciliators became the centre of attraction for all the right-wing elements in the ranks of the communist party, the mouthpiece for all defeatist moods and opportunist views. In view of this the plenum of the ECCI demands: (*a*) that the conciliators openly and emphatically disassociate themselves from the right deviators; (*b*) that they conduct an active fight not merely in words but in deeds against the right deviation; (*c*) that they submit implicitly to all the decisions of the Comintern and of its sections and actively carry them out. Failure to carry out any one of these conditions will place the culprits outside of the ranks of the Communist International.

The plenum of the ECCI is of the opinion that unless these decisions are carried out, unless the right and 'left' (Trotskyist) liquidators are destroyed, unless conciliation is resolutely overcome, it will be impossible to carry out the tasks confronting the Comintern and its sections in the period of the new upward swing, i.e. the tasks of combating the war danger and defending the USSR, of fighting social-democracy and especially its 'left' wing, of preparing the communist parties and the working class for the impending revolutionary battles, of selecting genuine revolutionary leaders of the working class, capable of boldly and unhesitatingly leading the proletariat to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

10. The fight against the liquidators and the conciliatory attitude towards the latter assumes particular importance in connexion with the communist parties' task of winning over the majority of the working class. By relaxing the struggle against social-democracy, by overestimating its strength and belittling the role of the communist parties, these elements are sabotaging the fight of the party for winning over the majority of the working class and are preventing the workers who are in transition from social-democracy to the communist movement from taking the final step towards communism. While pointing out this blackleg role of the right opportunist elements, the plenum of the ECCI calls upon all sections of the Communist International to concentrate all their efforts on the task of winning over the majority of the working class. The plenum of the ECCI emphasizes that in view of the new rising tide of the revolutionary labour movement, the winning over of the majority of the working class represents

the central task of the communist parties. This task implies that the communist parties must win the leading role in the labour movement, i.e. the leadership in all the actions of the working class, economic strikes, street demonstrations, and factory councils in order by this means to secure that the communist parties shall maintain the leadership in the decisive battles of the proletariat. . . .

In view of the threat of illegality which hangs over several communist parties which have hitherto been legal, the tenth plenum of the ECCI makes it obligatory for these parties unconditionally and immediately to take the necessary political and organizational measures so that a mass struggle may be launched with all possible means against this threat, to secure the continuation and even extension of communist party mass activity also when underground, and at all times to combine illegal with legal methods of work.

In the struggle against the threatening war danger, against the capitalist offensive, and against the campaign of slander of the reformists, all communist parties must carry on a broad enlightenment campaign to explain the gigantic achievements of socialist construction in the Soviet Union (the Five Year Plan). They must show the contrast between capitalist rationalization, which brings the proletariat ever greater poverty, and the socialist reconstruction in the USSR, which serves as a powerful lever in raising the material and cultural level of the working class and the toiling masses of the rural areas.

11. At the same time all parties must with great determination increase the activity of the communists and the revolutionary trade union opposition in the reformist unions, and work energetically in order to strengthen the red unions wherever there are dual labour organizations. . . .

In countries where there is a revolutionary peasant and national-liberation movement, the main task, along with the winning of the majority of the working class, must be the strengthening of the hegemony of the proletariat and the leadership of the communist party in that movement.

It is the task of the whole Comintern to further in every possible way the building up and consolidation of mass communist parties in the colonies, as parties of the proletariat, as the vanguard and the leading force in the forthcoming revolutionary struggles. . . .

In conclusion, the plenum of the ECCI points to the increasing efforts of the enemies of the revolutionary labour movement to isolate the communist parties from the broad masses of the proletariat (by expelling communists from the trade unions, by dismissing communists from work, by prohibiting the communist press and its organizations, etc.). The plenum of the ECCI calls upon the parties to fight against these efforts, and declares at the same time that the greatest danger that confronts us in the present period is that the communist parties may lag behind the tempo of

the development of the mass revolutionary movements (khvostism). The plenum of the ECCI calls upon all sections of the Comintern to wage a most decisive struggle against these tendencies to lag behind, which are a reflection of social-democratic survivals, for unless these are overcome the communist parties will be unable to play their part as the vanguard of the labour movement leading the working class to new revolutionary battles and victories.

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE TENTH ECCI PLENUM ON
THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE AND THE TASKS OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

July 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 46, p. 979, 4 September 1929

[The earlier paragraphs dealt with the development of the bourgeoisie towards fascism, the radicalization of the working class, rationalization, strikes, etc. Thaelmann and Lozovsky opened the discussion in immensely long speeches; Thaelmann explained the concentration on unorganized workers as reflecting the shift of emphasis from the unions, which were becoming fascist, to the factories; Lozovsky explained the ECCI's approval of new unions in the United States by saying that there 90 per cent of the working class was unorganized. The CPGB had resisted the formation of a breakaway union from the Scottish miners, but their resistance had been overcome—'we argued with the CPGB for about a year'. Whether or not communist parties should start new unions was a question to be decided not theoretically, but on practical grounds according to the given situation. Lozovsky had examined the resolutions and decisions of the Comintern and its sections on trade unions, the industrial struggle, etc. to find out defects and deficiencies. He listed ninety-four of these—there were more, but he would spare his audience. They ranged from underestimation of the radicalization of the masses to underestimation of the use made of reformism by militarism and imperialism; virtually all of them were right-wing failings. Lozovsky reported that shortly before the plenum a Latin American trade union congress had been held in Montevideo at which sixteen countries were represented; a permanent centre had been established. Both principal speakers made the point that, as the unions were becoming to an increasing extent part of the State apparatus, it was impossible to capture the trade union machine, and therefore work had to be concentrated on winning the membership for independent action against the trade union bureaucracy, and on organizing the unorganized who were free of reformist influence.

The fourth RILU congress had been held in Moscow from 17 March to 3 April 1928. It adopted 31 resolutions and issued 5 manifestos. The main resolution said, *inter alia*, that the interests of the class struggle were more important than formal trade union unity. 'There must be a vigorous struggle against the idea of "unity at whatever price", for unity is not a goal, but a means to a goal.' A single trade union International was still the goal, but this could only be attained by fighting the reformists and Amsterdam. The policy adopted, against strong opposition, called for the 'independent leadership of the

industrial struggle' by communists and RILU supporters. An article in the *Communist International* in April 1930 said that the main tactical task given out by the tenth plenum was leadership of the unemployed, linked through those on part-time with the employed. The second task was to organize and lead strikes. 'Apart from the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement there is now no other force capable of organizing and assuming the leadership of the strike struggle.' The reformists not only failed to organize strikes, but actually broke them once they had started.

In its *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress, the ECCI, dealing with the tenth plenum and the unions, noted that while the right wing had opposed the establishment of new unions, the sectarians on the left identified the trade union bureaucrats with the trade union membership, and in many places created new unions artificially and without mass support, instead of working within the reformist unions. 'As a result, the revolutionary trade union opposition existed in the main outside the unions.' At the congress itself Pieck, reporting for the ECCI, dealt with what he called the sectarian mistakes on the trade union question made in 1929. These included: continuing a strike after the majority of the workers had returned to work; failure to secure the consent of the majority in a factory before calling a strike; underrating the importance of the organized workers and the reformist unions. Although the RILU had been right in setting itself 'the task of smashing the monopolist claims of the reformist trade union bureaucracy' to decide on strikes, it had been wrong in saying that 'it is the task of the strike leadership and the strike committee independently to prepare for and lead strikes in spite of and in opposition to the reformist unions', or to say that in electing strike and other committees 'all persons connected with social-democracy and the trade union bureaucracy are to be rejected on the ground that they are strikebreakers'. It was true that the revolutionary trade union opposition, particularly in Poland and Germany, had to be consolidated, 'but again a sectarian mistake was committed; the revolutionary trade union opposition was transformed into new unions and as a result found itself isolated from the great mass of members of the reformist unions. Another mistake was that our sections in other countries mechanically took over the decision of the KPD.' In Britain the tactics were so 'clumsy and sectarian that the Minority Movement actually fell to pieces'; the CPGB had 'set up its scanty forces against the whole trade union movement'.]

I. THE CHARACTER OF MODERN CLASS BATTLES

6. A very significant feature of the present economic battles is the fact that, in spite of the blacklegging role played by the reformist trade union apparatus, to an extent hitherto unknown; in spite of the treachery of the rights and the undermining efforts of the conciliators; and finally, in spite of the mistakes of the revolutionary trade union movement and the communist parties themselves, which have not yet fully learnt to lead the strikes independently, how in spite even of a number of defeats, the militancy of the proletariat has not diminished. . . . All this definitely

refutes the theory of the reformists and the right-wing liquidators that all recent battles of the proletariat, even those in which wages demands, etc. were set up, are exclusively defensive struggles.

7. But the most characteristic feature in the appraisal of the contemporary economic battles bearing witness to an upward surge in the labour movement, is the ever growing activity of the unorganized workers. This is due particularly to the profound structural changes which have taken place in the composition of the working class as a result of rationalization. The number of skilled workers constituting the principal elements of the reformist unions is rapidly declining. . . .

This activity of the unorganized has expressed the increasingly growing discontent of the masses and has broken through the legal framework of the trade unions, involving the rank and file of the reformist unions in a struggle which is with ever greater frequency being waged not only without, but even against the reformist trade union apparatus. . . .

10. The struggle between the communist and revolutionary trade union vanguard on the one hand, and the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy on the other, is no longer being waged exclusively within the unions, but is involving all the workers in general. This struggle is primarily a struggle for leadership over the masses in the strikes. In accordance with this, new, more favourable conditions have arisen for the communist and revolutionary trade union vanguard (especially since the May Day demonstrations in Germany) to win the majority of the working class. Hence the tremendous importance of the problem of the unorganized. Hence the new tactics in the election of factory councils. Hence the decisive importance of independent leadership of strikes on the part of the communist revolutionary trade union vanguard, without and against the reformist trade union apparatus. Hence the ruthless struggle against opportunist trade union legalism in our own ranks and the tactics of the united front from below.

II. THE RADICALIZATION OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE REFORMIST TRADE UNIONS

1. The continued radicalization of the working class and the sharpening of class battles leads to a growing crisis in the reformist trade union movement. Already the sixth congress of the Comintern and the fourth congress of the RILU have recorded the fusion of the reformist trade union apparatus with the bourgeois State and with the large monopoly capitalist enterprises. During the last year, in connexion with the unfolding of the class conflicts, this process has gone still deeper. Just as social-democracy is evolving through social-imperialism to social-fascism, joining the ranks of the vanguard of the contemporary capitalist State in the

suppression of the rising revolutionary movement of the working class (Zörgiebel's May Day atrocities), the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy is, during the period of sharpening economic battles, completely going over to the side of the big bourgeoisie, defending compulsory arbitration, endeavouring to harness the working class to the yoke of capitalist rationalization, transforming the reformist trade union apparatus into a strike-breaking organization. . . .

In this process of rapid fascization of the reformist trade union apparatus and of its fusion with the bourgeois State, a particularly harmful role is played by the so-called 'left' wing of the Amsterdam International (Cook, Fimmen, etc.) who, under the cloak of opposition to the reactionary leaders of the Amsterdam International, are trying to conceal from the workers the real significance of this process and are forming an active and constituent part (and by far not the least important) in the system of social-fascism.

Naturally, the situation becomes more and more intolerable for the workers, when in their economic struggles they must remain under the leadership of politically reactionary, strike-breaking wire-pullers. These treacherous blacklegging tactics of the trade union leaders at a time when capitalism is widening and intensifying its offensive with the object of tremendously increasing the exploitation of the workers are the main source of the growing crisis in the reformist trade union movement.

2. This growing crisis has found its expression in a number of countries in the stagnation of the reformist trade unions (Great Britain) and in the mass growth of the revolutionary trade unions (India, Latin America, USA). It has also found its expression in a keen distrust of the trade union masses towards reformist bureaucracy and in the onslaught of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy on the revolutionary trade union opposition. . . .

3. The present stage of internal development in the reformist unions conforms to the general transitional period in the co-relation of class forces on the whole. The working class has already become sufficiently strong to be in a position to take up the counter-offensive. The trade union bureaucracy is still influential among certain sections of the workers, but the revolutionary unions and the revolutionary trade union opposition are increasingly winning over large masses of workers belonging to the reformist unions. This predetermines also the tasks of the communists in the reformist trade unions: not to withdraw from these unions, but to contribute in every way to the acceleration of the process of revolutionization of the rank-and-file members of the reformist unions by placing themselves at the head of the class struggle of the proletariat.

III. THE ECONOMIC BATTLES AND THE REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNION OPPOSITION

1. The ninth plenum of the ECCI and the fourth congress of the RILU placed before the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement not only the task of independent leadership of strikes but also of the best organization and preparation for this struggle, and the bringing about of working class unity from below, in the factories. Already at that time the disparity between the growth of the political influence of the revolutionary trade union movement and its organizational scope was pointed out. With this in view, it was proposed to reorganize the communist factions [fractions] in the reformist unions from the bottom, and also to reorganize the revolutionary unions on industrial lines (in countries with dual unions), to institute democratic centralism, and to set up factory committees as the basis of revolutionary unions. Attention was at the same time called to the danger of the social-democratic traditions and of trade union legalism which was particularly apparent then in countries where no independent revolutionary unions exist (Germany) in the slogan of 'compel the trade union bureaucrats' (Zwingt die Bonzen), and also in diplomatic upper combinations of the leaders of the revolutionary unions with the heads of the reformist unions.

2. The danger could and was bound to become particularly serious in the subsequent period of the growth and unusual intensification of the class fights. It is precisely in this process that the forces of the Comintern have become consolidated (and it could not be otherwise) on the basis of sifting out the anti-Leninist and opportunist elements. A similar regrouping was inevitable also in the revolutionary trade union movements. . . . The decisions of the Comintern and the RILU have achieved their object. The communist parties and the revolutionary trade unions (in countries where the trade union movement is united, as well as in those where it is divided) have made big progress during this period. . . . Experience has shown that the successes of the revolutionary trade union movement during this period were in direct ratio to the determination with which these decisions were carried into effect.

3. In countries in which there are no independent revolutionary unions, trade union legalism is still the greatest shortcoming of the revolutionary trade union movement, consisting of the fear of overstepping trade union rules and regulations. . . .

4. Another shortcoming in these countries is the fear to apply the new tactics of the revolutionary trade union opposition, believing that they would thereby weaken their positions within the reformist trade unions. This is exactly what the rights and conciliators are now harping on, just as before they used to speculate (when strike committees were set up in the

Ruhr) on the supposed conversion of the communist party and the revolutionary union opposition into organizations of the 'declassed slum proletariat'.

5. A great defect in this connexion is still the nature of the structure and activity of the communist fractions in the trade unions. A necessary pre-requisite to successful work by communist parties for winning the masses of the reformist unions is the existence of strong communist fractions in the unions capable of carrying out the party line in the unions, linked up with each other, and working under the leadership of the respective party committees. The plenum again places on record that many Comintern decisions on the question of trade union fractions are not satisfactorily carried out. Trade union fractions have not yet been organized everywhere where they should have been, in accordance with the decisions of the Second International Organizational Conference; and where they do exist, they are not always properly organized. . . .

6. Finally, in the communist parties themselves, there is as yet no clear understanding of the singular importance of trade union work in the present phase of development. Trade union work is regarded as ordinary work of the 'department'. The party does not concentrate the whole of its attention, and especially the attention of the factory nuclei, upon current trade union work, particularly however upon the preparation for leadership of economic fights. . . .

7. In countries where there are independent revolutionary trade unions (France, Czechoslovakia), the chief defect up to now consists in the under-estimation by a certain section of the revolutionary trade union militants of the fact that the masses are becoming radicalized, and also in an under-estimation of the new character of trade union reformism. In France the unitary trade unions were taken unawares and were overwhelmed by the movement. ('The movement developed over the heads of the unitary unions, our organizations lacked initiative', said Monmousseau at the October plenum of the unitary unions.) . . .

8. A direct result of this incorrect orientation and of the lack of initiative was the weak contact between the revolutionary unions and the masses. This fact is recognized also in the resolution of the central committee of the CP of France on the strike tactics of the communists in France. . . .

9. Finally the chief defect of the whole activity during the preparatory period of strikes in these countries, as well as in countries with a united trade union movement, is the predominance of agitation and propaganda over organization. A strike cannot be seriously prepared for unless sufficient preliminary organizational work is done.

IV. TRADE UNIONS AND COMMITTEES OF ACTION

1. Experience in the strikes which have taken place since the sixth congress of the Comintern have fully justified the course adopted for independent communist leadership of strikes. The best means of achieving the independent leadership of strikes and the attraction of the unorganized is the setting up of wide committees of action (strike committees, anti-lockout committees, etc.) elected by all the workers of a given factory including the organized and unorganized men and women. . . . Precisely the slogan of setting up independent committees not subordinated to the reformist trade union apparatus enabled the communist parties and the adherents of the revolutionary trade union movement organizationally to consolidate large masses of workers against the social-democratic and the reformist trade union apparatus as was the case in the Ruhr.

2. To lead the masses in their economic and political actions, the committees of action must be broad non-party mass organizations, since they are called upon to unite working men and women affiliated to different parties and different unions, as well as unorganized workers. Although non-party, nevertheless they cannot be politically neutral, indifferent, or non-political. The experience of Lodz has shown how dangerous it is to have reformist agents (PPS) of the capitalists in the committees of action. . . .

3. The committees of action unite the broad masses of workers regardless of trade and occupation, in the form of semi-consolidated temporary organizations. They cannot be appointed from the top as is done by the reformists (the appointment of strike committees by the unions). They must be elected at general factory meetings and delegate meetings of working men and women.

4. The committees of action are temporary organizations and the communists must take the initiative in their organization in connexion with mass actions of the proletariat on the basis of proletarian democracy. The committees of action should not limit their field of struggle, but should seek to widen it and to convert an economic into a political struggle. On the termination of the strike and after reports have been given on the results of the same, the committees of action are dissolved. . . .

6. An important means of struggle for the winning over of the masses of the reformist unions (in countries where there is no independent revolutionary trade union movement) is the intensive drawing in of the unorganized workers to the trade unions on the basis of the platform of the revolutionary opposition, the best layers of working men and women unite around the committees of action during mass struggles. The organization of the unorganized by the communist parties, which is an exceedingly important militant task of the immediate future, must proceed on the one

hand through the capture and organization of factory committees and their unification around the committees of action (and also around all possible mass revolutionary organizations, such as the WIR, the IRA, the Red Front Fighters, etc.) and on the other hand, through organizing them in the revolutionary unions in countries with dual trade unions. But the communist parties must devote particular attention to attracting the best elements to the communist party and to the revolutionary mass organizations during economic conflicts. . . .

V. TRADE UNIONS AND FACTORY COUNCILS

1. The radicalization of the workers and the increased activity of the working masses, the rise and intensification of class conflicts, and the growing influence of the communist parties among the workers have created the premises for a successful realization of the fundamental decisions of the Comintern in regard to capturing the factory councils from the reformists (or establishing such councils where they do not exist) and transforming them from organs of class collaboration, into which the employers and the social-imperialist trade union bureaucrats have turned them, into organs of class struggle.

2. Factory councils can and must be the natural basis of class unity from below in the factories. In contradistinction to the committees of action, they are not temporary but permanently functioning organs. They do not replace trade unions and cannot be replaced by them (as long as there are no industrial trade unions). The winning over of the factory councils (or factory delegations) is for the communist party and the revolutionary trade union movement one of the most important roads to the essential industrial districts and branches of industry. At the present stage of extreme intensification of the class struggle, the capture of factory councils means carrying out the tactic of 'class against class' directly in the factories; it means the mobilization of the masses for the further development of economic struggles. The factory committees must become the lever for the mobilization of the masses and for the struggle against the trade union bureaucrats in the factories. . . . The tactical inference to be drawn from this is—complete rejection of any electoral combinations with the reformists, and putting forward independent lists of candidates in spite of all regulations imposed by the reformist trade unions. For the duration of the election campaign, temporary mass organizations formed by general factory meetings (electoral commissions) must be created. . . .

VI. THE CONDITIONS WHICH NECESSITATE THE FORMATION OF NEW TRADE UNIONS

1. The new character of trade union reformism, the open fusion of the trade union reformist apparatus with the bourgeois State, have once more brought sharply to the fore the question of our tactics with [within] the reformist trade unions. The tenth plenum of the ECCI re-affirms that the policy of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy, a policy of splitting the trade union movement (expulsion of communists and members of revolutionary opposition from reformist trade unions, 'reverses', etc.), must on no account lead to any relaxation in our efforts for the winning over of the trade union rank and file, and especially must this not lead us to call upon the workers to leave the reformist trade unions. On the contrary, this work must be increased. . . .

2. The rising tide of the labour movement and the growing crisis in the reformist trade unions have brought forth the dangerous tendency of refusing to work in the reformist trade unions. At the same time this rising tide of the labour movement has brought forth the new problem of establishing at certain stages, under certain conditions, new revolutionary trade unions.

3. The former tendency is based upon an erroneous conception of the problem of the unorganized, upon confounding the trade unions with the committees of action, upon an underestimation of the possibility of capturing the trade unions by means of winning the rank and file of the membership (artificial creation of 'transitional' forms of organization leading up to new trade unions). These tendencies are directly contradictory to the repeated decisions of the Comintern in regard to winning the masses of the workers in the trade unions. Increased provocation on the part of the reformists, which is intended to split the trade union movement and which takes the form of expelling communists and members of the revolutionary opposition, cannot serve as a reason for a revision of the decisions concerning the work within the reformist trade unions in countries where there are no independent trade unions, nor can it justify a relaxation in our efforts to capture the trade union masses nor the artificial organization of new trade unions. The present period confronts the Comintern with the policy not of quitting the reformist trade unions or of artificially creating new trade unions, but of carrying on a fight for winning the majority of the working class, in the reformist unions as well as in organizations based upon wider masses (committees of action, factory councils) which pursue the same aims as the revolutionary trade union movement, but do so in their own special way.

4. At the same time it would be a harmful and opportunistic illusion to believe that we can under the present conditions capture the reformist

trade union apparatus, even if the membership of the trade unions be on our side. Yet this by no means signifies that the communists and revolutionary opposition have to be inactive when trade union leaders are being elected. On the contrary, the struggle for ousting all the bureaucrats and capitalist agents from the unions, the fight for each elected position in the unions, especially the struggle for the positions of the lower trade union delegates, must serve in our hands as a powerful instrument for exposing the role of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy, and for combating it.

5. Connected with this is the struggle against the disruptive policy of the social-fascist trade union bureaucrats. This struggle against expulsions and other disruptive measures must be a struggle against the reformist policy of 'industrial peace', for unity on the basis of the class struggle, for proletarian democracy in the trade unions. The disruptive work of the reformist leaders has for its object the weakening of the organizational strength of the workers in the struggle for their economic and political demands and the isolation of the communists and the revolutionary opposition from the organized masses. Therefore, one of the main tasks is to mobilize the widest masses of the workers against the disruptive activity of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy. . . .

The struggle against the disruptive policy of the trade union bureaucracy in such countries must be waged not by means of organization of the expelled communists and members of the revolutionary opposition in new unions, but by means of a more intense struggle for proletarian democracy in the unions, against reformism, for the elimination of the reformist trade union bureaucracy. The fusion of the reformist trade union apparatus with the bourgeois State apparatus on the one hand, and the growing influence of the communist parties among the workers and in the mass reformist unions on the other, not only extend the possibilities of the struggle against the reformist dictatorship, but also render it necessary to mobilize the masses for challenging the trade union statutes and for a rupture with the legalism of the reformist trade unions.

6. At the same time the revolutionary opposition cannot allow the dispersion of the growing number of members of the revolutionary opposition expelled from the reformist trade unions. Therefore, an active connexion between the revolutionary opposition and all the expelled members of the opposition becomes necessary. Yet this must not lead to the formation of new organizations (for instance, by collecting special membership dues from the expelled and issuing special membership cards) which might serve as artificial 'transitional forms' leading to new trade unions.

7. However, the communists cannot be opposed on principle to splitting the trade unions. The resolution of the second congress of the Comintern

pointed out the conditions under which communists are bound to work for a split, namely: 'Communists should not shrink from splitting the trade union organizations if to avoid a split would mean to give up revolutionary work in the unions, to abandon the attempt to organize the most exploited sections of the proletariat.' The growth of the strike movement since the sixth congress of the Comintern, and the furious onslaught of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy, which resorts to the expulsion and dissolution of entire organizations . . . has created in a number of countries the conditions under which it has been necessary in some cases to establish new revolutionary trade unions. . . .

8. Communists must understand, however, that the splitting of trade unions is not a question of mechanical formation of new trade unions. It is necessary to combat energetically the idea of the wholesale splitting of trade unions. The formation of new trade unions is possible only at the high tide of strikes, only when the political struggle is very acute, when considerable sections of the proletariat have already grasped the social-fascist character of the reformist trade union bureaucracy, and when these masses are actively supporting the formation of a new union. But even if all these conditions exist, the formation of new trade unions in countries where there are as yet no independent revolutionary unions (e.g. in Germany) should be undertaken only from case to case, in conformity with the whole objective situation. . . .

VIII. WORK IN THE COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES

The past year has been characterized by a great upswing in the economic struggle of all colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially in India. The strike wave reached even the most backward sections of the colonial proletariat (Equatorial Africa) and signifies that the developing upward swing of the labour movement has gone far beyond the boundaries of the old capitalist countries. The main features of the recent strikes in the colonial and semi-colonial countries . . . indicate that even where the movement broke out spontaneously, it was of a profound revolutionary character. This creates a favourable ground for the strengthening and development of the communist parties and revolutionary unions in those colonial countries where they exist, and for the formation of communist parties and revolutionary trade unions in those colonial countries where they do not as yet exist. The major task for all the communist and revolutionary workers of those countries is [to] secure working class leadership in all economic fights, eliminating from the strike committees the national-bourgeois and social-reformist elements, and elevating the economic actions of the workers to a higher stage of struggle. . . .

The most important task is to strengthen and extend both the illegal

and the legal revolutionary unions. It is essential, on the basis of the rising tide of the labour movement, to utilize all and any possibility to enable the illegal trade unions to overcome their isolation from the large masses, which still exists to a certain extent, to develop mass activity, and to fight their way to a legal existence. It is essential, further, to work untiringly and systematically in all the mass reformist and yellow organizations with the object of winning over the workers in those organizations to the revolutionary class struggle. It is the task of the communist parties to take advantage of the rising tide of the strike movement to break through all the barbed wire erected by imperialism and the national bourgeoisie against the class unions. The communist parties of the imperialist countries must systematically aid the strike movement in the colonial countries, intensifying the struggle against imperialism and for the independence of the colonies in connexion with the growing economic battles. Particular attention should be given to helping the labour movement in China and India, for the victory of the revolution in these two countries would deliver a mortal blow to imperialism throughout the world.

IX. THE MOST IMPORTANT PRACTICAL TASKS

1. The political character of the contemporary class conflicts, into which millions of men and women are drawn, brings very forcibly to the notice of the communist parties the necessity—repeatedly emphasized in the Comintern resolutions—of the local party organizations taking up the direct leadership of economic struggles. The communist parties have already begun to discard the old methods of leading strikes by means of handing over the leadership to the trade union departments of the party and to the communist fractions in the trade unions. Nevertheless, a number of resolute steps have yet to be taken in this direction. As the tide of the labour movement rises, the leadership of the economic fights should be the task of the party as a whole; all the forces of the party should be concentrated upon this work, and the whole organization of the party be adapted to this purpose.

2. The experience of last year's strikes has shown that the weakest spot in the communist party and in the revolutionary trade union movement is the insufficient consistency in carrying out the decisions of the sixth congress of the Comintern and of the fourth congress of the RILU. The carrying out of these decisions is still meeting with opposition in the ranks of the parties, and what is particularly important among the functionaries of the lower party and revolutionary trade union organizations. The main task confronting the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement consists in taking practical measures for accelerating the carrying out of these decisions at all costs. . . .

4. Of decisive importance in this connexion is the invigoration and training of new cadres of leaders of strike battles . . . probably the most serious defect in the leadership of economic struggles has been the conservatism of considerable strata of that section of the membership of the revolutionary trade unions who, while theoretically, in words, fully and entirely accepting the new tactics and decisions of the Comintern, practically, have proved incapable of carrying them into effect. . . .

5. The most important task of the communists and the revolutionary opposition must be, further, to concentrate the forces as well as the attention upon the main branches of industry and upon the factories which play a decisive role in the class fights. . . .

8. The conduct of the economic fights requires the creation of organs of proletarian self-defence to protect and organize factory meetings, to protect strike pickets, to combat strike breakers, factory fascism, all kinds of yellow organizations, etc.

9. The growth of unemployment as a result of rationalization affects first of all the ranks of the revolutionary opposition. The trade union bureaucracy on many occasions takes advantage of the existence of these unemployed in the revolutionary opposition to prevent them from participating in trade union activity within the reformist unions. The revolutionary opposition must by all the means at its disposal protect the rights of the unemployed in the unions even where they create unemployed organizations (Great Britain), or any other form of associations (e.g. in Germany) under the open leadership of revolutionary elements. . . .

13. As to the practical methods for the organization of the strike struggle, the tenth plenum of the ECCI recommends all the communist parties to take as a basis the decisions worked out at the International Strike Conference in Strasbourg.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE TENTH ECCI PLENUM
ON THE INTERNATIONAL DAY OF STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST
WAR

July 1929

X^e Session du Comité Exécutif, p. 882

[The day was said to be of special significance because preparations for an anti-Soviet war had now reached 'a directly actual phase'. A new monthly periodical was announced, *Der drohende Krieg*. The communist parties were enjoined to fight (in this order) social-fascism, fascism, and pacifism, to pay special attention to the unorganized and unemployed, and to establish footholds in war industries and transport centres. The decision of the Second International to hold anti-war demonstrations on 4 August (a Sunday) exposed it as 'a reformist swindle'.

The resolution was introduced by Barbé. Beuer, for the ECCI, said they had

to win the battle for the streets, prepare for self-defence, and get ready for the transition to illegality. So far only the German, French, and Polish parties had done good work in this respect. Towards the end of the discussion Bell (CPGB) thought that the unjustified pessimism of many of the speakers was probably the result of over-zealous self-criticism; he thought the parties ought to be encouraged rather than provoked.

After the session had closed, an article in the *Communist International* said that anti-war day, 'a militant review of the revolutionary proletarian forces', would raise the movement to a higher stage; it would test the fighting capacities of the sections. 'MacDonald's coming to power, the Kellogg pact, the Paris reparations agreements, all these form a pacifist smokescreen behind which preparations for war are being vigorously developed.' The smokescreen was clouding the judgment of unstable elements in the communist camp and engendering pacifist illusions; but the smoke had been dispersed by the tenth plenum, and the true state of affairs was now clear.

The campaign does not appear to have been very successful. Heckert wrote that 'by and large' the demonstrations were 'successful mass rallies of the proletariat against imperialist war'. But 'only here and there was it possible to get the workers of large-scale factories to take part in a demonstrative strike', and 'even the unemployed did not show themselves sufficiently in the streets'. There were still many communists who did not take the war danger seriously. *Pravda* wrote that, although dozens of workers were shot, 'the bourgeoisie did not dare to organize a bloodbath on an international scale . . . but mobilized every shade of social-fascism, from Zörgiebel to the Trotskyist renegades'. August the first was a decisive stage in the development of international social-democracy to social-fascism, the party of class war against the Soviet Union. In the *Communist International* for October 1929, the failure was implicitly admitted: 'The experience of the anti-war demonstrations showed that the party masses in the Comintern sections have not yet mastered the significance of the mass political strike as a weapon of working class struggle.' A year after the event, an article in the same periodical urged the CPGB 'to improve on last year's campaign, which could not be regarded as anything other than a failure. It revealed the very grave under-estimation of the war danger in all ranks of the party, particularly, however, in the central committee.' It was during this campaign that a number of leading French communists were arrested (an action against which the socialist deputies protested), and it was this which was said later to have given the Barbé-Celor-Lozeray group of 'young communists' the opportunity to assume a dominant position in the French CP. At the same time, six members of the editorial staff of *L'Humanité* were dismissed for 'retreating before the attack of the Government and the police' before and after 1 August.]

In fulfilment of the decision of the sixth world congress to organize an international day against imperialist war, the plenary session of the ECCI confirms the decision of the Brussels conference of thirteen communist parties to fix 1 August as that day, and approves in full the instructions of the political secretariat to the CI sections on this question.

The militant character of the May Day demonstrations this year,

particularly the heroic struggle of the Berlin proletariat on the barricades . . . gives to the action on 1 August greater significance than attaches to an ordinary demonstration of the working class against imperialist war.

The action on 1 August should be closely linked with the economic and political struggle of the working class as a whole, with its revolutionary struggle against capital, fascism, fascist social-democracy, including the MacDonald Government, which is a government of war and capitalist rationalization. . . . Given the enormous importance of 1 August in the struggle against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, the plenary session of the ECCI proposes to all Comintern sections:

1. To take all the necessary preparatory steps to give 1 August the character of a review of the fighting revolutionary forces of the proletariat. . . .

2. For this purpose, to intensify their work of mobilizing the broadest working masses by employing the new form of the tactics of the united workers front from below. . . .

3. The Comintern sections must carry on the struggle to win freedom for workers' street demonstrations. . . .

4. To develop a broad mass struggle against the attempts of the bourgeoisie to isolate the communist party from the working masses by repression and terror. . . .

5. The Comintern sections must take steps to draw the agricultural labourers and peasant masses into the 1 August action. . . .

6. To unmask social-democracy and its part in preparing war in the most implacable fashion, particularly 'left' social-democracy, which is the most dangerous variety of social imperialism, because it conceals its support for the military preparations of the capitalist countries behind pacifist phrases designed to put the proletarian masses off their guard. With this in mind, it is particularly important to organize the active participation of communist groups at the social-democratic meetings on 4 August.

7. To combat most energetically pacifist illusions, particularly now that the MacDonald Government is in power in England, explaining to the masses that MacDonald in power is a means to conceal direct preparations for a new imperialist war.

8. . . . Wherever possible, mass political strikes should be carried out. Despite police prohibition, mass meetings and mass street demonstrations must be held, to which soldiers, sailors, women and young workers, ex-soldiers and the war-disabled should be drawn in. In present conditions of growing reaction, and above all in view of the possibility of police and fascist provocation, all communist parties should take steps at once to reinforce or establish, in the first place in the factories, organizations for proletarian self-defence.

9. To continue the campaign against imperialist war and reaction, and for the defence of the Soviet Union, after 1 August. . . .

10. The plenary session of the ECCI calls on the workers of the colonies and semi-colonies to show vigorous support for the action of the international proletariat against imperialist war, and makes it obligatory for all Comintern sections to reinforce their revolutionary work among the workers of the colonies and semi-colonies, and to intensify their anti-military work among the imperialist armies of occupation.

In drawing attention to the inadequate energy displayed by some Comintern sections in preparing for 1 August, the plenary session of the ECCI observes that the passivity shown in this respect by certain strata in the communist parties is only one expression of the general opportunist tendencies connected with an underestimation of the war danger, a fatalist attitude towards war, an underestimation of proletarian strength and of the role of the communist parties in the class struggles of the proletariat.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE TENTH ECCI PLENUM ON BUKHARIN

July 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 45, p. 964, 30 August 1929

[The position of Bukharin, then editor-in-chief of *Pravda*, and of his chief adherents Rykov and Tomsy, was discussed at the session of the central committee of the CPSU in April 1929. Stalin made a long speech detailing their errors; in so far as these concerned the Comintern, Bukharin was accused of failing to see that conditions in Europe were becoming more revolutionary, that it was therefore necessary to intensify the fight against the right deviation, to expel the right-wing deviators, to intensify the fight against the conciliators who screened them, and against social-democratic survivals in the communist parties. Bukharin had not submitted to the CPSU delegation, before general distribution, as was customary, the sixth Comintern congress theses on the international situation, which he drafted; the Soviet delegation received them at the same time as other delegations, and had had to introduce several amendments. 'Why was it necessary for Bukharin to distribute the theses to the foreign delegations before they had been examined by the delegation of the CPSU?' Bukharin did not agree that capitalist stabilization was being shaken, he ignored the fight against the left social-democrats and the conciliators, he did not stress the need for iron discipline, which meant that he wanted to leave room for factions. On the Wittorf case in the KPD Bukharin wanted to endorse the removal of Thaelmann; he wanted to avoid the expulsion of Brandler and Thalheimer. The resolution proposed by Stalin condemning the views and activities of the group and warning them of further measures should they persist in their insubordination was approved. It was agreed that the resolution should be circulated within the CPSU but not published. After the meeting Bukharin was removed from his post as editor of *Pravda*.

At the tenth plenum Ulbricht said that Bukharin, Humbert-Droz, and Serra had opposed the ECCI open letter to the KPD the previous year, and had opposed the expulsion of Brandler and Thalheimer. Thaelmann said: 'Perhaps not all comrades at the plenum know that even before the sixth congress Bukharin tried to organize a fraction, as is clear from his well-known conversation with Kamenev.' Manuilsky, in his concluding speech, said that some communists were of the opinion that 'the methods of struggle admissible in the CPSU are not always suitable for the communist parties of western Europe. I believe such a view to be profoundly erroneous.'

After the plenum, an article in *Inprekorr* expounding Bukharin's errors said that he had been sliding downhill since the sixth congress. His opportunism in regard to Soviet affairs 'inevitably blossomed out into an international system'.

Bukharin was removed from the CPSU political bureau in November 1929.

Garlandi wrote a year later (in the *Communist International*, July 1930) that at the end of 1928 Serra had been asked to explain his position to the Italian CC; he had produced a 100-page memorandum on Comintern policies and the USSR. 'Serra formed around himself a group inside the CC, in all probability more homogeneous than the majority which we created against him.' Since he would not capitulate, he had left the party, and this was followed by a 'severe crisis' in the leadership; its entire policy was 'placed in question'. In December 1929 half the secretariat, and in January 1930 half the political bureau, were opposed to the change in party tactics. The Italian masses were becoming revolutionary, but the party was 'politically absent'. At its March 1930 session the CC had expelled Bordiga, 'the last Trotskyist leader who remained in our ranks'. He had not been expelled earlier because he had been exiled for three years from the end of 1926. The seventh congress *Materials*, dealing with the right opposition at this time, said success in the fight against them had been rapid in the CPSU, fairly rapid in Germany, and slow in Britain, because of the ideological weakness of its leading cadres. ECCI instructions had had to be sent to Sweden, Poland, Britain, China, and Hungary, and these 'mobilized the membership' against the right deviators, accomplished for the most part by the selection of new central committees. The fight had lasted until 1930. The successful fight on two fronts had led to the creation of 'monolithic leading organs'.]

Having acquainted itself with the decision of the point plenum of the CC and CCC of the CPSU (b) of 23 April removing Comrade Bukharin from work in the Comintern, the plenum of the ECCI declares:

Already before the sixth congress of the Comintern, Comrade Bukharin showed signs of disagreement with the general political line of the CPSU (b). In the course of the struggle carried on by Bukharin and those who share his views against the policy of the party this disagreement assumed the form of a separate opportunist platform, in substance a right deviation platform. . . .

Comrade Bukharin's errors in regard to the policy of the CPSU (b) are inseparably connected with his erroneous line in international policy. By underestimating the socialist offensive of the CPSU(b), as a factor

undermining capitalist stabilization, Bukharin, together with Humbert-Droz, Serra, Ewert, and others, is in fact providing an ideological-political basis for the policy of the right elements throughout the Communist International. Contrary to the line of the Comintern, and especially, contrary to the decisions of the sixth congress, Comrade Bukharin is slipping over to the opportunist denial of the fact of the ever-growing shakiness of capitalist stabilization, which inevitably leads to denial of the rising of a new revolutionary tide in the labour movement. At the bottom of Comrade Bukharin's attitude is his anti-Marxist 'theory' of the weakening of the inner contradictions of capitalism which he tries to smuggle through by phrases about the preservation of capitalist anarchy exclusively on the world market. This kind of 'theory', which serves as an ideological basis for all the right elements in the Comintern, is refuted by the whole development of capitalism and is, in substance, nothing but capitulation before reformist ideology (Hilferding theory of the 'recuperation of capitalism').

Comrade Bukharin's article 'The Theory of Organized Economic Disorder' (*Pravda*, 30 June 1929) shows that far from repudiating his anti-Marxist 'theory' about the weakening of the inner contradictions of capitalism he is persisting in his errors and is deepening them.

In this connexion, it is perfectly clear that Comrade Bukharin's and his followers' lamentations about the 'disintegration' of the Comintern are a method of cowardly support of the right elements, the struggle against whom was and is the main task in the Communist International. Comrade Bukharin and his group are trying to discredit in every possible way the healthy process of purging the communist parties of social-democratic elements, an absolutely necessary process particularly in view of the rising revolutionary tide, and to weaken thereby the struggle of the Comintern against the right renegades. Being the centre of attraction for all right elements in the Comintern, Comrade Bukharin and his group, by preaching pessimism, defeatism, and disbelief in the strength of the working class, are not only putting new life into all anti-Leninist tendencies, but are helping to undermine bolshevik discipline.

Comrade Bukharin's opportunist wobblings have resulted in him trying, behind the back of the party, to constitute an unprincipled bloc with former Trotskyites for struggle against the CPSU(b) and the Comintern.

In view of all this, the plenum of the ECCI, while confirming the decision of the joint plenum of the CC and CCC of the CPSU(b) to remove Comrade Bukharin from work in the Comintern, resolves to relieve him of his post of member of the presidium of the ECCI.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON MEXICO

*July 1929**Inprecorr*, ix, 34, p. 732, 19 *July 1929*

[In the spring of 1929 the Mexican communists supported the Government of Portes Gil against the military rebellion of Generals Escobar and Aguirre; the United States sent arms to the Government. The communist party's attitude was condemned by the ECCI, which explained the error as being due to the domination of the party by its right wing. 'To the surprise of communists outside the country', wrote an *Inprecorr* correspondent in New York, 'the workers' and peasants' bloc led by the Mexican Communist Party did not enter the struggle independently, but placed itself behind Portes Gil, that is, on the side of US imperialism.' The Comintern explained that the revolt was financed by British capitalists in an attempt to overthrow the puppet government of their United States rivals. Diego Rivera, President of the Mexican Workers' and Peasants' Bloc, and several of his colleagues were expelled from the CP; Rivera joined the Mexican Trotskyists. General Rubio, who succeeded Portes Gil, broke off relations with the USSR. In January 1930 the LAI issued a manifesto against 'the fascist dictatorship in Mexico'; the workers and peasants had been the first to help put down Escobar's rebellion, and this had frightened the Mexican bourgeoisie and their United States masters.

In May 1929 fourteen Latin American communist parties held a congress in Buenos Aires, and in the same month Latin American communist trade union groups and organizations met in Montevideo and set up an RILU bureau. At the ECCI plenum in February 1930 Manuilsky said that in Mexico communist collaboration with other classes had led to the suppression of the communist movement and the other Latin American parties must learn the lesson; workers' and peasants' blocs were useful for periods of illegality, but in Latin America the policy had been wrongly applied—the bloc had often become a parallel party with its own programme and tactics, and had degenerated into unprincipled collaboration with the petty-bourgeoisie. In the countries of Latin America the petty-bourgeoisie were losing their democratic character and becoming fascist. Workers' and peasants' blocs must accept the basic communist principles and have communist leadership; they should be based on organizations created by the communist party, not peasant parties and other petty-bourgeois organizations; within the bloc the communists must preserve their independent class policy and full freedom of criticism.

The South American Secretariat of the ECCI was transferred from Moscow to Buenos Aires after the sixth Comintern congress; in February 1930 it issued a manifesto against the Government in Mexico, where further arrests of communists had taken place; the Mexican bourgeoisie, it said, had abandoned the struggle against imperialism and betrayed the bourgeois-democratic revolution. An article in the *Communist International* in April 1930 said there was a great deal of unrest in Latin America, but in many countries there was no communist party to lead the movement. In Mexico and Brazil their identities had been lost in the workers' and peasants' parties; in Brazil and Ecuador they had lost control of the unions; it was a drawback that in most parties the leading elements were

intellectuals with a petty-bourgeois psychology, but an advantage that, except in Argentina, there were no social-democratic parties or traditions. All political phenomena in Latin America could be explained by the struggle between British and United States imperialism.

In an article published before the tenth ECCI plenum Manuilsky, who said he had 'discovered Latin America in 1927', wrote that in Ecuador and Colombia there was 'an immediate revolutionary situation', and the parties should take over the leadership of the peasant struggle. The idea of a permanent workers' and peasants' bloc should be abandoned, in line with the rejection by the sixth congress of workers' and peasants' parties.]

The assassination of our two heroic comrades Rodriguez and Gomez, who fell under the fire of the executioner, and the most shameful and cynical terror launched against the Mexican workers and peasants, together with the dissolution of the Communist Party, the prohibition of the workers' and peasants' revolutionary press, and the arrest of the best militants active in the consisting [consistent] struggle against imperialism completely unmasked the self-styled 'revolutionary' Government of Portes Gil, Calles, & Company, showing the whole world that the Mexican Government has become an openly fascist Government and an agent of North American imperialism. . . .

In developing its fascist policy as agent of North American imperialism, the Mexican Government is driving the workers from all the positions that they had conquered during the past years. The strike movements of the Mexican workers against foreign employers are persecuted. With the aid of the social-fascist Morones, the Mexican Government is working to break up the organizations of the revolutionary workers.

Furthermore, the few gains made by the peasants during the revolution have been destroyed. The big landed proprietors and capitalist agriculturists are taking back what little land they were forced to give over to the peasants. After the 'freethinkers' Calles and Gil—at the order of Yankee imperialism—got down on their knees before the Pope in order to guarantee 'social peace' in the districts of American silver exploitation, which were recently the scene of civil war, we find the Mexican clergy managing somehow to get back its former positions and regain the landed property that was taken from it by armed force. Already government troops are disarming the peasants and dissolving the guerrilla battalions, or transforming them into fascist organs of struggle. Deprived of their arms, the peasants will find it impossible to defend their gains and their rights.

The petty-bourgeois elements, the intellectuals, the 'liberal' landed proprietors, and the elements of the young national bourgeoisie which has become degenerate and extortionist—these groups which form the social basis of the Portes Gil Government, have cowed [cowered] before the rising wave of the revolutionary movement of the workers and

peasants, and under the pressure of North American imperialism have betrayed the cause of the national independence of Mexico; they have betrayed the interests of the workers and peasants of Mexico for the benefit of exploiting Yankee imperialism—they have betrayed the common cause of the peoples of Latin America, and have passed into the camp of the most rabid enemies of the working masses of Mexico. Yankee imperialism has gained another 'victory' in its campaign of expansion.

This 'victory' is piling up new explosive material in the world and constitutes a new step ahead by the United States on the road of preparation for imperialist war.

The lesson of these events is that there is but a single force left in Mexico which can and will consistently and energetically lead the struggle against imperialism; this is the Communist Party of Mexico.

The Mexican masses have grown more class conscious through experience and do not hide their sympathy for the communist party. During the past years the Communist Party of Mexico has gained very great political influence, and is being transformed more and more into a rallying-point and centre for political leadership of the movement of the workers, while it organizes around the Mexican proletariat the peasants, the poor Indians, and the anti-imperialist movement of Mexico in the struggle for the conquest of land and for national independence.

The unrest, discontent, and combative spirit of broad masses of Mexican workers and peasants is rising from day to day. The working masses of Mexico are reacting with increasing force against the treachery of the self-styled 'anti-imperialist revolutionists' and the reaction which they have launched. The workers and peasants of Mexico are faced with the question: either meet the fascist battalions of Portes Gil under the banner of the Workers' and Peasants' Government—or allow themselves to be crushed and subjected to the worst conditions of slavery and oppression under the yoke of Yankee imperialism.

There is no possible hesitation before this alternative. . . .

Mexican workers! Rally around your Communist Party! Build up your revolutionary trade unions!

Mexican peasants! Do not give back your arms to your exploiters who will use them to crush you! Rally around the proletariat, organize yourselves in your Peasant League, cleansing it of all traitors, prepare to carry on a great struggle under the valiant leadership of the Communist Party, to get the land from the big proprietors! Down with imperialism and its accomplices. Long live national independence!

Comrades, workers and peasants of Latin America!

Protest with vigour against the threat coming from the fascist Government of Mexico, which, if it is not warded off, will affect the entire anti-imperialist workers' and peasants' communist movement of Latin America.

Comrades, workers and peasants of all countries!

Your duty is to take a vigorous stand against Mexican fascism! Not a single communist party, not a single workers' organization, not a single truly anti-imperialist organization must fail to raise its voice of protest against the fascist Government of Mexico.

EXTRACTS FROM A COMINTERN STATEMENT ON THE CHINESE
EASTERN RAILWAY DISPUTE

18 July 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 36, p. 773, 26 July 1929

[Relations between the USSR and China were broken off by a Soviet Government decree of 16 August 1929, following the closing of Soviet consulates in North Manchuria in April, and arrest of Soviet railway personnel in July. The Comintern issued the slogan, taken up by all sections, 'Defend the Soviet Union'.

Chen Tu-hsiu criticized this slogan, as giving the impression that the communist party was calling on the Chinese workers to protect the special interests of a foreign Power in China; it was abstract and liable to be misunderstood; their slogans should direct the attack on the policy of the KMT as incompatible with Chinese interests.

An article in the *Communist International* at the beginning of September said that the attack 'was provoked by the imperialist powers with the object of drawing the USSR into war'. It was 'no accident' that it coincided with MacDonald's Government in Britain and a Liberal Government in Japan. Their policies gave greater freedom to the Chinese ruling cliques, and were an invitation to Nanking to abandon the fight against imperialism and join the fight against the USSR. 'There can be no doubt that these events would have been unthinkable otherwise than as part of the plan of the continued and furious onslaught of the imperialists against the Soviet Union. . . . The concrete motives and factors of this attack are of relatively secondary importance.' 'The Chinese Government', said an article in *Inprecorr*, 'is a group of bandits and mass murderers in the pay of the imperialists.' All articles in the communist press attributed the attack to outside influence; one in *Novy Vostok* emphasized French guilt, while Braun (KPD) and Voitinsky said the United States was the most aggressive in this respect; Wall Street had decisive influence in Nanking; it could give or withhold loans; moreover, America's reputation was not compromised by unequal treaties. All writers agreed that the American offer of mediation was a pretext for taking over control of the railway and for getting American capital into Manchuria; that was why the Japanese were so strongly opposed to it; Japan was pleased by the events on the CER, hoping to capture for its own railway in Manchuria the freight formerly carried by the CER; the French offer of mediation was made in the hope of getting some return on the old loans to Russia; China would gain nothing—it was to China's advantage to administer the railway jointly with Russia, thus keeping it out of the hands of the imperialists. The West European Bureau of the ECCI issued a statement on

20 July calling for immediate action in defence of the USSR; a manifesto by the CC of the CCP interpreted the Chinese action as an attempt by the KMT to sell the CER to the imperialists in order to get their support for crushing the Chinese revolution, which would prepare the way for a combined attack by China and the imperialists on the USSR.

The meeting of the Pan-Pacific trade union secretariat in June 1929 issued a manifesto against KMT action on the CER and the raids on the Soviet consulates, and the Pan-Pacific trade union conference in Vladivostok in August stated that the dispute was not one between China and Russia, but the 'common struggle of the workers of the Soviet Union and China against world imperialism'. The settlement of the dispute in December was called 'a victory of world revolution over world imperialism', and messages of congratulation were sent from the Comintern sections to Moscow.

At the meeting of the ECCI presidium in the following February Molotov said that it was the growth of Soviet power and strength which accounted for the victory in the CER dispute, as it also accounted for the intensification of the anti-Soviet campaign. It was noted that the reaction of communist parties to Chang Tso-lin's attack revealed those inadequacies in their anti-war work on which the tenth plenum had commented.

Two years later Voitinsky wrote in *Problemy Kitaya* that the events of July 1929 were the 'result of attempts by the Chinese counter-revolution and the imperialists to stabilize and settle their internal contradictions by means of war against the USSR'.

At the end of 1933, at the thirteenth ECCI plenum, Piatnitsky, referring to the 1929 dispute, said: 'It is well known that not only the Chinese militarists, the KMT, etc., but also the parties of the Second International in all the capitalist countries, in order to discredit the USSR, falsely depicted the seizure of the CER by the Chinese militarists, who were backed by the imperialists, as a war against unequal treaties. The northern militarists were also supported by the Trotskyists, Chen Tu-hsiu, and others. The Chinese communists did not allow themselves to be influenced by this demagoguery . . . and fought against the KMT and the militarists in their own country.']

Working men and women, toilers of the whole world! The danger threatening the cause of peace is growing. Chiang Kai-shek, the executioner of Chinese workers and peasants, acting on the orders of world imperialism, is openly provoking a fresh war against the Soviet Union. The advance of socialist development in the first proletarian State of the world is being watched by imperialism with spiteful rage, inspiring it to redoubled attacks upon the Soviet Union. World imperialism, which is organizing war against the Soviet Union in East and West, in Poland, Rumania, Afghanistan, presses the Nanking Government into service for direct raids on the Soviet Union. The Kuomintang, headed by the betrayers of the national revolution and the executioners of the revolutionary champions of China, is doing its utmost, under the dictates of imperialism, to convert China into a marching ground against the Union.

All the provocative machinations of the Kuomintang and its Government in Nanking, the raids on the Soviet representatives (Peking), the murders of members of the Soviet consulates (Canton) were frustrated by the firm and steadfast peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. Its wish for peace has, however, been interpreted by the militarists of the Kuomintang and their imperialist advisers as a sign of weakness.

On 10 July the Kuomintang generals seized the Chinese Eastern Railway, confiscated the telegraph service, locked and sealed the Soviet Russian organizations and official centres, and arrested or expelled from the country hundreds of Soviet Russian citizens. The breaking up of the Soviet Russian institutions in Harbin, and the seizure of the railway line, was accompanied by the simultaneous mobilization of military forces, and the concentration of White Guardist troops on the frontiers of the Soviet Union, for the purpose of an adventurers' warlike advance. Inspired by a sincere desire for peace, the Soviet Government replied to the unheard of provocations by proposing to the Kuomintang Government that a conference should be called at once for the peaceful settlement of all points of contention, imposing the sole elementary condition that the acts of despotism and violence and the repressive measures against Soviet Russian citizens should cease immediately. But even to this proposal the Kuomintang Government replied with an insolent refusal, cloaking this beneath lying phrases about alleged Soviet Russian propaganda, thereby unmasking its provocative line of action. The Soviet Government was obliged to break off diplomatic and commercial relations with the Kuomintang Government, which cynically tore up the agreements concluded with the Soviet Union, the sole country recognizing in actual fact the sovereignty of the Chinese people, the country which is the most faithful friend and ally of the peoples oppressed by imperialism. . . .

Working men and women, toilers of the world! The Communist International calls upon you to mobilize and organize a determined frustration of the leaders and wire-pullers of the counter-revolutionary campaign against the Soviet Union. Always remember the fact that behind the pacifist manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie and social democracy, feverish preparations for war are concealed, that the danger of a fresh war becomes more threatening day by day. The provocation organized in the Far East by the Chiang Kai-shek Government, on the commands of the imperialists, bears witness to this.

The insolence of the Chinese counter-revolutionaries has assumed a particularly provocative character since the coming into office of the MacDonald Government, which the Second International represents as being a 'guarantee of peace'. The German social-democracy, which is at the head of the coalition Government, joins the German bourgeoisie in supporting the Nanking adventures and eggs on the Chinese generals.

The French socialists combine with the Poincaré Government in an effort to exploit the conflict in the Far East for the reinforcement of the anti-Soviet front. Everywhere we see the parties of the Second International, now developed into social-fascist parties, standing side by side with counter-revolution, against the Soviet Union, and taking an active part in the drawing up and carrying out of the imperialist war plans.

Working men and women, toiling masses of China! The appeal of the Communist International is directed most of all to you. . . .

. . . The working masses of China will reply to this adventure, organized by generals who have taken leave of their senses, by binding more closely than ever the tie of brotherly alliance with the proletariat of the Soviet Union, and by the revolutionary struggle against the Chinese and Russian White Guardists.

Workers of India and of the whole East! The object of the fresh provocation from the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang is solely the firmer establishment of the positions of the imperialist bandits, and therewith the imposition of the imperialist yoke on the peoples of the East, the crushing of your heroic struggle. Forward to the fight against world imperialism, against the fresh war, and for the defence of the Soviet Union, the stronghold of the world proletariat, leading at the cost of much sacrifice a bold struggle for the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the East.

Working men and women of the capitalist countries! Behind Chiang Kai-shek there stand the imperialists and their lackeys, the social democrats, who are anxious to sweep from the face of the earth the first proletarian republic, which has inscribed on its banner the liberation of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the whole world from the yoke of capitalism and imperialism.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI POLITICAL
SECRETARIAT ON THE INSURRECTION MOVEMENT IN ARABISTAN

16 October 1929

Inprekorr, x, 11, p. 258, 31 January 1930

[The fighting between Arabs and Jews which broke out at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem on 23 August 1929 provoked a good deal of discussion in the communist press on the nature of the forces involved. The Zionist movement had from the outset been condemned by the Comintern as an agency and tool of British imperialism; it was a counter-revolutionary movement of the Jewish big bourgeoisie run by the financial magnates of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States. An article in the *Communist International* shortly after the outbreak asserted that: 'The Zionist immigrants . . . turned the country into a suitable strategic base for British imperialism, and . . . were to serve as lightning-conductors towards which, in case of need, British agents could direct the revolt of the Arab masses against the occupation regime.' At

any sign of revolutionary nationalism British agents provoked massacres and pogroms, thus temporarily paralysing the revolutionary movement. The fighting that broke out in August 'was undoubtedly organized by British agents, provoked by the Zionist-fascist bourgeoisie, and arranged by the Arab-Mohammedan reaction'; but the movement got out of hand and became a genuine Arab nationalist revolt. The British purpose was to strengthen their position against the penetration of American capital and to frustrate Arab-Jewish mass solidarity. The Arab masses no longer trusted their bourgeois leaders who, corrupted by the money channelled through Zionism, were conciliatory towards imperialism, but their own movement had been captured by Pan-Islamic reaction.

The official Comintern attitude was disputed by some Jewish members of the Palestinian CP, who denied the existence of an Arab revolutionary movement; the workers' movement was almost entirely Jewish. In an article in *Novy Vostok* Arbutziam [Averbakh] asserted that the fellaheen and the Beduin masses were waging an active political struggle against British imperialism; they did not, however, submit easily to class political discipline and might therefore become the tools of imperialist agents. 'The basic question of the revolutionary movement in the Arab East is to use the immense revolutionary energy of the Beduin tribes for the revolutionary class struggle against imperialism, against the native bourgeoisie and feudalists, and to link it with the movement of the impoverished fellaheen and proletariat.' The Jewish Socialist Party (Poale Zion), including its left wing, had become a national-chauvinist organization defending the plantation owners and colonizers, and the trade unions sacrificed the workers' interests on the altar of Zionism.

An article by a certain Nadab published four years later in *Revoliutsionny Vostok*, which argued that, since Zionism was counter-revolutionary, anti-imperialism in Palestine must be directed against the Jewish national minority as being overwhelmingly Zionist, stated that those members of the Palestine CP who insisted that the 1929 events were a pogrom, and not a rebellion, had been expelled.

The League Against Imperialism interpreted the fighting as an anti-imperialist struggle to which the imperialists had given a religious character; the Zionists and social-democrats had prevented a united front of Arab and Jewish workers. The imperialists welcomed the event as a pretext for annexing Palestine to the British Empire. An article in *Inprekorr* said the Arab Executive now regarded the Zionist leaders not as enemies but as rivals for British favour. An accompanying article (signed J.B.) said the 'street fight' which began on 23 August was 'the signal for a general Arab rising'. The British Government 'dropped a little oil whenever the fire threatened to go out' in an attempt to destroy the Arab-Jewish rapprochement of recent years. The communist party was too weak to 'gain influence on the mass movement which grew from hour to hour and was influenced by blind religious fanaticism'. The Haifa committee of the communist party, claiming that what had happened was a pogrom pure and simple, suppressed the central committee statement which interpreted the events as the work of imperialist stooges, deflecting the anti-imperialist revolt into pogroms. In a letter to the Palestine central committee, the Eastern

secretariat of the ECCI spoke of the dangers of opportunism in the party, and of the conciliatory attitude to Poale Zion.

In October 1930 the ECCI again suggested that preparations should be made for the formation of an Arab Communist Federation, to include the parties of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. At the seventh congress of the Palestine Communist Party in December 1930 the Arab and Jewish delegates were equal in number—previously the Arabs had been in a minority; the two chief dangers facing the party were said to be Jewish Zionist chauvinism and Arab bourgeois nationalism; the central committee elected by the congress had an Arab majority. An article in *Inprekorr* on the congress said prospects were improving because the Jewish workers were turning against their own bourgeoisie while the Arab bourgeoisie were turning away from the nationalist movement. The Pan-Islamic congress held in Jerusalem in the summer of 1931 was described as an attempt to consolidate reaction and mislead the masses; its reactionary character was shown by the resolution it adopted protesting against the oppression of Moslems in the USSR. Early in 1932 a draft programme for the Egyptian CP was published. This described Egypt as a British cotton plantation worked by slave labour, with the monarchy and landowners acting as slave-drivers. All Egyptian parties were subservient to Britain, the Wafd representing 'bourgeois-landlord-counter-revolutionary-national-reformism'. An article in *Inprekorr* in May 1932 noted that 'as a result of the temporary weakness of the labour movement in Egypt, police *provocateurs* and petty-bourgeois adventurers succeeded in disorganizing the activity of the Egyptian CP, detaching it from the workers, and alienating it from the revolutionary mass struggle'. The seventh congress *Materials* said that for a time 'an unprincipled group' in the Egyptian CP, behind whom the police was hidden, had condemned communist organizations to complete inactivity. At the congress itself a delegate said that because of internal feuds and intrigues, the party had at one time been expelled from the Comintern; in 1931 the ECCI had appointed a new leadership.

Referring to the events of 1929, the *Materials* noted that there had been strong opposition to the ECCI's instructions to Arabize the Palestinian CP; these opportunists had been removed and the position was corrected at the seventh congress of the Palestinian Communist Party, but the party was only now (1935) beginning to bolshevize itself, a process inseparable from Arabization.

A footnote to the present resolution states: 'The resolution is necessarily published in abridged form. In particular, it omits those passages concerning the attitude of the Palestine Communist Party to national-revolutionary trends.'

At the meeting of the LAI Executive in Cologne in January 1929 Heckert (representing the RILU) and Melnichansky (representing the Soviet trade unions) attacked A. J. Cook, a member of the Executive, who protested against outside interference in the League, and against the label of 'traitor' attached to union leaders, and said he was not inclined to support a League that was to become a new red international. Cook shortly afterwards resigned from the League. At the LAI congress in Frankfurt in July 1929 there were 260 delegates, 84 of them representing the colonies, although many did not come directly from

the colonies themselves. Münzenberg reported that the bourgeois nationalists who had been present at the Brussels congress, such as the KMT, had sold out to imperialism, and were not represented at Frankfurt; there were fewer intellectuals, but more representatives of workers' and peasants' organizations. An article on the congress in the *Communist International* in November said that in all the colonial countries the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie had moved to the right. The ILP and the Indian National Congress had played a treacherous part; Poale Zion was an agent of British imperialism. The left-wing social reformists (such as Maxton and Fimmen) had joined forces with the national reformists (such as Hatta and Gupta) and should have been more thoroughly exposed at the congress. (Maxton was later expelled from the British section of the LAI.) Neither the Indian nor the Indonesian revolutionary movement was represented, and hence there had been serious opportunist errors at the congress, which had failed to expose the left social-democrats, who were 'the worst enemies of the colonial peoples, the most dangerous enemies of the colonial revolution'. The congress resolution had not said a word about the 'treachery and perfidy' of the Indian National Congress. 'The time has come to raise the question of purging the League of elements which are obviously treacherous.']

The uprising of the Arab masses in Palestine and the events in Arabistan as a whole have by and large fully confirmed the correctness of the analysis made by the sixth CI congress and the tenth plenum of the sharpening of the struggle between imperialism and the working masses of the colonial countries, of the new surge of the national liberation movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries, of the appraisal of the English 'Labour' Government and the transformation of the Second International into a social-fascist, openly social-imperialist International.

The national disunity of the Arabs, the fragmented character of Arabistan, broken up into a number of small countries, the division of Arabistan among the various important countries, the complete absence of political rights for the indigenous population, forcible Zionist colonization, and the use of greater pressure by English and French imperialism on the Arab countries—these are one group of causes of the insurrectionary movement.

A second group of causes of the events in Palestine are the robbery of the Arab fellaheens' land for the benefit of Zionist colonization (often with the help of Arab large landowners), and of the Arab large landowners and foreign capitalists . . . the greater exploitation of the peasants by higher rents and taxes and by the moneylenders, the relatively rapid growth of a commodity and money economy . . . and the comparatively rapid development of class differentiation among the Beduin tribes.

The maturing of the revolutionary crisis was accelerated by the growth of unemployment . . . the harvest failure of 1928, the ferment in the Arab countries, the dissolution of the Syrian parliament, the Iraq government

crisis . . . the demonstrations and strikes of workers in Palestine and Syria, the new Anglo-Egyptian treaty . . . the approaching offensive by spiritually bankrupt Zionism, which has discarded its socialist mask and appears openly as an agency of capitalism (as shown in the decision of the Zürich Zionist congress in July 1929).

THE CHARACTER OF THE MOVEMENT

These are the characteristic features of the movement:

1. The Palestine uprising is occurring at a time of revolutionary ferment in the most important industrial centres of India, of crisis in the Chinese counter-revolution, and of a rising wave in the revolutionary labour movement of the West; it represents the beginning of a rising wave in the revolutionary liberation movement of the Arab countries.
2. The movement extends over the whole of Arabia and has a profoundly national character. It spread extremely quickly to the other Arab countries.
3. The movement is changing rapidly and moving on to a higher level. If, in the first days, the clergy and the feudalists, united in the Mejlis Islam, managed to direct it into the channel of an Arab-Jewish national feud, after that the masses turned spontaneously against the Mufti, against the Mejlis Islam, and against the representatives of the Arab Executive, condemning their treachery and their surrender to imperialism . . . the movement is changing rapidly from a Zionist-Arab conflict into a national peasant movement, in which the nationalist urban petty-bourgeoisie are also taking part. The fellaheen and particularly the Beduin are the most active participants in the insurrection movement.
4. The working class has remained in part passive; in any case it has not acted independently, much less tried to assume hegemony of the movement. A section of the Jewish and Arab workers fell under the influence of 'their' bourgeoisie and took part in the national-religious conflict under the hegemony and leadership of 'their' bourgeoisie. Nevertheless there were individual cases of heroic manifestations of proletarian class solidarity by Arab and Jewish workers. Thus, notwithstanding the fact that the insurrectionary movement was a response to an Anglo-Zionist provocation, to which Arab reactionaries (feudalists and priesthood) tried to answer with a pogrom, notwithstanding the fact that in its initial stage it came under reactionary leadership, it was still a national liberation movement, an anti-imperialist all-Arab movement, and in the main, by its social composition, a peasant movement.
5. The movement took place at a time when MacDonald's 'Labour' Government was in power in England. The 'Labour' Government, with the full support of the Independent Labour Party, came out openly in the role of executioner of the colonial revolution.

6. The movement revealed the growing depth of the contradictions between English and French imperialism in the struggle for influence in the Middle East.

THE CHARACTER AND DRIVING FORCES OF THE REVOLUTION IN ARABISTAN

The general Comintern position in regard to the character and driving forces of the revolution in Palestine and in Arabistan as a whole has stood the test of the revolutionary mass movement and has been confirmed by experience. The main socio-economic content of the revolution is the overthrow of imperialism, the national unification of all Arab countries, the agrarian revolution, and the solution of the national question. It is this which determines the character of the revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution in the Leninist sense of the word. The main driving forces of the revolution are the working class and the peasantry. The bourgeois-democratic revolution can be conducted to its conclusion only in revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. Without doubt this bourgeois-democratic revolution will turn into a socialist revolution. But the thesis advanced by some, about the proletarian character of the revolution in the conditions prevailing in Palestine, is [not] only completely out of accordance with the historical reality, and not only reflects the Trotskyist ideology of permanent revolution, but would signify, in the concrete conditions in Palestine, primarily the dictatorship of a small company of Jewish workers over the large masses of the Arab population.

THE ROLE OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES IN THE MOVEMENT

The Zionist colonizing bourgeoisie and their lackeys played the part of outright agents of English imperialism . . . The 'left' wing of Zionism, Poale Zion, merged with the Jewish fascists and sided with English imperialism and the Zionist bourgeoisie.

The Arab large landowners, the feudal lords, and the higher ranks of the priesthood, united in the Mejlis Islam, capitulated long ago to English imperialism, and played a treacherous, provocative, counter-revolutionary role.

The All-Arab National Congress, which in the last few years has revealed with a clarity that leaves nothing to be desired its national-reformist character . . . did not play an independent part in the movement; rather its right wing joined the reactionary camp of the feudals and priests.

The fellaheen and particularly the Beduin were the basic driving forces of the movement. But the peasant movement did not coincide in time with an organized and independent class action by the proletariat in the towns. The peasant movement was unorganized and fragmentary.

ACHIEVEMENT AND DEFECTS OF THE PARTY

The Arab insurrectionary movement clearly revealed both some positive features and the weaknesses of the Palestine CP.

1. The uprising took the party by surprise; this was because it is composed in the main of Jewish elements; it has no contact with the Arab masses as a whole, and in particular lacks any kind of contact with the peasantry.

The uprising has shown in practice how right the ECCI was in its repeated instructions about the need to Arabize the party. The deficiencies and errors of the Palestine CP, revealed in the course of the uprising, are a result of the party's failure to steer a bold and determined course towards the Arabization of the party from top to bottom. In the past the party has applied its forces and means incorrectly, and concentrated its work primarily on the Jewish workers, instead of concentrating its maximum forces and means on work among the Arab worker and peasant masses. The Arabization of the leadership was interpreted as the mechanical inclusion of a few Arab comrades on the central committee. The party did not succeed in creating solid party organizations among Arab workers and in the local Arab trade union organizations. There was a spirit of pessimism and scepticism as to the possibility of successful work among the fellaheen and Beduin, which in some cases led to passive sectarianism, to an underestimation of the revolutionary possibilities in Arabistan, to an exaggeration of the influence of the reactionary bourgeoisie on the Arab masses. . . .

2. Particularly in the first days of the movement, when it was almost exclusively influenced by events in Jerusalem and some other cities, the party failed to notice that the religious national conflict was turning into a general national anti-imperialist peasant action. Consequently the party failed to include in its slogans the questions of the seizure of the land, the formation of revolutionary fellaheen and Beduin committees, the agrarian revolution, and the national unification of all Arab countries, and to conduct agitation around the slogan of an all-Arab workers' and peasants' government, failures which can be explained by the right-opportunist vacillations in the party about this question in the past. The party failed to advance the slogan of forming Arab-Jewish workers' detachments, of arming the workers, of joint demonstrations of Arab and Jewish workers, of a joint general strike. . . . The exposure of the English 'Labour' Government's assumption of the role of executioner, revolutionary criticism of the Arab and Jewish political parties and organizations, particularly the adherents of Poale Zion and of their attitude during the uprising, was not concrete enough.

At the same time it must be emphasized that the Palestine CP showed

itself to be a firmly welded organization of devoted revolutionaries, anxious to fulfil their revolutionary duty in an honourable fashion. In respect to its theoretical level, its devotion to communism, the CP of Palestine certainly stands high. . . .

THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

The CPP, as well as the CI sections in other Arab countries, must learn the lessons to be drawn from the uprising.

1. The most urgent task of the party is to steer an energetic and bold course towards Arabization of the party from top to bottom. At the same time it must make every effort to establish Arab or joint Arab-Jewish trade unions, and to capture and extend those already in existence. . . .

2. The party must at all costs eradicate the scepticism and passivity on the peasant question which prevail in its ranks. . . . It must draw up an agrarian programme which pays heed to the partial demands of the fellaheen and Beduin.

3. The party must continue its work among the Jewish workers organized in the Zionist-reformist trade unions, as well as among the unorganized workers. The exposure of Zionism, and particularly of its left wing, as an agency of imperialism, remains as before one of the chief tasks, the concrete lessons of the movement being used to demonstrate this.

4. The party must expose the Mejlis Islam . . . as a direct agent of English imperialism. No less ruthlessly must it expose the national reformism embodied in the All-Arab Congress. . . .

5. The campaign for an active boycott of the commission appointed to investigate the events, and the organization of the boycott . . . must with the help of other CI sections be placed in the centre of the party's attention. . . .

8. The lessons of the rising clearly show the need for the closest contact between the communist parties of the various countries of Arabistan and of Egypt. The most appropriate form will be the formation of a federation of communist parties of the Arab countries. The condition for such a federation is the Arabization of the CPs of Palestine and Syria, the consolidation of the CPs of Palestine, Syria, Egypt, etc. Steps to accelerate the Arabization of the Syrian CP must be taken at once, to ensure that the communists in Syria, after overcoming liquidationism and opportunism, finally become independent communist parties.

9. These tasks can be accomplished only on condition that a bold and energetic struggle is waged against the right deviation in the party, which is bound to become stronger under the pressure of white terror and the impact of the temporary defeat of the uprising. The right deviation in the CP of Palestine is expressed in an underestimation of revolutionary

possibilities, open or concealed resistance to Arabization of the party, pessimism and passivity in regard to work among the Arab masses, fatalism and passivity on the peasant question, failure to understand the role of Jewish comrades as subsidiary forces, but not as leaders of the Arab movement, exaggeration of the influence of the reactionary bourgeoisie, large landlords, and priesthood on the Arab masses, a conciliatory attitude to opportunist errors, failure to understand the need for courageous and vigorous self-criticism of the mistakes committed by the party, a tendency to emigrate without the permission of the CC, that is, to desert, resistance to the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government. The appraisal of the rising as a 'pogrom' and concealed resistance to Arabization are manifestations of Zionist and imperialist influence on the communists. The eradication of these attitudes is essential for the further development of the party. . . .

The insurrection movement in Arabistan found a strong international echo. The parties of the Second International and a number of petty-bourgeois pacifists sided with English imperialism and counter-revolutionary Zionism. The 'left' social-democrats, above all Maxton, exposed themselves as agents of imperialism. Communists and national revolutionary organizations sided with the Arab uprising.

At the same time it must be noted that in the early stages of the uprising there was vacillation and confusion in some countries (the Jewish section of the CP of the USA) as well as in some communist newspapers (even in the Soviet Union) about the character of the movement. These were rapidly overcome in the CI sections.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

26 October 1929*

Strategiya i Taktika Komintern, p. 252

[The July meeting of the Chinese CC agreed that 'the serious attention of the party must be called to the activities of the Trotskyite opposition in the CCP, which have the possibility of temporary expansion, and are anti-revolutionary'. The Trotskyists argued that power in China was in the hands of the bourgeoisie and that the revolution would therefore be a socialist one. They denied that 'a new revolutionary wave was rising' and urged concentration on the industrial struggle, on the democratic political struggle, and the abandonment of the policy of artificial uprisings.

The second issue of *Problemy Kitaya* wrote that unless the CCP exposed and defeated the followers of Chen Tu-hsiu and the Trotskyist liquidators, it would be unable to ward off war, defend the USSR, or defeat the KMT reorganizers.

* Harold Isaacs dates this letter 26 October, using as source a communist periodical published in Shanghai. The book from which this text is translated gives as its source *Pravda*, 29 December.

Chen was expelled on 15 November 1929, together with about a hundred of his followers. Shortly afterwards *Problemy Kitaya* carried an article by Radek explaining and recanting his earlier mistakes about China, and attacking Chen Tu-hsiu. In January–February 1930 a discussion in the (Moscow) Institute of Research on China dealt with ‘the historical roots of Chen Tu-hsiuism’ in which Strakhov, Safarov, Voitinsky and others took part. The report carried an editorial note rebuking Borodin and Voitinsky for their errors in the past, particularly their failure to inform the ECCI about Chen’s views.]

Recent events in China compel us, without waiting for reports from you on the activities and policy of the party in the present circumstances, to give our appraisal of the situation now being created in China, and our preliminary proposals on the most important tasks of the communist party.

1. China has entered a phase of deep national crisis, reflected in (a) a new outbreak of internecine wars between military cliques, behind whom stand the imperialist Powers, among whom contradictions are growing more acute; (b) the formation—as a rival to the Nanking Kuomintang—of the ‘party for KMT reorganization’ . . . (c) the aggravation of this situation by the anti-Soviet adventure and the consequent sharpening of all contradictions; (d) the failure of all efforts to attract substantial foreign capital investments and to have the unequal treaties reviewed; (e) the obvious collapse of all the Kuomintang’s internal policies, which have failed to suppress the revolutionary mass movement (despite the unparalleled white terror) . . . (f) depression in a number of industries, while at the same time the role of foreign capital in the country’s economic life is growing; (g) the prolongation and deepening of the agrarian crisis, from which there is no escape within the framework of the present bourgeois-landlord regime; (h) the general worsening of the position of the working class and the basic peasant masses, already intolerable; (i) the rise of a new wave of the workers’ movement, advance signals of a new revolutionary upsurge; (j) the revival of the peasant movement, in particular of the guerrilla movement.

The attempt of the alliance of bourgeoisie and landlords to create and consolidate a national bourgeois centralized State on the basis of a victorious counter-revolution has failed. If, in the early stages of the Nanking Government, it might have appeared that a stable bourgeois development for China was possible, today the old contradictions are being reproduced on an enlarged scale, the result of the strengthening of imperialist influence, the deepening of the economic crisis, the new split among the rulers, and the revival of the mass revolutionary movement of workers and peasants. It is impossible to predict when the national crisis will develop into a directly revolutionary situation. But we must already begin to prepare the masses for the revolutionary overthrow of the

power of the bourgeois-landlord bloc, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry in the form of Soviets by actively promoting and energetically extending revolutionary forms of the class struggle (mass political strikes, revolutionary demonstrations, guerrilla activities, etc.).

2. In the counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialists, landlords, and the entire bourgeoisie . . . internal contradictions and dissensions are growing and becoming deeper. Counter-revolutionary as all the exploiting classes are, and little difference as there is in their respective attitudes to the basic contradictions both within China, and between China and imperialism, the bloc is nevertheless breaking up into two main political groups.

The first group consists of the warlords, feudal landowners, and the native big bourgeoisie (primarily, but not exclusively, the compradores and bankers). Politically this group is represented by the ruling landlord-bourgeois cliques, Kuomintang and non-Kuomintang. . . . All are helping to subject the country to foreign capital. Feudal fragmentation, and the fact that China is the scene and object of struggle among various imperialist Powers, explain the absence of internal peace within this political camp and the unceasing wars among the militarists.

The second group represents the attempt to form by political means a bourgeois national-reformist centre, representing the interests of the middle ranks of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, i.e. part of the industrial capitalists and merchants. It is in opposition to the present government KMT and is extending its influence among the medium and small capitalist entrepreneurs, among the dissatisfied small landowners and the upper (exploiting) strata of the petty bourgeoisie of town and village. Politically it is represented by the 'party for KMT reorganization'. . . . This party, which makes extensive use of social demagoguery and deceitful slogans about the struggle for national unity and democracy, is trying to exploit the growing discontent of the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the broad popular masses with the aim of renovating the Nanking Government and preventing a new revolutionary explosion. This group, and the 'reorganization' party representing it, is counter-revolutionary, deeply hostile to the revolutionary movement of workers and peasants, hostile to the USSR, compromising through and through, servile to imperialism and the warlords. . . .

But since, at the present moment, when the revolutionary wave is beginning to rise, these 'reorganizers' (whose party still reflects what hopes have survived for a 'renovation' of the KMT) have not yet been finally exposed in the eyes of the working masses, the most determined struggle against their reactionary compromising influence is an essential prerequisite to the further development of the revolutionary struggle and the maintenance of proletarian hegemony. . . .

In fact the emergence of this national-reformist wing among the middle rank of the bourgeoisie after the complete bankruptcy of Nanking represents no more than a new attempt by the Chinese bourgeoisie to paralyse or delay the revolutionary outbreak by presenting the reorganization of the KMT as a way out of the political impasse. . . .

3. . . . The effect of the war between the militarist cliques, which directly continue the counter-revolutionary policy of the bourgeois-landlord bloc, is objectively to weaken the regime, to draw the masses into political struggle, to strengthen their ever more active resistance to imperialist war and its consequences, and to promote the independent workers' and peasants' movement. Another peculiarity of the national crisis and the revolutionary surge in China is the peasant war. The bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution has not been able to crush the revolutionary peasant movement. The revolts of the Moslems, of the 'Red Lances', etc. which, though led by reactionaries, are by virtue of their mass character objectively revolutionary, and especially the all-round extension of the mass agrarian movement in most of the provinces of China, the existence of areas still under Soviet rule, which has recently been extended and strengthened, as well as the continuing guerrilla warfare in the south—all this represents one of the streams along which in the future the mighty surge of the revolutionary movement throughout the whole of China will make its way.

But the most substantial and reliable sign of the swelling surge is the revival in the labour movement, which has risen clear of the depression into which it fell after the severe defeats of 1927. The strike movement among the industrial proletariat is spreading, and is showing a tendency to grow into political battles, street demonstrations. These processes in the workers' movement have already led to a strengthening of the communist party, which led revolutionary demonstrations and strikes on 30 May, 1 August, and 1 September.

. . . Nevertheless the ideological and political influence of the CCP and the level of working-class organization lag behind the growth of mass discontent, the mounting revolutionary energy, and the spontaneous movement. Few of the red trade unions are mass organizations, while the influence of the yellow KMT unions is still great. . . . The communist party is far from having rallied to its side the revolutionary cadres of the industrial workers; still less has it accomplished the task of winning the majority of the working class, or, what is of cardinal importance at the present moment, winning the leadership of the spontaneous economic and political struggles of the proletariat. The party has not yet become the pioneer, organizer, and leader of the directly revolutionary struggle of the broad masses.

In the communist party itself there are serious vacillations about basic

questions of its tactics and policy (the liquidationist group of Chen Tu-hsiu, the tendency in favour of a bloc with the 'reorganizers' and the yellow trade union bureaucrats, the tendency to deny the necessity of supporting and leading the peasant war), which prevent it from taking the lead of the independent mass struggle in the new conditions of the approaching revolutionary surge.

This lagging behind of the party's influence on the working masses, of the level of organization in the revolutionary trade union movement and the party itself, in the rear of the growing spontaneous struggle of the working class, is the most serious danger for the entire future development of the revolutionary struggle in China.

4. What has been said indicates the immediate tasks of the party. In addition to our earlier letters on the peasant and trade union questions, we think it necessary to direct your attention to the following basic tasks now confronting the party:

(a) to exploit to the utmost the fighting which has already begun and use it to develop further the independent revolutionary mass movement... and to expose the counter-revolutionary role of all KMT groups. The party's cardinal topical slogans in its mass agitation must be 'turn the wars of the warlords into class war, civil war'; and 'overthrow the government of the landlord-bourgeois bloc'...;

(b) at the same time the fight to win mass influence, the fight for proletarian hegemony, must be intensified, and directed in the first place against the so-called 'reorganizers', who are trying to exploit the mass discontent and at the present moment represent the chief danger to the further development of the revolutionary movement. . . . It is especially important to demonstrate to the masses their servility to imperialism, particularly evident in their rabid and truly fascist campaign against the USSR in connexion with the conflict over the Chinese Eastern Railway. . . . It is obvious that any kind of bloc with the 'reorganizers' cannot be tolerated. If such blocs were permitted, they would mean the subordination of the independent movement of the proletariat to the leadership of the counter-revolutionary national-reformist bourgeoisie and would unquestionably lead to the defeat of the revolutionary movement. Now more than ever before we must concentrate on the independent struggle of the workers and peasants under the leadership of our party;

(c) particular attention must be paid to the strike movement. As the industrial and political struggles merge, every effort must be made to develop political strikes, designed to lead up to a general political strike. . . ;

(d) the party must pay more attention to the fight to win the leadership of the anti-imperialist movement against all the imperialist Powers, particularly the United States. . . . In connexion with the conflict in Manchuria it is necessary to organize a campaign under the slogan of

defence of the USSR, exposing all sections of the KMT, including the 'reorganizers', as agents of imperialism;

(e) reinforce and expand the partisan movement, particularly in Manchuria, in the areas where Mao Tse-tung and Ho Lung are active. Repel decisively those tendencies in the party which underestimate the revolutionary significance of the peasant struggle, in particular the guerrilla movement. Pay more attention to work among the soldiers. Try to the utmost to arm the worker and peasant detachments at the cost of the warlords' troops. . . . Occupy the areas evacuated by the militarists and consolidate your position there. Where the revolutionary mass struggle of the peasants is growing, try to form Soviet centres; you must be there. Where Soviet power is established, you must set actively about confiscating the land of the big landowners, arming the peasants, and organizing Soviets. Try to co-ordinate the scattered actions of the worker and peasant armies. . . .

5. It will be possible to accomplish these tasks successfully only with an enhanced fighting capacity and by the greater activity of the communist vanguard of the proletariat. In the new conditions the primary and fundamental task of the CP is to win the leading role in the revolutionary movement. While not permitting any repetition of past putschist mistakes, which have in the main been overcome, the party must do all it can to stir up and sharpen class conflicts, lead and guide the indignation of the masses, and as the conflicts develop raise correspondingly higher demands, carrying the revolutionary struggle to even higher stages. . . .

It is necessary to expose more forcefully the counter-revolutionary nature of Trotskyism, revealing how its attitude on the 'socialist' revolution in essentials merely supplements the views of the right-wing liquidators. The party must cleanse its ranks of disguised Trotskyists and liquidators. But at present the chief dangers in the party are the right opportunist views and trends—tending to tone down the struggle against the 'reorganizers', mistakenly regarding them as representing the petty bourgeoisie, to underrate the importance of peasant wars, to underrate and put a brake on the revolutionary energy and initiative of the masses, to minimize the independent and leading role of the proletariat and the communist party. Such tendencies have nothing in common with Leninism and are a denial of proletarian hegemony in the Chinese revolution.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO THE ELEVENTH
CONGRESS OF THE CPGB

November 1929

Inprecorr, ix, 66, p. 1399, 29 *November 1929*

[The tenth congress of the CPGB in January 1929 approved the new line against a large minority; its opponents in the central committee were uneasy about the

new electoral tactics, which would split the working-class vote, and about the new trade union policy, and were in general unconvinced by the Comintern theory of 'radicalization'. A confidential letter from the ECCI asserted that the central committee, which contained too many officials and not enough proletarians, was trying to stifle rank-and-file criticism, sabotaging the establishment of a daily newspaper, and confining the new line to the electoral field only. The twenty-five CPGB candidates in the general election polled 50,000 votes in all.

The attack on the central committee was organized and conducted by two prominent members of the YCL, Rust and Tapsell, who enjoyed Moscow's confidence. 'It became more and more clear', Rust wrote (in the *Communist International* in March 1934), 'that no serious success or headway would be made until a new party leadership was elected, and this period of 1929 was taken up by a bitter internal struggle in the party which lasted till the eleventh congress in December 1929.' A delegation went to Moscow to discuss the situation, and it was discussed again at the tenth plenum. Manuisky dealt with it in his opening speech. The situation in England was favourable for the development of a mass party; the working class would soon be disillusioned in the Labour Government, but this would not happen automatically—the communist party had to work at it. Was it in a state to exploit the situation? Organizationally it was weak, and ideologically it was inadequate. In the past two years it had lost more than half its membership. For ten years there had been no internal party struggle; many might think this a sign of health, but it meant that political questions were not taken seriously enough. 'We welcome the solidarity of the English central committee, but it seems good to me to make a crack in it now and again, not because we want to split the central committee, but to bring some life into its work, to raise its ideological level, to enhance the attention it gives to the most important problems.' They had been too friendly towards the Labour left; they did not have passionate discussions about policy and deviations such as occurred in the German and Polish parties; they were insular and isolated, a society of friends, not a bolshevik party. Khitarov (speaking for the YCI Executive) criticized the proceedings of the tenth CPGB congress; the outcome of the failure of the leaders to understand the new line was seen in the general election results. Piatnitsky said that the change in tactics introduced at the ninth plenum 'provoked the frantic opposition of the majority of the central committee of the CPGB'. They had been severely criticized by the ECCI for their opportunist errors, and it was this letter that aroused the local party organizations. Rust said that the fall in membership to 4,000 was the result of the central committee's failure to operate the new line; the leaders did not realize the need for change, but the members did; he told the plenum that Campbell had not revealed how serious the CPGB situation was. Since the ninth plenum there had been a series of conflicts between the CC and the ECCI; the ECCI had had to introduce radical changes in the resolution for the congress drafted by the CC. (Campbell and Rothstein had proposed that, where there was no communist candidate, the workers should be encouraged to vote for the Labour candidate.) The composition of the CC elected by the congress was not representative of the party; Murphy and Gallacher,

who were opposed to the right-wing tendency, had been dropped from the political bureau, and the congress had been recommended not to elect Arnot and Rust to the central committee. This showed that the CC accepted the ECCI's decision in words only. Pollitt said the party had vacillated for a year, and was encountering great difficulties; it earnestly sought the help of the Comintern. Molotov and Ulbricht urged the reappointment of Murphy and Gallacher to the political bureau; this would guarantee adherence to the Comintern line. Horner denied that Murphy and Gallacher had been dropped because they were guardians of the Comintern line; on the contrary, Gallacher was a pessimist and Murphy a right-winger. Changes had been made in order to bring in new people and to strengthen local work. Bell said the central committee had long been aware that it was over-weighted at the centre; Rust and Arnot had not been nominated to the bureau not because they were critical but because its size had been reduced from 9 to 5 members, in order to release more people for local work. There was no truth in the charge that there was a left opposition which was suppressed by the central committee. There was no better way to disrupt the party leadership than to sow mistrust.

Manuilsky said in reply that the CPGB should concentrate on factory rather than trade union work; it would have to make changes at the centre and start a daily paper. The speeches made by Campbell, Horner, and Bell 'were models of how one should not defend the British party'; while Khitarov's speech was a model of how not to attack it. After the plenum the central committee met for a five-day session; three members were removed from the political bureau and replaced by industrial workers; the resolution concluding the session admitted the committee's errors: 'The chief cause of the present critical situation in the party . . . is the right mistakes committed by the leadership.' The next congress would have to bring the entire party on to the Comintern line. Bell reported to the ECCI political secretariat on the meeting of the central committee; the secretariat approved the criticism of the committee's opportunist errors and its decision to concentrate all the party's forces on the exposure of the MacDonald government, 'which has most strikingly demonstrated its treason to the interests of the working class'. Horner, Rothstein, Bell, and Inkpin were not re-elected to the central committee, which was chosen from a list put forward by a 'nominations commission', replacing the previous method of open congress voting. Pollitt became general secretary, and the new daily paper started shortly afterwards was edited by Rust. Its business manager was Tapsell.]

Your congress meets at a decisive moment in the history of your party and of the British working class movement. It is taking place at the commencement of a world economic crisis, in the period of a new rising revolutionary tide in the international labour movement, in the period of the victorious fulfilment of the Five Year Plan of socialist construction in the USSR which is the most powerful factor of destruction of capitalist stabilization. In these circumstances, the ascension to power of the British 'Labour' Government, which is the government of capitalist rationalization, of preparation for war against the Soviet Union and

for the suppression of the colonies, opens a new page in the history of the struggles of the British proletariat. The self-exposure of the 'Labour' Government and the disillusionment of the broad masses of the working class in regard to the 'Labour' Party create favourable conditions for the development of a mass Communist Party in Great Britain. Your congress must mark a turning-point in the determined application of the new line and the radical transformation of the form of organization and methods of work of the party in order that it may play the leading role in the growing class struggles. Your congress is called upon to make a final and decisive break with the opportunist hesitations and vacillations of the past, to put an end to the present internal situation in the party which is hampering its activities and to bring it out on to the broad road of becoming a mass organization, the vanguard of the working class in the fight for the overthrow of capitalism. The ECCI is confident that the congress will approach its task in the Leninist manner and enable the party in the shortest possible time to become a decisive factor in the class struggle. . . .

British imperialism strives to overcome its difficulties by a policy of imperialist reaction at home and abroad. The bourgeoisie strives to crush the working class by means of rationalization, organizes the bloody suppression of the colonies, is making preparations for an imperialist war, is ceaselessly striving to undermine the work of socialist construction in the USSR in spite of diplomatic recognition. It is the mission of the capitalist 'Labour' Government to carry out this policy. . . . In many cases the resistance of the working class is in the nature of a counter-offensive which, in present conditions, assumes the character of a political struggle, and which is the forerunner of gigantic class conflicts. Wherever communists have been able to take the lead of the masses, they have met with undoubted support.

The opening of this new chapter in the history of the British working class calls for an immediate and determined effort to close the gap between the communist vanguard and the masses and to bring it closer to the progress of the spontaneously growing class struggles. Without this the communist party will be unable to fulfil its revolutionary duty to the British and the international proletariat. It is imperatively necessary that the British party from top to bottom shall thoroughly understand in the bolshevik manner the implications of the new tactics of class against class. Any further delay in the application of the correct line, the pandering to right opportunist vacillations, passivity, lack of resolution and initiative, and following in the wake of events, will be a serious menace to the very existence of the party. The party must understand that the very ascension to power of the Labour Government puts the party in the vanguard of the class struggle and imperatively calls for its transformation into a mass bolshevik party within the shortest possible time.

The Communist Party of Great Britain must definitely understand that it is useless talking about a mass bolshevik party, about the leading role of the party in the class struggle, unless it has close and constant contacts with the masses, unless it closely studies the mass economic and political struggles, unless it actually organizes and leads these struggles and unless it systematically, day in and day out, exposes the treacherous social-fascist role of the 'Labour' Government and its henchmen. The communist party must become the focus, the political expression, and the organizer of the growing mass protest movement and struggle against the 'Labour' Government. The communist party must become transformed from a merely propagandist organization into the independent leader of the economic and political struggles of the working class.

The party has not as yet succeeded in doing this, although certain steps in this direction have been made. The fact, however, that the party membership is beginning to recognize the necessity for this transformation and is seeking the means by which it can be achieved, marks important progress.

The party will be able to bring about this transformation only if it fully appreciates the implications of the new line and if on the basis of everyday experience, it will seek for, adopt, and develop new concrete forms of organization and methods of working-class struggles. Up to the ninth plenum the line of the party should have been to fight for the masses and to lead their struggles mainly by working in the Labour Party and in the trade unions. The ninth plenum radically changed this line. The intensification of the class struggle, the radicalization of the working class, the growing fascization of social-democracy and the reformist trade unions brought the communist party face to face with the task of independently leading the class struggle of the proletariat. The new line demands that the communist parties, while not in the least diminishing their activity in the trade unions, initiate and develop independent organs of struggle embracing all the workers—the organized and particularly the unorganized—for the fight against the employers as well as against the fascist Labour Party and trade union bureaucracy. To achieve this it is necessary to transfer the weight of the party work among the masses to the factories. But the party has not yet succeeded in establishing contacts with the masses in the new fields of struggle, and certain elements in it are still clinging to the old methods. . . .

The failure of the party to become the mass leader of the workers and the failure of the Minority Movement to become a mass independent workers' movement are due primarily to the right-wing mistakes committed by the party and its leadership. The opportunist elements in the party leadership hindered the reorganization of the party on a factory basis. These elements clung to the old forms of contacts with the masses

and to the old methods of work instead of utilizing the existing and creating new approaches to the masses on the basis of the united front from below in the factories. These elements must be brought out into the open and ruthlessly exposed. Particularly must determined and ruthless efforts be made to eradicate the form of opportunism which finds expression in the mechanical acceptance of all resolutions and criticisms from the ECCI without a radical change in the practical everyday work and tactics of the party.

In order to apply the line of the Comintern, not merely in words, but deeds, in order that the party may become the vanguard and revolutionary organizer in the everyday struggles of the working class, it must not only declare ruthless war against right opportunism and conciliation, but actually conduct this war in all spheres of its practical work. Only in this way will the party purge itself of right opportunism and conciliation. The overestimation of capitalist stabilization by the party leadership, the inability to see the development of the trade unions and the Labour Party towards social-fascism, the dragging at the tail of the sham left representatives of social-fascism (Cook, Maxton) hindered the party from realizing the necessity for new and independent forms of struggle. The deviation of a number of leading members of the party in this direction explains the resistance to the independent action of the communist party against the labourists during elections, the passive subordination to trade union legality and to the leadership of the reactionary trade union bureaucrats, the underestimation of the need for the party guidance of trade union work, etc., etc. These deviations fatally affected the party's contacts with the masses and particularly affected the Minority Movement. The application of the tactics of the united front from above led in practice to passivity in the fight for the united front from below, played into the hands of the reformists, and hindered the development of the mass struggles under the leadership of the party. . . .

But the party will never succeed in becoming the mass leader of the workers, and the Minority Movement will never become a broad mass organization unless the party succeeds in establishing a daily paper. The problem of a daily paper is not only the problem of the party, but of the whole of the British working class and of the mass revolutionary movement. The daily paper must become the medium for the most intimate and responsive contact of the party with the masses in their struggle. . . .

A systematic exposure of the Labour Government and of the trade union bureaucracy will be possible only through the medium of a communist daily. In fighting for a working-class paper, the party must follow the example of the Russian bolsheviks who, even under Tsarism, were able to create and maintain their mass revolutionary proletarian press.

Your congress will have to deliberate on these main problems confront-

ing the party. But the congress will be able to solve these problems only by the means of wide and ruthless self-criticism of the activities and life of the party, its achievements and fundamental weaknesses. . . .

Your congress must elect a new central committee composed of the best elements of the present leadership who are fighting for the correct revolutionary line of the Comintern and of new proletarian elements who have come to the front in the developing struggles and who correctly express the revolutionary determination of the party. In the recent period of development of your party a political differentiation has become revealed in the party leadership, between those who fight energetically for the line of the Comintern, and those who still hamper the party by their opposition to a clear independent revolutionary policy. From this your congress must draw the logical conclusions and elect a leadership that will guarantee the carrying out of the bolshevik line of the Comintern.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU
OF THE ECCI ON THE JAPANESE COMMUNIST PARTY

January 1930

Inprekorr, x, 7, p. 144, 21 *January 1930*

[There appears to have been little communist activity in Japan at this time, following the large-scale arrests in the spring of 1928 and again in the spring of 1929, and the introduction of the death penalty for certain political offences. A number of Japanese communists in Russia at the time were sent back to Japan to strengthen the party's shattered ranks. At the tenth ECCI plenum Katayama and Tanaka referred to the dislocation of the party's work by arrests and intimidation. Shubin, in dealing with the difficulty of liquidating the Workers' and Peasants' Party in India, said the same difficulties were being experienced in Japan, where the communists had founded such a party (Rodonominto); its existence hampered the formation of an illegal communist organization. (The Rodonominto had in fact been dissolved by government order in 1928.) Attention had also been given, since the end of 1928, to setting up a left-wing trade union organization—Kyogikai. There had been a dispute among the few remaining communist leaders outside prison between those who favoured a policy of anti-government violence, and those who wished to sever ties with Moscow and drop the demand for the abolition of the monarchy; the latter were expelled. At the end of 1929 the Japanese CP was said to have 200 members.

For no obvious reason, this and the following Comintern resolution on Japan were issued by the West European Bureau of the ECCI.]

The persecution to which the Japanese Communist Party, the only party of the Japanese proletariat, has been subjected by the Government, bears witness to its truly revolutionary work; so does the fact that the reformist elements have left the party. At present the chief danger for the

revolutionary movement are the liquidators of every brand, from Oyama & Co. to the opposition within the party.

All those who advocate the creation of a legal communist party in the conditions now prevailing in Japan are agents of the Japanese bourgeoisie within the working class; their object is to sow bourgeois reformist illusions among the working masses; they want to bring the movement into the confines of bourgeois-landlord reaction, of the existing social order. The more 'leftist' the positions of the advocates of a legal party, which in Japan today could be nothing but a means for subjecting the proletariat to the influences and interests of the bourgeoisie, the more dangerous are they as representatives of proletarian interests.

The least vacillation on this point within the Japanese CP is today exceptionally dangerous. What is necessary is a merciless struggle against liquidationism and against all hesitations on the question of liquidating the illegal CP, which shake confidence in the forces of the proletariat and the CP. It is necessary to wage an unyielding struggle against the attempt to organize a legal communist party for the whole of Japan, although the Japanese CP should not concentrate only on the struggle outside the existing legal local labour-party organizations, but should also work inside them.

The irreconcilable struggle against the legal political parties of the reformists and liquidators does not by any means imply the refusal to take advantage of all existing legal opportunities for the revolutionary education and organization of the worker and peasant masses, or to a weakening of this work. On the contrary, the members of the Japanese CP must show greater energy in putting into operation earlier decisions concerning the need to create and strengthen every possible organization of workers and peasants, legal or illegal, such as trade unions, factory committees, delegate meetings, peasant committees, women's organizations, etc. . . .

The chief tasks for all members of the Japanese CP and all progressive workers are to strengthen the CP in the fight against liquidationism and legalism, to expand political agitation among the masses, particularly in the factories, to prepare the organization and operation of mass strikes and demonstrations. The prospect of economic and political crisis, capitalist rationalization, growing unemployment, etc. is creating conditions which will radicalize the worker and peasant masses and accelerate the growth of the revolutionary movement. Whether in these conditions the movement will win successes depends entirely on the capacity, energy, and resolution of the members of the Japanese CP. . . .

It is necessary to organize mass strikes and protest demonstrations against the persecution of the CP, against the arrest and sentencing of communists, against bourgeois-landlord reaction, against the capitalist offensive, against the trade union law. This requires energetic and

resourceful communist work in the factories to establish and strengthen party factory cells, to extend the initiative and activity of the cells in providing a revolutionary education for the worker masses in preparing and waging their struggle, particularly strikes, and it also requires strengthening the party central committee.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU
OF THE ECCI ON THE FORTHCOMING ELECTIONS IN JAPAN

6 February 1930

Inprekorr, x, 14, p. 327, 7 February 1930

[The elections were held on 20 February; the labour candidates, with half a million votes, received five seats; eight had been returned in the 1928 elections.]

The parliamentary elections in Japan are taking place at a time when the economic crisis is growing more serious and the revolutionary wave is rising. Bourgeoisie and landlords are intent on exploiting the elections and are mobilizing their forces for a fascist and predatory attack, heavier than ever before, on the proletariat and the peasant masses under the banner of rationalization, economy, new taxation, and the fight against the communists. . . . What the communists have to do therefore is to use the elections: (1) to expose ruthlessly these predatory fascist plans, to expose the treacherous social-fascist idea that the existing fascist-reformist rule can be reformed by peaceful parliamentary means through bourgeois democracy; (2) to organize the counter-offensive of the proletariat and peasantry against the bourgeoisie and landlords, under communist party leadership, and prepare the masses for the overthrow of the monarchy (Mikado), the dictatorship of trust capital, and feudal landlordism, and for the confiscation without compensation of all large estates; (3) to mobilize the masses under the slogan of struggle for a revolutionary workers' and peasants' government based on Soviets, under the slogan of the revolutionary united front from below of workers and peasants; (4) to fight on the one hand for the communist party against the white terror, and on the other hand against all (right and left) social-fascist and pseudo-communist attempts to liquidate the party and conform to police-fascist 'legality'; (5) to fight for the complete independence of Korea, Formosa, and China; (6) to fight against the new imperialist slaughter now being prepared and for the defence of the Soviet Union. . . .

The partial demands and slogans to be put forward, which are inseparably connected with the main slogans, are:

1. Annulment of the anti-communist law, and of all laws designed to suppress the working people; immediate amnesty for the arrested Japanese communists and the Korean and Chinese revolutionaries; complete

freedom for class organizations of workers and peasants; fight against the military-police-fascist suppression of strikes. . . .

2. Comprehensive social insurance . . . unemployment pay at the full wage rate at the expense of the capitalists and their State . . . sharp reduction in rents and electricity prices for the urban poor, the unemployed to pay nothing for rent or electricity.

3. Seven-hour working day. . . . Abolition of compulsory arbitration. Higher wages. . . .

5. Immediate withdrawal of Japanese troops from Korea, Formosa, and China. . . . Publication of the secret documents on imperialist plans, as well as the plans for intervention against the USSR and China.

The communist party, whose united front tactics are to be operated only from below, must not only refrain from any agreement with the reformists and pseudo-communists, but must carry on an irreconcilable struggle against them. . . . Where there is no possibility of putting up 'legal' candidates, the communist party must nominate political prisoners, and get mass participation in a demonstrative vote for these names.

THE MEETING OF THE ENLARGED PRESIDIUM OF THE ECCI

[The presidium met from 8 to 28 February 1930. The agenda included items on the economic crisis and unemployment, preparations for the fifth RILU congress, and reports on the communist parties in Britain, Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union. In his opening speech Manuilsky dealt with the effects of the economic crisis on the theory of 'United States exceptionalism', on the social-democratic and Bukharinist theory of organized capitalism, on the ideas of the right wing and conciliators about the nature of the 'third period', etc. The crisis was 'accelerating in high degree the maturing of imperialist war between Britain and the United States', as the American search for a way out of the crisis passed from the economic to the political and military spheres. Although capitalist stabilization was breaking down, the situation was not yet revolutionary; the bourgeoisie were still attacking, and the working class was not yet ready for the counter-offensive. Whether the economic crisis would develop into a general political crisis depended in part on the strength and militancy of the communist parties. They had to eliminate the discrepancy between their ideological influence and their organizational strength. 'It is useless to talk of a revolutionary advance if, in regard to winning the leading role in the labour movement, we are unable to deal heavy blows at the social-democrats.' The majority of Comintern sections had not yet grown beyond the agitation and propaganda stage, and were still unable to organize and lead a mass movement.

Replying to Pollitt, who spoke of the difficulties of the struggle in the given situation, which might demoralize the parties, since unemployment had an adverse effect on militancy, Manuilsky said: 'Even with very great unemployment the number of strikes can and must increase, to the extent that unemployment itself revolutionizes the working class.' To urge the workers not to strike

was 'the ideology of capitulation, the lowest, most treacherous ideology'. Partial demands should be put forward regardless of whether they could be realized within the framework of monopoly capitalism and the bourgeois State—as they should demand press freedom in Italy and self-determination for the Polish Ukraine. 'The great majority of democratic demands can no longer be realized within the framework of the existing system; but by advancing them and advocating them we expose the fascist nature of the present bourgeois State, reveal the class character of the policy of social-fascism, which has abandoned the defence of the elementary demands of the workers. In doing so we educate the masses in a revolutionary spirit and lead them on to the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system as a whole.'

In his concluding speech Manuilsky dealt also with the struggle for the hegemony of the national revolutionary movement. Who was to lead the peasant classes, the bourgeoisie or the proletariat? The instrument for proletarian hegemony was the communist party. 'There is not even in India a communist party yet, not to speak of other colonial countries.' In India there were cells but no central committee; in Indonesia a central committee but no cells. Proletarian hegemony, Manuilsky said, meant that there must be a communist party which had cut the cords that bound it to bourgeois class society, liberated itself from petty-bourgeois ideology, and operated an independent class policy; the proletariat it led must draw the peasantry after it and carry its methods of class struggle into a bourgeois-democratic revolution, giving it a proletarian stamp. The peasantry had been the crucial question in the first phase of the Chinese revolution. Neither the KMT nor the proletariat had won the peasants to its side, and the struggle to win their allegiance was now proceeding in different circumstances.

The failure to establish a party in India was explained, in the *Materials* for the seventh congress, by the success of the Indian bourgeoisie, helped by the reformists, in isolating the communists from the workers' organizations, and by the errors of the communists themselves. Attacks on Gandhi and Nehru were repeated and persistent. R. P. Dutt described Gandhi as 'a police agent of British imperialism in India', and Kuusinen wrote that he feared the masses more than British imperialism; hence his sham struggle, designed to keep the mass movement under bourgeois control; his boycott movement was really a boycott of the Indian revolution. A CPGB manifesto in May 1930 said that as Gandhi's treacherous strategy had failed to hold the masses in check, the British had been forced to imprison him and his followers in order to delude the masses into believing that Gandhi was an enemy of imperialism. Chattopadhyaya wrote that Congress (100 of the 300 members of its committee were in prison) had adopted the slogan of independence in order not to lose its influence on the masses, whose support enabled the bourgeoisie to frighten British imperialism into making concessions.

In a series of articles published in June 1930 Radek wrote that the interests of the imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie were incompatible, because Britain relied on the support of the feudalists, whereas the development of the bourgeoisie was hampered by feudalism. But the slogan of Dominion status for India was utopian: it would mean nine-tenths independence as a present from

British imperialism to the Indian people, and that was unthinkable. 'The fight against the national-reformists, the fight against Gandhism, is no less a condition of success for the Indian revolution than the fight against English imperialism.' In his final speech at the enlarged presidium, Manuilsky emphasized the responsibility of the CPGB for communist progress in India. 'The fate of the Indian revolution lies in the hands of the metal workers of Manchester and the Scottish miners . . . This does not mean of course that the Indian revolution cannot triumph before the victory of the English proletariat. But it does mean that victory in India requires . . . a greater mass revolutionary movement in England than exists now.'

Thaelmann reported on the KPD; its 1929 congress had shown that some members thought the danger of inter-imperialist conflict greater than the danger of war on Russia, thus 'distracting the attention of the workers . . . and hampering the party's activities in defence of the Soviet Union'. (It was the concentration of the KPD on Soviet affairs that largely explained the rise within its ranks of a 'national-bolshevik' trend, recalling in some respects the similar phenomenon of the early 1920s. These communists argued that the object of the KPD appeared to be not to promote revolution, but to obstruct any anti-Soviet movement; it was part of the Russian, not the German political scene. To some extent their point of view was reflected in the KPD platform drawn up later in the year for the Reichstag elections.) At the October 1929 central committee meeting, Thaelmann continued, 'we clearly grasped for the first time the great importance of the national-fascist movement side by side with social-fascism, for unfortunately the national fascists got in first in the struggle against the Young Plan'.

Gusev congratulated the KPD on the advances it had made in winning the majority of the German working class; with the CPSU, the KPD was the backbone of the Comintern. The most important aspect of its struggle to win the German proletariat was the fight against social-fascism, in which it was hampered by the reluctance of some of the lower party officials to make an all-out attack on social-democracy; 'they even go so far as to sabotage party decisions'.

The presidium endorsed resolutions passed by the central committees of the communist parties of Britain, Germany, and Italy. (Judging from the tone and style, they seem to have emanated from Moscow; they are all written in the third person, as an outside judgment, and were subsequently included in official collections as Comintern documents.) The CPGB resolution concentrated on two points: the failure of that party 'to expose the social-fascist character of the Labour government', its role in the preparations for an anti-Soviet war, and its brutal suppression of the revolutionary movement in the colonies; and the weaknesses of the *Daily Worker*, launched at the beginning of the year.

The resolution of the KPD central committee noted the recent successes of the party 'in undermining the influence of social-fascism' and in consolidating its own political influence. Its tasks were: to promote the struggle against the Young Plan; to expose social-fascism, which was the chief force making for the establishment of fascist dictatorship and the chief organizer of anti-Soviet war, being careful to distinguish between the rank and file and the bosses; to

organize the unemployed; to fight against capitalist rationalization; to improve its work among rural and white-collar workers; to consolidate the RTUO; to fight opportunism; to recruit new members for the KPD.

The Italian central committee resolution dealt with the impact of the economic crisis in Italy, and the growing discontent with and opposition to the fascist regime. The CPI had to win leadership of this movement in town and country, which otherwise would be betrayed by those who believed that the fascist dictatorship would be succeeded by a period of bourgeois democracy. The CPI had to root out the entirely false idea that Italian social-democracy differed from other social-fascist parties—it was 'a political appendage of Italian fascism'. The CPI was lagging behind developments. Its tasks were: to recruit new members; to work more actively in fascist mass organizations; to expand and improve its work in the trade unions and among the unemployed; to intensify its work among Italian emigrants, in close co-operation with the local communist parties; to intensify its struggle against the Catholic Church, which was helping fascism; to destroy opportunism in its own ranks, which was found even in its leading bodies (in this context a 'comrade P.' was severely rebuked); to cleanse the party apparatus of these opportunist elements.

At the presidium Thaelmann said that the Young Plan 'embodies the international world programme of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union'; the Bank for Reparations was 'the centre of the economic and financial blockade of the Soviet Union'.

The refusal of the KPD to take part in the Young Plan referendum, on the ground that it could only promote fascism, was condemned as an error in the *ECCI Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress.

In October 1930 representatives of the parliamentary fractions of the KPD and the French Communist Party met in Berlin and issued a declaration to the workers of the two countries pledging action in their respective parliaments against 'the payment of tribute'; the Plan, which would be used to depress wages, would aggravate the effects of the economic crisis and increase the danger of war.

In the referendum on the Young Plan, proposed in September 1929 and held in December, the Nazi-Nationalist proposal to reject it obtained a majority of the votes (5.8 million); to be effective it would have had to receive 21 million. In the Reichstag debates the opposition to the Plan consisted of the Nazis, Nationalists, and KPD. The Plan was ratified the following March. At the meeting of the Central Committee of the KPD in October 1929 a resolution on 'the fight against the Young Plan' was adopted; the Plan did not smooth out imperialist contradictions, as Varga had asserted, but accentuated them; it had been drawn up to meet the danger of proletarian revolution and economic collapse. It portended a general offensive, led by social-democracy, against the working class; social-democracy had sold Germany to the German bourgeoisie and foreign capital. 'The KPD is the deadly enemy of both camps of bourgeois reaction. It will fight implacably against the fascist right bloc and the social-fascist coalition bloc.' The Plan was 'a new and powerful instrument for accelerating a war of imperialist intervention against the Soviet Union'. The Reparations Bank would enforce a financial blockade of Russia; Germany was being

aligned more closely in the anti-Soviet front; it was part of the international offensive against the working class; the economic dictatorship of finance capital provided the foundation for open fascist dictatorship. The SPD was responsible for 'this enormous crime'. Germany had agreed to the Young Plan 'in order to be able to take a more active part in the imperialist policy of the Western Powers, and most especially in the anti-Soviet front'.

Commenting on the presidium meeting, *Pravda* wrote on 1 March that the crisis would accelerate the radicalization of the masses, the development of the economic into the political struggle, and the self-exposure of social-fascism. 'Social-democracy is becoming a machine for the direct and violent suppression of the developing proletarian movement, a direct instrument for the preparation of imperialist war, in particular war against the Soviet Union, while its upper ranks are becoming a special kind of police and strikebreaker gang.' The renegades from the communist parties, right and left, were acting as instruments of social-democracy; they denied the immediate danger of war on the Soviet Union and so rendered a service to those preparing it.

At this time, Molotov reported to the sixteenth CPSU congress, the Comintern had 53 parties and 3 sympathizing national-revolutionary parties. In India a party was about to be created. He said that right-opportunist tendencies had been so marked in a number of central committees (he mentioned Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and the United States) that their composition had had to be changed. 'Even among members and candidates of the ECCI elected at the sixth congress seven are now outside the communist ranks.' Twenty-six communist members of parliament in Czechoslovakia had been expelled for refusing to fight the right-wing renegades, and six Paris municipal councillors, for co-operating with social-fascists. In Czechoslovakia, as a consequence, the red trade unions had lost 'some tens of thousands' of members. In Italy and France the struggle against the right wing was still going on. It was Bukharin who had been responsible for spreading the idea in the Comintern that capitalism was capable of organizing itself.]

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ENLARGED ECCI PRESIDIUM
ON THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

February 1930

Inprekorr, x, 23, p. 547, 7 March 1930

[Early in 1930 a conference of European communist parties decided to organize a 'demonstration day against unemployment' on 6 March. While stating that the numbers taking part in European countries were smaller than on 1 August 1929, the *Communist International* wrote in May: 'The 6th of March in all capitalist countries saw a mass movement of the unemployed accompanied by bitter fighting in the streets. The ruling classes took all possible measures to break the campaign . . . the capitals were turned into armed camps, fortified with the latest military technique. Large factories were surrounded with police and armed cordons, and above them circled special police aeroplanes.' The

demonstration in the United States was said to have been larger than on 1 August 1929; the masses were beginning to turn towards the Comintern, but the American CP was dragging at the tail of events.

Piatnitsky said the French party suffered from the same defects as the KPD in its industrial work. In March 1929 its central committee had written to the ECCI: 'We have displayed remarkable weakness in the strikes that took place or should have taken place. These great movements caught us unprepared to meet them.' However, the CPF had good opportunities before it, because social-democracy was not so strong in France as in Germany, and the CGTU was nearly as big as the CGT. The six municipal councillors of St Denis expelled from the CPF because their work was 'indistinguishable' from that of the Socialists, and the leaders of the Alsace-Lorraine party organizations who were expelled for similar offences, formed a workers' and peasants' party.

After the presidium the KPD central committee endorsed the ECCI resolution, and pointed to the dangers arising from left and right-wing tendencies. The party would have to make a decisive turn to revolutionary mass work, to win independent leadership of the industrial struggle. On the other hand, those who neglected work in the trade unions, who refused to work for the united front from below, and concealed their passivity behind radical phrases, must also be opposed. This resolution, adopted unanimously, appeared too conciliatory to Paul Merker, a central committee secretary, who wrote to the ECCI (without the knowledge of the central committee) complaining that its appraisal of the SPD was 'Brandlerist' and might lead to negotiations between the KPD and the Socialist party executive. He was removed from his post as a 'left sectarian opportunist' at a meeting of the political bureau on 5 April 1930. The 'red trade union opposition'—RTUO—had held its first national conference in November 1929; of the 1,100 who attended, 800 were members of the KPD and the YCL; 300 belonged to no party, and 3 were SPD members. Its first union, for metalworkers, was set up in November 1930, and one for miners in January 1931.

Brandler and his followers were protesting at this time against the mechanical transfer of CPSU disputes into the Comintern as a whole; the communist and trade union movements were being split because of events in Moscow; the danger of war at the time of the CER dispute was ridiculously exaggerated. Analysing their differences with the KPD, they predicted that, if it continued on its present path, it would become a self-sufficient but hollow machine without any connexion with the real struggles of the German working class; at the first serious test, the KPD would collapse.]

In appraising the characteristics of the world economic and political situation, the tenth ECCI plenum emphasized that the decisive feature of the third period of post-war capitalist development was to be seen in the pronounced sharpening of the fundamental internal and external contradictions of imperialism, now revealed in the acceleration of the rate at which capitalist stability is being shaken; the revolutionary surge of the international labour movement is becoming both broader and deeper,

and the anti-imperialist revolution in the colonial countries is reaching maturity. . . .

The economic crisis in the United States which began three months later, intensifying the depression already existing in a number of capitalist countries and colonies . . . is destroying the bourgeois legend of 'enduring prosperity' in the United States (Hoover) and is dealing an annihilating blow at social-democratic theories of 'organized capitalism'.

The American crisis is exposing the falseness of the reformist views about 'America's exceptional position' (Lovestone, Pepper), and the pitiful, untenable theory that 'the problems of the market, of prices, of competition and crises are more and more becoming world economic problems, being replaced within each country by the problem of organization' (Bukharin), and provides confirmation of the appraisal of the third period given by the sixth world congress and the tenth plenum.

I. THE CRISIS, GROWING UNEMPLOYMENT, SHARPENING OF CAPITALIST CONTRADICTIONS

1. The significance of the crisis of overproduction in the United States is heightened by the fact that it is developing at a time when the contradictions between the growth of productive forces and the narrowing of the market are rapidly becoming more acute, when the tendency common to all capitalist countries for the periods of depression to be prolonged is clearly apparent, and the depressions take on a chronic character. . . .

2. The American crisis, arising from the general crisis of the capitalist system, is more and more becoming a world economic crisis. . . . At the same time the unequal development of the capitalist system means that the manifestations of crisis take on a variety of forms, differing in character and degree, in the individual countries. . . .

3. The crisis is bringing boundless misery to the working class; what hits them worst is the mass unemployment consequent upon the sharp contraction of production in a number of capitalist countries, and the greater exploitation which accompanies the extension of capitalist rationalization. . . .

All together there are about 17 million persons in the capitalist countries—if their dependants are included about 60 million—suffering from unemployment, and in addition millions on part-time work who are liable at any moment to be thrown out on the streets to swell the army of the unemployed. The position of the unemployed masses is the more intolerable as they are either in receipt of no national unemployment benefits, or receive only minimal payments. Chronic unemployment is taking on ever more threatening dimensions as those sections of the poor peasantry ruined by the agrarian crisis join the reserve army of labour, this in

turn being exploited by the capitalists to reduce wages still further. . . .

4. The consequences of the world crisis will be the more fatal for capitalism as it is taking place at a time when the economy of the Soviet Union is making tremendous progress, thus offering a complete contrast to the capitalist world. . . . There can be no doubt that this is shifting the relation of forces between the two world economic systems in favour of international socialism and making the Soviet Union into an even more powerful factor deepening the capitalist crisis, revolutionizing the proletariat and all the exploited masses of the world. . . .

The development of the economic crisis is bringing to a head the struggle among the monopolist capitalist associations and their States for a re-division of the world and the extension of protectionist policies, thus driving the capitalist world into an era of new imperialist wars. The Anglo-American struggle for world hegemony, the feverish rivalry in arms between England and the United States, heavy American pressure on the British colonial possessions and Dominions, and England's desperate struggle to maintain its position . . . all this is accompanied by growing contradictions in Europe itself, rendered more acute by the increasing competition of American capital with its European competitors in the world market.

In these circumstances the Young Plan, as the fighting programme adopted by the bourgeoisie of the victor countries in agreement with the German financial oligarchy, and under the hegemony of American finance capital, is: (a) a plan to suppress and enslave the German proletariat, lower its standard of living, and increase its exploitation; (b) a plan to increase the power of finance capital in the victor countries (milliards to be squeezed out of Germany), consequently a plan for new attacks by the capitalists on the working class of those countries to reduce their standard of living; (c) a plan for the financial blockade of and for preparing a military attack on the Soviet Union; (d) finally, the Young Plan means that the struggle inside the imperialist camp itself will grow sharper because of the questions concerning the division of the imperialist spoils.

In this connexion the ECCI presidium calls on all the sections of the Comintern, particularly the English, French, and Italian communist parties, to give active support to the fight of the working class of all countries, particularly the German proletariat, against the Young Plan. . . .

As the bitter struggle within the imperialist camp for a re-division of the world grows, as the revolutionary movement in the capitalist and colonial countries develops, and socialist construction in the Soviet Union moves successfully forward, the danger of new imperialist wars becomes greater, above all the danger of a military attack on the Soviet Union. The collectivization of agriculture and the policy of liquidating

the kulaks in the Soviet Union, which deprives the imperialist bourgeoisie of their last allies there, on whom they could rely in the event of intervention, necessarily lead to greater activity on the anti-Soviet front, to attempts to extend that front, to anti-Soviet provocations by the imperialist Powers, energetically supported and inspired by social-democracy in all countries. . . .

The defence of the Soviet Union against the threatening danger of imperialist attack is more than ever before the most important task of all Comintern sections.

II. THE BALANCE-SHEET OF THE GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE PARTIES OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

6. As the crisis grows, the role of social-democracy as the active executant of the policy of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie becomes ever clearer. . . . In Germany the experience of eighteen months of social-fascist government has shown that, at the head of the government coalition, it is carrying out the will of the German capitalists and supporting their policy of increasing pressure on the working class and of preparing war. . . .

7. In England the same tendencies determine the policy of the Labour Government which, before the elections, promised general disarmament, improved relations with the Soviet Union, democratic reform in the colonies, an improvement in the position of the working class, and a reduction in unemployment, but which in reality is not only continuing the policy of the Conservatives, but in regard to worsening the position of the working class and suppressing the colonies is even going beyond them. . . .

8. This is the record of the two most important parties of the Second International. . . . As a rule, where social-democracy is not in the Government, it takes a very active and direct part in carrying out the measures of reactionary bourgeois Governments against the working class and the communist parties, places itself openly at the head of unbridled anti-Soviet campaigns, hand in hand with Russian white guards (France); gives active help to bourgeois parties in introducing fascist constitutions (Austria), mobilizes all its forces in the service of fascist terror against communist and revolutionary workers (Poland). . . .

III. ECONOMIC STRUGGLES, THE UNEMPLOYED MOVEMENT, AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

9. The crisis . . . is acting with extraordinary force to deepen social contradictions in the capitalist world. The resulting intensification of the class struggle is leading, at one extreme, to the growth of fascism, to a

steady increase in the use of terror against the masses . . . and at the other extreme to an expanding revolutionary surge, to a widening of the front of proletarian struggle, drawing the peasant reserves of the colonies and of a number of capitalist countries into the general revolutionary front.

10. . . . The most important feature of the labour movement since the tenth ECCI plenum is the further expansion of the revolutionary surge in the conditions of ripening world crisis and mass unemployment. What distinguishes the strike movement which is developing throughout the world on behalf of the economic demands of the proletariat is that, to an ever increasing extent, it is developing in opposition to the reformist unions, which are acting as strikebreakers, that the unorganized masses are taking an ever more active part in it. . . .

11. In the countries which have entered the phase of crisis, the expansion of the revolutionary surge, even in those countries where the number of industrial strikes has diminished, is revealed not only in the sharper character of the strikes themselves, but also in the variety of the forms of struggle. . . . The unemployed movement is growing, and taking the form of hunger marches and political demonstrations. . . . The slogan of the political mass strike is on the order of the day.

12. As the crisis spreads and deepens, the economic position not only of the industrial workers, but also of the peasant masses, grows worse. . . . The revolutionary peasant movement is beginning to revive, most markedly in some of the colonial countries, where it merges with the movement of the industrial workers and the national-revolutionary emancipation movement. . . .

13. Since the tenth ECCI plenum the process of ideological consolidation in the communist parties has gone further, following the sixth congress line of struggle against the deviations of the right-wing and conciliators and cleansing the parties of rotten semi-social-democratic elements. The appraisal given by the tenth plenum of the right wingers and conciliators, which declared right-opportunist ideas to be incompatible with membership of the Comintern, and asserted that the conciliators had in practice adopted the same position as the right, has been fully confirmed.

The right-wing renegades in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the United States, expelled from the Comintern even before the tenth plenum, have on all basic questions of working-class policy and tactics fallen into social-democratic positions . . . as have the opportunist elements in the unitary trade union movement and Communist Party of France (where they have united under the lying banner of the so-called League to defend the unions, and conduct vociferous agitation for the so-called Workers' and Peasants' Party).

Like the social-democrats, the right-wing renegades are in favour of reinforcing capitalist stabilization, deny that the revolutionary wave is

rising and the danger of war increasing, use arguments borrowed from the social-democrats against independent communist party tactics in the unions, try to shackle communists who are active in the reformist unions by disciplinary means to the social-fascist trade union machine, advocate a united front between communists and social-fascists, take an ever more active part in social-fascist campaigns against the communist party and the Soviet Union, and supply material for these campaigns. In practice, the scattered remnants of the Trotskyist groups have under Trotsky's leadership reached the same position. It can be said that the ideas of the Trotskyist and right-wing renegades completely coincide . . . both, in their capacity as outright agents of social-democracy, are working for the disintegration of the communist parties.

The resolute fight of the communist parties against social-democracy, which is closely linked with their task of winning the masses for communism, presupposes the ruthless exposure of the right-wing Trotskyist renegades . . . and a further cleansing of the parties of those elements which are trying to play the same game. . . .

14. The chief tasks of the communist parties in this situation of developing crisis . . . are to win the decisive masses of the proletariat, to mobilize the broad working masses (peasantry, impoverished urban petty-bourgeoisie, and the oppressed nationalities) around the proletariat and under its hegemony, to secure the leadership of all mass actions for the party, and to direct these frequently spontaneous actions . . . into channels of organized political struggle. . . .

To accomplish these tasks requires . . .

i. The consolidation of party organizations, particularly the factory cells and trade union fractions. . . .

ii. In addition to the utmost reinforcement of agitation and propaganda work, to change the forms and methods of work of communist parties to correspond with the tasks of leading mass proletarian actions. . . .

iii. In connexion with the basic task of winning the masses . . . particularly great importance attaches to work in the reformist unions, conducted on the basis of the tactics of a united front from below, to liberate the masses from the influence of reformist traitors. This also requires more intensive communist party work in the revolutionary unions . . . securing the leading role for the communist party in all organs of proletarian mass struggle created from below (factory councils, strike committees, unemployed committees, etc.), and strengthening the revolutionary opposition in the reformist unions. . . .

iv. The development of industrial struggles . . . imposes on communist parties the task of popularizing the slogan of the political mass strike, and requires them in their activities to combine legal with illegal methods of work. . . .

v. The central point of communist party work in colonies and dependent countries must be the creation and consolidation of proletarian mass organizations, and ensuring their independent class character, as the chief condition for winning the leading role of the proletariat in the growing national-revolutionary movement of the working masses of town and country. In China the task of the communist party is to strengthen the party and the red trade unions, to win over the masses in the Kuo-mintang unions, and to secure working-class leadership of the revolutionary peasant masses. In India the primary task is to create a communist party as the real leader of the proletariat. The same task confronts the communists of Indonesia and Indo-China.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE ENLARGED PRESIDUM
OF THE ECCI ON THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE RILU

February 1930

Inprecorr, x, 18, p. 347, 10 April 1930

In view of the growing acuteness of the economic and political struggles of the working class and the general upward swing of the labour movement, the work of the revolutionary trade unions, of the revolutionary opposition, and of the international centre of the revolutionary trade union movement, the RILU, becomes of extraordinary importance. Hence, the preparations for the fifth congress of the RILU must go beyond the ordinary, traditional methods used for preparing congresses and should bear a specific and urgent character. The fifth congress must serve as an important landmark in the history of the international labour movement. . . .

In connexion with the fifth congress the communist parties of all countries are faced with the following tasks:

1. To verify the manner in which the decisions of the fourth congress of the RILU and the sixth session of its Central Council have been carried out in practice.
2. To investigate the condition of the communist fractions in the trade unions and to establish the reasons of their continued weakness.
3. Carefully to examine and publicly discuss the weak sides in the work of the revolutionary unions and devise methods for its improvement.
4. To verify the work of the trade union opposition and of the Minority Movement, paying particular attention to the forms of their contact with the masses and the methods of their organizational mass work.
5. Thoroughly to discuss in the party press the main problems of the international revolutionary trade union movement, allocating for this purpose a special fifth RILU congress page.
6. To initiate a discussion among the masses on all questions connected

with the fifth congress, not only at trade union conferences and congresses, but also right in the factories.

7. To ensure through the activities of the communist fractions that the fifth congress shall have representatives of working men and women from the factories, especially from the basic industries (mining, engineering, transport, chemical, etc.).

8. To ensure that the preparations for the fifth congress be made with wide application of [severe] self-criticism and determined struggle against trade union legalism and opportunism in practice and a considerable strengthening of mass trade union work.

The presidium of the Comintern attaches exceptional importance to the preparations for the fifth congress of the RILU and urges all sections to do this work using the methods of international revolutionary competition.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE ENLARGED PRESIDUM
OF THE ECCI ON THE REPORT OF THE CPSU

February 1930

Inprecorr, x, 22, p. 409, 8 May 1930

Having heard Comrade Molotov's report on the situation in the USSR, the presidium of the ECCI declares that the new, gigantic successes achieved in the socialist advance of the proletariat of the USSR, headed by its vanguard the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, represent a great victory for the world proletariat. . . .

The CPSU is firmly carrying out its policy under the most difficult conditions, in which the socialist advance encounters the stubborn resistance of all the anti-proletarian, anti-socialist, and, in fact, counter-revolutionary forces at home and abroad. The Communist International takes note of the hopeless attempts of the class enemies to disrupt the cause of socialist construction in the USSR, greets the revolutionary struggle the CPSU and the Soviet Government are waging against the kulaks, against the saboteurs and against all the agents of the international counter-revolution. The presidium of the ECCI declares that the struggle the CPSU is waging against these enemies is the struggle of the whole Communist International and that it is determined to wage this struggle with the utmost persistence and ruthlessness.

The presidium of the ECCI is convinced that the correct leadership of the working class and the mobilization of all its creative forces necessary for completely surmounting difficulties will be further assured if the CPSU continues persistently its irreconcilable struggle against all hesitation and vacillation and for a clear-cut class line. All sections of the Communist International must learn from the invaluable experience of the CPSU, whose strength lies in its command of the Leninist art of leadership of the

masses, in its bolshevist tenacity in the struggle against distortions of the party line, its systematic verification of the party forces and in the close unity between the party and the proletarian masses based on wide and thoroughgoing self-criticism.

In greeting the Leninist leadership of the CPSU in the name of the sections of the Communist International, the presidium of the ECCI declares that the Comintern fully and unreservedly supports the irreconcilable struggle of the CPSU and its central committee for the principles of Leninism, for the Leninist line of the party, for the complete defeat of the right deviation and conciliation and against all manifestations of radical phrasemongering which is an echo of the petty-bourgeois, hysterical demagoguery of Trotskyism, which has by now definitely revealed its counter-revolutionary nature.

The presidium of the ECCI once again declares that the fight against deviations within the CPSU and in all sections of the Communist International is a matter of enormous importance and it notes with satisfaction that the CPSU has been consolidated on the basis of the Leninist line, which is the only correct line, and the defeat of all elements and tendencies threatening to weaken the fighting capacity of the party.

The success of the Five Year Plan and especially the socialistic transformation of the countryside is the true cause of the growing imperialist aggression against the USSR.

Held in the throes of implacable antagonisms which have been aggravated by the crisis in the United States, unable to prevent the spread of this crisis to other capitalist countries, imperialism sees in the successful fulfilment of the Five Year Plan the collapse of its own plans. The success of the Five Year Plan, while strengthening the positions of the proletarian dictatorship and of socialism, frustrates all the plans of the bourgeoisie to overcome the Soviet Government by economic pressure. The Young Plan, which is a plan to plunder the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses of Europe, and especially of Germany, for the benefit of the imperialists (primarily of the United States) has its sharp edge directed against the USSR. . . .

The immediate aim of the imperialists is at all costs to check the further advance of socialist construction in the USSR. This calls for greater vigilance than ever on the part of the international proletariat; more than ever before must all sections of the Communist International be on the alert.

The presidium of the ECCI again reminds all sections of the Communist International of the decisions passed concerning the organization of the defence of the country of the proletarian dictatorship—the only fatherland of the toiling masses of all countries.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE ECCI

*April 1930**Inprecorr*, x, 21, p. 387, 30 *April 1930*

Comrades! The maturing world economic crisis is laying bare more and more the contradictions which are tearing the capitalist world asunder. The boastful claims of the bourgeoisie and their social-democratic lackeys concerning the inexhaustible forces and the organizational and creative power of capitalism are collapsing. The bourgeoisie stand impotent before the crumbling of the world capitalist system. But they have still the power to condemn millions and tens of millions of workers and peasants to starvation and death. In all parts of the world, in the home countries and in the colonies, the bourgeoisie are striving to escape from the crisis by worsening the conditions of the toilers. While the financial magnates are making huge profits out of the crisis, the workers are being thrown out of work in hundreds of thousands. Twenty million unemployed, victims of the crisis and of capitalist rationalization, are tramping the streets of the cities; while in the country districts large masses of peasants, ruined by the agricultural crisis, are being sold up by the finance-capitalists and forced to join the army of unemployed and paupers.

The fascist terror rages more fiercely than ever. The capitalist governments, which means also the social-democratic governments, brutally attack the workers and peasants and put them to death by trial and without trial. They shoot down strikers, demonstrators, protesting peasants, and colonial slaves. Everywhere their first aim is to destroy the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, the communist party.

Workers, can you not see the leaders of the Second International and of the Amsterdam International among the executioners who shoot down and bludgeon the workers in Berlin, London, and New York, in South America, in China, in India, in Indo-China, and in Africa?

In the imperialist countries the rivalry in armaments is becoming more frenzied. While ordinary production is being curtailed, the munition industries are working at high pressure in all capitalist countries. The so-called peace treaties are nothing but a skein of lies to hide the preparations and the regrouping of forces for new imperialist wars. There is not a part of the world where the struggle for world domination between the USA and Great Britain, which is the pivot of international contradictions in the capitalist world, has not reached an unparalleled degree of intensity as a consequence of the economic crisis. There is not a place in the Pacific where the interests and appetites of Washington, London, and Tokio are not in irreconcilable conflict. The London Naval Agreement is a new instrument of war, and everyone of the parties to it is hastening with every effort to utilize it for its own war aims. In the present circumstances,

when the struggle for markets is more fierce than it has ever been, the Young Plan serves to hasten a new military clash between imperialist groups. The danger of war arising from French and Italian rivalry in the Mediterranean is so imminent that even the imperialists and the leaders of the Second International can no longer conceal it. . . .

The bourgeoisie believe that a new imperialist war is the only way out of the present crisis of world capitalism. But the activity of the international proletariat and the growing might of the Soviet Union hinder the imperialists from carrying out their plans for dividing up the world. The world bourgeoisie hoped to destroy the Soviet State by a political and economic blockade, by sabotage, violence, and threats, but their calculations have been upset by the successes in socialist construction achieved in the Soviet Union. . . .

It is precisely for this reason that the imperialist organizers of war are brandishing their weapons more violently and provocatively against the Soviet Union. It is precisely for this reason that the ruling imperialist cliques appoint such governments in Poland, in Rumania, and in other countries which are subservient to them, as are unreservedly prepared to supply cannon fodder for military attack on the USSR. It is for this reason that the social-democratic slanderers and provocators, who, confounded by the tremendous successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, hide from the workers the active preparations for war that are being made against the USSR and behind their backs take an active part in the preparation of this war. . . .

Proletarians of all countries! The Communist International calls on you to signalize May First, the day of international proletarian solidarity, by mass revolutionary actions, by mass strikes or demonstrations, according to the circumstances. It calls on you to rally to its banner for a determined struggle against the growing capitalist offensive, against the monstrous increase of exploitation, against the distress of unemployment, against the brutality of fascism, against the new imperialist wars which are approaching. The Communist International calls on you to increase your fighting preparedness, and to stand firmly in defence of the Soviet Union against the imperialist cliques and their flunkies in the camp of social-democracy and social-papalism, who are feverishly preparing for their attack upon her.

Workers! Take advantage of the situation created by the economic crisis: support with all your might the millions of unemployed and strengthen thereby the army of the proletariat. Organize your forces for the overthrow of capitalism, for the social revolution. Rally around the Communist Party!

Poor farmers and all the toiling masses of the villages! Only in a fighting alliance with the revolutionary proletariat will you succeed in throwing off

the increasing oppression of the capitalists and the landowners. March under the leadership of the proletariat to the victorious struggles for socialism. Learn from the fighters in the October Revolution, learn from the collective farmers in the USSR!

Oppressed nations of the colonies! Unite in a revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the power of the imperialist bandits and their feudal-capitalist allies in your country! Join closely with the revolutionary workers of the capitalist countries!

Toilers and oppressed! Remember the horrors and sacrifices of the imperialist war. Imperialist wars are stealing on you once more. Rouse the revolutionary consciousness of the soldiers and sailors! Prepare to convert imperialist war into a civil war of all toilers against your own bourgeoisie. Organize your forces for the defence of the USSR!

Soldiers and Sailors! Down with brass-hat discipline and barrack-room slavery! Fraternize with the workers. Firmly remember your duty in war time to turn your cannon and machine-guns against the exploiters.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI RESOLUTION ON THE CHINESE QUESTION

June 1930

Strategiya i Taktika Kominterna, p. 272

[The consolidation of authority in the Soviet areas was begun by the establishment of a provincial Soviet Government in Kiangsi in February 1930; this was followed in May by a conference of representatives of the various Soviet areas. Mif wrote in *Problemy Kitaya* (1930) that the Soviet areas would probably soon include some industrial and administrative centres which would give them a firm base and ensure communist leadership of the Red Armies. The following issue of the journal dealt with the May conference, which adopted provisional land and labour laws, passed a resolution calling for defence of the USSR, and issued a manifesto convening the first Soviet congress for the end of the year. The writer criticized the land law, which erred on the question of land distribution, and prematurely advocated the immediate establishment of collective and State farms.

The fifth RILU congress resolution on China noted that the red unions had no strong footholds in the factories and only weak links with the masses; the unions were few in number, and of their members only a very low proportion were skilled workers. Most of the big strikes had been organized and led without the participation of these unions. Harold Isaacs quotes a Chinese communist in support of his statement that: 'The gulf between what the workers wanted and what the communists proposed became so wide that the few communist workers who remained often concealed news of an impending strike from their party superiors in order to give the strikers a chance to conduct the struggle on their own terms.'

In the discussion on Molotov's report to the sixteenth CPSU congress one speaker referred to the difficulties of the last two years in the CCP arising from

the struggle against the right-wing deviationists; once it had won the industrial centres, the Soviet government would be strong enough to deal with the KMT and could proceed along a non-capitalist road of development. (The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh CI congress referred to 'the left sectarian errors' which marked the course of the CCP in 1928-9.) Stalin made a reference to China in his report to the CPSU congress: 'It is said that a Soviet government has already been set up there. I think that if this is true, there is nothing surprising about it.' This provoked Trotsky to the comment: 'Who says? And what does the CCP say? . . . Does it mean that the "Soviet government" was created in China without the CP and without its knowledge? Then who is leading this government? . . . What party has the power?' Was there 'nothing surprising' in a Soviet government without industrial centres and communist leadership? 'But we say that the appearance of the Soviet government in these circumstances is absolutely impossible . . . To think that the peasantry is capable of creating its Soviet government *independently* means to believe in miracles. It would be the same miracle to create a peasant Red Army.']

1. Recent events in China confirm in full the resolutions of the sixth CCP congress and the sixth Comintern congress referring to the inevitability of a new advance of the revolutionary wave in China. . . . The moving forces of the Chinese revolution—the working class and the peasantry—having recovered from the blows of reaction, are rising once more to revolutionary struggle under the slogans of agrarian revolution, destruction of imperialist rule, and overthrow of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang Government.

2. The past years of reaction in China have brought the heaviest burdens to the labouring masses . . . ruin and pauperization were the lot of the peasant masses. Famine took on unprecedented proportions, condemning tens of millions of peasants to death. Ruin spread more widely among the urban petty-bourgeoisie, particularly artisans and handicraftsmen. These results of reaction were bound to strengthen in the working masses the consciousness of the hopelessness of their position under the existing regime. . . .

4. In analysing the present stage of the struggle, it is necessary to start from the fact that so far there is no objectively revolutionary situation throughout China as a whole. The waves of the workers' and peasants' movement have not merged into one. They do not yet ensure the forces required for an offensive against imperialism and the Kuomintang. The revolutionary peasant struggle is developing so far only in parts of the southern provinces. The splits and struggles within the ruling cliques of the ruling classes have not yet incapacitated them and led to their political collapse. But events are moving in a direction which will create a revolutionary situation in the near future if not throughout the whole of China, at least in a number of the most important provinces. Acceleration of this process depends largely on correct communist tactics, in the first

place on the correct fulfilment of the party's tasks of reinforcing its leadership and carrying further the Soviet movement.

5. The Soviet movement confronts the party with a task of cardinal importance, to organize and direct the activities of a central Soviet Government. On this question the party should start from the assumption that that Government can acquire the necessary strength and importance on condition that . . . a real Red Army is created in the most secure areas, an army wholly subordinate to communist party leadership and able to serve as the pillar of the Government. It is therefore essential to concentrate attention on forming and strengthening the Red Army so that in future, when the military and political circumstances present the opportunity, it will be able to capture one or several industrial and administrative centres. . . .

In setting up the machinery of government great care must be taken in the selection of personnel; in no case should civil servants be taken over from the Kuomintang; only tried and devoted persons should be chosen for this work. The task of the provisional revolutionary Government is to unite and co-ordinate peasant activities on the basis of the vigorous eradication of feudalism and militarism and repression of the kulaks and usurers. . . . At the same time it should establish a form of rule which ensures the hegemony of the proletariat in the peasant movement, and secures the participation of the masses themselves in the organs of revolutionary power from top to bottom.

6. At the centre of its attention in the Soviet areas the party should place the settlement of the land question. The agrarian revolution must be a revolution of the poor and middle peasants, not the kulaks. Its moving forces must be the labourers and the village poor, in firm alliance with the middle peasants and with the industrial working class playing the leading role. Efforts by the kulaks, either to delay confiscation or to divide the confiscated land in proportion to the means of production owned by the peasants, must be energetically cut short. What the party should do is to confiscate the land of all the landlords, churches, and other large landowners and distribute it equally among the poor and the middle peasants, but without confiscating the land of the rich peasants.

8. In economic policy in the Soviet areas, the party should avoid premature measures, should not assume functions which will only loosen the peasant masses from our leadership. In particular it should permit freedom of trade, not yet prohibit the purchase and sale of land, not introduce centralization of supplies, or the regulation of internal trade and prices, with certain exceptions (such as salt and paraffin) dictated by military needs or by the struggle against speculators and saboteurs. . . .

9. To improve the legal position of workers in the Soviet areas the eight-hour working day should be introduced, as well as minimum social legislation

and freedom of organization and activity for class trade unions. Subsequent improvements should be gained not as the result of decrees by the Soviet authorities, but by class struggle and trade union activity linked to concrete local conditions.

10. . . . The party must secure complete control and leadership of the Red Army, destined to play an immense part in the further development of the revolutionary struggle. The Red Army must be made into a genuine national army. . . . With a strong core of industrial workers, the Red Army must be expanded from the ranks of the village poor and from the revolutionary elements of the peasantry as a whole. . . .

11. In all its campaigns and mass agitation the party should put forward as its central slogans, in the name of the workers' and peasants' Soviet Government: confiscation of the landlords' estates for the benefit of the peasants; struggle against imperialism up to nationalization of their businesses and concessions if they break the laws of the Soviet Government of China; make China a united independent Soviet State; overthrow the KMT Government; support and extend the Soviet movement throughout China; the eight-hour day; and control of production by workers' organizations.

12. The party's work in the Soviet areas should be linked with its activities in the rest of China. The party's basic task in conditions of the spreading wave of revolution is to secure the firm and consistent hegemony of the proletariat. . . .

13. To ensure proletarian hegemony presupposes a fight by the party to extend the strike movement, to organize and lead the industrial battles of the Chinese proletariat. As the economic and political struggles fuse, the party should make every effort to extend political strikes, in preparation for a political general strike in all or in a number of industrial centres. . . .

14. To ensure proletarian hegemony presupposes a fight by the party to develop and lead the anti-imperialist movement against all the imperialist Powers. . . .

15. To ensure proletarian hegemony presupposes struggle by the party to expand the revolutionary independent mass movement. The struggle against the militarists' war, the struggle to turn it into class civil war, and the struggle against all the warlords and all the counter-revolutionary KMT groups must become the current party slogan in its mass agitation. At the same time it must intensify its fight to win mass influence, directing it against the reorganizers, against a third party, against the Hu Shih group which is trying to save the Chinese counter-revolution from the newly advancing powerful wave of revolution. At the same time the party must expose the strike-breaking counter-revolutionary role of Chen Tu-hsiu's followers and the Trotskyists, paralyse their attempts to link themselves to mass organizations. . . .

16. In non-Soviet areas the party should set up peasant committees, peasant unions, and committees of struggle. . . . It should encourage the peasants to refuse to pay rent or the requisitions of the militarists. It should summon the peasants to guerrilla warfare and to support of the Soviet areas. . . .

17. The party should also reinforce its work among the national minorities. It should establish strong links with and take the lead in the Moslem movement in North China, in the national-revolutionary struggle in Inner Mongolia, in the struggle of the Korean workers and the Manchurian peasants, and of the tribes in South China. . . . Furthermore, given the immense importance of the growing revolutionary struggle in Indo-China, the party should extend its influence over the Annamite masses, particularly in Yunnan, Hong Kong, and Canton.

18. Since its sixth congress the CCP has had many successes in raising its ideological level and bolshevizing its ranks. But it is far from having successfully accomplished all its tasks in this respect. . . . If it is to deal correctly with all the new tasks confronting it, ensure correct application of the party line in practice, it must wage a struggle on two fronts, against the right-opportunist deviation, and against 'left'-putschist sectarianism, combating both deviations on the theoretical and the practical levels, and concentrating its fire against the right as the chief danger. . . .

21. The bourgeois-landlord bloc has not solved and cannot solve the contradictions which produced the Chinese revolution of 1925-7; on the contrary, it has made them more acute and profound. These contradictions, now amplified, will with historical inevitability bring a new and mightier surge of the revolutionary wave. Despite possible partial defeats and retreats . . . the agrarian revolution, led by the proletariat, will extend and lead unfailingly into a revolution encompassing the whole of China.

22. This situation makes it necessary to consider now the question of the methods and tasks of the Chinese revolution. Only in this larger perspective . . . can the current tasks and tactics of the party be correctly indicated. Since the revolutions of 1911 and 1925-7 were not completed, and the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic stage not fulfilled, the earlier basic tasks remain valid for the approaching wave of the revolution—the elimination of imperialist rule, the liquidation of the landlord agrarian system, the destruction of the bourgeois-landlord bloc, the establishment of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. . . .

23. But the Chinese revolution differs from the usual bourgeois-democratic revolution not only in the composition of the moving forces, and not only by the fact that the workers and peasants, far from acting together with the bourgeoisie—still less under their leadership—in carrying

out the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic stage, are engaged in direct struggle against them. Its peculiarity lies in this, that if successful it opens up the prospect of socialist development. For a number of reasons the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China, being at the same time an anti-imperialist revolution, prepares the prerequisites for proletarian dictatorship and the socialist revolution. The non-capitalist road of development will provide the material economic foundation for the gradual and steady transition of the Chinese revolution, by a series of intermediate stages, into the socialist revolution.

24. The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in China will be substantially different from the democratic dictatorship envisaged by the bolsheviks in the 1905 revolution. The difference is due in the first place to the international situation, to the existence of the USSR. . . . On the other hand, the situation in China itself justifies the belief that the communists will have a majority in the Government. In consequence the proletariat will be able to exercise not only ideological, but State hegemony over the peasantry. . . .

26. China's domestic economic situation also indicates the necessity for non-capitalist evolution. The industrial and agrarian crisis generates the demand for economic measures of the kind characteristic of the transition to socialism. The alternative for China is complete colonial enslavement, further mass ruin, or the Soviet, non-capitalist, socialist road of development . . . the nationalization of foreign industrial undertakings, banks, syndicates, joint-stock companies, railways, air services, and major water and road transport undertakings, in the first place those owned by foreigners; the nationalization of the undertakings and capital of those Chinese who have organized the counter-revolutionary struggle against the Soviet movement; control over other undertakings, including the smaller ones; nationalization of the land, and water and irrigation installations; consistent promotion of co-operatives, beginning with the simplest form of consumer co-operatives; collectivization as the following step, but solely on a voluntary basis, and with the help of the country of proletarian dictatorship. . . .

27. In its initial stages the Chinese revolution will not of course deprive capitalism of the possibility of developing. On the contrary, in agriculture particularly, once the landlord agrarian system and the usurer-warlord indebtedness have been destroyed, capitalism will undoubtedly show a tendency to further growth. . . . It should be remembered that our task is not to destroy, but to reshape the economy of the small peasant. In taking the transitional measures indicated, the proletariat should never cut itself off from its peasant reserves.

28. When conducting propaganda for this socialist road of development, care must be taken to differentiate the Comintern view of this process

sharply from (i) the Trotskyist–Chen Tu-hsiu concept, and (ii) the Sun Yat-sen ideology. To assert our position on the non-capitalist road of development does not imply agreement with the Trotskyist view of the coming stage of the Chinese revolution as socialist. Behind leftist phrases about the socialist character of the Chinese revolution Trotsky conceals his failure to take account of the widening struggle of the peasant masses, his characteristic underestimate of the forces and revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry, his failure to understand the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic stage and the process of transition to the socialist stage. The agrarian question lies at the centre of the Chinese revolution. The revolution develops in the form of peasant wars led by the proletariat. Trotskyist phrasemongering has nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist teaching. On the other hand, Sun Yat-sen utopias about avoiding the negative features of capitalism by partial restrictions on it are alien to the Comintern's position. The reactionary character of the Sun Yat-sen ideology can be seen from the fact that it envisages the fulfilment of its plans with the help of the capitalist world.

TELEGRAM OF CONGRATULATIONS FROM THE ECCI TO THE CC
OF THE KPD ON THE ELECTION RESULTS

14 September 1930

Inprekorr, x, 80, p. 1981, 23 September 1930

[In an attempt to divert to itself the nationalist sentiment which favoured the rise of the Nazi Party, the KPD in the summer of 1930 drew up a 'Programme of National and Social Emancipation of the German People' (drafted by Heinz Neumann 'with the help of the ECCI') which undertook, in the event of the communists coming to power, to annul the Versailles treaty and the Young Plan, all foreign debts and reparations. It said that 'the social-democratic leaders not only serve as executioners for the bourgeoisie, but are the willing agents of French and Polish imperialism', while the Nazis wanted to restore the rule of the junkers and army officers, and the rights and powers of the German princes. The programme ended with the words: 'Down with fascism and social-democracy. Long live Soviet Germany.' Piatnitsky at the twelfth ECCI plenum explained that since the Nazis opposed the Young Plan, and the KPD opposed the Nazis, the idea might spread among the workers that the KPD supported the Plan; therefore the KPD, 'with the assistance of the ECCI, proclaimed its programme of national and social emancipation'. At the thirteenth plenum, after the Nazis had come to power, Piatnitsky said the programme had been adopted very belatedly; it had been very useful although the *Rote Fahne*, with Neumann at its head, distorted the slogan of a 'people's revolution' and adapted it to the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie. There was a widespread belief in the KPD that Nazi successes were not in the long run unfavourable for the communists, since they weakened the Weimar regime. 'It is not for nothing

that one of the most serious German newspapers, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, fears that in the future the successes of the national-fascists will inevitably be utilized by the communists.' The workers would realize that Nazism offered Germany no way out of its difficulties, and would then turn to the KPD—'after Hitler, our turn'.

In the September 1930 elections the KPD vote rose from 3.3 million in 1928 to 4.6 million, the SPD vote fell from 9.2 to 8.6, and the Nazi vote soared from 0.8 to 6.4 million. *Pravda* commented that the Nazi vote reflected a temporary success for the bourgeoisie in keeping the workers back from the revolutionary road; it also showed the rebellious anti-capitalist mood of the voters, a clear sign of the decay of the bourgeois regime in Germany. An article in *Inprekorr* spoke of the results as a 'brilliant victory for the KPD'. 'The success of the Nazis, who are still able to hold back a large part of the rebellious working strata from moving over to the proletarian revolution, carries within itself the seeds of the coming disintegration of the fascist party.'

More than four years later, and two years after Hitler's accession to power, the ECCI, in its *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress, referred to the misinterpretation of the Nazi vote in September 1930 as an anti-capitalist vote; while endorsing the programme 'which served as a powerful instrument in the struggle to win the masses', it condemned the passivity of the 'left opportunists' in the KPD who regarded fascism as an inevitable stage in the development towards a proletarian dictatorship; the KPD had failed to assess fascism correctly; after the 1930 elections the *Rote Fahne* had called the Brüning Government 'an open fascist dictatorship', thus diverting the party's attention from the real Nazi danger.

The Trotskyists argued that it was only a Nazi, not a 'normal' bourgeois government, that would attack Russia; therefore a Nazi victory must at all costs be prevented; a victory for Hitler would mean a setback for ten or twenty years, and might entail the collapse of the Comintern; the social-democrats were helping fascism by clinging to the defence of bourgeois democracy, which was doomed to decline. The outcome of the elections was attributed to the lack of confidence of the petty-bourgeoisie in the ability of the KPD to make matters better.

An article on the election results in the *Communist International* said that this showed Germany to be 'on the eve of revolutionary events'; the successes of the KPD and Nazis were a clear sign of the disintegration of bourgeois society: 'a revolutionary crisis is maturing in Germany'. The KPD must fight against the fascist dictatorship being prepared by the bourgeoisie, and against the social-democrats and Brandlerites; the social-democrats, like Hitler's followers, were lackeys of the bourgeoisie. Radek commented on the loss of votes of the traditional bourgeois parties—that the petty-bourgeoisie were turning away from historical capitalist parties was a sign of the breakdown of the bourgeois regime; the petty-bourgeois parties could no longer serve as a democratic cloak for the big bourgeoisie; the drop of 600,000 in the SPD vote weakened the most important 'democratic' pillar of German capitalism; the Catholic Centre had not lost because it had 'the best organizers in the world, the Catholic priests', but it could never be more than the party of the Catholic minority; it could not

save the bourgeoisie. One part of capitalism was supporting fascism to frighten and discipline the SPD, another part hoped to seize power with its help and abolish all 'so-called democracy'. Nobody, however, had expected a Nazi success on this scale—the history of political struggle knows not its like. . . . Nothing is more significant than the fact that about this party, which has taken the second place in the political life of Germany, nothing was said either in bourgeois or in socialist literature. It is a party . . . which has arisen suddenly, as an island rises suddenly in the ocean as a result of volcanic forces.' The Nazi victory carried seeds of great surprises for the bourgeoisie; the masses who voted for it were not voting for capitalism. It promised to save them from world capitalism and the Young plan. 'Nothing is more worthy of note than the fact that trust capital had to deck out its new lackey, the fascist party, in a socialist mask.' The election results showed the extent of discontent and indignation among those who were not yet willing to break entirely with bourgeois society and join the KPD. The KPD was relatively weak organizationally—it has gone through more splits than any other party—and many workers therefore distrusted it; moreover, it had little money for the campaign; its greatest successes were in areas of industrial concentration.

An article in the following year summarizing the result of the eleventh ECCI plenum stated: 'Even before the September elections to the Reichstag there began, with the increased encouragement of finance-capital, the tempestuous upsurge of the national-socialist fascist movement in Germany. The communist party answered with counter tactics. Having presented the programme of the "social and national liberation of Germany", it opened fire on the fascists, attracting the social-democratic workers to a united front in the struggle with fascism. Consequently, it was able to put a stop to the growth of Hitler-fascism, and even to introduce elements of decomposition in it. . . .' Shortly before Hitler came to power, it was stated in the Comintern journal that there had been 'inner inhibitions' and 'apprehensions' in the KPD about that part of the programme which appeared to be borrowed from the Nazis. This was an error; the KPD was the first and only opponent of the Versailles system in Germany. 'The German party must concern itself more with the question of the German population in neighbouring countries. . . . We must not leave them a prey to the national socialists, but must emphasize the fact that they will not enjoy the full right of self-determination, and to join the future German Soviet State, until the chains of the Versailles system are broken asunder by the German Soviet Republic of the future.']

The ECCI sends the KPD, which in the Reichstag elections rallied more than $4\frac{1}{2}$ million proletarians to its banner and dealt a heavy blow to social-democracy, its most fraternal greetings. The victory of the KPD is of the greater significance as it was won on the basis of a fully developed programme of proletarian revolution and the slogan of struggle for a Soviet Germany. Your victory is the only genuine victory in these elections, for it was gained on the ground of the proletarian class struggle.

The great success of the fascists is a success, attained by the help of

radical phrases, for deception of the masses who are turning away from the parties of the big bourgeoisie. The success for the centre is only temporary, for it is based on the attempt to organize class community, on the denial of the class struggle. The KPD must continue with all its energy the fight against social-democracy, to which significant sections of the working class still hold allegiance. It must completely expose the national-socialists and the Centre Party and fight to win over the workers who still follow them. It must intensify its work among the unemployed, pay greater attention to work among agricultural workers, and fight tirelessly to win over the majority of the working class in the factories.

The political crisis in Germany is maturing rapidly. The class front is becoming clearer and clearer. The role of the KPD is growing enormously, as the decisive factor in the class struggle. We are firmly convinced that the party will concentrate its revolutionary proletarian forces on developing on the broadest scale the economic and political struggle and will consolidate organizationally the successes it has won.

Forward in the fight for Soviet Germany.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MATERIAL ISSUED BY THE AGITPROP
DEPARTMENT OF THE ECCI ON THE THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

October 1930

Inprekorr, x, 88, p. 2151, 21 October 1930

[At the twelfth KPD congress in 1929 Thaelmann said: 'Defence of the Soviet Union must be made the central axis of the revolutionary policy of the workers of all countries.' The USSR, said Heckert, was not only the ally of all workers, but their fatherland, 'to whom we dedicate ourselves to our last breath, our last drop of blood'. In October 1929 *Inprekorr* reported a proposal for the establishment of an 'International federation of workers to render technical aid to the Soviet Union'.]

The thirteenth anniversary of the October revolution falls at a time of tremendous successes for socialist construction in the Soviet Union and of severe crisis, increasing irresistibly in depth and extent, of the capitalist world economy. It falls at a time when class contradictions in the capitalist economy are growing immensely sharper, as are the contradictions between the imperialist States and the workers' fatherland, the Soviet Union.

On this anniversary the working masses of the whole world draw up the balance-sheet of the struggle between capitalism and communism. For thirteen years the bourgeois and social-fascist prophets have foretold the decline of the Soviet Union, the breakdown of its economy. . . . In the

Soviet Union we see flourishing progress, while capitalism is going through its most severe crisis. . . .

This anniversary is a day of revolutionary celebration for the proletariat of the whole world, on which they recall the achievements of the proletarian dictatorship, which fill them with fresh courage, fresh strength for the fight to overthrow the capitalist class, fresh belief in socialism. . . .

The thirteenth anniversary however falls at a time when it is by no means enough to proclaim solidarity with the workers' State by demonstrations of sympathy alone. More than ever the fate of the working class of the whole world is bound up with the cause of the October revolution, for good and ill—every victory of socialist construction is a victory for the world proletariat; every blow against it is a blow against the vital interests of the workers of all countries. The powers which threaten socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which try to disorganize it by means of espionage, sabotage, and boycott, and to destroy it by war, are the same powers which organize one attack after another on the existence of the workers in town and country in the capitalist countries and the colonies.

That is why defence of the Soviet Union coincides more than ever before with defence by the workers of their own vital interests. Defence of the Soviet Union means defence of the proletariat against the capitalist starvation offensive, against wage cuts and unemployment, against the terrorism of fascist dictatorship.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI POLITICAL
SECRETARIAT ON THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES

26 October 1930

Communist International, 15 January 1931, p. 65

[Early in July 1930 an international conference of Negro workers was held in Hamburg, with Ford (USA) presiding. There were Negroes from Nigeria, South Africa, the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Gambia, Trinidad, and the United States. The idea of such a conference had been suggested at the second LAI conference held in Frankfurt in July 1929 (presumably on the initiative of the Negro bureau of the ECCI set up after the sixth Comintern congress), where it was said that there were too few links between the Negroes of different countries, that they were being misled, to the advantage of imperialism, by Garveyism, Pan-Africanism, national reformism; Negroes should be organized internationally on a class basis. A committee was chosen to organize the 1930 conference, which came to the conclusion that race and colour played a subordinate part in the Negro question; this had to be tackled on a class basis. (The thesis that Negroes could be freed only as part of the wider class struggle was embodied in the 'trade union action programme for Negroes' drawn up by the RILU committee for Negro workers in the spring of 1929.) Piatnitsky wrote at this time that the American CP still showed traces of 'white chauvin-

ism'; the same charge had been made a year earlier by Lozovsky at the tenth ECCI plenum, where Minor, the United States representative, said there was a tendency for Negroes in the party to be hostile to the central committee, whatever its complexion, because 'the party as a whole is opportunist on the Negro question'. There were entire local party organizations which were opposed to the admission of Negroes. In November 1930 a 'League of Struggle for Negro Rights' was set up, with self-determination for the Black Belt as its programme.]

1. The CP of the United States has always acted openly and energetically against Negro oppression, and has thereby won increasing sympathy among the Negro population. In its own ranks, too, the Party has relentlessly fought the slightest evidence of white chauvinism, and has purged itself of the gross opportunism of the Lovestoneites. . . . But the Party has not yet succeeded in overcoming in its own ranks all under-estimation of the struggle for the slogan of the right of self-determination, and still less succeeded in doing away with all *lack of clarity* on the Negro question. In the Party discussion the question was often wrongly put and much erroneous counter-posing of phases of the question occurred, thus, for instance, should the slogan of social equality *or* the slogan of the right of self-determination of the Negroes be emphasised. Should only propaganda for the Negroes' right to self-determination be carried on, or should this slogan be considered as a slogan of action; should separatist tendencies among the Negroes be supported or opposed; is the Southern region, thickly populated by Negroes, to be looked upon as a colony, or as an 'integral part of the national economy of the United States', where presumably a revolutionary situation cannot arise independent of the general revolutionary development in the United States?

In the interest of the utmost clarity of ideas on this question the Negro question in the United States must be viewed from the standpoint of its peculiarity, namely as the question of an *oppressed nation*, which is in a peculiar and extraordinarily distressing situation of national oppression not only in view of the prominent *racial distinctions* (marked difference in the colour of skin, etc.), but above all because of considerable *social antagonism* (remnants of slavery). This introduces into the American Negro question an important, *peculiar* trait which is absent from the national question of other oppressed peoples. Furthermore, it is necessary to face clearly the inevitable distinction between the position of the Negro in the South and in the North, owing to the fact that at least three-fourths of the entire Negro population of the United States (12 million) live in compact masses in the South, most of them being peasants and agricultural labourers in a state of semi-serfdom, settled in the 'Black Belt' and constituting the majority of the population, whereas the Negroes in the Northern States are for the most part industrial workers of the lowest

categories who have recently come to the various industrial centres from the South (having often even fled from there).

The struggle of the Communists for the equal rights of the Negro applies to all Negroes, in the North as well as in the South. The struggle for this slogan embraces all or almost all of the important special interests of the Negroes in the North, but not in the South, where the main communist slogan must be: *The right of self-determination of the Negroes in the Black Belt*. These two slogans, however, are most closely connected. The Negroes in the North are very much interested in winning the right of self-determination for the Negro population of the Black Belt and can thereby hope for strong support for the establishment of true equality of the Negroes in the North. In the South the Negroes are suffering no less but still more than in the North from the glaring lack of all equality; for the most part the struggle for their most urgent partial demands in the Black Belt is nothing more than the struggle for their equal rights, and only the fulfilment of their main slogan, the right of self-determination in the Black Belt, can assure them of true equality.

1. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE EQUAL RIGHTS OF THE NEGROES

2. The basis for the demand of equality of the Negroes is provided by the *special* yoke to which the Negroes in the United States are subjected by the ruling classes. In comparison with the situation of the other various nationalities and races oppressed by American imperialism, the yoke of the Negroes in the United States is of a peculiar nature and particularly oppressive. This is partly due to the historical past of the American Negroes as imported slaves, but is much more due to the still existing slavery of the American Negro which is immediately apparent, for example, in comparing their situation even with the situation of the Chinese and Japanese workers in the West of the United States, or with the lot of the Philipinos (Malay race) who are under colonial repression.

It is only a Yankee bourgeois lie to say that the yoke of Negro slavery has been lifted in the United States. Formally it has been abolished, but in practice the great majority of the Negro masses in the South are living in slavery in the literal sense of the word. Formally, they are 'free' as 'tenant farmers' or 'contract labourers' on the big plantations of the white landowners, but actually, they are completely in the power of their exploiters; they are not permitted, or else it is made impossible for them to leave their exploiters; if they do leave the plantations, they are brought back and in many cases whipped; many of them are simply taken prisoner under various pretexts and, bound together with long chains, they have to do compulsory labour on the roads. All through the South, the Negroes are not only deprived of all rights, and subjected to the arbitrary will of the

white exploiters, but they are also socially ostracised, that is, they are treated in general not as human beings, but as cattle. . . .

. . . As wage-earners, the Negroes are forced to perform the lowest and most difficult work; they generally receive lower wages than the white workers and don't always get the same wages as white workers doing similar work, and their treatment is the very worst. Many AF of L trade unions do not admit Negro workers in their ranks, and a number have organized special trade unions for Negroes so that they will not have to let them into their 'good white society'.

This whole system of 'segregation' and 'Jim Crowism' is a special form of national and social oppression under which the American Negroes have much to suffer. The origin of all this is not difficult to find: this Yankee arrogance towards the Negroes stinks of the disgusting atmosphere of the old slave market. This is downright robbery and slave-whipping barbarism at the peak of capitalist 'culture'.

3. The demand for equal rights in our sense of the word, means not only demanding the same rights for the Negroes as the whites have in the United States at the present time, but also demanding that the Negroes should be granted all rights and other advantages which we demand for the corresponding oppressed classes of whites (workers and other toilers). Thus in our sense of the word, the demand for equal rights means a continuous work of abolishment of all forms of economic and political oppression of the Negroes, as well as their social exclusion, the insults perpetrated against them and their segregation. This is to be obtained by constant struggle by the white and black workers for effective legal protection for the Negroes in all fields, as well as actual enforcement of their equality and combating of every expression of Negrophobia. One of the first communist slogans is: Death for Negro lynching!

The struggle for the equal rights of the Negroes does not in any way exclude recognition and support for the Negroes' rights to their own special schools, government organs, etc., wherever the Negro masses put forward such national demands of their own accord. This will, however, in all probability occur to any great extent only in the Black Belt. In other parts of the country, the Negroes suffer above all from being shut out from the general social institutions and not from being prohibited to set up their own national institutions. With the development of the Negro intellectuals (principally in the 'free' professions) and of a thin layer of small capitalist business people, there have appeared lately, not only definite efforts for developing a purely national Negro culture, but also outspoken bourgeois tendencies towards Negro nationalism. The broad masses of the Negro population in the big industrial centres of the North are, however, making no efforts whatsoever to maintain and cultivate a national aloofness, they are, on the contrary, working for assimilation.

This effort of the Negro masses can do much in the future to facilitate the progressive process of amalgamating the whites and Negroes into *one* nation, and it is under no circumstances the task of the communists to give support to bourgeois nationalism in its fight with the progressive assimilation tendencies of the Negro working masses.

4. The slogan of equal rights of the Negroes *without a relentless struggle in practice against all manifestations of Negrophobia on the part of the American bourgeoisie* can be nothing but a deceptive liberal gesture of a sly slave-owner or his agent. This slogan is in fact repeated by 'socialist' and many other bourgeois politicians and philanthropists who want to get publicity for themselves by appealing to the 'sense of justice' of the American bourgeoisie in the individual treatment of the Negroes, and thereby side-track attention from the one effective struggle against the shameful system of 'white superiority': from the *class struggle against the American bourgeoisie*. The struggle for equal rights for the Negroes is in fact, one of the most important parts of the proletarian class struggle of the United States.

The struggle for the equal rights for the Negroes must certainly take the form of common struggle by the white and black workers.

The increasing unity of the various working-class elements provokes constant attempts on the part of the American bourgeoisie to play one group against another, particularly the white workers against the black and the black workers against the immigrant workers and vice versa, and thus to promote divisions within the working class, which contributes to the bolstering up of American capitalist rule. The party must carry on a ruthless struggle against all these attempts of the bourgeoisie and do everything to strengthen the bonds of class solidarity of the working class upon a lasting basis.

In the struggle for equal rights for the Negroes, however, it is the duty of the *white* workers to march *at the head* of this struggle. They must everywhere make a breach in the walls of segregation and 'Jim Crowism' which have been set up by bourgeois slave-market morality. They must most ruthlessly unmask and condemn the hypocritical reformists and bourgeois 'friends of Negroes' who, in reality, are only interested in strengthening the power of the enemies of the Negroes. They, the white workers, must boldly jump at the throat of the 100 per cent bandits who strike a Negro in the face. This struggle will be the test of the real international solidarity of the American white workers.

It is the special duty of the revolutionary Negro workers to carry on tireless activity among the Negro working masses to free them of their distrust of the white proletariat and draw them into the common front of the revolutionary class struggle against the bourgeoisie. . . . Furthermore, the Communist Party must resist all tendencies within its own ranks to

ignore the Negro question as a national question in the United States, not only in the South, but also in the North. It is advisable for the Communist Party in the North to abstain from the establishment of any special Negro organizations, and in place of this to bring the black and white workers together in common organizations of struggle and joint action. Effective steps must be taken for the organization of Negro workers in the TUUL and revolutionary trade unions. Under-estimation of this work takes various forms: lack of energy in recruiting Negro workers, in keeping them in our ranks and in drawing them into the full life of the trade unions, in selecting, educating and promoting Negro forces to leading functions in the organization. The party must make itself entirely responsible for the carrying through of this very important work. It is most urgently necessary to publish a popular mass paper dealing with the Negro question, edited by white and black comrades, and to have all active followers of this paper grouped organizationally.

2. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE NEGROES IN THE BLACK BELT

5. It is not correct to consider the Negro zone of the South as a colony of the United States. Such a characterization of the Black Belt could be based in some respects only upon artificially construed analogies, and would create superfluous difficulties for the clarification of ideas. In rejecting this estimation, however, it should not be overlooked that it would be none the less false to try to make a fundamental distinction between the character of national oppression to which the colonial peoples are subjected and the yoke of other oppressed nations. Fundamentally, national oppression in both cases is of the same character, and is in the Black Belt in many respects worse than in a number of actual colonies. On the one hand the Black Belt is not in itself, either economically or politically, such a united whole as to warrant its being called a special colony of the United States, but on the other hand this zone is not, either economically or politically, such an integral part of the whole United States as any other part of the country. Industrialization in the Black Belt is not, as is generally the case in colonies properly speaking, in contradiction with the ruling interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie, which has in its hands the monopoly of the entire industry, but in so far as industry is developed here, it will in no way bring a solution to the question of living conditions of the oppressed Negro majority, or to the agrarian question, which lies at the basis of the national question. On the contrary, this question is still further aggravated as a result of the increase of the contradictions arising from the pre-capitalist forms of exploitation of the Negro peasantry and of a considerable portion of the Negro proletariat

(miners, forestry workers, etc.) in the Black Belt, and at the same time owing to the industrial development here, the growth of the most important driving force of the national revolution, the black working class, is especially strengthened. Thus, the prospect for the future is not an inevitable dying away of the national revolutionary Negro movement in the South, as Lovestone prophesied, but on the contrary, a great advance of this movement and the rapid approach of a revolutionary crisis in the Black Belt.

6. Owing to the peculiar situation in the Black Belt (the fact that the majority of the resident Negro population are farmers and agricultural labourers and that the capitalist economic system as well as political class rule there is not only of a special kind, but to a great extent still has pre-capitalist and semi-colonial features), the right of self-determination of the Negroes as the *main slogan* of the Communist Party in the Black Belt is appropriate. This, however, does not in any way mean that the struggle for equal rights of the Negroes in the Black Belt is less necessary or less well founded than it is in the North. On the contrary, here, owing to the whole situation, this struggle is even better founded, but the form of this slogan does not sufficiently correspond with the *concrete* requirements of the liberation struggle of the Negro population. . . .

The slogan of the right of self-determination occupies the central place in the liberation struggle of the Negro population in the Black Belt against the yoke of American imperialism, but this slogan, as we see it, must be carried out only in connexion with two other basic demands. Thus, there are three basic demands to be kept in mind in the Black Belt, namely, the following:

1. *Confiscation of the landed property of the white landowner and capitalists for the benefit of the Negro farmers.* The landed property in the hands of the white American exploiters constitutes the most important material basis of the entire system of national oppression and serfdom of the Negroes in the Black Belt. More than three-quarters of all Negro farmers here are bound in actual serfdom to the farms and plantations of the white exploiters by the feudal system of 'share cropping.' . . . Without this revolutionary measure, without the agrarian revolution, the right of self-determination of the Negro population would be only a Utopia, or at best would remain only on paper without changing in any way the actual enslavement.

2. *Establishment of the State unity of the Black Belt.* At the present time this Negro zone—precisely for the purpose of facilitating national oppression—is artificially split up and divided into a number of various states which include distant localities having a majority of white population. If the right of self-determination of the Negroes is to be put into force, it is necessary wherever possible to bring together into one governmental unit

all districts of the South where the majority of the settled population consists of Negroes. Within the limits of this state there will of course remain a fairly significant white minority which must submit to the right of self-determination of the Negro majority. There is no other possible way of carrying out in a democratic manner the right of self-determination of the Negroes. . . .

3. *Right of Self-Determination.* This means complete and unlimited right of the Negro majority to exercise governmental authority in the entire territory of the Black Belt, as well as to decide upon the relations between their territory and other nations, particularly the United States. It would not be right of self-determination in our sense of the word if the Negroes in the Black Belt had the right of determination only in cases which concerned *exclusively* the Negroes and did not affect the whites, because the most important cases arising here are bound to affect the Negroes [whites] as well as the whites [Negroes]. First of all, true right to self-determination means that the Negro majority and not the white minority in the entire territory of the administratively united Black Belt exercises the right of administering governmental, legislative and judicial authority. At the present time all this power here is concentrated in the hands of the white bourgeoisie and landlords. It is they who appoint all officials, it is they who dispose of public property, it is they who determine the taxes, it is they who govern and make the laws. Therefore, *the overthrow of this class rule* in the Black Belt is unconditionally necessary in the struggle for the Negroes' right to self-determination. This, however, means at the same time the overthrow of the yoke of American imperialism in the Black Belt on which the forces of the local white bourgeoisie depend. Only in this way, only if the Negro population of the Black Belt wins its freedom from American imperialism even to the point of deciding *itself* the relations between its country and other governments, especially the United States, will it win real and complete self-determination. One should demand from the beginning that no armed forces of American imperialism should remain on the territory of the Black Belt.

7. As stated in the letter of the Political Secretariat of the ECCI of 16 March 1930, the communists must '*unreservedly* carry on a struggle' for the self-determination of the Negro population in the Black Belt in accordance with what has been set forth above. It is incorrect and harmful to interpret the communist standpoint to mean that the communists stand for the right of self-determination of the Negroes only up to a certain point, but not beyond this, for example, to the right of separation. It is also incorrect to say that the communists are so far only to carry on propaganda or agitation for the right of self-determination, but not to develop any activity to bring this about. No, it is of the utmost importance for the Communist Party to reject any such limitation of its struggle for

this slogan. Even if the situation does not yet warrant the raising of the question of uprising, one should not limit oneself at present to propaganda for the demand: 'Right to self-determination', but should organise mass actions, such as demonstrations, strikes, tax-boycott movements, etc.

Moreover, the party cannot make its stand for this slogan dependent upon any conditions, even the condition that the proletariat has the hegemony in the national revolutionary Negro movement or that the majority of the Negroes in the Black Belt adopts the Soviet form (as Pepper demanded), etc. It goes without saying that the communists in the Black Belt will and must try to win over all working elements of the Negroes, that is, the majority of the population, to their side, and to convince them not only that they must win the right of self-determination, but also that they must make use of this right in accordance with the communist programme. But this cannot be made a *condition* for the stand of the communists in favour of the right of self-determination of the Negro population; if, or so long as the majority of this population wishes to handle the situation in the Black Belt in a different manner from that which we communists would like, its complete right to self-determination must be recognized. This right we must defend as a free democratic right.

8. In general, the CP of the United States has kept to this correct line recently in its struggle for the right of self-determination of the Negroes even though this line—in some cases—has been unclearly or erroneously expressed. In particular some misunderstanding has arisen from the failure to make a clear distinction between the demand for 'right of self-determination' and the demand for governmental separation, simply treating these two demands in the same way. However, these two demands are not identical. Complete right to self-determination includes also the right to governmental separation, but does not necessarily imply that the Negro population should *make use of this* right under all circumstances, that is, that it must actually separate or attempt to separate the Black Belt from the existing governmental federation with the United States. If it desires to separate it must be free to do so; but if it prefers to remain federated with the United States it must also be free to do that. This is the correct meaning of the idea of self-determination and it must be recognized quite independently of whether the United States are still a capitalist state or if a proletarian dictatorship has already been established there. . . .

9. The general relation of communists to separatist tendencies among the Negroes, described above, cannot mean that communists associate themselves at present, or generally speaking, during capitalism, indiscriminately and without criticism with all the separatist currents of the various bourgeois or petty-bourgeois Negro groups. For there is not only a national-revolutionary, but also a reactionary Negro separatism, for instance, that represented by Garvey; his Utopia of an isolated Negro

State (regardless if in Africa or America, if it is supposed to consist of Negroes only) pursues the only political aim of diverting the Negro masses from the real liberation struggle against American imperialism.

It would be a mistake to imagine that the right of self-determination slogan is a truly revolutionary slogan only in connection with the demand for complete separation. *The question of power is decided not only through the demand of separation, but just as much through the demand of the right to decide the separation question and self-determination in general.* A direct question of power is also the demand of confiscation of the land of the white exploiters in the South, as well as the demand of the Negroes that the entire Black Belt be amalgamated into a State unit. . . .

10. The slogan for the self-determination right and the other fundamental slogans of the Negro question in the Black Belt does not exclude but rather pre-supposes an energetic development of the struggle for concrete *partial demands* linked up with the daily needs and afflictions of wide masses of working Negroes. In order to avoid, in this connection, the danger of opportunist back-slidings, communists must above all remember this:

(a) The direct aims and partial demands around which a partial struggle develops are to be linked up in the course of the struggle with the revolutionary fundamental slogans brought up by the question of power, in a popular manner corresponding to the mood of the masses. . . .

(b) One should not venture to draw up a complete programme of some kind or a system of 'positive' partial demands. Such programmes on the part of petty-bourgeois politicians should be exposed as attempts to divert the masses from the necessary hard struggles by fostering reformist and democratic illusions among them. Every positive partial demand which might crop up is to be considered from the viewpoint of whether it is in keeping with our revolutionary fundamental slogans, or whether it is of a reformist or reactionary tendency. Every kind of national oppression which arouses the indignation of the Negro masses can be used as a suitable point of departure for the development of partial struggles. . . .

(c) Everything should be done to bring wide masses of Negroes into these partial struggles—this is important—and not to carry the various partial demands to such an ultra-radical point, that the mass of working Negroes are no longer able to recognize them as *their own*. Without a real mobilization of the mass movements—in spite of the sabotage of the bourgeois-reformist Negro politicians—even the best communist partial demands get hung up. On the other hand, even some relatively insignificant acts of the Ku-Klux-Klan bandits in the Black Belt can become the occasion of important political movements, provided the communists are able to organize the resistance of the indignant Negro masses.

(d) Communists must fight in the *forefront* of the national-liberation

movement and must do their utmost for the progress of this mass movement and its revolutionization. Negro communists must *clearly dissociate* themselves from all bourgeois currents in the Negro movement, must indefatigably oppose the spread of the influence of the bourgeois groups on the working Negroes, and in dealing with them must apply the communist tactic laid down by the Sixth CI Congress with regard to the colonial question, in order to guarantee *the hegemony of the Negro proletariat* in the national liberation movement of the Negro population, and to co-ordinate wide masses of the Negro peasantry in a steady fighting alliance with the proletariat. . . .

11. It is particularly incumbent on Negro communists to criticize consistently the half-heartedness and hesitations of the petty-bourgeois national-revolutionary Negro leaders in the liberation struggle of the Black Belt, exposing them before the masses. All national reformist currents as, for instance, Garveyism, which are an obstacle to the revolutionization of the Negro masses, must be fought systematically and with the utmost energy. Simultaneously, Negro communists must carry on among the Negro masses an energetic struggle against nationalist moods directed indiscriminately against all whites, workers as well as capitalists, communists as well as imperialists. Their constant call to the Negro masses must be: *revolutionary struggle against the ruling white bourgeoisie through a fighting alliance with the revolutionary white proletariat!* Negro communists must indefatigably explain to the mass of the Negro population that even if many white workers in America are still infected with Negro-phobia, the American proletariat, as a class, which owing to its struggle against the American bourgeoisie represents the only truly revolutionary class, will be the only real mainstay of Negro liberation. In as far as successes in the national-revolutionary struggle of the Negro population of the South for its right to self-determination are already possible under capitalism, they can be achieved only if this struggle is effectively supported by proletarian mass actions on a large scale in the other parts of the United States. . . .

12. The struggle regarding the Negro question in the North must be linked up with the liberation struggle in the South, in order to endow the Negro movement throughout the United States with the necessary effective strength. After all, in the North as well as in the South, it is a question of the real emancipation of the American Negroes which has in fact never taken place before. The Communist Party of the United States must bring into play its entire revolutionary energy in order to mobilize the widest possible masses of the white and black proletariat of the United States, not by words, but by deeds, for real effective support of the struggle for the liberation of the Negroes. . . . This alone will enable us to get rid of the bourgeois white chauvinism which is polluting the ranks of the white

workers of America, to overcome the distrust of the Negro masses caused by the inhuman barbarous Negro slave traffic still carried on by the American bourgeoisie—in as far as it is directed even against all white workers—and to win over to our side these millions of Negroes as active fellow fighters in the struggle for the overthrow of bourgeois power throughout America.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY ON LI LI-SAN'S
POLICY

16 November 1930*

Strategiya i Taktika Komintern, p. 283

[Pavel Mif attended, as ECCI representative, the third plenary session of the CC, CCP, held in September 1930. This followed shortly after the failure of the Red Army's attempt to capture Changsha. It entered Changsha on 28 July and (part of the KMT garrison having been withdrawn) held the city for a few days, but was then forced to withdraw. The KMT forces were said to have been assisted by gunboats of the American, British, Japanese, and Italian navies. The initial success of the undertaking was applauded in Moscow; 'This opens a new phase in the history of the Chinese revolution', wrote Chi-hua in *Inprekorr* at the beginning of August; it would give the peasant Soviet areas a broader social basis and reinforce urban proletarian leadership; the next step was to take Wuhan. Its defeat, and the revenge taken on the inhabitants on the return of the KMT forces, made it necessary for the ECCI to attribute the undertaking to the incorrect policy of the Chinese party, and in particular to depose Li Li-san as its leader. It is said that Li Li-san had in fact been reluctant to use the army to capture urban bases, but had agreed under pressure to do so, on the theory that the revolutionary movement had to be under 'proletarian hegemony' and the Soviet movement had to have 'a proletarian base', the peasants being only 'an ally of the revolution' and not its moving force. There appears to have been a letter from the ECCI political secretariat of 23 July 1930 advising consolidation and expansion of the Red Army so that 'in the future, according to political and military circumstances, one or several political or industrial centres can be occupied'. The central committee later referred to 'insufficient connexion between the attack of the Red Army and the mass struggles in Changsha'. An article in *Problemy Kitaya* dealing with the May conference but clearly written after the Changsha débâcle, said that the conference had failed to appreciate the importance of the uneven development of the revolution in China; that it affirmed the existence of a directly revolutionary situation throughout China and therefore advanced the slogan of immediate armed uprising, whereas it should have concentrated on the organization of the urban

* The date given in the volume from which this translation was made is October 1930; the Russian text was translated from a Chinese source; Chinese communist publications agree in giving the date as 16 November.

and rural proletariat and their immediate demands; the party leaders had completely overlooked the weakness of the revolutionary movement among the urban workers.

There was also opposition to Li Li-san within the CCP itself, both from a group of trade union leaders, and from the 'returned students', a number of Chinese communists who had been studying in Moscow and returned to China in the spring of 1930 with Mif (who had been head of the Sun Yat-sen university); the best known among them was Chen Shao-yu, who used the name of Wang Ming, and Chiu Pang-hsien, who used the name of Po Ku. There is no evidence that Wang Ming and his group opposed the policy that Li Li-san had pursued; earlier he had written that one of the Red Army's tasks was to 'occupy cities and unite with the revolutionary forces in the city'; only the industrial cities 'can form the organized centres of revolution'; and in May 1930 he argued that it was necessary to capture Wuhan as a prelude to the establishment of a Soviet government. Chu Chiu-pai had also been sent from Moscow to attend the CC plenum, which was apparently called on the initiative of the ECCI. At the plenum, Li, who was supported by Chou En-lai, admitted that the timing of the Changsha attack had been wrong, and that tactical errors had been made, but neither the theory nor the strategy underlying the enterprise was challenged, since these were considered to be in harmony with ECCI policy. The delay in abandoning these was due in part to the criticism of the policy by the supporters of Chen Tu-hsiu and Trotsky, but by November this reluctance had been overcome. The political bureau of the CC met on 25 November, endorsed the ECCI letter, and Li Li-san, after recanting his errors, resigned and was called to Moscow (where he remained for fifteen years).

In January 1931 the fourth central committee plenum, in which the leadership was taken by the 'returned students', with Mif's backing, decided to strengthen the party's ties with the Soviet areas and to assist in establishing a solid Soviet regime. (A Chinese communist account published in 1951 refers to the 'returned students' as 'a "left" opportunist clique' who 'seized leading positions in the central committee'.) The resolution passed by the plenum stated *inter alia*: 'There was a premature, adventurist, and dogmatic instruction to seize big cities when we had no consolidated rear, had not made the necessary preparation, and had an insufficient base in the masses. The Changsha débâcle was a result of these mistakes.' Chu Chiu-pai and Chou En-lai confessed their errors at the plenum, but retained their membership of the central committee. The 'trade union' opposition which resented the position gained by the new arrivals from Moscow, and were dissatisfied with the party's failure to gain any following among the industrial workers, were expelled. The ECCI now gave greater attention to the movement in the Soviet areas, which it hoped to bring under the control of the central committee.

An article by Kuchymov in the *Communist International* in March 1931 on 'the bolshevization of the CCP' stated that 'the decisive problem for this developing dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry is the correct solution of the agrarian question, which requires first of all that the proletariat should seize the leadership of the peasant movement'; the three principal tasks of the party were to form a regular and disciplined Red Army out of the existing semi-guerrilla

detachments, to establish an authoritative Soviet Government, and to organize the industrial struggle in the large cities.]

The ECCI noted with satisfaction the report of the political bureau of the Chinese central committee that, after the report of Comrade M[if] it annulled its previous decisions and adhered to the decision worked out in full agreement with the delegation of the CC of the CCP. The ECCI trusts that the CC of the CCP will, with bolshevik firmness and consistency, put into effect the political line contained in the resolutions, decisions, and political directives of the ECCI, thereby ensuring the further progress of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in China.

But since, at a historically important moment in the Chinese revolution, the most serious differences have arisen between the ECCI and a number of members of the politbureau of the CC of the CCP on the one hand, and other members of the politbureau, including Li Li-san, on the other, we think it our duty, in elaboration of the resolutions and decisions of the political secretariat and political commission of the ECCI, to dwell on the substance of these differences. . . .

What was the content of the political line of Li Li-san, supported by several comrades in the party leadership? From what appraisal of the factors and distribution of forces did he start when he put forward his line in opposition to the ECCI political line?

Comrade Li Li-san did not start from an analysis of the objective situation, of the balance of conflicting forces obligatory for every Marxist-Leninist, and therefore he made not only particular mistakes, but created an entire system of erroneous views, worked out an anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist position. Since it turned aside from the concrete reality, from the masses, from the organization and mobilization of the masses, this position was bound to lead to putschist, adventurist tactics. Though it concealed its passivity behind allegedly 'left' phrases, this position was just as opportunist as, for example, Trotskyism. From this non-Marxist, non-Leninist position, he derived the theory that in China a revolutionary situation had already matured on an all-national scale and was developing on a world scale. Armed risings in Wuhan, Nanking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Peiping, Harbin, Canton, Hong Kong, Dairen, the advance of the Red Army on Changsha, Nanchang, Hankow—this was the upshot of Li Li-san's conception of the situation. He adhered to his thesis that victory in one or several provinces meant an immediately insurrectionary situation in the whole country, and to this he added the clearly Trotskyist thesis that once the revolution achieved some success, once a revolutionary regime had been set up, this signified the immediate transition of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, without a break, into the proletarian revolution.

This was the political line advanced by Li Li-san. What were its errors, dangers, harmfulness?

1. Comrade Li Li-san ignored one of the most important features of the present revolutionary surge in China—the unevenness of the development of the revolutionary movement in the country. The scope, level, degree of consciousness and organization of the workers' movement varies widely in different parts of the country. . . .

2. The views of Li Li-san, in opposition to the ECCI analysis, entirely overlook the fact that the peasant movement has far outpaced, in speed and scope, the movement of the industrial workers. This is not an invention. The workers' struggle has already spread to the most remote, most backward parts of the country, but it must be remembered that as a whole it lags behind the peasant movement even in the decisive industrial centres. . . . Even in Shanghai and Wuhan the spontaneous strike struggle is developing slowly; our party was unable to become organizer and leader of powerful economic and political strikes; in the May and August actions in Shanghai and Wuhan only the vanguard of the vanguard took part; the proletariat was poorly organized. . . .

3. A Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Chinese situation should take into account the immense role of imperialism in China. The most important industrial—and therefore proletarian—centres are not only exposed to the direct and immediate blows of imperialist intervention; the imperialists exercise direct military and political control of the most important industrial, commercial, and administrative centres. Translating this into concrete terms, it means that when Comrade Li Li-san proposed an armed rising in Wuhan, the CCP had 200 members in Wuhan, the red trade unions 150 members, and every subsequent action in Wuhan revealed how poorly organized and how unprepared was the proletariat, whereas the imperialists, according to reliable data, disposed of forces equal to ten European divisions. Nor was the position in Shanghai any better, not to mention the fact that the KMT counter-revolution also disposed of certain armed forces, not yet in a state of disintegration. In these conditions an armed rising would have subjected the flower of the Chinese proletariat to direct imperialist attack, would have bled white the working class of the decisive industrial centres for the approaching big battles, bled white the Red Army and thrown our movement back.

The road of armed rising is taken. The creation of a Soviet Government means that the CCP sets out on armed risings in the big industrial centres. But to organize a rising without taking the concrete situation into account, without analysing the relation of forces in the big industrial centres at a time when the balance of forces favours the class enemy is not Leninism but putschism. . . .

4. Every communist must soberly weigh the strengths and weaknesses of the Soviet movement in China. There is not yet a real Soviet Government in China, and in so far as it does exist, it does so only in manifestos, on paper, but not as a real government, as organizer and leader of insurgent masses. The Soviet areas are not yet organized. Soviet power is not consolidated. Even in the Soviet districts the agrarian revolution has not been carried through in the sense of accomplishing the most important tasks. . . . We can say that in actual fact, in the bolshevik sense, the fulfilment of these tasks has not even been approached. And in such circumstances real Soviets cannot be created, the middle peasant cannot be detached from kulak influence, no firm and strong alliance with the middle peasant can be established. There is not even a new machinery of government; in many places the Soviets are not elected. Side by side with these weaknesses, we find premature and mistaken attempts to create collective and State farms, to introduce a planned economy, to establish monopolies, to regulate economic life where such regulation is not called for by military needs. The first conference of Soviets adopted a provisional agrarian code which at bottom represents incorrect decisions on a number of questions. It is not true that equal distribution should be applied only for confiscated landlord estates. It is not true that large farms should not be split up but turned into state farms. It is not true that the holdings shared out among agricultural labourers should be united into collective farms at this stage. It is incorrect, and extremely harmful, that Red Army soldiers should receive land only after the establishment of Soviet power in China as a whole. The published programme of the Soviet Government has a clearly Trotskyist spirit. The reports of this programme that we have received show that the Soviet Government has set itself the aim of the immediate introduction of socialism, instead of creating a strong Soviet Government, strong Soviet authority, instead of concentrating on organizing and consolidating the territorial basis of the revolution, uniting the Soviet areas, reinforcing the successes already won, carrying through a real middle and poor peasant agrarian revolution, organizing the rear and tightening up the reserves. Comrade Li Li-san devoted not a thought to these fundamentally important tasks.

5. We will not go into detail about the monstrous exaggeration of the armed forces of the revolution permitted by Comrade Li Li-san (5 million workers, 30 million peasants, a workers' guard in every town, 5 million members of the young guard, etc). But it must be pointed out that he simply does not understand that we have not yet got a real workers' and peasants' Red Army, with an officers' corps composed of workers built around a strong party frame. The Red Army has had great successes, and the entire world proletariat admires its heroic deeds. But it is still weak, inadequately organized, and not sufficiently in the hands of the CCP. . .

For these reasons the capture of large cities, frontal attacks on the imperialist armies, advances on large centres, are still beyond the powers of the Red Army. Experience has shown that the capture of Changsha and the assault on Hankow demanded greater strength than the Red Army possesses. . . .

The ECCI thought and still thinks that this line is non-Marxist and non-Leninist, and it condemned and rejected it. It leads to passivity, to defeats, and might lead to dangerous adventures. Against this line there is the line of the ECCI, worked out jointly with the delegation of the CC of the CCP. The ECCI considers the central, practical tasks of the CCP, tasks whose immediate fulfilment is demanded by the entire situation, to be the following:

1. The immediate formation of a real workers' and peasants' Red Army, consisting for a start of 40,000–50,000 men; it should be by social composition a workers' and peasants' army, with its officers' corps made up of workers, with a strong communist framework, and at the top the best and most reliable leaders, with iron discipline. This army, wholly and completely in the hands of the CCP, should have a strong physical base in one or several Soviet areas, which should also serve as the territorial basis of the revolution. . . .

2. The immediate creation of a strong and capable Soviet Government with a communist majority, drawing in the most outstanding non-party workers, peasants, and Red Army soldiers. . . . It should draw up and announce its programme of anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, start on the carrying out of its programme, and show the working masses in practice that the Soviet Government can build a new life for them without the imperialists and landlords. . . .

3. Real revolutionary mass work, organizing in bolshevik fashion the masses in the Soviet areas, developing the economic and political mass struggle, and organizing the masses in the course of that struggle, in the non-Soviet areas. The CCP must grasp that every economic struggle, every strike, every mass action in the non-Soviet areas is not only a step in the organization of the masses, and hence a step on the road of armed insurrection, but is also of direct and immediate help to the Soviet areas. To neglect the daily needs and demands of the workers and peasants is objectively to serve the imperialists and the Kuomintang. . . .

At the same time the ECCI thinks it not only permissible, but even necessary, to manoeuvre in regard to the imperialists. We warn the party that illusions in regard to so-called coexistence with imperialism are harmful and dangerous. But at the same time we must do everything we can to exploit the contradictions between the imperialists in order to weaken the bloc of the imperialists and Chinese counter-revolutionaries, to avoid head-on collisions until we are stronger, to postpone the decisive

battle with imperialism. At the same time the CCP must step up its struggle against imperialist intervention, mobilize and educate the workers and peasants, make the peasants understand the national task of fighting imperialism.

These are the basic features of the ECCI political line, worked out in full agreement with the CC/CCP delegation.

Only those who have nothing in common with bolshevism can interpret this line as a retreat. In following this line the CCP will not retreat, but advance. . . . The road of insurrection is taken. The insurrection must be prepared, organized with bolshevik determination and consistency. . . .

The ECCI notes with satisfaction that the politbureau and, we hope, the entire party have accepted this line, and rejected the fundamentally different Li Li-san line. . . . The ECCI thinks that a discussion of these questions at the present time would paralyse the party's work and divert its forces from the decisive tasks of the revolution. But it is essential to explain clearly to all active party members, using bolshevik self-criticism, the substance of the two political lines, to explain the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist character of Comrade Li Li-san's position, and to rally the members around the correct bolshevik policy.

This is the more necessary since some dangerous notes were sounded in Comrade Li Li-san's speeches. He allowed himself to play with the outworn theory of all right and 'left' renegades from communism that the Comintern is ill-informed, that China has a special position, that the Comintern does not understand the trend of the Chinese revolution. He was bold enough to oppose loyalty to the Comintern to loyalty to the Chinese revolution . . . saying that after the capture of Hankow it would be possible to take a different tone with the Comintern. . . .

The ECCI is convinced that all members of the CCP will decisively reject this anti-Comintern attitude, that all Chinese bolsheviks will rally as one man around the ECCI policy.

EXTRACTS FROM A CIRCULAR LETTER ON FACTORY CELLS OF THE
ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT OF THE ECCI ENDORSED BY THE
POLITICAL SECRETARIAT

December 1930

Inprekorr, x, 109, p. 2693; 110,
p. 2717; 111-12, p. 2764, 19,
23, & 30 *December 1930*

[In *Communists in Action* Piatnitsky had complained that 'so far party reorganization on the basis of factory nuclei has not been carried out in any of the sections of the Comintern'. At best, they included 20 per cent of the communists working in factories. To remedy this situation, and to improve trade union work,

were two of the seven tasks confronting communist parties. (The other five were to investigate the causes of their loss of ground, to fight the dangers from left and right within the parties, to wage a systematic campaign against social-democracy and reformism, to build the united front from below, and to pay more attention to party structure, since political could not be separated from organizational questions.) In the summer of 1930 the ECCI convened a conference of representatives of seven communist parties (Germany, France, Britain, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Sweden, Switzerland) to discuss agitation and propaganda. The chief weaknesses in their work were said to be their inadequate use of material about capitalist crises and Soviet progress, a low theoretical level, a failure to link their political agitation with the economic crisis and unemployment, and an inadequate explanation of the need to fight on two fronts. Progress had been shown in the bolshevization of the press, in better publications, in the success of the Lenin School, and in the better ideological preparation of campaigns.

The earlier part of the letter referred to directives issued in February 1930 on expanding agitation and propaganda to ensure that the forms and methods of work fitted the task of communist leadership of mass industrial action. All parties without exception must improve and strengthen their factory-cell organization; the KPD attributed its electoral success in part to the establishment of 188 new factory cells.

The fifth RILU congress was held in Moscow in the latter half of August 1930. The number of countries represented is given as 55 in one source, 60 in another. In his opening speech Lozovsky said it was 'the policy of the entire reformist trade union leadership to break off any and every struggle and to enslave the working class'. This they did very subtly in order not to lose the loyalty of their members; sometimes they called strikes in agreement with the employers. The resolution adopted said the congress marked 'a turning point in the strategy and tactics of the RILU in western Europe'. The congress ratified 'the decision of the revolutionary trade union opposition in Germany and Poland to drop the slogan of "into the reformist unions"'. 'Parallel red unions' were to be established wherever the situation warranted this step, in preparation for taking over the leadership of the class struggle. There was growing antagonism between the reformist leaders and the masses; revolutionary unions were the 'best weapon' for the complete defeat of Amsterdam, 'the most dangerous enemy of the working class'. Where there were no RILU unions, the trade union opposition had to be strengthened. 'RILU adherents must take steps to create opposition groups in the factories, and to strengthen the local and central organization of the revolutionary trade union opposition.' The splitting policy of the social-fascist trade union leaders had to be vigorously combated, but this did not run counter to the need to build independent unions; for revolutionaries to dispute this need was tantamount to a renunciation of revolutionary work in the trade union movement, an abandonment of the most exploited sections of the working class. The congress also 'welcomed the decision of the Soviet trade unions to establish an international school for the trade union movement'.

An article in the *Communist International* shortly before the RILU congress

opened argued that the old idea of a labour aristocracy was no longer valid; the capitalists could no longer afford to bribe large numbers, the few 'labour aristocrats' did not work in industry, but in government and social-fascist organizations, where they 'deceived and terrorized' the masses. However, the results of the factory-committee elections in Germany showed that these masses were not yet disillusioned about the reformist unions, whose influence could be countered and eliminated by independent revolutionary leadership of the industrial struggle. Revolutionary unions would bring in the unorganized and the unemployed, and include representatives of factory committees. 'No Leninist considers it necessary to establish new trade unions "just for the sake of a split", but no communist can declare—as Brandler, Walcher & Co. do—that the establishment of revolutionary trade unions is a violation of unity, once there is no longer any possibility of carrying on revolutionary mass work in the reformist unions.'

The establishment of communist-controlled unions had long been urged by Lozovsky. At the sixteenth CPSU congress he argued that there was far too much 'trade union legalism' in the American, British, German, and other communist parties; they submitted to trade union discipline in preference to party discipline and independent leadership. The old opportunist leadership of the Russian unions, he said, had sabotaged the RILU, interpreting the united front as fraternization with Amsterdam, and not as a revolutionary tactic to expose the IFTU leaders. A year earlier, in the trade union commission of the ECCI (February 1929), Piatnitsky had been extremely critical of the CGTU and the communist unions of Czechoslovakia (where some members, he said, had acted as strikebreakers). The time might come when it would be necessary to split the German unions; the harder they worked in the reformist unions now, the better their chances later. Lozovsky said there was no problem about organizing the unorganized and the unemployed where there were red unions; where there were no revolutionary unions, there was a good deal of opposition by communists to bringing the unorganized into the reformist unions because it would strengthen them; how could they urge them to go into unions whose leaders they had accused of strike-breaking? There had been much opposition in the KPD to running their own independent list of candidates for factory-committee elections.

At the tenth plenum Lozovsky answered Gusev's objections to the formation of new unions; these were a necessary outcome of the decisions of the ninth plenum and the fourth RILU congress; the situation for them was favourable in Poland and the United States.

Writing about the fifth RILU congress at the beginning of 1933, Martynov explained the declining influence of the RILU at the time to isolation from the masses, failure to work for concrete partial demands, and 'unprincipled blocs' with the reformists.]

In all communist parties, including even the strongest such as the KPD, the most serious shortcomings in factory-cell work are the following:

1. There are very few factory cells. . . .
2. The majority of existing factory cells are concentrated in small-scale

plants. There are very few in large plants, and these are as a rule numerically weak and politically with little influence.

3. Existing factory cells are as a rule not active enough and have no contact with the daily life of the factories.

4. Among the workers who are party members there is a strong tendency to evade factory-cell work, and consequently not all of them belong to the factory cell. The Czechoslovak CP, for example, stated that on 1 July 1930 57 per cent of its members were industrial workers, but only 14 per cent were organized in factory cells.

5. The factory cells as a rule have no ties with the communist fractions in the corresponding trade union.

6. The work of the factory cells is very bad, and frequently completely disconnected from the work of the party as a whole, in consequence of the inadequate attention paid to factory-cell work by the leading party bodies.

To change this state of affairs, to transform the factory cells into the real basic organizations of the communist party, all these shortcomings must be eliminated. . . . In the big political campaigns conducted by the party the factory cells as a rule take only a very minor part, sometimes none at all. Usually political campaigns are run in the old way, repeatedly condemned by the Communist International, inherited from the social-democratic parties—general agitation, popular meetings, participation by members in their home area but not where they work; the driving forces in the campaign are still the central party press and agitators sent out by the party centre. . . . It is said that the weakness of the factory cells makes it impossible to organize campaigns around them. . . . This means that in practice nothing is done to reorganize the party on a factory-cell basis, and that the party is not in a position to bring our slogans to the masses of workers and to expose the treacherous and counter-revolutionary work of the social-democrats, the reformists, and the fascists. . . .

The central committees of the communist parties must take every measure to see that the entire system of party leadership must be turned to face the factories. Above all the entire party press must be recast for this purpose. . . . Articles must be written in simple language, so that the average workman, including the non-political workman, still unaccustomed to specific political expressions and formulations, can understand them. . . . In addition to articles of a general character, party newspapers must carry a great many letters from different districts and factories. Some intensive work must be done to create a network of worker correspondents, and to organize groups of worker correspondents in all factories; others as well as party members should be drawn into these groups—sympathetic workers belonging to no party, revolutionary social-democratic workers and members of reformist unions. Groups of ‘friends

of the party press' should also be set up, on the lines of the 'Friends of *L'Humanité*' groups in France. . . .

What has been said here about the party newspapers applies completely, though in another form, to the party committees, particularly those which are directly responsible for work in the factories. Factory cells can grow stronger and become the decisive party units only if the party committees which guide their work give them constant daily help. . . . Instead of the present bureaucratic contact, maintained by circulars, the party committees must establish direct and lively contact with the factories and factory cells. . . .

Members of communist trade union fractions must maintain the closest contact with the appropriate party committee and keep it regularly informed about what is happening in the factories and about the sentiments of trade union members. . . .

One of the greatest difficulties in reorganizing the party on the basis of factory cells is presented by the problem of how to form cells in factories where there are no party members, or where there are at most only one or two. . . .

The first step is to find out, from the fractions in the mass organizations (Young Communist League, trade union, Red Aid, sports organizations, delegate meetings) whether there are in these organizations members who are in the communist party or who sympathize with it. If no party members can be found by this means, the fractions in the mass organizations should be asked to suggest the names of sympathizing workers, through whom or with whose help the foundation can be laid for forming a factory cell. . . . It may be necessary to this end, in particular cases, to raise the question whether to direct some party members to seek work in a particular factory.

These methods might be employed with particular advantage on agricultural plantations, sugar-beet farms, potato distilleries, etc., which are usually remote from industrial centres and employ the more backward sections of the proletariat and semi-proletariat.

Help in forming factory cells should be given by the street cells in the neighbourhood of the factory concerned. The street-cell members should make contact with the factory workers, wait for them when they leave the factory, or catch them on their way to work, make their acquaintance in the local public-houses, or call on them in their homes. . . .

Once contact has been established, by these or other means, with three to five workers in the factory, they must be immediately organized into a factory cell. However weak numerically the cell may be, it must at once set energetically about establishing further contacts and recruiting new members into the ranks of the communist party, and do its best to establish connexions with departments of the factory where there are not yet

party members. The party committee must pay most careful attention to this work and must give unceasing help to the comrades in correcting their mistakes and if necessary sending in some officials to help them in their work. . . .

The primary link in the party factory cell is the shop cell. Some comrades believe that shop cells can be organized only in parties with strong and numerous factory cells. That is not correct. Party work in the factory always begins in the shop. A party member cannot be active in the factory as a whole, but only in one shift in one shop. . . . He must first find out all about the workers in his shift, whether there are any party members or sympathizers there . . . and with them create the core of the workshop party cell. With this basis established, they must ascertain the political colouring of their workmates, which of them are members of reformist unions, of the social-democratic party, of fascist organizations, etc. This knowledge is absolutely essential for every party member. When they are doing their party work in the shop, party members must first of all, naturally, establish contact with revolutionary-minded non-party workers, and also try to approach revolutionary-minded members of reformist unions and of the social-democratic party, and also individual fascist workers. . . .

In all capitalist countries the factory cell can operate only as a conspirative organization. Consequently its work, and the work of each member, must be conducted in such a way that the various police agents in the factory should as far as possible be unable to find out which of the workers are communists, and should in no case learn about the practical work done by the communist party, about its political propaganda and agitation among the factory workers, and the organizational consolidation of its influence in the factory. In its work, therefore, the factory cell must strictly observe the primary conspirative rules. This applies both to illegal and to legal communist parties. In countries where the communist party is illegal the maintenance of contact between the cell and the party committee is a complicated matter. It requires (in addition to the creation of a solid illegal apparatus and a particularly solid machinery of illegal contacts), the thorough utilization of all legal and semi-legal possibilities, in the first place the utilization of the party fractions in the legal and semi-legal mass organizations, municipal councils, etc. But even in countries where the communist party is legal, the party committees which guide the factory cells in their work must instruct the cell members in the rules of conspirative work. Examples of such rules are: (1) At meetings of the cell and in discussions of party affairs, and most particularly in drawing up minutes of proceedings and other documents, cell members must not use their correct names but make use of cover names. (2) As a rule party affairs must never be discussed in the presence of unknown persons,

certainly not in the presence of those of whom there is some reason to suspect that they have connexions with the police. (3) As a rule party meetings and discussions should not be held in the presence of others. Therefore meeting places should be chosen which give the best guarantee that party questions can be discussed without risk of being overheard by outsiders. It follows that as a rule factory-cell meetings should be held not in the factory itself, although this should not change the character of its work as connecting link between the party and the workers in that factory. (4) Every member must carefully avoid bringing with him to the meeting party documents which would reveal, if the meeting were broken up, that it is a communist meeting. (5) In general party members working in a factory should not unnecessarily reveal to everybody that they are communist party members.

When instructing the cells in conspirative methods, party committees must at the same time explain that these rules should in no circumstances be applied in a way that cuts the cell off from the masses in the factory; that, while adopting conspiratorial methods in regard to the police and their agents, they must always make the workers aware of their existence, employing such means as leaflets and factory news-sheets, holding meetings, etc. The most important duty of a factory cell is to react immediately to every event in the factory and in the country, to issue appropriate slogans in the name of the party for organizing and conducting the struggle for working-class interests. . . . If conditions make it necessary (e.g. when there is great excitement among the workers because of a mine disaster), the cell must instruct the most active members to come out openly before the workers in the name of the party, without regard to the risk, to the possibility of arrest or dismissal. . . .

In assigning duties to factory-cell members, provision must be made for work among juvenile and women workers. . . . In its day-to-day work the cell must rely on the various legal and semi-legal auxiliary organizations—trade unions, educational and sports associations, etc. Of these the trade unions are the most important, as the body in which the factory cell connects with the broad working masses of the factory. If the factory cell is to be able to get support from the trade unionists in the factory, the trade union itself must be reorganized according to its members' place of work, as outlined in the decisions of the fifth RILU congress. Party factory cells must take the initiative in getting this reorganization put through by the party members in the union. Within the factory trade union group, the factory cell must serve as an organizing centre. Using the trade union group as its point of departure, the party cell can extend its influence over the backward workers, win them for the struggle for immediate demands, and in the course of that struggle explain the general policy and aims of the revolutionary trade union movement and of the communist party.

If the workers become discontented with the way things are run in the factory, with the employers' attacks on wages, with the action of the bourgeois Government, the treachery of the social-democrats, etc., the party cell must take the initiative in establishing appropriate fighting bodies—to prepare for a strike, a fight against a lockout, organizing demonstrations, etc. . . . The cell's most powerful instrument, both for spreading the party's slogans among the workers in the factory and for mobilizing the masses behind them, is the factory news-sheet. Its importance is seriously underestimated in many communist parties. They are still poorly distributed, and in many cases, even where a factory cell has long been in existence, there is no news-sheet. . . . Factory news-sheets must be put out by the factory-cell members, and not by the party committee, which is what often happens now in a number of cases in all parties. The committees must, however, give careful and continuous guidance to the cells in regard to the news-sheets, and for this purpose assign to the cells politically capable members with literary ability. The party committees must keep the contents of the news-sheets under constant review and arrange discussions about it . . . so that by means of self-criticism the news-sheets can be improved. . . .

Red factory committees and revolutionary shop stewards can be of the utmost assistance to the factory cell in its work. The attention of the party factory news-sheet must be concentrated on the question of winning over the factory committees and consolidating their influence when won. . . .

The party cells must give particular attention to activities among social-democratic workers and members of reformist trade unions. This is of special importance at the present time because the treacherous social-fascist role of the leaders of the Social-Democratic and Amsterdam Internationals is being more and more clearly recognized by broad sections of the working class, who are consequently turning away in increasing numbers from their reactionary leaders. . . . One of the most important tasks of the fight against social-democratic and reformist influence in the factory is to expose those in the factory who are the vehicles of that influence. All those who directly carry the influence of social-fascism into the factory, all the social-democratic and reformist officials, must be kept under constant and sharp fire in the factory cell's day-to-day propaganda, through the party's fractions in those organizations, and particularly in the columns of the factory paper. . . . At the same time the cell must keep track of the growth of discontent among the members of the social-democratic party and reformist unions with the policy of their leaders, establish close contacts with these discontented elements, and draw them into various activities in defence of immediate working-class interests on the basis of the united front from below. . . . The chief job of the factory cells in regard to such workers is not to criticize them because they have not yet

broken completely with their leaders, but to find a common language with them on those questions on which they are already prepared to break, in order to draw them through these questions into the struggle for immediate demands and in the course of that struggle to widen the breach between them and their reactionary leaders and in the end to detach them from those leaders.

THE ELEVENTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE ECCI

[The eleventh ECCI plenum met from 25 March to 13 April 1931. There were 180 delegates (50 with voting powers) representing 25 countries. An article in the *Communist International* in May said its task had been to overcome any backwardness in the subjective factor at a time when objective conditions were very favourable to the revolutionary movement. There were two items on the agenda: the tasks of Comintern sections in connexion with the deepening of the economic crisis (introduced by Manuilsky, Thaelmann, Lenski, and Chemo-danov); and the growing danger of military intervention in the USSR (introduced by Cachin). The first item covered, *inter alia*, the nature of fascism and social-fascism as manifestations of social support for the bourgeois dictatorship. 'It has been said that our chief enemy is fascism. Such a view contains within itself great danger, because it bolsters up social-democracy, which tries to justify all its vileness and all the vileness of the bourgeois-democratic government by the fact that it is, they say, "the lesser evil". . . . Comrade Thaelmann showed plainly that social-democracy can most successfully play the role of fascists, not to mention that it clears the way for fascism by its whole policy. . . . The social democratic leaders are the conscious enemies of the working class, the conscious agents of an alien class.'

In July Kuusinen wrote that, except for the KPD, nothing had been done to put the resolutions of the eleventh plenum into effect. In the following March the *Communist International* published a long review on the same question: the execution of the decisions of the plenum was very unsatisfactory. The sections failed to grasp the imminence of the danger of armed intervention in Russia; their press did not give a bolshevik explanation of Soviet progress (one communist meeting in Paris had objected to the introduction of piece work in the USSR: it did not understand that piece work was different under socialism); some parties appeared to believe in the possibility of state capitalism developing into socialism; the fight against the left social-fascists was not being waged vigorously enough. These opportunist mistakes were made because the parties were not Leninist enough. 'In the CPSU the basic cadres of party workers, particularly the party writers, in solving this or that political question, check up first of all whether anything has been said by Lenin and Stalin on this question . . . study the fundamentals of Leninism which have been masterfully expanded and splendidly applied under the modern conditions of the world revolutionary movement by Comrade Stalin. . . . Since Lenin's death the best interpreter of Lenin and the best successor of his work who best applies his principles in the modern conditions is Comrade Stalin. He who does not carefully study everything said and written by Comrade Stalin, everything said and

written by Comrade Lenin, cannot but deviate from the correct Marxian road, cannot but deviate from the general line of the Comintern.'

The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress (1935) said that the eleventh plenum met at a time when the conditions for a revolutionary crisis were maturing in a number of countries, when the danger of war on the USSR was increasing, and social-democracy was clearing the road for fascism. The chief question at the plenum was how to organize the fight against fascist aggression, the social-democratic policy of the lesser evil, and the preparations for imperialist war. It showed that social-democracy was 'acting as a leading detachment of world imperialism, preparing war against the Soviet Union'.

On 17-18 September 1929, the West European Bureau of the ECCI had convened a conference of central European communist parties, attended also by representatives of the RILU and YCI, to discuss the fascist danger in Austria and to protest against the dictatorship in Yugoslavia. A statement by the Balkan Communist Federation in September 1930 on a conference of (unofficial) representatives of Balkan countries to discuss a proposal for the creation of a Balkan Union, to be held in the following month, described it as a conference of 'imperialists, executioners, and exploiters, jointly with the English and French imperialists', to prepare for war, primarily against the Soviet Union, and to organize the attack on revolutionary movements in the Balkans. The Federation was consistently hostile to any form of collaboration between the Balkan governments, encouraged national minority movements, and opposed the 'Little Entente'. The Balkan Pact of 1934 was denounced as 'an episode in the feverish regrouping of imperialist forces throughout the capitalist world' in preparation for war.

The financial report for 1929 and 1930 showed an income (given in dollars) of \$838,000 and \$1,096,000, of which members' dues accounted for \$676,000 (46 sections, 2 million members), and \$956,000 (49 sections, 2.5 million members); the chief expenditure items were administration, \$323,000 and \$321,000, publishing and educational \$436,000 and \$641,000. The plenum admitted to the Comintern the communist parties of Indochina, Iceland (founded in November 1930), and Cyprus. The CP of Indochina, founded in 1930, superseded the former party (called the Association of Revolutionary Youth), which had split at its conference in Hong Kong in May 1929, both parts claiming the title of communist party.

In November 1931 an article in the *Communist International* said that 'the biggest regroupings' in the communist parties began after the adoption of new tactics by the sixth Comintern congress. 'As a result of these regroupings, during the period between the tenth and eleventh plenums of the ECCI (approximately during the course of two years), seven members of the ECCI have been excluded for opportunist deviations from the line of the Comintern and for breaches of party discipline; moreover, the leadership in twelve communist parties has been completely changed.'

The May Day manifesto repeated, more briefly, the main themes of the plenum resolutions.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE ELEVENTH ECCI PLENUM ON
THE TASKS OF THE COMINTERN SECTIONS IN CONNEXION WITH
THE DEEPENING OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE DEVELOP-
MENT OF THE CONDITIONS MAKING FOR A REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS
IN A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES

April 1931

Inprekorr, xi, 38, p. 946, 24 *April 1931*

[In his opening speech Manuilsky spoke of the deepening capitalist crisis and the success of the Five Year Plan. The workers were becoming more radical, but the development of the revolutionary crisis was uneven; it was most rapid in India, China, Spain, and some Latin American countries. The chief obstacle to winning a working-class majority was social-democracy, which was trying to rescue capitalism by destroying working-class organizations and annulling their past achievements. Objective conditions justified a more rapid revolutionary advance, but the communist parties were lagging behind. The American, British, and French parties were the chief bottlenecks. The development of the crisis also depended on the rapid advance of the Soviet Union, which aggravated the contradictions of capitalism. The successes of the Comintern since the tenth plenum were given as the 'bolshevik unity' of the CPSU and other parties, the progress of the KPD, the rise of Soviets in China, the establishment of communist parties in India and Indochina, the expansion of communist influence over the masses and the greater militancy of the sections. The weaknesses of the sections were attributed to the solidarity of capitalist States, the strength of bourgeois organizations, the cramping effect of bourgeois democracy on the working class, the existence of strong social-democratic organizations, the use of fascist methods in suppressing the revolutionary movement, the failure of communist parties to keep pace with events, as shown in their underestimation of the degree of working-class radicalization, their incapacity to mobilize the masses on the basis of day-to-day demands, their failure to consolidate organizationally the political influence they had gained.

Manuilsky also referred to the capitulation of the CP of Finland to fascism in the summer of 1930. The KPD was commended for its 1930 programme, which linked social with national emancipation; this programme should serve as the pivot of its struggle. 'We must endorse in full the general line of the KPD.' Its central task was to win the majority of the working class by destroying the mass basis of social-democracy, and to win dominant influence over the petty-bourgeois masses of town and country. The tasks of the Chinese CP were to transform the Red Army into a regular Workers' and Peasants' Red Army with a solid territorial basis, to establish a Soviet Government which would carry through a programme of anti-imperialism and agrarian revolution in its own territories, and to promote the struggles of the workers and peasants in non-Soviet areas.

Since there was still great reluctance in many communist parties to treat the social-fascist thesis seriously, as well as great confusion about the nature of fascism, Manuilsky dealt with these questions at length: 'The fascist regime is not a new type of State; it is a form of the bourgeois dictatorship in the epoch of

imperialism. It grows organically out of bourgeois democracy. . . . Only a bourgeois liberal can accept that there is a contradiction between bourgeois democracy and a fascist regime, that these two political forms are different in principle; by constructing such a contradiction, social democracy is deliberately deceiving the masses.' The mistake made by, for example, Kostrzewa in Poland was to see such a difference of principle, or, in Finland and Austria, to deny the development of one into the other. The coup d'état method of establishing fascism, as in Italy and Poland, had 'an almost comic opera air', as a 'revolt' of the ruling class against the proletariat, which threatened capitalist society with revolution. But fascist dictatorships could also be established step by step, where social-democracy led the workers into retreat without a fight. Fascist theories of industrial peace, industrial democracy, etc., were taken straight from social-democracy and clothed in medieval garb. 'This common ideology is the best proof of the kinship of fascism and social-fascism.' It was 'incomprehensible to find in the communist press references to fascists as enemies of the existing regime. What regime? . . . Fascism is no enemy of bourgeois dictatorship.' Fascism could not be fought except as part of the fight against every form of bourgeois dictatorship; this meant in the first place 'the methodical exposure of social-democratic treachery', and secondly 'that only by decisive struggle against bourgeois dictatorship which appears in the form of bourgeois democracy can communists win victory in the fight against fascism'. In his concluding speech Manuilsky said that the appearance of fascism showed that the objective conditions for the transformation of society were present. 'Our definition does not place fascism in the position of a deciding factor of the revolutionary crisis, but allocates it the modest role of one of the symptoms of the disorientation of the ruling classes and of their endeavour to find a way out of the position by the suppression of the working class. . . . Fascism is not a new method of rule distinct from the whole system of bourgeois dictatorship. Whoever thinks that is a liberal.'

At the beginning of 1931 Varga wrote: 'The objective pre-conditions for a successful revolutionary struggle of the communist parties will be more favourable in 1931 than at any time since the first years after the war.' To be able to take advantage of this, the parties would have to 'conduct the sharpest struggle against the social-fascists who deny the necessity of revolution' and 'the fascists who betray the workers by means of pseudo-revolutionary demagogy'. It was decided that 25 February should be 'an international day of struggle against unemployment'. The statement issued by the LSI and IFTU, after their meeting in Zürich at the end of January, that wage reductions would only aggravate the economic crisis, was said in the *Communist International* to have been designed 'to mislead the proletariat. . . . The attempt to induce the workers to believe that an improvement in their position . . . is possible without the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat, without the abolition of the capitalist order . . . is treachery to the working class perpetrated in the interests of finance capital.' The demand for State expenditure on public works was equally treacherous, since it was utopian to expect the bourgeois State to spend money in this way, and such measures if adopted would intensify and not alleviate the crisis.

The results of the 25 February demonstrations were discussed by the RILU; the report published in the *Communist International* in May said that although unemployment had doubled since the previous year, the demonstrations in many countries were smaller. At the plenum Manuilsky said: 'The task of winning independent leadership of class struggles still requires a long time for complete fulfilment. . . . To accomplish this task requires the undermining of the mass basis of social-democracy, which has a solid basis in the reformist trade unions. The decision of a number of communist parties to set about organizing an independent revolutionary trade union movement is a decision of truly historical importance.' Lozovsky reported that the RTUO in Germany had 150,000 members, of whom about 50,000 were in independent trade unions, 30,000 were unemployed, and 70,000 in factory groups. He thought the chief reason for its slow development was that it appeared in public as the trade union department of the KPD; it did not have a non-party body of officials. Apart from the Russian unions, the CGTU was the biggest RILU section, but it had lost members in 1930 and was cut off from the masses. The minority in the CGTU had joined with the left wing in the CGT to work for fusion (Jouhaux, of the CGT minority, and Monatte, of the CGTU minority, had met with some of their supporters in Paris on 9 November 1930 and drawn up 'the manifesto of the twenty-two' on the restoration of trade union unity); what had the CGTU done to counteract this disruptive manoeuvre? 'It needed the intervention of the Comintern as well as the Profintern to remind our comrades of the fact well known to all that only the CGTU stands for trade union unity . . . and that our job is to seize the initiative from the hands of our opponents.'

Thaelmann's report pursued the theme that Germany was one of the weakest links in the chain of imperialist States; the economic crisis had shaken the political superstructure. The reason why the Nazis had not entered the Government after the September 1930 elections, and 'today scarcely have the prospect, in the foreseeable future, of becoming "Regierungsfähig" from the point of view of the bourgeoisie', was that the KPD had prevented them from penetrating the working-class masses. In essentials, the KPD had succeeded 'in bringing the advance of fascism to a halt, and in bringing about a certain stagnation, indeed the first beginnings of a decline, in the national-socialist movement'. The bourgeoisie still preferred the SPD to the NSDAP to support their fascist policy. Fascism and social-fascism were on one class front, but Merker and his followers were mistaken in thinking of them as identical. The defence detachments (Schufo) organized by the SPD were not intended to fight fascism, but to train the members for civil war against the revolutionary proletariat. The SPD had been gripped by panic at the results of the elections, but the KPD did not allow itself to be misled, although some members exaggerated the danger. At the twelfth ECCI plenum, in September 1932, Manuilsky said that the eleventh plenum 'had had to combat the underestimation of fascism', and the theory that it was no more than a product of capitalist decay, a movement to defend capitalism—these theories, he said, had been created by Heinz Neumann (who had in the meantime lost his position in the KPD).

In August 1931 the KPD supported the referendum initiated by the NSDAP against the social-democratic Prussian Government. The central committee

had at first decided to oppose the Nazi move, but were persuaded by the ECCI to reverse their position. In their campaign the referendum was called the 'Roter Volksentscheid' and working-class members of the NSDAP and SA were referred to as 'Schaffende Volksgenossen'.

On 24-25 July a conference in London of representatives of the central committees of the British, French, German, Polish, and Czechoslovak communist parties welcomed 'the decision of the KPD central committee to take part in the referendum against the social-fascist Government of Prussia'. 'The working and peasant masses in all countries must realize that the road to emancipation from capitalist bondage and imperialist slavery lies through the overthrow and annihilation of the Second International. To win the workers . . . who still follow treacherous social-democracy is the command of the hour for the revolutionary movement of Europe.' The English and French delegates published a protest against Versailles and their countries' policy towards Germany; the Polish and Czech delegates followed suit, and added a demand for self-determination for the Germans in Czechoslovakia and for the Ukrainian and White-Russian minority areas of Poland.

The result of the referendum (9.8 million votes for dissolution of the Landtag, out of an electorate of 26.4 million) was regarded as a victory for the KPD; all those who voted 'yes', under whatever misleading slogan, objectively strengthened the revolutionary front. *Pravda* wrote that it was a move forward by the German workers towards the forthcoming struggle under KPD leadership. One KPD writer said that an SPD Government confronting a proletariat that was confused and divided was a thousand times greater evil than an open fascist dictatorship confronted by a class-conscious, resolute, and united proletariat. Trotsky was bitterly critical of this attitude; in November, when the SPD made overtures to the KPD for a united front (which were rejected), Trotsky's approval of the move was described in the KPD press as 'Trotsky's fascist proposal for a KPD-SPD bloc'. This was 'a criminal idea'.

At the end of the year Thaelmann wrote of the opposition in the KPD to support of the referendum, on the ground that 'the Braun-Severing Government in Prussia was after all a "lesser evil" than a Hitler-Goebbels Government', that the tendency to make such distinctions 'is the most serious danger for the party'. 'How great this danger is', he went on, 'can be seen *inter alia* from the latest social-fascist manoeuvre, which "threatens" to make "a united front with the KPD". We must ask ourselves: Have we created all the conditions to enable us to counteract easily this new treachery, this misleading of the masses?' To say that Brüning was preferable to a Hitler-Hugenberg dictatorship was 'a despicable and treacherous betrayal', designed to discourage the masses from fighting the bourgeoisie.

Trotsky wrote that the KPD action would enter the textbooks of revolutionary strategy as an example of what not to do; within bourgeois-democratic Germany the proletariat had been able to establish its own proletarian democratic organizations, which it was the basic aim of fascism to destroy. 'The idea that the triumph of fascism will not introduce anything new is now being zealously propagated in all CI sections.' To say that they saw no difference between Brüning and Hitler meant that it did not matter whether working-class organi-

zations existed or not; it also meant the acceptance of defeat. To identify Brüning with Hitler meant to identify the situation before the struggle with the situation after defeat, that is, to admit that defeat was inevitable, to surrender without fighting.

In praising the flexibility of the KPD Piatnitsky said at the twelfth plenum: 'You know that the KPD leadership was opposed to participation in the referendum on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag. Some party newspapers had published editorial articles against participation. But after the central committee, in consultation with the Comintern, reached the conclusion that the party should take an active part in the referendum, our German comrades managed in a few days to get the whole party on its feet. Apart from the CPSU, no other party could have done that. It shows that the KPD knows how to manoeuvre.'

The *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress said the plebiscite marked a stage in the development of the KPD. Though devised by the fascists it acquired, thanks to communist participation, a wholly different character and became a weapon against fascism, but the sudden change in KPD tactics which this entailed, and the shortness of the period for preparing the campaign, made it difficult to explain the policy to the social-democratic workers.

The French CP continued to have difficulties with those of its members who rejected the idea that the socialists were 'social fascists'. In the *Communist International* in August 1930 Thorez wrote that the Comintern was justly critical of the party's organizational weakness (membership had dropped from 56,000 in 1926 to 39,000, and *L'Humanité's* circulation was falling), its attitude to the socialists, and its failure to apply the CI line. 'In several instances our comrades . . . have allowed the social democrats to establish contact with the workers' in areas where the socialist party had previously been inactive, instead of mobilizing the workers 'against this new social-democratic offensive'. In the fight against opportunist deviations they had expelled 'the clique of nationalist adventurers who had been contaminating the communist organizations of Alsace and Lorraine' and the 'decomposed politicians' on the Paris municipal council. The renegades had formed the Parti Ouvrier et Paysan (POP), which co-operated with the minority in the CGTU. Doriot had admitted his past opportunist errors but was maintaining a passive attitude.

At the CPF conference on 28 February 1931 Frachon proposed that the CGTU should call a national congress to discuss trade union unity; Vassart, a member of the political bureau, wanted top-level negotiations between the two federations, but received no support. At the plenum Thorez reported that since the previous plenum the CPF had had to get rid of its former general secretary and six of his colleagues, almost the entire CP fraction in the Paris municipal council, one parliamentary deputy, and a group of influential but corrupt trade union leaders who were now conducting a bitter struggle against the CPF in the CGTU.

The new Government which came into office in Finland in July 1929 arrested the communist deputies; this was described in *Inprekorr* as part of 'the old British plan of a firm block of anti-Soviet border States'. In August it published the first part of an article on the new government by Kuusinen; the second part

did not appear. The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress dealt with the subject: 'During the preparations for and the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, the CP of Finland did not manage either to get itself ready, or to mobilize the masses to put up any kind of serious resistance. This was a very serious error.' The call for a one-day general strike had been a failure. 'The confidence of the masses in the communist party and the left-wing trade unions, in their ability to lead the masses into struggle and to lead the struggle, was shattered.' The reason for the failure was the opportunist distortion of the party line in the period of relative capitalist stabilization. 'The most active opportunists in the party began to tread the renegade's path as early as the winter of 1929.' The entire leadership was responsible. The situation was examined at a party conference in the autumn of 1930, where 'with the help of the ECCI, and by means of pitiless self-criticism, the Finnish CP corrected its policy'. It had been 'able to put this change through only at the cost of a most embittered struggle'.

Towards the end of 1930 Dutt wrote that the revolutionary movement in India 'remained at the level of primitive and sporadic class struggle' because no communist party had yet been formed. In December a 'Draft programme of action for the CP of India' was published, setting the goals of national independence by the forcible overthrow of British rule and agrarian revolution. The greatest obstacle to success was the illusion among the Indian masses about the nature of the Indian National Congress, described as a class organization of the Indian bourgeoisie hostile to the interests of the masses. Even communists, said an article in the *Communist International* at the beginning of 1931, were confused about the Congress; its programme 'completely corresponds to the interests of British imperialism'. Nehru's position was 'insincere and false'. Writing on the Irwin-Gandhi truce agreement, Safarov referred to Nehru as 'the sly son of an even more sly father', and to Congress policy as 'openly mocking and betraying the struggling masses'. At the plenum Arnot said the truce 'marks the beginning of the end of illusions about Gandhi'; he represented the Indian capitalists and landowners; the agreement was 'only the culmination of his role as traitor. From the beginning he put himself at the head of the movement in order to throttle it.' The masses had now lost faith in him, while 'he sat proudly in his comfortable and extremely well-equipped prison'.

The CP of Spain at this time had a few hundred members and was said (in the seventh congress *Materials*) to have been taken completely by surprise by the fall of the monarchy in April 1931; it had paid no attention to the Catalanian and Basque nationalist movements. Péri, sent by the Comintern to Spain, wrote that 'eight days after the proclamation of the Republic the characteristic feature of the mood of the masses is the strength of their republican illusions'.

In February 1931 Riazanov, director of the Marx-Engels Institute, was expelled from the CPSU 'for treachery to the party' by giving support to the mensheviks and maintaining liaison between mensheviks in Russia and abroad. (He was not among the group of former mensheviks publicly tried and sentenced in March on charges of counter-revolution—a trial which evoked bitter protests from the leaders and parties of the Second International.) At the end of 1930 Humbert-Droz announced that he had abandoned all ideological opposi-

tion; Bukharin acknowledged his errors and stated his full agreement with the decisions of the sixteenth CPSU congress; Darsono (Indonesia), a candidate member of the ECCI, was expelled for having proposed co-operation with the 'national reformists' in Indonesia; he had argued that in the absence of a national bourgeoisie in that country there was no basis for reformism, and had re-asserted his views at the Frankfurt congress of the LAI. The LAI Executive met in Berlin at the end of May 1931; of the 46 persons present, 15 were from colonial countries. Communist hostility to 'national reformism' had led to the resignation of Maxton, Fimmen, Nehru, Hatta, and others who, Münzenberg said in his report, had 'shown themselves to be outright aides and agents of imperialism'. The meeting adopted a resolution condemning Nehru as 'a traitor to the cause of the emancipation of the Indian people from British imperialism who had joined the camp of counter-revolution'; he was expelled from the LAI. Münzenberg also reported that the League had extended its activities to cover oppressed peoples and national minorities in Europe, such as the White Russians and Ukrainians in Poland and the Germans in Czechoslovakia.]

1. THE CRISIS OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM: THE ADVANCE OF SOCIALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

The world economic crisis, which developed on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism and is the most severe crisis yet known, which has struck all capitalist countries and every important industry, and the gigantic expansion of socialist construction in the Soviet Union have brought out more clearly than ever before the contrast between the advancing socialist system and the decaying capitalist system. . . . This contrast, growing progressively sharper, is the main axis around which international relations today revolve, and affects the further development of contradictions within the imperialist world which have become particularly acute as a result of the crisis. . . .

The year that has passed since the session of the enlarged ECCI presidium in February 1930 witnessed the deepening of the crisis and revealed the inevitability of the decay of capitalism and the victorious advance of socialism. Capitalist stabilization is drawing to an end. In the Soviet Union the construction of the foundations of a socialist economy is being completed.

1. In capitalist countries the development of the industrial crisis is seen in (a) the steady decline of production; (b) the sharp reduction in consumption and the restriction of the home market because of the impoverishment of the masses; (c) a tremendous decline in foreign trade.

In the Soviet Union, where not only is there no crisis, but an advance, production is increasing at a rate never known in capitalist countries. The Five Year Plan of industrial construction is not only being fulfilled, but actually exceeded. . . .

5. In the Soviet Union the power of the working class means a firm policy of peace, the establishment of brotherly relations with all peoples, the consistent fight for complete disarmament, the alliance of the working people of all nations inhabiting the Soviet Union, the economic, political, and cultural progress of all nationalities formerly oppressed by tsarism, the expansion of the role of the country of proletarian dictatorship as the chief obstacle to imperialist war.

In the capitalist countries the robber character of the imperialist State, as the dictatorship of a handful of financial magnates, is expressed with particular force in the conditions of crisis in greater imperialist aggressiveness, in the efforts of the imperialists to extend their colonial possessions and 'spheres of influence', in the intensification of all forms of colonial slavery, in the attempt to transfer the main burdens of the crisis to the weaker countries and the oppressed peoples.

The crisis accentuates particularly sharply the chief contradiction in the capitalist world—the struggle between Britain and the United States for world hegemony, expressed both in the pressure of American imperialism on the British Dominions and in Britain's policy of imperial tariffs, as well as in the heightened scramble for 'spheres of influence' in Latin America and China. The crisis is releasing all the contradictions inherent in the Versailles system—between the victors and the vanquished, between the French imperialist clique, who are trying to maintain and strengthen their military and political hegemony in Europe, and the German bourgeoisie, who are meeting with growing resistance from the working masses in their attempt to execute the Young Plan. Rivalries among the victor countries are also growing more acute—between France and Italy in the Mediterranean and North Africa, and between the vassal States of the big imperialist robbers (the Balkans, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc.). . . .

The imperialist policy of bourgeois dictatorship, which makes all the contradictions of the world imperialist system more acute and creates danger centres for new conflicts, is leading inevitably to monstrous new imperialist wars. Although it will not in the least resolve the contradictions among the imperialists, this policy signifies feverish preparation for a war of intervention against the Soviet Union, the explicitly imperialist and counter-revolutionary war to subjugate the peoples of the Soviet Union and re-establish capitalism.

6. As the world economic crisis expands, the development of the class struggle confronts the broad working masses with the decisive choice: either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat; either economic and political slavery, or an end to capitalist exploitation and oppression; either the colonial yoke and imperialist war, or peace and brotherly relations among the peoples; either capitalist

anarchy and crises, or the socialist economic system which excludes anarchy and crisis.

The growth of contradictions between the capitalist and socialist worlds, between bourgeois and proletarian dictatorship, makes the danger of a war of intervention against the Soviet Union ever greater. . . . The same purpose of preparing an anti-Soviet war was and is served by the agrarian, 'disarmament', and Pan-European conferences, the anti-Soviet campaign against 'religious persecution' conducted by the Roman Pope and the leaders of other religions, the campaigns against Soviet 'dumping' and against 'forced labour' in the Soviet Union.

II. ACCENTUATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE, THE REVOLUTIONARY SURGE, THE GROWTH OF CONDITIONS OF REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS IN A NUMBER OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

1. . . . The recent growth of fascism was possible only because of the support given by international social-democracy since the war to the bourgeois dictatorship, whatever its form. Social-democracy, which, by fabricating a contradiction between the 'democratic' form of the bourgeois dictatorship and fascism, blunts the vigilance of the masses in the struggle against the rising wave of political reaction and against fascism, and which conceals the counter-revolutionary nature of bourgeois democracy as one form of bourgeois dictatorship, is the most active factor and pace-maker in the development of the capitalist State towards fascism.

The successful struggle against fascism requires the communist parties to mobilize the masses on the basis of the united front from below against all forms of the bourgeois dictatorship and against every one of its reactionary measures which clears the way for open fascist dictatorship. It requires the rapid and decisive correction of errors, which arise primarily from the liberal idea of a basic difference between fascism and bourgeois democracy, and between the parliamentary and the openly fascist forms of the bourgeois dictatorship; such ideas are a reflection of social-democratic influence in the communist parties.

2. Since the last meeting of the enlarged ECCI presidium the revolutionary surge has advanced further, in connexion with the sharp fall in the workers' living standards and the tremendous growth of unemployment; white-collar workers and the urban petty-bourgeoisie are being pushed to the wall, the peasants exploited to the hilt, the colonies impoverished. . . .

3. In *Germany* the bourgeoisie . . . supported outright by social-democracy, are moving more and more vigorously to establish a fascist dictatorship. . . . The development of conditions making for a revolutionary crisis can be seen in the growth of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat

(increase of 50 per cent in the communist party, expansion of the revolutionary mass organizations), in the shrinking mass basis of social-democracy, in the launching of a mass struggle against fascist dictatorship, in the success achieved by the programme of social and national emancipation in pushing back the fascist movement . . . in the increasing uncertainty of the ruling classes, as shown in the political regrouping of the bourgeoisie, in the growth of mass discontent with the yoke of Versailles and the Young Plan. . . .

In *Spain*, where the exploitation of the working class and the poverty of the peasant masses, falling into ruin because of the crisis, the church, and semi-feudal landownership, and suffering national oppression (Catalonia, the Basque country) have reached an unprecedented degree, the development of elements of a revolutionary crisis can be seen in the tremendous growth of economic and political strikes among the proletariat, in the beginnings of a revolutionary movement among the peasants, in the mass movement of the petty-bourgeoisie against the monarchy (student demonstrations, etc.), in the accentuation of the national-revolutionary movement in Catalonia and the Basque country, in the disintegration of the army, and in the disarray of the ruling classes and their parties.

In *China* the revolutionary crisis is reflected in the organizing of Soviets and a Red Army over a territory with a population of several tens of millions, which brings China into the very first place among national-revolutionary movements in the colonial world. The formation of Soviets and of a Red Army is a condition for the successful assertion of proletarian hegemony in the national-revolutionary movement, in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, a hegemony which is already anchored in the beginnings of a State authority. The Soviets, growing out of the agrarian revolution, and the Red Army, are rousing the workers of the industrial centres and the peasant masses, who witness what is happening in the Soviet areas, to struggle; they are liquidating the feudal property of the big landowners, dividing the land in the interests of the overwhelming peasant majority, and are shaking the counter-revolutionary hangman's regime of the Kuomintang more and more severely. . . .

In *India* the revolutionary mass movement against English imperialism is spreading wider and deeper . . . while signs can be observed that the national-reformist bourgeoisie are resorting to treacherous machinations and moving towards a counter-revolutionary alliance with English imperialism. Millions of workers, peasants, and the urban poor are breaking out of the confines of counter-revolutionary Gandhism, to free themselves from its influence and to move towards open forms of revolutionary struggle. . . . The most important prerequisite for the triumph of the Indian revolution is to establish proletarian leadership in the revolutionary liberation movement of the masses. . . . The working class must

organize the revolutionary offensive of the oppressed classes against English imperialism and against the National Congress, expand the workers' and peasants' movement, organize a strong all-Indian communist party and red mass trade unions and prepare the political general strike.

In *Indochina* the revolutionary surge, which is occurring in conditions of the most brutal terror, with mass shootings and the destruction of entire villages by the French occupation authorities, is characterized by the uninterrupted growth of the anti-imperialist movement among the working class, the peasantry, and the urban poor, which is largely under communist leadership. . . .

III. SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AS THE CHIEF SOCIAL PILLAR OF THE BOURGEOISIE

1. The world economic crisis has revealed most clearly the part played by international social-democracy as the chief social support of the bourgeois dictatorship. At every decisive stage in the development of the class struggle since the imperialist world war and the foundation of the proletarian dictatorship, social-democracy has stood on the side of capitalism against the working class. . . .

2. The entire course of social-democracy since the war and the rise of the Soviet Union has been an unbroken process of evolution towards fascism. . . .

3. The entire counter-revolutionary, anti-working-class policy of international social-democracy reaches its culmination in the preparation of a blockade and a war of intervention against the world's first proletarian State. The swing of the world bourgeoisie, who have lost hope of a capitalist degeneration in the Soviet Union, of a victory for the right-wing elements in the CPSU, to military intervention, the all-round offensive against capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, the rise of the revolutionary wave in capitalist countries—all this has strengthened the trend towards intervention and sabotage among all parties of the Second International (above all in German social-democracy, which is the heart of the Second International), because they realize that the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union will finally undermine their influence over the working masses in capitalist countries.

The trial of the 'Union Bureau' of the Russian mensheviks (social-democrats) . . . showed that the Second International, whose aim was to re-establish capitalism in the Soviet Union by a war of intervention, and which, through its counter-revolutionary branch in the Soviet Union, organized sabotage in all branches of the economy, tried to disrupt the system of food supplies for the workers and peasants, and deliberately set

out to reduce the real wages of the workers, has turned into assault troops for world imperialism preparing war on the Soviet Union. . . .

Hence the immediate and most urgent task of communist parties is to expose social-democracy and the Second International, to liberate the working masses from their influence, to isolate and subdue social-democracy, for unless they do so success for the proletariat in winning freedom from the capitalist yoke is impossible.

IV. THE STATE OF THE CI SECTIONS AND THEIR IMMEDIATE TASKS

1. The eleventh ECCI plenum notes with satisfaction a number of serious political and organizational achievements among the sections of the Communist International. Since the tenth ECCI plenum the right-wingers in the CPSU, whose views reflected the resistance of those elements in the Soviet Union bent on the restoration of capitalism and hostile to the socialist offensive, have been thoroughly defeated; the groups of right-wingers and conciliators in the communist parties of the capitalist countries, who reflected the pressure of capitalism on the offensive and of social-democracy, have also been defeated. . . .

The most important successes of the CI sections in the period under review are seen in:

(a) The formation of Soviets and of a Red Army in China; the leading role of the communist party in the peasant movement of China and Indochina;

(b) the growth of the political influence of a number of communist parties, the increase in the mass influence of the KPD in the revolutionary struggle against carrying through the fascist dictatorship (4.6 million votes at the elections) . . .

(c) the more and more important part taken by the communist parties in organizing defence against the capitalist offensive . . .

(d) the successful realization of the general line laid down by the fifth RILU congress on the formation of an independent revolutionary trade union movement in Germany . . .

2. As well as successes, the eleventh ECCI plenum has also to note a number of great weaknesses and deficiencies in the work of most Comintern sections, revealed primarily in their lagging behind the radicalization of the masses and in the inadequate exposure of social-democracy; these are particularly dangerous at the present higher stage of the class struggle. These defects are shown in:

(a) a rearguard policy in respect of a number of great revolutionary movements . . .

(b) backwardness in mobilizing the masses in defence of their daily demands . . .

(c) impermissible passivity in organizing defence against the fascist offensive . . .

(d) opportunist passivity in regard to work in the army, in the struggle against the danger of imperialist war and of an interventionist war against the Soviet Union . . .

(e) the wholly inadequate support of the revolutionary liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies by the communist parties of the imperialist countries . . .

(f) the opportunist or sectarian underestimation and neglect of the tremendously important work within reformist trade unions; inadequate work in factories . . .

(g) the general weakness of organizational work; a weakness in consolidating through organization the party's political influence . . .

(h) the mechanical application of general instructions; the failure to give them concrete form in relation to the particular country and to the state of the class struggle there . . .

3. The eleventh ECCI plenum, while approving without reservation the general line of the ECCI presidium and its efforts to eliminate the said weaknesses and defects in the work of the CI sections, thinks it necessary to concentrate the attention of the sections on the immediate tasks ahead. . . .

The chief task is to win the majority of the working class as the indispensable condition for victory over the bourgeoisie. . . . Success in this is closely bound up with strengthening the independent revolutionary trade union movement. . . .

The fight for the majority of the working class must be pursued along the following main lines:

1. Fight against the capitalist offensive and organization of a broad proletarian counter-offensive; against wage reductions and for wage increases, against mass dismissals and for the seven-hour day. . . .

2. Fight against the bourgeois dictatorship in all its forms; against terror by the police and the employers; for freedom for revolutionary labour organizations, press freedom, right of association, freedom of speech, the immediate dissolution of fascist organizations, their disarming and the arming of the workers for defence against fascist attacks, against imperialist terror in the colonies. . . .

3. Fight against imperialist war and war of intervention against the Soviet Union. . . .

The eleventh ECCI plenum, which emphasizes the inadequate work of the communist parties in the fight against the direct danger of a war of intervention, imposes on all Comintern sections the duty of conducting the most active struggle in defence of the Soviet Union, against imperialist war, and for peace, and of tirelessly exposing the scoundrelly pacifist

manoeuvres of the social-fascist Second International—the most active instigator and organizer of counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

In the preparation and organization of every form of revolutionary action, it is imperative to carry on a most stubborn, consistent, and comprehensive fight against the social-democratic reformist leaders, and to work persistently to win over the social-democratic workers and members of reformist trade unions, using the tactics of a united front from below.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE ELEVENTH ECCI
PLENUM ON THE DANGER OF A WAR OF INTERVENTION AGAINST
THE USSR

April 1931

Inprekorr, xi, 38, p. 953, 24 *April 1931*

[The resolution was introduced by Cachin, who explained that France had taken the lead in organizing anti-Soviet preparations because British imperialism was experiencing great difficulties. The war of 1914–18 had brought France great material benefits; it had large gold reserves which it wished to invest in a non-Soviet Russia, and so to gain outright possession of Donetz coal, Caucasian oil, and Russia's great natural resources. An article in the *Communist International* shortly before the plenum, entitled 'Preparation of transport for anti-Soviet intervention', stated that 'the construction of railways and highways, particularly in Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia', was designed 'for the development of war action against the USSR'; the writer appealed to communists to do more and better anti-war work in transport unions, the merchant service, and the armed forces.

Mr Legge was chairman of the United States Federal Farm Board, set up in 1929, which had been instructed by Congress to examine *inter alia* questions of overproduction and falling prices in wheat. The United States government bought up and stored surplus stocks, and recommended a reduction of wheat acreage.]

I. THE PREPARATION OF A WAR OF INTERVENTION

The danger of a war of intervention against the Soviet Union has become an urgent and immediate danger for the entire world proletariat. Relations between the capitalist and socialist worlds have entered a new historical phase. While the general capitalist crisis is becoming extremely acute, the Soviet proletariat, supported by the peasants on the collective farms, the poor peasantry in alliance with the middle peasants, and with the help of the revolutionary proletariat of the capitalist world, is completing the construction of the economic foundations of socialism in one-sixth of the earth. The Leninist policy of the CPSU and its central committee, the enthusiasm of the entire working class and of the broad masses

of the working peasantry in building socialism have finally destroyed the hopes of the capitalist world and the predictions of the Trotskyists about the transformation of the Soviet economy into a capitalist economy.

In these circumstances world imperialism is again raising the question of resolving the historical conflict between capitalism and socialism by war. The successes of the Five Year Plan . . . are in themselves a danger to capitalism. The rising living standards of the Soviet working people on the one side, and on the other the unprecedented sufferings, mass unemployment, poverty, and fascist oppression . . . reveal clearly the differences between the two world systems. . . . In the struggle between these two systems the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals stand decisively on the side of capitalism in its preparations for a war of intervention.

The French bourgeoisie—the chief organizers of the anti-Soviet war—have already established a number of political and military alliances to encircle the Soviet Union. . . . The same purpose of encircling the Soviet Union is served by the Pan-Europa plans and the coalition plans among the so-called agrarian States of South East Europe. The revision and supplementary provisions of the statutes and powers of the League of Nations are designed with the same object of openly organizing a crusade against the Soviet Union. . . . The coups of a fascist type in Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Finland, which can be traced back to the direct or indirect influence of French and English imperialism, are most closely linked with the preparations for war against the Soviet Union. . . . The date set for the beginning of military operations was 1930, at the latest 1931. These intervention plans received the active support of the influential imperialist Hoover group in the United States. Under cover of a committee to assist farmers, the Hoover group created a special organization, headed by Legge . . . which bought up stocks to the value of half a milliard dollars to meet the requirements of the intervention army's commissariat. The stocks were bought up in great haste, to meet the date set by French imperialism for the opening of the war of intervention against the Soviet Union, and held ready in the harbours of the Atlantic seaboard.

As part of the preparations, and as the introductory phase of the war, an economic war against the Soviet Union was organized. One campaign of slander succeeded another in methodical fashion: the campaign against the alleged kidnapping of General Kutepov, the campaign against alleged religious persecution, against so-called Russian dumping, and the most ridiculous and shameless campaign of all, the campaign of the exploiters of the capitalist wage slaves against free socialist labour on the pretext of fighting against so-called 'forced labour' in the Soviet Union. . . .

II. THE ROLE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN PREPARING A WAR OF INTERVENTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

In these criminal activities of organizing an economic blockade and preparing a war of intervention, the Second International and the social-democratic parties have taken a leading part and bear the complete responsibility. The 'socialist' and social-democratic parties, which took part in the earlier armed intervention against the Soviet Union, have finally turned into the most important instrument of preparation of blockade and counter-revolutionary war. . . .

The parties of social-fascism are sharing openly and directly in the policy of armaments, blockade, and intervention. The strongest party of the Second International, the German Social-Democratic Party, the accomplice of the German militarists in the robber peace of Brest-Litovsk, in the occupation and plundering of the Ukraine . . . is the most active of all German parties organizing the anti-Soviet front. The German social-democrats Breitscheid and Severing are the initiators and most active advocates of the policy of forming a bloc between imperialist Germany and the reactionary-militarist France of Poincaré, Tardieu, and Briand. . . .

French social-democracy is the champion of the most aggressive anti-Soviet policy of French imperialism. . . .

The Polish Socialist Party is now as before a sturdy support for Pilsudski's anti-Soviet militarism. . . .

The English Labour Party Government, which under mass working-class pressure was forced to give up its sabotage of the re-establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, is stubbornly carrying out British imperialism's policy, maintaining the closest relations with the French Government in organizing the encirclement of the Soviet Union. . . .

More zealously than any other party in the country, the Czech social-democrats support the military alliance with French imperialism. . . .

III. THE TASKS OF COMMUNISTS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST PREPARATIONS FOR A WAR OF INTERVENTION

If, despite feverish preparations by international imperialism and the parties of the Second International, war against the Soviet Union has not yet broken out, this is due both to the contradictions inside the imperialist camp, and in particular to the increasing readiness of the proletarian masses in the capitalist and colonial countries to defend the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, and to the consistent policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Government. . . . It is incontestable that the number of working people ready to give active and revolutionary support to the Soviet Union as their only fatherland is constantly growing, and

reaches far beyond the political sphere of influence of the communist parties. It is equally incontestable that the work of the Communist International is one of the most important factors in maintaining peace among the nations, in postponing the imperialist slaughter. . . .

Nevertheless it must be stated that the intensity of the struggle against the war danger, and particularly against the danger of a war of intervention, is far from corresponding with the tempo of imperialist war preparations against the Soviet Union. Agitation is not carried on methodically, but in fits and starts.

The eleventh plenum stresses most emphatically that it depends on the activities of the communist parties, on the activities of every individual communist, whether the sympathies for the working class of the Soviet Union held by the broad working masses, the working peasants, the oppressed nations of the capitalist countries are turned into active revolutionary struggle against the danger of war and intervention, or whether the capitalists will succeed in leading the working people once more into fratricidal war. It is the duty of every communist party and of every individual communist to expose social-democracy as the agency of the imperialist bourgeoisie in preparing a war of intervention against the working class of the Soviet Union, their false pacifism as an organic part of war preparations, and to tear the working masses away from social-democracy. . . .

The eleventh ECCI plenum directs the attention of all CI sections to the inadequacy of their work in popularizing Lenin's teaching on war, and especially the decisions of the sixth Comintern congress on the methods of struggle against the war danger and the danger of a war of intervention. The slogan of transforming imperialist war into civil war against one's own bourgeoisie must be popularized in word and writing on the widest scale. The slogan of transforming war against the workers of the Soviet Union into war against one's own bourgeoisie must become the most popular of all slogans for the millions of workers in capitalist countries.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDUM ON THE
TASKS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

26 August 1931

Strategiya i Taktika Komintern, p. 294

[Although the Comintern now began to pay greater attention than before to the Soviet areas of China, the hope of winning support from the urban workers was not abandoned. Mif wrote in July 1931 that the CCP must do its utmost to repair the weakness of its organization in the industrial centres. This was 'a problem of paramount importance'.

The first KMT 'extermination campaign' against the Soviet areas was

conducted in November 1930, and was followed by a second in April 1931. 'The defeat of the KMT armies', said an article in the *Communist International* in November 1931, 'is now possible only if the "right-leftist" line of Li Li-san, which prevents the alliance between workers and peasants and the leading role of the proletariat in the CP and the agrarian revolution, is decisively destroyed once and for all.' It was 'absolutely essential' to strengthen the leading role of the proletariat in the Soviet movement, to give 'a proletarian communist framework of commanding officers' to the Red Army, to organize Soviets in the towns in the Soviet areas. It was 'dangerous to look upon the Soviets in China as "peasant" soviets. . . . To sink the proletariat into the general mass of toilers, to belittle the role of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution, obviously contradicts the decision of the eleventh ECCI plenum that the "hegemony of the proletariat in China is already being consolidated in the beginnings of state power". . . . It is the Chinese proletariat which, through its party, is leading the fighting of the workers' and peasants' Red Army, leading the Soviets, and will without doubt have a majority in the central soviet government of China. It would be extremely dangerous for the Chinese communists to be satisfied with this alone and to weaken for one moment their stubborn fight to consolidate the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution.' (Commenting on Manuilsky's statement that the communist majority in the Government of the Soviet areas enabled the proletariat to exercise 'state hegemony over the peasantry', Trotsky wrote: 'Classes decide, and not parties'; Manuilsky's formula was not an explanation but a face-saving device to cover up the Comintern's retreat from its former position.)

The pressure of the KMT attacks and the economic blockade of the Soviet areas led to a more conciliatory attitude to merchants and to the richer peasants who maintained trade with the towns (which, even in the Soviet areas, were not held by the communist forces). One Soviet government official is reported to have said in 1933 that of the 3 million inhabitants of the central Soviet district, 2 million were oppressed by rich peasants and landlords, while the Soviets themselves had become instruments for oppressing the poor.

In February 1931 the CCP admitted that 'now there are no real red unions They have been wiped out. All work has been abandoned.' At the eleventh ECCI plenum Lozovsky sharply attacked the CCP's policy on the trade union question. The Chinese central committee, he said, believing the situation throughout China was revolutionary, thought unions were no longer necessary. 'It was decided to dissolve the trade unions and in their place committees of action were established which were in reality committees of inaction. This left deviation cost the Chinese trade union movement very dear. It was in any case in a very difficult situation because of the frightful terror, and this self-liquidation isolated our party even more from the masses.' He attributed the error to Li Li-san. It could be made good only by resolute concentration on the industrial struggle and on work in the KMT trade unions.]

THE PRESENT REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS IN CHINA

1. The eleventh ECCI plenum noted that China had entered a phase of revolutionary crisis. . . .

2. The revolutionary crisis in China signifies the bankruptcy of the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution, the complete incompatibility of imperialist rule with the most elementary needs of the overwhelming majority of the population. . . . The bankruptcy of KMT policy, its failure to honour its promises to stabilize the economy and unite the country by suppressing the revolution and reaching agreement with the imperialists . . . all this exacerbates the divisions in the camp of the counter-revolutionary landlords and bourgeoisie and hastens its disintegration. In this situation the masses are becoming increasingly aware that, without a revolution, without the overthrow of imperialism and the Kuomintang, without victory for the Soviets, there is not and cannot be a way out.

The KMT supplements its basic policy of direct suppression of the workers and peasants by outrageous terror with attempts to break up the revolutionary movement by using various manoeuvres (convening a national assembly, proposals for agrarian and labour legislation, demagogic gestures about taxation, empty declarations about abolishing extra-territoriality, etc.). The CCP should not underestimate the danger of these manoeuvres. It must expose them with the object of still further undermining the KMT regime.

3. The revolutionary movement in China is developing unevenly; while the Soviets have gained power in territory with a population of tens of millions, in the greater part of the country the revolutionary crisis has not brought the masses into direct struggle for the overthrow of the power of the KMT and the imperialists. The most important obstacle to the further expansion of the Soviet movement is the strength of international imperialism, acting in a united front against the national liberation movement of the Chinese people. . . . The foreign imperialists have occupied with their armed forces the most important proletarian centres in the country, fettering and suppressing jointly with the KMT the revolutionary energy of the fighting masses.

The braking effect of this factor is reinforced because of the weakness of party organizations in non-Soviet territory; as a result of this weakness the work of the CP in leading, organizing, and expanding the mass revolutionary struggle of workers and peasants in the non-Soviet areas has been inadequate. . . . There is still evidence the old, almost total neglect by the old party and trade union leadership both of mass trade union work, and of the tasks of extending and leading the anti-imperialist struggle. Precisely because of these weaknesses of our party in the non-Soviet areas, the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution, with the help of armed

imperialist intervention, is still managing to obstruct the alliance of the urban labour movement and the peasant movement in the non-Soviet territories with the struggle of the workers' and peasants' Red Army in the Soviet areas.

4. However, despite the concentrated pressure of the KMT, helped by the powerful armed forces of the imperialists, on the workers' and peasants' movement, the peasant war, led by the proletariat, a leadership which is being ever more methodically put into operation by the CP, the Red Army, and the Soviets, is spreading to more and more areas. . . . The further development of the Soviet movement in China, which is revolutionizing the entire colonial world, is bound up with the expansion and consolidation of the territorial basis of the Soviets and Red Army. When the entire bourgeois-landlord counter-revolutionary regime maintains itself in power largely by the armed suppression of the workers and peasants, when the least attempt of the masses to protest or to fight brings them into collision with the entire KMT regime, the workers' and peasants' Red Army, led by the communists, naturally becomes the centre around which the revolutionary workers and peasants rally, unite, and organize, the most important lever in getting the revolutionary movement into action, the supreme expression of the revolutionary crisis in China, and the basic form of struggle to overthrow the KMT, a force which ensures the further powerful development of the revolution.

5. The attention of all party organizations must be directed to the further expansion of the Soviet areas, to the establishment of a broad militant alliance between the workers' movement and the peasants' movement, to the co-ordination of the revolutionary struggle in the non-Soviet territories with the activities of the workers' and peasants' Red Armies. The party should popularize throughout the non-Soviet areas the activities of the Soviet Governments and Red Armies. To further the victorious progress of the revolution and ensure proletarian hegemony, the CCP must in the first place achieve the following objectives: (a) establish and consolidate the Red Army on a firm territorial basis . . . (b) establish a central Soviet Government . . . (c) extend the mass revolutionary struggle These three tasks must be linked with a more powerful and more widespread anti-imperialist struggle. . . .

THE CCP AS THE LEADER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

6. The success of the Soviet movement led by the communist party means that in the rest of China the influence of CP slogans and ideas is spreading with great spontaneous force among ever wider strata of workers, peasants, and soldiers of the warlords' armies. The entire course of the class struggle impels the many millions of working people into active

revolutionary struggle. This is the chief source of a party's strength and the guarantee of victory for the revolution.

But the CCP has not yet managed to adapt its work among the masses to the requirements flowing from the spread and growth of the revolutionary struggle. Its influence over the masses has only to a very small degree been organizationally consolidated. . . . This is the main reason why, despite the revolutionary crisis in the country, the party has failed to stir up in the non-Soviet areas a powerful movement in defence of the Soviet areas against the KMT campaign. . . .

7. The ECCI presidium notes that when, in the summer of 1930, the revolutionary movement confronted the CCP with new tasks . . . part of the leadership, headed by Comrade Li Li-san, put forward, in opposition to the Leninist line, an anti-bolshevik and semi-Trotskyist line. . . . The ECCI presidium fully approves the consistent struggle waged against Comrade Li Li-san's anti-Leninist policies. . . .

8. The ECCI presidium notes that the third plenum of the CC/CCP did not reveal to the party the real substance of the errors and semi-Trotskyist positions of Comrade Li Li-san, did not understand that to overcome Li Li-san's anti-Leninist ideas was in this sphere the prerequisite for and the basic form of the struggle against right opportunism as the chief danger at the present time. The third plenum adopted an ambiguous and conciliatory position in regard to Li Li-san's anti-Leninist policies, which made it easier for the right liquidators and splitters, agents of the counter-revolutionary Chen Tu-hsiu group (Lo Chang-lung) to go over to an offensive against the CCP line. It is satisfactory to note that there then arose from within the party itself a healthy tendency to overcome the vacillations of some of the leaders of that time.

9. The ECCI presidium notes with satisfaction that the fourth enlarged plenum of the CC/CCP, fighting on two fronts, repelled the attack of the right splitters and liquidators, who are trying to exploit for anti-party purposes the discontent of parts of the worker cadres with the errors of the Li Li-san group, and with the conciliatory attitude towards them. . . . The ECCI presidium agrees with the necessity for those organizational measures (re-election of the politbureau, expulsion from the party of Lo Chang-lung and two of his supporters for publishing an anti-party pamphlet and for splitting activities) taken by the party at the time and immediately after the fourth plenum with the object of ensuring the execution of the party's line and consolidating its ranks. . . .

11. The party's links with the masses, the confidence of the masses in the party—this is the decisive condition for the victory of the revolution. . . . At the same time the party must intensify its struggle against the Chen Tu-hsiu and Trotskyist groups which are now joining forces. Recently the party's organizational and ideological struggle against these

counter-revolutionary groups has slackened, while the groups themselves have shown markedly greater activity. In view of their new manoeuvres to break up the ranks of the party and the Red Army, the CCP must wage a vigorous battle in the press, in its organizations, and also among the worker and peasant masses, against these lackeys of the Kuomintang and the counter-revolution.

12. Proletarian hegemony and the victorious development of the revolution can be ensured only if the CCP becomes a proletarian party not merely in virtue of its political line, but also in its composition and in the part played by industrial workers in all its leading bodies. Fearless, methodical, and vigorous recruiting of the best workers into the party must become the main political task of all its cells and committees. The CCP must infiltrate its basic organizations into all large industrial undertakings. Party organizations must be re-established and strengthened in all the important centres of the country. It must in the shortest possible time re-establish the broken links with the groups of party members in industrial undertakings, who have for some years struggled on without the guidance of and contact with party organizations. . . .

EXTENDING MASS WORK TO THE NON-SOVIET AREAS

13. The immediate aim of the party's work in non-Soviet areas, to reach which it must exert all its forces, is the organization of a powerful mass movement in defence of the Soviet areas, and to give all help to defeating the KMT's military campaign against the workers' and peasants' Red Army. To organize the masses, to lead their daily struggle in conjunction with a mass campaign in defence of the Soviet movement—that is the primary link which the party must seize for rousing the working masses in the industrial centres to active support of the Soviet areas.

14. The decisive condition for raising the fighting capacity of the working class is the re-establishment, strengthening, and expansion of the mass organizations of the proletariat. . . . The party must re-establish and strengthen the red trade unions by setting up a comprehensive network of rank-and-file organizations in the factories. . . . After careful study it should draw up a definitive programme of partial demands, and make them the basis of its mass work. . . .

15. This programme of demands should be used as a means of exposing the treacherous role of the leaders of the yellow trade unions and the labour legislation of the KMT. There is a serious danger of underestimating the importance of work in the yellow unions. Among their members there is growing sharp discontent with the KMT, in particular its decree on 're-organizing' the unions. The party must expose the KMT's 'reorganization' of the unions as a measure provoked by the radicalization of the union

members, and designed to oppress still further the working class. It is particularly important by means of concrete facts to expose the dual role of the yellow union leaders, who are in fact carrying through this 'reorganization' while in words opposing it. While in no way defending the former yellow unions, communists must use the reorganization to sharpen the struggle of the workers against the KMT and to strengthen the red unions. Greater activity by the red unions, in particular in the leadership of strikes, will create favourable conditions for setting up a mass opposition movement in the yellow unions and carrying out the tactics of united front from below. . . .

16. It is a characteristic of the present labour movement that, although strikes are becoming more frequent and acute, the overwhelming majority break out spontaneously, and find no revolutionary leadership, because of the extreme weakness of party work among the masses. . . . It follows that the party must, at whatever cost, strengthen its links with the masses, prepare, organize, and lead the workers' strikes, which will undoubtedly quickly increase the scope of the strike movement and lead it on to more aggressive forms of struggle. . . .

17. One of the most dangerous manifestations of opportunism at the present time is the reluctance and inability to combine the struggle for daily economic demands with steady day-by-day mass work to mobilize the masses in defence of the Soviet movement. Communists must use every sign of mass discontent, every action of the masses, for skilful and consistent agitation, designed primarily to explain the significance of the struggle of the Red Army and Soviets to liberate the labouring masses of all China, and of the revolutionary achievements of the workers and peasants in the Soviet territories. . . .

18. At the same time the party must do everything possible to extend the anti-imperialist movement and to bring it under communist leadership. . . .

21. The party must at the same time actively develop the peasant movement in the KMT areas. . . . The agrarian movement and guerrilla warfare in Kuomintang China can and must lead to the formation of more and more centres of Soviet power and the expansion of the existing Soviet bases.

22. The party must expand its work to disrupt the armies of the militarists, in the first place those troops conducting operations against the Soviets and the Red Army. The objective situation is more favourable than ever before for the party's work in this field. The struggle for land is bringing the pauperized peasant masses, who form a large part of the militarists' armies, on to the side of the workers' and peasants' revolution. . . . The CCP must make wide use of the positive experience (Mao Tse-tung) of running short-term courses for soldiers of the militarist

armies taken prisoner by the Red Army, continue the steps taken to send its best workers and guerrilla fighters into the militarists' armies, to form within them communist groups to disintegrate the enemy's army from within, to support and incite every kind of conflict within the KMT armies. . . .

23. With the aim of mobilizing the working and peasant masses of the non-Soviet areas for active support of the Red Army and the Soviets, and of developing the agrarian revolution, the central Soviet Government should publish a programme of struggle for the labouring and exploited masses of China, a programme of agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, proclaiming the aims and objects of the Soviet Government, and the gains made in the Soviet territories by the workers, peasants, and urban poor. . . .

THE PARTY'S TASKS IN THE SOVIET AREAS AND THE PROSPECTS OF THE SOVIET MOVEMENT

24. The most important current task is to strengthen and consolidate the Red Army, to secure unity of action of all parts of the Red Army, to secure militant support for it from the entire mass of workers and peasants, to repulse the new attacks of the Kuomintang, to shatter and break up its armed forces, and to begin an offensive to expand the Soviet areas and to form a single compact Soviet area. . . .

25. It is necessary to put Soviet democracy into effect, that is, to ensure genuine and unbreakable bonds between the Soviet and the masses; all the organs of Soviet power must be elective . . . kulaks and other exploiting classes of town and village must be deprived of electoral rights, and the Soviets must be methodically purged of any kulak elements. . . .

26. A central Soviet Government must be set up as quickly as possible in the safest area. The Soviet Government must promulgate and put into operation a programme of anti-imperialist agrarian revolution. . . .

27. The party and the Soviets must do everything to see that the agrarian question is decided by the labourers, the poor and middle peasants themselves, in their own interests. All the estates of the landlords, militarists, gentry, churches, and usurers, without any exception of small landlords and 'good' gentry, both those who work their own farms and those who rent them out, must be immediately confiscated without any compensation to the former owners. The confiscated lands should be equally divided, under the guidance of the Soviets, among the poor and middle peasants, the labourers, coolies, and Red Army soldiers. The former owners of the confiscated estates should not receive any share of it. Confiscation should not be extended to the land of the middle peasants, not even the rich ones. . . . But the communists should not propose equal distribution if this question is not raised by the peasant masses themselves.

The Soviets should carry out these measures only with the direct and active support of the masses of peasants and labourers, and only with the agreement of the poor and middle peasants who own their own land. . . .

The party should at the same time give warning against premature attempts to decree nationalization of the land. Nationalization of the land can be effectively carried out only when the Soviet revolution has triumphed over decisive areas of the country and if it has the support of the basic peasant masses. . . .

29. The starting point of the policy of the party in the Soviet areas should be the task of carrying out the bourgeois-democratic agrarian revolution and its development into the socialist revolution. As the present Soviet movement extends, the workers and peasants are already creating the prerequisites for China's transition to a socialist road of development. . . .

With every day that passes the agrarian revolution reveals more clearly its anti-imperialist character; the reciprocal interaction of the agrarian and anti-imperialist movement is spreading more widely and becoming more marked. In the struggle against imperialism, the struggle to destroy its political and economic footholds in China, the basic masses of the peasantry, under proletarian leadership, are rising, and learning from their own experience that without the liberation of the country from imperialism, the agrarian revolution cannot succeed. . . .

30. At the same time the struggle to create and reinforce the prerequisites for China's transition to the socialist road of development demands the utmost possible expansion of the territorial basis of the Soviets and Red Army, their victory over the armed forces of counter-revolution, and the establishment of Soviet authority over an area of decisive significance in China.

Only the Soviet revolution can really unite China into one State. The union of the industrial and peasants' movements, the overthrow of the counter-revolutionary Government, the establishment of Soviet power in the large proletarian centres, will draw immense new sections of workers and peasants into the revolution, strengthen many-fold the hegemony of the proletariat . . . and so give the central Soviet Government a genuinely national Chinese force and significance. . . .

31. The interests of the Soviet struggle to unite China, to liquidate the agrarian system and imperialist enslavement, make it imperative for the Soviet authorities in the course of the revolution not only to nationalize all foreign undertakings, but also to confiscate and to nationalize enterprises owned by native capitalists, above all those which are of national importance. . . .

But it must not be forgotten that in China, a country of small and very small-scale production, where as a result of the agrarian revolution the

role of simple commodity (peasant) production will become even greater, where, even after the liquidation of feudal land tenure for the benefit of the peasant masses . . . capitalism will undoubtedly show a certain tendency to expand, where, in virtue of the low level of productive forces the proletariat is comparatively few in number . . . the period of transition (and hence the period of socialist construction) will be more prolonged than in countries where capitalism is more highly developed.

32. The direct transition from the dictatorship of two classes, proletariat and peasantry, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the socialist stage of the revolution, will become the party's central task only after the victory and consistent execution of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution in the decisive part of China, which will immensely strengthen the political hegemony of the proletariat and create the necessary shift in the balance of forces to its advantage. . . .

33. In observing that the Comintern sections in the capitalist countries have so far done little to fulfil their duty of giving wholehearted support to the Soviet revolution in China, the ECCI presidium makes it obligatory on all CI sections to carry out the widest possible mass campaign in support of the Chinese Soviets, to struggle by every means in their power, including organized revolutionary work in the armed forces, against the granting of financial and military support by the imperialists for the Chinese counter-revolution, and for the withdrawal of foreign troops from China, and against counter-revolutionary intervention.

The cause of the Chinese Soviets is the cause of the entire international proletariat.

APPEAL BY THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU OF THE ECCI AND THE
EUROPEAN SECRETARIAT OF THE RILU ON THE JAPANESE INVASION
OF MANCHURIA

September 1931

Inprekorr, xi, 93, p. 2080, 29 September 1931

[Hostilities in Manchuria were opened by the Japanese on 18-19 September 1931. This was interpreted by a Japanese writer, in the following issue of *Inprekorr*, as a move promoted by the British and French, and directed against the United States, and as a measure to ward off the bolshevik danger; backed by United States dollar imperialism, Nanking had been standing up to Japan. (This article was promptly disavowed in the *Communist International*. It was incorrect to imply that Japanese imperialism was *forced* to defend its interests against United States penetration of China.) *Pravda* wrote that Manchurian recognition of Nanking as the central Chinese Government was taken by Japan as part of Mukden's effort to free itself from Japanese influence.

The Japanese Communist Party promptly issued a manifesto against the war. Subsequent articles in the communist press asserted that the League of Nations

was organizing a united imperialist front to enslave China. The Chinese Soviet Government predicted that the KMT would sell out to the imperialists, strangle the Chinese revolution, and so prepare the ground for an attack on the USSR. The Chinese Communist Party published an appeal to all Comintern sections to protest against KMT terror. *Pravda*, on 5 November, wrote that the occupation of Manchuria was a step on the road to supremacy in the Pacific for which Japan, America, and Britain were contending, and the prelude to a new imperialist war. 'The League of Nations is the organizer of a new war for the division of China. The task of the Second International is to conceal from the proletariat what is happening in the Far East, particularly what Japanese imperialism is doing. If war among the imperialists has not yet begun, that is because all the necessary conditions, particularly those of an internal character, the fascist enslavement of the proletariat, the ruthless suppression of the communist movement, are not yet prepared, and secondly because the Soviet Union . . . is pursuing a consistent peace policy and exposing the imperialists.' Both *Izvestia* and *Pravda* accused the United States of actively instigating war: the American imperialists regarded the Japanese invasion as an essential part of the encirclement of Russia, and a means of provoking Moscow to premature hostilities; they were anxious for a new war because they had made such large profits in the last one; the war would at the same time weaken Japan, their rival.

The argument was elaborated in an article in the *Communist International* in mid-December, taking up the theme of the 'bourgeois and social-fascist press' that the League of Nations was too weak to act effectively. This was said 'to hide the fact from the toiling masses that the League of Nations is most actively supporting the rapacious advance of Japan upon Manchuria. The whole point is not that the League "did not prevent" Manchurian intervention because it was too "weak", but that this international organization of imperialist bandits from the very beginning had cynically and frankly supported the occupation of Manchuria in order to create the necessary conditions for the partition of China and the factors required to bring about intervention on a broad scale against the Soviet Union.' The United States was supporting Japan in order to provoke a Soviet-Japanese conflict over the CER, to damage the Five Year Plan, to draw Russia into war, to make profits from the sale of arms to Japan. Japan would be weakened by war, and so make American victory in the Pacific easier. Another article in the same issue explained that the KMT was no longer strong enough to act as a barrier between Soviet Russia and Soviet China, and the imperialists realized that 'Chinese territory bordering upon the USSR should no longer remain under the government of feeble Chinese vassals of imperialism, but that it should be occupied by the imperialists themselves'. Japan was acting as the 'plenipotentiary of French, British, and American imperialism', as well as for her own ends. Japanese movement southwards, that is, away from the USSR, was fitted in by the argument that the Japanese troops were 'penetrating the spheres of influence of both England and the United States. Japanese imperialism has allowed itself to interpret the mandate given so broadly in the hope that the deep economic crisis in England and the United States . . . will force the latter countries to overlook the fact that she has overstepped her powers.' Whatever happened, it was 'the result of an imperialist

pact and a plot against the USSR'. An article on the war and the Chinese CP said that the chief task of that party was to win the leadership of the anti-imperialist mass movement, strengthen proletarian hegemony in the nationalist movement in KMT China, and bring it under communist leadership to wage the fight for the integrity, national independence, and revolutionary unification of China. The fight against Japan was being obstructed by the KMT, acting as the bloodhound of imperialism.]

Japan has occupied the most important localities in south Manchuria and is pushing its armed occupation ever further. The Manchurian satrap Chang Hsueh-liang and the Nanking Government are surrendering vast areas of the country without resistance to Japanese occupation. They are not waging war against the Japanese; they are waging war only against Chinese workers and peasants, against the Chinese Red Army and Soviets. The Chinese people, the most numerous in the world, is completely powerless and defenceless, for in China power is in the hands of the executioners of the masses and the traitors to the national emancipation movement, in the hands of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang and generals bribed by imperialism.

The whole of China is now in danger of a new partition and of imperialist occupation. The blow struck by the Japanese Government has been met fairly benevolently by the other imperialists, because they are all lying in wait along the coast and in the towns of China, and have long been planning to seize the country. It is not only the Japanese robbers, guilty of the hunger and sufferings of the masses, but the English, American, and French imperialists also who are seeking feverishly for a way out of the world crisis by dividing up and plundering China by armed force. But they do not find it so easy to reach agreement. In so far as they succeed, they do so at China's expense and at the same time mobilize their forces for a war of intervention against the Soviet Union, the land of socialist construction.

Proletarians and working people of all countries!

It is now up to you to raise your voice and to act. You must put an end to this robbery and strike from the hand of your exploiters and oppressors the sword they have raised against the Chinese people.

Japanese communists, who are waging a heroic struggle for the workers' cause against the monarchy of the Mikado, the bankers, and landowners, you must open the eyes of the Japanese workers. The Japanese proletariat must see to it that no troops or munitions are sent to Manchuria. It is your duty to explain to the soldiers that they are to be used as bloody executioners of the Chinese people.

English, German, American, French communists, and all adherents of the RILU!

At the factory gate and in the factories, at meetings and demonstrations,

you must organize the working masses against the violence of the slave-owner, for China's complete independence, for the Chinese Soviets. Every working person must understand that the capitalists are taking food and unemployment pay away from the unemployed, imposing millions in new taxes on the working and peasant masses, in order to strangle the 400 million coolies and impoverished peasants of China. This is how they see their way out of the crisis. And in this they are supported by counter-revolutionary social-democracy.

Chinese communists! You are the vanguard of the enslaved and oppressed country in its fight against the invaders. You have already unfurled the flag of the Soviets and created a glorious Red Army. You must rally and unite the working millions of China to the fight for the salvation of the country from the partition threatening it.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE FOURTEENTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

6 November 1931

Inprekorr, xi, 105, p. 2353, 6 November 1931

[The manifesto, addressed 'to all working people', dealt first with industrialization in the USSR, contrasting it with the economic crisis elsewhere.]

Seeking a way out of the crisis, the imperialists have in fact already started war in the Far East. . . . The French imperialists have given their blessing to the Japanese occupation of Manchuria. The League of Nations, which in Geneva, under the leadership of England and France, is presenting a pacifist comedy, has come to an understanding with Japan about the division of the spoils and flooded the world with assurances that there is 'no war in Manchuria at all' and is organizing the partition of China. It wants to turn China into the jumping-off ground for military robber expeditions throughout the entire East and into one of the many deployment centres for the coming war against the Soviet Union. American imperialism is seeking persistently for its share of the booty. The Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek, who as lackeys of the imperialists allowed them to fire on the anti-Japanese demonstrations, cannot and will not defend China's independence.

The occupation of Manchuria is not a war against Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang; it is the beginning of the war against the working masses of China and against the Chinese revolution: it is war against you.

Organize revolutionary mass defence against the instigators of the new imperialist war. Give active support to your Chinese brothers in their fight against the Japanese occupation, against the League of Nations, against the treacherous Kuomintang, against Chiang Kai-shek, and for a united independent Soviet China.

The imperialists are bent on finding a way out of the crisis at the expense of the Soviet Union. The military and political preparations for intervention against the Soviet Union, which do not cease for a single day, have now been supplemented by a financial blockade. The organization of the anti-Soviet front on the broadest possible basis is the subject of all the secret conversations in Paris, London, and New York. The war which has begun in China is a further step in the direction of war against the Soviet Union.

Working people of the world!

Defend with your life the Soviet Union, the only fatherland of the workers of all countries. Use every means at your command to protect the victorious construction of socialism. . . .

Capitalist or revolutionary way out of the crisis. These are the only alternatives placed before you by history. . . .

The social-democrats have inscribed 'Save Democracy' on their banners to conceal with this slogan the slogan of saving capitalism. Tear the mask from the faces of these murderers of workers, who hide their treachery and their crimes behind high-sounding phrases.

Do not let the 'left' demagogues once more break your will to fight . . . split your forces and disarm you in face of the enemy, as they did in the memorable years 1918 to 1920.

Social-democratic workers. The fate of the unity of the proletarian ranks depends on you. . . . Only the communists, relying on the experience of the October revolution, will lead you in the decisive class battles to victory.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU
OF THE ECCI TO THE SPANISH COMMUNIST PARTY

January 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 4, p. 91, 15 *January 1932*

[The fall of the monarchy in Spain stimulated the Comintern's interest in that country. Until then it had been fitted into the routine scheme: Primo de Rivera's Government represented finance-capital and the large landowners, and was supported by the United States. Berenguer's Government, which succeeded it, was installed in an attempt to hold up the advance of revolution; the bourgeois camp was in a state of confusion, and its army disintegrating.

The national conference of the Spanish CP, held early in 1930, repudiated the 'social-fascist' idea, entertained by a number of Spanish communists, that a bourgeois-democratic regime was possible; this was an illusion deliberately fostered to confuse the revolutionary forces. The conference also decided to fight the social-fascist attempt (supported by some anarcho-syndicalists) to co-operate with the liberals and republicans, and to advance the slogan of 'a workers' and peasants' government of federal socialist republics of the Spanish

peninsula, resting on the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants in the form of workers', peasants', and soldiers' councils', which would recognize the right to independence of Catalonia, the Basque country, and Morocco. The conference also decided to establish new unions, arguing that the UGT (General Labour Union) was completely discredited in the eyes of the workers and had been kept in being only with Primo de Rivera's support; in June 1930 a trade union conference was held in Seville which called for the expropriation of large estates and decided to send a delegation to the fifth RILU congress.

At the enlarged presidium in February Manuilsky found little on which to congratulate the Spanish section: 'Whatever the forms of the civil war in which the revolutionary surge in Spain is taking place, for the time being the Spanish working class is taking a very minor part in this movement. . . . A single partial strike can have more significance for the international labour movement than a "revolution" of the Spanish type, in which the communist party and the proletariat do not take the leading part.' At the beginning of 1931 the Spanish CP issued a long statement attacking the 'republican, social-fascist, and anarcho-reformist' leaders, including Caballero and Alcala Zamora, for treachery in postponing the struggle; the bourgeoisie were prepared to sacrifice the monarchy to maintain their rule. It was time for the party to cease being a sect, to take up the task of organizing and influencing the masses, who still placed their hopes on a 'republican revolution'. Russia's road was the road for the Spanish proletariat.

An article in the *Communist International* shortly after the fall of the monarchy in April 1931 gave the membership of the Spanish CP as 3,000 (an editorial article in the same periodical in March 1934 put the membership at 'several hundreds' in 1931); the trade unions it controlled were said to number 75,000 members; the anarchist and socialist federations were given as each having 200,000 members. The party was said to be still very sectarian, and unable to explain its programme to the masses; it should have called for the creation of Soviets, the arming of the workers, the confiscation of church property, the establishment of peasant committees to take over and divide the land. By issuing, after the fall of the monarchy, the slogan 'Down with the bourgeois republic', it had isolated itself from the masses and aroused the hostility of the workers, who still had strong republican illusions, sustained by the initial measures of the new Government. The party's immediate programme should be: the arrest of the monarchist ministers and leading officials; the dissolution of the secret police; the disarming of the civil guard and the arming of the workers and peasants; the organization of soldiers' committees; the destruction of all religious orders and confiscation of their property and of crown property, etc. To realize this programme it would be necessary to organize Soviets of workers, peasants, and soldiers. Later Piatnitsky wrote that when the republic was proclaimed in 1931 'the party organizations in many towns followed incorrect tactics. When the masses streamed into the streets to celebrate the proclamation of the republic, the communists together with the monarchists cried "Down with the republic", so isolating themselves from the masses. With the help of the Comintern the Spanish CP corrected this mistake, and became an important factor in the revolution.'

Joaquin Maurin had been expelled from the Spanish CP on charges of 'liberalism' and 'menshevism', and failure to recognize the leading role of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution; his attitude to events in Spain was said to reflect the views expressed by Trotsky in a pamphlet on the Spanish revolution. Maurin protested to the ECCI against the charge of Trotskyism, and in June 1931 a Comintern delegate investigated the question. The ECCI endorsed his expulsion in July.]

The Spanish proletariat, which is the chief driving force of the revolution, has displayed tremendous revolutionary energy, disabling the old regime by its strikes in 1930, and awakening the petty-bourgeoisie as well as the national-liberation movement of the oppressed national minorities, thus preparing the ground for the April revolution. But as it was under the ideological influence of the socialists and anarcho-syndicalists, the proletariat was unable to establish itself as the leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, or to bring the peasantry, the second most important driving force of the revolution, under its leadership. Consequently the bourgeoisie succeeded, in alliance with the landowners, and with the active participation of the socialists and the anarcho-syndicalists—finance capital being in supreme command—in seizing power for themselves. In reality the bourgeois-landlord bloc has not solved a single one of the basic tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The agrarian question remains unsolved. The bill for agrarian reform, prompted by cowardice and half-heartedness, was rejected by the National Assembly. . . . The bill for the separation of Church and State leaves the enormous economic power of the Church, and hence its political influence, untouched. The national question is not solved and the old bureaucratic State apparatus and the robber semi-feudal system of *cacique* rule have remained practically unchanged. The civil guard, an armed force of the counter-revolution, has even been strengthened. Instead of democratic rights, the bourgeois-landlord bloc has given the working people nothing but bullets and prison.

The character of revolutionary development in Spain since the fall of the monarchy and the proclamation of the republic can be summarized as follows:

1. The economic (and agrarian) crisis is from month to month becoming more acute, widespread, and deep. The bourgeois-landlord bloc has not merely not improved the conditions of life of the proletariat and peasantry, but has actually made the wage increases won by the working masses from the bourgeoisie by means of mass strikes after 14 April illusory, by devaluation of the currency, higher prices, etc. Unemployment is growing steadily. . . . The peasantry is being impoverished at great speed. The villagers are in the grip of hunger, particularly the agricultural labourers and poor peasants. The bourgeois-landlord republican bloc, which has left untouched the privileges of the landowners and finance-capital . . .

has made the economic crisis and its social and political consequences even more complex and acute.

2. The Government of republicans and socialists, all the republican parties and the National Assembly have strikingly revealed their counter-revolutionary bourgeois class character. The leading part in the policy of this bloc is taken by the big bourgeoisie of finance and industry, and by the large landowners allied with them. The regrouping of classes and parties which began with the April days has now assumed shape. We are faced with a new relation of forces of classes and parties. The leading part in the counter-revolutionary camp is played by the republican big bourgeoisie, actively supported by the forces of the monarchist counter-revolution—landlords, church, officers' corps, etc.; they have brought under their control the urban petty-bourgeoisie and their parties as well as the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois parties of Catalonian nationalists. The revolutionary camp is composed of proletariat and peasantry. The workers' disappointment in the republican parties is growing steadily. Democratic illusions are being more and more rapidly dispelled.

3. The Socialist Party took and is taking the chief part in the counter-revolutionary bloc in stupefying the masses.

The Socialist Party is the pace-maker of reaction in the offensive of the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution against the working class and the working masses. It was no other than the socialist Minister Largo Caballero who drafted and laid before the Cortes the Law for the Protection of the Republic—a law which forbids any strike not permitted by the Government. Bourgeoisie and socialist leaders have elevated the incitement of bloody collisions between different groups of workers into a system . . . in order to split the proletariat and make it powerless against the united bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution. They organized and are organizing strikebreakers for the employers. They themselves declare that only if they remain in the Government can they prevent the spread of 'violent' revolution. The part being played by the socialists has not been exposed to the masses, and they are still successful here and there in capturing new positions. The disillusionment of the workers in the adventurist tactics of the anarcho-syndicalist leaders, who systematically betray the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, is cleverly exploited by the socialists in the interests of their own counter-revolutionary aims. At the same time the anarcho-syndicalist leaders are drawing ever closer to government social-democracy, supporting it from without. . . .

4. In the revolutionary camp a noticeable regrouping of forces has been and is going on. In addition to the urban and rural proletariat, which is the only completely consistent revolutionary force, and together with it and under its political leadership, the peasantry, particularly its poorest sections, have taken up the revolutionary struggle. . . .

The outlines of the immediate perspective are becoming sufficiently clear. They reveal no 'social peace' and no 'stable political equilibrium', but embittered class struggles and a further outbreak of the revolutionary storm. The Spanish bourgeois-democratic revolution is not at an end. Its basic tasks . . . have not yet been accomplished. But the proletariat has to solve these old tasks in a new situation, a new relation of class forces and political parties, and a clearly marked differentiation in the camp of revolution and of counter-revolution. Because the bourgeoisie and their parties, including the Socialist Party, have revealed themselves as counter-revolutionary forces, it will be easier for the proletariat to rise to leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to enrol the peasantry among its followers, to guide the democratic revolution to complete victory and so to create the conditions for its rapid transformation into a socialist revolution.

The essential condition for completing the bourgeois-democratic revolution and for its transformation into a proletarian revolution is the existence of a mass communist party, clearly conscious of the basic questions of the revolution and knowing how to organize the proletariat and to make it capable of achieving hegemony in the revolution.

The more consistently and energetically the proletariat, led by the communist party and in alliance with the peasantry, undertakes, under the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, the radical liquidation of all feudal survivals, carries through the agrarian revolution, and wages the struggle to expand the framework of the bourgeois-democratic revolution . . . the greater will be the possibility of the rapid transformation to the proletarian, socialist revolution. . . .

The chief immediate task of the communist party is to prepare, organize, and lead the revolutionary mass struggles of the proletariat, to launch and lead the agrarian revolution. This requires the organizational consolidation of the communist party and of the revolutionary class organizations of the proletariat. The practical link that must be seized if this is to be done is the strike struggle, the unemployed movement. . . . At the same time every effort must be made to organize the peasant struggle against the attacks of the landowners, to give the scattered partial actions the mass character of an agrarian revolution. . . .

The party will be able to accomplish this tremendous task if its forthcoming congress is made into a congress for organizing the party, a congress for transforming it into a genuinely bolshevik mass party. The Spanish CP undoubtedly has some political and organizational successes to its credit. Over the last year its membership has risen from 1,500 to nearly 10,000. . . . Recently it has managed to turn its central organ *Mundo Obrero* into a daily. . . .

The growing influence and numbers of the party cannot, however, be

correctly appraised except in relation to the events which have occurred in Spain and are now developing. In a time of unparalleled ferment and militancy, when more than a million proletarians engaged in struggle and came out on to the streets, when hundreds of thousands showed themselves ready to go to the limit, a membership of 10,000 is merely a drop in a storm-lashed sea.

As true revolutionaries should, the Spanish communists must seek out and lay bare the reasons for the party's lagging behind and for the mistakes it has made, and must take energetic measures to eliminate them rapidly and completely. . . . The basic reason for the party's errors, its failure to understand the character of the revolution, the function and tasks of the proletariat as hegemon in the present democratic revolution, its failure to grasp the role of the communist party, to advance correct and timely political slogans for mass action and to take these slogans to the masses, the mistakes reflected in the relatively marked passivity of the party—the basic reason is that the party was, and unfortunately still is, bound fast by sectarianism and anarchist traditions. . . .

The party as a whole and its leaders in particular had, and unfortunately still have, no correct and comprehensive political attitude; their appraisal of the character and peculiarities of the class contradictions, of the revolution in Spain, was false; erroneous judgments were and are being given of the concrete political factors. The leaders of the Spanish Communist Party have not grasped the immense political significance of the economic, social, and political survivals of feudalism in Spain, and so did not see the democratic revolution that was maturing on that basis; they did not prepare the proletariat for that revolution.

The party did not grasp in time that precisely because the bourgeoisie were going to play a counter-revolutionary part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution that was coming to a head, the proletariat, as the only truly consistent revolutionary class, could and should lead that revolution. . . . Since the communist party underestimated the role of the proletariat, it cut itself off, lost contact with the working class, ignored the peasantry, lost contact with the broad masses, failed to measure the pulse of the masses or gauge their sentiments, underestimated their demands and their militancy. And when events came to a head, when the republic was proclaimed under the tremendous assault of the masses marching in the streets, the party put out incorrect slogans that were incomprehensible to the masses.

During May and throughout the election campaign in June there was no visible change in the party's activity. Slogans about the formation of councils of workers', soldiers', and peasants' deputies, about the formation of factory committees, the disarming of the gendarmerie and the arming of the proletariat, the formation of the revolutionary united front, the

revolutionary seizure of land by the peasants, the solution of the agrarian problem by the peasants themselves—these slogans, in so far as they were put forward at all, were presented in a much too general and propagandist manner. . . . The comrades believed, incorrectly, that Soviets serve as organs of revolutionary power only after the seizure of power. In reality, however, Soviets are organs of revolutionary power before that too—organs of the struggle for power, organs to mobilize and organize the masses for the seizure of power by the proletariat and peasantry, and to establish their revolutionary democratic dictatorship. . . .

The Spanish Communist Party showed and to a certain extent still shows a similar attitude, sectarian, passive, towards the national liberation movements of the Catalonians, Basques, and Galicians, which it underestimates, and leaves the Moroccans almost completely out of account. . . .

Sectarianism and impermissible passivity were displayed also, and particularly by the leaders, in regard to trade union work. . . .

While exposing the anarcho-syndicalist leaders, who have become traitors to the workers' movement, lackeys and instruments of the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to try to establish a united front with the anarchist workers and those anarchist leaders who really want to fight the capitalists and the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolutionary regime of the monarchists, republicans, and socialists. . . .

The Spanish Communist Party has not fought and is not fighting with sufficient determination counter-revolutionary Trotskyism which, by its systematic slanders against the Soviet Union and the Comintern, its liberal attitude—cloaked in 'left' phrases—to the questions of the Spanish revolution, is trying to introduce confusion among the working class, to hamper the erection and consolidation of a united revolutionary fighting front of the proletariat, and to disorganize the ranks of the proletariat and the communist party.

Nor did the party have the correct attitude to Maurin's group and its workers' and peasants' bloc. Without in any way relaxing the fight to expose Maurin's petty-bourgeois ideas, and the collaboration in practice of his group with the bourgeoisie—indeed by intensifying that fight and refusing to make the slightest concession on questions of principle—without glossing over existing differences, the communist party must help all members of that organization who are really ready to come under the Comintern banner to join the ranks of the Spanish Communist Party.

Sectarian errors and defects, as well as passivity and the anarchist heritage, are particularly marked in the party's internal life. It is not yet a centralized proletarian mass organization of political action with clearly defined aims and tasks. . . . In many respects it still consists of loosely associated sectarian propagandist groups of 'selected' communists, without strong and enduring contact with the masses and the factories, without

clear political attitudes, clearly defined perspectives, or a united will, for neither centrally nor locally has it a firm, active leadership working collectively and closely linked with the party organizations and the working masses. . . .

For more than a year and a half the central committee has not been functioning, and the leadership of the party has been in the hands of an executive committee consisting of a few comrades only . . . whose work in most cases has been limited to sending out circulars which, moreover, have not always embodied the correct policy. . . .

These, comrades, are the basic criticisms, which do not by any means cover all the problems and aspects of the Spanish Communist Party's work, but which we wished to set forth openly in connexion with your fourth congress.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI TO CENTRAL COMMITTEES OF COMINTERN SECTIONS ON THE STATE OF MEMBERSHIP

April 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 32, p. 985, 19 *April* 1932

[An article in the issue of *Inprekorr* which published this circular letter (which was not reproduced in full), explained that although the communist parties were growing in countries where a revolutionary crisis was developing, such as Germany and Poland, this was happening spontaneously, not as the result of systematic party work; the proportion of factory workers among the members was declining and recruiting work had to be concentrated on them, although no artificial obstacles should be placed in the way of entry by the unemployed and the intelligentsia. There was a high turnover in the membership—in the United States it exceeded 100 per cent; this showed that newcomers were not properly integrated into party life and work. Other articles in the same issue gave some details of membership. The Polish CP had grown by 107 per cent since the beginning of 1931, but had made no gains among the industrial workers and few among the unemployed; the new recruits were mostly peasants. The Czechoslovakian CP had made 36,000 new members in 1931, but the proportion of members organized in factory cells remained stationary. Membership of the CPGB had risen from 3,200 at the end of 1929 to 6,300 two years later; of these 49 per cent were unemployed, and 30 per cent worked in industry; the proportion of those organized in factory cells had fallen from 8.5 to 4.2 per cent. In 1930 the KPD had gained 143,000 members and lost 95,000. The French CP, Piatnitsky said at the tenth plenum, 'is continually registering new members, while the total membership figures are in continual decline'. A resolution of the ECCI presidium of 16 July 1930, following a meeting of the French commission attended by sixteen leading members of the CPF, directed the party to establish committees of the unemployed; the French representatives undertook to increase the membership of the party and the CGTU, and the circulation of *L'Humanité*, but, said Piatnitsky two years later at the twelfth plenum, none of this had happened. He rebuked the communist deputies for

their voting behaviour in the Chamber, and the CGTU for its failure in the industrial field. An article in *Inprecorr* in November 1932 reproved those parties which excused their lagging behind by the absence of trained cadres: their complaints were a reflection on their own work; this had been concentrated on agitation and propaganda; what was needed was operative leadership in launching and waging revolutionary struggles. Every member must be given a specific task and the volume of paper instructions and circulars reduced.

Attention was also being paid at this time to the agrarian question. In 1930 representatives of European CPs met in Berlin and set up a European Peasant Committee, but nothing is known of its work, if any. In 1931 the eleventh ECCI plenum appointed a special sub-commission to examine communist work in the village, and in 1932 the ECCI convened a conference of those in charge of work among the peasants in a number of countries. These parties were instructed to draw up a programme of action embodying partial demands for the peasants; in a number of countries the fascists were carrying the peasants with them, and this was said to be due in large part to the inadequacy of communist work in the village.]

Close analysis shows that in all countries the main reason for inadequate recruiting of factory workers lies not outside but within the party itself, in incorrect plans and methods of recruiting, and above all in the insufficient attention paid to questions of work in the factories, in the absence of the requisite bolshevist vigour in reorganizing all party work on to a factory basis. . . .

It is therefore essential that in future the party's entire recruiting activity must be concentrated on the factory, in the first place the large factories in the most important industries. . . . Recruiting work must become the daily obligation of every party member, and the enrolment of new members in the cells must be immediately undertaken and completed without any unnecessarily formal procedures. It is in the first place up to the central and district committees of the party to ensure that their recruiting work is carried on systematically in these factories. The parties—and in particular such parties as the Polish and the German—must see to it that in the immediate future, in the next month or two, those localities and factories which represent the advanced outposts of the proletarian class-struggle front are given particular and careful attention in respect to the extension and consolidation of contact with the workers employed there, to winning the best revolutionary elements among them for the party. The appropriate local party committees must, with the whole-hearted and close participation and support of the central committee, work out special methods for approaching the different groups of workers in these factories (skilled and unskilled, women, juveniles, foreign workers, socialists, Christians, etc.), draft demands appropriate for each group, discuss them, issue special literature, appoint special organizers or form special brigades.

It is of the utmost importance, in connexion with the war danger, to pay special attention in the immediate future to reinforcing work to recruit those women workers . . . who will replace male munitions workers called up for the forces. . . .

To make this change in the party's recruiting activities requires in addition the most resolute and ruthless struggle against elements of bureaucratism in the work of party organizations among workers sympathetic to the party who wish to join it but are kept waiting for months (as sometimes happened in 1931, or as happened in Spain, when hundreds were refused admission because there were no party cards). A resolute struggle must also be waged against sectarian tendencies, against the fear of taking in new members, rejected on the most varied pretexts. Against those guilty of such bureaucratic formalism and sectarian narrow-mindedness, the party must proceed with the utmost rigour. . . .

Such a situation is wholly abnormal, and involves the danger that the present stream of workers into the communist party may be followed by a movement in the opposite direction, and that in general the numerical growth of the parties will not be stable. The retention of new party members, the question of the special measures required for work among them, for raising their political level, drawing them into current practical work, assimilating them into the party—all these tasks are today of the utmost political importance, and in this regard the leading bodies of the communist parties bear a great responsibility to the world communist movement.

Clearly, rapid and decisive changes are urgently required in the entire present way of dealing with new members. Seeing that the situation in this respect is wholly unsatisfactory, although numerous decisions have been taken to deal with fluctuations in membership, what is now required is a thorough and methodical examination of what is in fact being done, so that mistaken methods of work can be singled out and the work itself intensified; all obstacles rooted in incorrect methods of work in party organizations, and in particular those which are the result of bureaucratic attitudes or of the incapacity of individuals in the party apparatus, must be eliminated 'without respect to persons'. . . .

It is what goes on in the life of the factory cell that is as a rule decisive in regard to fluctuation. If the factory cell is lively and active, if it takes part in all mass movements of the workers in the factory, if it is at the head of them, if all the cell members have party duties to carry out, and if inner-party democracy gives them the opportunity to discuss all questions of party life, to fight against deviations from the party line, to fight bureaucratic, sectarian, and other distortions in the party apparatus there will as a rule be no defections; on the contrary, the cell will grow and its mass influence increase. And conversely, cells which are not active,

where there is no self-criticism, are as a rule certain to lose members and decay.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO ISSUED BY THE ECCI

April 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 35, p. 1085, 29 *April* 1932

[The communist press continued to interpret the Japanese action in Manchuria as a prelude to war on the Soviet Union, and to deride the idea that the League of Nations could intervene. An article in the *Communist International* in March 1932 said the disarmament conference was designed to camouflage war preparations and to regroup the imperialist Powers in order to transform the war in the Far East into a war of intervention against the USSR, and this had to be made clear to the working class. 'There is today no greater danger than to proceed from the mistaken assumption that the widest masses already know that the League of Nations consists of outspoken representatives of the imperialist war-mongers, that the League of Nations is an imperialist swindle, that pacifism is a deception, that the Second International is an organ of the bourgeoisie for the preparation of war.' 'The League of Nations', said the *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum*, 'is an extremely important instrument for carrying out imperialist policy. In conjunction with international social-fascism it is of invaluable service to this policy, not only in deceiving the mass of the people and sabotaging the Soviet disarmament proposals, but also in carrying out the imperialist policy of the plunder of weak peoples by strong ones, and the preparation and legalization of war against the Soviet Union.' In the previous October, R. P. Dutt, surveying the Vienna congress of the Second International, referred to Kautsky's suggestion that world trade could be increased by expanding Asian markets: 'Here the subjection of Russia and China to Western capitalism is openly and cynically held out as the solution of the crisis.']

After three years of a world economic crisis without parallel in history the international proletariat this year celebrates the First of May in a situation marked by the most crushing poverty and hunger in all capitalist and colonial countries and by war in the Far East. The attempt of international capital to surmount the crisis has resulted in more than 40 million unemployed, wage robbery after wage robbery, an unbearable weight of taxation, reduction in social-insurance benefits, undernourishment, devastating disease, and a rising mortality. Millions and millions of working peasants have been ruined.

Despite fascist terror, despite social-democratic treachery and strike-breaking, the revolutionary wave is rising day by day, the revolutionary class struggle assuming ever sharper forms. Broader and broader sections of the working class are enrolling under communist leadership in the revolutionary united front to fight the capitalist dictatorship.

The oppressed nations, the colonial peoples, the impoverished peasant

masses are joining the fighting front against imperialist oppression and feudal exploitation. A number of capitalist countries are already in the grip of the revolutionary crisis. In other countries the conditions for a revolutionary crisis are drawing rapidly to a head. The capitalist world is falling irreversibly into catastrophe.

The attempts of the bourgeoisie to overcome the crisis were in vain. Now they are seeking a way out through imperialist war. . . .

The war against China is the prelude to military intervention against the Soviet Union. The greed and hatred of the imperialist robber Powers are directed to the country of socialism, in which there is no crisis and no unemployment. Their weapons are already turned against the Soviet Union. On the pretext of fighting banditry in Manchuria, Japanese imperialism is moving an increasing number of its armed forces closer to the Soviet eastern frontiers. . . .

War has not been formally declared, but Japan has invaded China. Who can prevent this war turning into a general imperialist world slaughter? The League of Nations perhaps? The League of Nations, which is supporting warring Japanese imperialism against the Chinese people, which, since its foundation, has supported all the major imperialist robber Powers against the weak and oppressed peoples? The League of Nations, which has openly and cynically rejected the repeated Soviet proposals for universal disarmament made at the preparatory and disarmament conferences? The Second International perhaps? The Second International, which in 1914 betrayed the working class? The Second International, which during the 1914-18 war announced that it would be the last war? Or perhaps its sections, which regularly vote the war credits in parliament? Was it not the Second International which supported the attack on Morocco, on Syria, and on Indochina? Was it not with its collaboration that entire villages in India were destroyed by air bombardment? Was it not the Second International . . . which by the most despicable calumnies about 'red imperialism' prepared war against the Soviet Union? . . .

Incapable of meeting the Soviet Union in economic competition, the capitalist world would like to destroy socialist construction in the first country of proletarian dictatorship by force of arms. Two worlds confront each other. The capitalist world is choking in the grip of crisis. The Soviet Union is winning one victory after another in fulfilling its gigantic plan of socialist construction. . . .

Despite all imperialist provocations, despite the subversive activities of imperialist diplomacy and its general staffs, despite the organization of sabotage and wrecking activities, the proletarian State is firmly and un-deviatingly pursuing its policy of peace. . . .

The preparations for military intervention in the Soviet Union are

accompanied by the use of the most inhuman terror against the working and peasant masses in all capitalist countries. . . . Wherever the revolutionary wave is rising, wherever the working people resist the capitalist offensive, the blood of workers and peasants is flowing in streams. . . . All the forces of fascism and social-fascism are mobilized to hold up the advance and the victory of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and national-revolutionary fight for emancipation. Fascists and social-fascists compete in their use of terror and unscrupulous social demagogy. The Second and the Amsterdam Internationals, the chief supports of the bourgeoisie in the working class, by the open and concealed use of terror and strike-breaking, hamper the industrial struggles of the factory workers against wage reductions, the struggle of the unemployed for work and bread. With the help of the police they break up revolutionary workers' and peasants' organizations. Using the slogans of bourgeois democracy, of the veiled dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, they are clearing the road for the unconcealed fascist dictatorship of capitalism. In the midst of the world economic crisis they are saving capitalism as they did in the 1914-18 war and later, when they drowned the insurrection of the German proletariat in blood.

The anti-Soviet campaign of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, their pacifist peace slogans, their manoeuvres to conceal the feverish rearmament that is going on, their fight against the proletarian revolution, all this is active preparation for the new imperialist world slaughter and for armed intervention against the Soviet Union. . . .

Working people, oppressed and exploited of all countries. . . . It depends on you when the death knell of capitalism, the hour of your liberation, will strike.

All out on the streets on the First of May.

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE WEST EUROPEAN BUREAU
OF THE ECCI ON THE SITUATION IN JAPAN AND THE TASKS OF THE
JAPANESE COMMUNIST PARTY

May 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 42, p. 1303, 20 *May 1932*

[The Japanese Communist Party suffered severely from the arrest of its leaders and members; at the time of the invasion of Manchuria it was said to have 2,000 of its members in prison; in October 1932 it gave the figure of 14,000 persons arrested for communist sympathies. The membership of the revolutionary unions in Japan fell from 35,000 in 1928 to 3,000 by mid-1930. Both these, and the Japanese CP, were accused of 'ultra-left deviations' by the ECCI, and at the fifth Profintern congress the unions were said to be no more than 'a body of sympathizers or party candidates'.

The original draft of the theses was made in 1930 by Kazama, then in Moscow, to replace the 'Bukharinist' theses of 1927; the draft was revised on his return to Japan (where a new central committee was formed early in 1931 to take the place of those arrested), and published on 17 May 1931. They were condemned by the ECCI because they played down the struggle against the monarchy and for the agrarian revolution on the ground that the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution was past (they also said that the slogan 'defence of the USSR' was 'as yet incomprehensible to the masses'); these errors were corrected in the present theses. 'With this weapon in our hands', wrote the central committee, 'we shall now begin the second stage of our rapid advance.' 'The theses', wrote Hayama, 'opened a new era in the history of the Japanese Communist Party.' Sano and Nabeyama, in prison, were said to have been recruited by the police, who had failed to break the party by persecution; in a letter published in 1933 they called for disaffiliation from the Comintern, which was more concerned with the defence of Russia than with the interests of the revolution, and condemned the fight against the monarchy as 'doctrinaire terrorism', only outwardly revolutionary but in fact fatal, since it alienated the masses from the party and diverted attention from the struggle against the bourgeoisie and landlords, who could take cover behind the monarchy which was the symbol of Japan's unity and independence. Their prediction that the future war in the Pacific would be one between the Asian peoples and the 'white imperialists' was said by the ECCI to be a fascist idea designed to win support for the war in Manchuria. Kazama himself was arrested in October 1932; M. Yamomato was sent from Moscow to replace him; he too was arrested. Kazama and two other former members of the central committee, Sano and Nabeyama (who said the Japanese Communist Party was nothing more than 'a society of friends of the Soviet Union'), resigned from the CP, as did two other prominent members, Takahashi and S. Tanaka.

The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh congress described the theses as 'an important turning-point' in overcoming the party's 'serious internal ailments'. Its weaknesses, according to an article (by 'Aki') in the *Communist International* in March 1932, were its underestimation of the peasants, its failure to emphasize the guilt of the monarchy, and its appeal for fraternization between the Japanese and Chinese troops. This was wrong because, of the two armies, one was imperialist and the other colonial. It should have called on the Japanese soldiers to refuse to fight, and the workers at home to sabotage industry. The same author discussed, in two subsequent issues of the same periodical, the nature of 'Japanese social-fascism': there were two social-fascist parties, the right-wing social-democratic party, and the left-wing party, 'and also the organization of professional agents and provocateurs known as "the labour group of the communist party of Japan"'. In the past the Japanese CP's incorrect strategy had played into the hands of its enemies; it had underestimated the strength of the monarchy and the importance of the agrarian question; its view of the fascist dictatorship was crude; in its application of the united front from below it failed to distinguish between leaders and masses in the social-fascist organizations.

There was anxiety in Moscow about the behaviour of communists under interrogation after arrest, not only in Japan; in Bulgaria there were several

cases of suicide, while other arrested communists would reveal their knowledge to the police.

At the end of 1932, in articles in *Inprekorr* celebrating the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Japanese CP, it was said that its central committee 'is carrying out the theses of the ECCI West European Bureau not in words but in deeds, and in a bolshevik manner is criticizing and correcting the incorrect formulations and appraisals contained in the draft political theses of April 1931 in respect to the character of the forthcoming revolution and the tasks of the party'. The errors were attributed to 'some individual functionaries in the ECCI and the RILU'; neither the Japanese central committee nor the party as a whole was responsible. The party had exposed the liquidators, the sectarians, and the left opportunists; it was now based on the most advanced sections of the Japanese proletariat. The 'sectarians' were the group led by Fukumoto, who resigned and formed 'the workers' group of the Japanese Communist Party'; they were described by the ECCI as 'the party's most dangerous enemy', and as harbouring a number of police agents.]

I. JAPANESE IMPERIALISM AND THE WAR

The robber war unleashed by Japanese imperialism is plunging the masses into a new historical crisis, the greatest since the end of the world slaughter. The occupation of Manchuria, the bloody events in Shanghai and elsewhere in China, the entire military operation undertaken by Japanese robber imperialism, are, in the conditions created by the present world economic crisis, the first large-scale warlike enterprise of one of the biggest imperialist Powers. The imperialist war which has begun reflects the depth of the general as well as the economic crisis of the capitalist world, the unprecedented acuteness of all its contradictions. It opens an entire period of new political convulsions of the greatest significance. As a result of the present Japanese-Chinese events the international situation has become extremely complicated, and consequently tasks of the greatest import arise for all sections of the Comintern, and in the first place for the Japanese revolutionary proletariat and its communist vanguard.

1. . . . Bourgeois-landlord Japan's growing appetite for conquest perpetually comes into conflict with the plans and claims of the other imperialist Great Powers. The war which Japan has begun in China makes these contradictions still more acute. . . . It releases all the forces which make more threatening than ever before the danger of a new world war, the danger of a direct armed collision between Japan and America and other, if not all, imperialist Great Powers, or the most intense preparations for such a collision.

2. Another dominant factor in the policy of world imperialism is the more marked attempt to create a united front of the imperialist Powers for war against the Soviet Union. We are confronted with the immediate danger of armed intervention against the land of proletarian dictator-

ship. The instrument of this war is the League of Nations. By making war on the Soviet Union the international bourgeoisie and their social-democratic agents design above all to frustrate the struggle of the international proletariat for its liberation, for the revolutionary way out of the crisis. . . . For the working masses of the capitalist countries, who are condemned by the crisis to unemployment, to indescribable poverty and savage exploitation, the Soviet Union is eloquent testimony and convincing proof of the necessity to fight for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, for the annihilation of capitalism. But the imperialists are planning to shipwreck socialist construction, to strangle the Soviet Union, and to open the way for the still more pitiless exploitation of the working and peasant masses of all countries, for the consolidation of the system which keeps them in economic and political slavery. What is particularly significant is the alliance of two imperialist gendarmes—imperialist France, the gendarme of Europe, and imperialist Japan, the gendarme of the Far East, both of whom have assumed the role of instigators of the campaign against the land of Soviets. By attacking in the East, Japanese imperialism is to create the conditions making possible a simultaneous or subsequent attack by France and its vassals (Poland, etc.) on the Soviet Union from the West. It is these anti-Soviet plans which largely explain the support given Japan in its predatory war in China by other imperialist Powers and by the League of Nations as a whole. . . .

3. Bourgeois-landlord Japan is assuming the role of war-instigator, which is wholly in keeping with the character of Japanese imperialism. . . . By this war Japanese imperialism is trying to use its monopoly of military power to establish a jumping-off ground for attack on the Soviet Union, to crush the Soviet movement in China, to turn as much of China as possible into a Japanese colony, to get a more solid economic foundation, to acquire sources of raw materials, particularly for its armaments industries and military requirements, to settle itself firmly on the Asiatic mainland, and so to arm itself for further wars for mastery in the Pacific. . . .

4. Japanese communists must understand the indissoluble connexion between the external aggressiveness of Japanese imperialism and its internal policy, between its imperialist predatory war abroad, its enslavement of colonial countries, and its reactionary policy at home. By entering on the path of war, the Japanese imperialists are seeking to maintain and to strengthen the regime of the army-police monarchy, the regime of unparalleled and arbitrary violence against the working people, to reinforce bondage on the land, to lower the workers' standard of living still more. The war intensifies all class contradictions within the country to the most extreme pitch. It confronts the Japanese proletariat and its communist party with the task of combining the fight against the war with the

fight for the most vital daily interests of the workers, peasants, and all working people against their economic and political enslavement, and so to turn the imperialist war into civil war and bring about the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois-landlord monarchy. Japanese imperialism's robber war does not push the revolution in Japan into the remote distance but, on the contrary, into the immediate forefront. . . . In these circumstances the part falling to the Japanese Communist Party is one of the greatest responsibility. The future course of events and the future course of the revolutionary movement will depend to a significant and decisive extent on the strength and resolution of the communist party, on its ability to rally millions of workers behind its slogans and place itself at the head of their struggle. Consequently the question of the ideological and organizational consolidation of the Japanese CP is of first-class importance. The present situation categorically requires of the Japanese CP the exertion of all its forces to extend and strengthen its links with the industrial workers and peasants and other working people, links which are still very weak. Whatever the cost, the party must liquidate the situation in which it fails to keep pace with the rising activity of the masses, must become a genuine mass party, able to advance with confidence towards the coming revolution.

II. THE CHARACTER OF THE COMING REVOLUTION

5. The CP of Japan must have a correct and clear picture both of the relation of class forces in the country and of the nature and tasks of the forthcoming revolution in Japan. It must correct the erroneous ideas held in its ranks on these cardinal questions. The present relation of class forces, the character and tasks of the coming revolution, cannot possibly be correctly appraised without taking into account and analysing the peculiarities of the system prevailing in Japan, which combines extraordinarily strong elements of feudalism with a very advanced development of monopoly capitalism.

(i) The first is the character and specific weight of the monarchy. . . . The monarchy is the chief pillar of political reaction and of all the survivals of feudalism in Japan. The monarchical State apparatus is the solid backbone of the dictatorship of the exploiting classes. Its destruction must be regarded as the first task of the revolution. The underestimation of the role of the monarch, the contrasting of parliament and party cabinet with the monarchy as though they were separate forms of the bourgeois State, independent of the monarchy, ideas formerly found in the Japanese CP, are totally wrong. . . .

The war makes the role of the bureaucracy still more important, particularly that of its most aggressive and reactionary part, the militarists.

The militarist leaders have a greater share of power, which means the acceleration of preparations for anti-Soviet intervention and greater police terror against the Japanese workers and peasants. It would be false to regard as opposites the militarists and the bourgeois-landlord monarchy, and it would be particularly dangerous to divert the mass struggle against the monarchy into a struggle against the allegedly growing danger of a fascist coup d'état. Certain historical peculiarities must not hide the basic and decisive fact that the present absolutist regime in Japan is not by any means a less oppressive form of the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship over the workers than is fascism in other capitalist countries. The party must expose the treacherous manoeuvre of the ruling classes and the social-democrats, which is to use the spectre of the fascist threat in order to show the existing monarchist regime in a good light, to delude the masses about the growing pressure of reaction, to maintain and strengthen monarchist illusions, to divert the masses from struggle against the main enemy, which in present circumstances is the bourgeois-landlord monarchy.

(ii) The second main component of the regime prevailing in Japan is landownership, the backward, Asiatic, semi-feudal regime in the Japanese village, which hampers the development of its productive forces and promotes the degradation of agriculture and the pauperization of the greater part of the peasant population. . . . It is quite impossible that the ruling classes of Japan will themselves undertake on their own initiative any serious measures to change the feudal basis of Japanese agrarian relations. The agrarian revolution is one of the primary tasks of the Japanese revolution, and its importance must not be underestimated.

(iii) The third basic element in the prevailing system is predatory monopolist capitalism. . . . Japanese capitalism, which has reached a high level, was and is reactionary and monarchist. This is most clearly revealed in the fact that the Japanese working class, whose labour productivity is not less than that of European industrial workers, is still in a situation characteristic of colonial countries. The wages of a Japanese worker are as wretchedly low and his working day as long. . . .

6. It follows from all this that the entire political and economic state of the country will drive the revolutionary movement to fight the imperialist war, the police regime of the monarchy, the low colonial level of living of the workers, and the denial of political rights, as well as the feudal and usury bondage in the village.

The Communist Party of Japan, whose main goal is to establish socialism, must clearly and fully realize that in present Japanese conditions the road to the proletarian dictatorship must lead through the bourgeois-democratic revolution, that is, through the overthrow of the monarchy, the expropriation of the landowners, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the workers and peasants. This will take the form of councils of

workers, peasants, and soldiers, which will also be the means for transforming the bourgeois-democratic into the socialist revolution. The chief tasks of the forthcoming stage of the revolution are therefore:

- (i) Overthrow of the monarchy.
- (ii) Liquidation of the large estates.
- (iii) Institution of the seven-hour working day and (in the conditions of a revolutionary situation) amalgamation of all banks into one national bank; this, together with large-scale capitalist undertakings and trusts, to be placed under the supervision of workers', peasants', and soldiers' councils. . . .

For the present moment, the chief slogans for action must be:

- (i) Against the imperialist war. Change the imperialist war into civil war.
- (ii) Overthrow the bourgeois-landlord monarchy. For a workers' and peasants' Soviet government.
- (iii) Confiscation without compensation of the estates of all landowners, of the Mikado and the churches, on behalf of the peasants. Cancellation of all peasant debts to landlords, moneylenders, and banks.
- (iv) A seven-hour working day. . . . Freedom for the organization and activities of class-conscious trade unions.
- (v) Liberation of the colonies (Korea, Manchuria, Formosa, etc.) from the Japanese imperialist yoke.
- (vi) For the defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution. . . . The Japanese Communist Party must closely link the fight for the workers' and peasants' Soviet republic with systematic propaganda for socialism, in which the fullest use must be made of the experiences and successes of the Soviet Union. . . .

7. The chief driving forces of the revolution are the proletariat and the poor and middle peasants. It is incorrect to assume that the middle peasants are incapable of revolutionary struggle against the landlords and the police monarchy. . . . The victorious development of the revolution is possible only if there is the closest alliance between the workers and peasants under proletarian hegemony. To win and consolidate this hegemony is decisive for the triumph of the revolution. In Japan the workers' and peasants' revolution can succeed only if, parallel with the overthrow of the army-police-bureaucratic monarchy, it removes all the exploiting classes, including the bourgeoisie, from political power at the centre as well as locally.

8. The workers' and peasants' revolution can triumph only if it sets up the power of the workers', peasants', and soldiers' councils. . . . The imperative tasks of the communists when there is a revolutionary situation are to create these councils throughout the length and breadth of the country, and, particularly at the moment the monarchy is overthrown, to

fight for the complete destruction of the State apparatus of the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship. . . .

III. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

9. Because of the deepening of the economic crisis, of the war, and of the developing offensive by the capitalists and landlords against the workers and peasants, the economic struggles of the proletariat and peasantry are becoming sharper. The workers' movement in Japan is at a turning-point in its development, moving from scattered defensive struggles to revolutionary mass action. . . .

The leftward turn of the masses is proceeding under the heavy pressure of the white terror and unbridled police violence. For the moment it is taking place spontaneously, with the CP playing an extremely feeble part in the mass movement, and meeting with the strongest resistance from the social-democrats of all shades. The discontent of the masses has not yet revealed its full strength. The social-fascists, particularly the left, . . . still retain the leadership of strikes and of peasant struggles, of course only in order to betray them.

10. The policy of the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship is pursued with the active support of the social-democrats, who have concluded an alliance with the police, which provides the bourgeoisie with the means to combine left democratic speech with police truncheons, rifles, and poison gas. The social-democrats appear under the banner of the 'unity' of the labour movement, but in reality they are splitting the working class. . . . The more radical their words, the more despicable is the conduct of these traitors in the industrial conflicts in the factories, where they act as organizers of compulsory arbitration by the police, organize strike-breaking, betray the workers' interests to the capitalists for money, actively support capitalist rationalization and mass dismissals, make pacts with the police and betray the most active workers to the police.

In the war that has broken out the Japanese social-democrats of all shades have taken up an openly imperialist position. They are wholly in the camp of the organizers of war against the Chinese people and the Soviet Union. . . .

Social-democracy and the leaders of the yellow trade unions are the chief danger to the revolutionary movement of workers and peasants. Most dangerous of all are the left social-democrats (Rono-Taisyuto, and the group of police agents organized by renegades from the communist party, which calls itself 'the workers' group of the CPJ', etc.), who conceal their treacherous role . . . behind revolutionary phrases.

11. The entire situation in Japan is developing in a way that offers the communists wide opportunities for drawing into the revolutionary

movement really large masses of workers, peasants, and the urban poor, who in the course of the struggle will themselves become revolutionary. . . . Consequently in the very near future great revolutionary events may take place. A number of facts already show that in the very near future there may be spontaneous outbreaks of mass protest and mass struggle. These spontaneous actions might easily be diverted from their revolutionary path if the CP does not immediately explain to the masses who and what are responsible for their poverty, if it does not make clear the real nature and objects of the present war, if it does not systematically expose throughout the length and breadth of the country the policy of the Government and the ruling classes, exposing every step and measure they take, if it does not undermine the influence of the social-fascists and really raise itself to the position of leader in the daily mass struggle, if it does not show the masses the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

12. The party's tasks in fighting the war are:

(i) To carry on untiring agitation and propaganda against the imperialist and counter-revolutionary war . . .

(ii) To reveal the counter-revolutionary, imperialist, and anti-national character of the war slogans advanced by the ruling classes and the social-democrats . . .

(iii) To fight resolutely against the policy of the bourgeois-landlord monarchy and social-democracy, designed to establish class peace in the country. To work persistently and patiently to overcome the chauvinist delirium of the popular masses . . .

(iv) To conduct all-round propaganda about the successes of socialist construction, the achievements of the workers and peasants in the Soviet Union, its peace policy, and about the successes and aims of the Soviet movement in China.

(v) The CPJ, whose guiding object it is to transform the imperialist war into civil war, must adapt its slogans and its work to the character of the war. The slogan of fraternization, obligatory in an imperialist war, must be combined, in the circumstances of the present war of imperialist Japan against the Chinese people, with the demand for the immediate recall of troops from China, and with an appeal to the Japanese soldiers to refuse to wage war, an appeal to leave the front without discarding or surrendering their weapons, and to form soldiers' committees. The slogan of fraternization, in the event of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union and revolutionary Soviet China, must be combined with active agitation for the soldiers to go over to the side of the Red Army.

(vi) In a reactionary war, a revolutionary class can desire only the defeat of the Government of its own country. Defeat of the government army will weaken the monarchist Government of Japan and facilitate the civil war against the ruling classes. In the present war of Japanese

imperialism for the colonial subjugation of China, the action slogan of the Japanese communists must be: 'Fight for China's complete independence'. In the conditions of an imperialist war against China or the Soviet Union the Japanese communists must not only be defeatists, but must fight actively for the victory of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the Chinese people.

(vii) Every effort must be made to carry out strikes on the railways, in the merchant service, and in the armaments factories. . . . The goal set must be the proclamation of a general strike and its transformation into armed insurrection. . . .

(ix) Communists are obliged to support the partial demands of the soldiers and sailors, such as better material conditions, better treatment . . . and help the rank and file in their conflicts with the officers. Work must be done to disintegrate the patriotic mass organizations of reservists and young people, etc.

13. The Japanese communists must keep clearly in mind that the main emphasis in the fight against the war must be on the mass movement, the struggle of the masses. Only work among the masses in the factories and the army, in the trade unions and on the land, will really lead to the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war. . . .

The current tasks of the party are:

- (i) to strengthen the CP and expand its contacts with the workers;
- (ii) to expand the industrial struggles of the proletariat . . . on the basis of the united front from below;
- (iii) to stir up and organize the struggle of the peasants against the landowners;
- (iv) to direct all popular mass expressions of discontent, of protest, and of struggle into the channel of political struggle against the war and the monarchy.

14. The CP has begun and is continuing to turn to mass work, but its contact with the masses, its role in the mass movement, remain intolerably weak. A radical change must be made in the party's mass work, so that it really does lead the daily struggle of the workers, peasants, and soldiers. The party will be able to effect this change only if it finally rids its ranks of the remnants of study-group attitudes, of sectarianism and opportunist passivity. . . . The fear of recruiting workers to the party must be combated as a highly dangerous form of opportunism. Workers must be boldly and energetically promoted to leading posts in all party and mass organizations. Agricultural labourers and poor peasants must also be recruited into the party. . . . The most glaring recent examples of right opportunism are the cases in which communists helped to collect money for the war on the pretext of maintaining contact with the masses, as well as the attempt to ignore and set aside the task of fighting for the defence of the Soviet

Union on the ground that the masses are allegedly not yet mature enough to understand this. Among the left opportunist errors are those tendencies which renounce the struggle for freedom of speech, of the press, of meeting and association for the workers, a sectarian attitude in the left trade unions. . . .

Particular attention must be paid to the improvement of conspirative methods, to an examination of the reasons for the success of police raids, to measures designed to avoid them, and particularly to provisions to ensure the continued activity of all party organizations in the event of further successful police raids. . . .

15. The party must make a radical change in its methods of work in the trade unions and in other non-party organizations; the habit of giving orders, as though these were party organizations, must be dropped. Communists must win the leading part in these organizations by their energy and ideological zeal (and not by reference to their position as communists); they must use methods of persuasion (and of persuasion alone) to win the members for revolutionary proposals. To secure correct methods of work, competent communist fractions must be set up in these mass organizations. . . .

16. An unceasing struggle for the masses against the social-democrats of all shades must be waged. This struggle has up to now had little success because it was not given concrete form, not closely linked with the direct struggle of the masses for their daily needs and the lessons of that struggle; in some cases it was replaced by appeals for physical struggle against individual social-fascists. Neither has anything to do with the tasks of the CP. The essence of the fight against social-fascism lies in the struggle for the masses and against the influence of the social-fascists on the masses. . . . The treachery of the social-fascists must be exposed; they must be deprived of the confidence of the masses not through abstract discussions but on the basis of the experiences of the daily struggle. . . .

17. The CPJ must become a party of political mass action. With this in view, the CPJ must in its day-to-day revolutionary practical work bear in mind the task of launching, organizing, and leading every kind of protest against the war, against the police-bureaucratic regime of the bourgeois-landlord monarchy. . . .

18. The party must work out a programme of partial demands which takes due account of the peculiarities of the concrete political situation. . . . In addition to the anti-war demands already considered, the programme should include demands:

- (i) against military-police suppression of strikes . . . for unrestricted freedom of trade unions and peasant unions and all other worker's organizations, against arbitration and against any interference by the authorities in the workers' and peasants' struggle . . .

- (ii) for the immediate release of all victims of police action and all political prisoners . . .
- (iii) for the unrestricted freedom of association, speech, and press for the working people . . .
- (iv) for the refusal to pay rent . . . for the cancellation of all peasant debts to landlords, moneylenders, trusts, and banks; for the refusal to pay any such debts or to pay tax arrears;
- (v) for the abrogation of all laws directed against the workers and peasants . . . for equal rights for women;
- (vi) against the semi-slave conditions of labour . . . for equal pay for equal work. Judicial prosecution of the open and concealed purchase and sale of women and children, etc.
- (vii) against capitalist rationalization; for a seven-hour day for adults, a four-hour day for workers under 16, and a six-hour day from 16-18; prohibition of child labour. . .
- (viii) for an all-round increase in wages, a compulsory minimum wage . . .
- (ix) for the immediate introduction of national insurance for unemployment, sickness, accident, and old age, the costs to be borne by the capitalists . . .
- (x) . . . for higher taxation of the rich and total tax exemption for workers, small peasants, poor artisans, and the urban poor;
- (xi) for the liberation of Korea, Formosa, Manchuria, and other areas stolen from China; for the immediate withdrawal of Japanese troops from these areas; for the defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese people. . . .

The war and the crisis are bringing class contradictions in the country to a pitch of extreme sharpness. The revolutionary mass struggle of the workers and peasants under the leadership of the CPJ will make more acute the revolutionary crisis which will deal the death blow to the monarchy, set up workers' and peasants' councils under whose banner the CPJ will lead the working class and all working people to the final victory.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDUM ON THE
WORK OF TRADE UNION FRACTIONS

July 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 57, p. 1817, 12 *July 1932*

[In August 1931 a conference on the unemployed movement was held in Prague of representatives of eleven communist parties, of the RILU, and of trade union opposition groups; it adopted a resolution saying that the LSI and IFTU were trying to keep the workers from fighting; they engaged in organized strike-breaking and 'bloody massacres of the unemployed'. Their proposals to

raise the school-leaving age and to limit hours of work to 40 a week were 'inimical to the workers'. Making the main speech at the conference, Ulbricht said that the communist parties were trying to fight the battle of the unemployed instead of organizing the unemployed to fight. In the Latin secretariat Doriot attacked the CGTU leaders who had opposed the proposal for a 40-hour working week as 'an employers' trap', and Piatnitsky at the twelfth plenum derided those communists who evaded their duty to work in the reformist unions on the ground that this was 'opportunism'; he criticized those who said that the reformists either led no strikes, or always betrayed them when they did. In nine countries—which he enumerated—there had been nearly 3,000 strikes in the first half of 1932, and many of them had been successful. Had they all been led by communists? That kind of propaganda only repelled workers.]

Experience in carrying out the decisions of the sixth Comintern congress and the supplementary decisions of the plenary sessions of the ECCI confirms the belief that it is impossible to accomplish the central task of the day—to win the majority of the working class in preparation for the fight for the proletarian dictatorship—without well-organized, systematic, and persistent work day by day both within the revolutionary trade unions which are under the ideological and organizational influence of the communist parties, and in the reformist and other reactionary unions. Nevertheless, this most vital sector on the front of communist party mass work is now as before receiving only slight attention; this neglect is one of the chief obstacles to the further development of the parties. In the resolution of the second international organization conference, ratified by the sixth enlarged plenum of the ECCI, on the structure and methods of work of communist fractions in trade unions, the communist parties were given important and practical directives on trade union work. By and large these still retain their validity.

The changes which have occurred since the sixth plenum in the general situation of the proletarian class struggle, and in the structure, methods of work, and composition of the leading cadres of the communist parties and revolutionary trade union movement, require some additions and alterations to be made. What comes out most clearly is the inexpediency of retaining the trade union departments of the party in countries where the revolutionary trade union movement is legal.

The communist parties of France, Germany, and Czechoslovakia have already abolished their trade union departments; the ECCI presidium endorses this action and, as an amendment to the directives of the second organization conference, proposes that other communist parties in countries with a legal revolutionary trade union movement liquidate their trade union departments, and transfer direction of the work of the fractions to the bureau of the competent party committee. . . .

In countries where the revolutionary trade union movement is illegal,

the trade union department is to be replaced, as it has been in the Polish CP, by regular working conferences of representatives of the trade union fractions under the direction of specially appointed representatives of the competent party committees (central, district, and local). These conferences are to exercise the functions of the fraction bureaus (central, district, and local) of the revolutionary trade union centres.

When liquidating the trade union departments it is most important that the party committees should not tackle the job mechanically . . . their abolition should help to strengthen the link between fraction and party committee, the committee and the entire party organization being drawn into regular examination and settlement of trade union questions.

The most serious weaknesses in the work of communist trade union fractions are:

(a) the trade union fractions are not well instructed by the corresponding party committees. The guidance they receive is often formal and given mechanically in the form of circular letters and general directives. . . .

(b) in their work in the unions, communists very often carry out the work of party leadership by giving orders instead of using methods of patient persuasion and personal example; as a result the revolutionary unions have no life of their own and merely duplicate the party organizations, with roughly the same composition, the members doing no more than repeat mechanically party decisions;

(c) very often the party committees fail to discuss and decide the practical questions of trade union work. . . . All communist party committees must immediately give the most careful attention to the practical tasks of overcoming the defects and weaknesses in trade union work and of strengthening their positions in union organizations. The ECCI presidium considers that the most important of these tasks are:

(i) Efforts must be made to set up as quickly as possible trade union fractions in all unions, whatever their character, of which communists are members. For this purpose the central committees of all parties must send out experienced instructors and organizers. . . .

(ii) The eleventh ECCI plenum endorsed the decision of the second international organization conference that fractions should be linked not only with their corresponding party committees, but also with each other, the fractions in the higher trade union bodies giving binding instructions to the fractions in the subordinate bodies, so that every fraction has a dual subordination, to both the corresponding party committee and the fraction in the higher trade union body. This regulation has in practice been often ignored, and even disputed. . . . The presidium recommends all communist parties to put the decision of the sixth ECCI plenum on the dual subordination of fractions into operation. . . . If the work of the fractions is properly managed by the party committees, the

decisions and directives of the fractions will be brought into line with party policy, thus making them directives for all members of the party who work in the trade union organization concerned. . . .

(iii) The presidium fully endorses the decision of the second organization conference that trade union fractions should carry out their work through the factory cell. . . . The factory cell must direct all trade union work in the factories. It follows that the fractions working in the various unions represented in the factory must work under the direct control of the factory cell. For its part, the cell must make vigorous use of these factory fractions to penetrate the unions which have branches in the factory, thus consolidating the influence of the communist party in these unions. To this end, it is supremely important that the area and local party committees should hold regular conferences with representatives of the factory cells and fractions in their area to discuss the practical current questions of trade union work, with the object of organizing joint action by all the unions represented in the factory under the ideological and organizational leadership of the revolutionary trade union group of that factory. . . .

(iv) When questions of great political importance arise, such as the formulation of a programme of immediate demands, preparations for a strike, etc., the party committees concerned must hold prior consultations with one or more representatives of the fraction, so that clear instructions can be worked out for the fraction, telling it what to do and what not to do, and how to set about it, but leaving detailed practical questions to the fraction. . . .

(v) Before meetings, congresses, and conferences of the red trade unions or the revolutionary trade union opposition (RTUO), the party committees concerned must discuss the agenda for these meetings, calling in representatives of the corresponding communist fractions. The committee must draw up instructions for the fractions on every item of the agenda. If there are to be trade union elections the party committee, together with representatives of the fraction, must carefully consider which candidates the fraction should support, and which reject. In doing so the following considerations must be kept in mind: (a) there should be a kernel of party members who will carry out the party's policy . . . (b) in addition to members of our party, it is essential to put forward revolutionary-minded workers (non-party, socialist, anarchist, etc.) who enjoy the confidence of the masses and have shown themselves to be good organizers of proletarian revolutionary activities . . .

(vi) In preparing for party conferences and congresses which are to discuss trade union questions and industrial struggles, the leading trade union fractions must be drawn into active practical collaboration in the drafting of theses; in this way the party will be able to rely on the experience of the trade union movement. . . . The party must instruct its

members in the trade unions that their main task is to convince the bulk of the trade union membership by democratic trade union methods of the correctness of the slogans and the proposals of the communist party referring to the strengthening of the revolutionary trade union movement. . . .

(vii) The most important and the most difficult thing is to establish the correct mutual relations between the communist fractions and the trade unions, particularly the revolutionary unions. It is precisely in this field that most mistakes are made and the greatest confusion exists. Since the revolutionary unions must be mass organizations, embracing all strata of the working class regardless of political affiliation, the communists who work in these organizations must gain influence and a leading position in them by good and intelligent work, by patiently and persistently expounding the communist line . . . and by their own actions giving a personal example of consistent and devoted struggle. . . .

When communists, in accordance with decisions of the fraction or party committee, put forward proposals at trade union meetings, they do not necessarily have to emphasize that these proposals are the outcome of a party directive. By decision of the fraction, one of its members may put forward the proposal in his own name. The other members of the fraction must vote for it as one man and support it by appropriate means, such as taking part in the discussion. This applies also to those members of the fraction who, at the fraction meeting, were not in agreement with the proposal.

(viii) In carrying out party directives, the fractions, while persevering undeviatingly with their policy, must always act according to trade union democracy, so that the unions retain their separate identity and the initiative of the union officials is not hampered. If at a trade union meeting the majority are opposed to a proposal of the party committee, it should as a rule be withdrawn, no matter how useful and necessary it may be, and communists should not act upon it before the question has been again discussed. . . . The proposal should be put forward again and again, until a majority in its favour has been won. Communists must learn not to force their opinion on others, but to convince the erring, otherwise they will never be able to win new recruits.

(ix) While adhering irreconcilably to everything that concerns communist party policy, and pitilessly exposing the counter-revolutionary role of the reformist leaders, communists must adopt a comradely attitude to workers belonging to the socialist party and the reformist unions. In the revolutionary unions, from top to bottom, an atmosphere must be created in which non-party and social-democratic workers feel that they have equal rights with communists and communist sympathizers.

The fight against the opposition in the revolutionary unions must be

waged differently from the fight within the party against the right and the 'left' opposition. On no account should questions of party discipline be brought into the fight. . . . The struggle must be waged only on trade union questions. . . .

The ECCI presidium . . . proposes that the central committees should bring these instructions to the knowledge of all party members; they should be thoroughly discussed and popularized in the party press, at party meetings and training schools. Furthermore, all party committees, from the central committee down to the factory cell, must work out practical measures on the basis of these directives for their trade union work, and subsequently examine strictly and methodically how the directives have been put into effect and how the local party organizations have in fact used them in practice. At the same time the ECCI presidium demands the most resolute struggle, if necessary by organizational measures, against those party bodies and committees which continue to pay inadequate attention to questions of trade union work.

THE TWELFTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE ECCI

[The meeting was held from 27 August to 15 September 1932. There were 174 delegates (38 with voting powers) from 35 countries. The four items on the agenda were the international situation and the tasks of the sections, the lessons of strikes and the struggle of the unemployed, the Far Eastern war and the struggle against imperialist war and anti-Soviet intervention, and socialist construction in the USSR. All the meeting's decisions were unanimous. Summarizing its work in the following month, the *Communist International* wrote that it placed the emphasis on mass strikes and political strikes as the chief means of struggle; communist parties were passing from the stage of agitation and propaganda to the organization of mass activity.

The end of capitalist stabilization was once more announced in Manuilsky's opening speech; this determined Comintern policy; the Dawes and Young Plans had broken down, the Washington agreement was no more; imperialist rivalries, attacks on the colonies, hatred of Russia were all mounting while production was declining. In these objectively favourable conditions, the communist parties were lagging behind, so delaying the transformation of the capitalist crisis into a revolutionary crisis. The change from a revolutionary mood to a revolutionary crisis could be made, Manuilsky said, if the communist parties fought for the economic demands of the masses, which social-democracy abandoned on the ground that capitalism was unable to grant them. It depended on the communist parties whether the proletariat would have to suffer new wars before establishing its dictatorship, whether in some countries fascism would precede the revolution. There were fatalists in the communist parties who argued that 'the historic task of preparing the proletarian revolution will be carried out for us by war and fascism, that war and fascism will undermine and destroy the influence of social-democracy, which is the main obstacle in the path of the

proletarian revolution', fascism being an inevitable stage in the development of capitalism, and 'the sooner fascism comes into power, the sooner will it spend itself and become bankrupt, and finally, that the fascist masses will come over to our side spontaneously'. This was a dangerous theory, demoralizing for the working class.

Manuilsky spoke at length on developments in the USSR. 'The cause of socialism in the Soviet Union would make undreamed of progress if help came from your side in the form of a proletarian revolution. The world proletariat must know that the delay in the proletarian world revolution made further difficulties for us.' He admitted that in some respects the situation in other countries was less favourable than it had been in Russia in 1917, but there were factors working in the other direction too; if capitalism was stronger, so was the proletariat, which also had the benefit of Russian experience and could count on the USSR. 'It is your fault that you have not been able, given the war and the proletarian revolution in Russia and Central Europe, and the world crisis, to destroy the influence of social-democracy'—which he had earlier referred to as a 'contemptible reptile'. *Pravda*, commenting on the plenum, said the difference between the present and the earlier cycle of revolutions and wars was that the communist parties in the major countries were now genuinely bolshevik parties. On 20 October it wrote that, while the strike movement had grown deeper and wider since the eleventh plenum, the communist parties were lagging behind objective conditions, particularly in relation to the industrial struggle. The same point was made in an editorial article in the *Communist International*. With the end of capitalist stabilization, the period of social reforms had come to an end; hence the industrial struggle challenged the very existence of capitalism and undermined social-democracy. But many important strikes took place quite independently of the communist parties and red trade unions. This reflected the failure of the communist parties to strike at social-democracy by the united front from below. 'To prepare the masses for decisive fights means, above all, to tear them away from the influence of social-democracy.' Social-democrats called strikes only in order to keep control of the masses; otherwise they could not carry out their mission as the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie. The *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum* stated: 'The reformists feared to lose their influence on the masses and led a number of strikes, taking the line of starving the strikers out.' An article on the execution of the decisions of the plenum in *Inprekorr*, in December 1932, said that events in Central Europe since the plenum had shown how urgent it was to accelerate the execution of their chief strategic task in the preparatory stage of fighting for the proletarian dictatorship—to destroy the mass basis of social-democracy and to win the majority of the working class. It depended on the communist parties how brief the interval was between the end of stabilization and an immediately revolutionary situation. The writer noted that before the plenum Humbert-Droz and his supporters had talked of 'the chain of defeats' suffered by the Comintern, and had called for a bloc, if only temporary, with social-democracy. The Comintern had soon put a stop to that. Working-class unity could be achieved only under communist leadership.

The *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum*, a pamphlet which appeared after Hitler had come to power in Germany, said the 'keynote of the plenum was the nearness of

revolutionary perspectives, preparations for the decisive battles of the proletariat for power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat'. It attributed 'defeatist moods' in part to the results of the 1932 presidential election in Germany. 'The opportunist over-estimation of the power of fascism... leads to right-opportunist strivings to organize a united front with the leaders of social-democratic organizations', while the 'leftist under-estimation' of fascism had led to passivity, to neglect of the struggle against fascism, to exclusive concentration on fighting social-fascism. The fascists wanted to crush the proletariat by naked force; the social-fascists wanted to preserve legality and parliamentary forms because this was the only way they could carry out their special job of deceiving the masses. The friction between the two reflected their rivalry for influence over the Government of the bourgeois dictatorship.

'Another big "left" manoeuvre of social-democracy is the proposal recently made to the communists for joint action in various election campaigns, in the struggle against fascism, against the capitalist offensive, etc. . . . All these "left" manoeuvres of social-democracy are attempts to wreck the real united front which is formed from below in the revolutionary struggle.' Some communists had taken them seriously, but they were 'very dangerous' and had to be 'mercilessly and consistently opposed'. The plenum passed a resolution addressed 'to the CPSU and the toilers of the USSR' congratulating them on the success of the Five Year Plan, which would 'accelerate the maturing of a revolutionary crisis in capitalist and colonial countries. . . . The duty of defending the Soviet Union to the last drop of blood against all bandit attacks is dictated to the communist parties, to the whole of the international proletariat and to the broad masses of toiling peasants not only by the interests of achieving the victory of socialism throughout the world, but by the most urgent everyday interests of the toilers.'

The membership of the Comintern, excluding the CPSU, was given as 913,000 for mid-1932. Germany accounted for 332,000, China for 250,000, Czechoslovakia for 75,000, Spain for 17,000, and Poland for 15,000.

The plenum elected additional members to the presidium (no names were given), sent a message of greetings to the CPSU, and passed the financial report for the year 1931. This showed an income of \$1,295,000, the largest item being membership dues, given as \$1,128,000. The chief items on the expenditure side were: administration, \$372,000; subsidies, publishing, and editorial, \$757,000; travel, \$53,000.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE TWELFTH ECCI PLENUM ON
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE COMIN-
TERN SECTIONS

September 1932

*Theses of the Twelfth Plenum**

[The theses were introduced by Kuusinen. He enumerated the features which marked the new phase of the capitalist crisis—Soviet progress, continued capitalist decay, the expansion of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist and

* Checked against the German version in *Inprekorr*, xii, 82, p. 2629, 4 October 1932; corrections are shown in square brackets.

colonial countries, the acuteness of imperialist contradictions, the outbreak of war in China, the more intense preparations for war against Russia. For the capitalists there was no economic way out of the crisis—they could only fight and defeat one another. However, the period of new wars and revolutions had not yet opened—they were still approaching it. The degree of mass radicalization was very uneven—it was very marked in the German elections, scarcely visible in the English. Some communists thought that the adherence of previously non-political workers to the fascist movement was a sign of radicalization, but this was not so. This was a sign of activization—radicalization meant drawing closer to the revolution. To win the majority of the working class was still their main strategic objective, as it had been since the third if not the first Comintern congress. But they had preferred not to use the old formula in the theses because of the new factor of the transition to a revolutionary situation. The formula used—preparing the proletariat for the struggle for power—looked not only to the present, but to the future. The end of capitalist stabilization was not a phrase, but a fact with political implications, and preparation for the struggle was the strategic conclusion drawn from the fact. He compared the situation to that at the time of the second Comintern congress in 1920, when Lenin asked what should be done to prepare for the proletarian dictatorship. They could not say that even their best party (outside the USSR), the KPD, was really ready for the decisive struggle, in the sense that it not only wanted to fight but was in a position to do so. Lenski asked whether the total destruction of social-democracy was necessary before the fascists could complete the establishment of their dictatorship, and, arguing from Polish experience, answered in the negative. This showed that the right wing and Trotskyists were wrong in arguing that, because fascism threatened it, social-democracy was forced to fight fascism. 'The German bourgeoisie fully appreciate the important role social-democracy plays as their chief agent among the working class.' The task of the communists was 'to accelerate the collapse of social-democracy'. In Poland 'the tendency to go part of the way with social-democracy, to replace the united front from below by a united front with the social-democratic leaders', was the chief danger, leading to isolation from the masses; the danger from the left was the tendency to order strikes 'from above', without the participation of the factory masses; this too led to isolation.

The fall of Bukharin had brought with it the downfall of his supporters in the Polish central committee—in particular Warski, Kostrzewa, Stefanski, and Brand—who were in the majority. They were accused of underestimating the weakness of capitalist stabilization and the counter-revolutionary role of the reformist parties, and of encouraging the illusion that the socialists would fight fascism; they, said an ECCI 'open letter' to the Polish CP, were even more dangerous enemies than the fascists. Kostrzewa and Stefanski were told that their declarations of support for the party line were inadequate and unsatisfactory. In June 1929, at the plenary session of the central committee, the leadership was taken over by Lenski, Bronkowski, and Henrykowski. Piatnitsky said in *World Communists in Action* that before the tenth ECCI plenum there 'existed in fact two factions with their respective central committees'; the local organizations were divided into partisans of this or that faction, but 'with the assistance

of the ECCI the Communist Party of Poland has set up a leadership which rallied all the local party organizations'. A further dispute arose on whether or not to form breakaway trade unions, as recommended by the RILU. Prukhnjak led the group which opposed their formation. A writer in the *Communist International* (August 1930) maintained that the Polish Socialist Party's offer of a united front, and the Bund's demand for the legalization of the communist party, were only 'deceitful slogans' intended to conceal their active participation in preparations for war against the Soviet Union. Reporting on the fifth congress of the Polish CP held (at Peterhof) in August 1930, Lenski said the party was lagging behind the masses, who might be nearer to the direct struggle for power than any other working class. The right opposition had 'capitulated like a group of bankrupt officers without an army'; Prukhnjak, Stefanski, and others had declared that they accepted the ECCI and central committee decisions without reservation. But the fight against Warski and Kostrzewa had to be continued. In the Ukrainian and White Russian areas, and in Upper Silesia, the party should take over the leadership of the movement against Polish occupation. In the following April the Polish central committee adopted a resolution protesting against 'the robber attempts of Polish imperialism to occupy Danzig'; Danzig would provide Poland with a naval base in the Baltic from which to attack Russia. The Polish CP should fight against the anti-German campaign of the entire nationalist, bourgeois, and social-fascist press and against the ever-growing oppression of the German population of Poland. An article accompanying the report of the central committee meeting (*Inprecorr*, 7 May 1932) bore the headline: 'Polish occupation threatens Danzig'. The conclusion of a non-aggression agreement with the USSR was also said (in the *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum*) to indicate that 'Poland is zealously playing the part of a first detachment in the preparation of anti-Soviet intervention'. The *Communist International* in August published a strong attack on Polish nationalist claims to Danzig, Silesia, and East Prussia. In 1930 Lenski gave the membership as 12,000, of whom half were in prison; in the *Materials* for the seventh CI congress the figure for 1932 was given as 17,000, of whom roughly 7,000 were in the Ukrainian and White Russian areas. Writing at the end of the year on the sixth congress of the Polish CP, attended by 33 delegates of whom 9 had voting powers, which was held at Mogilev in October (at the time it was said publicly to have been held in Vienna), Lenski said that in Poland right opportunism had fused with Trotskyism on a programme calling for a compromise with the social-democrats and a joint struggle with them against fascism. 'The moral and political responsibility for the existence of this group lies with Warski and Kostrzewa.' The Polish central committee published a declaration against the Polish threat to annex Danzig, and against 'the new acts of violence against the oppressed German population', which were 'further steps in preparing a war of intervention against the Soviet Union'.

Since the previous plenum the Comintern had issued no public statement dealing with events in Germany in which the KPD was clearly concerned, significant though these were. Nor did the twelfth plenum resolutions deal with KPD policies except in the most summary fashion. Although Manuisky explicitly stated that 'the Comintern wholly and entirely supports the leadership

of the German party', it is clear from the speeches which were published and from later accounts that these were closely examined and debated in commission meetings. The widespread uneasiness about them was reflected in Lenski's call for 'the strongest opposition to any attempt to shake the KPD leadership'.

Thaelmann said the Brandlerists, Trotskyists, and SAP 'put forward the slogan of union of the SPD with the KPD to divert the desire for unity among the masses into false political channels. When such demands are rejected on principle by the communist party there is sometimes a feeling of dissatisfaction among the masses which is quite consciously fostered by renegades.' (The SAP, the Socialist Workers' Party, was founded at Breslau in October 1931 by discontented left-wing social-democrats; a number of ex-communists also adhered.) Although fascism and social-fascism were not synonymous, it was 'precisely at the present stage of development in Germany that the two appear in their true colours as "twin brothers", as Comrade Stalin once acutely emphasized'. To neglect the struggle against social-democracy 'might produce new and dangerous illusions among the masses to the effect that the SPD is an anti-fascist force. . . . In accordance with the party line, and with the help of the Comintern . . . our party has of late been combating with great success all tendencies to weaken the struggle in principle against social-democracy, and has fought with all severity against all conceptions that the main offensive within the working class ought no longer to be directed against social-democracy and against all deviations in this field.' The proposal made by the Berlin communists for joint demonstrations with the social-democrats against the Nazis had been 'rightly rejected by the central committee of our party'. The SAP, the Brandlerists, and Trotskyists had frequently raised the question of a KPD-SPD alliance and common voting lists. 'Trotsky has attempted on more than one occasion to lead the working class astray by his writings, by demanding negotiations between the leaders of the KPD and SPD.' He had argued for a KPD-SPD bloc against fascism.

Thaelmann attacked Neumann, in particular for his attempt to discredit the KPD leadership. If he continued in this way 'it will very soon spell certain political death for him'. At the KPD conference held immediately after the plenum, Neumann was made the scapegoat for the errors of the past. He had been dropped from the political bureau earlier in the year and called to Moscow, where he was deprived of his post as candidate member of the ECCI presidium. The slogan 'Beat the fascists wherever you find them', attributed to Neumann, was said to be inappropriate once the Nazis had become a mass party, and hampered work by implicitly denying the need for an ideological struggle for the masses already attracted to fascism. The conference welcomed 'the attitude of the twelfth plenum on the disruptive activities of the Neumann group, which had tried to turn the members against the leaders, and to incite the youth league against the party'.

Breitscheid's offer of a united front in November 1931 was rejected by the KPD as a 'demagogic manoeuvre'. The SPD leaders, said the seventh congress *Materials*, were finding it more and more difficult to keep their followers from contact with communists. 'By offering a "pact of non-aggression" they tried to

introduce confusion among the working masses, particularly the factory workers.' The periodical *Propagandist*, issued by the agitprop department of the KPD central committee, was criticized at the end of 1931 by Thaelmann for its theoretical errors in drawing a 'liberal contrast' between democracy and fascism; the chief and deputy-chief of the department were dismissed. Members of the KPD who had co-operated with the SPD during the municipal elections in Württemberg were condemned as opportunists who were working for a 'united front from above', and a group of communists in Leipzig who had continued to insist on the radical difference between SPD and NSDAP were expelled.

An open letter from the KPD central committee, published in the *Rote Fahne* of 5 January 1932, dwelt on the dangers of opportunism in the party. The social-democratic leaders and the SAP were proposing a united front in order to create confusion and to undermine the proletarian united front under KPD leadership. 'The SAP leaders and Brandlerists have demagogically identified the question of the proletarian united front with the question of "agreement" (*Einigung*) between the SPD leaders and the KPD leadership, counting on the sentimental attitudes and illusions among the working class. They are deliberately trying to deceive the workers.' The united front led by the KPD 'would create the conditions necessary for annihilating the mass influence of the SPD'. Proposals for organizational unity, or even a 'neutral' attitude towards them, were 'the worst and most dangerous opportunism'. All these mistakes arose from drawing 'a false and undialectical distinction' between the fascist and the bourgeois-democratic forms of capitalist dictatorship.

In January 1932 the KPD announced that it was putting forward Thaelmann as candidate in the presidential election not because it believed he would be elected, but as a part of the general class struggle; all the other candidates were class enemies. In February Remmele wrote that the Nazi candidature was only a sham—Hitler had agreed to withdraw in favour of Hindenburg in the second round; this showed there was a united front from Hitler to the SPD. The KPD election slogan was 'Class against class. For the red united front against the entire reaction, from Severing to Hitler.' Hindenburg's vote increased from 49.6 per cent of the total in the first round to 53.0 in the second; the vote for Hitler went up from 30.1 per cent to 36.8, and the vote for Thaelmann dropped from 13.2 to 10.2 per cent.

During the election campaign Thaelmann said that the danger of an attack on Russia was greater than at any time since 1920. The entire bourgeoisie, 'including the social-democrats and the Nazis, are utterly unable to pursue any other policy than the policy of . . . capitulation to French imperialism'. The KPD struggle to win the proletariat 'is directed in the first place against the two most important counter-revolutionary mass parties, the SPD and the NSDAP. But even in this struggle the main blow must be directed against the SPD, and it must be made clear to the masses that the Hitler party and the possibility of a Hitler government cannot be fought if the mass influence of . . . the "moderate wing" of fascism, namely the SPD, is not first overthrown.' To do this they had to expose the treacherous SPD policy of the 'lesser evil' (Hindenburg rather than Hitler), and their deceptive offers of a united front against Hitler. These were aspects of 'the shameful role of German social-democracy,

which, in the service of French imperialism, in the service of the League of Nations and world imperialism, is pursuing a policy of incorporating Germany in the anti-Soviet front, of Germany's participation in the coming war of intervention against the Soviet Union'.

On 17 March, between the first and second electoral rounds, *Pravda* wrote that the bourgeoisie had put forward Hindenburg as their candidate, and Hitler as their threat to the revolutionary workers. The SPD's 'hysterical outcry' against the fascist danger concealed its alliance with fascism, and would deceive only the inexperienced into thinking there was a difference between the two. The 5 million votes for Thaelmann were good, but not good enough. The KPD central committee resolution at the end of March called on the party to overcome within its own ranks 'every tendency to draw a liberal contrast between social-fascism and Hitler-fascism, between bourgeois democracy and fascist dictatorship'. When the results of the second round on 10 April were published, the KPD central committee attributed the drop of 1.3 million in the Thaelmann vote to abstentions, not to a swing to Hitler, whose vote had risen from 11.3 to 13.4 million.

The SPD Reichstag group had published in *Vorwärts* an open letter to the KPD urging the withdrawal of Thaelmann's candidature. Did the KPD believe that there was no difference between Hindenburg and Hitler, or between Brüning and Frick? 'To think that the Hitler-State will be no worse than the Republic under Brüning is to deceive yourselves.' Hitler would destroy the trade unions and the trade union opposition, the right of association and meeting and an independent press. 'Despite the shortcomings of the Republic, you hold hundreds of meetings every day and your newspapers appear. Hitler's State will rob you of all political rights and of every opportunity for economic and social struggle.' To this the *Rote Fahne* replied: 'We do not usually correspond with you because we think of you as enemies of the working class. But we want to open the eyes of the social-democratic workers whom you mislead and so we are making an exception.' It was because the KPD wanted to defeat Hitler that it waged 'a ruthless struggle against Hindenburg and Brüning, Wels and Severing, who do everything to help Hitler to power. . . . Hitler would never have become important except for the activities of social-democracy and the trade union bureaucracy, who split, suppress, betray, and confuse the proletariat.' The SPD machine had worked day and night to protect Hitler and the Storm Troops. Thaelmann would defeat Hitler not at the polls but in the factories, the employment exchanges, and the streets. Every vote for Thaelmann was a proletarian oath against Hitler, against social-democracy, against the Brüning system and the capitalists. A fascist dictatorship was already being exercised by Brüning and the social-democrats. Whether Hitler would carry that dictatorship further depended on the resolution and militancy of the proletariat.

After the Prussian Landtag elections at the end of April, in which the Nazi vote exceeded that of the SPD and KPD combined, the *Rote Fahne* said the results reflected the growing acuteness of the class struggle; *Pravda* commented that the bourgeoisie had succeeded in diverting the masses from the class struggle to hostility to Versailles and the Young Plan. Knorin's explanation was

that the bourgeoisie had begun to doubt whether the social-democrats were strong enough to hold the workers back from action, and were therefore putting the Nazis in to do the job their way. 'The essential thing', Remmele wrote in June 1932, 'is that the November Republic has run its course. . . . The period of social-democratic betrayal is drawing to an end.' At the end of April the KPD central committee announced that it was ready 'to fight together with any organization of workers which is really fighting against wage and benefit cuts', and the KPD fraction in the Prussian Landtag made similar statements, but the SPD leaders were specifically excluded. 'It is not we, but the social-democratic workers who must change their line', Thaelmann said on 1 May.

At a meeting early in June 1932 of KPD officials Thaelmann said that the growing fascist terror made it more than ever necessary to detach the social-democratic workers from their leaders in order to strengthen the anti-fascist mass front. The KPD must get rid of all inhibitions against the revolutionary united front from below. On 17 June *Rote Fahne* published an offer from the Berlin committee of the KPD to the local SPD committee proposing joint action against the fascists. The SPD replied that proletarian unity was more necessary than ever, but it could not co-operate unless the KPD ceased its attacks on the social-democratic leaders and organizations. This, said the *Rote Fahne*, showed that the social-democrats did not want a united front. An SPD circular issued at the end of June 1932 after a meeting of the party executive dealt with the KPD offer. 'All proposals from the social-democratic side to stop the mutual fight and concentrate on the common enemy of the working class were rejected with scorn'; the hypocrisy of the communist offer of a united front was shown in the Prussian Landtag, when the KPD voted with the NSDAP against the SPD; successful negotiations were possible only through the central party bodies; local negotiations only introduced confusion.

In an article on 'the strategy of the anti-fascist struggle' published early in July 1932, Thaelmann answered those who had suggested that the united front from below should be supplemented by one from above. There were circumstances in which this might be possible, but for the present, since the KPD was the only anti-fascist party, its strategy was to defeat and isolate social-democracy; when the lie that the SPD was an anti-fascist party was exposed, the masses would lose their parliamentary and democratic illusions; the fight against Papen and Hitler did not mean that the KPD defended the Weimar Republic, or wanted the restoration of the constitutional order.

The dismissal by Papen of the SPD Prussian ministers on 20 July elicited another conditional united front offer from the KPD, although Stampfer noted in his memoirs that the news of their dismissal was received with applause at some KPD meetings. Unofficial conversations between some KPD and SPD officials were fruitless. The KPD call for a general strike aroused no response whatever. Later in the year, an article in the *Communist International* explained that the call for a general strike met with no response because the KPD had shown insufficient initiative, although the situation was 'favourable'. Radek commented that 20 July had destroyed working-class illusions, but it was bound to take some time before they dropped their old habits. The *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum* said that on 20 July 'the masses came out into the streets . . . but the

party was late in its appeal for a strike'. The 20 July appeal, said Trotsky, was a 'shattering verdict' on the KPD's previous tactics, but a move of this kind could succeed only if it were based on a coherent and consistent policy; the Nazis in power would mean ten to twenty years of fascist rule, the end of the KPD, and war against the USSR; the KPD had learnt nothing; the Comintern should return to the united front policy of the third and fourth congresses. Two years later, at an ECCI presidium meeting in July 1934, the KPD was criticized for not leading at least part of the proletariat into battle on 20 July; its passivity had had a shattering effect on the working class. The seventh congress *Materials* said that at the plenum the KPD criticized its own position in this respect; it was weak in the factories, it had failed to undertake genuine mass trade union work, its slogans were abstract, its agitation lacked popular appeal; it was therefore unable to establish its independent leadership of the masses in the fight for the democratic rights and liberties of the working class. Despite 'all its efforts for a united front', it had been unable to rid itself of sectarianism and establish friendly relations with social-democratic workers.

The proposal made by the SPD Berlin organization before the Reichstag elections of 31 July 1932 that there should be 'civil peace' between the two parties was rejected by the KPD, whose central committee, three days before the elections, stated that a vote for the SPD was a vote for strengthening the Hitler-Papen dictatorship. The election results (compared with those of September 1930) showed a drop in the SPD vote from 24.5 per cent of the total to 21.6; the KPD vote rose from 13.1 to 14.3 per cent, and the NSDAP vote more than doubled, from 18.3 to 37.3 per cent. *Inprekorr* commented that 'the chief tendency was the further decline of the SPD'. Its vote had dropped by one million since September 1930 (the Nazi vote had gone up by more than 7 million). Knorin wrote in August that the results showed the continuing rise of the revolutionary wave. Comments in the Czech socialist press, urging better relations between KPD and SPD, were noted by Gottwald: the nervousness in the social-fascist press showed 'how successful we have been at hitting them where it hurts'.

At the plenum Piatnitsky said the French party was lagging behind despite constant assistance from the Comintern. In the last two years the ECCI presidium and political secretariat had given more attention to the CPF than to any other party: there had been 5 meetings to discuss the seventh CPF congress, 6 to discuss the French elections, 3 to consider work among the French peasants, 2 on the trade unions, and others. 'In the majority of cases, French comrades were present when these questions were discussed.' The membership of the party was declining, the circulation of *L'Humanité* was falling, and the work of the parliamentary fraction was extremely poor; although it had been agreed that a member of the politbureau should sit on *L'Humanité's* editorial board, this had not been done; there was in fact no contact between the bureau and the board. The 'loss of tempo' in the French Communist Party had been discussed at a meeting of its central committee in May 1931 which endorsed unanimously the resolutions of the eleventh plenum. The report referred to the lack of belief among many members in the correctness of the 'class against class' line. The report on parliamentary tactics to the seventh CPF congress in March

1932 noted that many members did not understand this policy, while others opposed it. Many workers did not understand the automatic retention of CPF candidates in the second electoral round.

In December 1931 a CPF central committee resolution outlined the story of the 'conspirators group' in the central committee whose activities were largely responsible for the party's decline despite favourable objective conditions: the group, organized by Barbé, Celor, and Lozeray, and including among others Billoux and Guyot, had concealed its existence from the party and the Comintern. Since 1928 it had been working against them, and had managed to occupy many leading positions; it was sectarian and it feared the masses; it acted as an organized fraction with its own discipline; the central committee had not reacted quickly enough to this situation, and was itself therefore partly to blame. In the summer of 1931 Ferrat had broken with the group, and Guyot had helped the party and the Comintern to expose its activities. He had denounced the group at a meeting of the political bureau in July 1931. Barbé and Celor were removed from the political bureau and, together with Lozeray and Billoux, were publicly reprimanded; Celor was recalled as representative on the ECCI, and the decision of the ECCI presidium, taken on French initiative, to remove Barbé as member of the ECCI presidium and Celor as candidate member of the presidium and the political secretariat, was approved. After the plenum Celor was expelled from the CPF.

In the May 1932 elections the communist vote fell from the 1,067,000 it had reached in 1928 to 790,000. The rise in the radical and socialist vote, Berlioz wrote, reflected the discontent of the masses; the CPF did not know how to exploit this, its propaganda consisted of abstract generalities; the masses did not look on it as their leader, nor did they understand the bolshevik line of the CPF. This was in part due to the sectarian policy of the Barbé-Celor group. Cachin, Marty, and Duclos lost their seats.

The communist position on Alsace-Lorraine had been discussed at a conference at Schillingheim in 1929, which came out in favour of self-determination for Alsace-Lorraine as an oppressed people, and again in October 1930 at a conference in Strasbourg attended also by representatives of the KPD and the West European Bureau of the ECCI. Alsace-Lorraine was a case of national oppression by French imperialism; the conference issued a manifesto on its 'social and national emancipation', calling for the establishment of an independent workers' and peasants' republic. At the central committee meeting in May 1931 Thorez criticized those speakers who doubted whether the autonomy movement had mass support; the movement weakened French imperialism, which Stalin in the previous June had called 'the most aggressive and militarist of all the aggressive and militarist countries in the world'. The question was brought up again in Thorez' report to the seventh CPF congress in March 1932; it was French policy to get Germany into the anti-Soviet front; hence the CPF had to fight against Versailles and to support the struggle of Alsace-Lorraine for self-determination. In the elections communist candidates in Alsace-Lorraine could be withdrawn in the second round in favour of candidates who were fighting French imperialism if they agreed to work for self-determination up to and including secession, to fight all parties, including the socialists,

which upheld French imperialist oppression of Alsace-Lorraine, and to support the economic demands of the workers and peasants. An article in the *Communist International* at the time of the election criticized the CPF for its 'indifference' to the Alsace-Lorraine national emancipation movement.

The position of the CGTU was also unsatisfactory. In an article published before its sixth congress in November 1931 a steep drop in membership since the fifth congress in 1929 was reported—more than 20,000 in Paris alone, whereas the CGT was growing. The CGTU was 'dangerously separated' from the masses. The anti-communist minority in the CGTU had been called to Moscow in July 1931 for consultation with the RILU Executive, where they were condemned as 'disintegrators and splitters of the revolutionary labour movement' for having advocated the re-establishment of trade union unity by direct negotiations 'from above', and for having disorganized the campaign for unity on a class basis. In an article in the Comintern journal in November 1931 a certain B. Vassiliev argued that the workers were beginning to turn their backs on the CGT, which was therefore pushing its 'left minority' into the foreground. These people, 'on behalf of the most vital interests of the French bourgeoisie', were beginning to 'manoeuvre for unity among the trade unions', and worked in alliance with the CGTU minority who objected to communist control, resented RILU interference in internal French affairs, and doubted the imminence of war or the danger of an attack on the USSR. At the plenum Piatnitsky said the CPF had not responded correctly to the demoralizing activities of the CGTU minority: 'on this question we had to draft a document jointly with the French comrades and the CGTU'. Further meetings were held later in the year, but the situation was still not satisfactory. 'The failure of so many strikes in France is due in no small degree to the fact that the red trade unions, which have a membership of about 300,000, are not able to expose the manoeuvres of the reformists and social-democrats, to establish the united front from below.'

In the 1931 parliamentary elections the CPGB put up 25 candidates; they received a total vote of 75,000. The party was severely criticized for failing to provide central political leadership, to follow the decisions of the eleventh plenum, or to make it clear to the masses that the Labour Party 'was deceiving them and supporting the Conservatives'. The explanation of the low vote given by Manuilsky and Kuusinen at the English commission of the ECCI in December was that the workers still believed that the Labour Party represented their interests. 'We are faced with the very serious and important task of exposing the Labour Party.' An article published the following March in the *Communist International* asserted that some communists had actually believed that the Conservative Party was out to destroy the Labour Party in the elections; the CPGB had helped to spread illusions about 'the lesser evil', had made attempts at a united front from above with the ILP, and had allowed some members of that party to speak at communist meetings. Another article in the same issue stated that the CPGB was divorced from the masses, who were becoming more radical.

In May 1932 J. T. Murphy, who disagreed with the official communist analysis of the elections, resigned from the CPGB. He had also wanted the CPGB

to work up mass pressure for credits to the USSR to relieve unemployment, arguing that an expansion of Anglo-Soviet trade would help the Five Year Plan, associate the British workers with it more closely, and link their fate with the fate of the USSR, thus serving as an obstacle to war. This, said the statement of the political bureau of the CPGB, made him 'a propagandist of the peace mission of capitalism, and an exponent of the inability of socialism to overcome capitalism'. Murphy's 'childish argument that international trading relations reduce the danger of war', was 'nothing but vulgar capitalist propaganda, which is regularly churned out in the columns of the capitalist press in order to disarm the workers and to prevent them from fighting against the warmongers'.

Wang Ming attended the plenum for the CCP. He had left China at the end of 1931 to act as representative on the ECCI (and stayed there until 1937). Although appointed chairman of the CCP (after the execution of the previous chairman) he was not given any post in the provisional Chinese Soviet Government, of which Mao Tse-tung was chairman, set up at the first congress of representatives of the Soviet areas held in November 1931. *Inprekorr* first reported the congress in a telegram dated from Tokio on 17 December 1931: 'with great delay news has reached here of the first Chinese Soviet congress held in Kiangsi on 7 November'. After the establishment of the provisional Government the Chinese central committee moved from Shanghai, where it was in constant danger from the KMT, to the Soviet area. Chou En-lai was made commissioner for military affairs. The Far Eastern Bureau of the ECCI, also in Shanghai, was dismantled when the two principal members of its staff, a M. and Mme Noulens, were arrested. Wang Ming reported to the plenum that the Chinese Red Army now had 26 army corps, 15 'independent divisions', and 'a well-armed GPU'. The movement in China, Manuilsky said, with its repercussions in India, Indochina, Malaya, and elsewhere, 'is the centre of the instability of the whole colonial system of world imperialism'. Chinese victories proved 'the possibility and suitability of the Soviet system not only for China, but for the colonial peoples in general'. In February 1932 the Chinese Soviet Government declared war on Japan.

Although, in an earlier article, the date of foundation of the Indian Communist Party was given as 1930, an 'open letter' from the communist parties of China, Britain, and Germany to Indian communists, published in the Comintern journal in June 1932, appealed to them to 'undertake the formation of the communist party'. So far there were only a small number of weak groups, not united in any way, and not clearly differentiated in all cases from the national reformists. They had failed to take part in the anti-imperialist movement; this had been left to the Congress Party. The communists must take up this fight, and isolate the Congress from the masses. 'The role of the Indian communists is enormous. The Indian anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution can deliver a death blow to British imperialism.' An article published the following month in *Inprekorr*, over the name of Rathan Singh, elaborated the tactical line. The masses could be won for the anti-imperialist revolution and liberated from reformist influence only if there was an 'independent illegal party of the proletariat'; such a party could be formed only by vigorous communist participation in all forms of the mass struggle, and by the formation of com-

munist fractions in all mass organizations; they had none so far. These were essential for a unified policy and for proletarian hegemony. The existence of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, described as 'an organization of leaders', objectively hindered the formation of a communist party. Local legal labour parties offered communists useful opportunities, and their formation was approved on condition that an illegal communist organization existed capable of organized revolutionary activity in such a party, that it did not take the place of a communist party, that it had a class programme, that it did not divert the workers from revolutionary into reformist activities. These and other conditions had to be fulfilled 'before we take on the job of organizing such labour parties'.

The arrest of Gandhi, Bose, and others, and of the 'left national-reformist menshevik renegade M. N. Roy' was explained by Magyar as demonstrating the desire of the British authorities to provoke the Indian masses to come out on to the streets so that they could then be shot down 'with machine-guns, artillery, and aeroplanes'. That was why communists protested against the arrest, although Roy was 'the worst enemy of the CPI' and 'an agent and defender' of British imperialism in the labour movement. Roy had returned to India in December 1930, anxious to promote co-operation with the National Congress, was arrested in July 1931, and given a sentence of twelve years imprisonment. The Comintern Indian secretariat was set up by C. P. Dutt (CPGB) and Chattopadhyaya in Berlin.]

I. THE END OF CAPITALIST STABILIZATION AND THE GROWTH OF THE USSR

The sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism is proceeding with enormous strides which are carrying this crisis to a new stage. The fundamental changes which are taking place in the world situation are characterized by a number of recent important facts.

1. A tremendous change has taken place in the relation of forces between the socialist and the capitalist worlds, due primarily to the increase in the relative importance of the USSR, which is carrying out its great programme of socialist industrialization, collectivization and the cultural revolution at a tremendous rate. That country has completely established itself in the position of socialism; the second Five Year Plan provides for the final abolition of classes and for the conversion of the whole of the toiling population of the country into active and conscious builders of classless socialist society. The successes achieved in socialist construction are securing to an increasing degree the economic independence of the Soviet Union in relation to the capitalist world, and its international power, its revolutionizing influence on the toilers and the exploited of all countries, and its significance as the basis of the world socialist revolution have increased.

2. Meanwhile in the capitalist world there is a continuation of:

- (a) *the sharpening of the economic crisis*—industry has contracted to such a

degree that more than half of the working class is partially or totally unemployed: the expropriation and impoverishment of the peasants has reached unprecedented dimensions;

(b) *the growing revolutionary upsurge* both in imperialist and colonial countries (stubborn and turbulent strikes, revolutionary demonstrations, fierce clashes between the workers and the police and fascists, militant activity by the peasant masses, etc.); the sharpening of the struggle of the colonial peoples against the imperialists;

(c) *a further sharpening of the antagonisms between the imperialist powers* (trade war, acceleration of the imperialist race for armaments, rifts in the Versailles system, the Japanese war against China, an acute sharpening of the relations between Japan and the USA, between Great Britain and USA, between Italy and France, between Germany and France, etc.);

(d) *intensified preparation for a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR.*

3. The domination of monopolist capital which, at the present day, has brought under its sway almost the whole economy of capitalist society, makes it extremely difficult, in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, to overcome the economic crisis in the way that was usual for capitalism in the period of free competition. . . . This, however, does not imply that capitalism will break down automatically; it implies the inevitable further growth of the revolutionary upsurge and a further sharpening of the fundamental antagonisms which drive the bourgeoisie to seek a violent solution of these antagonisms, both within their own countries and on the international arena.

4. All these facts taken together completely confirm the estimate of the tendencies of development given in the decisions of the tenth and eleventh plenums of the ECCI, and also reveal, in the course of the development of the general crisis of capitalism, a definite *change*, a peculiar swaying [gathering momentum] of the antagonistic forces, very rapid in some places and slow in others. In certain extremely important key points, the antagonistic forces are already becoming unleashed for the conflict. The end of relative capitalist stabilization has come. But a directly revolutionary situation has not yet arisen in the important and decisive capitalist countries. What is taking place at the present moment is the *transition* to a new round of big clashes between classes and between states, a new round of wars and revolutions.

This transition, which in international relations is especially accelerated by the military aggression of Japan and France, is taking place in the form of an uneven process in the various countries. In Spain a revolution is taking place. In China there is a revolutionary situation, and a Soviet revolution has been victorious over a large territory. In Germany there is a tremendous sharpening of class antagonisms—on the one hand the

growth of fascism, and on the other hand, the growth of the revolutionary mass struggle, the accelerated maturing of the prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis. Certain other countries are either approaching very closely to a revolutionary crisis (Poland), or, as a result of the extreme sharpening of antagonisms at home and abroad, may find themselves in the situation of a revolutionary crisis in the near future (Japan). In India and the Latin American countries the development of the revolutionary crisis is retarded, primarily by the low degree of organization of the proletariat and the immaturity of the communist parties. In all capitalist countries the forces of the international proletarian revolution are steadily growing, but in such important countries of world capitalism as the USA, Great Britain and France, the upsurge of the revolutionary movement, although developing, is still greatly lagging behind the high intensity of the whole international situation.

II. THE DANGER OF A NEW WORLD WAR, THE WAR OF JAPAN AGAINST CHINA, THE NEW PHASE IN THE PREPARATIONS FOR INTERVENTION AGAINST THE USSR

1. The fierce struggle the imperialists are waging for markets and colonies, the tariff wars and the race for armaments, have already led to the immediate danger of a new imperialist world war. French imperialism, in developing feverish activity in the struggle for hegemony on the European continent, is trying to strengthen its old military and political alliances and to form new ones (Danube Federation), but encounters the resistance of Germany, USA and Italy. Germany demands the equal status of an imperialist power (the annulment of reparations, equality of armaments, the revision of Eastern frontiers, etc.), while Poland is preparing to seize Danzig and East Prussia. Thus Germany is one of the main centres of the sharpest and most intense world imperialist conflicts.

2. The seizure of Manchuria by Japan and the attack on Shanghai have upset the compact that has hitherto existed between the USA, Japan and Great Britain regarding the establishment of spheres of influence in China. Japanese imperialism, in alliance with France and with the actual support of England, is converting Manchuria into its colony and has thus put the armed struggle for the partition of China and intervention against the USSR on the order of the day. The League of Nations, acting at the behest of France and England, supports Japan. The United States, in pursuing its imperialist aims in the Far East, openly threatens another race for armaments. The agglomeration of antagonisms in the Pacific form[s] the chief hotbed for breeding a new imperialist world war.

3. For the purpose of *preparing a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR* under the cloak of the peace declarations of the League of Nations and the

Second International, there is proceeding the [arming of Japan by the imperialists of Europe and the USA, the] concentration of the Japanese army in Manchuria, the formation and arming of white-guard units in the Far East, and also the organization of an expeditionary army in France, feverish preparations of the army in Poland, Rumania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland, and the strengthening and activization of specially selected fascist formations, unceasing provocation, etc. It is only the firm peace policy pursued by the USSR, and the fears the bourgeoisie entertain of the prospects of imperialist war being converted into civil war and of colonial uprisings, that restrain them from slipping into war and intervention.

4. Under these circumstances of rapidly approaching criminal war, especially hastened by fascism, the communist parties must, as an offset to the abstract and hypocritical pacifist statements of the social-democrats, commence a real struggle against the preparations for war. The ECCI imposes the duty upon all communist parties to apply with greatest persistence and energy the decisions of the Comintern on the question of struggle against imperialist war and intervention.

III. BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP, NATIONALISM, FASCISM AND SOCIAL-FASCISM

1. The bourgeois dictatorship continues to undergo transformation in the direction of the further strengthening of political reaction and the fascization of the State and in this is revealing a contraction of the basis of bourgeois rule and manifestations of fissures and disintegration. The bickerings in the camp of the bourgeoisie frequently result in [take the form of] splits into hostile camps (Germany, Finland, Yugoslavia), in some cases—the assassination of prominent bourgeois politicians (Japan). As a rule, the bourgeoisie are finding it more and more difficult to smooth over the conflicts which arise among them.

In most capitalist countries, the big bourgeoisie are organizing fascist units for civil war, are making a system of political banditism, white terror, the torture of political prisoners, provocation, forging documents, the shooting down of strikers and demonstrators, the dissolution and suppression of the organizations of the workers. But while doing this the bourgeoisie do not cease to utilize parliament and the services of the social-democratic party [parties] to deceive the masses.

In Germany, in an atmosphere of sharpening antagonism abroad and extreme tension in class relations at home, the von Papen-Schleicher Government, with the help of the Reichswehr, the 'Steel Helmets', and the national socialists has established a form of fascist dictatorship, for which the social-democrats and the Centre prepared the way. The further

development or breakdown of this dictatorship depends on the revolutionary struggle of the working class against fascism in all its forms.

In those countries where a fascist dictatorship existed before the world economic crisis, a process of disintegration of fascism is observed as a consequence of the growing revolutionary mass upsurge (Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy).

2. The destruction caused by the present world economic crisis, the breakdown of the economic contacts of world capitalism and the sharpening of the struggle for markets favour the spread of [unbridled] *nationalism and chauvinism* among the ruling nations. In Germany a wave of chauvinist sentiments and passions has arisen out of the hatred which has accumulated against the humiliating and predatory conditions of the Versailles peace treaty, and out of the impotent desire for 'revenge' combined with fear of the prospects of the further decline and collapse of German capitalism. In France, chauvinism is cloaked by the slogan of 'safety of the frontiers', in Great Britain, by the theory of 'unity of the Empire', in Japan, by the pan-Asiatic idea, in Italy, by the theory of overpopulation, etc. A stubborn struggle must be carried on everywhere for internationalism and against the dangerous ideology of chauvinism, and account must be taken of the peculiar character and the special forms of chauvinism in each separate country.

3. *Both fascism and social-fascism* (social-democracy) stand for the maintenance and the strengthening of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship, but from this position they each adopt different tactical views. In view of the fact that the position of the ruling bourgeoisie of every country is one of inherent [most extreme] contradiction at the present time, which compels them now and again to manoeuvre between a course for determined struggle against their enemies at home and abroad, and the more prudent course, this inherent [most extreme] contradiction in the position of the bourgeoisie is also reflected in the difference in the positions taken up by fascism and social-fascism. The social-fascists prefer a [more] moderate and [more] 'lawful' application of bourgeois class coercion, because they do not want to contract the basis of the bourgeois dictatorship; they guard its 'democratic' drappings, and strive chiefly to preserve its parliamentary forms, for without these, the social-fascists would be hampered in carrying out their special function of deceiving the working masses. At the same time, the social-fascists restrain the workers from revolutionary action against the capitalist offensive and growing fascism, play the part of a screen behind which the fascists are able to organize their forces, and build [clear] the road for the fascist dictatorship.

4. To the extent that the economic policy of monopolist capital is adapted to the special conditions and difficulties of the economic crisis, *social-democracy adapts its ideology* to the requirements of the crisis policy

of the financial oligarchy. The social-democratic leaders are again unearthing their threadbare slogans of the *nationalization* of certain branches of industry. . . . They even draw up for the bourgeoisie ultra-reactionary schemes of forced labour and present these quack schemes as plans to establish socialism under capitalism.

5. The mass influence of the social-fascists has declined [in almost all countries]. For that very reason their manoeuvres have become more energetic and varied (leading strikes with the aim of throttling them, in some cases, even demonstrative declaration of general strikes, sham fight against fascism, for peace, in defence of the USSR, etc.). In these manoeuvres particular zeal is displayed by the 'left' social-democratic groups, who simultaneously carry on a frenzied campaign of slander against the communist party and the USSR. Only by taking fully into account the variety of the forms of the policy and manoeuvres of the social-fascist in all their concreteness will the communists be able really to expose and isolate the social-fascists. Only by directing the main blows against social-democracy, this social mainstay of the bourgeoisie—will it be possible to strike at and defeat the chief class enemy of the proletariat—the bourgeoisie. And only by *strict differentiation between social-democratic leaders and workers* will the communists be able, by means of the [revolutionary] united front from below, to break down the wall which often separates them from the social-democratic workers.

IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND THE PREPARATION OF THE STRUGGLE FOR THE DIC- TATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

1. The growth of the revolutionary upsurge has become particularly evident since the XI Plenum of the ECCI. . . .

2. During this period the communist parties have increased their strength. In Germany, the party achieved great successes in the last Reichstag elections, and the anti-fascist struggle is developing under the leadership of the party on the basis of the united front from below. A growth of the mass influence of the communist parties is observed in China, Poland and Bulgaria. In France, in spite of the fact that the Communist Party lost considerably in the parliamentary elections and that the membership of the Unitary Confederation of Labour has declined, there is a considerable upsurge of the revolutionary anti-war movement. . . . Despite the weakness of the mass influence of the communist parties in a number of countries, the communists in all parts of the capitalist world, in numerous fights and trials, under conditions of merciless terror, have shown themselves to be courageous and truly revolutionary, advanced fighters of the proletariat.

3. The end of capitalist stabilization, the rapidly growing prerequisites of a revolutionary crisis in a number of capitalist states, and the international situation in general, sharply raises the problem of solving the main task of the communist parties at the present time, *i.e.*, of preparing the working class and the exploited masses, in the course of the economic and political struggles, for the impending fight for power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Precisely because little time remains before the revolutionary crisis matures, it is necessary, without losing a moment, to *intensify and accelerate our bolshevik mass work* to win over the majority of the working class, to increase the revolutionary activity of the working class. The opponents of the revolutionary movement have not yet lost the support of an enormous section of organized and unorganized workers, and this circumstance, which enables them to impede the revolutionization of the proletariat, constitutes the fundamental danger from the point of view of preparing for the victory of the proletariat. . . .

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

5. In the practical work of our parties it is necessary to put an end to a number of repeated weaknesses and mistakes which hinder the development of their mass work. The chief of these shortcomings and mistakes are as follows: most of our party workers are isolated from the reformist and other non-communist workers; work in the reformist unions meets with actual resistance; agitation is abstract and stereotyped, and this applies also to the press, and especially to slogans; there is a lack of ability to defend in a practical manner the vital interests of the workers and to take advantage of practical causes which specially excite the workers, for the purpose of organizing the activity of really broad masses, using various forms of the struggle according to the situation; there is a

lack of bold application of the forms and methods of proletarian democracy for the purpose of building up the united front from below; and on the other hand, there is an opportunist slurring over of differences of principle when applying the tactics of the united front; there is a lack of ability to combine the struggle against the employers, the government and the fascists, with the struggle for winning the workers away from the influence of the social-fascist agents of the bourgeoisie; there are shortcomings and mistakes in the tactics and strategy of strikes; there is a lack of ability to develop the movement of the broad masses from comparatively elementary movements to higher and higher forms of struggle, big economic and political strikes and other revolutionary actions.

6. The twelfth plenum emphasizes the importance and the urgent necessity of overcoming these shortcomings and mistakes in the practice of the communist parties. There must be determined dissociation from right opportunist 'tailism' which frequently manifests itself in capitulatory moods, in disbelief in the possibility of revolutionizing the reformist working masses, and from 'left' opportunist subjectivism which wishes to substitute for the necessary, difficult work of the bolshevik education and mobilization of the masses and of really developing these struggles by organizing and winning the leadership of the everyday struggle of the workers and peasants, empty phrases about developing revolutionary struggles. The correct bolshevik mass policy can be carried out only in an irreconcilable struggle against right opportunism as the chief danger and against 'left' deviations from the line of the Comintern. . . .

V. THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE SECTIONS OF THE CI

1. The general task of the Comintern and its sections in all capitalist countries at the present time is to wage a concrete struggle: (1) *against the capitalist offensive*; (2) *against fascism and reaction*; (3) *against the impending imperialist war and intervention in the Soviet Union*. . . .

2. The specific tasks of the major communist parties are as follows:

CP OF GERMANY: To mobilize the vast masses of toilers in defence of their vital interests, against the bandit policy of monopolist capital, against fascism, against the emergency decrees, against nationalism and chauvinism, and by developing economic and political strikes, by struggle for proletarian internationalism, by means of demonstrations, to lead the masses to the point of the general political strike: to win over the bulk of the social-democratic masses, and definitely overcome the weaknesses of trade union work. The chief slogan which the CPG must put forward to offset the slogan of the fascist dictatorship (the 'Third Empire') and the slogan of the social-democratic party (the 'Second Republic') is the slogan of the workers' and peasants' republic, *i.e.*, Socialist Soviet Germany,

which will guarantee the possibility of the voluntary affiliation of the people of Austria and other German territories.

CP OF FRANCE: To turn its work in the direction of defending the interests of the workers and peasant masses (fight against wage cuts, for social insurance, for immediate relief for the unemployed, against the burden of taxes, etc.) and to link up this defence with the struggle against the Versailles system, against the subjection of Alsace-Lorraine and the colonies, and against the war policy of French imperialism . . . and patiently and tirelessly fight for the liberation of the syndicalist and socialist workers from their reformist, parliamentary and pacifist illusions. . . .

CP OF GREAT BRITAIN: A sharp turn must be made towards work in the reformist trade unions and in the factories, and to rouse the working masses, on the basis of the united front from below, for a struggle: 1. against the new capitalist offensive on the wages of the workers and unemployment insurance benefits; 2. against the government policy of supporting and encouraging the anti-Soviet aggression of Japanese and French imperialism; 3. for the independence of the British colonies and Ireland.

CP OF USA: The American Party must mobilize the masses and concentrate chiefly on the struggle: 1. for social insurance, against wage cuts, for immediate assistance for the unemployed; 2. for assistance for the ruined farmers; 3. for equal rights of the Negroes and the right of self-determination for the Black Belt; 4. for the defence of the Chinese people and the Soviet Union. It is necessary to carry out the decision on the turn in the work of the party and the Trade Union Unity League.

CP OF JAPAN: The Japanese Party has the task of transforming its struggle against war and the seizure of the territory of China into a real mass movement of the workers and peasants, linking it up closely with the struggle for the immediate needs of the masses. Workers' and Peasants' Self-defence Committees and the combined action of villages must be organized against the forcible collection of rents and taxes from the peasants and the seizure of land from tenants; the party must explain to the masses the necessity for a revolutionary struggle for the confiscation of the land of the landlords without compensation for the benefit of the peasants.

CP OF CHINA: 1. To mobilize the masses under the slogan of the national revolutionary struggle against the Japanese and other imperialists and for the independence and integrity [unification] of China; 2. to develop and unite the Soviet territories, to strengthen the Red Army; 3. to fight for the overthrow of the Kuomintang regime; 4. to pursue a resolute policy of converting the Red trade unions into mass organizations, to win over the workers belonging to the Kuomintang unions; 5. to develop the guerrilla movement, putting forward in Manchuria slogans

calling for the formation of peasant committees, for boycotting taxes and government decrees, the confiscation of the property of the agents of the imperialists, the establishment of an elected people's government; 6. the popularization of the achievements of the Soviet districts and the slogan of the fraternal alliance of the workers and peasants of China with the USSR.

CP OF INDIA: To strengthen the Communist Party, politically and organizationally; to train bolshevik cadres, to wage a stubborn struggle in the reformist trade unions, develop a wide anti-imperialist front, to liberate the masses from the influence of the National Congress, to make agitational and organizational preparations for a general strike, to give the greatest possible support to the peasant movement for the non-payment of taxes, rent and debts, to popularize the basic slogans and tasks of the agrarian revolution.

[3.] In regard to *organization*, the chief tasks of the sections of the CI are: (a) carefully to conceal the communist nuclei in the factories, combining this with fearless mass work; (b) to create immediately nuclei in military detachments and in the militarized organizations of the bourgeoisie, in war factories, railways and ports; (c) to wage a determined struggle against provocation in all forms; (d) to take measures to ensure that the party can promptly pass to an illegal basis in case of necessity; (e) to transform the party press into real mass organs which must deal with all questions that concern the workers in simple language, intelligible to the workers; (f) there must be a thorough elimination from the leadership of all branches of party work of *super-centralism*, of the mere issuing of orders. The maintenance of a big central apparatus while the local organizations are bereft of forces must not be permitted.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE TWELFTH ECCI PLENUM
ON THE LESSONS OF ECONOMIC STRIKES AND THE STRUGGLE OF
THE UNEMPLOYED

September 1932

*Theses of the Twelfth Plenum**

[The theses were introduced by Thaelmann, Lenski, and Gottwald. They asked the questions Piatnitsky had asked earlier in a speech to students of the Lenin School—why had the communist parties and the RILU not won over more workers to their side, in spite of favourable objective conditions and social-democratic treachery? Despite dozens of conferences and articles and resolutions, the job had not yet been seriously tackled; they only reached those who were already on the communist side. Work should be concentrated on the factories and the employment exchanges. 'There is no need at all to shout in the factories and mills that we are communists . . . It is possible and necessary to

* Checked against the German version in *Inprekorr*, xii, 55, p. 2733, 14 October 1932.

carry on real party work . . . without calling oneself a member of the party or the cell.' At the plenum Kun and Thaelmann emphasized the need to work in the reformist unions, and were supported by Pollitt, who underlined the importance of getting communists elected to trade union branch committees. 'Wrong formulations on this question of the trade union movement, which have given the impression that we are out to smash and disrupt the trade union movement, have placed weapons in the hands of the Amsterdammers.' In March an article in the *Communist International* had called for a complete change in the work of the Minority Movement, which was 'a small, self-absorbed organization of leaders who have nothing to do with the real struggle of the workers'. Less than 7 per cent of the CPGB membership were organized in factory cells, and the percentage of members in trade unions had dropped from 53 in November 1930 to 37 in June 1931; the percentage in the Minority Movement had dropped from 21 to 15. At the twelfth congress of the CPGB in November 1932 Pollitt described the Minority Movement as a sectarian organization with a membership of 5,600.

Piatnitsky said communist influence in reformist unions had not increased since the previous plenum; among the unemployed it was also declining; many parties had failed to work in the spirit of the eleventh plenum resolution, which said that the unemployed organizations should be non-party in character; many comrades had confessed that they had not read the resolution. Many factory cells existed only on paper, and some that did exist did not function.

Thaelmann reported that the plenum commission on this resolution had dealt chiefly with recruiting new members for the trade union opposition and how to get communists into office in union branches. It also discussed weaknesses in RILU work, the importance of trade union fraction work, and the unemployed.]

1. THE GROWTH OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND THE CHARACTER OF STRIKE STRUGGLES AND THE STRUGGLES OF THE UNEMPLOYED

The growth of the revolutionary upsurge in the sphere of the economic struggle of the proletariat is expressed in: the development of the *mass* strike movement . . . the inclusion of [new groups of] the proletariat in the economic struggle in countries where the crisis developed late . . . the *rapid* conversion of small economic movements into mass economic and political strikes . . . the increase in the role of the communist parties and revolutionary trade union movement in strike struggles and in the struggle of the unemployed, in the rise of a *new, non-party group of worker activists* who fight heroically against the attacks of capital in spite of and against the reformist trade union bureaucrats.

The communist vanguard and the revolutionary trade union movement, however, has not since the eleventh Plenum of the ECCI succeeded in rousing the majority of the working class to the struggle against the unceasing attacks of capital. The chief cause of the insufficient development

of economic struggles is the still unsatisfactory application of the line of independent leadership of economic struggles, on the basis of the tactics of the united front from below, in the underestimation of partial struggles, in the weak contacts with the masses in the factories and among the unemployed, in the weakening of revolutionary positions inside the reformist trade unions, in the inability to expose the manoeuvres of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, in capitulation to reformist trade union bureaucrats, openly or concealed by 'left' phrases. . . .

The economic struggle of the proletariat is assuming more and more a *revolutionary* character, and combining, in an increasing number of cases with various elements and forms of political activity, is, at the present stage, in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries, the *fundamental link* for leading the masses to the forthcoming big revolutionary battles. *The greatest possible development and strengthening* of the struggle of the proletariat against wage cuts and the worsening of the conditions of labour, the exertion of all the efforts of the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations to ensure the independent leadership of strike struggles and the unemployed movement, the raising of the fighting capacity of the masses, leading them on the basis of their own experiences from the struggle for everyday partial demands to the struggle for the general class tasks of the proletariat—represent *the chief tasks* for all sections of the Communist International, especially under the conditions of the end of capitalist stabilization.

2. THE FIGHT AGAINST THE CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE AND THE TACTICS OF THE UNITED FRONT

The experience of a number of strike movements since the eleventh Plenum . . . shows that the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations have achieved successes in the leadership of the economic struggle of the proletariat in those cases when they have *consistently* applied the tactics of the united front from below at all stages of the struggle, when they have *promptly* put forward demands and slogans of the strike, intelligible to the *masses*, when they have organized them on the basis of broad *proletarian democracy*, drawn all sections of the fighting workers into the leadership of the strike, and when they have *decisively exposed* the manoeuvres of the reformist trade union bureaucrats and the 'confiding' conciliatory attitude towards them.

In addition to this the twelfth Plenum of the ECCI declares that *in the overwhelming majority* of the sections of the Comintern *serious shortcomings and a number of serious opportunist mistakes have been discovered in carrying out the tactics of the united front from below*, which have been utilized by the social-democrats and the reformist trade union bureaucrats in their tricky

manoeuvres. These shortcomings have arisen both from the underestimation and an insufficient application of the tactic of the united front (especially with regard to social-democratic workers), and also from opportunist capitulation to the reformist trade union bureaucrats (unity at any price), and in fact they have been the chief causes of the insufficient advances of the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement in the development of the independent leadership of the economic struggle of the proletariat. . . .

3. METHODS OF LEADING UNEMPLOYED STRUGGLES

The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI directs the special attention of all sections of the Comintern to the tremendous and ever growing political significance of the *unemployed movement* which is being directed more and more *directly against the capitalist state* (the struggle for food, for relief, for social insurance, against forced labour, etc.). The struggle of the unemployed has up to the present time been prepared by the communist vanguard and organized by it to a much less degree than the strike struggle of the proletariat. The communist parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations *have not succeeded* in organizing serious mass activity by the *employed workers* in defence of the interests of the unemployed, although it has been found possible more and more frequently, to get the unemployed to actively support workers on strike.

The most serious shortcoming in the mass work of the communist parties among the unemployed has been that insufficient attention has been paid to the organization of the struggle for the partial demands of the unemployed. . . . The unemployed movement has been left without proper revolutionary leadership, which to a certain degree has been taken advantage of by the social-democrats and fascists. In cases when communists and adherents of the revolutionary trade union movement have properly estimated the political importance of work among the unemployed, and have widely popularized the programme of demands of the unemployed, capably combining them with the concrete defence of the everyday interests of the unemployed, in most cases, they have been able to obtain material successes and to extend their political influence.

The communist parties, while systematically explaining to the working masses that unemployment is an inevitable accompaniment of the capitalist system and can only be abolished by the dictatorship of the proletariat, must devote special attention to the wide mobilization and organization of the broad masses of the unemployed for a struggle for their everyday demands and social insurance, but must not allow the Red trade unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition to serve as substitutes for the broad organization of the unemployed. . . .

4. WORK IN THE REFORMIST TRADE UNIONS

One of the chief causes of the insufficient mobilization of the masses by the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations in the struggle against the capitalist offensive is the impermissibly weak revolutionary work carried on *inside the reformist trade unions*.

The consistent everyday struggle of communists and supporters of the revolutionary trade union movement for the establishment of the united front of the workers urgently raises before all the sections of the Comintern and of the Red International of Labour Unions the question of work *inside* the reformist trade unions and the *methods* of this work. The influence of the reformist trade union bureaucracy, especially in countries with long established and strong reformist trade unions, is one of the chief hindrances to the development of the class struggle, and cannot be broken down by shouts about wrecking the trade unions for which communists are not striving, nor by deserting the trade unions, but by persistent work inside the reformist trade unions, by fighting hard to win every member of the reformist trade unions, for *every elected post* in the trade unions, for securing the dismissal of the reformist trade union bureaucracy and winning over the local organizations of individual trade unions and the local trade union councils of the reformist unions.

The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI calls upon all sections of the Communist International to continue the struggle with all Bolshevik consistency and determination against capitulation to the reformist trade union bureaucrats, as against the *chief danger*, and against those opportunist elements in the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement which still in practice oppose the existence of Red trade unions and the RTUO and the organization and the carrying on of independent economic strikes by them, and who, as substitute for them, support the slogan: 'Make the leaders fight'. The ECCI instructs all sections of the CI to explain to the party members and the revolutionary non-party workers that the trade union bureaucrats can only be successfully exposed and the mass of members in the mass reformist, Catholic, Nationalist, Kuomintang, yellow and similar trade unions can be liberated from their influence only if, in addition to detailed everyday work, explaining and putting forward their own proposals, the supporters of the RILU speak at all meetings, conferences and congresses on all questions concerning the organization and the tactics of the economic struggle and criticize and expose the leaders of these trade unions because they are carrying on negotiations with the employers behind the scenes, because they are in favour of voluntarily worsening the conditions of labour, because they sabotage the struggle of the masses, strangle the initiative of the masses of members and individual members, and when they cannot prevent the struggle any further,

they commence it after considerable delay and then capitulate to the employers behind the backs of the workers.

The sections of the CI must wage a ruthless struggle against those 'leftist' sectarian elements in the communist parties and the revolutionary trade union movement who take advantage of the struggle of the Comintern against the opportunist slogan of 'Make the leaders fight' in order to give up revolutionary work in the reformist trade unions. The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI calls on all sections of the Comintern to wage a determined struggle against 'leftist' sectarian refusals to fight for elected positions in the reformist trade unions, which is the duty of every communist according to the decisions of the tenth Plenum of the ECCI.

In countries where there are *mass fascist trade unions* or similar mass reactionary organizations (Italy, China) and especially in places where the fascist trade unions have the monopoly, communists must actively work inside them in an organized manner, utilizing all legal and semi-legal opportunities to draw the masses of members of these organizations into the class struggle, to discredit these organizations in the eyes of the masses, to strengthen the positions of the revolutionary trade union movement among the masses.

5. ACHIEVEMENTS AND DEFECTS IN THE WORK OF THE RED TRADE UNIONS

... The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI declares that in spite of a number of important successes (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Spain, Japan), the majority of the Red trade unions have not succeeded in taking advantage of the growth of the discontent among the masses against the capitalist offensive, and of the sharpening of the class struggle, in order to take the lead of the strike struggles and of the unemployed movement. ...

The chief shortcomings and weaknesses of the leadership of the economic struggles of the proletariat by the Red trade unions, which arise in the main from the absence of a firm and practical line for the independent leadership of economic struggles, from the extremely insufficient contacts with the masses, from the existence of considerable relics of social-democratic (in some countries, anarcho-syndicalist) methods of work, have found expression in the inability to seize on the concrete economic demands and the political slogans which excite the masses, the inability in most cases to decide on the concrete moment for commencing a struggle; the narrowness of the organizational basis in the Red trade unions; the absence, even now, of a serious organizational basis in the factories; the extremely poor development of democracy in the trade unions; and the smallness and political weakness of the cadres which is due to this.

6. ACHIEVEMENTS AND DEFECTS IN THE WORK OF THE RED TRADE UNION OPPOSITION

The *Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition*, as an organization embracing the organized and unorganized workers, has achieved a number of successes in a number of countries since the eleventh Plenum of the ECCI. Nevertheless, politically and organizationally, it still lags behind the growing revolutionary upsurge of the masses of the workers.

The main task of all the Revolutionary Trade Union Oppositions is to unite the organized and unorganized workers on the basis of the class struggle, to independently lead economic battles, to work in the reformist, Catholic and similar trade unions, to isolate the treacherous trade union bureaucracy from the mass of the trade union membership and to build up a mass organization which will link the communist parties with the masses.

The main weakness of the RTUO lies in the fact that, with few exceptions, it has not formed groups in the factories, has worked badly in the trade unions, has not set up its organizations in all the links of the reformist, Catholic, etc., trade unions, and, in the majority of cases, has not led [managed to take the lead in] the struggle of the organized and unorganized workers against the capitalist offensive. . . .

On the wave of the growing revolutionary upsurge and of the mass movement against the reformist trade union bureaucracy, the RTUO must become the lever and the organizational base for the creation of independent Red trade unions.

7. THE GROWTH OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST DEVIATIONS

The development of the economic struggle of the proletariat under conditions of the end of capitalist stabilization urgently requires that the communist vanguard pursue a clear and distinct struggle against opportunism, which becomes more dangerous in proportion as the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat rises higher.

Adaptation to the ideology and policy of social-democracy, capitulation to the reformist trade union bureaucrats in the independent leadership of the economic struggle of the proletariat, a confiding attitude to the 'left' manoeuvres of the reformist trade union bureaucrats (in particular to the slogan of the 'demonstrative' general strike), refusal to link up partial economic demands with general class slogans, the tactics of a 'bloc' with reformist trade union bureaucrats instead of the policy of a united front from below, refusal to form the RTUO on the pretext of defending the unity of the trade union movement and finally, repudiation of the leading role of the communist parties in the revolutionary trade union organiza-

tions and hiding of the face of the CP in economic struggles—these represent the *chief* danger at the present stage of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

A necessary condition for a successful struggle against the chief danger of right opportunism is a determined struggle against 'left' opportunist deviations which are expressed in a leftist 'theory' that the workers organized in the reformist trade unions represent a '[uniformly] reactionary mass', in the leftist sectarian underestimation of the tactic of the united front, in the statement that the reformist trade unions are 'schools of capitalism', in a sectarian attitude to work inside the reformist trade unions, in reducing all the work in the reformist unions to the task of wrecking the apparatus and in the bureaucratic ignoring of the methods of proletarian democracy.

8. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE OF THE PROLETARIAT

The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI is of the opinion that an immediate and radical change, *not in words but in deeds* is necessary in the whole of the revolutionary work of the communists for the mobilization of the masses for economic struggles, for the organization and leadership of strike struggles and the unemployed movement, and particularly in all trade union work, both in the revolutionary trade unions and the RTUO and also in the reformist trade unions. The *chief condition* for the development of the economic struggle and independent leadership of this struggle at the present stage is the correct Bolshevik application of the tactics of the united front from below, which requires a *radical change in the mass work of the communist parties*.

For this purpose it is necessary:

(a) To ensure that all party and revolutionary trade union organizations establish contacts with the majority of the *employed* and *unemployed*, *promptly* formulate the slogans of struggle and determine its methods and forms on the basis of a *really* concrete knowledge of the economic situation, of the requirements and the sentiments of the employed and the unemployed workers;

(b) To ensure the wide adoption [application] of the *tactic of the united front from below*, and in particular a proper approach to the reformist workers, patiently overcoming their reformist illusions and prejudices, raising their class consciousness step by step, drawing them into the revolutionary organizations and leading them more and more to the decisive revolutionary battles;

(c) To ensure *proletarian democracy* in all stages of the economic struggles (election of strike committees and other organs of struggle) attracting the

broad masses of the fighting employed and unemployed workers to the discussion and decision of all questions of the struggle. . . .

(d) To exert every effort to make the strikes of employed workers and the actions of the unemployed result in some *material gain*, in this way the confidence of the masses in their revolutionary vanguard will be strengthened. . . .

(h) To ensure the *immediate restoration and extension of revolutionary positions in the reformist trade unions*; to ensure the preparation of every strike, of every action of the employed and unemployed also inside the reformist trade unions;

(i) To ensure the all-round leadership of *all factory organizations and the mass organizations of the unemployed* (factory committees, unemployed committees, etc.) by the Red trade unions and the RTUO, *without overshadowing or domineering* them. . . .

(j) To ensure that the activities and forces of the party organizations *are concentrated* on the development of the strike struggle and the unemployed movement, especially in those important branches of industry (metal industry, transport and munitions) where there has been the greatest lagging behind up to the present. To ensure the rapid formation, consolidation and regular working of *communist fractions* in all trade union organizations, including the RTUO, unemployed committees and factory committees, without which it is impossible to establish a correct political line, to control its application, to give correct instructions (without overshadowing or domineering), or in general to strengthen the role of the Party and the revolutionary trade union organizations as the directing and leading force in the strike struggle, the unemployed movement and the general class struggle of the proletariat.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE TWELFTH ECCI PLENUM
ON THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST AND THE TASKS OF COMMUNISTS
IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR AND MILITARY
INTERVENTION AGAINST THE USSR

September 1932

*Theses of the Twelfth Plenum**

[The theses were introduced by Nozaka (using the name of Okano). To a greater extent than usual, all international events were interpreted by the Comintern in the light of an impending attack on the USSR. Thus the proposal made in the House of Commons early in 1932 to replace the 1921 trade agreement with the USSR by a new one was discussed as the first step towards breaking trade relations, to be followed by the rupture of diplomatic relations; preparations for war on Russia were coming to a head, timed to coincide with a Japanese attack from the East.

* Checked against the German version in *Inprekorr*, xii, 86, p. 2775, 18 October 1932.

After the outbreak of fighting in Manchuria, an article in the *Communist International* complained that communist parties underestimated the danger of imperialist intervention. 'The imperialists . . . were forced to postpone intervention, which they had fixed for 1930-31, and to begin universal preparations for intervention on a more extensive front.' This was being done behind a pacifist smokescreen.

In January 1932 the communist parties of Germany, France, Britain, the United States, Czechoslovakia, and Poland issued a joint manifesto calling for the defence of the USSR and the Chinese revolution; the partition of China and war on Russia was being organized by the League of Nations, supported by the Second International; the prime mover was France, which was giving most aid to Japan, and organizing its satellites in Europe for anti-Soviet aggression. 'France', said an article in the *Communist International* at the end of 1931, 'while preparing for war on the one hand, entered into negotiations with the Soviet Union on the question of a non-aggression pact and the renewal of trade negotiations on the other. French imperialism had to do this in order to hide from the broad masses the fact that she was organizing the anti-Soviet war on a broader basis.' This was followed by an appeal on similar lines signed by 'all communist parties on the American continent'; it stated that Japan in Manchuria, like the United States in the Caribbean, was acting through local puppets. The report of the Lytton Commission, published in October 1932, received varying interpretations in the communist press. Radek said that it offered Japan a leading position in Manchuria, which was to become an international colony; China would receive imperialist support against Russia and its own communists if it would agree to China being run by an international banking consortium; the United States hoped to get Britain and France into its anti-Japanese front by offering debt concessions. The provisional Chinese Soviet Government issued a statement saying the task of the Commission had been to draft a plan for the division of China and the suppression of the revolutionary movement. China could be liberated by a national revolutionary war only if the KMT regime were first overthrown.

At the instigation of Münzenberg (KPD), Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse organized an international committee to call an international anti-war congress; the committee included, *inter alia*, the names of Gorki, Upton Sinclair, Einstein, Madame Sun Yat-sen, and Theodore Dreiser. The congress, originally planned for Geneva in July, was held in Amsterdam at the end of August 1932. There were present 2,195 persons, of whom 830 represented communist organizations, and 682 came from RILU organizations (although, curiously enough, the ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress stated that the majority of delegates—it gave the number as 3,000—were pacifists). Dimitrov, then working in the West European Bureau of the ECCI, was in charge of the communists present, though he did not speak in public. The congress elected a committee of 141 members and appointed a permanent secretariat with its seat in Paris and Barbusse as president. A number of national subcommittees were also set up (which subsequently organized regional conferences in London, Montevideo, Copenhagen, Shanghai, and Melbourne). The manifesto issued by the congress said that war had already begun in China and was moving with

the help of the imperialist States towards the USSR. Its instigators were capitalist concerns and banks, using the governments as their tools. It depended on the workers whether the war went further. After the congress Thorez wrote: 'The important thing is to make sure of communist direction of this mass movement.']

1. The period of relative stability in international relations has ended. The attack of Japanese imperialism on China which is taking place with the full and open support of France and with the secret support of England, marks the beginning of a new imperialist war. The struggle for the re-division of the world, sharpened as the result of the world economic crisis, is expressed by the intensification of all the contradictions within the imperialist system. The intensification of the main contradiction[s] in the camp of imperialism—the contradiction between the USA and Great Britain, the sharpening of the conflict between the USA and Japan, the extreme intensification of the struggle around the Versailles system between France and Germany, and between Poland and Germany around the questions of Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and the question of East Prussia, the sharpening of the struggle between French and Italian imperialism and in connection with all these facts the regrouping of imperialist powers which is taking place—all these are leading to the outbreak of new military conflicts. The attitude of the League of Nations towards the Japanese attack on China once again plainly shows that the League of Nations serves as an instrument of war and intervention in the hands of French and British imperialism. In opposing the occupation of Manchuria, the USA is pursuing its own imperialist aims of securing a 'fair redistribution of spheres of influence' in the Far East. . . .

2. The intensification of the imperialist antagonisms is increasing the tendency in the camp of imperialism to settle these antagonisms at the expense of the USSR. The imperialist powers, and first of all, the imperialists of France and Japan, are exerting every effort to extend and strengthen the anti-Soviet *bloc* in order to deliver a decisive military blow at the basis of the world proletarian revolution—the USSR—which is strengthening itself on the socialist path. British imperialism supports all the plans for intervention against the USSR. The USA is striving to provoke war between Japan and the Soviet Union in order that, by weakening both Japan and the USSR, it may strengthen its own position in the Pacific. In Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic countries and the Balkan countries, preparations for war are being carried on with the greatest possible intensity under the guidance of the French General Staff. . . .

3. . . . The sharpening of all forms of bourgeois dictatorship, the strengthening of reaction, the growth of fascism, the persecution of the revolutionary movement, shootings and hangings, are already the preparation of the rear for an imperialist war and military intervention against the USSR.

The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI is of the opinion that the main task

of all communist parties is to organize and lead the struggle of the workers, peasants and all the toilers for the defence of China and the Chinese revolution, for the defence of the fatherland of the workers of all countries, the USSR, against the closely approaching intervention and for the defence of the toilers of capitalist countries against a new imperialist war.

4. During the Far Eastern War, the leaders of the Second International and its parties adapted their tactics to suit the requirements of the bourgeoisie of their respective countries. . . . They either silently ignored the danger of intervention against the USSR, or directly deceived the masses by alleging that the USSR is not in danger of intervention. At the same time the parties of the Second International increased their slanderous anti-Soviet campaign and strove to weaken the influence of the peace policy of the USSR on the toiling masses and supported the ill-concealed aggressive policy of the imperialist governments in opposition to the Soviet proposal for complete disarmament. The reformist trade unions sabotaged the struggle against the manufacture of munitions and the transport of munitions to Japan, and argued that a war would put an end to unemployment. The Japanese social-democrats, who are in contact with the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, fully and completely supported the predatory war of the Mikado Japanese bourgeoisie, on the plea that this war is the path to socialism. This position taken by Japanese social-democracy is an indication of the position which will be taken up by world social-democracy as a whole when a new imperialist war breaks out.

Later under the pressure of the masses, the Executive Committee of the Second International in Zürich adopted a resolution which formally appeared to oppose imperialist war and advocate defence of the USSR, thus passing from the position of intervention and the support of counter-revolutionary efforts against the Soviet State to a position of formal neutrality and verbal defence of the USSR. In reality, however, the parties of the Second International are continuing their slanderous anti-Soviet campaign, supporting the Russian Menshevik interventionists, sabotaging all the concrete actions of the workers against the production and transport of munitions for Japan, continuing to sow pacifist illusions with the aim of diverting the masses from the real struggle against imperialist war and military intervention, boycotting the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress, participating in the preparations and the organization of imperialist war and military intervention, and in every country are supporting their own bourgeois government.

5. The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI greets the heroic struggle the CP of Japan is waging against the imperialist war commenced by the Japanese bourgeoisie and landlords, and the revolutionary struggle of the CP of China against Japanese imperialism and against all imperialists.

The *CP of China* must continue to exert every effort to guarantee the

hegemony of the proletariat in the mass anti-imperialist movement in Kuomintang China. For this purpose the CP of China must set itself the task of further developing and deepening the Soviet movement, strengthening the Red Army of the Chinese Soviets, linking up the Soviet movement with the mass anti-imperialist struggle in Kuomintang China, widely and consistently using the tactic of the united front from below in the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses, organizing the masses under the slogan of a revolutionary national liberation war for the independence, unity and territorial integrity of China, against all imperialists, for the overthrow of the agent of imperialism—the Kuomintang.

The *CP of Japan* must increase its work in the army and navy, especially in Manchuria, must carry on popular agitation among the workers, peasants and the exploited urban petty bourgeois masses, in language that can be understood by the broad masses, in order to expose the indissoluble connection that exists between imperialist war and the direct preparations for military intervention against the USSR, on the one hand, and the strengthening of the military-police reaction and the increased plundering of the toiling masses in Japan itself, on the other hand. . . .

The *communists of Korea and Formosa*, in close collaboration with the CP of Japan and the CP of China, must mobilize the workers and peasants of Korea and Formosa for the struggle against Japanese imperialism, for the independence of Korea and Formosa, and must establish a revolutionary fighting alliance of all the oppressed and exploited for the national liberation struggle.

6. While recognizing the undoubtedly favourable results in the work of the CPs in imperialist and colonial countries in the matter of mobilizing the masses against imperialist war and against preparations for military intervention, the twelfth Plenum of the ECCI declares that the communist parties of the imperialist countries have not been able, by their revolutionary actions, to prevent the transport of troops to China and military supplies to Japan, that they have not been able to rouse the broad working masses employed in munition factories and in transport for the struggle, that the mass anti-war campaign has developed slowly, partly because of an opportunist underestimation of the war in the Far East and also because of a leftist-fatalistic, frivolous attitude to the war.

The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI calls particular attention to the impermissible weakness of the contacts of the CPs with the principal munition factories, with the chief ports and with the key-points on the railroads, and also to the fact that the anti-war work of the communist parties and the YCL in the army, the may [navy] and the special fascist semi-military organizations is in an intolerably neglected condition. The twelfth Plenum of the ECCI particularly emphasizes the weakness and the backwardness of the YCL in the struggle against imperialist war and military

intervention. In addition the twelfth Plenum states that the communist parties have not succeeded in fulfilling the urgent task of creating legal, semi-legal or illegal control committees and illegal committees of action, based on the masses, in the factories, railroads, ports and ships, have not succeeded in mobilizing the masses of workers in the reformist trade unions and other mass workers' organizations on the basis of the tactic of the united front from below for the purpose of preventing the transport of troops to China and munitions of war to Japan, and in developing the agitation against imperialist war and military intervention among the masses of peasants and the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Inadequate Bolshevik resistance was shown to the opportunist underestimation of the war in China and to the underestimation of the danger of imperialist war and military intervention. . . .

7. The general tasks of all communist parties in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention and in the struggle against fascism, social-democracy and bourgeois pacifism which facilitate the various methods of preparing and carrying on imperialist war and military intervention against the USSR, are as follows:

(a) To develop a systematic ideological struggle against chauvinism and nationalism, to carry on propaganda for real proletarian internationalism, to expose to the masses all the machinations of the foreign policy of their own bourgeoisie, to expose all the measures of the home policy of the bourgeoisie in preparation for war. . . .

(b) To react actively to all manifestations of the anti-Soviet campaigns, to seriously improve the propaganda about the success of socialist construction in the USSR among the broadest masses, to mobilize the toilers against the whiteguards, to popularize the peace policy of the USSR, to mobilize the masses for the active defence of the USSR, China and the Chinese Soviet revolution.

(c) To expose on the basis of actual and well-known facts all the sophisms and manoeuvres of the bourgeois pacifist and especially the social-democratic parties.

(d) To expose widely to the masses the peculiar, secret birth and conduct of a new imperialist war (mobilization in parts, formation of a covering army, preparations to cleanse the rear from revolutionary elements), and in deciding the anti-war tactics of the communist party, to take into account the variety of new methods employed by the bourgeoisie in preparing and carrying on war.

(e) By employing the tactic of the united front, to set up legal, semi-legal and illegal control committees and committees of action in the munition factories, in ports, in factories, on railroads, and on ships, for the purpose of developing mass activity and carefully prepared protest strikes and economic strikes to prevent the transport of munitions and troops

and to rouse the initiative of the broad masses of workers in this matter.

(f) . . . To support the national liberation movement of the colonial and subjected nations.

(g) To carry on extensive anti-imperialist work among the soldiers and sailors, among conscripts, reservists and in the special military organizations of the bourgeoisie. . . .

All the CP's must carry on an irreconcilable Bolshevik struggle in their own ranks against an opportunist underestimation of the war danger, against opportunist passivity in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention and against a pseudo-left fatalistic attitude towards war. . . .

The communist party must understand that bare and empty propaganda of peace, unaccompanied by calls for and the organization of the revolutionary actions of the masses, is only capable of sowing illusions, or depraving the proletariat by imbuing them with confidence in the policy of the bourgeoisie and their agents in the working class and of making the working class a plaything in the hands of the bourgeois governments.

The communist parties, in carrying on a real struggle against the preparations for imperialist war and military intervention against the USSR, must go to the workers with Lenin's teachings that imperialist war is caused by capitalism, and that the only guarantee against new imperialist wars and intervention is the conversion of imperialist war into civil war and the overthrow of capitalism.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO TO THE WORKERS,
PEASANTS, AND COMMUNISTS OF SPAIN

4 November 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 93, p. 2998, 8 November 1932

[Throughout the year the Comintern continued to reproach the Spanish CP because it was not giving effective leadership to the revolutionary movement, which was still 'largely spontaneous'. It was charged, in an article in February 1932 in the *Communist International*, with sectarian attitudes, anarchist methods of work, and opportunist passivity. The same article referred to the 'socialist and syndicalist strikebreakers and traitors', and to the 'anti-national butcher government of Caballero and Azana'. The party must combat democratic and syndicalist illusions among the workers, organize the masses for the direct struggle for power, win the peasants by launching the agrarian revolution, and expose the treachery of those like Caballero and Azana who held the revolution back on the pretext of the danger of counter-revolution and restoration of the monarchy.

On the failure of General Sanjurjo's coup, Vicente Arroyo wrote that the Government's dismissal of 4,000 civil guards who had supported the general

was 'a demagogic manoeuvre'. Again the CP was reproached for having failed to act—the strike against Sanjurjo was a spontaneous action by the workers, and the CP failed to follow it up by setting up workers' and soldiers' councils to continue the fight against the monarchists 'and their republican-socialist supporters'; the fact that the Azana-Caballero Government was 'the chief bearer of the counter-revolution' should not blind the CP to the inner contradictions in the enemy camp.

Bullejos and three of his colleagues—Adame, Trilla, and Vega—on the central committee had wished to issue the slogan 'Defend the Republic' at the time of Sanjurjo's attempted coup but were overruled. They went to Moscow to argue their case, and, having failed to persuade the presidium, resigned on 5 October. On 31 October (one Russian source dates it 29 October) the ECCI published a statement on their expulsion from the Spanish CP and the CI; the statement was signed by the members of the Spanish commission appointed by the twelfth ECCI plenum, of which Marty was the chairman. It summarized a resolution adopted the same day at a joint session of the ECCI presidium and the International Control Commission, which 'emphasizes their sectarian and anarcho-syndicalist methods, and the policy which allowed the working masses to trail in the wake of the republican bourgeoisie. The policy of this group was an attempt to prevent the bolshevization of the party, to hamper the formation of cadres, and to discredit the new cadres.'

The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress attributed the backwardness of the Spanish CP chiefly to this group of leaders. There had also been 'desperate efforts' by Trotsky to impose his counter-revolutionary views, but these had been frustrated. Trilla and Vega later rejoined the communist party.

The Spanish communists held their fourth congress in Seville in March 1932; it was attended by 201 voting delegates. The report of the congress in *Inprecorr* referred to the 'strong Trotskyist offensive which ended in complete defeat'. They had exploited the justified discontent in the party in an attempt to disrupt it.

An attempt had been made to establish a trade union federation on RILU lines, distinct from the UGT (with approximately half a million members, affiliated to the IFTU), and the anarcho-syndicalist CNT, with 400,000 members. A conference was held in Madrid (30 June–2 July) attended by 118 delegates claiming to represent 133,000 trade unionists (the ECCI *Materials*, three years later, doubled this figure): it passed resolutions on the danger of an anti-Soviet war, decided to join the international anti-war committee, and to set up a national trade union unity committee. The foundation congress of the RILU unions was held in April 1934.]

For two years the industrial and agricultural proletariat as well as the working peasants of the Iberian peninsula have been waging great and heroic revolutionary struggles. On the instructions of the Azana-Caballero Government, the civil guard is shooting down proletarians and peasants in the towns and villages of Spain. Throughout Spain, in the industrial centres and on the large landed estates, heroic struggles are taking place, and the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government sounds from the

factories, from Barcelona, Seville, Bilbao, and from the smallest and most remote villages.

In the midst of this rising mass struggle four former leaders of the Spanish Communist Party, Trilla, Adame, Vega, and Bullejos, having shown with contempt their lack of faith in the militancy of the workers and peasants, broke with the Communist International. For many months these people fought stubbornly to prevent the creation of a real mass party in Spain, to prevent the organization of joint struggle with the honest, revolutionary anarchist and socialist workers, the joint struggle of the workers in the different trade unions against the bourgeois agrarian counter-revolution.

While in effect thus supporting the policy of the Spanish counter-revolution, these four sabotaged the political line of the CI, which is dominated by the purpose of uniting the masses for struggle and in struggle. The policy of splitting the masses is the policy of the counter-revolution, which does all in its power to split the forces by which it will be defeated. For this criminal purpose it uses its social-democratic agents (Caballero and others), gives support to the 'anarchist' leaders who revile communism, and try to divert the workers from the fight for the proletarian dictatorship, thereby strengthening the dictatorship of capital. . . .

There is no doubt that in the last two years the Spanish Communist Party has grown, has led the struggles of the workers and peasants, has risen against the counter-revolutionaries; if it has done so, then no thanks to Adame, Trilla, Vega, and Bullejos, but in spite of them and against them. If the Spanish Communist Party does not occupy a more important place in the revolutionary movement of the Spanish masses, the responsibility lies on this group, which wished to isolate the party from this movement, in defiance of advice and decisions. . . .

Tomorrow these four will resort to the most contemptible bourgeois calumnies, in an attempt to demoralize the young communist party which has chased them out. They will try to sow confusion among the Spanish masses by pointing out that they served prison sentences under the monarchy. But Zamora and other murderers of the exploited were also in prison, and where are they now? What are they doing?

Adame, Vega, Trilla, and Bullejos are following the road of the Spanish counter-revolution. Whether they join the Trotskyist camp of splitters, or go directly over to the camp of Spanish fascism is a secondary matter. What is certain is that the Spanish counter-revolution has gained four new recruits.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE FIFTEENTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

4 *November* 1932

Inprekorr, xii, 93, p. 2977, 8 *November* 1932

The proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union has been in existence for fifteen years. Fifteen years ago a new epoch in the history of mankind opened—the epoch of the proletarian world revolution. Socialism, the dream of the best and noblest minds, for which the First International stood, and for which thousands and thousands of the best representatives of the working class went to their death, is today being established in one-sixth of the earth. . . .

The successful conclusion of the Five Year Plan in four years is a tremendous asset to the cause of working-class emancipation throughout the world. The mighty Soviet Union stands as an invincible fortress of peace against predatory imperialism, as shock-brigade of the proletarian world revolution against fascism, reaction, and unbridled chauvinism in the capitalist countries. . . .

Compare the results of fifteen years of working-class dictatorship in the Soviet Union with the fifteen years of bourgeois rule and social-democratic policy.

Which road was the right one? Which road was cheaper for the working class? The one taken by the working class and peasant millions of Russia under the leadership of the Leninist bolshevist party, or the one to which you in the capitalist countries were enticed by the social-democratic leaders? . . .

It is true that in the Soviet Union the proletariat in power is approaching its lofty goal through a series of difficulties and sacrifices. But what a gulf there is between the temporary deprivations of the Soviet workers, which make for more rapid material and cultural advance, and the unnumbered sufferings and sacrifices demanded of you by your capitalist masters, the capitalist State, the social-democratic leaders, to save capitalism, which condemns tens of millions to unemployment, starvation, and death.

Yes, the proletariat in power in the Soviet Union is paying dearly for the economic and cultural backwardness inherited from the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

The cause of socialism would make still more rapid progress in the Soviet Union if you would set out firmly on the road of revolution by chasing the social-democratic leaders out of the ranks of the working class. There is no treachery, no scoundrelly betrayal of the working class, which the social-democratic leaders would not deliberately commit to save capitalism.

Who thought up and supported the idea of civil peace during the imperialist slaughter?

The social-democratic leaders.

Who, together with the imperialists, with the Industrial Party, prepared for intervention against the Soviet Union, organized acts of sabotage and wrecking in the Soviet Union?

The social-democratic leaders.

Who acted as watchdog of capitalist rationalization? Who expelled revolutionary workers from the trade unions for striking against capitalist exploitation?

The social-democratic leaders.

Who is clearing the road for fascism?

The social-democratic leaders.

Who opened the road to the fascist generals in Germany on 20 July?

The social-democratic leaders.

Take note, workers. The social-democrats promised you peace. Together with the bourgeoisie they thought up fairy-tales for the masses about the League of Nations as an instrument of peace.

In reality the League of Nations was exposed long ago as an instrument of war. In reality the first fires of a new imperialist slaughter are spreading in the Far East. In reality the governments of the social-democrats MacDonald and Boncour, actively supported by the Second International, are strangling the Indian and Indochinese workers and peasants. In reality social-democracy supports the bloody wars in the colonies. . . .

Workers, peasants, oppressed colonial peoples! On the fifteenth anniversary of October the Communist International turns to you, countless victims of capitalist slavery and imperialist robbery, with the appeal to unite your forces in irreconcilable struggle against imperialism, against colonial slavery, against the bankrupt capitalist system. . . .

Only under the leadership of the communist party will you win success in your fight. Only with your active participation, with your mass support will the communist parties strengthen their bolshevist positions in the factories and the mass organizations, and be able to lead you to decisive class struggles and historical victories.

ECCI STATEMENT ON THE GERMAN SITUATION AND ON THE UNITED FRONT

5 March 1933

Rundschau, ii, 4, p. 91, 11 March 1933

[The Reichstag elections in November 1932 gave the Nazis 33·1 per cent of the total vote as against 37·3 in July, the SPD 20·4 per cent (21·6), and the KPD 16·9 per cent (14·3). The Centre maintained its vote at 15 per cent. In October the Berlin transport workers' union had voted on whether to call a strike against a proposed wage reduction; the voting did not give the required majority, but

the KPD and NSDAP called out their members; the strike was called off after the elections. Nazi participation was explained in the *Communist International* as being due to 'the pressure of their own masses'; it was at the same time an attempt to deceive and split the proletariat before the elections. *Rundschau* (which took the place of the German edition of *Inprekorr* in July 1932) wrote that the bourgeoisie wanted a broad mass basis for a new dictatorship which would include the NSDAP, but the negotiations were being drawn out because they feared open civil war.

An article in the *Communist International* after the elections, entitled 'The KPD takes the offensive', attacked the SPD leaders who 'appeal with ever increasing frequency and urgency to the Comintern to limit its activity, to give up its irreconcilability . . . in the name of the "united Marxist front" for the "salvation of the German Republic"'. These "Marxists" . . . say nothing about the bourgeois character of the "democracy" of the German Republic, and again endeavour to trick the masses with the bait of socialist phrases.' The new rise of the revolutionary wave reflected in the election results was 'the direct and unmistakable reply of the German proletariat to the treacherous work of social-democracy' and to the 'defeatists and panic-mongers' in the KPD. 'The second lesson of the campaign is to be found in the defeat of national-socialism.' The mass fascist movement had not been destroyed, but 'the changes in the relationship of the forces of revolution and counter-revolution are continuing to move irresistibly in a direction beneficial to the working class and its communist vanguard'. When the social-democrats said that the question on the agenda of history was not the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship but the struggle for the Republic, they were asking for peace with the bourgeoisie, which would strengthen the role of social-democracy. 'The task of the KPD remains, as before, to direct the chief blow, at the present stage, against social-democracy.' Papen's fall, said *Rundschau*, was brought about by the proletarian mass movement and by differences within the bourgeoisie; Schleicher, representing heavy industry as against Papen's agrarians, was working for collaboration between the Nazis and the reformist trade unions as the foundation of capitalist rule; the ADGB and the Reichsbanner were in favour of Schleicher's plans, and of the incorporation of the unions in a fascist dictatorship, but the SPD wanted to conceal its support of a fascist regime.

The fall of Schleicher's Government and the appointment of Hitler was said to mark the end of the German bourgeoisie's attempt to halt the revolutionary movement by 'social' means—they would now resort to open terror, although fearing both the greed of the East Prussian landlords who supported Hitler, and the loss, because of the new Government's 'crude measures', of the support of social-democracy.

The KPD offer of a united front in January 1933 was made, not to the SPD executive, but to local organizations. The SPD were willing to consider united action, provided a 'non-aggression pact' was agreed to beforehand. To this condition the KPD would not agree. Some well-known KPD members, including Erich Wollenberg, and Felix Wolf, who demanded a change of policy after 30 January, were expelled. The SPD proposal was repeated by Breitscheid on 12 February, and again rejected. Trotsky, in exile, wrote that

Breitscheid's offer, however diplomatic and ambiguous, should have been welcomed with open arms; the KPD's proposals for a united front were for 'a united front with themselves'. The SPD, he said in the *Manchester Guardian*, had hoped to 'educate' fascism gradually; it had held the workers back and allowed the fascists to carry out their revolution by stages; the policy of the KPD had been 'thoroughly wrong'; its leaders had been blind; 'fascism was assisted to power by the united efforts of the leaders of both the workers' parties'. Speaking for the KPD Reichstag fraction on 6 February, Pieck said: 'However seriously we take the situation, we are not pessimistic. . . . To a growing extent the KPD is winning the confidence of the masses.' The SPD approached Soviet diplomatists in Berlin to intervene with the KPD in the autumn of 1932. Shortly before the Reichstag fire Stampfer (editor of the SPD central newspaper, *Vorwärts*) was informed by a Soviet Embassy secretary that Moscow believed a period of fascist rule was an unavoidable transitional phase of development. (A *Pravda* editorial of 16 November argued that greater fascist terror would intensify the class struggle and accelerate the growth of the KPD.) A meeting between SPD and KPD officials arranged for 28 February did not take place because of the repercussions of the Reichstag fire. It was not until after the fire that the KPD made a direct approach to the SPD and ADGB executives. *Rundschau* wrote that the Nazi terror was directed 'in part also against social-democracy'; the Weimar Republic was in ruins, the constitution a scrap of paper, and any legal communist activity impossible. No direct answer was given to the LSI proposal for a cessation of KPD-SPD hostilities. Commenting on it in the *Communist International*, Knorin wrote: 'The Comintern did not believe in the sincerity of the Second International Bureau's proposal, and could not believe in it, in view of all their past behaviour. Nevertheless, in the present critical days, it did not refuse the proposal.' Mutual hostilities would cease 'during the joint struggle against the bourgeoisie', although the motive behind the offer was that the SPD hoped to have its past sins forgotten 'and be free as before to betray the working class'. The German proletariat was in the greatest danger, but 'only a short period of power remains to the bourgeoisie'.

In the elections on 5 March 1933 the NSDAP received over 17 million votes (43.9 per cent of total), the SPD over 7 million (18.3 per cent), the KPD 4.7 million (12.3 per cent), the Centre vote fell to 13.9 per cent. After the elections the KPD was declared illegal, and all its property was sequestered. In the summer of 1933 all parties other than the NSDAP were banned. Piatnitsky wrote that the 'Weimar parties' had betrayed the workers for so many years that these no longer wished to defend them from destruction by the fascists; the bourgeoisie handed the government over to Hitler so that he could lower wages, stop unemployment benefits, take over the unions, etc. in order to transfer the entire burden of the crisis on to the working class; the KPD alone, bitterly opposed as it was by the SPD and ADGB, was not strong enough to prevent this; its members, moreover, were taken unaware. 'Many of the responsible workers of the KPD did not expect that the attacks on the KPD would be made on such a scale so soon. . . . The majority of the members of the KPD were not prepared for such unprecedented mass repression.' On 14 March the KPD central committee suggested to the SPD *Vorstand* a joint appeal to organize joint

defence against Nazi attacks on workers' organizations, etc. If the proposal were accepted the KPD, in agreement with the ECCI, would refrain from attacking the SPD so long as the joint action lasted. In April the *Communist International* published a leading article on 'the collapse of Weimar Germany and preparations for the German October', which asserted that since the Reichstag fire the KPD was successfully establishing a united front. 'Up to now social-democracy has stood in the way of this unity . . . has disrupted the working class struggle and gradually brought it under the blows of bloody fascist terror.' Now that social-democracy was crumbling the KPD had 'an exceptional opportunity indeed of winning the majority of the working class'. The *Guide to the Twelfth Plenum* argued that to look at events in Germany as a defeat of the revolutionary forces was opportunist and capitulatory. Referring to the present statement, the ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress said: 'This important political step by the Comintern was conditioned by the revolution in the entire international situation which set in with Hitler's accession to power, reflected in the sharpening of international relations, in the changing relations of class forces in a number of countries, and also in the shifts which occurred within the labour movement as a result of the collapse of German social-democracy and the growing crisis of the Second International.' Communist united front offers had been rejected because the social-democratic workers put up no resistance to their leaders, and because of 'defeatist sentiments' among some communists. (At the ECCI presidium in July 1934 Piatnitsky attributed the failure of the workers to respond to the KPD appeal of 5 March to the absence of any response from the SPD leaders.) The workers had also been 'demobilized' by the 'opportunist tendency' to 'equate fascism with bourgeois democracy'. This sectarian attitude had hampered friendly relations with social-democratic workers; at the same time, the KPD had to fight against the tendency to establish 'an unprincipled bloc' with social-democracy, to work for unity from above without simultaneous mobilization of the masses; it had also to fight erroneous theories about the ADGB reflected in the slogan 'destroy the reformist unions'. Despite all its efforts, the KPD had been unable to convince the masses of the harmfulness of SPD policy. 'The decisive lesson of the establishment of open fascist dictatorship in Germany is that without rooting out the mass influence of the reformists, particularly in the trade unions, without an energetic struggle against all varieties of opportunism, it is impossible to win the majority of the working class.'

No change was made in the customary appraisal of the Nazi movement: 'from the very beginning the Comintern and the KPD sharply opposed the attempt of the social-democrats, the Trotskyist and Brandlerist renegades, to present fascism as the dictatorship of the petty-bourgeoisie or lumpenproletariat, as a government "above classes", not only above the proletariat but also above the bourgeoisie. . . . Fascism, the worst and bloodiest enemy of the working class, is the openly terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist, and most imperialist elements of finance capital.' At the end of 1934 Martynov, at that time editor of the *Communist International*, wrote that the Comintern did not give a direct answer to the LSI's proposal because it had no faith in the LSI's declaration, because the LSI did not put forward a programme of joint

action, and without this 'any agreement between the parties would be directed against the interests of the working class', and because agreement between the socialist and communist parties of the individual countries themselves would be more promising.]

To the workers of all countries

The crisis continues. Unemployment is steadily increasing. Hunger and poverty are overtaking ever new sections of workers. The capitalist offensive is taking on sharper forms. The bourgeoisie are launching out on a campaign against all the political and economic achievements of the working class. Fascist reaction is gripping one country after another. The establishment of an open fascist dictatorship in Germany confronts millions of workers in all countries with the urgent need to organize the united fighting front against the fascist offensive of the bourgeoisie, above all the German bourgeoisie, who, step by step, are robbing the workers of all their economic and political gains and trying by the most brutal terror to crush the labour movement.

The chief obstacle to the formation of the united fighting front of communist and social-democratic workers was and remains the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the social-democratic parties, which has now exposed the international proletariat to the blows of the class enemy. This policy, known as the so-called policy of the 'lesser evil', has in fact led in Germany to the triumph of fascist reaction.

The Communist International and the communist parties of all countries have repeatedly declared their readiness for a joint struggle with social-democratic workers against the capitalist offensive, political reaction, and the war danger. The communist parties were the organizers of the joint struggle of communist, social-democratic, and non-party workers, despite the leaders of the social-democratic parties, who systematically broke up the united front of the working masses. On 20 July last year, after von Papen had thrown out the Social-Democratic Government of Prussia, the KPD proposed to the SPD and the ADGB the organization of a joint strike against fascism. But, with the approval of the entire Second International, they described this proposal as provocation. The KPD repeated its proposal of joint action at the moment when Hitler seized power, calling on the SPD presidium and the ADGB presidium to organize defence against fascism, but again was met with a refusal. Even more. When in November last year the Berlin transport workers went on strike against wage reductions, the SPD broke their united fighting front. The course of the international labour movement is full of such examples.

Now the bureau of the LSI has published, on 19 February of this year, a statement on the readiness of the social-democratic parties affiliated to it to form a united front with the communists to fight against fascist

reaction in Germany. This statement sharply contradicts the entire previous behaviour of the LSI and the social-democratic parties. The entire previous policy and action of the LSI justify the CI and the communist parties in doubting the sincerity of this statement, made at a time when in a number of countries, and particularly in Germany, the working masses are taking the initiative in organizing the united fighting front.

Nevertheless, in view of fascism's offensive against the German working class, unleashing all the forces of world reaction, the ECCI calls on all communist parties to make a further attempt to establish a united fighting front with the social-democratic working masses through the social-democratic parties. The ECCI is making this attempt in the firm conviction that the united front of the working class on the basis of the class struggle is capable of repulsing the offensive of capital and fascism and greatly hastening the inevitable end of all capitalist exploitation.

Taking into consideration that, because of the variety of the practical fighting tasks confronting the working class, arising from the varied conditions peculiar to each country, an agreement between the communist and social-democratic parties on defined actions against the bourgeoisie can be most successfully carried out within the individual countries, the ECCI recommends the communist parties of the individual countries to approach the central committees of the social-democratic parties affiliated to the LSI with proposals for joint action against the capitalist offensive and fascism. But the negotiations to this end must be based on the primary conditions for joint struggle. Without a concrete programme of action against the bourgeoisie any agreement between the parties would be directed against the interests of the working class. The ECCI therefore proposes the following conditions as the basis for any such agreement:

(a) Communists and social-democrats will at once begin to organize and operate defence against the attacks of fascism and reaction on the political, trade union, co-operative and other workers' organizations, on the workers' press, on the right to assemble, demonstrate, and strike. They will organize joint defence against the armed attacks of fascist groups by mass protests, street demonstrations, political mass strikes. They will set about organizing committees of action in factories, employment exchanges, and working-class districts, as well as detachments for self-defence.

(b) Communists and social-democrats will start immediately to organize the workers' protest by meetings, demonstrations, and strikes against any wage reductions, any worsening of labour conditions, attacks on social insurance, the reduction of unemployment benefits, dismissals.

(c) If these two conditions are accepted and executed, the ECCI considers it possible to recommend the communist parties to refrain, for the period of the common struggle against capital and fascism, from attacks

on social-democratic organizations. Anyone who violates the conditions of the agreement in carrying out the united front must be fought mercilessly as strikebreakers disrupting the workers' united front.

These conditions, which will be put to the LSI, are also valid for those parties, such as the ILP, which have proposed a united fighting front to the Comintern.

The ECCI, which makes these proposals in the sight of the international working class, calls on all communist parties, in the first place on the KPD, without waiting for the results of negotiations and for agreement on a joint struggle with social-democracy, to set about organizing joint fighting committees with social-democratic and all other workers.

The communists have shown in years of fighting that they stand and will stand, not in words but in deed, in the foremost ranks of the struggle for the united front in class actions against the bourgeoisie.

The ECCI is firmly convinced that social-democratic and non-party workers, regardless of the attitude of the social-democratic leaders to the creation of the united front, will overcome all obstacles and together with the communists will build the united front not in words, but in actions.

Today, when German fascism, in order to crush the workers' movement in Germany, has organized an unparalleled provocation (firing of the Reichstag, forged documents about insurrection, etc.), every worker must recognize his class duty in the struggle against the capitalist offensive and fascist reaction.

RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDIUM ON THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

1 April 1933

Rundschau, ii, 9, p. 229, 12 April 1933

[Heckert wrote at this time (in *Rundschau*) that 'the events in Germany are a most significant step on the road to the ripening of the revolutionary crisis in the heart of Europe'; fascism had triumphed because social-democracy, on behalf of the bourgeoisie, had split the proletariat in order to reduce its fighting capacity; the petty-bourgeoisie had been disillusioned in bourgeois democracy, and regarded Weimar, because of Versailles, as 'volksfeindlich'. 'German nationalism today is the offspring of Versailles; French bourgeois democracy, the pillar of the Versailles system, produced Hitler.' This relation of forces explained why the KPD was unable to organize a decisive political strike on 30 January, which would have exposed an unarmed proletariat to all the armed forces of the country. (He contrasted this with the situation in Russia in 1917.) The KPD central committee resolution of May 1933 said: 'With only the revolutionary vanguard, without the mass following of the decisive proletarian

strata, it was impossible for the KPD to take up a hopeless struggle against the fascist dictatorship, condemned in advance to defeat.' The party had been unable to bridge the gap between correct decisions and their execution; the emancipation programme [1930] had not been taken seriously enough, and the initiative in the movement against Versailles and the Dawes and Young Plans had been captured by the Nazis. The party had also been hampered by the opportunism and sectarianism of the Neumann and Merker groups. The charge of the Neumann group that the KPD was responsible for the rise of Hitler was an attack not only on the central committee but on Stalin, Manuilsky, and the decisions of the ECCI eleventh and twelfth plenums. But the proletariat had not surrendered; the SPD was annihilated, morally and politically, but never had the reputation of the KPD been so high. The collapse of fascism in Germany depended primarily on the KPD winning the working-class majority and eliminating SPD influence. 'Social-democracy has proved its readiness to share in all the bloody crimes of fascism against the working class.' In this it had found an ally in Trotsky, who was 'sniffing about among the fascist jackboots' in an effort to get into the limelight. He had said that the KPD should have joined with the SPD to defend the parliamentary regime. This was a 'Hitler-Trotsky platform'; it would have meant defending the Brüning Government and the trade union bureaucrats, the united front of reaction which had brought Hitler to power. It was true that the Nazis were attacking social-democrats, but only rank-and-file members, not the leaders; 'the Nazis beat the SPD as they would beat a faithful dog who had outlived his usefulness'. But fascism needed the trade unions, and was taking the social-democratic bosses into its service. Germany was still a bourgeois dictatorship 'whether in the form of the Weimar Republic or the "Third Reich" '. The reference to *Vorwärts* presumably refers to the SPD election programme published in that paper, which stated that the SPD government had given equal civil rights to all. In endorsing in the Reichstag the demand for equal rights for Germany, Wels said the SPD stood for equal rights at home as well as abroad, not vengeance by the victors over the vanquished. It demanded equal rights and equal security under the law. The SPD alone voted against the enabling law introduced by the Nazis in the Reichstag on 23 March (the KPD had already been outlawed).

After the presidium meeting the *Communist International* wrote: 'The events of the last few months in Germany have demonstrated the complete correctness of the Comintern theses on social-fascism.' The trade union leaders were 'open allies' of Hitler. 'This capitulation will help us communists drive the last nail into the coffin of world social-democracy.' An article in the following issue spoke of 'the approach of proletarian revolution in Germany'. The KPD was leading the masses 'from the present temporary lull towards new, big, and ever bigger battles. The struggle for the proletarian dictatorship in Germany is on the order of the day. The road of the German proletariat to victory has been shown by the ECCI presidium.' Only 'social-Hitlerites like Trotsky' could talk about basic differences between social-democracy and national-socialism. In the same periodical, in June 1933, Heckert wrote that Trotsky and Brandler had recommended the Comintern to form a united front with the LSI and IFTU, but 'we rejected a united front with the capitulators and party errand boys of the

fascists', and criticized those KPD members who maintained that, because of its policy in 1932-3, the KPD would be unfit for struggle for years to come. In *Rundschau* a certain Schudel dealt with Trotsky's assertion that it was not the proletarian revolution which was maturing in Germany, but the counter-revolution taking a firmer hold. 'If events went as Trotsky said, we would have to get ready for many years of fascist rule.'

The KPD central committee resolution following the presidium meeting argued that the loss by the social democrats of their posts in the governmental service, and the brutal suppression of their organizations and press, could not alter the fact that the SPD remained, as before, the chief social pillar of the capitalist dictatorship. 'The influence of "left" SPD leaders is the more dangerous because they seek, through persecution by fascism, to give themselves a "martyr's" popularity.' The foundation for a successful anti-fascist struggle was the united front from below, but in certain situations it might be necessary to propose joint action with social-fascist leaders 'in order to expose social-fascist sabotage of all anti-fascist action'. That was why the CI and KPD had made offers to the social-democratic leaders. The KPD would fight the Brandler-Trotsky proposals for a 'bloc'. The party's strategy remained unchanged—by developing partial struggles to lead the masses up to the political mass strike and the struggle for power, for a workers' and peasants' republic. The objective factors of revolutionary crisis were ripening; everything now depended on the subjective factor, that is, on the capacity for action of the KPD and the working class.

In a manifesto of 20 June the KPD central committee explained Hitler's attacks on other parties: action against Hugenberg's Nationalists and the Centre reflected the view of finance-capital that undivided Nazi rule was the best guarantee of their profits; the attack on some junkers was a diversionary manoeuvre in response to pressure from below; social-democrats and trade unionists were dismissed in order to give their jobs to NSDAP adherents; the dissolution of the SPD and the arrest of some of its leaders showed that, with growing working-class hostility to the fascist dictatorship, 'an "illegal" SPD was most useful, for, while talking of a "fight" against fascism, it would try to maintain the split in the working class and obstruct the formation of a revolutionary united front'. It was incorrect to say that fascist terror and economic crisis made a fight impossible.

The *Communist International* in August wrote that the task of the KPD was 'to mobilize the growing indignation of the toiling masses' and convert it into an 'open struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the power of the fascist hangmen'. In January 1933 it was impossible for the KPD to fight independently, but it was 'now preparing for an independent decisive battle . . . making actual revolutionary preparations for decisive struggles for a real workers' government and for the proletarian dictatorship'. Those in the KPD who smuggled in 'social-fascist contraband' by arguing that fascism was a 'new system' and not just another form of bourgeois rule would have to be unmasked. The KPD political bureau resolution of 10 October 1933 announced that 'the fascist dictatorship was trembling before the uninterrupted growth of the forces of communism'; the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses were desert-

ing fascism, and these sections of the German population were urged to refuse to pay taxes, rents, and interest charges; the illegal SPD organizations were designed to prevent the masses from joining the communist camp. 'Communists must make it clear to the working class that the restoration of the social-democratic organizations and of the social-democratic leadership in the trade unions is harmful for the cause of the working class.' By the end of the year the *Communist International* was announcing that 'a new revolutionary upsurge has already begun and is growing in Germany, which places before the KPD the task of preparing the conditions for the armed overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat'. At the factory-committee elections in April the ADGB (social-democratic) candidates received 73.4 per cent of the votes, the NSBO (Nazi) 11.7 per cent, the Christian unions 7.6 per cent, and the RGO (communist) 4.9 per cent. (The Nazi authorities then put an end to all factory-committee elections.)

The Zionist congress in Prague in the summer of 1933 was described (in *Rundschau*) as 'a peculiar cross-breed of national and social fascism'. Of the speakers who dealt with anti-Semitism in Germany it said that their 'inhibitions could be felt. True, Hitler is the enemy of the Jews, but Hitler is a national German racist and the Zionists are national Jewish racists. At bottom they speak the same language. And in fact it seems as though there might be some kind of understanding between Hitler and the Zionists . . . there is no basic conflict of principle between the two, but only a conflict of interest.' There were no Zionists from Russia at the congress because 'Zionism in the Soviet Union is quite bankrupt', and none from Germany because the Zionists had 'knuckled under completely to the Hitler dictatorship'. A week later an article in the same periodical said that 'the German Zionists and the Nazis have at last concluded peace with each other'; their differences had been set aside; Rosenberg's anti-Jewish outbursts were designed to conceal from the German masses the bargaining going on behind the scenes. If the Nazis went so far as to attack the property of the rich Jews, the policy would be resisted in America and Britain. 'So the German Jews can look forward hopefully to the future, so long as they have money.']

Having heard Comrade Heckert's report on the situation in Germany, the presidium of the ECCI states that the political line and the organizational policy followed by the CC of the Communist Party of Germany, with Comrade Thaelmann at its head, up to the Hitlerite coup, and at the moment when it occurred, was completely correct.

Confronted by the extreme acuteness of the economic and political situation in Germany—shown on the one hand by the growth of the KPD into a tremendous working-class force and by the rapid maturing of the revolutionary crisis, and on the other by the emergence among the ruling classes themselves of deep contradictions, and by the inability of the fascist dictatorship, in the shape of the Papen and Schleicher Governments, to stem the advance of communism or to find a way out of the ever more acute economic crisis—the German bourgeoisie have handed over

to the fascist Hitler and his 'national-socialist' party the carrying through of the open fascist dictatorship.

Hitler's victory and the establishment of the power of the 'national socialists' were made possible by the following circumstances:

German social-democracy, which had the majority of the proletariat behind it in the November 1918 revolution, split the working class and, instead of driving the revolution forward to the proletarian dictatorship and socialism, as would have been the duty of a proletarian party, allied itself with the bourgeoisie and the Wilhelmian generals to crush the rising of the revolutionary masses and opened the deep split in the German working class. As testimony to its policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and the tactics of 'the lesser evil', in alliance with the bourgeoisie and with the approval of the entire Second International, it continued this policy of brutal repression of the revolutionary movement and of splitting the working class up to the most recent past. It prohibited the Red Front Fighters' League, it prohibited the revolutionary workers' organizations, it prohibited workers' demonstrations or had them fired on, it broke up industrial and political strikes against the capitalist and fascist offensive, and supported the rule of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Social-democracy concentrated in the hands of its corrupt bureaucratic bosses the leadership of the mass labour organizations. It expelled revolutionary workers from them and through the network of centralized workers' organizations subordinate to it suppressed the initiative of the working masses, broke their capacity to fight capital and fascism, and so obstructed the resolute action against the fascist dictatorship and the terrorist fascist gangs which were passing to the offensive. This policy of fighting the revolutionary masses and of collaborating with the bourgeoisie and supporting reaction on the pretext of the tactics of 'the lesser evil' was and is the policy of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, from 1914 to the present day.

In its imperialist setting, and particularly in a country defeated in imperialist war and profoundly shaken by the general crisis of the capitalist system, the 'democratic' bourgeois Weimar Republic could be nothing but the reactionary dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Labour legislation, social insurance, the democratic rights which the bourgeoisie had to grant to the workers in the years of the revolution, were gradually withdrawn by the Weimar coalition, consisting of social-democrats, the Centre Party, and the 'Democrats'. An unbroken series of concessions to reaction, the suspension one after another of the provisions of the constitution, of the gains made by the workers, the development step by step of the entire state machinery towards fascism, discredited the Weimar coalition and the Weimar Republic to such a degree that the masses no longer took them seriously.

The Versailles system plundered Germany and subjected the German working masses to the yoke of unbearable exploitation not only by their own but also by foreign capital, to which the German Government had to pay reparations. The Versailles yoke, reinforced by the yoke of the German bourgeoisie, led to an unparalleled decline in the standard of living of the proletariat, and to such impoverishment of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie that a part of them began to think of pre-war Germany, where there was no general capitalist crisis and no mass impoverishment as there are now, as their ideal. In these circumstances it is understandable that, at the moment when the economic crisis was at its most severe, making the burden of the foreign yoke imposed by the Versailles treaty even heavier, there was bound to be a violent outbreak of German nationalism and chauvinism, particularly as the proletariat, split by social-democracy, was not strong enough to carry the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the peasant masses along with it; this outbreak greatly strengthened the position of the bourgeoisie and brought the most demagogic nationalist party of all—the party of ‘national-socialists’, to the top.

The communist workers organized and led the struggle against the offensive of capital and fascism. They supported every action of the social-democratic workers, even the slightest, against capital, whenever such action was taken. Guided by the desire to re-establish the revolutionary unity of the working class, they repeatedly proposed, long before the victory of fascism, to the social-democratic workers and to the lower social-democratic organizations a united front of struggle against the bourgeoisie and their lackeys, the fascists. But the social-democratic workers, behind whom stands the majority of the German working class, shackled by their social-democratic leaders, who are opposed to the revolutionary united front and prefer to maintain their reactionary united front with the bourgeoisie, for the most part rejected the united front with the communists every time, and this broke up the working-class fight. While the communists stood for the revolutionary united front of the working class *against* the bourgeoisie, *against* fascism, social-democracy drove the workers into the reactionary united front *with* the bourgeoisie, against the communists, against the revolutionary workers, destroyed and persecuted communist organizations whenever and wherever it had the opportunity to do so.

In carrying out its policy of fighting for the revolutionary unity of the working class against the social-democratic united front with the bourgeoisie, the communist party, as the only revolutionary leader of the German proletariat, despite the strike-breaking activities of social-democracy on the question of the united front against the bourgeoisie, called for a political general strike of the working class on 20 July 1932, when the fascists dismissed the Social-Democratic Government of Prussia,

and again on 30 January 1933, when Hitler came to power, and proposed a united front with the social-democratic party and the reformist trade unions to carry out the strike.

The development of the proletarian struggle against bourgeoisie and fascism, and the general strike, would have brought the hesitating working masses of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie over to the side of the proletariat. But social-democracy, continuing its previous policy and seeking further collaboration with the bourgeoisie, clamped down on the initiative of the masses, using for this purpose its network of centralized organizations, above all the reformist trade unions, and prevented the organization of a general strike, shipwrecked it, and so directly abetted the further fascist offensive against the proletariat. As a result of this, the vanguard of the revolutionary wing of the German proletariat, the communist party, found itself deprived of the support of the majority of the working class.

In these circumstances the proletariat found itself unable to organize immediate and resolute defence against the State apparatus, which had drawn into its sphere of operation the fighting organizations of the fascist bourgeoisie, the storm detachments (SA), the Stahlhelm and the Reichswehr for the fight against the proletariat. The bourgeoisie were able without any serious resistance to hand over State power in the country to the national-socialists, who attacked the working class with provocations, bloody terror, and political gangsterism.

Analysing the prerequisites for a victorious proletarian insurrection, Lenin said that the time for the final and decisive battle could be considered ripe when 'all the class forces hostile to us have become sufficiently entangled, are sufficiently at loggerheads with each other, have sufficiently weakened themselves in a struggle which is beyond their strength; when all the vacillating, wavering, unstable, intermediate elements—the petty-bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois democrats as distinct from the bourgeoisie—have sufficiently exposed themselves in the eyes of the people, have sufficiently disgraced themselves through their practical bankruptcy; and when among the proletariat a mass sentiment in favour of supporting the most determined, supremely bold, revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie has arisen and begun vigorously to grow. Then revolution is indeed ripe; then, indeed, if we have correctly gauged all the conditions indicated and briefly outlined above, and if we have chosen the moment rightly, our victory is assured.'

The characteristic peculiarity of the situation at the moment of the Hitler coup was that these prerequisites for a victorious insurrection had not yet matured; they were present only in embryo form. As to the proletarian vanguard, the communist party, it could not, since it would not slip into adventurism, make up for their absence by its own actions.

'Victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone', Lenin wrote. 'To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it . . . would be not merely folly but a crime.'

These were the circumstances determining the retreat of the working class and the victory of the counter-revolutionary fascist party in Germany.

Thus, in the final analysis, the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany is the consequence of the social-democratic policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie throughout the entire life of the Weimar Republic. Social-democracy repeatedly stated that it would have no objection to Hitler's coming to power if he did so 'constitutionally'. Even after he came to power *Vorwärts* wrote, on 2 February, that a man like Hitler would not have been able to become Reich Chancellor except for social-democracy. Wels said the same on 23 March in his declaration to the Reichstag, when he said that the social-democrats had rendered great services to the 'national-socialists', for it was thanks precisely to social-democratic policy that Hitler had come to power. Not to speak of Leipart, Löbe, and other social-democratic leaders, who unreservedly support the fascists. The communists were right when they called the social-democrats social-fascists.

But, because the fascist dictatorship rests on the armed national-socialist gangs and on the Stahlhelm, because it is waging civil war on the working class and abolishing all the rights of the proletariat, it is thereby also destroying social-democratic theories about the possibility of winning an elected parliamentary majority and about a peaceful development to socialism, without revolution. It is destroying social-democratic theories about class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and about the policy of 'the lesser evil', and demolishing all democratic illusions among the broad working masses. It is proving that the State is not a superstructure rising above classes, but an instrument of bourgeois dictatorship, that the State power today is the armed SA gangs, the Stahlhelm, the police, and the officers' mob, who rule in the name of the bourgeoisie and the junkers. The working class is being convinced by experience that the communists were right when year after year they fought against democratic illusions and the social-democratic policy of 'the lesser evil' and of collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

However, Hitler's unbridled fascist dictatorship, which has unleashed civil war in the country, is incapable of solving a single one of Germany's economic or political problems. The poverty of the masses is growing day by day. The economic situation is deteriorating, for the Government's adventurist policy only accelerates the narrowing of the home and foreign market. There is no prospect of a serious fall in unemployment, nor

can there be. There is no possibility whatever of creating jobs and posts for all the national-socialist adherents. Other workers will have to be sacked to make room for national-socialists. The prolongation of the moratorium to October, and the quotas placed on the import of agricultural products will satisfy a thin layer of the most prosperous peasants for a short time, but will not halt the growth of poverty and of the discontent of the peasant masses. Demagogic action against the big department stores and Jewish capital will not help the needy petty-bourgeoisie, whose position will get worse as the purchasing power of the proletariat falls still further, shrinking the home market. The distribution of microscopic amounts of flour and bacon to the needy was only bait to catch votes. The increase in unemployment benefits by two marks a month is bound to be withdrawn because the economic situation is getting worse. It is clear that Hitler is leading Germany to an economic catastrophe which is becoming more and more inevitable.

National-socialism shot up primarily as a nationalist and chauvinist movement directed by Wilhelmian officers and civil servants, a movement of the petty-bourgeois and partly also the peasant masses against Versailles. The two months of Hitler's Government have been nothing but a single chauvinist tirade against proletarian internationalism and 'world bolshevism', a policy of worsening relations with all States without exception. Such a policy will not strengthen Germany but, on the contrary, weaken it and isolate it still more. The attempts of the Government in these circumstances to break the Versailles treaty and to make gains in the field of foreign policy if only by the *Anschluss* of Austria, in order to raise its prestige in the eyes of the masses whose hunger and poverty it is unable to alleviate, will only make the international situation more acute and greatly increase the danger of war. Every day that passes will expose more clearly the fraud to which the masses who followed Hitler have fallen victim. Every day that passes will show more clearly that Hitler is driving Germany to catastrophe.

The calm that has succeeded the triumph of fascism is only a transitory phenomenon. Despite fascist terror, the revolutionary surge in Germany will rise; the revolutionary resistance of the masses to fascism is bound to grow. The establishment of the open fascist dictatorship, which is destroying all democratic illusions among the masses and liberating them from social-democratic influence, is accelerating the rate of Germany's advance towards the proletarian revolution.

It must be the task of the communists to explain to the masses that the Hitler Government is leading the country towards catastrophe. More vigorously than ever before, the working masses must be shown that their only salvation from still greater poverty and wretchedness, the only way of preventing catastrophe, is the proletarian revolution and the proletarian

dictatorship. A struggle must be waged to fuse all the forces of the proletariat and to establish the united front of the social-democratic and communist workers for the fight against the class enemy. The party and all proletarian mass organizations must be strengthened, to prepare the masses for the decisive revolutionary struggle, for the overthrow of capitalism, for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship by armed insurrection.

Proceeding from these considerations, the presidium of the ECCI approved the programme of practical work put forward by the Communist Party of Germany.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MAY DAY MANIFESTO

April 1933

Rundschau, ii, 11, p. 301, 28 *April* 1933

[Radek wrote at this time, when negotiations were proceeding for the Four Power pact (initialled in Rome on 7 June), that the revision of Versailles would only put in its place another 'peace of prisons, fetters, and enslaved masses', since it was precisely the fascist governments which had become the standard-bearers of revision. The diplomatic exchanges were a form of war preparation. 'Revision is only another name for world war'; the international proletariat remained the enemy of Versailles, but only its own victory would bring peace. An article in the *Communist International* attributed the proposal for a Four Power pact to 'British imperialism' (it was in fact suggested by Mussolini), a step in building a united front of European powers against the USSR. It was also a British move to unite Europe against the United States, and a British attempt to strengthen German fascism and weaken French hegemony in Europe. The policy behind the pact had its parallels in the British embargo on trade with Russia (at the time of the trial of British engineers in Moscow), in the anti-Soviet outbursts of Nazi propaganda, and in Japanese acts of provocation; the British and Japanese were organizing an uprising in Sinkiang to create a base for anti-Soviet activities there and to separate Russia from revolutionary China. The Austro-Marxists and the social-fascists of France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium, who suggested that the USSR should conclude an alliance with the democracies against fascism, pretended to ignore these imperialist activities.

Communist attacks on the Second International were again provoked when the agreement prolonging the Soviet-German treaty of 1926, published on 6 May 1933, was ratified. *Izvestia* had written, on the same day, that the development of Soviet-German economic relations was in the best interests of both countries; guided by its policy of maintaining peace, 'the Soviet Union has nothing to change or to revise in its policy towards Germany'. The argument of Trotsky and the socialists was that Germany was isolated internationally, and the protocol would strengthen the fascist regime. The KPD central committee stated in *Rundschau* that the objections of the LSI proved that 'it is the driving force for military intervention by the imperialist Powers against the Soviet

Union'. The agreement was consistent with Soviet peace policy, and on the German side reflected Hitler's recognition of Russia's growing power and the postponement of Germany's war plans. Bela Kun wrote in the *Communist International*: 'The Comintern's repeated demonstrations that the Second International is the vanguard of international imperialism in the preparation of military intervention in the Soviet Union were confirmed anew by the campaign of incitement against the prolongation of the Berlin agreement. . . . The central committee of the KPD has rightly characterized the Second International's anti-Soviet incitement when it writes in its manifesto: "They are for a war against the Soviet Union because they hope that by an anti-Soviet war the crisis of capitalism may be overcome. . . . They are for military intervention in the Soviet Union and prefer fascism to proletarian dictatorship. . . . They are in all capitalist lands the most extreme enemies of the Soviet Union who want to defer all questions in dispute between the imperialist countries in order to be able to realize the great plan of overthrowing socialism in the Soviet Union by the united forces of the whole imperialist world". . . . Savage incitement against the Soviet Union is the sheet-anchor of the Second International.'

Similar arguments were used when the LSI and IFTU proposed a boycott of German goods. The boycott campaign, wrote the *Communist International* in an article on the Leipzig trial of Dimitrov and his fellow prisoners, was designed by the social-fascists to draw the masses into a united front with their own bourgeoisie. 'Under the slogan "Buy British and Dutch goods" the social-fascists are carrying out the social orders of the bourgeoisie of their own countries.' Bela Kun wrote that the demand 'to boycott this merchandise is merely dictated in reality by the desire to protect the industries of their respective fatherlands against foreign competition'. Communists 'will not allow themselves to be used as tools in the hands of one imperialist country against another'.

The seventh congress *Materials* asserted that the SPD 'voluntarily entered into political unification with the fascists in the hope of saving their organizational apparatus from destruction. . . . But despite all these efforts, fascism was compelled to break up social-democracy, for any organization outside the fascist organizations . . . was bound to become a centre of organized resistance. . . . Fascism was able to do this because for the time being the bourgeoisie did not need social-democracy, and social-democracy was no longer strong enough to guarantee by its support the stability of the capitalist system.'

Piatnitsky wrote that the only explanation for the continued loyalty of the workers to the social-democratic parties and unions was the inadequate work of the Comintern sections, in which the sectarians excused themselves from work in the unions by calling them 'a part of the State apparatus' and 'strike-breaking fascist organizations' in which 'even the rank and file are reactionary'. Recruits could not be won for revolutionary policies if they were approached with insults; the communist press and verbal propaganda was 'abstract, dry, and boring', and was directed only to the converted.

In May Barbusse called for a conference to organize the fight against fascism (later said to have been convened by the 'revolutionary unions' of Germany, Italy, and Poland); it was held at the Salle Pleyel in Paris on 4 June. There was

an audience of 3,000, of whom 2,000 were French; the manifesto adopted on 6 June declared that the struggle against fascism could only be a class struggle against capitalism; the call to defend bourgeois democracy was a capitalist device to get the genuine anti-fascist struggle into the service of the bourgeoisie. The conference appointed a committee which in August amalgamated with the international anti-war committee set up at Amsterdam a year earlier. A report on the conference in the *Communist International* said that it was not only in Germany and Italy that fascism had come to power—more and more it was being used in France, Czechoslovakia, Spain ('in a social-democratic disguise'), while in the United States 'the newly-elected President has been given dictatorial powers'. The essence of the New Deal, according to an article in the same periodical in September 1933, 'consists in the prohibition of strikes and the complete identification of the AFL with monopoly capital'. Foreign markets were to be captured by reducing the standard of living; the farmers were to be set against the workers, and the employed against the unemployed, these plans being 'smothered in the most extreme and clever demagoguery', which had 'even influenced certain sections of revolutionary organizations'. Roosevelt would probably 'respond to the disillusionment of the masses with sharpened terror. So far he has tried to deceive them, but this cannot go on indefinitely.']

Never has the capitalist world presented such a picture of chaos as now. And still no end to the crisis can be seen. Bankrupt capitalism can only increase its exploitation of the working people, but it cannot give work to the unemployed or bread to the hungry. Incapable of finding a way out of the crisis, the bourgeoisie in a number of capitalist countries are going over to open fascist dictatorship, dragging the working people into the abyss of new imperialist wars.

Political reaction is spreading throughout the capitalist world. In Germany the fascist terror is indulging in bloody orgies; hundreds of workers have been murdered, thousands have been tortured and crippled in the fascist dungeons and barracks, tens of thousands thrown into prison and concentration camp; the communist press has been closed down, the offices of workers' organizations broken up, and their property, bought with the workers' pennies, looted by the fascist gangs.

In the Far East the flames of Japan's robber war on China are spreading. All the contradictions of the capitalist system have reached their most acute stage. An imperialist bloodbath to re-divide the world is on the agenda. In Europe the crisis of the Versailles system threatens hourly to plunge the working people into new bloody hostilities. All those stirring up war against the USSR, the country of proletarian dictatorship and socialism, are setting feverishly to work. The Four-Power pact devised by the two former socialists MacDonald and Mussolini is a pact to consolidate fascist reaction and the anti-Soviet bloc.

The decisive struggle between the world of the exploited and the world of the exploiters is drawing near. Everywhere there is rising the wave of

indignation of the workers and peasants against capitalism, bourgeois dictatorship, and fascist terror. A profound revolutionary ferment has seized the working people, the revolutionary surge is advancing irresistibly. The ground under capitalism is shaking. In the tempestuous strikes, in the heroic struggles of the proletariat against fascism, in the revolts in the navies, in the triumphs of the Red Army in China, capitalist reaction scents the subterranean shocks of the approaching revolutionary explosion. It is enraged because the victories of socialism in the USSR are making the workers and the oppressed of the entire capitalist world still more revolutionary.

For years we communists have been telling you that the Second International was leading you towards fascism and imperialist war. Why were the bourgeoisie successful in establishing the bloody fascist dictatorship in Germany? They were successful because social-democracy went over to their side, because the bourgeoisie were and are still supported by social-democracy, which split the German proletariat. . . . It is German social-democracy, the strongest section of the Second International, which, by yielding to the bourgeoisie one after another the positions won by the workers, cleared the road for fascism and helped it to power. It is the Second International which, by slandering the proletarian dictatorship, socialism, and the Red Army, the solid bulwark of the USSR, undermined the striking power and determination of the working class in its struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. It is the Second International which took a direct part in preparing armed intervention in the USSR and is now trying to disarm the proletariat in the international arena too. . . .

Were the communists not right when they warned you that the Second International and its parties wanted to have nothing to do with a united class front of proletarian struggle? In order to save capitalism, international social-democracy broke up the workers' united front, is breaking it up now, and will continue to do so.

In Germany the most important party of the Second International has gone over to the side of fascism. Through the mouth of its leader Wels it cynically admits that it brought Hitler to power. It is begging the fascists for the right to be incorporated in the system of the fascist dictatorship and thereby announcing its readiness to take part in all the bloody crimes of fascism against the working class. It is surrendering the trade unions to the fascists. It defends the fascist terrorist dictatorship and is assuming the part of an outright fascist agent outside Germany. In the Reichstag it expressed complete solidarity with the war policy of German fascism. On Hitler's orders it has left the Second International, openly becoming a nationalist 'German' party.

The road of German social-democracy is the road of the entire Second International. The social-democratic policy of 'the lesser evil', which

brought Hitler to power, is the reactionary policy of the united front with the bourgeoisie, of the entire Second International against the revolutionary workers. Have not the most prominent leaders of the Second International—MacDonald, Thomas, Snowden, Boncour—gone over openly to the bourgeois camp? The Austrian Socialist Party, under the banner of defending democracy—in this following German social-democracy—has brought the working class to a position in which it is directly exposed to the blows of fascism. Its earlier arrogant declarations that if the bourgeoisie resorted to force, it would answer with force, embodied the same tactics of disarming the proletariat as does the tactic of ‘the lesser evil’. Like Wels and Leipart, the French socialists are advocates of the united front with the bourgeoisie and combat frenziedly the united front of the working class. It does not matter with which fraction of the bourgeoisie—with the ‘left’, the moderates, or the right—the socialists unite in a bloc against the proletariat. What matters is that these are only different stages of the development of social-democracy into fascism. The hypocritical words of the French socialists and the English Labour Party people against German fascism are nothing but a flimsy cloak which they drape round their own ‘national’ imperialism which is preparing the new war.

Take note, proletarians, that international social-democracy prefers a united front with fascism to defend and save capitalism to a united front with the working class to overthrow fascism by the proletarian revolution. Take note, proletarians, that the Second International, at the moment of greatest war danger and the spread of fascism, rejected the Communist International’s proposal of 5 March 1933 for a united fighting front against fascism and the capitalist offensive. . . .

What we need now is the united front from below and not negotiations at the summit with Wels and Renaudel. For the leaders of the Second International negotiations at top level are only a way of putting off the united working-class front, hampering it and breaking it up. Only the initiative of the working masses themselves, their effective intervention . . . will ensure the fulfilment of this central task of the international labour movement. Only the struggle of the masses themselves under the leadership of the communist party will put an end to the exploitation of the workers by social-democracy to strengthen the reactionary united front of capital. Only the mass front of proletarian struggle will spread beyond the frontiers of individual countries and become one with the heroic proletariat of the USSR, the lofty cause of socialist construction, the Soviets of China, and so become one fighting front of the entire international working class, which no force in the world will be able to break. . . .

By widespread mass strikes against wage reductions, for wage increases, by fighting for the forty-hour week without wage cuts, for immediate aid to the unemployed, for social insurance at the expense of the capitalists, the

proletariat will re-establish its revolutionary unity as a class. By political action against fascist terror, in defence of its press, its political rights, and its class organizations, the proletariat will consolidate and extend this unity in the political field. By its devoted advocacy of the demands of the peasants facing ruin, by fighting for immediate aid at the expense of the junkers, for the annulment of peasant debts and exemption from taxation, the united proletariat will extend its revolutionary united front by drawing in the bulk of the peasantry. In this way and only in this way will it approach the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship and bring it nearer.

Eighty-five years ago Marx wrote that 'communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purposes can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order.' Today also the Communist International declares openly to the millions of workers of the whole world that there can be no real unity of the working class without the fight for the violent overthrow of the entire existing capitalist order, for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The bankruptcy of German social-democracy is the bloody collapse of the legend of the entire Second International about democracy as the road to socialism. Workers, you must realize that there is no other way to emancipation from the yoke of capital than the proletarian revolution, no other road to socialism than the proletarian dictatorship.

It is only the proletariat of the USSR, which took the road of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, which today knows neither crises nor unemployment, neither wage reductions nor the ruin of the peasants, neither oppression by one nation of another, nor international enslavement and dependence. The land of Soviets . . . stands as an impregnable wall against international fascism, and by the successes of socialist construction is mobilizing the working class of the entire world against capitalism. By ruthlessly defeating the capitalist elements, by liquidating the big peasants as a class, the proletariat of the USSR is advancing victoriously to the classless society. Day by day the working people of the Soviet Union are showing by practical experience, which the millions can understand, the advantages of the socialist system over the decaying capitalist system.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM THE ECCI SECRETARIAT
TO THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

17 September 1933

Communist International, 15 October 1933, p. 673

[The ILP decided to withdraw from the Labour Party at a conference held in July 1932; the CPGB, which welcomed the step, regarded the ILP as a competitor—it could 'hold back the workers from following the revolutionary path of the Comintern'—and appealed to its members to join the communists.

In the following spring the CPGB attacked those leading members of the ILP who had condemned the KPD rather than the SPD for the course of events in Germany and had rebuked the CI for its rigid sectarian tactics. The ILP conference of April 1933 held in Derby voted 83–79 to leave the LSI and to approach the CI, and a letter was sent to the ECCI enquiring about methods of collaboration. The ECCI, in its reply of 18 May, expressed ‘its readiness to commence negotiations with the National Administrative Council of the ILP’, and suggested that the ILP could begin by organizing ‘solidarity actions’ with the CPGB, by supporting it in its struggle against the Labour Party, the reformist unions, and the LSI. The editor of the *Daily Worker* attacked Fenner Brockway, chairman of the ILP, who had said that Hitler’s advent to power revealed the bankruptcy of both the Second and the Third International, and that the Soviet agreement with Germany, and its offer to sell the CER to Japan, compromised the workers’ struggle against the Nazis and Japanese imperialism—this latter was ‘a new demonstration of the peaceful policy of the USSR to hinder the organization of new provocations against her by Japan’. A number of local ILP committees were opposed to joint activities with the CPGB, arguing that the communists were intent on wrecking and absorbing the ILP organizations. In July the NAC wrote to the ECCI deploring those Comintern policies ‘which have divided and weakened the industrial organizations of the workers and which, by treating sections of the working class outside its own ranks as enemies indistinguishable from the fascists’, had prevented united working-class action. It proposed to call a world congress of all organizations prepared to co-operate on a revolutionary socialist programme, and hoped the Comintern and its sections would be willing to take part.

In August the ILP was represented at a conference in Paris of those interested in forming a new socialist international (fourteen groups and parties were represented in all), for which Trotsky did some preparatory work, drafting some of its resolutions. The ILP did not endorse the resolutions, but later published an article by Trotsky in its journal. At the thirteenth ECCI plenum in December 1933 Piatnitsky said: ‘Clearly our task was to drive a wedge between the leaders who sabotage the Derby resolution and the members of the ILP who were in its favour.’ This the CPGB had failed to do. In January Brockway asked what were the precise obligations undertaken by a party accepted by the Comintern as a sympathizing party, which of the 21 conditions still remained in force, would the ILP be free to state publicly its disagreements with the CI and the CPGB, etc. He then referred to the control exercised by the Executive over the national sections; it had ‘narrowly circumscribed the latter’s powers of initiative. The desires of national sections have been overridden, their policies reversed by instructions from the centre, their leaders removed from office against the wishes of their members or expelled from the party, and whole parties forced out of the CI . . . the recent history of the sections of the CI in most countries has been one of continuous fission, their prestige is lower than in 1920 and their powers less than in 1923.’ The letter attributed these ‘disastrous results’ to CPSU control of the ECCI, to the uniformity of tactics imposed on all sections, and to the ‘deliberate policy of temporarily sacrificing the revolutionary movement in one country in order to strengthen the world revolutionary

movement by safeguarding the USSR by a network of trading agreements, non-aggression pacts, and treaties of friendship'.

The reply of the ECCI, signed by Kuusinen and dated 20 February 1934, said that Brockway's letter consisted for the most part 'of anti-communist and anti-Soviet slanders'. Admission as a sympathizing party did not imply recognition of the 21 conditions, nor would such a party be bound by Comintern statutes, but it would have to fight 'treacherous social-democracy', the Second International, the reformist trade union leaders, and any attempt to create a new world war, and there was no contradiction between that and the interests of the workers' movement in all countries, but this was the policy attacked by Brockway. The charge of over-centralization under CPSU domination was a travesty of the truth; there was iron discipline, without which the parties could not fulfil their role; the leading position of the CPSU was one of the guarantees of their victory. The ILP conference was held at York at the end of March 1934; it voted by 126 to 34 against joining the Comintern as a sympathizing party.]

After we had given a clear answer to the question put by your Party Conference as to how the ILP may assist in the work of the Communist International we received a letter from the National Administrative Council which made a series of absolutely unfounded charges against the Communist International, and brought forward a proposal to 'call a world congress of all organisations which are prepared to co-operate on a revolutionary socialist basis'. . . .

We consider that nothing useful can come out of such a proposal. If the National Administrative Council of the ILP, together with the independent fragments of social-democratic parties, calls a world congress, as stated in its letter, nothing will come of this except an attempt, foredoomed to failure, to resurrect the inglorious Two-and-a-Half International, as was proved by the recent Paris Conference of these organizations. We doubt if this idea will be received with any enthusiasm even by the members of the Independent Labour Party itself. At the Derby Conference, the representative of the National Administrative Council advocated the idea of an 'all-embracing international' as against the resolution to approach the Communist International. But the majority decided for the latter. We believe that the members of the ILP wish to adhere to the decision of their Party Conference, and do not wish to be dragged into new internationals with old bankrupt policies.

The idea of a 'left socialist' world congress, which is advanced by the National Administrative Council, is basically the old idea of the ILP which dates back to 1920. . . .

Experience soon showed where this 'left' idea would lead. In 1921 the ILP participated in the formation of the Vienna organization of 'left' socialist parties, and two years later, in 1923, this Two-and-a-Half

International brought back to the fold of the Second International those radicalised workers who had left this treacherous International.

At that time, by means of this manoeuvre with the Two-and-a-Half International, the left workers in a number of European countries were kept back for a long time from the common fighting front with the Communist International against the bourgeoisie. In Great Britain, this manoeuvre guaranteed support for the bourgeois imperialist policy of the Labour Government from those workers who were under the influence of the ILP, and made it easier for the leaders of the reformist trade unions to betray the General Strike in 1926. . . .

At the present time, the radicalization of the working masses in Britain is a fact, from which practical political conclusions should be drawn. We communists put forward the task of organizing the mass struggles for the defence of the vital everyday interests of the workers, for the liberation of the majority of the working-class from the influence of the reformists, for rallying together the fighting front of the proletariat, and organizing international united front actions against fascism, the war danger, and the bourgeois offensive against the living standards of the working class. But what could a joint congress of social-democratic and communist parties such as proposed by the leadership of the ILP, give to the poverty-stricken working masses at the present time? Nothing but illusions. The leaders of the social-democratic parties do not want to struggle against the capitalist offensive. They want to continue their class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and a joint congress with them could only distract the attention of the workers from the necessity of a mass struggle in defence of their interests. . . .

For the carrying through of these most important tasks of the revolutionary working-class movement, the assistance of the ILP in the work of the Communist International could be of exceptional value. But some parts of the letter of the NAC to us, and statements of prominent members of the NAC (Brockway, Sandham, Jowett, etc.) during recent months, the breaking-off of the united front with the communists by some leading functionaries of the ILP, give grounds for fearing that the intention of the Derby Conference to assist in the work of the Communist International may be frustrated. . . .

It seems to us that in your party there are *two distinct tendencies*, two political lines. Many members of the party are for the new line outlined by the Derby Conference, but many leaders are for the old reformist line. Many members of the party are for an uncompromising fight against the bourgeoisie and the Labour Party, but many leaders are sabotaging the fight against both one and the other. Many members of the party are firm supporters of the USSR, but many leaders are against the USSR. Many members of the party want to get nearer to the Communist International

and to co-operate with it, but many leaders want to get further away from it.

In short, many members of your party are revolutionaries, but many leaders are reformists. To be more exact, they are 'left' reformists. The latter are not quite the same as right reformists, the leaders of the Labour Party or 'National Labour'. What do the 'left' reformists stand for? They are in favour of a revolutionary policy in words, but in practice they are against it. They can accept a much more radical programme than the right reformists, but they do not cease their resistance to the revolutionizing of the practice of the party. They talk loudly about the united front of the proletariat, but act along the lines of conciliation with the Labour leaders and continue their co-operation with the saboteurs of the united front, such as Mr. Sandham, and in this way also helping the National Labourists and the National Government. Formally, they are for co-operation with the Communist International but actually, they are assisting its bitter enemies in the setting up of a new international body, for the purpose of holding back the masses from the revolutionary class struggle, by means of deceptive phrases and left manoeuvres which are essentially directed against the communist movement. . . .

'We also want socialism', say the 'left' reformists, 'but by a pacifist technique of revolution.' In other words, this means we do not actually want revolution, which brings all kinds of dangers. But if socialism could be brought in without dangers and fights, either by a democratic vote in Parliament for a suitable Bill, or by means of the peaceful organization of legal workers' councils, then we would have no objection to socialism.

But the British bourgeoisie are emphatically against the fate of capitalism being decided by peaceful means. It is strongly armed and is in favour of using the most merciless violence against the proletariat. Its policy is a bloody one and its 'democracy' is shown up as a class dictatorship. Its State is shown up as the apparatus of class violence.

Bourgeois class violence cannot be broken by 'pacifist technique', but only by the class violence of the proletariat. The British working class will be strong enough to do this, if its vanguard, its revolutionary movement and the united front will be strengthened. For this purpose it is necessary to take advantage of all actual possibilities and practical means, including the election campaigns and the Parliamentary tribune, to activate, to educate and organize the working class and to win its decisive strata over to the side of the revolution.

Such is the line of a genuine revolutionary policy.

The reformists complain that the present political situation is 'disastrous'. Some of them resign (Mr. Paton, secretary of the ILP), or seek a place in the camp of open reformism. Others twist and manoeuvre desperately so as to hang on somehow, until the old times of stable capitalism

return. But their calculations are mistaken. The capitalist system is bankrupt.

We say that the political situation is *favourable* for revolutionary work. A period of great class battles for power is approaching with the inevitability of historic law. This signifies the *possibility of great victories for the proletariat*. But everything depends on how the conscious revolutionaries carry on their work *at the present time* to prepare the working-class for these struggles for power.

For this purpose it is necessary, above all, to have a *clear political line*.

The path of the ILP lies forward and not backwards! Backwards means to bankrupt reformism. Forward means to communism, which is already leading the working class on one-sixth of the globe from victory to victory, and which will grow and conquer in all countries.

We propose that the following questions be raised for discussion in all the organizations of the Independent Labour Party:

1. What concrete mass actions on the basis of the united front of the CPGB and the ILP can and must be carried out in the near future, with the aim of a successful struggle for a 10 per cent wage increase, against the Means Test, and other similar demands advanced by the CPGB and the ILP?

2. Is it desirable for the Independent Labour Party to join the Communist International as a party sympathizing with communism, with the right to a consultative vote, according to paragraph 18 of the Statutes of the Communist International?

We are aware that the latter question has been advanced by some members of the Independent Labour Party. We consider it timely for the party to discuss this question fundamentally.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1933

Rundschau, ii, 42, p. 1625, 10 *November 1933*

[In *Rundschau* (September 1933) A. Kellermann took to task those Czech communists who said the official attitude to the social-democrats prevented a united front, and writers in the Czech communist press who interpreted fascism as a movement of the proletarianized middle classes and urged concessions to the social-democrats; there could be no mobilization for struggle, the author concluded, that was not directed against social-democracy. In the following month an article by Gottwald, attacking opportunism in the Czech party, argued that a conciliatory policy towards social-democracy would make it more difficult for socialists to leave their party and join the communists; the united front was possible only under communist leadership. As a later article explained, it was 'not a policy of a communist-social-democratic bloc . . . but

on the contrary one of the chief levers for eradicating social-democratic ideology from the working-class ranks'. The offer by the social-democrats of a non-aggression pact with the CP was 'a social-fascist swindle'. 'The social-fascist cohort of leaders is sold body and soul to the bourgeoisie and serves it to the end without hesitation in plundering and suppressing the proletariat.' On the Sudetenland question it was said (*Communist International*, May 1933) that the Czech bourgeoisie were trying to present the defence of Versailles as the defence of democracy against fascism. Karl Braun wrote in June that the 'alleged measures' by the Czech Government against the Nazis in that area were only a pretence, designed to keep the workers back from the real struggle; the attitude of the Government, which was itself moving towards fascism, towards the Nazis was one of benevolent toleration. 'The Czech bourgeoisie', Kellermann wrote, 'determined to defend by war their privileges to exploit the oppressed nations of Czechoslovakia acquired under the Versailles treaty, and at a favourable moment to attack, in alliance with their imperialist allies, the Soviet Union . . . are preparing all their forces for war.' Support by the social-democrats for Benes's attempt to dissolve German nationalist organizations in the Sudetenland was described by Karl Neumann as 'this disgusting alliance with the national and social oppressors'.

Criticism of communist policy within the communist parties was reflected in an article in the *Communist International* in December 1933 which, after urging the parties to prepare for the revolutionary overthrow of their governments in Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, to lead the struggle of the masses 'for the power of the Soviets' in Spain, and to convert the imperialist war into civil war in Japan, attacked the opportunists who denied that the world revolutionary crisis was maturing and wanted a united front 'from above'; the danger was great in the Czechoslovak CP, where there was a tendency to make a bloc with the social-democrats, and in France, where communists passively supported the betrayal of a strike by reformist trade union bosses.

The following issue of the periodical attacked the social-democrats for saying that the German proletariat was defeated, and an epoch of fascism and reaction had set in; this attitude, taken up by the Trotskyist-Brandlerist traitors, had 'found some echo' in the communist parties—the Neumann-Remmele group in the KPD, the Gutmann group in Czechoslovakia; it also attacked those in the United States party who exaggerated the importance of Roosevelt and believed that he genuinely intended to improve the conditions of the workers. 'Social-democracy, as against us and in contradiction to the truth, tries to make a distinction of principle between the regime of bourgeois democracy and that of fascist dictatorship', which it considered the dictatorship not of monopoly capitalism but of the petty-bourgeoisie and the lumpenproletariat. 'In Czechoslovakia many communists at first did not understand that social-democracy . . . is not only the conductor but also the bearer of fascism.' They attributed the decline in the CP to the depression among the Czech proletariat following the defeat in Germany. In France the central committee at one time thought it possible to have 'unity with the reformists' and entered into negotiations with the French Socialist Party. 'This mistake the central committee of the CPF has corrected, and the situation is now changed.' The Young Communist

League in Saxony had made 'the opportunist error' of 'exchanging representatives with the union of Social-Democratic Youth'. The united front would be carried out 'only in proportion as the social-fascist leaders are exposed'. Heckert, in the first issue of the periodical for 1934, wrote that the question of the proletarian dictatorship was now on the agenda in Germany, as Nazi policies were bankrupt, but the slogan of the struggle for power was still premature. 'The decisive task of the KPD, in its struggle to prepare the conditions for a violent overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, is the task of becoming the only mass party of the workers of Germany in the shortest possible time. It must do this by liquidating the mass influence of social-democracy.' When 'the hatred against the social-democrats embraces the working class, and when the CP wins over to its side the majority of the working class', the last hour of fascism would strike. The SPD had been made illegal because the fascists found this the best way 'of using the help of social-democracy to restrain the workers from going over to communism'. The renegades and pseudo-lefts, 'from Thalheimer to Trotsky', argued that the KPD was as ineffective as the SPD, and that a new revolutionary organization ought to be created.

Hitler's speech at a specially summoned session of the Reichstag on 17 May was made after a number of speeches by Nazi leaders and diplomatists had created great uneasiness and suspicion abroad, which prompted a British warning that German attempts to rearm in contravention of the Versailles treaty 'would bring into operation the sanctions which that treaty provides', and induced Roosevelt to send a message to all heads of governments represented at the disarmament conference. He welcomed Roosevelt's message, and said that Germany was willing to disarm completely, if others would do the same; if there was no disarmament, Germany would maintain its claim to equality. There was no debate following the speech, and no other speeches. The SPD *Vorstand* had instructed its deputies not to attend the sitting of 17 May, but the remnants of the SPD parliamentary fraction (more than half its members were dead, in prison, or in hiding) decided to attend, to answer the Nazi charge of 'SPD treason' and in the hope that it might prevent another wave of terror against the party. The SPD members voted with the rest of the Reichstag for a resolution approving the declaration.

A few weeks after the November anniversary, Stalin hinted at a changed attitude towards the League of Nations in an interview with the American journalist Duranty when he said: 'the League may become a certain factor in retarding the outbreak of hostilities or in preventing them altogether. If that is so . . . then we shall not be against the League . . . despite its colossal shortcomings.'

The LSI Bureau met twice in March, first in Zürich and then in Paris, to examine the situation after Hitler's accession to power. It recommended the constituent parties to refrain from negotiations with the communist parties so long as the Comintern refused to agree to the one preliminary condition put by the LSI—the cessation of attacks by the Comintern on the LSI. This, said *Rundschau*, was sabotage. At an LSI conference in Paris in August 1933 Nenni, who proposed a meeting between the two Internationals, said that those who lived in a country where there was no democracy learned to value it; Russia

outlawed its social-democrats, but concluded friendship treaties with Mussolini and Hitler. Otto Bauer said the split in the working-class movement was less justified than ever, but communist literature now being distributed in Germany was still full of insults to the SPD. The proposal put forward by Nenni, Blum, and Alter, that the LSI and IFTU should propose an international united front to the Comintern (described by *Rundschau* as 'a cunning manoeuvre') was defeated, but the Bureau was left a free hand to act according to circumstances.

The LSI slogan 'fascism means war' was deceptive, Bela Kun wrote. It should be 'capitalism means war', but the social-democrats used it as part of their policy of exempting capitalism from responsibility for war. Social-democratic pacifist treachery was one way by which the bourgeoisie could draw the working class on to the side of imperialist war and intervention. 'The anti-fascism of social-democracy . . . was, is, and will remain a means of defending the existence of the shaken capitalist system from the proletarian revolution.' A few days before the LSI meeting the same writer said its job was to find 'new methods of betrayal' to replace the old bankrupt methods. 'The leaders of the Second International are out to use the temporary victory of fascism in Germany for . . . maintaining the split in the labour movement, for preparing the way for fascism in other countries too.' At the IFTU meeting in Weymouth later in August the RILU proposal for a united front was rejected; the RILU and its affiliated organizations should be dissolved and their members join the IFTU unions.

Answering criticisms of the Soviet offer to sell the CER to Japan, made on 2 May 1933, Wang Ming wrote in *Rundschau* that the railway was being used as a pretext to provoke war against the USSR. Russia's offer was designed to remove a possible source of conflict with Japan and was 'in the interests of the workers and peasants of the entire world'. If the KMT had defended China against Japan, instead of crushing the anti-Japanese forces, the question would not have arisen. An article in the *Communist International* in September 1933 said: 'The KMT took advantage of the negotiations for the sale of the CER to develop a gigantic demagogic campaign against the Soviet Union. To counteract this, the local party organizations . . . resolutely exposed the slanderous inventions of the KMT.' Katayama wrote that 'American, French, and British imperialism will not allow Japan to enlarge the sphere of its robbery in China', but would allow it to consolidate its positions, because they 'want to weaken revolutionary China and prepare the ground for war against the Soviet Union, which . . . threatens the capitalist world with destruction'. Japan would prefer to fight the United States before fighting the Soviet Union, but for this it needed Britain as an ally, and 'Great Britain is not so keen on a war with America as it raises a grave danger of losing Canada'. Consequently the danger of war on Russia was imminent.]

The capitalist world is approaching this anniversary in a state of unusual disorder and anxiety. The great achievements of October, the mighty victories of socialism in the Soviet Union, are inspiring the workers of the whole world in their struggle against the exploiters and oppressors. Like an impregnable rock the Soviet country stands in the midst of the

capitalist countries in which chaos, destruction, and decay reign. To save their rule the bourgeoisie are resorting to the weapons of fascism and imperialist slaughter.

We are on the eve of a new world war.

In the East Japanese imperialism is acting the part of pacemaker in the anti-Soviet war, the part of instigator of the new imperialist world war. In the West fascist Germany offers its services to the entire imperialist world as counter-revolutionary mercenary. British imperialism is taking the part of chief organizer of the counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. French imperialism is rallying its forces to defend the Versailles robber peace. The frantic armaments competition between the United States, Japan, and England, between France and Germany, is accelerating the development of the extremely acute imperialist contradictions into the outbreak of war. The danger of a new war is growing from the Geneva 'disarmament' conference itself.

Sixteen years of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union—these were sixteen years of the gigantic struggle of millions of workers and peasants for socialism. The balance sheet of this struggle is now being drawn before the judgment seat of history. . . .

Workers! International social-democracy promised you a peaceful and bloodless road to socialism through democracy. In the name of this democracy they helped the bourgeoisie to defeat with blood and iron the revolutionary struggle of the workers for the proletarian dictatorship. In Germany, Italy, Poland, Austria, Hungary, and Finland, it wrought vengeance on the revolutionary workers, cleared the road for the fascist dictatorship, and brought hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants under the guillotine of the fascist executioners.

In the Soviet Union the workers and working peasants hold power fast in their hands. In the Soviet Union there are no unemployed. The workers and collective peasants have no painful anxiety about tomorrow, do not fear to be out on the street, workless and homeless. . . . In the capitalist world there are tens of millions of unemployed and tens of millions on part time; there are millions of young workers who have never had a job. In the Soviet Union the welfare of the workers is rising uninterruptedly. Together with rising wages social insurance is being improved year after year. In all the capitalist countries the theft of wages and benefits has taken on the most cynical forms. . . .

The end of the world economic crisis is not in sight. The attempts of the big bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries to find a capitalist way out of the crisis at the expense of the working people and of foreign nations, by plundering the national treasury, by arms contracts and inflation, are making the internal and external contradictions of the capitalist system still more acute. In all capitalist countries, more than ever before, the

workers are becoming galley-slaves of capitalist labour. In Germany and the other fascist countries their most elementary rights are being stolen from them. The trade unions are shattered, the workers' press forbidden, the communist parties driven into illegality. In the so-called democratic countries, too, the bourgeoisie are making their State fascist. . . . Year after year hundreds of millions of small and medium-sized farms in the capitalist and colonial world are falling into ruin. The peasant is losing his last bit of property, plundered by the landlord, the moneylender, the banker, and the tax collector. The agrarian crisis is raging throughout the capitalist world. The rising anger of the peasant is answered with unparalleled terror and the despatch of punitive expeditions manned by fascist gangs. . . .

Sixteen years ago the October revolution dealt an annihilating blow to the world war. In those sixteen years the imperialists have tried hundreds of times to provoke the Soviet Union into war. A new imperialist slaughter, a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, would have broken out long ago if the Soviet Union had not stood steadily on guard for peace. The Soviet Union has exposed the war plans of the imperialists and more than once frustrated them. More than once fear of the revolutionary defence of the Soviet Union by the proletariat of their own countries has bridled the imperialists, thirsting for war. The Soviet Union has become the strongest centre of peace and the protector of the oppressed nations and colonial peoples.

Fascism is hastening the opening of imperialist war and provoking intervention against the Soviet Union. Supported by the League of Nations and social-democracy, the Japanese fascist military camarilla is already in occupation of large parts of China. Every day it thinks up new provocations of the Soviet Union. It is exploiting the chaos created by the crisis and hurrying forward war on the Soviet Union in the hope of drawing the other imperialist countries into the war. In the West, German fascism is increasing the danger of war. The Hitler Government, the chief incendiary in Europe, is offering the international bourgeoisie the services of German mercenaries against the Soviet Union. Stricken British imperialism is inciting the nations to a bloodbath, mobilizing counter-revolutionary forces everywhere against the Soviet Union. The League of Nations was from the first a league for preparing war. The Second International was always a faithful servant of the League of Nations. . . .

Revolutionary defence of the Soviet Union by the workers of the whole world is the best answer to fascism and to the Second International, which is becoming more and more fascist.

Proletarians! Working people! Colonial peoples! For several years the Soviet banner has been waving victoriously over the vast area of the Chinese Soviet districts. It is arousing the entire colonial world, mobilizing

tens of millions of colonial slaves for the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Covered in glory, and with unshakeable confidence in victory, the Chinese Red Army is meeting the sixth Kuomintang campaign, organized with the help of American, Japanese, English, and other imperialists. . . .

The German proletariat has not bowed and will not bow its head before fascism. It is putting up a heroic resistance. Out of fear of communism, Hitler arranged the provocative Reichstag fire, to divert the anger of the hungry masses; he is flourishing the axe over the heads of the communist leaders. But communism is growing in Germany from day to day. By its selfless struggle the KPD serves as an example to the workers of all capitalist countries. Only the communist party can lead the revolutionary united front against fascism. Only the communist party, with the active support of the entire world proletariat, can free the German proletariat from the clutches of fascism and lead it on the road to October. . . .

More than ever before the fate of the proletariat, the fate of socialism, depends on the degree of class organization, and the revolutionary solidarity of the working class.

Criminal social-democracy is perpetuating the split in the working class in order to continue its reactionary united front with the capitalists. The Paris conference of the Second International once more forbade social-democratic workers to fight together with their class brothers, the communists, against fascism and imperialist war. It intensified the struggle of counter-revolutionary social-democracy against communism and the proletarian dictatorship. Under Löbe's leadership the German social-democrats voted as one on 17 May for the Hitler Government. . . . The social-democratic leaders tell the workers—as Otto Bauer did—that the struggle now is not for proletarian dictatorship, but for an alliance with bourgeois democracy. They defend Dollfuss's clerical fascism in Austria as a 'lesser evil' than the fascism of Hitler's national-socialism. They say openly that on the day when the structure of fascism breaks down under the assault of the working masses, the proletarian revolution must at all costs be prevented.

Only over the heads of the social-democratic leaders, only by uniting its forces under the banner of proletarian revolution, will the proletariat destroy fascism and imperialist reaction and bury the capitalist system.

Proletarians and working people of all countries! In your hands lies the fate of entire working humanity. Your only road is the road of Lenin, of the October revolution. That is the road to which the Communist International untiringly calls all the exploited and oppressed, for only the conquest of power by the proletariat is able to bring all working people work, bread, freedom, and peace, the complete victory of socialism.

THE THIRTEENTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE ECCI

[At the thirteenth (and last) plenary session of the ECCI, held in December 1933, 72 sections were represented; Piatnitsky reported that of these 16 were legal parties (including the Chinese party in the Soviet areas), and 7 semi-legal. In some countries there were legal non-communist mass organizations, in which communist fractions should work; in other countries, there should be fractions in the fascist mass organizations. The CP of Italy had erred in not working in these; the KPD should not make the same mistake. The KPD had lost a great part of its active members at the lower and middle levels by arrest; the parties should decentralize their organizations in preparation for illegality.

A number of speakers dealt with the need to prepare for illegality. Vasiliev said that if the KPD had had good fractions in mass organizations, they would have survived the destruction of the legal apparatus of those organizations. Other parties should sift and regroup their cadres, establish an illegal press and flexible machinery for distributing its output, arrange for the destruction of membership cards, etc. Krajewski said it was essential to select and train cadres for illegal work; they should be primarily proletarians, as petty-bourgeois were not on the whole steadfast enough. The secret political agents of the bourgeoisie were internationalized—men and ideas were exchanged. In this respect the Comintern lagged far behind its enemies. The parties should set up an organization to supervise the behaviour under examination and in prison of arrested communists. Prison could steel comrades, but it could also turn them into renegades, and it was important to know about this. Ercoli said the imminence of an attack on the Soviet Union made preparations for illegality more urgent than ever. Piatnitsky spoke of the need to select cadres, decentralize the party apparatus, and instruct members on behaviour under investigation.

Vasiliev stated that since the twelfth plenum no party had done systematic recruiting or worked to improve its social composition, with the result that, though the masses were becoming more radical, the communist parties had not grown and the turnover in membership was very high. He gave as examples the CP of the United States, which between 1931 and 1933 had made 27,000 new members, but which on 1 October 1933 reported a total membership of 20,000. Between 1930 and 1932 the CP of France had made 25,000 new members, and lost 33,000—a turnover of 134 per cent.

Piatnitsky referred to the attitude of socialists to the Russo-German agreement. The SFIO had been critical of the Soviet agreement with Germany, but the USSR, surrounded by imperialists, could hamper the formation of a united anti-Soviet front by making temporary agreements with capitalist States at the economic and diplomatic levels. 'Is the Soviet Union to be guided . . . by the form taken by the bourgeois dictatorship, "democratic" or fascist?' The form might make a difference to the revolutionary struggle within the country, but from the point of view 'of relations between the proletarian State and the capitalist world . . . all capitalist countries are the same'. The French CP had accused the SFIO of treachery because it supported Herriot's policy, while in Moscow Herriot's visit had been welcomed 'as the dawn of a new era'. This had caused confusion in communist ranks only because the French central

committee had not done enough to explain Soviet peace policy. The rumours about a possible military alliance between Russia and France, and the supply of French arms to Russia, were spread only to hamper the work of the anti-war committee set up by the CPF and CGTU. On the pretext of sending arms to Russia, France could continue to send arms to Japan. The CP of Poland had also failed to achieve clarity on this point.

Lozovsky dealt with the proposal made by a number of trade unions for a boycott of German goods. The IFTU, he said, was an Entente organization serving Entente aims, and the proposed boycott was designed to give better opportunities for the goods of Entente countries. IFTU actions 'go in the direction prescribed by the French general staff, and do not go beyond their instructions'. Knorin also spoke on the boycott proposal. 'What could the boycott bring to the proletariat of Germany and the German revolution? . . . Can a boycott undermine the existence of a capitalist country? Obviously not. Why should we take part in such a boycott . . . which was aimless and doomed to failure?' The spread of fascism had, Lozovsky continued, created new difficulties, 'but the acuteness of class relations, the uninterrupted collapse of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals also give us immense new opportunities. . . . The area open to manoeuvres by international social-democracy has become significantly narrower, and this creates new opportunities for the Comintern and the Profintern not only in capitalist but also in colonial and semi-colonial countries. The ordinary social-democratic worker now listens more willingly to what we say. . . .' Despite these opportunities 'one thing is common to all our sections—they are all lagging behind the tempo of development of events'.

Kostanyan also referred to the unsatisfactory state of trade union work. There had been losses in RILU membership; the CGTU did practically no opposition work in the CGT; in Spain the CP had overestimated the rate of disintegration and decay in the reformist and anarcho-syndicalist unions—in many places they were in fact growing. The strength of the AFL had also been underestimated. Reformist influence would not decay automatically—communists had to fight actively against it. Too many communists thought of the party and the red unions as identical, doing the same work. Trade union statements read precisely like communist party statements, with references to the proletarian dictatorship and the transformation of imperialist into civil war, etc. The RILU press was equally guilty in this. The trade unions were not the party, but transmission belts from the party to the masses. The party had failed to interpret united front tactics 'as the unity of the rank and file for the struggle against the reformist leaders'. 'At every plenum and congress', Lozovsky said, 'we disclose all our weaknesses and shortcomings over and over again, and it appears that part of the mistakes are repeated year after year, and simultaneously new ones are added.' Kostanyan, speaking as a member of the CP fraction on the RILU Bureau, also spoke of the different tactics required for trade union work (summarizing a joint resolution of the ECCI presidium and the RILU bureau adopted in March 1932): opposition in the revolutionary unions had to be fought only on trade union questions and within the framework of union statutes. What was most required was education and persuasion.

'Our task—of convincing the masses and isolating the leaders—cannot be accomplished by flat accusations of reformism or anarcho-syndicalism, but only by persistent and patient educational work', avoiding disciplinary measures except in extreme cases. Lozovsky referred to the election of Horner (CPGB) to a leading position in the mineworkers' union. 'Of course, the party exerted pretty big efforts to attain this. And what followed? Did the political bureau and the leaders of the Minority Movement discuss how Horner should work, how to utilize this position? . . . They regard elections as an end in themselves, and not as a means of widening our influence, of consolidating our positions and struggling for new positions.' In Germany the communists should 'mobilize the workers against compulsory membership' of the fascist unions, organize 'a boycott of all functionaries appointed by the fascists', call meetings to find out what membership dues were spent on, and 'expose all the fascists as hangers-on of the capitalists'.

At the RILU bureau meeting held at the same time as the plenum Piatnitsky advised RILU adherents to 'sign any obligation which the trade union bureaucrats force upon them under threat of expulsion' so that they could actively carry on their work. 'Perhaps we shall have to change the outer forms of the work of the RTUO, to give it another name, perhaps an absolutely "innocent" one . . . and if necessary we must organize secret communist fractions in the reformist unions. . . . What sort of revolutionaries would we be if, because of some formalities, we could not or would not work in the reformist unions?'

Marty made a statement on behalf of the ECCI presidium about the position of Remmele (KPD). Remmele had resigned his mandate as member of the presidium of the ECCI and as member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. At its last meeting the presidium had accepted his resignation and recommended the plenum to do the same. At the twelfth plenum, Marty said, Remmele and Neumann defended a group line opposed to the line of the KPD and the Comintern. They argued that the fascist seizure of power meant a change in the system of capitalist rule, that fascism stood in contradiction to bourgeois democracy. Both in the struggle against fascism, and in the struggle against social-democracy, Remmele and Neumann had an incorrect attitude towards questions of the united front, of strikes, and of the development of the class struggle in Germany, and held incorrect views on the question of the people's revolution. On his return to Germany, Remmele had continued his group work. He had sent an 80-page letter to the CI, containing a fully elaborated platform. The guiding idea in this letter was a counter-revolutionary theory of 'western socialism', a theory which rejected the bolshevization of the parties—and especially of the KPD—and was incompatible with international bolshevism. At the national conference of party workers of the KPD on 16 October 1932 Remmele had declared that he would cease all group activity, but had not in fact done so. The former secretary of the central committee of the Youth League had described these activities in detail to the investigation commission of the CI.

Remmele, said Marty, had also maintained his relations with the Neumann group. With the fascist seizure of power this group activity became fractional activity under Remmele's leadership. He had said that when Hitler seized

power the party should have proceeded to armed insurrection to 'save its honour'. But none of the necessary conditions formulated by Lenin were present, and such an act of desperation would have given the Nazis the opportunity they sought of breaking up the party. KPD tactics on this as on other points were completely correct, while Remmele was totally mistaken. Remmele maintained that the KPD had 'suffered the greatest defeat of the proletariat since 1914'. The working class of all countries knew that '1914' meant the bankruptcy of the Second International, and if Remmele were right, the seizure of power by the fascists in Germany would be not only a defeat for the German proletariat, but would also mean the collapse of the Communist International. To compare the Leninist Communist International with the shameful actions of social-democracy in 1914 was despicable. In maintaining that they were now in an epoch of fascism and reaction, Remmele was taking up precisely the same position as the social-democrats, whereas favourable prospects lay ahead for the Comintern.

After Marty had made his statement, Richter [Schubert] spoke for the KPD. The Comintern, he said, had always helped the KPD to fight opportunism and deviation; with its help the opportunists had been got rid of, 'just as this last Remmele-Neumann group has been'. Their idea of a 'West European communism' was an echo of Otto Bauer's idea that bolshevism was appropriate for Asia, but not for Europe. 'We want to give Remmele the opportunity, under the bolshevist vigilance of the CPSU, to rectify his errors.' Piatnitsky said the mistakes of the KPD before Hitler's accession to power were 'mainly the fault of Neumann, at that time in the leadership'.

Pieck said the idea advanced by Bauer and Trotsky that fascism was a petty-bourgeois counter-revolution was very dangerous; it would imply 'that it would have been in principle right to enter into a coalition with Brüning and parts of the bourgeoisie against fascism'. The Neumann-Remmele group described it as 'the dictatorship of the lumpenproletariat', thus denying that class content and class rule were the same under a fascist dictatorship as in 'Weimar democracy'. This was a justification of social-democratic policy, and a denial that fascist dictatorship grew out of bourgeois democracy. The only force that could have stopped Hitler was a united working class, and this the social-democratic leaders had prevented. 'Thus the unity of the German working class can be achieved only by liquidating the influence of social-democracy on the masses.' It was only because social-democracy deprived the KPD of the support of the majority of workers that finance capital had been able to establish the fascist dictatorship. Social-democracy had done all it could to deceive the workers about the true nature of fascism, to keep them back from struggle. Even now, though suppressed, it was the chief social support of the bourgeoisie. It was in a state of crisis, but it still existed. 'It is up to us communists to destroy it. Any hesitation in our attitude of struggle against social-democracy, any confusion in our united front policy to win the social-democratic masses, increases the danger that social-democracy may be reconsolidated and block the way to our re-establishing working-class unity.' Togliatti also referred to Neumann and Remmele as 'social-democratic deviators'. There had been no change in the class nature of the German regime, whereas the social-democrats

believed that a period of reaction had set in. 'The assertion of the social-democrats that the aim of the proletarian struggle under fascism must be a return to bourgeois democracy is nothing but an admission that in the forthcoming struggle for power social-democracy will play the same part of bloodhound for the bourgeoisie as in 1919 and up to today.' Remmele was transferred from the KPD to the CPSU.

After the plenum Remmele confessed his errors; he admitted the charge of fractionalism, denounced his 'theory of West European communism' as erroneous, and agreed that it would have been a mistake to call for armed insurrection on 30 January 1933; his statement that they were now in 'an epoch of fascism' was dangerously false, and incompatible with Lenin's theory of the 'epoch of imperialism', etc. Neumann also recanted; his fractional struggle against the central committee was irresponsible, anti-party, and criminal: 'I repeat my unconditional agreement with the historic ECCI resolution of April 1933 on the German question.' The KPD central committee, in publishing Neumann's statement, added that he had made declarations of loyalty before, and would have to prove this latest one by prolonged practical work.

Humbert-Droz was charged with pessimism and defeatism, and, while denying the charge, admitted to having said that the Comintern instruction to communist parties to undertake united front activities with the socialist parties 'marked an important change in Comintern policy on united front tactics, a return to united front tactics from above and below. I admit that this appraisal of Comintern policy was a grave relapse into the opportunist errors I committed in 1928.' Knorin asserted that there was no need for the Comintern to change its line: 'In all our estimates of the situation we have been proved right. Our analysis has been justified from year to year. We have not had occasion to revise our views on any point. . . . Our analysis of the situation is true, our tactics are correct.' It was the 'left' social-democrats who had given the 'arch-sphinx' Humbert-Droz the idea that in its reply to the LSI 'the Comintern began a new tactic on the question of the united front. . . . There are not and cannot be any lefts except our party. We are the only lefts. . . . Either join us, or we fight you. There is no other way. Moreover, our fight against the "lefts" will be the fiercest of all.'

The plenum approved the action of the political secretariat in regard to the ILP. Winding up the plenum, Togliatti said it had given 'a conscientious and scientific analysis of the situation'. All parties would have to re-examine and reorganize their work, to establish and eradicate the reasons why they were lagging behind. All decisions of the plenum were unanimous. It was decided to call the seventh congress in the latter half of 1934; the agenda was to be published not later than 1 June 1934.

The accounts for 1932 showed an income of \$1,135,000, of which membership dues accounted for \$968,000. These were in respect of 38 parties, with a membership of 3.6 million; 19 parties were exempted from paying dues. The chief items on the expenditure side were: administration, \$418,000; subsidies, publications, and educational, \$601,000; travel, \$48,000.

An article in the Comintern journal following the plenum stated that what was new in its decisions was the realization that the general slogan of struggle for

a revolutionary way out of the crisis was now inadequate; the parties now had to formulate 'the concrete programme' which they would put into effect after the seizure of power. This underlined the importance of popularizing the achievements of the USSR. It was cited as another sign of the deficiencies of communist work that those who left the social-democratic parties either joined the fascists or renounced political activity altogether. Some of the speeches at the plenum, the article continued, had revealed serious opportunist distortions. In one case in France 'the main thesis of the programme of the united front spoke of the defence of French "democracy"'. Similar attempts to 'hide the face of the party' had been made in Czechoslovakia and Norway.

The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh congress said that the plenum met at a time when the objective conditions of a revolutionary crisis were maturing, and when the behaviour of the German and Japanese parties was enhancing the authority and prestige of the Comintern. Nevertheless the sections failed to take advantage of the world crisis and the crisis in social-democracy. The severe criticism which marked the plenum had since shown good results.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE THIRTEENTH ECCI
PLENUM ON FASCISM, THE WAR DANGER, AND THE TASKS
OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

December 1933

*Thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI**

[The theses were introduced in speeches given by Kuusinen, on fascism, war, and the tasks of communist parties; by Pieck, on the KPD; and by Pollitt, on the united front in Britain. The resolution on Pieck's report ran: 'The plenum approves the work of the KPD since the fascists came to power and the plans submitted for its further activities'; on Pollitt's report that 'the CPGB has had some successes to show in carrying through the united front, particularly in relation to the ILP'.

Kuusinen gave the main report. He dealt first with the economic crisis, which was becoming a revolutionary crisis; it depended on the international proletariat to transform this into revolution. On the international situation he spoke in contemptuous terms of the League of Nations. Britain was taking the lead in organizing an anti-Soviet war, and in these preparations social-democracy was taking an active part. 'In the countries of fascist dictatorship the social-fascist leaders are ingratiating themselves with the fascist cut-throats.' The communist press outside the USSR did not always correctly explain Soviet peace policy, which was not only honest and consistent, but also bolshevik, to be clearly distinguished from bourgeois pacifism. Otherwise workers might ask why the Soviet Government concluded agreements with reactionary governments. They should be told that this policy, even if it could not prevent war, made difficulties for the imperialist enemies of the USSR and might postpone war, particularly if it were actively supported by the proletariat of capitalist

* Checked with German version in *Rundschau*, 1934, i, 2 January 1934.

countries. It was obvious that the capitalist governments regarded non-aggression pacts and similar instruments as scraps of paper, but they had their value in exposing the hypocrisy of these governments and made it more difficult for them to deceive the workers. A government which refused a non-aggression pact exposed itself to the whole world. The longer war was delayed, the more time for the revolutionary crisis to mature, and for the Soviet Union and the anti-imperialist forces to grow stronger. The growth of Soviet power was the chief reason why the imperialists had not yet attacked. Growing Soviet strength was also the chief factor in the development of the world capitalist crisis. If this were explained, 'every worker will understand that there is not and cannot be any incompatibility between the interests of the Soviet Union and the interests of the international workers' movement'.

Kuusinen then turned to an analysis of fascism. As a movement, its class composition was very mixed; but the class character of fascism was shown in its policy, which was the policy of the big bourgeoisie. The Trotskys and Thälheimers called it bonapartism, petty-bourgeois counter-revolution, in order to divert the attention of the masses from the struggle against the bourgeoisie which they served; Remmele's position was the same. Fascist terror both accelerated revolutionary development and made it more difficult. The indignation of the masses would bring them more quickly to communism if the parties took the correct line. Fascist demagoguery would facilitate 'the liberation of the masses from the illusions of parliamentary democracy and peaceful evolution'. There were differences between fascism and social-fascism, but they were not differences of principle; the two were still twins. In the United States the AFL supported Roosevelt's economic measures, which were essentially fascist in character. (Dutt wrote of the Roosevelt administration's measures that they showed more clearly than elsewhere the development towards fascism: '... extreme violence against the workers and intensified war preparations, all under a cover of extreme social demagoguery. Here is the classic type of the most modern process of fascisation within the Western imperialist, still nominally bourgeois democratic states.') But, in spite of the depth and extent of the crisis of the Second International, social-fascism was still a force, 'a dangerously great force in the struggle against the united front, against the communist parties, and against the USSR. . . . That means that the communists must exert all their strength to destroy the mass influence of social-democracy . . . The stronger the influence of social-democracy, the greater the danger of fascism. Therefore success in the struggle against fascism as well as against war requires of all Comintern sections intensified activity in detaching the workers from the influence of the social-democratic parties.'

Knorin also dealt with the relation between fascism and social-democracy. 'The victory of fascism is inevitable or possible only in those countries where social-democracy, by means of its system of centralized proletarian mass organizations, has succeeded in keeping its followers back from a revolutionary united front with the communists, in preventing the communist party, despite the profound crisis, from winning the majority of the proletariat, obstructing success in the proletarian class struggle, and so compromising Marxism and the class struggle in the eyes of the masses. . . . In no single country can fascism

succeed without the direct support of social-democracy, which for a long time has split the proletariat, kept it back from struggle, enfeebled its fighting capacity by police violence, terror, and treachery, and handed it over entirely to fascism.' Fascism had come to power in Germany because social-democracy, while strong enough to prevent the workers from resisting fascism, was not strong enough to guarantee the security of the capitalist system. German capitalism could for a time be saved only by the super-centralized dictatorial power of the fascist State. Hitler had destroyed the social-democratic organizations in order to gain control of a disorganized working class and fit it into the fascist system. Now the Trotskyists and Brandlerites were taking over the work social-democracy was no longer able to undertake, of keeping the workers back from struggle. But they would not succeed. 'Great revolutionary events may occur quite unexpectedly. Therefore we must place on the order of the day the question of the struggle for Soviet power, of the overthrow of the power of the ruling classes by armed insurrection.' There was as yet no directly revolutionary situation in any country; in Germany 'the proletarian revolution is closer than in any other country', and their task was 'to create the revolutionary army for the decisive class struggle for power'. For this they had to use the united front 'without for a moment letting control of the movement out of our hands'.

Bela Kun also pursued this theme. 'Since the victory of fascism in Germany the contradiction between communism and social-democracy has not become less; on the contrary the gulf is wider and deeper', and the parties must take a firm stand against those who 'seek to revise the theory that social-democracy is the chief social pillar of the bourgeoisie and want a reconciliation between communism and social-democracy on the ground that both are persecuted by fascism'. The aim of united front tactics was to overcome the split in the working class by demonstrating to the masses that there were two camps in the class struggle; one to defend capitalism, to which social-democracy belonged, and the other to overthrow capitalism, which was led by the communist party.

Martynov said that only an understanding of Leninist theory would enable the parties to avoid opportunist errors. 'Immediately after Hitler came to power, the social-democrats talked of the united front with the communists, of the conclusion of a "non-aggression" pact with them. In reply to these manoeuvres . . . the ECCI, with a view to defeating this lying manoeuvre, instructed the communist parties to conclude fighting agreements with the social-democratic parties regarding the united front of struggle. In this statement the ECCI enumerated all the past acts of treachery committed by social-democracy and put forward two essential conditions for agreement. . . . We have already heard here how our French comrades took up this appeal of the Comintern and how they committed a serious opportunist mistake in carrying it into practice—nor were they alone in so doing.' This had happened because they failed to understand 'that whatever tactical steps we may take in respect to social-democracy, at the basis of our tactics there lies an unalterably irreconcilable attitude in principle towards social-democracy'.

Vasiliev said: 'The chief enemy is the bourgeoisie, fascism in power. But in order to overthrow fascism the chief blow must be directed against the social-democratic party. The cardinal fighting task of the communist parties of these

countries is to isolate the social-democratic parties from the masses.' Unless this was grasped, communists might begin to believe with social-democrats 'that the social-democratic party and the communist party have one common fascist enemy'. Togliatti thought there were aspects of fascist ideology to which greater attention should be paid, particularly the strengthening of the State apparatus, the emphasis on nationalism, and its anti-capitalist demagogy, designed to win a mass basis.

Before dealing with the tasks of the communist parties, Manuilsky enumerated the main features of the international situation. These were that though the economic crisis was now not so deep as before, it was so closely interwoven with the general capitalist crisis that world capitalism would continue to decline. Bourgeois attempts to find a way out, such as the New Deal in the United States, had been failures. The elements of fascism and war were developing more quickly than the elements of revolutionary crisis, but there was every sign that the latter would develop into a revolutionary crisis of the entire capitalist system; there could be such a crisis without there being a revolutionary crisis in any one country. The encouragement given to fascism by Hitler's accession to power had 'given rise to certain vacillations among those communists least capable of resistance. In France and England, in Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Austria, even in Germany itself, there were individuals who had not stood the test.' But the parties as a whole showed strength and maturity. Fascism was making gains among the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie, and not a single communist party in the capitalist world had paid attention to winning over or neutralizing the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Although class antagonisms had never been so acute, and mass indignation was growing, as well as the influence of the communist parties and communist ideas, the parties had failed to exploit the crisis to strengthen their ranks, or to exploit the crisis of democracy in Germany by undermining the foundations of the Second International. With the exception of China, Japan, and France, they had failed to mobilize the masses against the war danger. Although Hitler had dealt a severe blow to the working-class movement, the victories in China and Russia had shifted the international balance of class forces in favour of the proletariat; added to this was the revolutionary ferment in the colonies.

Manuilsky enumerated four main tasks for the communist parties: (1) To do everything to prevent war against Russia; this was not a remote and abstract danger, but an immediate one from the Japanese side; this meant fighting Japanese imperialism in China; defence of China was equivalent to defence of the Soviet Union. (2) The French, German, and Polish parties must do their utmost to prevent war between France and Germany, and between Poland and Germany. (3) The establishment of fascist dictatorships had to be prevented in those countries where the bourgeoisie had begun to give fascist forms to the State apparatus. (4) To overthrow fascist dictatorships where they already existed. The idea that only the proletarian dictatorship could replace the fascist dictatorship was too schematic. It was true for Germany, but where communist parties were weak, where the working class was not under communist leadership, the fascist dictatorship could be replaced by a bourgeois dictatorship, in the form of a republic, as in Spain. 'All these four tasks lead to

the central slogan of our theses, the overthrow of bourgeois dictatorship and the establishment of Soviet power throughout the world. . . . The way to realize this central slogan is the old one: to win the majority of the working class as the condition for re-establishing the unity of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle and gaining revolutionary reserves for the proletariat. This presupposes the destruction of the agent of the class enemy in the working class—international social-democracy. By advancing the slogan of Soviet power, we want to underline the importance of armed insurrection of the masses as the only means of overthrowing bourgeois dictatorship.' He ended with a warning that the parties must prepare thoroughly for illegality. If they were not illegal now, they would be when war broke out.

Pieck reported that the KPD was creating the preconditions for the overthrow of fascism and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. 'The present situation in Germany is characterized by the advance of a new wave of the revolutionary mass movement under KPD leadership. . . . The KPD is organizing mass struggles against the Hitler dictatorship.' Its chief task was to turn the anti-fascist campaign from agitation to action, and industrial struggles into political strikes. This was extremely difficult under Nazi terror; so far there were only small partial strikes. Now that the trade unions had been *gleichgeschaltet*, the KPD was trying, by strikes and mass trade union work, to create the preconditions for founding independent class trade unions. The party must have as its slogan, on which all agitation and propaganda must be focused, armed insurrection to overthrow the fascist dictatorship. This could be the work only of the revolutionary proletariat in alliance with all the oppressed and exploited. Pieck then outlined a ten-point programme for the KPD once it had established Soviets in Germany. In his reply to the discussion on Germany, he said that in order to popularize the idea of Soviets the KPD had revived its programme of national and social emancipation, to show what the victorious proletariat under KPD leadership would do for the working people when it got power.

Kuusinen also spoke of the need to prevent the re-establishment of social-democratic organizations in Germany; it would be 'fatal for the victorious struggle against fascism'. The KPD had to become the only mass party of the German proletariat, though there were 'exceptional cases' when bolshevik tactics required them to make proposals to social-fascists with a mass following. It was only social-fascists who could call what had happened in Germany 'a catastrophe'. It was a severe blow. Trotsky had said that it was not the proletarian revolution that was maturing in Germany, but the fascist counter-revolution that was deepening. This, said Kuusinen, was Trotsky's Horst Wessel song. (Trotsky had asked how, if the KPD had been unable to stop Hitler coming to power, it could overthrow him when he had seized power.) Richter added a sober note. The KPD, he said, had believed that Hitler would not dare to ban the party, or the ban would be a temporary and unreal measure, as in 1923. He said that contact was lost for weeks at a time between the central committee and the districts, and between the districts and the cells.

Those who had argued that the KPD should have fought, Togliatti said, did not understand that the conditions for a fight were not present in January 1933. Those who said that, however hopeless the position, something should

have been done 'to save the honour of the working class' only brought confusion and demoralization into the proletarian ranks. The KPD was not defeated; it had rallied and taken up the revolutionary fight at the head of the masses. Manuilsky argued that had the KPD taken up armed struggle against Hitler it would have fallen into the trap set by the Reichstag fire. That was also the intention of the SPD and the Second International when they turned down the Comintern offer of 5 March 1933. 'To lead the German communists to the fascist executioner's axe, to put an end to the KPD, one of the vanguards of world bolshevism, at one blow—that would have been in accordance with the wishes of Herr Wels too. . . . International social-democracy, in alliance with the Trotskyists, would like the military destruction of the Soviet Union because they know that the victory of socialism means the death of social-democracy.' Piatnitsky said the KPD had failed to pay enough attention to the fight against Versailles; the hatred of Versailles had been exploited by the Nazis and nationalists. 'The KPD did not wage widely enough, stubbornly enough, and deeply enough the campaign against the Weimar coalition, and principally against social-democracy.' The KPD had founded a number of mass organizations—Red Aid, International Workers' Aid, Freethinkers, War Veterans, Friends of the Soviet Union, Red Sportsmen, the unemployed, and the trade union opposition. 'The sad thing was that the membership of all those organizations was practically identical.' The 'broad electoral masses' had not been drawn in. Now, however, 'in spite of the incredible terror, it is easier to work among the German proletariat, because a large part of the social-democrats and the non-party workers who followed the SPD, as well as the members of the reformist trade unions, have been disillusioned about social-democratic policy. . . . Thanks to the changed situation in Germany and to the heroic work of the KPD, the communists no longer meet such resistance within the working class as the trade union bureaucrats and the SPD used formerly to offer them.' However, communists still did not get up and speak at fascist trade union meetings to answer lying fascist demagogic propaganda. An editorial in the *Communist International* after the plenum said the KPD was becoming the only mass party of the German proletariat 'and is preparing to storm the fascist regime'. It was becoming more difficult for the class enemy to damage the party organizations, which were consolidating and extending their contacts with the masses. 'The situation opens up huge possibilities for liquidating the mass influence of social-democracy.' Class contradictions were more acute than ever before. 'Therefore the proletarian revolution is nearer at hand in Germany than in any other country.' After the plenum *Pravda* wrote: 'The lesson of the German events for the world proletariat lies in this, that the establishment of the fascist dictatorship shows the broadest working masses how fascism grows out of bourgeois democracy, how social-democratic policy prepares the way for fascism, and how the communist party is the only party which fights to overthrow the fascist dictatorship.'

Pollitt said the British Government had become the organizer of an anti-Soviet war. It was supporting Japan in the Far East, and was trying to establish the most friendly relations with Hitler. The country was moving rapidly towards fascism; what Hitler was doing by force, MacDonald would do gradually, as

shown in the new regulations about unemployment benefit. The Labour Party rejected communist united front proposals. In making these overtures, the CPGB had to answer questions put by the workers: why, when the communists used to say a united front with the Labour Party was impossible, was the approach now made? Why should the big and powerful Labour Party and trade unions bother about the tiny communist party? They were themselves a united front of many millions. How could the CPGB propose a united front when it put up its own parliamentary candidates against the Labour Party? Was this no more than a tactical manoeuvre? Pollitt also gave an account of the negotiations between the CPGB and the ILP.

Thorez gave a picture of confusion, doubt, and indiscipline in the French CP: some communist municipal councillors had voted in favour of resolutions 'in defence of bourgeois democracy', some CP members had proposed the abandonment of anti-Versailles slogans; some local party committees had asked the CC to deny the rumours of a Franco-Soviet alliance; others had protested against the reception of Herriot in Moscow; others had talked of 'France's peaceful intentions'. There were doubts about the correctness of KPD policy; the talk about 'the capitulation of the KPD' had been severely condemned by the CC. Some communist trade union leaders had entered into negotiations with the CGT about a joint strike, which was also condemned as an error by the CC. In a number of strikes communists had 'neglected the fight against social-democracy' and formed joint committees with the CGT and the Christian trade unions. A year before, the socialist party had written to the CC proposing negotiations for the formation of one workers' party. Their representatives had met but no decisions had been taken 'and later we broke off connexions'. The mistake of the central committee was not the exchange of views itself, but in 'allowing the idea to arise that in certain circumstances we communists were ready to discuss organizational union with the socialist party'. The aim of the socialist party in this move had been to sabotage mass action. 'In addition to opportunist errors in united front tactics, and to the tendency to relax the fight against the socialist party, there were many proposals made to abandon the "class against class" tactics. There were even members of the CPF in 1933 . . . who blamed us for "playing into the hands of reaction" . . . some proposed that in the second electoral round we should vote for the socialists. In the municipal elections many communists proposed a joint communist-socialist list in the second and even in the first round. The central committee vigorously rejected these opportunist proposals and condemned their adoption.' The root of the error lay in illusions about democracy, and the failure to understand the role of social-fascism as agent of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the working class. Social-democracy was actively helping the bourgeoisie to prepare war, for though, under pressure of the mass enthusiasm for the construction of socialism in the USSR, the relations between France and Russia were changing, the basic hostility of the French bourgeoisie to Russia remained. They sought salvation in war, which they were organizing in the name of security and the defence of democracy. There were many fascist organizations in France, but what was characteristic of the situation was that 'in all "left" parties, including the socialist party, there is a wing which more or less openly advocates

a fascist programme'. The open division in the socialist party (between Blum and Renaudel) was merely a cunning division of labour in support of the bourgeoisie. The CP fight had to be directed primarily against the Blum faction, because they were liable to arouse illusions. 'Never have we been so successful as now in shaking the position of the socialist party and the CGT' by the tactics of the united front from below. Marty also spoke of 'misunderstandings' in the CPF since Hitler had come to power. 'There have even been vacillations among members of the politbureau. . . . It remains an essential task to overcome resistance to the Comintern line, for this confuses the party and cripples its action.'

Knorin said that in March and April 1933 the French CP revealed some Trotskyist views. 'The *Cahiers du Bolchévisme* was more concerned with investigating the "errors" of the KPD than with exposing the treacherous role of social-democracy in the triumph of fascism in Germany.' Like Guttman in Czechoslovakia, these people had lost the revolutionary perspective, had fallen under the influence of Trotsky and Brandler. They argued that if no blame attached to the KPD, that implied that fascism was inevitable.

Analysing the weaknesses of *L'Humanité*, Bela Kun referred to the disquiet among French workers about possible negotiations between France and Hitler. 'In the interests of French imperialism Blum and company are mounting a sharp attack against this and taking the opportunity to pass themselves off as friends of the Soviet Union. . . . Behind the scenes they are instigating a new campaign against the Soviet Union and the Comintern, attacking the Soviet Union on the pretext that, instead of relying on the real forces, i.e. the social-democratic parties, it is splitting the working class and bargaining with imperialist diplomats. Our *Humanité* did not reveal to the social-democratic workers the real background reasons why Blum and company now dress themselves up as friends of the Soviet Union, why they are against direct negotiations with Hitler . . . in the service of French imperialism.' He added later: 'The central point of our attacks on the social-fascists must be to split the socialist party.'

Piatnitsky explained the growth of social-fascism in the working class by the poor work of communist parties. He reported that while the circulation of *L'Humanité* was falling, that of *Le Populaire* was rising; between 1928 and 1932 the socialist vote in France had risen from 1.7 to 2.0 million, the communist vote fallen from 1.1 to 0.8 million, and the membership of the CGTU had dropped from 465,000 in 1926 to 288,000 in 1933. It was not a mistake for the central committee to negotiate with the SFIO; the mistake was to have negotiated not about a united front of action on a definite platform for specific purposes, but about possible discussions on how to organize the united front. The object of the SFIO was to halt the process of disintegration in its own ranks, not to get action.

Gottwald said the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia, as elsewhere, were seeking a way out of their difficulties in war. Benes talked hypocritically about his friendly attitude to Russia, but secretly he was hatching plots against the Soviet Ukraine. 'Czechoslovakia is a classic example of how bourgeois democracy, organically and in legal form, becomes a fascist dictatorship.' The opportunists and petty-bourgeois in the ranks of the Czech CP had panicked after Hitler came to power, blaming the KPD as well as the SPD. Guttman, a member of

the politbureau, unfortunately shared these views; at the twelfth plenum he had criticized KPD tactics; he had not understood that the collapse of the SPD meant the collapse of the Second International, thus giving the communist parties their best opportunity to demonstrate the correctness of their policy. Such errors had made it easier for the Czech Socialist Party to get the masses behind it 'in defence of democracy'. The reason why the discontent of the masses had not brought them over from social-democracy to the communist party was the opportunism in the ranks of the CP, urging concessions to social-democracy. Guttman had said that Comintern policy was 'leading the proletariat into the abyss'. He had been invited to Moscow but had refused; he did not wish 'to be forced into silence for years'. Guttman was expelled as a 'Trotskyist counter-revolutionary and class enemy'.

Lenski noted that Polish-German relations were strained, but this did not mean that they were not at one in their hostility to the USSR, although Poland had strengthened its alliance with France and concluded 'the so-called Eastern pact with the Soviet Union'. Pilsudski's policy was designed 'to disorient the masses and diminish their vigilance against the danger of war on the USSR'. The Polish CP had 'refuted the idea held by many comrades that a German-Polish understanding was impossible'. Earlier in the year Lenski had written in *Rundschau* that Polish fascism and social-fascism were coming forward as defenders of Polish independence against the danger of a German attack. The Polish social-fascists concealed their chauvinism behind an anti-fascist mask in order to divert the attention of the masses from the revolutionary struggle against their own bourgeoisie. Britain was working for a Polish-German rapprochement because Germany played so important a part in its anti-Soviet preparations.

Hernandez reported that a group in the Spanish CP took the Trotskyist line on Germany, arguing that the Comintern and the KPD shared responsibility for the severe defeat, but it had no support. Spanish social-democracy defended not only the capitalists, but the landlords and feudalists as well; it was betraying not only the proletariat but the bourgeois-democratic revolution, with the aim of legalizing the counter-revolution. But it was less dangerous than the anarchists, who by their putschism were helping the fascists. Many workers were deserting the anarchists, but not finding their way to the CP. The party had not yet convinced the masses that it was the only force capable of halting fascism which, stretching from the extreme right to the anarchists, was gaining influence among the petty-bourgeoisie, the peasants, and parts of the working class. There were powerful movements in town and country, but unfortunately 'their leadership is not in the hands of our party', except in a very few cases. However, the party, having got rid of its renegade group, was growing; its vote had increased from 60,000 in July 1931 to 400,000 in the last elections. (The communist vote was in fact 200,000.)

Both Browder and Winestone referred to the fascist character of Roosevelt's New Deal. The United States Government was 'unleashing a wave of nationalism, chauvinism, and patriotism' and accelerating the establishment of fascism behind a democratic mask. The economic measures taken were making for a war economy; unemployment relief was used for military training, and run by the

Defence Department. 'The whole world sees clearly that Roosevelt's policy is leading the United States in the direction of fascism.'

Morales reported for Latin America where, he said, revolutionary developments were taking place unevenly in different countries. In 1932 there had been a revolutionary situation in Chile; now there was one in Cuba, which had international significance because of the volume of American capital investment, and because of Cuba's strategic position as key to the Panama Canal. 'It has given the anti-imperialist movement on the entire continent a powerful impulse forward. We have formed "Hands off Cuba" committees everywhere.'

Wang Ming spoke of the defection of right-wing opportunists from the CCP under the impact of the KMT campaigns. The sixth campaign (which opened in October 1933) was distinguished from the earlier five by the open and direct participation of the international imperialist counter-revolution. The KMT forces had United States aircraft, German poison-gas, imperialist officers, etc. The destruction of the Chinese Soviet Republic was the essential prelude to imperialist world war in the Pacific and intervention against the USSR from the east. The CCP called for a national revolutionary war of the armed people against Japanese and all other imperialisms; for the overthrow of the KMT Government, and the establishment of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants throughout China in the form of Soviets. Only such a government and its Red Army could defeat the imperialists. He complained of the lack of interest shown by other Comintern sections in what was happening in China; they underestimated the danger of imperialist intervention, and failed to see the connexion between the fight of the CCP and their own struggles. Neither Wang Ming, nor Kang Sin, who reported on the strike movement in China, mentioned the name of Mao Tse-tung. (Peter Fleming estimated the Red Army strength at this time at not less than 50,000 rifles and described them as 'hard, well-disciplined, and very mobile troops with a formidable reputation'; there were in addition semi-independent units composed mostly of bandits. Mao Tse-tung, 'political adviser to Chu Teh', he described as 'a gifted and fanatical young man suffering from an incurable disease'.)

Okano predicted that the Japanese attack on Russia would begin in 1934; among the evidence he cited for this was the establishment of direct telephone communication between Tokyo and the Manchurian capital. The chief task of the Japanese CP was to stop the war preparations against the USSR and turn the coming war into civil war; unfortunately the social-democrats, who were actively helping to prepare war, still had the support of 85 per cent of the organized workers.

In 1933 and 1934 the series of arrests of Japanese communist leaders, the suspicion that many members were police *provocateurs*, the discontent and unease of local organizations, disturbed the ECCI (where Nozaka represented Japan after Katayama's death in November 1933); the party was said to be threatened by a split and the total disorganization of its work. The extreme fragmentation of the trade union movement was also matter for concern. In June 1935 the Comintern journal wrote that 'communists and their adherents are an insignificant minority of the working class'. This was due not only to police terror, but to sectarianism and factionalism.

In his final speech, Kuusinen said that though the masses were becoming revolutionary, there would be no automatic collapse of capitalism. Communists should not be guided by subjective wishes, nor should they be the slaves of objective development. They were the active revolutionary instruments of history. The large number of working people who were seeking revolutionary leadership were not finding their way into the communist parties, and this was because the parties had failed to exploit the bankruptcy of social-democracy. 'Comrade Gallacher helplessly asked the question here: "How should we explain to the masses that we do not rejoice in the accession to power of the fascists?"' . . . In Comrade Gallacher's speech there was also a touch of uncertainty on the question how to make comprehensible to the masses the dialectical link between the two forms of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—bourgeois democracy and fascist dictatorship. Is that really so difficult? We do not say that bourgeois democracy is the same thing as fascist dictatorship . . . the egg is not the same thing as the chicken.' Kuusinen then enumerated the essential tasks of the chief Comintern sections. The KPD was 'to mobilise the masses for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship'. The French party was 'to develop industrial struggles in close connexion with the struggle against the dictatorship of the French bourgeoisie, and against the war which the French bourgeoisie are preparing under a "democratic" cloak'. The CPGB was to become a mass party. The CP of the United States was to become a mass party and mobilize the masses against Roosevelt's demagogic legislation. In China the CP was to extend and strengthen the Soviet areas and the Red Army and defeat the KMT campaign. The slogan of the Japanese CP should be 'Clear out of Manchuria and North China.' All parties were to fight against opportunism and for revolutionary working-class unity.

In June 1933 the central committees of the communist parties of Germany, France, Britain, Italy, Poland, Rumania, and Austria issued a manifesto on the war danger; it described the Four Power pact as a 'joint attempt by MacDonald and Mussolini to solve imperialist contradictions at the cost of the Soviet Union'. The Second International was held together only by its hatred of the USSR and its endeavours to promote a war of intervention; this explained its hostility to the Soviet-German agreement, and its proposal that the USSR should join the democratic countries in a fighting alliance against fascist countries, but the USSR would not be exploited by an imperialist Power. In the Comintern journal in the following month Dutt explained that the attack on Russia had had to be postponed because of American disapproval of Japanese action in the Far East and of the decline of fascist power in Germany; the anti-Soviet character of the Four Power pact was concealed behind 'revision of Versailles'. Before the plenum opened, an article in the same journal rebuked those communists who disputed the imminence of war, and those whose anti-war propaganda was conducted on incorrect lines. In the preparations for a youth anti-war conference in Paris 'comrades in some parties attempted to turn these preparations into a vulgar pacifist demonstration. They even went so far as to invite an archbishop to take part in a peace demonstration.' In February 1934 the *Communist International*, commenting on the discussion of the war danger at the plenum, noted that the wise use made by the USSR of the contradictions in the

imperialist camp and of its own strength had brought about 'a change of front on the part of France, Poland, Czechoslovakia . . . in the direction of a rapprochement with the USSR'. This change of front, 'caused by the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, is also finding its reflection in the League of Nations'. When Germany and Japan left the League, its imperialist nature remained unchanged, but it might act as a brake on military operations. The Second and Amsterdam Internationals, wearing pacifist masks, 'shout about the war danger and adopt "anti-military" resolutions, in order to retain their hold upon the masses by shamming a fight against war, so as to disrupt, smash, and pulverize the revolutionary energy of these masses'.

In February 1934 a conference was held in Moscow of editors of communist daily newspapers, as agreed by the presidium after the plenum. The conference agreed that the language used in their press was dry, abstract, and lacking in appeal, and undertook to make improvements.]

The development of the general crisis of capitalism, after the end of the relative stabilization that was noted by the last (twelfth) Plenum of the ECCI, has already shaken the capitalist system to a far-reaching degree all over the world. . . .

The tremendous strain of the internal class antagonisms in the capitalist countries, as well as of the international antagonisms, testify to the fact that the objective prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis have matured to such an extent that at the present time the world is closely approaching a new round of revolutions and wars.

I. FASCISM AND THE MATURING OF THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS

1. Fascism is the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist elements of finance capital. Fascism tries to secure a mass basis for monopolist capital among the petty bourgeoisie, appealing to the peasantry, artisans, office employees and civil servants who have been thrown out of their normal course of life, and particularly to the declassed elements in the big cities, also trying to penetrate into the working class.

The growth of fascism and its coming into power in Germany and in a number of other capitalist countries means:

(a) that the revolutionary crisis and the indignation of the broad masses against the rule of capital is growing;

(b) that the capitalists are no longer able to maintain their dictatorship by the old methods of parliamentarism and of bourgeois democracy in general;

(c) that, moreover, the methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy in general are becoming a hindrance to the capitalists both in their internal politics (the struggle against the proletariat) and in their

foreign politics (war for the imperialist redistribution of the world);

(d) that in view of this, capital is compelled to pass to open terrorist dictatorship within the country and to unrestrained chauvinism in foreign politics, which represents direct preparation for imperialist wars.

Born in the womb of bourgeois democracy, fascism in the eyes of the capitalists is a means of saving capitalism from collapse. It is only for the purpose of deceiving and disarming the workers that social-democracy denies the fascization of bourgeois democracy and draws a contrast in principle between the democratic countries and the countries of the fascist dictatorship. On the other hand, the fascist dictatorship is not an inevitable stage of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in all countries. The possibility of averting it depends upon the forces of the fighting proletariat, which are paralysed by the corrupting [disintegrating] influence of social-democracy more than by anything else.

2. While the general line of all bourgeois parties, including social-democracy, is towards the fascization of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the realization of this line inevitably gives rise to disagreements among them as to forms and methods of fascization. Certain bourgeois groups, particularly [including] the social-fascists, who in practice stick at nothing in their acts of police violence against the proletariat, urge the maintenance of parliamentary forms when carrying through the fascization of the bourgeois dictatorship. The fascists, however, insist on the full or partial abolition of these old, shaken forms of bourgeois democracy, on carrying through fascization by means of the establishment of an open fascist dictatorship and by a wide application of both police violence and the terrorism of fascist gangs. Having come to power, fascism pushes aside, splits and disintegrates the other bourgeois parties (for instance, Poland) or dissolves them (Germany and Italy). This striving of fascism for political monopoly intensifies the discord and conflicts in the ranks of the ruling classes which follow from the internal contradictions in the position of the bourgeoisie who are becoming fascized.

3. The establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany has unmasked German social-democracy before the whole world. From the bloody crushing of the proletarian revolution in 1918, through an uninterrupted chain of treachery and strike-breaking, through all the coalition governments, the savage police massacres of revolutionary workers, voting for Hindenburg as the 'lesser evil,' to servile endeavours to co-operate openly with the fascist gangs—such is the record of German social-democracy, the leading party in the Second International. . . .

Social-democracy continues to play the role of the main social prop of the bourgeoisie also in the countries of open fascist dictatorship. In fighting against the revolutionary unity of the proletariat and against the USSR, it helps the bourgeoisie to prolong the existence of capitalism by

splitting the working class. In the majority of countries, however, it is already in the process of disintegration. The radicalization of the social-democratic workers intensifies the squabbles among the leading circle of the social-fascists. Avowed neo-fascist groups are arising; 'left' fragments break away and try to patch together a new Two-and-a-half International. Trotsky, the lackey of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, is unsuccessfully trying to prevent the social-democratic workers from coming over to the side of communism by his despicable attempts to form a Fourth International and by spreading anti-Soviet slanders. On the basis of the sharp antagonisms between the imperialist countries, the international organization of social-democracy is disintegrating. The crisis of the Second International is a fact.

4. The economic policy of the financial oligarchy for overcoming the crisis (the robbery of the workers and peasants, subsidies to the capitalists and landlords) is unable to restore the stabilization of capitalism; on the contrary, it is helping still further to disintegrate the mechanism of capitalist economy (disorganization of the money system, of the budget, state bankruptcies, a further deepening of the agrarian crisis), and to sharply intensify the fundamental contradictions of capitalism.

In this situation, all the capitalist countries are developing their war industries to unprecedented dimensions, and are adapting all the principal branches of industry, as well as agriculture, to the needs of war. The 'demand' thus created for means of extermination and destruction, combined with open inflation (USA, Great Britain and Japan), super-dumping (Japan), and hidden inflation (Germany), has in the past year caused an increase in output in some branches of industry in a number of countries (particularly iron, steel, non-ferrous metals, the chemical and textile industries). But this whipping up of production for non-productive purposes, or the speculative leaps in production on the basis of inflation, is accompanied by stagnation or a fall in production in a number of other branches (machine construction, building, the production of articles of [mass] consumption), and in the near future cannot but lead to the still greater disturbance of state finances and to a still further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism.

The furious struggle for foreign and colonial markets has already assumed the form of an actual international economic war.

5. Therefore the social-democratic estimation of the present world situation as one in which capitalism has succeeded in consolidating its position, in which it is already on the path towards overcoming its general crisis, is completely wrong. As distinguished from the first wave of the fascization of capitalist states which took place at the time of the transition from a revolutionary crisis to partial stabilization, the capitalist world is now passing from the end of capitalist stabilization to a revolutionary crisis,

which determines other perspectives of development of fascism and the world revolutionary movement of the toilers.

Even the most savage terror, which the bourgeoisie employs in order to suppress the revolutionary movement cannot, in the conditions when capitalism is shaken, for long frighten the advanced strata of the toilers and restrain it from taking action; the indignation which this terror has roused even among the majority of the workers who followed the social-democrats, makes them more susceptible to communist agitation and propaganda. When the bourgeoisie reorganizes its tottering dictatorship on a fascist basis in order to create a firm, solid government, this, in the present conditions, leads to the strengthening, not only of its class terrorism, but also of the elements which disrupt its power, to the destruction of the authority of bourgeois law [legality] in the eyes of the broad masses, to the growth of internal friction among the bourgeoisie and to the acceleration of the collapse of its main social support—social-democracy. Finally, when the bourgeoisie tries, by an aggressive war policy, to strengthen its foreign position, it extremely intensifies international antagonisms and the danger for capitalism which arises from them.

6. It would, therefore, be a right opportunist error to fail to see, now, the objective tendencies of the accelerated maturing of a revolutionary crisis in the capitalist world. But the presence and operation of these tendencies, both economic and political, do not imply that revolutionary development is proceeding upwards by itself, or unhindered, without resistance from counteracting forces. Revolutionary development is simultaneously hindered and accelerated by the fascist fury of the bourgeoisie. The question of how soon the rule of bankrupt capitalism will be overthrown by the proletariat will be determined by the fighting preparedness of the majority of the working class, by the successful work of the communist parties in undermining the mass influence of social-democracy. . . .

The mainstays of capitalism are already being destroyed by virtue of its profound, insoluble contradictions. The world economic crisis is most closely interwoven with the general crisis of capitalism, and sharpens all the cardinal contradictions of the capitalist world to such an extent that a turn may take place at any moment, a turn which will signify the transformation of the economic crisis into a revolutionary crisis. The great task of the international proletariat is to turn this crisis of the capitalist world into the victory of the proletarian revolution.

II. THE IMPERIALIST PREPARATIONS FOR A NEW WORLD WAR

The growing uncertainty of the bourgeoisie as to the possibility of finding a way out of the crisis only by the intensified exploitation of the toilers of their own countries has led the imperialists to put their main

stake on war. The international situation bears all the features of the eve of a new world war.

1. The flames of a new world war are flaring up in the Pacific. The Japanese militarists, spurred on by the profound internal crisis which the bourgeois-landlord monarchy is undergoing, are continuing the predatory war against China and, with the aid of the Kuomintang, are subjugating Northern China and are preparing a blow against the Mongolian People's Republic. British imperialism is stretching out its hand to the Southeastern provinces of China, Tibet, Szechwan, while French imperialism is stretching out its hand towards Yunnan. The fascist military clique of Japan is acting as the battering ram against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in China. The American, Japanese and British imperialism[s] are behind the Kuomintang in its sixth campaign against the only people's government in China, against the Chinese Soviets. The victories of the Soviet revolution in China, the partisan war in Manchuria, the growth of the revolutionary forces in Japan and of the liberation movement of the colonial peoples, create a new front in the rear of the imperialists. The Soviet revolution in China has become a big factor in the world revolution.

2. The Japanese militarists are calling to the German fascists and the British imperialists to unleash a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR from the East and from the West. . . . At the same time, German fascism is inviting the international bourgeoisie to purchase its national-socialist mercenaries to fight against the USSR, intriguing with British, Italian and Polish imperialism (the German-Polish negotiations). The British imperialists at the present time have taken the place of the French as the chief organizers of an anti-Soviet war.

The Soviet Union has achieved considerable successes in the unswerving and firm policy of peace it has pursued in the interests of all the toilers (a number of pacts of non-aggression, a number of new recognitions, the definition of the aggressor, the forced raising of the embargo by Great Britain). The land of the Soviets is the only bulwark of peace and of the independence of the weak states against the attacks of the predatory imperialists. . . .

3. The fascist government of Germany, which is the chief instigator of war in Europe, is provoking trouble in Danzig, in Austria, in the Saar, in the Baltic countries and in Scandinavia and, on the pretext of fighting against Versailles, is trying to form a *bloc* for the purpose of bringing about a new bloody carving up of Europe for the benefit of German imperialism. Imperialist *blocs*, headed either by France or Italy or by Great Britain which intrigues behind their backs, are being feverishly reorganized around the key-points of imperialist contradictions. Europe has become a powder-magazine which may explode at any moment. . . .

4. In this situation social-democracy sticks at nothing in the support of the imperialist interests of its own bourgeoisie and combines this support with service to international capital against the USSR. . . .

At the same time, the Second and Amsterdam Internationals are adapting their policy to the situation of the eve of war, trying to safeguard the interests of their own bourgeoisie and to ensure that the main blow will be directed at the USSR; they hypocritically mask this by expressing readiness to reply to war by a general strike and a boycott, but they declare in advance that they will do so only against the government that will be declared the aggressor by the League of Nations. They pretend to be leading a boycott against goods from fascist Germany, but they persecute the workers who really carry out this boycott. Under the slogans of pacifism and of a fight against war and fascism, they act as pioneers in working up public opinion in the capitalist countries in favour of a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR.

* * *

The bourgeoisie want to postpone the doom of capitalism by a criminal imperialist war and a counter-revolutionary campaign against the land of victorious socialism. The great historical task of international communism is to *mobilize the broad masses against war even before war has begun, and thereby hasten the doom of capitalism*. Only a Bolshevik struggle before the outbreak of war for the triumph of revolution can assure the victory of a revolution that breaks out in connection with war.

III. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

In the conditions of the maturing of the world revolutionary crisis, when the bourgeoisie is trying to divert the ferment, the discontent and the indignation of the masses into the channel of fascization and war in order to strengthen its dictatorship, the main task of the communists is to direct this mass movement towards the fight for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the exploiting classes.

A. The Fight Against Fascist Ideology

The communist must:

(a) daily and concretely expose chauvinism to the masses in every country and oppose it by proletarian internationalism;

(b) in the imperialist countries, come out determinedly for the independence of the colonies, for the liberation of the dependent nations from all national oppression; in the key-points of national antagonisms communists must struggle against imperialist occupation and violence, for the right of self-determination (Upper Silesia, the Saar, Northern Bohemia, etc.), coming out in all these regions, and also in Austria and Danzig,

against the chauvinism of their national bourgeoisie and against incorporation in the hangmen's 'third empire' of German fascism;

(c) widely popularize the solution of the national question in the USSR and the tremendous economic social and cultural successes achieved by the peoples which were liberated by the October Revolution.

B. The Fight Against the Fascization of the Bourgeois Governments and Against War

In the fight against the fascization of the so-called 'democratic' countries, the communist parties must first of all brush aside [repudiate] the fatalist, defeatist line of the inevitability of a fascist dictatorship and imperialist war and also the opportunist underestimation of the tempo of fascization and the threat of imperialist wars, which condemn the communist parties to passivity.

In carefully explaining the economic and political slavery which the fascist dictatorship is bringing to the toilers, in showing the masses that the fascists are not socialists and are not bringing in a new [social] order, but are lackeys, lickspittles of capital, the communists must: rouse the masses in time for the defence of the trade unions, of the labour press, of the workers' clubs, of the freedom to strike and of workers' meetings, organizing protests, demonstrations, strikes and setting up fighting self-defence detachments to resist the terrorist gangs.

In the fight against the fascist dictatorship, the communists must:

(a) taking as the starting point the defence of the everyday economic and political interests of the toilers, rouse the masses against the fascist dictatorship which deceived the workers, the peasants and the urban toilers; expose the demagogy and all provocations of fascism (the burning of the Reichstag, the faking of the Reichstag elections, etc.), stirring up strikes and leading the proletariat up to mass political strikes;

(b) penetrate all the *fascist mass organizations* and also carry on revolutionary work in the forced labour camps; while fighting against the revolutionary workers leaving the fascist trade union individually, but not calling upon the workers to join the fascist trade unions, the communists must utilize all mass movements as well as all manifestations of discontent shown by the masses in the fascist trade unions in order to form and consolidate *independent class trade unions*, while at the same time continuing their revolutionary work inside the fascist organizations;

(c) expose in the eyes of the *peasants* the policy which fascism pursues in the interests of the landlords and the kulaks, illustrating this by concrete examples from their own farm life; join the mass fascist organizations in the rural districts in order to split off the toiling peasants; organize the *agricultural proletariat* in independent trade unions which are to serve as the main lever for the whole work in the rural districts.

In fighting *against* war, the communists must prepare even now for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, and concentrate their forces in each country at the *vital parts of the war machine* of imperialism.

In addition to increased agitation, the communist parties must by all means in their power ensure the practical organization of *mass action* (preventing the shipping of arms and troops, hindering the execution of orders for belligerent countries, organizing demonstrations against military manoeuvres, etc.) and must *intensify political, educational work in the army and in the navy*.

The thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI calls upon all the sections of the Communist International, upon all the workers and the toilers of the world self-sacrificingly to defend the USSR against the counter-revolutionary conspiracy of the imperialists, and to defend the Chinese revolution and its Soviet power from imperialist intervention.

C. Against Social-Democracy and For a United Front from Below

In their fight against *social-democracy* the communists must prove to the workers that the new bankruptcy of social-democracy and the Second International was historically inevitable. While carefully exposing to the masses and refuting the hypocritical and treacherous sophistries of social-democracy, the communists must win over the social-democratic workers for active revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the communist parties.

The thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI fully approves the appeal for a united front issued by the Presidium of the ECCI, and the position of the Political Secretariat of the ECCI in the correspondence with the British Independent Labour Party. Social-democracy, which split the working class by its treachery at the time of the imperialist war and the October Revolution, has in all countries, in accordance with the directives of the Second International, refused the offers made by the communist parties for united working-class action, and sabotaged the united anti-fascist and anti-war movements created in Amsterdam and Paris, and in the face of fascism and war, strove to deepen the split in the ranks of the proletariat.

The thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI calls upon all sections of the Communist International persistently to fight for the realization of a united militant front with the social-democratic workers, in spite of and against the will of the treacherous leaders of social-democracy.

The Plenum fully approves the resolution of the Presidium of the ECCI of April 1, 1933 on the situation in Germany and the political line pursued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, headed by Comrade Thälmann, before and at the time of the fascist *coup*. The Plenum notes the heroic Bolshevik struggle waged by the Communist Party of Germany against the fascist dictatorship.

D. The Tasks of Mass Work and the Strengthening of the Communist Parties

The fulfilment of these fundamental tasks demands the genuine re-organization of the whole of the *mass work* of the communist parties, especially the work in the factories and trade unions, which still represents their weakest sector. In the situation when the toilers are in a state of great ferment, the communists, while taking into account the moods of the masses, must formulate *slogans and demands* in such a way as to make them arise from the present level of the movement; at the same time they must show the workers the revolutionary way out.

This means:

(a) that the content and language of *agitation and the press* must henceforth be addressed to the broadest strata of the proletariat and the toilers . . .

(b) securing within the *shortest possible time* a decisive turn *to work in the factories*, concentrating the forces of the party organization in the decisive enterprises and raising the political level of the leadership given by the factory nuclei to the daily class struggles;

(c) putting an end to the opportunist, defeatist neglect of *trade union work* and, in particular, work *inside the reformist unions* and the mass fascist and Christian trade unions . . .

(d) really developing *mass work among the unemployed*, carrying on an untiring fight for social insurance, for all kinds of municipal relief;

(e) intensifying *revolutionary work in the rural districts*, opposing the landlord-kulak slogan of a 'united countryside' by the class slogans of the toilers and by the agrarian programmes of the Soviet revolution; developing the fight for all the partial demands of the peasantry, at the same time opposing the kulak demands which conflict with the interests of the proletariat and the village poor; obtaining a foothold (trade unions of agricultural workers; peasant committees) among the farm labourers, poor peasants and the semi-proletarian elements of the villages; to win over the basic masses of the small and middle peasants. . . .

The whole situation demands that the communist parties prepare in good time *cadres* for underground work, that they seriously tackle the questions of *combating provocateurs*, that they combine the methods of *strict secrecy* with securing the best contacts with the masses, and avoiding a schematic structure and work of the underground organizations.

Only the concentration of all the efforts of the party organizations on forming underground factory nuclei and intensifying the work of the communist fractions in all the mass organizations can ensure contacts with the masses and also the maximum of secrecy and efficiency.

In carrying out these tasks, the communists must utilize all legal possibilities to develop mass work, and to link up legal and illegal work.

The thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI calls on all sections of the Comintern to ruthlessly root out opportunism in all its forms, and, above all, right opportunism ([Guttman,] Remmele, Neumann, the defeatists in other countries in their estimate of the prospects of the German revolution), for unless this is done the communist parties will not be able to lead the working masses up to the victorious struggles for the Soviet power.

E. For a Revolutionary Way Out of the Crisis—For a Soviet Government

1. The communist parties must with all resoluteness raise before the masses the task of the revolutionary way out of the crisis of capitalism.

Against the quack recipes of the fascists and the social-fascists for saving decaying capitalism, the communists must prove to the masses that the ills of capitalism are incurable. Therefore, the communists, while defending in every way the demands of the toilers, must untiringly disclose to the masses who are suffering from starvation and exploitation the whole truth, *viz*, that their catastrophic conditions will grow worse and worse under the blows of the continuous offensive of capitalism, until the toilers succeed in uniting their forces for a counter-blow and the crushing of bourgeois rule.

There is no way out of the general crisis of capitalism other than the one shown by the *October Revolution*, *viz*, the overthrow of the exploiting classes by the proletariat, the confiscation of the banks, of the factories, the mines, transport, houses, the stocks of goods of the capitalists, the lands of the landlords, the church and the crown.

2. It is necessary to increasingly popularize the *living example of the Land of the Soviets* and to explain to the toilers and the exploited masses in all capitalist countries how Soviet economy, freed from the anarchy and the crisis [crises] of capitalism, is in the position to develop unhindered the productive forces on the basis of a socialist plan. . . .

It is necessary to unfold before the toilers of each country a programme which, basing itself on the experience of the great triumphs of the Soviet workers and collective farmers on all fronts of the class struggle and socialist construction, should, while making allowance for the peculiar conditions of the different countries, show *what the Soviet power will give them in their own country*. . . .

3. It is necessary with all insistence to raise the question of *power* in the mass work of the communist parties. The chief slogan of the Communist International is: *Soviet power*.

The example of the USSR is the example of *Bolshevism*. Only *this* example shows the way out, and the way to save the exploited and oppressed in all the imperialist and colonial countries.

The example of Bolshevism is the example of proletarian international-

ism. The victory of the socialist revolution is possible only by strengthening the international ties of the revolutionary proletariat. The way of Bolshevism is the way of uniting the proletarian forces of all nationalities and races, it is the way of their joint struggle hand in hand with the Soviet proletariat against the oppressors and exploiters.

The Plenum of the ECCI obliges all sections of the Communist International to be on their guard at every turn of events, and to exert every effort, without losing a moment, for the revolutionary preparation of the proletariat for the impending decisive battles for power.

EXTRACTS FROM A MANIFESTO ON THE EVENTS IN AUSTRIA
ISSUED BY THE ECCI, RILU, AND YCI

3 March 1934

Rundschau, iii, 19, p. 711, 8 March 1934

[The Austrian Government, attempting to maintain itself against the growth of the Austrian Nazi movement, and unwilling to offend its right-wing supporters by conciliating the social-democrats, was coming to rely more and more on the para-military right-wing Heimwehr. On 11 February 1934 the socialist mayor of Vienna was forced to hand over his powers for maintenance of security in the capital to a Public Safety Commissioner; on the 12th the socialists in Linz resisted the Heimwehr auxiliary police who attempted to search their premises and fighting broke out, and on the following day the socialists in Vienna called a general strike. This was followed by severe fighting between the social-democrats entrenched in the municipal apartment houses and regular army and police forces, as well as the Heimwehr. Fighting in Vienna, Linz, Graz, and elsewhere lasted until the evening of the 15th. Government figures gave the casualties as 102 killed on the government side, and 193 among the socialists. The socialist party put their losses in killed alone at 1,500, and this figure is generally taken as nearer the truth. The government's charge that the socialist *Schutzbund* had been preparing to revolt was not substantiated. The socialist party and trade unions were prohibited (the Austrian CP had been declared illegal earlier); eight socialists were executed, and about 2,000 arrested. The Vienna municipal Council, with its overwhelming socialist majority, was dissolved.

In an article in *Rundschau* immediately after these events, Gruber wrote that 'social-democracy led the uprising to defeat', and another article in the same issue said: 'Austro-Marxism lived in shame and died in shame.' It was now up to the Austrian Communist Party to see that the social-democrats could no longer wield influence; working-class unity must be established within the CP. *Pravda* wrote that 'The events in Austria are a brilliant confirmation of Stalin's thesis that the idea of revolt was ripening in the consciousness of the masses.' Gottwald wrote that the Austrian proletariat would soon rise again, this time under revolutionary communist leadership. An unsigned article in *Rundschau* early in March said all the objective conditions for victory were present, but the

revolt lacked a strong revolutionary party to lead it. Historically, February 1934 in Austria could be compared to 1905 in Russia; its 1917 would come not in 12 years, but perhaps in 12 months. In New York, communists broke up a socialist meeting called in honour of the Austrian socialists who had died in the fighting. When Doriot's paper *Émancipation*, in dealing with the Austrian events, referred to Vienna as 'a socialist city', and spoke of Dollfuss's campaign to put an end to social-democracy, the *Communist International* wrote that Vienna never had been socialist because the social-democrats had a bourgeois policy. 'Austrian social-democracy put an end to itself politically by revealing its anti-democratic and social-fascist nature to the masses.' Dollfuss had attacked the social-democratic organizations because they might have been used by the workers against the wishes of the socialist leaders. In the same journal, at the beginning of June, Lenski wrote that 'it would be a mistake to underestimate the fact that the social-fascists have earned a certain moral capital from the struggle of the Austrian workers'. The seventh congress *Materials* said the slogans of the Austrian communists in February had been correct, but they were too weak to put them into effect.]

After the fascist coup in Germany the bourgeoisie in France made an attempt to mobilize the fascist forces, and in Austria set out to deal a decisive blow against the working class. In France the proletariat replied with mass demonstrations and a general strike; in Austria with a general strike and armed insurrection.

Tormented by hunger and unemployment, the Austrian workers lost their belief in democracy; they rose to the only just war, the war against their oppressors. For four days they fought courageously against Austrian fascism. . . . Thousands of the boldest and most devoted working-class fighters fell, weapon in hand, among them women and children. Thousands fell into the hands of the fascist executioners; many have met their death on the gallows, others await court-martial. But neither the difficulties of the fight nor the immense sacrifices can break the militancy of the Austrian proletarians. The temporary victory of fascism and its atrocities will only draw the working class closer together, increase their hatred of the bourgeoisie and their determination to overthrow the rule of capital, will spur them on in their inexorable struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Responsibility for the shedding of the workers' blood in Austria lies not only on Dollfuss, Fey, and the Austrian bourgeoisie. It rests in equal measure on the German fascists. . . . German fascism is the pacemaker of reaction throughout Europe, the most rabid executioner of the European working class, the spiritual origin of the bloody sadism which now rages in the capitalist world.

Austrian proletarians! The world working class and the Communist International give full recognition to your heroism, and lower their banners at the bier of the fallen. Betrayed by social-democracy, you fought like lions for the cause of socialism. . . . You gave the first example

in Europe of armed insurrection against fascism. By your insurrection you have strengthened the belief of the working class in its own power, and demonstrated how to fight fascism with deeds, not words. . . . You did not break fascism, but severely shook its confidence. Inspired by your rising, tens and hundreds of thousands of workers in other capitalist countries are rising against fascist reaction. Your rising marked an extremely important stage in the movement of the social-democratic working masses towards communism. Out of the blood shed by Dollfuss and Fey new and stronger cohorts of proletarian fighters will arise, who will not let themselves be betrayed as before by social-democracy. And that is why your fight and your heavy sacrifice were not in vain. . . .

More than once the social-democratic workers broke out in a storm of indignation against the treacherous policy of their leaders, and in the end they lost patience. In answer to the Dollfuss Government's provocative actions in Linz, the Austrian proletariat called for a general strike and took to arms. Social-democracy later agreed in words to the general strike which was already in operation, but it did not want to fight. It only wanted to intimidate the Dollfuss Government and reach a peaceful settlement of the conflict. The rising flared up against its will, for the Austrian proletariat, having learnt from the bitter experience of the German workers betrayed by social-democracy, did not want to submit to fascism.

But were the Austrian workers as well equipped for this armed struggle as the situation demanded? No. The social-democratic leaders prevented them from seizing the initiative in the struggle. The Schutzbund did not start by occupying the central bourgeois areas of the city, they did not make them the arena of the fight. They did not occupy the railway stations or the important strategic buildings. The rebels limited themselves to defence in the working-class apartment houses of Floridsdorf, Simmering, etc. without going over to the offensive against the armed enemy. But to keep to the defensive is fatal to armed insurrection. . . .

The Schutzbund fighters had no central leadership. Some of the Austrian social-democratic leaders . . . from the outset went over openly to the fascists, the others shamefully ran away at the height of the struggle or capitulated at the very beginning. They allowed themselves to be arrested by the police in order to evade responsibility for the further course of events. The trade union bosses betrayed the workers on the very first day by failing to call out the railway workers and sending workers who were on strike back to the factories. . . .

But the Austrian proletariat could have been victorious in its insurrection in February 1934, if the rising had taken place under the bolshevik slogan of the seizure of power and the establishment of workers' Soviets. Only the communists, who fought shoulder to shoulder with the social-

democratic workers, put forward clear and unambiguous fighting slogans. Two days before the events in Linz the Austrian CP called on the Austrian workers to arm and to begin a general strike. It was the misfortune of the Austrian proletariat that the CP was still too weak to place itself independently at the head of the insurrection. . . .

Merely by resorting to arms in the fight against the bourgeoisie, the social-democratic workers have broken with the ideology, policy, and tactics of social-democracy. Whoever takes the road of armed insurrection thereby places himself at the side of the world communist party, thereby turns his back on the Second International. . . .

The bolshevik road is the road to victory, the reformist road is the road to defeat. . . .

Proletarians of all countries, the Austrian and French workers who came out on the streets against growing fascist reaction, fought and are fighting for your common cause, for liberation from the yoke of capitalism. By their actions they are destroying everything taught by international social-democracy since the imperialist war of 1914-18. In doing so they are creating the conditions for a real united front from below. This united front can be welded only in ruthless struggle to destroy that treacherous Second International which has brought the workers of the capitalist countries to their present position, has surrendered them to the insolent offensive of capital and the terror of fascist reaction. Today, when millions of proletarians in all countries are ready to support the fight of the Austrian and German workers against fascism, the agents of Hitler and Starhemberg in Spain, the Spanish socialists and anarchists, are breaking the solidarity strike of the Spanish proletariat.

In all capitalist countries the social-democrats frustrate the fight against fascism, the cause for which the revolutionary Austrian workers gave their lives. Down with the henchmen of Hitler and Dollfuss in the working class. Otherwise, workers, your victory, success in your fight against capital and fascism, is impossible.

EXTRACTS FROM THE THESES OF THE AGITPROP DEPARTMENT
OF THE ECCI ON THE FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
FOUNDATION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

March 1934

*Fifteen Years of the CI**

[The earlier paragraphs dealt with the Second International, the foundation of the Third, post-war risings in Europe, Comintern congresses and the treachery of the socialist parties.

The sixth Kuomintang campaign against the Soviet areas in China ended

* Checked against the German version in *Rundschau*, iii, 19, p. 677, 1 March 1934.

in the withdrawal of the Chinese Soviet forces to the north-west—the 'long march' which lasted a year.

It was from this march that Mao emerged as undisputed leader of the Chinese CP. A brief official history of the CCP, published after the communist victory in China in 1949, says of this incident: 'At the time of the long march the central committee continued to pursue an incorrect line on military questions, as a result of which the Red Army, when it encountered detachments of the enemy and was constantly harassed by them, more than once faced a critical situation and suffered heavy losses. In order to save the Red Army and the revolutionary cause in China, the party in January 1935, as a result of a resolute struggle against the opportunists conducted by Comrade Mao and other comrades, held a meeting of the "enlarged politburo" where "the left opportunists" were dismissed from the leadership and a new leadership formed headed by Mao.' Mao argued that it was in order to mount the sixth anti-communist campaign that the KMT agreed to an armistice with Japan and sent its finance minister to Europe and the United States for money and arms. To strengthen their army and ensure good supplies, the CCP would have to intensify the class struggle in the village and improve the economy. The Executive of the Soviet Republic issued a manifesto, signed by Mao and Chu Teh, appealing to the workers of Britain, France, Germany, Japan, and the United States, to 'stop the attack on the Soviet areas' and 'not to prevent the masses from organizing forces to resist the Japanese robbers'. An article on the sixth KMT campaign (*Communist International*, January 1935) complained of 'the almost complete absence of real direct aid on the part of the proletariat and our fraternal parties in the imperialist countries'. The offer of an alliance with the CCP, made as a protest against Chiang Kai-shek's reluctance to resist Japan by the 19th Route Army which had defended Shanghai against the Japanese, was rejected by the CCP committee in Shanghai on the ground that it was made by 'social-fascists'. The seventh CI congress *Materials* stated that the Chinese Soviet Government offered a truce to the troops fighting the Red Army if they would fight the Japanese and guarantee freedom of association and the right of self-defence against the Japanese to the population of KMT China. This offer was said to have dealt a crushing blow to the counter-revolutionary demagoguery of Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei, who justified their struggle against the CCP by saying that its war on Nanking weakened Chinese resistance to Japan; thus the CCP realized the need to take the lead in the anti-imperialist movement, 'which would have been impossible if the CP, with the help of the ECCI, had not carried through beforehand the liquidation of the adventurist opportunism of the "lefts", Li Li-san and his supporters, who deliberately ignored the unevenness of growth in the revolutionary movement in different parts of China. The party was also strengthened by the defeat of the right opportunist liquidator Lo Cheng-lung.'

An article in the *Communist International*, in support of its assertion that the sixth KMT campaign 'was prepared and carried out with the direct participation of the international imperialist counter-revolution', explained that the United States grain and cotton loan to China was being used for the purchase of arms, that the British Ambassador 'personally, by means of bribery, organized

a united front of the generals' to conduct the war against Soviet China, that 'the Japanese have their fingers in every pie', that the French had wiped out Soviets in South China, the Germans supplied military advisers, American and Canadian pilots were flying Chiang's aircraft, Italian warships had joined American, Japanese, and British ships 'for the purpose of shooting down the revolutionary Chinese soldiers . . . by training their naval guns on them', while the League of Nations technical aid mission was being exploited for counter-revolutionary purposes.

It is clear from statements in Moscow and articles in the Comintern press that direct communication between the Chinese communists and Moscow at this time was very poor. The death of Mao Tse-tung was announced in *Inprekorr* as early as March 1930; an article by Mif in the *Communist International* in May 1933 relies on Reuters for a good deal of its information. An article in the same journal in the following month by Safarov, dealing primarily with the policy of the CCP towards 'the oppressed national minorities' in China and the need for 'the most pitiless eradication of every manifestation of great-power chauvinism in its own ranks', reveals a similar absence of direct information: 'The newspapers issued in China are studded with information of uprisings. . . . Recently the newspapers reported an uprising in the north-west part of Kwangsi. . . . There have been frequent reports of similar movements in Yunnan. . . .' In the November 1934 issue of *Rundschau* Wang Ming reported the opening of the long march from a Japanese press source. In September 1933 in the same periodical news about the Chinese Red Army is given as 'according to information received'. Nor was Mao Tse-tung accorded a high place of honour. Manuilsky's report to the seventeenth CPSU congress (January 1934) mentioned no Chinese leader by name, while a review of the state of communist parties published in the *Communist International* in March 1934, which mentioned communist party leaders such as Pollitt, Lenski, etc. made no mention of Mao, who had earlier been elected chairman of the Chinese Central Soviet Government. The Comintern's reluctance to acknowledge his position was later interpreted as arising from the realization that his success destroyed the accepted theory of the relations between the communist party and the industrial working class; it was in fact because of this 'severance from the proletariat' that Trotsky and Chen attacked the CCP.

There were also wide divergences between the Chinese and the Russian estimates of the structure and strength of the CCP. Mif claimed that between 1931 and 1933 both union membership and the number of strikes had increased, whereas the Shanghai party committee reported loss of membership; the Chinese Youth League paper wrote in 1934 that as a result of their own isolation they not only could not lead mass struggles, 'but we cannot even grasp them by the tail'. Of the 60,000 CCP members in 1927, 58 per cent were industrial workers; at the third CC plenum (September 1930) Chou En-lai reported a membership of 120,000, of whom no more than 2,000 or 1.6 per cent, were industrial workers. In Moscow, Wang Ming gave a membership of 410,000 for 1933, of whom 25-30 per cent were said to be industrial workers. *Sovety v Kitae*, published in Moscow in 1933, stated that the CCP's principal base was 'the proletarian centres' whose underground organizations directed

the Soviets and recruited their cadres from among industrial workers; but at the second Chinese Soviet congress, which met in Juichin in January 1934, only eight of the 821 delegates were described as industrial workers. An article by Kon Sin in the *Communist International* in September 1933 claimed 2 million trade union members in the Soviet areas, and a membership of 300,000 for the CCP, of whom 20 per cent were said to be industrial workers. 'In the days of Li Li-san there were no trade union organizations in the territory of the Soviets.' To give further proof of the advantages of having dropped Li Li-san, the writer of the article referred to the following incident: 'Here is another instance from a Soviet district which shows how deeply the response of the toiling masses to our struggle for the party line has been. A certain peasant beat his wife who, in defending herself, said "you think we are still living in the days of Li Li-san? We are now living along the line of the Comintern".' The seventh congress *Materials* stated that the immediate task of the Chinese Soviet Republic was not the liquidation of capitalism. This was not a proletarian government, though it was under proletarian hegemony, since the communists monopolized the leadership.

The central committee of the KPD, meeting after the thirteenth ECCI plenum, decided to re-issue its 1930 programme of national and social emancipation. The accompanying statement (published in *Rundschau* on 9 May 1934), said that fascism had cut off the Germans of Austria, Silesia, Danzig, the Saar, etc. from 'the road to the Reich'; only the proletarian revolution would open the doors of the Reich for the free union of all working Germans. 'Because we love our homeland and our working *Volk* . . . we are ashamed before the working people of the whole world to have to say that this Germany has become a country of barbarism!' Discontent and resistance in the country, said the committee, 'indicate the ripening of a revolutionary crisis, which will become broader and stronger than it was in 1918'. It appealed to all members to 'put an end to conciliatory attitudes towards social-democracy, which, even in illegality, is still the chief social support of the bourgeoisie in the working class'. Only the KPD could save Germany, and for this it was essential to build up independent class trade unions as 'broad, illegal, mass organizations'. The KPD should organize political strikes against Nazi terror, against arrests, and for freedom to hold meetings and demonstrations. 'These will bring us nearer to the general strike and to insurrection.' A KPD manifesto of 5 February 1934 repeated that 'social-democrats and nazis are twins in the service of capitalism'; the attempt of the SPD to reorganize its ranks illegally was designed to deepen the split in the working class. 'It is therefore the task of the KPD and the revolutionary proletariat to make the re-establishment of the SPD impossible.' An article in the *Communist International* at the beginning of April 1934 attacked the two journals *Gegenangriff* and *Unsere Zeit* published by Münzenberg in Prague and Paris respectively, because they differentiated 'in principle' between fascist and democratic countries; this was a social-democratic trick. 'The fact that fascism and social-democracy are not antipodes but twins has been established.' They were also charged with treating Trotskyism not as a 'dangerous counter-revolutionary trend', but as a political deviation with which discussion was permissible. They wrote 'about' Trotskyism, not 'against' it.

An editorial in the same journal at the beginning of March 1934 attacked the social-democrats because, 'instead of conducting a struggle against the bourgeoisie, [they] are engaged in a campaign of slander against the communists'. It concluded that 'Social-democracy as mass parties will soon cease to exist, but only on condition that the communist parties expose them to the end.' In his report to the seventeenth CPSU congress Manuilsky said: 'The crisis of social-democracy is first and foremost the result of long years of struggle by the Comintern and its sections against the Second International.' That the crisis was not more severe was a reflection on communist work. The fascist victory in Germany could have been avoided, Manuilsky said, if the social-democrats had not prevented the united front, if they had arrested a few dozen Nazi leaders and the two or three capitalists who gave them money, dissolved the Nazi organizations, dissolved the Reichswehr, and armed the workers. This they could have done at any time from 1928, even under the Governments of Schleicher and Papen. If they had worked with the KPD, the social-democrats could have overthrown the Nazis even after Hitler came to power. More than a year after Hitler's accession to power, Radek wrote in 'The Place of Fascism in History' that fascism was finance capital in fear of the workers' revolution; it was the method chosen by the financial oligarchy to keep the proletariat in chains in those countries where the revolution was approaching; it was a manifestation of the decay of capitalism. But it was not an inevitable interlude; it had no historical function, it made no change in the relations of production; it was the final attempt to postpone the inevitable proletarian victory. Bourgeois democracy, on the other hand, was not a complete swindle; it could not bring real liberty, equality, and fraternity, but it gave freedom to the forces of production, to trade and movement, and had carried industry to the most backward countries.

The condemnation of the CP of France for 'attempts to arrange blocs at the top' suggests that there was a strong group in the CPF which was agitating for a change in the communist attitude to the socialist party. In January 1934 the French central committee met to approve the resolutions of the thirteenth ECCI plenum. Thorez said events were moving so fast in France 'that some elements in the party, yes, even in the central committee, became confused by the pressure of the enemy (defence of "democracy" against fascism, distortion of the Soviet Union's peace policy, etc.)'. The party failed to understand the role of social-democracy, and some party organizations were not convinced of the necessity of a bitter struggle against the socialist party. One central committee member [Doriot] made proposals which meant changing the entire political line about social-democracy, making united front proposals to the socialist leaders. 'This proposal was indignantly rejected by all members of the central committee unanimously, for it would have led to capitulation to social-democracy.' The meeting approved a resolution on the party's tasks which said: 'The central committee calls upon the entire party to apply resolutely the tactics of a militant united front from below, combating vigorously any opportunist attempt to propose a united front to the leadership of the socialist party.' Berlioz wrote that as a result of the longing for unity among French workers and of socialist manoeuvres, 'officials of the CP have in many places succumbed

to this pressure and concluded vague agreements with the socialists in which the face of the CP is lost'. It would be a crime to hush up the responsibility for the fascist danger of the socialist and other left parties.

In France financial and political scandals, the transfer to another post of the Prefect of Police, rumours of corruption, plots, and planned coups d'état, culminated on 6 February 1934 in a demonstration, composed mainly of right-wing and royalist organizations, which led to the resignation of the French Government. After many hours of rioting, both the demonstrators and the police used firearms; several people were killed, and some hundreds injured. Communist demonstrators joined in the attack on the police. In *L'Humanité* on the 6th Marty had called on the workers to demonstrate against the fascists, the Government, and social-democracy.

The Times reported (7 February) that communists joined in the attack on the police who were attempting to keep the demonstrators at bay, and the *Manchester Guardian* wrote that 'the mob' was composed of 'royalists, nationalists, communists and ex-servicemen', and attributed the 'first act of hooliganism' to communist rioters. *Le Populaire* on the same day said the socialists would do their best to make 'a loyal and fraternal agreement' with the CPF and CGTU, and on the following day reported that the CGTU had refused to join in joint action against fascism. The letter from the SFIO to the CP said: 'This is not the time for divisions. All proletarian organizations should join hands to form an unbreakable barrier against the fascist peril. We ask for an interview to determine the bases of agreement for working-class unity of action.' The CP reply said the socialist and radical parties had paved the way for reaction and fascism. SFIO representatives on 7 February called at the CP central office to propose an agreement on joint action, and were told that the proposal would be referred to the central committee. *L'Humanité* on the following day referred to the 'odious treason' of the 'social-fascists', and Thorez referred to the 'good work of the CP which has . . . hastened the disintegration of the SFIO'. Berlioz wrote that 'the sham struggle between "democrats" and open fascists grew sharper, but in reality they were supporting each other'. The CP would yield 'neither to fascist daggers nor to democratic bayonets'. A CPF-CGTU statement placed responsibility for the disturbances on the socialist party, but instructed their members to join in the strike and demonstration called by the socialists for 12 February. They themselves organized a series of small demonstrations on 9 February. On 14 February *Le Populaire* again advanced a plea for trade union unity. After 12 February the CPF claimed the credit for the success of the demonstration, while noting that 'the socialist papers dare to say that the strike and demonstration of 12 February was the work of the socialist party'.

In the *Communist International* in March the collaboration of communists with the right-wing demonstrators on 6 February was presented as follows: 'On 6 February the fascists organized a demonstration and marched to parliament to overthrow the government of the "left bloc". . . . In reply to this demonstration, the workers spontaneously came out on to the streets. One part of the workers openly demonstrated against the fascists, while another part of the workers also marched to parliament with their own demands without, however,

separating their demonstration sufficiently clearly from that of the fascists. Leadership by the communist party over the workers' demonstrations which spontaneously took place was not in evidence on that day. The socialists began a campaign against the communist party, accusing communists of demonstrating together with the fascists. However, on 7 February the communist party not only advanced correct slogans, but also developed an energetic campaign against the fascists.' Another article in the same issue asserted that the CGT had wished to call off the strike on 12 February, but had been prevented from doing so by mass pressure. 'To prevent the development of this proletarian counter-offensive, French social-democracy . . . resorted to the most elaborate forms of treacherous manoeuvres and "left" demagoguery. . . . At the same time the social-fascists made and are making feverish efforts to adapt their demagoguery to the striving of the workers for a united front. . . . [They] wanted to impose a "non-aggression pact" upon the CP in order to be able to continue their treacherous policy with impunity. . . . In clutching at the slogan of "unity of action", the French social-democrats are striving to take the lead of the mass movement towards the creation of a united front in order to deprive it of its class content and to divert it to the defence of the "French Republic" which is now becoming fascised.' The SFIO leaders had invited the CP to negotiate a truce in preparation for joint activity. 'However, the object of all these "left" gestures of the social-fascists was first and foremost to gain time for the bourgeoisie, to secure a peaceful transition . . . to the new stage of accelerated preparation for an open fascist dictatorship.' Before 6 February, the article continued, the CP had underestimated the growing intensity of the political situation, and 'instead of acting in serried anti-fascist ranks, the proletarian counter-demonstrators in many cases got mixed up with the fascist crowd'. It had also prevented the CPF from making a quick enough change to meet the situation. Its job now was to prevent the socialists from 'diverting the anti-fascist mass movement on to the lines of "defence of the Republic"'. It would continue the struggle against the social-fascists and expose their manoeuvres, while extending and leading the united front movement.

When Piatnitsky addressed the ECCI presidium in the summer of 1934, he reported that at the end of 1932 the SFIO proposed negotiations on working-class unity to the CPF, but this was rejected as a manoeuvre to halt the movement of the socialist masses into the communist party. The LSI had also proposed negotiations for a communist-socialist pact of non-aggression, also rejected on the ground that the socialist parties were concerned only to get the communists into larger bodies where they would be in a minority. It was only after February 1934, he concluded, that mass pressure from below forced the SFIO to cease to sabotage the united front.

At the seventh Comintern congress Lozovsky claimed that it was the CGTU which made proposals to the CGT for a joint strike on 12 February. After the congress, Manuilsky, referring to these events, wrote: 'At first there was confusion in the ranks of the communist party. The fascist slogan "Down with the Daladier Government, the government of murderers", did not at first meet with sufficient resistance from the CP. In some places the communists echoed the fascist cry for the overthrow of the Daladier Government. But the CP quickly

got its bearings and began to criticize Daladier not for having fired, but for not having fired enough.'

In India the formation of a socialist group (led by Nehru) within the Congress Party was described by Dutt as a manoeuvre by bankrupt leaders to meet the demands of 'the masses betrayed by the Congress leaders'. Gandhi was a hypocrite and Nehru and his supporters had 'capitulated to British imperialism' because they feared the revolutionary movement more. Safarov wrote that the programme of the Congress Socialist Party was 'a cunning forgery, counterfeiting revolutionary sentiments', intended to distract attention from the failure of the policy of non-violence. 'The Congress socialists act as errand-boys for the national-reformist bourgeoisie.' These latter had for years 'exploited the humiliated and downtrodden state of the enslaved people of India' in order 'to emasculate and destroy the mass anti-imperialist struggle by betraying the masses at every stage'. In the Comintern journal (February 1933) an article signed 'Valia' said that communist groups, in their anxiety to show that the National Congress was a bourgeois class organization, inimical to the struggle for independence, had drifted away from the anti-imperialist movement, confusing the Congress leaders with their followers. They had been put on the right path by an open letter from the communist parties of China, Britain, and Germany, and would now enter all organizations of an anti-imperialist character 'and found a united All-India CP'. The attempt by Joshi and his colleagues to start a Labour Party, said *Rundschau* in May, was an attempt to obstruct the formation of a communist party. Only such a party, it was said in the same journal in October, could eliminate the influence of national-reformism and ensure the victory of the Indian people. 'The bankruptcy of Gandhism is rapidly accelerating the process of disillusionment among the revolutionary sections of the petty-bourgeoisie. . . . The road of national-reformism is the road of defeat and slavery.'

In the summer of 1932 a 'provisional central committee' of the Indochinese Communist Party issued an 'action programme' aimed at complete economic and political independence, the overthrow of the dynasties in Annam, Cambodia, and Laos and confiscation of their property, the nationalization of all foreign undertakings, cancellation of all foreign loans, and expropriation of the land. In a letter to the Indochinese party in 1934 the Chinese CP warned them against the 'pseudo-left bourgeoisie' who were pretending to fight French imperialism in order to gain control of the revolutionary movement. 'There can be no all-national united front in your country today against French imperialism.'

In January 1934 Manuilsky reported to the seventeenth CPSU congress that communist parties in capitalist countries now had a membership of 860,000. The KPD was said to be 'growing'; Czechoslovakia claimed 55,000, France 40,000, Poland (including YCL) 30,000, Spain 30,000, the United States 20,000, and Bulgaria 'the majority of the working class'. At the same congress Bela Kun reported on Comintern activities in initiating and promoting the formation of committees and the calling of conferences to fight war and defend the USSR; into these they had drawn 'the best representatives of the intelligentsia of capitalist countries'. It was stated that, after prolonged internal

struggles, the right wing in the Polish CP had been completely defeated and the party was now consolidated and united. Although pretending friendship for Russia, the Polish bourgeoisie were trying behind the scenes to reach agreement with Hitler, as shown by their non-aggression pact with Germany. For their part, the Nazis were encouraging Ukrainian nationalism in Poland; 'Skrypnikism' (Skrypnik had criticized Stalin's policy in the Ukraine in 1922; he committed suicide in May 1933—he was then Ukrainian Commissar for Education—during the 'purge' of Ukrainian officials following collectivization) had penetrated the party ranks in Polish White Russia and Ukraine, and this had hampered the fight against bourgeois nationalism and against Polish occupation. An article by Bronkowski in the Comintern journal in March 1934 (which alleged that Sochacki, a member of the CPP since 1921, was a police agent), also referred to strong traces of bourgeois nationalism in the Polish party; there were members who believed that Poland was not an imperialist State, but bore a semi-colonial character. Although these traces of bourgeois nationalism were said to have been overcome, the charge was repeated in June of the following year in the same journal; groups in the White Russian and Ukrainian sections of the CPP had 'fallen victim to the pressure of local counter-revolutionary nationalism'.

In an article on the anniversary, Piatnitsky wrote that, organizationally, the parties were still lagging behind the radicalization of the masses; this was due both to social-democratic survivals and to sectarianism. He listed the chief defects of the sections as inadequate struggle against social-democracy and other enemies, with the frequent use of insults instead of argument, inadequate exposure of fascism as the most reactionary and imperialist representative of finance capital, the failure to work systematically in reformist and fascist unions and in the factories, the deteriorating standard of work among the unemployed, and insufficient use of the devotion and love of the working masses for the Soviet Union in order to extend and consolidate communist influence.]

23. The whole world development after the Sixth Congress fully confirmed the correctness of the analysis given by the Comintern of the third period of the general crisis of capitalism which had set in.

The economic crisis which began in the middle of 1929 in the United States became the most severe and prolonged world crisis in the history of capitalism. . . . This crisis caused a sharp decline in the standard of living of the workers and gave rise to unemployment on a monstrous scale and an unprecedented ruination of the peasantry.

On the one hand the completion of the Five Year Plan of the USSR, one of the results of which was the liquidation of unemployment and a general improvement in the welfare of the masses, and on the other hand, the colossal misery of the masses in the capitalist countries, extremely sharpened the class struggle within each country and hastened the growth of the revolutionary movement throughout the world.

The revolutionary battles of this period have been distinguished by their desperate and stubborn character, and frequently assumed the form of

civil war and revolution, and thus hastened the end of capitalist stabilization.

The years of 1930–33 were years of the rapid weakening of all the positions of capitalism and of the crisis of the Second International on the one hand, and of the reinforcement of the positions of socialism in the USSR, of the world revolutionary movement, and of the Communist International, on the other hand. . . .

24. . . . The revolution in Spain (14 April 1931), which overthrew the fascist regime and involved millions of workers and peasants in a struggle against the power of the bourgeoisie and the landlords; the heroic struggle of the workers, peasants and soldiers who broke through the military terror in Japan; the unemployed hunger marches in Great Britain and the United States; the turbulent growth of the revolutionary movement of the peasants in practically all countries of the world; the demonstrations of the war veterans, the anti-war demonstrations, mutinies [disturbances] in the armies and navies of the capitalist countries, assuming the form of open rebellions (the strike in the British Navy on 14 September 1931, in Invergordon, the mutiny of 5 February 1933 in the Dutch Navy on one of the biggest cruisers, *De Zeven Provinciën*, the mutinies [disturbances] in the Austrian Navy, the spontaneous uprising in the Chilean Navy in September, 1931, mutinies [unrest and ferment] in the Japanese Army of Occupation), all these represent a series of links of the chain of uneven but constant maturing of the revolutionary crisis.

25. The Soviet revolution in China which is successfully developing, its leader the Communist Party of China, and its offspring, the Red Army, are the standards of struggle of all subjected Oriental nations which are rebelling against the yoke of imperialism.

At the time of the Japanese attack on China, the Communist Party of China was already a menacing [an imposing] force at the head of a powerful and invincible Soviet movement over a vast territory, and the only leader in the anti-imperialist struggle of the Chinese people. On the streets of Chapei and Shanghai, on the [battle-] fields of Manchuria, Jehol and Chahar, the communists fought in the front ranks against Japanese imperialism.

From the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution emerge[d] the Soviets and their workers' and peasants' Red Army. Breaking the yoke of imperialism, carrying out the agrarian revolution, consolidating the Soviet state, organizing trade unions, organizing groups of poor peasants, rallying the middle peasants around the Soviets and strengthening the alliance of the workers and peasants, the Chinese Soviet Republic has already repelled six counter-revolutionary campaigns of the Kuomintang and imperialist interventionists, and has become one of the greatest factors in the world proletarian revolution.

The successes of the Soviet revolution in China have proved by the experience of a vast [semi-] colonial country that 'the Soviet power is the State form of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, which ensures the growing over of the bourgeois democratic revolution into a socialist revolution' (Theses and Decisions of the Thirteenth Plenum ECCI).

In all the colonial and semi-colonial countries, national reformism plays the same role of the chief impediment of [brake on] revolution, as the Second International plays in the imperialist countries. The Kuomintang paved the way for the partition of China among the imperialists. The National Congress in India, WAFD in Egypt, Kut el Vatani in Syria, the Arabian Executive Committee in Palestine, and the African National Congress are following in the footsteps of the Kuomintang.

By exposing their treachery, the communists are undermining the influence of these organizations on the masses.

In Indo-China and in India the proletariat has already commenced a struggle under the leadership of the communist party for hegemony in the national liberation movement. In the Philippines, in Korea, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Algeria and in the Union of South Africa and Indonesia, communist parties have already been formed. The colonial and semi-colonial countries are approaching the second round of revolutions and wars with growing and tempered communist parties.

26. The third period has brought to the fore as the main task of the communist parties the accelerated leading of the masses, through partial economic and political battles, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, for a Soviet government.

Although they lag behind the revolutionary upsurge to a certain extent, the communist parties are on the upward grade, having achieved the consolidation of their ranks on the basis of the general line of the Communist International as a result of the smashing of the right and 'left' opportunists, the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists in all sections of the Communist International, the right-wing Bukharin-Tomsky-Rykov group and the right-'left' Syrtsov bloc in the CPSU, Serra['s group] in Italy, the Barbé group in France, the Li Li-san 'leftist' group [and the counter-revolutionary Lo Chang-lung group] in China, the group of Remmele-Neumann conciliators in Germany and Gutmann in Czechoslovakia.

The creation of genuine Bolshevik mass parties has already been achieved in the weakest links of the imperialist chain, viz., in China, Germany, Poland, France, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Spain. The communist parties have thousands and tens of thousands of members each; their influence extends over hundreds of thousands and millions of workers and peasants; they have already scored their first successes in establishing

the united front. There is not a single communist party whose influence has not grown among the masses since the beginning of the economic crisis. The communists are the only leaders of the masses, the motor of every revolutionary struggle, and they are the first to receive the blows of the class enemy. Most of the communist parties have gained the necessary prerequisites for becoming real mass fighting parties of the proletariat in the near future.

27. The social-democratic survivals in the communist parties have not yet, however, been overcome. They are not yet quite able to conduct mass work, and especially to organizationally consolidate their political influence. This results in the communist parties lagging behind the extremely favourable objective conditions for the offensive.

Although the disintegration of social-democracy is largely the result of the struggle of the communists, the communist parties are not yet developing sufficiently their offensive against international social-democracy, the unexampled treachery and collapse [decay] of which creates unusually favourable conditions for this offensive. During the past year, the opportunist mistakes of the communist party in the united front tactics were expressed in dragging at the tail, in adaptation to the backward moods of the social-democratic workers (Norway, Czechoslovakia), in [attempts to arrange] blocs with the social-democratic leaders at the top (France). The development of the united front in the struggle jointly with the social-democratic workers of the reformist, Christian and mass fascist trade unions, and energetic exposure of the social-democratic parties by the communists is the central task of the communist parties in the present circumstances. This task makes it necessary for the communists to work in absolutely all hostile mass organizations, and especially in the reformist unions, which still embrace the decisive mass of the organized proletariat.

The Communist Party of Italy began very belatedly to organize its work in the fascist organizations. The Chinese Communist Party was similarly tardy in developing its activity in the yellow Kuomintang unions. The French and Spanish Communist Parties are still weak in the reformist unions. The Young Communist Leagues have not yet been able to carry on systematic work in the numerous bourgeois youth sport and other organizations [with their millions of members].

The task of winning over the majority of the working class demands the transformation of the factory committees, of the trade union oppositions, of the committees of unemployed, of the peasant committees, and especially the transformation of the big enterprises, into strongholds of the communist parties.

Abolishing their political and organizational lag and their opportunist passivity, fighting against the tendency to leave things to take their own

course, rejecting all theories of the automatic collapse of capitalism and fatalistic ideas of the inevitability of the triumph of fascism, the communist parties are rising ever higher to the level of the great tasks which history has raised before them.

28. A number of historical tests have already shown that the Comintern has achieved colossal successes in 'the most difficult and most important matter' (Lenin), that of creating genuine Bolshevik Parties.

The War of 1914-18 was the test which proved that the Second International was bankrupt. In the struggle on two fronts, in the struggle against the opportunist underestimation of the danger of war, against pacifist illusions, against mechanical theories about war as 'the only road to revolution' and against [the theories of] adventurism and putschism, the sections of the Comintern have mastered the Marxian-Leninist policy in relation to war and have accumulated rich experience in applying that policy in actual practice. The communist parties are conducting a constant struggle in defence of the USSR as the fatherland of the toilers of all countries. The communist parties have led the broad masses many times into the streets against imperialist war and preparations of an armed attack on the USSR and in the defence of China and the colonies; and they are exposing all anti-Soviet intrigues and provocations, are fighting first and foremost the 'enemy in their home countries', and are displaying examples of true proletarian internationalism.

Examples of this nature were displayed in the struggle of the French Communist Party against French imperialism during the war in Morocco, when, in an atmosphere poisoned with chauvinism, it organized open proletarian action against colonial plunder, for the defence of the right of Morocco and other colonies to self-determination and for the withdrawal of French troops from Morocco.

An example of Bolshevik struggle against war has been displayed by the Communist Party of China which revealed itself as the only party capable of leading the mass anti-imperialist movement, the national revolutionary war against Japanese and world imperialism, in defence of China's independence and integrity. The Communist Party of China is organizing mighty resistance to Japanese imperialism, and is at the same time fighting against its own bourgeoisie and landlords represented by the Kuomintang government of national betrayal and disgrace. Enriching the world revolutionary movement with forms of struggle such as the creation of an invincible Red Army, the experience of guerrilla warfare and mass demoralization of the enemy and of the rear, the Communist Party of China has already become the most dangerous enemy of imperialism in the Orient.

An example of Bolshevik struggle against imperialist war is displayed by the Communist Party of Japan which, in an atmosphere of poisonous

Japanese chauvinism and bloody terror of the monarchist-militarist dictatorship, has been able to go against the stream, to hold aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism, to organize resistance to Japanese imperialism and to mobilize the workers, peasants and soldiers of the Japanese army under the Bolshevik slogans of 'Defeat your own government', 'Transform the imperialist war into civil war', 'Withdraw the Japanese forces from China', and 'Defence of the USSR'.

The sections of the Communist International have already shown in the decisive countries that they represent a serious obstacle on the road to imperialist war, that they alone will fight to the end to prevent war by means of revolution, and in the event of an outbreak of war will organize a powerful blow in the rear of the imperialist armies and hasten the transformation of war into revolution.

29. Hitler's coming to power was a test especially for the Communist Party of Germany and also for all other sections of the Comintern. The Communist Party of Germany, far from being frightened by the severe test, turned it into a starting-point for the further consolidation of the whole party around the central committee and the Communist International.

Although the fascists threw comrade Thaelmann, the party leader, into jail and imprisoned thousands of active party members, drove sixty thousand revolutionary workers into concentration camps, and are killing communists daily with and without trial, the KPD has not discontinued its struggle for a single hour. Having gone underground as a mass party it is organizing and is at the head of the united front of communist, social-democratic, and non-party workers in their struggle against fascism, leads the workers in demonstrations in spite of the reign of terror, is leading strikes. . . . The KPD is the force which is leading and will bring the German proletariat to the victory of Soviet Germany.

Hitler's coming to power, which increased the activity of the fascist gangs in all other countries, far from catching the communist parties of these countries unawares and demoralizing their ranks, has on the contrary consolidated them more than ever in the struggle against fascism as a united army. . . .

31. The unshakeable unity of the ranks of the CPSU, the leading section of the Comintern, accomplished under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, is a decisive factor in the growth and consolidation of the forces of communism throughout the world. The party of Lenin and Stalin is able, on the fifteenth anniversary of the Comintern to report victories of world historical importance. The Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU, a congress of the decisive victory of socialism, admitted not only by friends, but also by the enemies of the USSR, held the attention of the whole world. Under the leadership of the CPSU, the proletarian revolution has fulfilled its

fundamental tasks and has achieved splendid victories over the forces and traditions of the capitalist world. The CPSU has demonstrated to the workers of all countries that it is possible to build socialism in a single country. The CPSU has shown to the revolutionary fighters of all countries the Bolshevik art of rousing millions for the struggle for socialism and of leading them through all obstacles from victory to victory. The Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU, having demonstrated to the world that the ranks of the CPSU and the Comintern are monolithic and solidly united around their leader, Comrade Stalin, has already become a new mighty lever in the cause of Bolshevization of all Sections of the CI.

IV. ON THE THRESHOLD OF A SECOND ROUND OF REVOLUTIONS AND WARS

32. Having intensified the struggle for foreign markets, having destroyed the last remnants of free trade, and called forth a trade and currency war, the world economic crisis strengthens nationalism in the economic policy of the bourgeoisie and places war on the order of the day as a means of bringing about a redivision of the world.

The extension of the war of Japanese imperialism against China, the extreme intensification of antagonisms in the Pacific, the preparations of Japanese and German imperialism, with the support of Great Britain, for a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR, the withdrawal of Germany and Japan from the League of Nations, the decline of bourgeois pacifism and the fascization of the dictatorship of finance capital, all signify the attempt of decaying capitalism to find a way out of the crisis and frustrate the revolutionary blow [onslaught] of the proletariat by demolishing the vanguard of the working class through fascism and war. . . .

33. The General Strike in France, the armed struggle [uprising] of the Austrian proletariat (February 1934) is another historical landmark in the struggle for Soviet power, the beginning of a new counter-offensive of the working class against capitalism, against fascism, for socialism, the beginning of a wave of civil war in Europe. The proletariat of Austria, doubly enslaved by its own and foreign capital, reduced to despair by starvation and unemployment, by the onslaught of fascism, the menace of war, and by the treacherous policy of the leaders of Austro-Marxism, courageously raised the banner of struggle for power, and heroically threw the lives of its men, women, and children on the scales of the proletarian revolution. The armed struggle [uprising] of the Austrian proletariat dealt a severe blow to Austrian social-democracy. A militant united front of all the workers of Austria was realized in the civil war, over the heads of Bauer and Renner.

In those days the united front also triumphed over the heads of the Blums and Faures in France in the form of revolutionary demonstrations attended by hundreds of thousands, and in the great General Strike of the French proletariat which held the attention of the world, scared the bourgeoisie to death and revealed the invincible strength of the proletariat.

The events of Austria and France which found a revolutionary echo in Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Great Britain, the United States and other countries, revealed the sharp turn of the social-democratic masses to the side of the proletarian revolution. These events will mark a turning point in the history of the struggle of the Communist International for the united front. . . .

34. In the conditions when the last and 'decisive battle' is approaching, a cleavage in the working class is the main source of its weakness, the main obstacle in the way of winning over its numerous reserves to the side of the proletarian revolution. This cleavage is the result of the treachery of social-democracy, a result of its policy of saving bourgeois rule from the proletarian revolution. There can be no other unity for the working class than fighting unity against the bourgeoisie, the unity of struggle for the achievement of the historical aims of the working class, for the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois rule, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism. Such unity will be accomplished by the world proletariat, in spite of all obstacles, in a relentless struggle not only against the bourgeoisie, but also against the main social support of the latter, International Social Democracy.

35. The Second International stands exposed [is breaking down]. Bankrupt at the beginning of the World War in 1914, the Second International consolidated its ranks in 1924 after the proletarian revolution in Western Europe was defeated. The Second International retained its influence on the workers by relying on the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, on the temporary stabilization of capitalism. Under the banner of democracy it defended bourgeois dictatorship against the revolutionary workers with the aid of machine guns used by Noske, Wels, and Grzesinski. It tore out of the hands of the German workers the weapon of the mass political strike, when it became necessary for the masses to defend themselves against the fascist onslaught. It invariably sabotaged the daily struggle of the proletariat and hundreds of times broke up the united proletarian front which alone would have been able to deliver a decisive blow at fascism. The most despicable behaviour of German social democracy at the time of Hitler's coming to power summed up a whole period of betrayal, treachery and provocation. . . .

The political suicide of German social-democracy, the leading section of the Second International; the split of the French Socialist Party into three parts; the complete bankruptcy of Austrian social-democracy; the

withdrawal of the British Independent Labour Party from the Second International; the drop in the membership of the reformist unions; the formation in [secession from] practically every social-democratic party of neo-fascists on the one hand and 'left' groups on the other; the unprecedented ideological confusion in the leadership and the surging mass movement of the social-democratic workers in favour of a united front with the communists, all this clearly speaks of the disintegration of the Second International. The new crisis of social-democracy, which is part of the crisis of bourgeois rule, is the result of the successful struggle of the communist parties to win over the majority of the working class, and is the forerunner of the new round of proletarian revolutions.

36. Establishing a united front against the entire system of wage slavery and colonial oppression, the international proletariat, on the threshold of the great impending battles, is equipped with a faultless compass which shows the way to power and emancipation. That compass is Leninism, 'Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions' (Stalin). . . .

There is not a country in the world in which the advanced workers are not waging a revolutionary struggle for a Soviet government. Even the weakest communist party strikes terror into the hearts of the exploiters. The world proletariat has its world communist party, hardened, united, and trained in the course of fifteen years of battles in the cause of the working class. The great strength of the Communist International and of its sections in face of war and fascism lies in the iron unity they have won.

During the fifteen years of its existence the Communist International has welded the struggle of the international proletariat with the cause of October, with the victorious construction of socialism in the USSR, and the protection of the latter; and it has united the struggle of the colonial peoples against imperialism with the struggle of the proletariat for the world socialist revolution into one indivisible whole. . . .

Comrade Stalin mapped out the path of the world proletarian revolution and the fundamentals of Bolshevik strategy and tactics in the new conditions of world development. Comrade Stalin not only defended and splendidly developed Lenin's teachings of the possibility of building socialism in a single country, he has headed the struggle of tens of millions for the realization of this theory and has transformed the USSR into the greatest [a great] lever of history, that is hastening the downfall of capitalism. Comrade Stalin's fight against Trotskyism and against the right liquidators on the questions of the Chinese Revolution placed the Communist Party of China on the right track, and secured the conditions necessary for its transition to the Soviet phase of development. The struggle against all anti-Leninist deviations conducted in the CPSU and in the Comintern under Comrade Stalin's leadership revealed to all communist parties the

profound, fundamental and practical revolutionary significance of the fight for the purity of the Marxian-Leninist teachings, the struggle on two fronts, for the leading and organizing role of the party, for winning the majority of the working class, for winning its allies, for correct concrete and operative leadership in the class battles of all detachments of toilers. Comrade Stalin took a leading part in working out the programme of the Communist International. There is not a single important decision of the CI, not a single forecast that is not permeated with Stalin's farsightedness, his ability to map out the line of attack and strike a crushing blow at the enemy.

Lenin led the proletariat to the victory of October on one-sixth of the globe, formed the Communist International, and headed its struggle in the period of the first round of wars and revolutions. In the period of the second round of wars and revolutions the Leninist Communist International under Stalin's leadership will lead the proletariat of all countries to the victory of the world October.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE ECCI

April 1934

Rundschau, iii, 27, p. 1005, 26 *April 1934*

[Commenting on the international situation at the seventeenth CPSU congress in January 1934, Manuilsky said that no worker anywhere would now support fascist Germany's fight against Versailles. Editorials in the communist press at the same time said that the agreement between Germany and Poland was bound to raise questions in other countries, and particularly Poland's neighbours; Pan-German chauvinism brought Germany into opposition to all other powers, but these were too divided to form an anti-fascist bloc: Italy was trying to turn Germany against France, Britain trying to turn it against Russia, etc.; German overtures to Poland indicated the direction of Nazi aggression; the rejection by Germany of the Soviet proposal for a joint guarantee of the Baltic States showed that Germany wanted to use the Baltic to attack the USSR; the Poles, anxious for German support for their plans to annex Lithuania and the Ukraine, were counting on the contradictions between the Soviet Union and the imperialist States, but in this they might be mistaken; the 'dialectical process of imperialist contradictions', the resignation of Germany and Japan from the League of Nations, and the proposal that Russia should join, were transforming that body from an instrument of imperialist oppression and a means to prepare anti-Soviet intervention into one where those interested in maintaining peace were gaining the upper hand. France was 'doing everything possible' to hamper German war designs and so had 'withdrawn from the anti-Soviet camp', but Britain was encouraging Berlin and Tokio to attack the USSR. 'British imperialism, the most consistent and irreconcilable enemy of the toilers of the Soviet Union, places itself at the head of all the anti-Soviet forces. It is precisely Britain which is now the organizer of the anti-Soviet war.' It was

trying to get the French to agree to German rearmament, and it refused to guarantee the security of the frontiers established at Versailles, which was the object of French diplomacy. Soviet entry into the League was celebrated as 'a great victory for Soviet peace policy'; it had baffled and confused the imperialists. Soviet power and policies, the dangers from Japan and Germany, now recognized by Britain, 'compelled even the worst enemies of the proletarian dictatorship to draw nearer to the Soviet Union and seek its entrance into the League of Nations'. Russia was still opposed to the Versailles treaty, but it was also opposed to changing it by war.]

Every day the position of the working masses in capitalist countries is growing worse. The slight amelioration of the economic crisis has brought no relief worth mentioning to the workers and small peasants. . . . Capitalism is unable to set the economy on its feet again or to eliminate unemployment. Heavier and heavier burdens and taxes are imposed on the workers to pay for more and more armaments, for maintaining large armies, large numbers of government officials, and for increasing the police force.

The hungry working masses, driven to desperation, are rising to the struggle against their oppressors and exploiters. Their hatred of capitalism is growing. Everywhere the urge to form a united fighting front against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and the danger of imperialist war, is growing. More and more the working people are coming to see that they will be able to resist their exploitation by capital and bar the road to fascist reaction and imperialist war only by creating a united fighting front.

Throughout the world the revolutionary crisis is maturing. May Day this year finds the working class in the midst of fiery class battles. . . .

The strikes and demonstrations of the working masses driven to the utmost limit of poverty and desperation, the spontaneous outbreaks of the ruined and robbed peasantry, are beginning to break over the entire capitalist world in ever broader waves. Every day the will of the masses for a united-front fight against capitalism, against fascist dictatorship and the preparations for imperialist war, is growing.

Day by day the contradictions among the imperialist Powers are growing more acute. So are the contradictions between the imperialist Powers and the oppressed colonies striving for freedom. Nationalism and chauvinism are rising to furious heights; imperialist armaments are increasing madly, and for these the workers must give up their meagre crust of bread, the unemployed the pitiful pennies of their unemployment benefit, the small peasants and the urban petty-bourgeoisie their last possessions. Gripped by fear of the growing mass movement, the bourgeoisie are abolishing the last remains of democratic freedom and setting up regimes of bestial fascist terror. Fascism and war—these are the means

by which capital tries to save itself from the anger of the masses. But fascism and the drive to war only strengthen the anger of the masses, in whom tremendous revolutionary energy has already built up which more and more often breaks out in furious attacks on the capitalist system.

Thanks to the treachery of the social-democratic leaders fascism has won a temporary victory in Germany and Austria. It has robbed millions of working people of their most elementary rights. But fascism has not succeeded and never will succeed in destroying the revolutionary workers' movement. The more bloodthirsty the fascist terror, the more oppressive the capitalist yoke, the greater grows the hatred of the masses of the entire capitalist system.

The Japanese and German imperialists are marching in the front ranks of the warmongers. Japanese imperialism, armed to the teeth, is continuing its robber war in China and by unceasing provocation is preparing counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. The German imperialists are arming feverishly and seeking allies everywhere for the coming war. The English imperialists inspire the plans for a counter-revolutionary robber campaign against the Soviet Union. But the more openly the bourgeoisie arm for war, the greater grows the hatred of all working people for the entire capitalist system.

Imperialist war, a new monstrous slaughter of the peoples, can be prevented only by strengthening the revolutionary struggle of the working masses in a united resolute front against capitalism. . . .

Social-democracy promised to lead you to socialism by the road of bourgeois parliamentary democracy and class collaboration. It weakened the working class by splitting its ranks. It strangled the workers' will to fight, it capitulated to fascism. The social-democratic road was not the road to socialism but the road to fascism. To fend off fascism, to overthrow the fascist dictatorship, you must break with social-democracy, unite under the fighting banner of the Communist International for the revolutionary struggle for working-class power, for a Soviet Government.

Look at the Soviet Union. Look how the proletariat and working people of the Soviet Union, who know neither unemployment in the towns nor impoverishment in the village, who are free of the capitalist yoke, are building a new classless socialist society. . . . Follow the example of the Soviet proletariat! Rally to the banner of the Communist International.

**ECCI PROPOSAL TO THE LSI FOR JOINT ACTION IN SUPPORT
OF THE SPANISH WORKERS**

10 October 1934

Rundschau, iii, 60, p. 2680, 15 November 1934

[An article in *Rundschau* by Chavarroche in May 1933 asserted that the Spanish masses were beginning to understand the counter-revolutionary character of the

Socialist-Republican Government, and the fatal policies of the anarchists and anarcho-sindicalists. Although the urban and rural proletariat were not yet ready for the decisive fight, now was the time to prepare for the seizure of power, by forming factory committees and peasant committees as mass organizations through which the communist party could operate its policy. This task had been neglected. The social-democrats and anarchists had to be politically isolated; the social-democrats were counter-revolutionaries; the anarchists, though not traitors, were putschists. In the following issue of *Rundschau* Arroyo, writing on the April meeting of the Spanish central committee, said that one Trotskyist there had proposed an unconditional united front with the socialists, since the Comintern line had suffered complete bankruptcy in Germany; the committee, however, 'unanimously approved the policy of the CI and the KPD'. In face of the fascist danger, the CP had sent an open letter to the socialist party and the trade union centres proposing joint meetings and demonstrations and a joint anti-fascist militia. The Spanish CP membership, he wrote, was now 20,000. A month later, in the same periodical, Arroyo wrote that the communist deputies were opposed equally to the Azana-Prieto Government and the right-wing opposition under Lerroux. The capitalists thought it time for the socialists to leave the Government, as greater demagogic use could be made of them in opposition.

When Lerroux's Government was installed after the November 1933 elections the Spanish central committee said its class character and role were the same as that of the Azana-Caballero Government; both were counter-revolutionary dictatorships. 'We repeat once more that the entire and inescapable responsibility for this situation rests on the socialist party. . . . The masses overthrew the hateful government of Azana-Caballero, and will overthrow Lerroux.' In the elections, the CP polled 200,000 votes and one communist deputy was elected. 'The social-fascist leaders, in particular Caballero & Co.', said the CP, had 'kept the working masses from coming over to our party by left demagoguery.'

At the 17th CPSU congress in January 1934, Dolores Ibarruri said that Caballero's law for the defence of the republic could be compared with Hitler's. In July 1934, following the change in Comintern policy, the Spanish CP wrote to the Socialist Party Executive that, although they would not withdraw their criticism of the socialist party, they would cease their attacks on it if these impeded united action. The socialists replied that a united front had already been established and was operating through the committees of the 'Workers' Alliance' organized at the end of 1933, which the CP could join. Until then they had refused to do so. In September 1934 the CC decided to join the Alliance provided they retained the right to criticize and to put their own point of view.

In October 1934 the miners of the Asturias region rose against the inclusion in Lerroux's Government of representatives of CEDA, a large right-wing anti-republican Catholic party. Socialists, anarchists, and communists collaborated in establishing a local 'Socialist Republic'. The local regular troops were reinforced by forces despatched from Madrid (under General Franco), and by detachments of the Foreign Legion. After 15 days fighting, the miners surrendered. Widespread and dreadful reprisals followed, and between 20 and

30 thousand Asturians were imprisoned. The anarchists in Madrid and Barcelona held aloof from the shortlived riots and strikes organized by the socialists in these two cities against CEDA representation in the Government.

The ECCI *Materials* for the seventh Comintern congress said: 'The revolutionary miners in Asturias tried to establish Soviets. As a result of anarchist treachery, and of sabotage by the majority of social-democratic leaders, and of inadequate preparation of the proletariat and peasantry—the result of earlier social-democratic policies—the Spanish proletariat was forced to retreat.'

The ECCI letter was handed by Cachin and Thorez on 15 October to Vandervelde and Adler in Brussels, who said it would be discussed by the LSI bureau, meeting in Paris on 13 November. Both Internationals had asked their affiliated parties to take action on behalf of Spain without awaiting the outcome of the negotiations. At that meeting the LSI decided not to forbid its affiliated parties to make agreements with the communist parties, but refused to collaborate with the CI, whose past actions aroused doubt as to the genuineness of the proposal. Had the Comintern agreed to negotiations when Hitler came to power, joint action on Spain would have been easier; there was strong opposition to joint action from the British, Scandinavian, and Dutch labour parties. Cachin and Thorez denied that the offer was a manoeuvre; Vandervelde and Adler replied that after the last twelve years they could not be expected to agree at five minutes' notice to an *ad hoc* pact—this had taken months even in France. Adler asked whether the Comintern now recognized that social-democrats were not fascists and traitors, and that the liberties enjoyed in democratic countries were not a sham. Thorez replied that once agreement was reached, mutual criticism would cease, but there was and could be no change in Comintern policy. 'We think that what we did was right.' An article in the *Communist International* at the end of the year stated that 'the communists will not restrict themselves to the framework of the agreement already arrived at. . . . They will on the one hand unmask those who oppose the united front; on the other, they will criticize in a comradely and businesslike manner the hesitations and indecisions of those who participate in united front agreements but hinder the transition to more mature, higher forms of struggle.'

After the rising Togliatti wrote in *Rundschau* that the October fighting was part of the European fight against fascism. It showed that the Spanish workers understood that fascism could be fought only by the workers seizing power. The reason why the strike did not spread was anarchist treachery; in Barcelona they had joined the counter-revolution. The socialist party had failed to organize a broad mass movement which would have been the basis for Soviets. But from the fighting the Spanish workers would learn that only the communist policy would give them victory.

An article in the *Communist International* in December analysing the failure of the strike accused the socialists and anarchists of disrupting the committees of the Workers' Alliance. Although communist policy was correct, their preparatory measures were inferior to those of the fascists. 'From first to last our party was in the forefront of the armed uprising'; their failure was due to inadequate preparation, to be explained by the fact that 'the majority of the working class were under the leadership not of the communists but of the socialists and

anarchists', and it was they who were responsible for the defeat. The peasants, moreover, were unwilling to defend the republic which had given them nothing; the army was not on the side of the proletariat—this again was largely the fault of the socialists, who were interested only in the officers, not the rank and file; finally, the movement lacked central leadership. The anarchists were the 'black hundreds' of Spain, and the socialists were bankrupt. At the seventh Comintern congress, Garcia said that although the rising was premature, the CP had to take part: 'it tried to bring it under communist leadership and turn it into a broad and victorious popular rising'.]

Fascist-monarchist reaction in Spain has attacked with all the forces of the army, navy, and air force the working class and peasantry, who are fighting under the leadership of the Workers' Alliance which represents the fighting union of communists and socialists and has sealed this union in blood shed in battle. Victory for fascist-monarchist reaction in Spain would, after the seizure of power by fascism in Germany and Austria, not only bring immeasurable suffering to the Spanish working class and peasantry, but also deal a severe blow to the entire international proletariat. Only the fighting unity of the working class of all countries can bring effective help to the Spanish workers and bar the road to Spanish and world reaction. At this moment, when the bourgeoisie are seeking to destroy one of the fighting detachments of the international working class, the Spanish proletariat, the Communist International has called on its sections to organize, jointly with other workers' organizations, mass meetings and demonstrations to show their solidarity with the Spanish working class.

At the same time the Communist International proposes to the Labour and Socialist International to undertake immediately joint actions to support both the fighting Spanish proletariat and the struggle against the support given to the Lerroux Government by other capitalist countries. The Communist International is instructing Comrade Cachin to make contact at once with the representatives of the LSI in order to reach agreement on concrete methods and practical execution of such joint actions.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE SEVENTEENTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1934

*Communist International, 5 November,
p. 804. (Rundschau, iii, 58, p. 2569,
8 November 1934.)*

[Although 'the united front from above' was not yet official Comintern policy, it had in fact been adopted by the French CP by a sudden reversal of tactics in the summer of 1934. A resolution of the central committee, at the end of March

1934, stated that 'while the party organizations will increase tenfold their efforts to bring about a united front of action, they will reject any policy which makes for a bloc with social-democracy. . . . The policy of the socialist party must be exposed in the eyes of the socialist workers and the entire working class', and a few weeks later Berlioz wrote of the anxiety of the CGT 'to serve as an instrument of fascism'. He rebuked those members of the CPF who took the statements of the SFIO seriously, 'and are inclined to think of the united front as a "loyal" alliance between the socialist and communist parties'. The communist programme and tactics had done much to disintegrate social-democracy. In an article in *Rundschau* early in May 1934, Berlioz published a strong attack on Doriot, recalling his behaviour at the January central committee meeting, his attitude to the socialists, his denial that Hitler's seizure of power was the result of socialist treachery; at the March central committee he had said that the repulse of fascism in France was the outcome not of communist activity, but of the stand taken by the CGT and the SFIO, and had urged the CC to change its attitude to those two bodies. 'From there to the idea of a bloc between the socialist and communist parties is only one step', and Doriot had taken this step and had resigned from the central committee. 'Doriot's policy would have run counter to the essential task of undermining socialist influence, which is the pledge of victory over fascism. It aimed at the liquidation of the CP of France.' Bolsheviks, said an article in the *Communist International* in May 1934, must not 'capitulate to the social-democratic slogans of "defence of the Republic", "defence of democracy", etc.'. On 23 April 1934 the French central committee and Doriot were asked to submit their differences to the ECCI, but Doriot refused to go to Moscow, and the ECCI declared that he was concerned, not to establish a united front, as he claimed, but to split the CPF. Doriot thereupon sent an open letter to the ECCI putting forth his views, and arguing that *L'Humanité's* campaign against the socialist party was conducted in a way which made a united front impossible. The ECCI empowered the French CC to take all the necessary measures against Doriot to preserve the unity of the party. Doriot was asked by the political bureau to make a public statement that he would give up all forms of struggle against the CC, and would submit his paper *Émancipation* to the party's control. Doriot's CP cell (St Denis) was the first to make an agreement on unity of action with the local branch of the SFIO, and this was one of the charges against him when he was expelled from the CPF. Another was that he wished to replace the slogan 'Defend the Soviet Union' by 'Alliance with the Soviet Union'. When he spoke at a joint CGT-CGTU meeting early in June it was broken up by communists.

At its conference in Ivry on 23-26 June 1934 the CPF reversed its attitude and no longer insisted on the 'united front from below only'. This, it said, was not a change in policy, but in tactics. Duclos denied Doriot's assertion that the CPF was now belatedly taking his advice and pursuing the policy he had advocated; Doriot had wanted 'a Trotskyist bloc of the two parties'. Communists, said Thorez, had always worked for the united front; they were doing so now in a way the social-democratic workers would understand. The conference requested the central committee to expel Doriot; this was done on the ground of 'splitting activities' and open anti-party struggle. (Trotsky referred to the

'expulsion of all those who were imprudent enough to grasp the lessons of the situation' before the Comintern did.)

On 23 June *Le Populaire* proposed a non-aggression and non-intervention pact between the two parties. On 2 July *L'Humanité* put forward counter-proposals, previously endorsed by Moscow, for a pact on unity of action; the parties would refrain from attacking each other so long as joint action lasted. Representatives of the two parties met on 15 July and on 27 July signed an agreement on joint struggle against fascism, imperialist war, etc. United front proposals on similar lines were made by the communist parties of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland, Spain, etc.

In June 1934 Dimitrov, drafting the speech he proposed to make at the seventh CI congress (later postponed), suggested that the terms 'social-fascist' and 'social-democratic treachery' should be dropped, and the policy of a united front only from below abandoned; the united front should be led and directed by the communists not in words but in action.

A manifesto issued by the central committees of the communist parties of France, Britain, Germany, and Poland and published at the beginning of July 1934—which made no mention of social-fascism or social-democratic treachery—appealed for unity to all working people 'whatever party or trade union you belong to', and proposed that the communist and socialist parties should demonstrate jointly on the twentieth anniversary of the outbreak of war in 1914 under slogans calling for the defence of Russia, the Chinese revolution, and the colonial peoples. Bela Kun wrote (*Communist International*, July 1934) that Hitler's opposition 'to the united front of the international proletariat which is developing against German fascism is sufficient to show that in proposing to act in unison with the social-democratic parties the communist parties acted correctly'. Communists would not abandon their political or organizational independence. 'We do not think it possible to unite the Communist International and the Second International. But we have firmly resolved with all our strength, to strive for and to ensure the unity of action of the proletariat.' The renunciation of polemics against the social-democrats was a concession for which they asked in return action by the socialist parties to establish a common front against the common class enemy. 'It is necessary to make up in the nearest future for all that has been neglected until now in this campaign against fascism.'

At the ECCI presidium on 9 July Piatnitsky said the Nazis were steadily losing mass support, and relying more and more on the army and police. Richter spoke of widespread discontent in Germany. 'On the one hand, fascism has made the struggle to win the masses more difficult, but on the other made it easier by destroying illusions . . . we have not done enough to establish working-class unity in Germany. We are still somewhat in a state of isolation from the social-democratic workers. . . . Something in our tactics is not right.' Pieck said had there been unity, then on 30 June, the crisis of the Nazi dictatorship, united mass action in the form of street demonstrations might have given impulse to serious mass struggles against the regime. The KPD was the only force capable of conducting and organizing resistance to Hitlerism; the SPD leaders had capitulated and were ready to conclude an alliance with fascism: 'They want

to continue their old policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie and splitting the working class. Whoever wants German working-class unity must decide in favour of the KPD.' In September Piatnitsky wrote: 'We must do everything in our power so that the social-democratic party of Germany, as such, should no longer be able to exist.' If the local KPD organizations did not change their tactics, the SPD might one day be restored to life. In November Dimitrov warned communists that success in united front efforts did not mean a relaxation of the struggle against social-democratic ideology, which on the contrary had to be intensified. An editorial in the *Communist International* on the anniversary said that the masses had to be detached from social-democracy in the course of the revolutionary struggle for power; the workers were beginning to recognize the inevitability of the Soviet path. 'This is irrespective of the fact that due to the crisis which social-democracy is experiencing, the united front may be and is being operated by us not only from below but also from above, a state of things which makes it easier for us to approach the social-democratic masses.' At the end of 1934 a 'discussion article' in the *Communist International* suggested that in future communists should 'make a distinction between the "left" social-democrats in inverted commas and those who are genuinely left', since the changed situation required a change in tactics. 'We do not change our tactics because our former tactics were incorrect, as the social-democrats and the renegades from communism are now trying to prove. In spite of isolated mistakes . . . our former tactics were correct. We are changing the tactics of the united front now because conditions have changed.' This meant fighting those social-democrats who resisted the united front, and those who urged organizational unity. The Comintern could not tie its hands: 'The chief aim of the united front is to make it easier for the social-democratic masses to come over to the side of communism for the conquest of Soviet power. This was and still remains our chief objective in the new tactics of the united front.' To do this meant overcoming 'left sectarian isolation' and the right danger of 'separating the tactics of the united front from our strategic tasks'. The right danger was all the greater because the socialist parties in a number of countries were still growing, while in countries where they had been driven underground the members who had left them had not gone over to communism; they would do so only when convinced that the bankruptcy of social-democracy was not accidental, but inherent in its policy.

The seventh congress *Materials* noted that the KPD, hampered by its sectarianism, did not change its policy quickly enough after 30 June. Their attitude was: 'The door to unity is open. Social-democratic workers, join the KPD', although these workers were not prepared to do so. 'Its united front policy . . . was primarily a method of recruiting into the KPD.' The attempt to organize 'independent class trade unions' had been a mistake and a failure.

There was majority opposition to the new line in the KPD central committee, represented by Florin, Dahlem, Heckert, Schubert, and others; the minority, represented by Pieck and Ulbricht, were supported by the ECCI presidium at a joint meeting in January 1935, and on 11 February the committee made its first open overtures to the SPD Executive in Prague, proposing joint action in specified fields. These were rejected. The presidium resolution

instructed the KPD central committee to extend its activities to organize resistance to Hitler, to the Catholics, the middle classes, and the intelligentsia. In the previous autumn the KPD periodical *Die Internationale* had referred to the dissolution by the German Government of Catholic associations, and warned its readers against believing that this made the Catholics allies of the KPD; the KPD was 'the leader of the entire workers' opposition to the Hitler regime'; unless the communists prevented it, the Catholics and social-democrats 'could become the basis for a new form of capitalist dictatorship'.

The change was set forth in two articles in the *Communist International* in March 1935 (by Pieck) and April (by Müller). The KPD should not overestimate its influence over the social-democratic workers; it had not yet learned how to advance slogans which would attract the masses, which the masses could understand, and for which they would be prepared to fight; it still had to fight the sectarians who thought the united front a deviation from the revolutionary line, and the opportunists who would use it to capitulate to social-democracy. The SPD had succeeded in re-establishing 'a definite and centralized organizational network', but the Comintern 'did not promptly take account of the fact that the situation had changed'. The KPD had tried to recruit the active socialists, failing to understand 'that it is only a broad united front policy that can prevent the renewal of the split in the working class'. The KPD was prepared to make proposals to the SPD committee 'in a suitable form'. 'By means of the united front we want to link up more closely with our social-democratic class comrades, to paralyse the right social-democratic leaders and restrict their freedom of action in the struggle which they are carrying on for collaboration with the bourgeoisie . . . we want to destroy all the illusions of the social-democratic workers. . . . By means of the united front we shall be able to bring the masses closer to the proletarian revolution.' The KPD had been mistaken in its trade union policy; 'we will therefore also work for the liquidation of the district committees of the RTUO as they are frequently a hindrance to the re-establishment of the free trade unions'. The united front was 'the transmission belt to the anti-fascist people's front'. The struggle against sectarianism in the KPD must be vigorously pursued, 'the more so because we, the leaders, are ourselves responsible to a certain degree for this'.

At the end of July the KPD central committee, proclaiming fascism the enemy, stated that although the SPD had misled the workers, 'today we communists do not wish to argue about the past . . . the door to unity is open'. All KPD organizations were instructed to approach all SPD organizations with practical proposals; the KPD's gravest weakness, said a political bureau statement, had been its failure to work for trade union unity. 'Our common experiences and common sacrifices under Hitler's bloody regime . . . have eliminated much that separated us and still keeps us apart . . . we can overthrow the Hitler dictatorship if the working class is united and follows the revolutionary path according to the principles and tactics of the Comintern. . . . Unite with the communist party into a single revolutionary mass party of the German working class.'

In Italy, after four meetings between representatives of the two parties, the SPI and CPI on 17 August 1934 agreed on joint action on a number of specified

issues; in Poland the communists met with little success, although Lenski explained that there was 'a fundamental change in entire party practice', designed to eradicate the last vestiges of sectarianism. Negotiations with the Bund broke down, while the PPS leaders 'are doing everything in their power to prevent the formation of a wide united front', using as one of their pretexts that the Polish CP 'supports the foreign policy of the Soviets, a policy of agreement even with fascist states' (this was a reference to the Soviet proposal for 'an Eastern Locarno'). Lenski explained that not all members of the CP had adapted themselves to the new situation. 'Some of our active comrades have seen a narrow manoeuvre in our tactics, and have thought not so much of how to reach agreement with the social-democratic organizations for a joint struggle, as of how to expose the leaders of these parties at once. Hence, on more than one occasion, demands . . . have been put forward in the form of an ultimatum, and this has made it easier for the social-democratic leaders to reject these demands.' Nevertheless, 'the Chinese wall' between the two parties was breaking down.

At the ECCI presidium in October 1934 Pollitt reported on the progress of the united front policy in Britain: there were many members who adopted it reluctantly, and sighed with relief when the Labour Party turned the proposal down. At meetings the CPGB was asked how they could talk of the united front and at the same time fight the Labour Party at elections. The Labour Party and the TUC said they *were* the united front, and the CPGB the splitters. Pollitt asked for 'a clear line on united front tactics' in elections; the reformist workers deeply resented CP vote-splitting; in future they would consider on its merits each case where a CPGB or ILP candidate would mean the victory of a capitalist candidate (it withdrew a number of its candidates in the October 1934 municipal elections). Its anti-fascist work had brought the CPGB closer to the masses than at any time in its history.

Changes were also made in trade union tactics. At a meeting of the communist fraction of the RILU Executive on 2 August 1934, Piatnitsky said that while the united front from below remained the basic form of their tactics, the united front from above could also be used. CI and RILU directives on work in reformist unions had been correct, but had been very badly applied. The proposal for unconditional entry into the reformist unions was correct if this gave communists a good opportunity to stand for elective posts and carry on their work, but it could not become the main communist trade union policy; this would mean unconditional surrender to reformist demands; they must retain freedom of action inside the unions; they had to consider very carefully 'the advisability of liquidating even a small mass organization which is under our influence, if in so doing there is no chance at all of really winning influence in a broader organization still under the influence of a hostile leadership'. Only the reformists were to blame for the existence of parallel organizations, but it had been a serious mistake, after the fifth RILU congress, to transfer mechanically from the German and Polish parties to other parties the instructions not to use the slogan 'go into the reformist unions'. 'It was a complete mistake to try to build up a revolutionary trade union opposition in all countries' on the lines adopted in Germany. It had been right in Germany, but the failure to work in

the ADGB had greatly harmed the KPD. The reformists had looked on the trade union opposition as parallel organizations designed to split the unions, and they were suspicious and resentful; that was why the opposition attracted only the unemployed. Lozovsky wrote, in November 1934, that 'the entire meaning of RILU policy', in the past and now, was trade union unity, 'without any *arrière pensée*', nationally and internationally.]

The danger of a new imperialist war menaces the toilers of all countries. The capitalist world is feverishly arming itself, preparing more and more new hitherto unknown weapons for mass extermination. But war can be postponed only by uniting all the forces of the proletariat into the united front for a decisive struggle against capitalism, for the power of the working class. It is possible to prevent war, a new blood bath of the toilers, only by the workers making a clean break with the compromise policy of the social democracy, only by a victorious fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to find a way out of the crisis in which the capitalist world is writhing, the bourgeoisie are still further increasing the robbery of the workers, farmers and peasants of the colonies and the economically weak countries. They are trying first and foremost to crush the working class, to deprive it of the last vestiges of democratic rights, to cut down the beggarly wages still more, to worsen its situation still further, to destroy its revolutionary vanguard. Fascism has come to power in Germany and Austria, it is in power in Italy and Poland, it menaces the toilers of all countries. As the storm detachment of the bourgeoisie against the working class, fascism is trying in the first place to organise an attack on the shock brigade of the world proletariat, the Soviet Union.

But the proletariat and the toiling masses can beat back the attack of fascism only if the proletariat establishes the fighting unity of its ranks, and, together with all the toilers, carries on a decisive struggle against capitalism. . . .

For the proletariat there is no peaceful path to power. There is no peaceful path to socialism.

True to its historic mission—the preparation of the masses for the winning of the state power by the proletariat—the Communist International calls on the workers more insistently than ever to join in the united front for the organisation of joint actions by all workers against fascism and the war danger. It calls on the workers of all countries to unite under the tested red banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, under the banner of the Communist International for the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie.

The idea of the storming of capitalism is ever more maturing in the consciousness of the masses. The social-democratic workers are breaking away from reformism and from compromise with the bourgeoisie, and are

taking the path of the class struggle. In February this year the heroic workers of Austria, rejecting in practice the social-democratic policy of class collaboration, took up arms to bar the path of fascism. But they were defeated, because the social-democratic party, which led them, [had disarmed them politically,] had not prepared them for the decisive struggle and did not lead them to the attack on capitalism. In France, in the days of February, the working class gave the first rebuff to fascism by the general strike. But their fight against fascism, which is attacking, will be the more successful the more quickly the proletariat rids itself of democratic illusions and the more quickly it unites under the banner of communism.

In October the toilers of Spain, led by the working class, took up arms in defence of their bread and freedom, and to beat back the attack of fascist reaction. The workers of Asturias entered on the fight for the power of the workers and peasants, under the leadership of the communist party.

The workers in the social-democratic parties are more and more beginning to break with the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie; together with the communists, the social-democratic workers are beginning more and more to take up the struggle against fascism, capitalism and war.

Brothers, workers!

The Communist International proposed to the Labour and Socialist International the organisation of immediate joint actions of the communist and socialist parties in all countries, for the defence of the fighting Spanish people. But at the moment when the government artillery was bombarding the mines of Asturias, burying alive the mine workers who had taken shelter there, at the moment when the military aeroplanes were bombing the towns and the villages of Spain from the air, when every day, even every hour, cost the lives of thousands of heroic workers and peasants of Spain, together with their wives and children—at this moment the official leaders of the Labour and Socialist International postponed for three weeks the discussion of the question of joint activity on formal grounds!

The Communist International is continuing its policy of the united front. Workers of all countries, show your solidarity with the fighting Spanish workers! Come forward like one man against the Spanish bourgeoisie, who have called up all their forces in order bloodily to crush the working class and the peasants.

The Spanish workers, who have entered into the battle against capitalism, are our class brothers. The workers of Asturias, who have raised the banner of struggle for the power of the workers and peasants, are our brothers.

Their cause is the cause of the whole of the world proletariat.

Class brothers! Comrades!

Exert every effort to establish, as soon as possible, the united front of

the working class for the struggle [against fascism and imperialist war,] for bread and freedom, for the struggle for power, for socialism!

Social-democratic workers! Workers of all political views! Unite under the banner of the Communist International! March along the revolutionary path on which the October revolution of the proletariat of Russia was victorious, along which alone the working class may conquer!

ECCI STATEMENT ON LSI REJECTION OF JOINT MAY DAY
DEMONSTRATIONS

22 April 1935

Rundschau, iv, 19, p. 963, 25 April 1935

[The RILU also made proposals to the IFTU. In March 1935 Lozovsky said the RILU wanted amalgamation of parallel unions on the basis of conferences with proportionate representation, and executives elected on the same basis. Since they were in most cases in the minority (the RILU claimed that its unions were larger in China, Italy, Cuba, and Chile), this would give them a representation on the executives which they would not otherwise receive; this too, he said, was the reason why the IFTU wanted the RILU unions to be dissolved, and their members to join the IFTU unions as individuals. The RILU Executive proposed a joint meeting with the IFTU Executive to discuss joint May Day demonstrations, the promotion of trade union unity in France and Spain, the re-establishment of unions in Germany, and conditions of IFTU-RILU unity. The IFTU replied in April that no practical results could be expected from such a meeting; the IFTU provided the centre which all could join through their national unions, and it could have in each country only one national trade union organization.

The RILU found it impossible to accept the condition of the dissolution of its unions, and repeated its proposal for numerically proportionate representation. Meanwhile it would recommend to its unions to work for joint May Day demonstrations and joint meetings to discuss unity. The RILU, said the *Communist International*, 'was formed fifteen years ago to do away with the split in the working-class movement caused by the policy of class collaboration pursued by the Amsterdam International. . . . The entire history of the RILU is a history of the struggle to bring about the unity of the trade union organizations so as to carry on active class struggle.' At the seventh Comintern congress Lozovsky explained that the RILU had not approached the IFTU earlier because it knew that Amsterdam was not interested in the united front. The communist parties and RILU unions had been at fault in their attitude to the lower-ranking union officials—he himself at the sixth CI congress had called the reformist unions 'a school of capitalism'. 'Particularly dangerous in the present new situation are the residues of the old views, that the economic struggle can be waged without and against the trade unions, that serious results can be achieved without penetrating the reformist and other mass unions. The false formulations which crept into our former decisions must be eradicated.']

The Executive Committee of the Communist International proposed to the Executive of the Labour and Socialist International

to organize in all capitalist countries joint May Day demonstrations against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, to safeguard peace, against imperialist war, and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

On behalf of the LSI secretariat Friedrich Adler informed the CI in a letter of 15 April that:

In accordance with the decisions of the Executive of the LSI, which were communicated to Comrades Cachin and Thorez in a letter dated 7 November 1934, there can be no doubt that the decision whether or not May Day may be celebrated jointly is to be left to each individual socialist party.

In all capitalist countries the CI has promoted agreements between the communist and socialist parties for a joint struggle against the common enemy of the working class. But recently events have occurred which give particular emphasis to the need for joint international working-class action beyond the national framework: the re-introduction of universal conscription by the fascist Hitler Government; its warlike threats against Lithuania and the other Baltic States, against Austria, and particularly against the Soviet Union; the extreme acuteness of the danger of a new imperialist world war started by Hitler Germany and its allies, military-fascist Japan and fascist Poland.

Precisely because of these new factors in the international situation, which make it urgently necessary to concentrate all the forces of the world proletariat against the chief instigator of war, German fascism and its allies, in common international action, a joint display of the two Internationals on May Day would be commendable. Joint demonstrations would also open the way for the further joint struggle of the proletariat to raise the living standards of the working class, to defend their rights against fascism in every capitalist country, and to maintain the peace.

The ECCI secretariat is convinced that the members of the social-democratic parties, as well as the broad masses of the militant proletariat, approved and welcomed the CI proposal to organize joint May Day demonstrations. The social-democratic workers will however remember that the LSI first made joint action by communists and social-democrats on a national scale dependent upon prior agreement between the two Internationals, then rejected the new CI proposals to the LSI for joint international action on the ground that such action could only be arranged by agreement between the individual national parties affiliated to the LSI and the CI. After these mutually contradictory statements on the question of establishing international unity of action, the workers will ask in wonderment: What events will make the LSI leaders consider that the

appropriate time has come to give their consent to united international proletarian action?

Despite the rejection by the LSI of its united front proposals in support of the fighting Spanish workers, the Communist International did not refrain from making new proposals to the LSI, when new events of international import occurred, for joint May Day demonstrations by the two Internationals. Nor in the future will the CI leave any means untried to convince the social-democratic workers that the policy of class collaboration pursued by the social-democratic leaders is incompatible with working-class interests, and is the chief obstacle to international proletarian unity of action. Supported by the efforts of militant workers for a united front against the bourgeoisie, the CI will do all it can to bring about working-class unity of action on the national and international scale, for the fight against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, to maintain peace, against imperialist war, and in defence of the Soviet Union.

The negative reply of the LSI secretariat makes it impossible for joint May Day demonstrations of the two Internationals to be held this year. The ECCI recommends all communist parties to renew their proposals to the socialist parties of the individual capitalist countries for the joint organization of May Day demonstrations, referring to the LSI secretariat letter of 15 April 1935 to the CI quoted above, with the object of overcoming the resistance of the social-democratic party leaders. The more broadly and energetically the social-democratic workers and their organizations, nationally and locally, conclude a united front with communist organizations against the common class enemy, the more quickly will the international united front of communists and social-democrats, fighting under the banner of proletarian internationalism in defence of the vital interests of the working class, become a fact.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE ECCI

April 1935

Communist International, 20 April 1935, p. 335

[At the end of March 1935 the CPF central committee wrote to the SFIO proposing negotiations to prepare a unity congress, and a similar letter was addressed by the CGTU to the CGT. In the same month Thorez attacked Doriot, 'the counter-revolutionary degenerate who hobnobs with Trotsky', for claiming that he was right to fight against the 'class against class' tactics in 1928-9. Conditions had changed, and now success in the fight against fascism required an alliance, under CP leadership, with the middle classes. This would establish a 'people's front'. The CPF had first made proposals to the Radicals in October 1934 for common action in defence of the constitution, for the dissolution of the fascist leagues, etc. In May Thorez wrote that in the existing circumstances it was necessary to make proposals for a united front to the leaders

of the SFIO and CGT. 'Together with the CC of the CPF', wrote *Pravda*, 'the Comintern is of the opinion that, in view of the fascist danger, proposals from the CPF to the SFIO on these lines are not only permissible but in certain circumstances necessary.' The attitude to socialist parties was not 'programmatic' but determined by 'considerations of revolutionary expediency'. There was no mention in the article of 'social-fascism' or 'social-democratic treachery'.

The April 1935 elections in Danzig had given the NSDAP 60 per cent of the vote. In the May elections in Czechoslovakia the Henlein party (Hitler's followers in the Sudetenland) gained 44 seats (they had none in the 1929 elections). At the seventh Comintern congress Gottwald said the Czech CP was determined 'to defend the bourgeois-democratic republic against fascism'. Henlein's followers were said to have been encouraged by the results of the Saar plebiscite.

In the summer of 1933 the Saar communist party advised its adherents not to vote for French imperialism, or German fascism, or the League of Nations, but to 'take the revolutionary road to solve the Saar question', fighting with the German proletariat for social and national emancipation. In June 1934 the Saar communists said the social-democrats were responsible for 'loading the fascist yoke on to the German people and the oppression of the League of Nations on to the shoulders of the working people of the Saar', but since their own policy of 'a red Saar within a Soviet Germany' was not now possible, the working people should vote for the *status quo*. In July the communists and socialists of the Saar agreed on joint anti-fascist action. In the plebiscite of January 1935 the vote for Germany was 476,000, for the *status quo* 47,000, for France 2,000. *Rundschau* explained that this was a vote for Germany, not for Hitler. The *Materials* for the seventh congress stated: 'After the party liquidated its first erroneous and sectarian slogan "For a Red Saar", it campaigned for the *status quo*.' The *status quo* was 'a defeatist slogan requiring a high level of class consciousness'. The result emphasized the decisive importance of the national question, 'to which up to the present the party has paid too little attention in its struggle against the fascist dictatorship'.

Articles on May Day said capitalist contradictions were greater than in 1914, but war had not been unleashed because the struggle against it 'is under the leadership of the world revolutionary party'. Dutt wrote that the 'basic antagonism of world imperialism' was that between Britain and the United States, and the Franco-Soviet pact 'the principal obstacle . . . to the war plans of imperialism'. Radek wrote (at the time of Eden's visit to Moscow) that if Hitler were convinced that in a war against Russia he would have England and France against him too, he would choose peaceful means of improving Germany's position. Britain's fear of German ambitions meant that 'its role as organizer of anti-Soviet tendencies in world politics has somewhat diminished'; Dutt continued to write of the 'British-German alliance'. Any uneasiness among communists about the course of Soviet policy was met with the argument, developed in an article in the *Communist International* in April 1935, that 'never in the past and never in the future can the interests of the Soviet Union contradict or fail to correspond to the interests of the international working-class movement, just as the maintenance, consolidation, and prosperity of the USSR—

the base of the world proletarian revolution—is the vital task facing the working class of the whole world'. An article in July in the same periodical stated: 'Just as in time of peace so in time of war, the actions of every revolutionary organization must be determined by the interests of strengthening the might of the USSR as the base of world socialist revolution.' In April 1935 the central committees of the communist parties of Germany, France, Britain, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Austria, Hungary, and Lithuania issued a manifesto greeting the expansion of Soviet defensive capacity, pledging support to the Red Army, and undertaking to work for the defeat of any State that made war on the USSR.]

The sufferings of the working class and of all the toilers in the capitalist, colonial and dependent countries are growing from day to day. The partial increase of industrial production has been advantageous to only a handful of the biggest capitalist magnates. Their profits are growing, while the broad masses of the toiling people are sinking into ever deeper poverty. . . .

The bourgeoisie are making a desperate effort to find a way out of the crisis at the expense of the toilers by establishing terrorist fascist governments. Fascist gangs, in the countries under fascist dictatorship, deprive the toilers of their last vestiges of freedom, disperse the trade unions, take possession of and plunder the workers' co-operative societies, destroy the legal working-class press, militarise the workers' sport organisations, dispatch the unemployed and the young people who have finished school to forced labour camps, while tens of thousands of proletarian fighters, regardless of the political parties they follow, are interned in concentration camps. A similar fate awaits the toilers in the countries where bourgeois democracy exists, by means of which the social-democrats promised to bring them to socialism. The democratic rights of the toilers in these countries are now being more and more curtailed, while the oppression of the broad masses is being uninterruptedly intensified, and thus the road to fascism is being paved.

The world is on the verge of a new imperialist world war. The strained international relations are coming ever more closely to a point like that at which the world war broke out in 1914. The expenditure on the preparation for the new world slaughter is being mercilessly squeezed out of the toilers, who are doomed first and foremost to be the victims of that war.

Fascist Germany, the principal instigator of imperialist war, has already created an army which leaves the old army of the Kaiser far behind. The introduction of universal conscription, and the legalisation and further increase of German armaments production, which has hitherto been carried on secretly, are a warning that German fascism is feverishly completing its last preparations for war.

The military alliance between fascist Germany, military fascist Japan

and fascist Poland is becoming a fact. This military alliance is directed first and foremost against the land of Socialism, against the USSR.

While a counter-revolutionary onslaught is being prepared against the USSR, imperialist wars are already being carried on between various countries. The robber war being conducted by Japanese imperialism in China has been going on for years, and is now menacing the whole of China. War is being waged in South America between British and American imperialism through their vassal states, Paraguay and Bolivia. Italian imperialism is calling up one group of recruits after another to the army, and is dispatching troops to Abyssinia, preparing to subject the people of Abyssinia to colonial plunder and servitude. German fascism is already reaching out its mailed fist against Austria, Lithuania and Danzig, and is making ready to put its plans of colonial plunder into operation.

Only by mustering the broad masses of the working class into a united front of struggle will it be possible to stop the fleecing of the toilers by the capitalists. Only in this way will it be possible to stop the further advance of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie in establishing their bloody fascist domination. Only thus can a stop be put to the mad armament race of the war-thirsty imperialist cliques. . . .

Wherever communist and social-democratic workers, members of the revolutionary and reformist trade unions, whom also unorganised workers follow, have proceeded to consolidate their forces, the united front has already yielded its first successes.

The workers of France have entered the path of the united front, and have repelled the first onslaughts of fascism.

The united front of the working class in Austria prevented the fascists from demoralising the ranks of the Austrian proletariat, which is carrying on a heroic struggle to overthrow the fascist dictatorship.

Workers of all political shades in Spain fought shoulder to shoulder in armed struggles. They were not the victors in this combat; but they prevented the consolidation of the fascist dictatorship, and they are continuing heroically and in serried ranks to carry on the struggle against fascism. . . .

These first united front successes can be increased manifold provided that the united will of the working masses will put a stop to the policy of class collaboration, pursued by social-democracy.

The oppressed peoples in the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries are more and more entering the world front of struggle against imperialism. The Red Army in Soviet China is fighting the Kuomintang, the traitor to and hangman of the Chinese people, and is becoming the central gathering point for the forces of the national liberation struggle against Japanese imperialism, and against the partition of China between the imperialist powers.

Communist, social-democratic and non-party workers! Members of reformist, revolutionary, anarcho-syndicalist and christian trade unions, members of co-operative societies, sports societies, cultural and all other working-class organisations!

Build the united front of all proletarians in joint struggle! The united front of the struggle against the class enemy can prevent the destruction of the rights of the toilers, can overcome fascism and strengthen the struggle for the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for real government by the people, for proletarian democracy, and for Soviet Power, which will do away forever with capitalist exploitation and oppression. . . .

In the name of the world party of the revolutionary proletariat, the Executive Committee of the Communist International addresses to the Executive Committee of the Labour and Socialist International the proposal that joint May Day actions be organised in all capitalist countries against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, for the preservation of peace, against imperialist war and in defence of the Soviet Union. The Red International of Labour Unions has already addressed a proposal to the International Federation of Trade Unions that joint demonstrations be organised on May 1st. Joint action by communist and social-democratic workers, by members of the reformist and revolutionary unions will also attract the unorganised workers, and the members of the anarcho-syndicalist and christian trade unions. Joint action will draw in and weld together the broad masses who still stand aside from the class struggle, and who may fall victim to fascist demagoguery. . . .

Against fascism, and for the defence of the democratic rights of the toilers! For the release of Ernst Thaelmann, Mathias Rakosi and all revolutionary fighters! For the liberation of Largo Caballero and all anti-fascists!

Against the bloody terror in China, Japan, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, Hungary, and all other capitalist countries! Against the death sentences in Spain, Germany and Bulgaria!

Against the imperialist armaments race, against the principal instigator of war, fascist Germany and its allies, the Polish fascists; against Japan engaged in pillaging China and preparing to attack the Soviet Union. Against British imperialism, inciting anti-Soviet war; against fascist Italy, engaged in throttling Abyssinia!

Render active support to the struggle of the Soviet Union for peace!

For the defence of the USSR, the fatherland of the toilers in all lands!

Protect Soviet China!

Fight for the united front of all fighting proletarians!

Fight for the unity of the international trade union movement!

Forward to the victorious struggle against fascism, against capitalism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Soviet Power and for Socialism!

THE SEVENTH COMINTERN CONGRESS

[The seventh and last Comintern congress opened on 25 July 1935 and closed on 20 August. Sixty-five parties were represented. Seven new parties were admitted to membership on 20 August—from Indochina, the Philippines, Peru, Colombia, Costa Rica, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela, and the People's Revolutionary Party of Tannu Tuva was admitted as a sympathizing party. The number of parties had increased since the sixth congress from 65 to 76, of which 19 were sympathizing parties and total membership from 1.7 to 3.1 million. Of the parties attending, 22 (excluding the CPSU) were legal: 11 of these were in Europe. There were 371 voting, and 139 consultative delegates. All decisions, resolutions and elections were unanimous. It had originally been decided to hold the congress in 1934 and on 29 May of that year the ECCI presidium published the agenda; on 5 September it decided, 'at the request of several sections', to postpone the congress for a year. The reports on the work of the sections (referred to in these notes as seventh congress *Materials*) were prepared in the autumn of 1934, some additions being made subsequently; the introduction says 'it does not give a full picture of the state of affairs' in July 1935.

An editorial in the *Communist International* before the congress opened said: 'The main task of the CI sections is to stand at the head of the masses in the fight for peace against the instigators of war, preparing the proletariat for the struggle to convert the imperialist war into civil war, assisting to the utmost in bringing about the defeat of their own bourgeoisie, fighting with all the forces at their disposal for the victory of the Red Army.' Another task was to see that social-democracy did not recover from its defeats. 'It depends upon us, upon the activities of the communist parties first and foremost, whether we shall be able to prevent the revival of social-democracy in those countries where it has disintegrated.'

Manuilsky spoke on 'the results of socialist construction in the USSR'. The triumph of socialism was the triumph of the Comintern, of its programme, policy, and tactics. The social-democratic parties had suffered defeats, but the CPSU had fulfilled its duty to all the enslaved and exploited; its victories were destroying the mass basis of capitalism and fascism, and 'smashing the influence of social-democracy upon the working class'. The defence of the USSR must be made 'the starting-point for a broad, general people's front of classes, organizations, and political parties which are beginning to render the USSR active support'. Although the growing antagonism between fascist and democratic states was 'of subsidiary importance compared with the fundamental division of the world into the world of socialism and the world of capitalism, the proletariat cannot adopt a neutral attitude towards the struggle that is going on in the capitalist camp'. It must 'do everything to extend the anti-fascist front in the international arena'. Although 'the capitalist world cannot exist without wars', there were 'bourgeois governments of important imperialist countries which today are not interested in war. What their motives may be is a matter of secondary importance at the present time.' The congress passed a resolution on 'The victory of socialism in the USSR.'

For the first time, the question of communist party participation in 'bourgeois' governments was brought up. It was suggested that communist parties could on certain conditions enter 'united-front' governments which were committed to fight fascism and reaction and were supported by powerful mass movements.

In closing the congress Dimitrov said: 'At this congress we have adopted a course for the formation of a single mass political party of the working class, for putting an end to the political split in the ranks of the proletariat, a split caused by the class-collaboration policy of social-democracy . . . we lay down definite fundamental conditions to serve as the basis for such unity. . . . Ours has been a congress of a new tactical orientation for the Comintern.' There was to be no mass 'hunting imaginary deviations or deviators', but there was to be no factionalism either. 'The party is above everything else.'

Reporting on the congress to the Moscow-Leningrad party *aktiv*, Manuilsky said that the change in the Comintern line meant that the communist parties had to abandon their old propagandist view that they represented the militant revolutionary opposition in the working class, while disclaiming responsibility for what happened. Because social-democracy was bankrupt, they now had greater opportunities than ever to carry through their policy, 'and this places on them responsibility for the fate of the working-class movement. . . . They must become the most important factor in the political life of their country and of the world.' To fight fascism did not mean to abandon the fight against capitalism, because fascism was becoming the predominant form of capitalism. 'Many people believe that by our attitude to the united front with the social-democrats we are . . . deviating from Stalin's theory that fascism and social-democracy are not antipodes but twins. . . . By its entire policy of class collaboration social-democracy paved the way for fascism and demonstrated the correctness of the thesis that it was fascism's twin brother. . . . Precisely because of this, social-democracy led the working masses of central Europe to defeat and helped the offensive of fascist reaction throughout the world.' Now the threat of war divided all classes, peoples, and States into two camps—the camps of war and of peace. The war camp was represented by the fascist Powers, whose aggression was directed against the USSR. 'The interests of the defence of the Soviet Union determine the attitude of the world proletariat to war.'

To those who questioned why, if the Comintern now proposed amalgamation with the socialist parties, there had been for so many years an irreconcilable struggle against socialist parties and against those communists who opposed that struggle, Manuilsky said that the communist parties were now steeled in struggle and free of deviations, and so could approach unity without misgivings. The five conditions put forward by the congress corresponded to the present situation, as did the 21 conditions in 1920. It was not the communists, but the socialists who had rejected the united front. The cause of unity, however, had not been advanced 'by creating our own small trade unions which isolated the communists from the masses, leaving them to stew in their own juice'; their meetings had been a sheer waste of time because everything had been agreed beforehand. 'Instead of trying to understand the specific situation in which the communists in fascist countries have to work, we preferred to explain everything by the fact

that they failed to carry out decisions . . . the gulf between desire and deed was created because those who drew up the resolutions paid little attention to the possibilities of carrying them out'; and while the situation changed, the resolutions were repeated in identical terms.

He reaffirmed the intention of the ECCI to interfere less in the work of the sections, whose cadres were now reliable and mature—'a bolshevik Stalinist guard has grown up'.

On 1 August 1935 the Chinese CP and Soviet Government published an appeal 'to all sons and daughters of the mother country', despite differences of opinion and interest, and despite past and present hostilities, to unite against Japanese aggression, since 'the national existence of the Chinese people is at stake'. What was wanted was 'a united all-China popular government of national defence', which would include representatives of the Chinese Soviet Government, to fight Japan, confiscate the property of the Japanese and of traitors, reduce taxes, raise wages, release political prisoners, and form a united anti-Japanese army. Chinese speakers at the seventh Comintern congress continued for the most part to bracket the Kuomintang with the Japanese and other imperialists as the enemy to be fought.

At the third conference of Latin American parties (19 in all) at Montevideo in October 1934, popular front tactics were introduced; the conference was admonished not to underestimate the importance of bourgeois national-reformism, which exercised great influence on the peasants and on many workers; it was necessary to differentiate between the different bourgeois parties, not all of which were reactionary. The Brazilian and Peruvian parties were commended; the severe fluctuations in membership were deplored. The Argentine delegate confessed that his party had been sectarian and isolated: 'Our sectarian policy perpetuated the split in the proletariat'; it had now abandoned its earlier policy of breaking up the peasant unions and agricultural co-operatives, and was trying to persuade all workers to join the socialist trade unions. The Chilean delegate said his party's united front offer to the socialist party had been rejected; it was now trying to get into the 'left-radical bloc', which had the majority of the country behind it, and transform it into a popular front. The Cuban delegate also confessed to sectarian sins; his party had opposed the Grau Government, although that Government opposed imperialism and gave wide opportunities to the labour movement. During the coup against Grau, the CP had remained neutral, 'thus objectively facilitating the seizure of power by the present reactionary government'. In the spring of 1935 the Brazilian CP had formed the 'National Liberation Alliance', with Prestes as its president, on a programme of national independence, land for the peasants, etc. In April 1935 Musso was sent back to Indonesia from Moscow to introduce the new line and to revive the PKI, which had been virtually paralysed for some years, but with little effect.

An article by Togliatti published while the congress was in session attributed the move of the social-democrats towards the united front to 'the defeat suffered by reformism', and referred to past communist errors. 'We have often spoken of the defeat of reformism . . . we must confess that in many cases we overestimated the importance of particular successes achieved by our movement. . . . In the

same way we have on several occasions been mistaken in our estimate of the forces of fascism.' One of the most important things they had to do now was to change their polemical style. It was not enough to send an ultimatum on the united front to the social-democratic leaders and then register the fact of its rejection; they were prepared to make concessions, and to insist only on important questions, such as the formation of local united front committees elected directly by the masses (like the local Soviets in 1917), because in France for example, the combined forces of the CPF, SFIO, CGT, and CGTU were still only a minority of the proletariat, and the rest had to be drawn in. 'Why', Togliatti asked, 'do we defend bourgeois-democratic liberties? Primarily because we, the party of the working class, have no other interests than those of the entire proletariat. We are quite well aware that however reactionary the real essence of the bourgeois-democratic regime, it is still better for the working class than open fascist dictatorship.' Real liberty, however, could be secured only by the proletarian dictatorship.

In an article on the work of the congress published in October Manuisky spoke of the possibility of international trade union unity. The IFTU had about 9 million members, the RILU (excluding the USSR) about one million (but 'mechanical' and 'arithmetical' arguments were to be avoided). 'If we were to end the "division" which the bourgeoisie have succeeded in bringing about in the ranks of the organized working-class movement, we would multiply the forces of the movement. . . . We do not put forward any conditions for the realization of trade union unity.' Political unity was a much more difficult question. Some comrades would ask, in that case why had they carried on an irreconcilable struggle against social-democracy? The answer was that if they had not split they would not now be in a position to unite. 'Had we not carried on the struggle during the entire post-war period against social-democracy, against all sorts of deviations in our ranks, for the bolshevization of the communist parties, then we would never be able to put the question of a single party as we are doing at the present time.' They now had the basic communist framework and could take the initiative in establishing a single working-class political party. 'Only we communists have the right to raise the banner of political unity of the working class, the banner of a single revolutionary party of the proletariat.' The five conditions for unity put forward by the congress 'cover the 21 conditions of the second congress'.

Membership figures in the congress *Materials* gave an increase of 300,000 since the sixth congress. Since Hitler the KPD had fallen to 100,000; China now had more than 400,000; the Spanish CP had grown from 800 at the sixth congress to 20,000; Poland had 17,000, of whom 10,000 were said to be in prison. The membership turnover was very high, amounting in many sections to 50-70 per cent. An examination of 19 sections showed that 64 per cent of central committee members were from the working class; the proportion was higher in European than in Eastern countries. Half of the central committee members had party membership since 1923; 16 per cent had joined after 1929, and 24 per cent in 1931-2.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH COMINTERN
CONGRESS ON THE REPORT OF THE ECCI

1 August 1935

Resolutions and Decisions, p. 5

[The fifth paragraph, omitted here, refers to the YCI. Pieck gave the report for the ECCI. He did not in fact deal with the work of the ECCI at all, nor did he explain why there had been a delay of five years in convening the congress, which under Comintern statutes should have been held in 1930. He referred obliquely to the changes which had taken place in the leadership of the sections. 'In all the communist parties of the large countries, leaderships faithful to our principles have been formed who are able, on the basis of the decisions of our congresses and plenums, to decide the most complex political and tactical questions of their countries independently. This changes the function of the ECCI and enables it to devote the greater part of its activity to working out the fundamental political and tactical positions of the international labour movement.' Leading representatives of the sections should take a more active and permanent share in the work of the ECCI, its presidium and secretariat.

Pieck divided the period since the sixth congress into three phases—up to the economic crisis, the years of crisis, and the later years marked by 'the move among the socialist workers to establish a united front with communism'. He started with a defence of 'class against class' tactics, which, he claimed, had 'strengthened the communist parties' and had not been 'directed against the united front of communists and socialists'. It was only by pursuing these tactics that the KPD had been able 'to create a powerful front of revolutionary class struggle'. But 'these successes' could not conceal the sectarian mistakes that had been made. It was wrong of the KPD to dissociate itself from the social-democratic workers. 'Owing to this defective application of our class against class tactics, and frequently even to the distorted idea that these tactics supposedly precluded the united front', the sections had not made the progress they should have done. Among sectarian mistakes he listed: continuing a strike after the majority of workers had resumed work; failure to secure the consent of the majority before calling a strike; underestimating the importance of the organized workers (as against the unorganized and the unemployed) and of the reformist unions; it was right to destroy the monopolist claims of the trade union bureaucracy, 'but again a sectarian mistake was committed; the revolutionary trade union opposition was transformed into new trade unions and as a result found itself isolated'. In Britain tactics were 'so clumsy and sectarian that the Minority Movement actually fell to pieces'.

Turning to the years of acute economic crisis, Pieck explained that the communists had failed to mobilize the industrial workers for strike struggles because of reformist sabotage; such movements as there were were largely spontaneous, not in response to communist action. The parties had not been prompt enough in changing their tactics 'from the united front from below to a united front with the organizations'. In Germany some communists 'had even spoken of the need to "destroy" the reformist unions'. In the United States the CP had described the AFL as 'a purely capitalist strike-breaking organiza-

tion'. Pieck went on to analyse the mistakes made by the KPD in describing the Brüning Government as a fascist dictatorship while underrating the danger of Hitler's movement. Until bourgeois democracy was replaced by proletarian democracy, 'the proletariat is interested in retaining every scrap of bourgeois democracy' and using it to overthrow capitalism.

The third phase was opened when the workers realized the horrors of Hitlerism and were convinced of the victory of socialism in Russia. The armed struggles in Austria and Spain in 1934 had ended in defeat because they lacked bolshevik leadership. In France 'the fate of the Republic, of democracy, and of the working masses' depended on the progress of the people's front, which had 'produced the greatest change in the international labour movement since the October revolution'. The Chinese revolution, Pieck said, was 'the outstanding event of the whole post-war period'. Since the sixth congress it had taken on a Soviet form, and now provided the first model of a colonial revolution embodying the ideological and State hegemony of the proletariat. The Chinese CP, however, which now numbered 300,000, had not yet succeeded in organizing the industrial proletariat. It was also an event of great importance in the colonial revolution that a communist party had at last been established in India.

In the discussion of Pieck's report, which lasted six days, and in which 60 delegates from 46 countries spoke, Franz, a speaker for the KPD, criticized that party for its failure to 'lay sufficient stress on the struggle for democratic rights and liberties'. This mistake was aggravated by its concentration on fighting the SPD when it should have been fighting the Nazis; but the KPD would still maintain that the SPD 'lent direct assistance to the fascists and paved the way for their accession to power'. After Hitler's accession to power, the KPD leaders 'entertained the view that the SPD had been utterly destroyed and that the ideology of reformism had been fully overcome. Instead of taking account of the new situation, they took a narrow view of the united front and tried to reduce it to the recruiting of members for the communist party.' This also made it impossible for the KPD to exploit the events of 30 June 1934 by approaching 'the disorganized and disillusioned sections of the storm troops'. The KPD was now working much more flexibly and trying to reach agreement with the SPD Executive. Cachin, who gave the membership of the French CP as 71,000, said the CP alone was not strong enough to repulse fascism; it had to have allies, hence the united front. The fascists and Trotskyists had tried to make capital out of Stalin's approval of the French Government's military policy, but this campaign had failed.

An Austrian delegate asserted that many more workers would have joined the Austrian CP but for its attitude to social-democracy and its 'dictatorship of leaders'. It was simply not true that the socialist leaders were traitors, while the workers were revolutionary. The situation was far more complex than that.

Campbell criticized Pieck for his failure to deal with ECCI activities since the sixth congress, and to examine the policies worked out at the various plenary sessions. 'It goes without saying that the ECCI must examine its own work in those seven years in the same objective spirit as it examines the work of the various parties. Of course, there will be no tendencies in this congress which deny that the decisions of these seven years were as a whole correct. . . . But there

is much more than merely arriving at correct decisions. A decision may be correct, but belated.' Other decisions might be correct on the whole, but promote incorrect tendencies which destroyed their essence. He instanced sectarianism in trade union work, which was encouraged by the Strasbourg resolution on strike strategy, and the distortion of the theory of social-fascism. 'Can the Executive really say that the entire responsibility for this rests on the individual parties? Can the Executive really say that in a timely fashion it took the initiative in correcting these tendencies? Our own experience in Britain was that, two years after the Strasbourg resolution was passed, it was being imposed on us in Britain as being fundamentally correct in all particulars and in all its formulations.' The ECCI, in addition to criticizing the parties, should examine how it itself reacted to the question, and whether it corrected the incorrect tendencies in good time. Did the ECCI, when the change was made from united-front-from-below tactics to united-front-from-above-and-below tactics, ensure that the change was made with promptness and vigour? 'At any rate, we raise the question for the congress to discuss. It must be discussed. There can be no question of our passing it over as if it simply does not exist.' It was a pity that the ECCI had allowed the LSI to get in first with a united-front declaration in March 1933, particularly as the LSI move was only a manoeuvre to obstruct the united front. Campbell went on to criticize the Minority Movement, which 'appeared as a body outside the trade unions, dictating to the unions what they had to do'. It was a movement of communist sympathizers, repeating CP slogans and advancing a communist programme. It had 'an apparatus outside the trade union movement and appeared as an alternative apparatus to that of the unions'. The new rank-and-file movement, on the other hand, was growing as part of the unions themselves. Campbell gave CPGB membership as 7,700; of these 600 held trade union office.

Pieck replied that his report had drawn attention to ECCI shortcomings. He welcomed Campbell's criticisms, but they were sometimes off target. The ECCI shared responsibility for shortcomings with the sections, which had not always given adequate support to the Executive. The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth plenums had drawn attention to sectarian tendencies on the trade union question; perhaps the ECCI had not always dealt with them promptly and vigorously enough. He countered the charge that the Strasbourg resolution had been forced on the CPGB by asserting that the ECCI had always given heed to the peculiarity of British conditions. Some speakers, Pieck went on, had shown too much self-satisfaction, and had not explained why, in spite of favourable circumstances, communist influence on the masses was not greater. 'After the armed fighting in October 1934 our comrades in Spain . . . were not able to enlighten the masses as to the mistakes of the social-democratic leaders of the fight, nor to induce large numbers of social-democrats to turn towards communism'.

He dealt with the negotiations between the Second and Third Internationals, and the unpromising replies from the LSI to Comintern proposals. 'Either the Second International is unable to act as an international organization or it is sabotaging the unity of the proletariat.' If the LSI leaders believed that there would once again be a situation favourable to reformism, they were mistaken.

And if it were to happen, it would be a catastrophe for the working class. 'We must all leave this congress clearly realizing that the fate of the proletariat and of all mankind depends on us and on our work.' He repeated what he had said in his earlier speech, that in future the ECCI would concentrate its work on 'questions at the international level'. It would 'refrain from intervening in the internal organizational affairs of the sections. . . . The Executive will, of course, continue to intervene if the work of our sections betrays serious defects.' The congress instructed the ECCI to revise the statutes of the Comintern in accordance with the resolution on the report of the ECCI for submission to the next congress.]

1. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International endorses the political line and practical activity of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

2. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International approves the proposals of the Executive Committee of the Communist International of March 1933, October 1934 and April 1935 to the national sections and the leadership of the Second International for joint action in the struggle against fascism, the offensive of capital and war. Expressing its regret that, to the detriment of the working class, all these proposals were rejected by the Executive Committee of the Second International and by most of its sections, and noting the historic significance of the fact that the social-democratic workers and a number of social-democratic organizations are already struggling hand in hand with the communists against fascism and for the interests of the toiling masses, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International enjoins the Executive Committee of the Communist International and all parties affiliated with the Communist International to strive in the future by every means to establish a united front on a national as well as international scale.

3. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International records the growing revolutionary influence of the work and slogans of the communist parties on the broad masses of the workers including the members of the social-democratic parties. With this as its point of departure, the congress enjoins all sections of the Communist International to overcome, in the shortest time possible, the survivals of sectarian traditions which prevented them from finding a way of approach to the social-democratic workers, and to change the methods of agitation and propaganda which hitherto were at times abstract in character and scarcely reached the masses, by giving these methods absolutely definite direction and linking them to the immediate needs and the day-to-day interests of the masses.

4. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International notes the serious shortcomings in the work of a number of sections of the Communist International—the belated carrying out of the tactics of the

united front, inability to mobilize the masses around partial demands, political as well as economic in character, failure to realize the necessity of struggling in defence of the remnants of bourgeois democracy, failure to realize the necessity of creating an anti-imperialist people's front in the colonial and dependent countries, neglect of work in the reformist and fascist trade unions and mass organizations of the toilers formed by bourgeois parties, underestimation of the importance of work among the toiling women, underestimation of the importance of work among the peasants and the urban petty-bourgeois masses, also the delay with which the Executive Committee gave political assistance to these sections. Taking into consideration the constantly growing importance and responsibility of the communist parties which are called to head the movement of the masses in process of revolutionization, taking into consideration the necessity of concentrating day-to-day leadership within the sections themselves, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International instructs the Executive Committee of the Communist International:

a) While shifting the main stress of its activity to the elaboration of the fundamental political and tactical lines of the world labour movement, to proceed, in deciding any question, from the concrete situation and specific conditions obtaining in each particular country, and as a rule to avoid direct intervention in internal organizational matters of the communist parties;

b) Systematically to assist in the formation and training of cadres and genuinely Bolshevik leaders in the communist parties, so that the parties may be able at sharp turns of events independently and quickly to find, on the basis of the decisions of the congresses of the Communist International and of the Plenums of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, correct solutions for the political and tactical problems of the communist movement;

c) To render effective aid to the communist parties in their ideological struggle against political opponents;

d) To assist the communist parties in making use of their own experience as well as the experience of the world communist movement, avoiding however the mechanical application of the experience of one country to another country and the substitution of stereotyped methods and general formulations for concrete Marxian analysis;

e) To ensure closer contact between the leading bodies of the Communist International and the various sections of the Communist International by still more active participation on the part of authoritative representatives of the most important sections of the Communist International in the day-to-day work of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. . . .

6. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International notes

that during the last few years, under the influence of the victory of socialism in the USSR, of the crisis in the capitalist countries, the fiendishness of German fascism and the danger of a new war, a turn of the broad masses of the workers and the toilers in general from reformism to revolutionary struggle, from disunity and dispersion to the united front, has set in all over the world. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, taking into account the fact that the striving of the toilers for unity of action will continue to grow in the future despite the resistance of individual leaders of social-democracy, instructs all sections of the Communist International, in the process of struggle for the united front of the proletariat and the people's front of all toilers against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the danger of a new war, to focus their attention on the further consolidation of their ranks and the winning over of the majority of the working class to the side of communism.

7. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International points out that the transformation of the maturing political crisis into a victorious proletarian revolution depends solely on the strength and influence of the communist parties among the broad masses of the proletariat, on the energy and self-sacrificing devotion of the communists. Now, when a political crisis is maturing in a number of capitalist countries, it is the most important, the paramount task of the communists not to rest on the successes already achieved but to advance towards new successes, extend the contacts with the working class, gain the confidence of the millions of toilers, transform the various sections of the Communist International into mass parties, bring the majority of the working class under the influence of the communist parties and thus secure the conditions necessary for the victory of the proletarian revolution.

EXTRACTS FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH COMINTERN
CONGRESS ON FASCISM, WORKING-CLASS UNITY, AND THE TASKS
OF THE COMINTERN

20 August 1935

Resolutions and Decisions, p. 11

[Dimitrov made a long speech on the fascist offensive and the tasks of the Comintern. The imperialists, he said, needed fascism in order to shift the entire burden of the economic crisis on to the workers, to enslave the weak nations, intensify colonial exploitation, re-divide the world, forestall the growth of the revolutionary movement, and organize the attack on the Soviet Union. The social-democrats, by their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, had cleared fascism's path to power in Germany, Austria, and Spain. On their side, the communists had underestimated both the fascist danger and the strength of national sentiment. The only condition put forward by the Comintern for united action, nationally and internationally, was that it should be directed

against fascism, the capitalist offensive, war, and the class enemy. Communists would criticize and attack only those who hindered unity of action. In capitalist countries they were 'prepared to defend every inch of bourgeois-democratic liberty'. National and international trade union unity had to be established; the Comintern sections had been talking endlessly about the 'crisis of Amsterdam', the flight of disgusted workers from the unions, etc., but in fact the unions had grown because the workers saw in them the champions of their interests. As examples of correct tactics Dimitrov gave the decision of the CPGB to support the fight for a Labour Government, and the formation by the Brazilian CP of a National Liberation Alliance. In India communists should support all anti-imperialist activities, including those led by the national reformists, and should work in Congress organizations. Communists were prepared to carry their united front policy as far as taking part in a united front or popular front government, on an anti-fascist platform, when the masses were in revolt against fascism though not yet ready for a revolution under communist leadership. Such a government would take over the control of production, disband the police, establish a workers' militia, and give full freedom for communist party activities. There was, however, still a good deal of sectarianism in the parties, reflected in an overestimation of the degree to which the workers were becoming disillusioned in reformism and deserting their traditional leaders. On the other hand, as the united front movement made progress, there was a greater danger of right opportunism. United front tactics did not imply 'a reconciliation with social-democratic ideology and practice'.

The interests of the class struggle demanded a single party of the proletariat in each country, and the communist parties should take the initiative in bringing this about. But political unity, Dimitrov said, was impossible unless the socialists recognized the necessity for the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois rule and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in the form of Soviets, rejected support of the bourgeoisie in time of war, etc.; the united party would have to be constructed on the basis of democratic centralism. 'The bourgeoisie would rather drown the labour movement in a sea of blood than allow the proletariat to establish socialism by peaceful means.' In pursuing these 'reconstructed policies and tactics', the parties did not have to follow a cut-and-dried plan, but in all cases they must find a common language with the masses and end their isolation.

The discussion of Dimitrov's report lasted eight days. Wang Ming dealt with united front tactics in the colonial struggle. In China these tactics pointed the way to the defeat of Japanese imperialism. They had not been applied consistently, because some communists thought 'a union of workers, peasants, soldiers, merchants, and intellectuals' inadmissible. This was not so. The CCP and the Chinese Soviet Government should unite all Chinese parties and armies and people to form an 'All-China United People's Government of National Defence'. All anti-Japanese forces had to be brought in, even if only as temporary, uncertain, and vacillating allies. This was justified by the situation in China and the growth in power of the Chinese Red Army and Soviets. The CCP now had nearly half a million members. 'In order to realize our new, wholly correct tactical line, the CCP . . . will also revise a number of measures in the field of

economic policy which it was forced to carry out in the past. . . . For instance, the policy towards the kulaks will be made more precise. The policy with regard to small landowners who . . . can by no means be considered landed gentry, will be corrected. The fact is that the land of even these petty owners was often confiscated as a result of individual, incorrect instructions of local soviets.' Taxation and trade policy would also be given 'a popular and clearly national character'. In India communists had been guilty of sectarian errors, failing to 'participate in all the mass demonstrations organized by the National Congress and its affiliated organizations'. Since they were not strong enough to organize a mass anti-imperialist movement of their own, this had led to their isolation. In December 1934 they had proposed a united anti-imperialist front with the National Congress, but had made it a condition that it should work for 'a workers' and peasants' Soviet Government in India', 'confiscation of land without compensation', etc. This error had been corrected and in April 1935 the reformist and revolutionary unions had amalgamated, and the CP now had a working agreement with the Congress Socialist Party.

Florin, for the KPD, said the chief question in Germany, if the fascist dictatorship was to be overthrown, was to establish relations with the social-democratic masses and their organizations appropriate to the new conditions. In the past their united front work had been 'attended by grave defects and shortcomings'. They had believed a united front with the SPD to be impossible, and had concentrated, even after Hitler's coming to power, on the propaganda of communist doctrine. The change to a policy of united front and popular front had been made at the beginning of 1935. They had to enter the fascist mass organizations, where they could exercise a decisive influence on the opposition movements, and they would have to combat the social-democratic theory that the fascist regime could be overthrown only in war or with outside help. He spoke of the KPD's mistakes before and after January 1933: 'We thought we could stop the rebuilding of social-democracy.' At the beginning of 1935, 'after a serious and critical examination, we made the change to a united front and popular front policy, and changed our methods'. They were now in favour of one proletarian party, and would form one front with the Catholic and other opposition groups, with anybody willing to fight for democratic liberties.

Walter [Ulbricht], another speaker at the congress for the KPD, said many workers were hypnotized by the power of Hitlerism. 'As the heirs of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel', the KPD stood for enlightenment, progress, and culture. R. P. Dutt (who in May 1935 published an article saying that 'up to the very end the German social-democratic leadership sought to carry through the role of social-fascism to its logical conclusion, and openly offered their services to the Hitler fascist dictatorship') said: 'In our agitation and propaganda we were sometimes inclined to call practically anything outside the communist camp fascist'; this had had serious consequences, and had delayed the adoption of the new united front tactics. But it was still true that communists must fight social-democratic ideology; even those social-democrats who came in to the united front thought the aim of the anti-fascist struggle was the defence of bourgeois democracy, and this difference in the communist and socialist approach would grow deeper as the struggle went on.

Thorez said one factor in the recent successes of the French CP was its 'consistent position on questions of bourgeois democracy' and its utilization of French revolutionary traditions. 'We claim the intellectual and revolutionary heritage of the Encyclopedists who paved the way for the great revolution of 1789 . . . of the Jacobins . . . and the Commune. We present ourselves to the masses of the people as the champions of the liberty and independence of the country.' Soviet power could not be their immediate goal, because only a small minority of the people shared their convictions, but the CPF would support a Popular Front Government and, if necessary, participate in it. In November 1934 and again in May 1935 the CPF had proposed a joint conference with the SFIO to form a single party, but this had not yet been agreed on. In elections they would put forward CP candidates in the first ballot; if there were a second ballot they would reach agreement with the socialists and the radicals on the candidates to be supported.

Pollitt explained the difficulties of establishing a united front in Britain, where the Labour Party and the TUC replied that they *were* the united front of the working class. In an indirect plea for the withdrawal of communist candidates at elections, he said that the CPGB must make proposals 'that will take out of the hands of the labour leaders the weapons which they now use to prevent united action'. Dutt (CPGB) and Browder (USA) spoke of the growing danger of fascism in their countries. (In the 1935 general election, the CPGB put forward two candidates—one was returned—and for the rest supported the Labour candidates. In most cases it was 'regarded as a victory' if communist offers of help were accepted. The help was given individually, not as an organized communist group. The CPGB application for affiliation to the Labour Party, in November 1935, was rejected.)

Manuilsky said that capitalism would never be able to give the masses their pre-1914 standard of living. 'The American worker is sinking to the level of the majority of the European workers, as the bolsheviks foresaw. The colonial workers are not becoming decolonized . . . the European white worker is sinking more and more to the level of the colonial coolie.'

Replying to the discussion, Dimitrov claimed that it had shown complete ideological and political solidarity and genuine enthusiasm for the new Comintern line. Was social-democracy still the main bulwark of the bourgeoisie? Its position was now changing; the labour aristocracy were questioning the policy of class collaboration, while in a number of countries the bourgeoisie were abandoning bourgeois democracy. The events of the last few years were in some cases making it difficult, if not impossible, for social-democracy to maintain its former role as bulwark of the bourgeoisie. It was by their attitude to the united front that social-democratic parties could be divided. The choice now was not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism. This marked the change from the period of capitalist stabilization, and it was in failing to recognize this change that the KPD had erred.]

I. FASCISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

1. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares that the alignment of class forces in the international arena and the tasks facing the labour movement of the world are determined by the following basic changes in the world situation:

(a) The final and irrevocable victory of Socialism in the Land of the Soviets. . . .

(b) The most profound economic crisis in the history of capitalism. . . . Despite a growth of industrial production in a number of countries and an increase in the profits of the financial magnates, the world bourgeoisie has not succeeded on the whole either in emerging from the crisis and the depression, or in retarding the further accentuation of the contradictions of capitalism. . . .

(c) The offensive of fascism, the advent to power of the fascists in Germany, the growth of the threat of a new imperialist world war and of an attack on the USSR, by means of which the capitalist world is seeking a way out of the impasse of its contradictions.

(d) The political crisis, expressed in the armed struggle of the workers in Austria and Spain against the fascists, a struggle which has not yet led to the victory of the proletariat over fascism, but which prevented the bourgeoisie from consolidating its fascist dictatorship; the powerful anti-fascist movement in France, which began with the February demonstration and the general strike of the proletariat in 1934.

(e) The revolutionization of the toiling masses throughout the whole capitalist world which is taking place under the influence of the victory of socialism in the USSR and of the world economic crisis, also on the basis of the lessons derived from the temporary defeat of the proletariat in the central part of Europe—in Germany, as well as in Austria and Spain—that is, in countries where the majority of the organized workers supported social-democratic parties. A powerful urge for unity of action is growing in the ranks of the international working class. The revolutionary movement in the colonial countries and the Soviet revolution in China are extending. The relation of class forces on a world scale is changing more and more in the direction of a growth of the forces of revolution.

In this situation, the ruling bourgeoisie is increasingly seeking salvation in fascism, in the establishment of the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist and the most imperialist elements of finance capital, with the aim of putting into effect extraordinary measures for despoiling the toilers, of preparing a predatory, imperialist war, of attacking the USSR, enslaving and dividing up China, and, on the basis of all this, preventing revolution. Finance capital is striving to curb the indignation of the petty-bourgeois masses against capitalism

through the medium of its fascist agents who demagogically adapt their slogans to the moods of these sections of the population. Fascism is thus setting up for itself a mass basis and, by directing these sections as a reactionary force against the working class, leads to the still greater enslavement of all the toilers by finance capital. . . .

2. The most reactionary variety of fascism is the German type of fascism which brazenly calls itself National-Socialism though it has absolutely nothing in common either with socialism or with the defence of the real national interests of the German people, and merely fulfils the role of lackey of the big bourgeoisie and constitutes not only bourgeois nationalism but also bestial chauvinism.

Fascist Germany is plainly showing to the whole world what the masses of the people may expect where fascism is victorious. The raging fascist government is annihilating the flower of the working class, its leaders and organizers, in jails and concentration camps. It has destroyed the trade unions, the co-operative societies, all legal organizations of the workers as well as all other non-fascist political and cultural organizations. It has deprived the workers of the elementary right to defend their interests. It has converted a cultured country into a hotbed of obscurantism, barbarity and war. German fascism is the main instigator of a new imperialist war and comes forward as the shock troop of international counter-revolution.

3. In emphasizing the growth of the threat of fascism in all capitalist countries, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International warns against any underestimation of the fascist danger. The congress also rejects the fatalistic views regarding the inevitability of the victory of fascism. These views are basically incorrect and can only give rise to passivity and weaken the mass struggle against fascism. . . .

4. The victory of fascism is insecure. In spite of the formidable difficulties that fascist dictatorship creates for the working class movement, the foundations of bourgeois domination are being further shaken under the rule of the fascists. The internal conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie are becoming especially acute. The legalistic illusions of the masses are being shattered. The revolutionary hatred of the workers is accumulating. The baseness and falsity of the social demagogy of fascism is revealing itself more and more. Fascism not only did not bring the masses the improvement in their material conditions which they had been promised, but has brought about a further increase in the profits of the capitalists by lowering the living standard of the toiling masses, has intensified their exploitation by a handful of financial magnates. . . . The congress, however, warns against the dangerous illusions about an automatic collapse of the fascist dictatorship, and points out that only the united revolutionary struggle of the working class at the head of all the toilers will bring about the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

5. . . . Although the united front movement is as yet only in the initial stage of its development, the communists and social-democratic workers of France, fighting side by side, succeeded in beating off the first attacks of fascism, thereby exerting a mobilizing influence on the united front movement internationally. The joint armed struggle of the social-democratic and communist workers in Austria and Spain not only set an heroic example to the toilers of other countries, but also demonstrated that a successful struggle against fascism would have been fully possible but for the sabotage of the right and wavering of the 'left' social-democratic leaders (in Spain there must be added the open treachery of the majority of the anarcho-syndicalist leaders), whose influence over the masses deprived the proletariat of determined revolutionary leadership and of clarity in the aims of the struggle.

6. The bankruptcy of the leading party of the Second International, of German Social-Democracy, which by its entire policy facilitated the victory of fascism, also the failure of 'left' reformist social-democracy in Austria, which drew the broad masses away from the struggle even when the inevitable armed clash with fascism was drawing close, have tremendously increased the disillusionment of the social-democratic workers in the policy of the social-democratic parties. The Second International is undergoing a profound crisis. Within the social-democratic parties and the whole Second International a process of differentiation into two main camps is taking place—side by side with the existing camp of the reactionary elements who are trying to continue the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, there is being formed a camp of elements who are becoming revolutionized, elements who declare for the establishment of the united proletarian front and are adopting more and more the position of the revolutionary class struggle.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International welcomes the aspiration of the social-democratic workers to establish a united front with the communists, regarding this as a sign that their class consciousness is growing, and that a beginning has been made toward overcoming the split in the ranks of the working class in the interests of a successful struggle against fascism, against the bourgeoisie.

II. THE UNITED FRONT OF THE WORKING CLASS AGAINST FASCISM

In face of the towering menace of fascism to the working class and all the gains it has made, to all toilers and their elementary rights, to the peace and liberty of the peoples, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares that at the present historic stage it is the main and immediate task of the international labour movement to establish the united fighting front of the working class. For a successful struggle against

the offensive of capital, against the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie, against fascism, the bitterest enemy of all the toilers, who, without distinction of political views, have been deprived of all rights and liberties, it is imperative that unity of action be established between all sections of the working class, irrespective of what organization they belong to, even before the majority of the working class unites on a common fighting platform for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolution. But it is precisely for this very reason that this task makes it the duty of the communist parties to take into consideration the changed circumstances and to apply the united front tactics in a new manner, by seeking to reach agreements with the organizations of the toilers of various political trends for joint action on a factory, local, district, national and international scale.

With this as its point of departure, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International enjoins the communist parties to be guided by the following instructions when carrying out the united front tactics:

1. The defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defence of the latter against fascism, must be the starting point and form the main content of the workers' united front in all capitalist countries. . . .

While preparing the working class for rapid shifts in the forms and methods of struggle as circumstances change, it is necessary to organize, in proportion as the movement grows, the transition from the defensive to the offensive against capital, steering toward the organization of a mass political strike, in which it is indispensable that the participation of the principal trade unions of the country should be secured.

2. Without for a moment giving up their independent work in the sphere of communist education, organization and mobilization of the masses, the communists, in order to render the road to unity of action easier for the workers, must strive to secure joint action with the social-democratic parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers against the class enemies of the proletariat, on the basis of short or long-term agreements. At the same time, attention must be directed mainly to the development of mass action in the various localities, conducted by the lower organizations through local agreements.

Loyally fulfilling the conditions of the agreements, the communists must promptly expose any sabotage of joint action by persons or organizations participating in the united front, and if the agreement is broken, must immediately appeal to the masses while continuing their tireless struggle for the restoration of the disrupted unity of action.

3. The forms in which the united proletarian front is realized, which depend on the condition and character of the labour organizations and on the concrete situation, must be varied in character. . . .

In order to develop the united front movement as the cause of the masses themselves, communists must strive to secure the establishment of elective (or, in the countries under fascist dictatorship, selected from the most authoritative participants in the movement) non-party class organs of the united front in the factories, among the unemployed, in the working-class districts, among the petty townsfolk, and in the villages. Only such bodies (which, of course, should not supplant the organizations participating in the united front) will be able to bring into the united front movement also the vast *unorganized mass* of toilers, will be able to assist in developing the initiative of the masses in the struggle against the offensive of capital and against fascism, and on this basis help to create a large body of working-class united front activists.

4. Wherever the social-democratic leaders, in their efforts to deflect the workers from the struggle in defence of their everyday interests and in order to frustrate the united front, put forward widely advertised 'socialist' projects (the de Man plan, etc.), the demagogic nature of such projects must be exposed, and the toilers must be shown the impossibility of bringing about socialism so long as power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, however, some of the measures put forward in these projects that can be linked up with the vital demands of the toilers should be utilized as the starting point for developing a mass united front struggle jointly with the social-democratic workers. . . .

5. Joint action with the social-democratic parties and organizations not only does not preclude, but, on the contrary, renders still more necessary the serious and well-founded criticism of reformism, of social-democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and the patient exposition of the principles and programme of communism to the social-democratic workers.

While revealing to the masses the meaning of the demagogic arguments advanced by the right social-democratic leaders against the united front, while intensifying the struggle against the reactionary section of social-democracy, the communists must establish the closest co-operation with those left social-democratic workers, functionaries and organizations that fight against the reformist policy and advocate a united front with the communist party. The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of social-democracy, which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of social-democracy which is becoming revolutionized. And the self-determination [crystallization] of the various elements within the left camp will take place the sooner, the more resolutely the communists fight for a united front with the social-democratic parties.

The attitude to the practical realization of the united front will be the chief indication of the true position of the various groups among the social-

democrats. In the fight for the practical realization of the united front, those social-democratic leaders who come forward as lefts in words will be obliged to show by deeds whether they are really ready to fight the bourgeoisie and the right social-democrats, or are on the side of the bourgeoisie, that is, against the cause of the working class.

6. Election campaigns must be utilized for the further development and strengthening of the united fighting front of the proletariat. While coming forward independently in the elections and unfolding the programme of the communist party before the masses, the communists must seek to establish a united front with the social-democratic parties and the trade unions (also with the organizations of the toiling peasants, handicraftsmen, etc.), and exert every effort to prevent the election of reactionary and fascist candidates. In face of fascist danger, the communists, while reserving for themselves freedom of political agitation and criticism may, in election campaigns, declare for a common platform and a common ticket with the anti-fascist front, depending on the growth and success of the united front movement, and on the electoral system in operation.

7. In striving to unite, under the leadership of the proletariat, the struggle of the toiling peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities, the communists must seek to bring about the establishment of a wide anti-fascist people's front on the basis of the proletarian united front, supporting all those specific demands of these sections of the toilers which are in line with the fundamental interests of the proletariat. It is particularly important to mobilize the toiling peasants against the fascist policy of robbing the basic masses of the peasantry. . . . While working everywhere among the urban petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia as well as among the office workers, the communists must rouse these sections against increasing taxation and the high cost of living, against their spoliation by monopoly capital, by the trusts, against the thralldom of interest payments, and against dismissals and reductions in salary of government and municipal employees. While defending the interests and rights of the progressive intellectuals, it is necessary to give them every support in their movement against cultural reaction, and to facilitate their going over to the side of the working class in the struggle against fascism.

8. In the circumstances of a political crisis, when the ruling classes are no longer in a position to cope with the powerful sweep of the mass movement, the communists must advance fundamental revolutionary slogans (such as, for instance, control of production and the banks, disbandment of the police force and its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc.), which are directed toward still further shaking the economic and political power of the bourgeoisie and increasing the strength of the working class, toward isolating the parties of compromise, and which lead the

working masses right up to the point of the revolutionary seizure of power. If with such an upsurge of the mass movement it will prove possible, and necessary in the interests of the proletariat, to create a proletarian united front government, or an anti-fascist people's front government, which is not yet a government of the proletarian dictatorship, but one which undertakes to put into effect decisive measures against fascism and reaction, the communist party must see to it that such a government is formed. The following situation is an essential prerequisite for the formation of a united front government: (a) when the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie is seriously paralysed so that the bourgeoisie is not in a condition to prevent formation of such a government; (b) when vast masses of the toilers vehemently take action against fascism and reaction, but are not yet ready to rise and fight for Soviet power; (c) when already a considerable proportion of the organizations of the social-democratic and other parties participating in the united front demand ruthless measures against the fascists and other reactionaries, and are ready to fight together with the communists for the carrying out of these measures.

In so far as the united front government will really undertake decisive measures against the counter-revolutionary financial magnates and their fascist agents, and will in no way restrict the activity of the community [communist] party and the struggle of the working class, the communist party will support such a government in every way. The participation of the communists in a united front government will be decided separately in each particular case, as the concrete situation may warrant.

III. THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Emphasizing the special importance of forming a united front in the sphere of the economic struggle of the workers and the establishment of the unity of the trade union movement as a most important step in consolidating the united front of the proletariat, the Congress makes it a duty of the communists to adopt all practical measures for the realization of the unity of the trade unions by industries and on a national scale.

The communists are decidedly for the re-establishment of trade union unity in each country and on an international scale; for united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism; for one trade union in each industry; for one trade union centre in each country; for one international federation of trade unions organized according to industries; for one international of trade unions based on the class struggle.

In countries where small Red trade unions exist, efforts must be made to secure their admission into the big reformist trade unions, with demands put forward for the right to defend their views and the reinstatement of

expelled members. In countries where big Red and reformist trade unions exist side by side, efforts must be made to secure their amalgamation on an equal footing, on the basis of a platform of struggle against the offensive of capital and a guarantee of trade union democracy.

It is the duty of communists to work actively in the reformist and united trade unions, to consolidate them and to recruit the unorganized workers for them, and at the same time exert every effort to have these organizations actually defend the interests of the workers and really become genuine class organizations. To this end the communists must strive to secure the support of the entire membership, of the officials, and of the organizations as a whole.

It is the duty of the communists to defend the trade unions against all attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie and fascism to restrict their rights or to destroy them. . . .

IV. TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS IN THE INDIVIDUAL SECTORS OF THE ANTI-FASCIST MOVEMENT

1. The Congress calls particular attention to the necessity of carrying on a systematic ideological struggle against fascism. In view of the fact that the chief, the most dangerous form of fascist ideology is chauvinism, it must be made plain to the masses that the fascist bourgeoisie uses the pretext of defending the national interests to carry out its sordid class policy of oppressing and exploiting its own peoples as well as robbing and enslaving other peoples. They must be shown that the working class, which fights against every form of servitude and national oppression, is the only genuine protagonist of national freedom and the independence of the people. The communists must in every way combat the fascist falsification of the history of the people, and do everything to enlighten the toiling masses on the past of their own people in an historically correct fashion, in the true spirit of Lenin and Stalin, so as to link up their present struggle with the revolutionary traditions of the past. The Congress warns against adopting a disparaging attitude on the question of national independence and the national sentiments of the broad masses of the people, an attitude which renders it easier for fascism to develop its chauvinist campaigns (the Saar, the German regions in Czechoslovakia, etc.), and insists on a correct and concrete application of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy.

While communists are irreconcilable opponents, on principle, of bourgeois nationalism of every variety, they are by no means supporters of national nihilism, of an attitude of unconcern for the fate of their own people.

2. Communists must enter all fascist mass organizations which have a monopoly of legal existence in the given country, and must make use of

even the smallest legal or semi-legal opportunity of working in them, in order to counterpose the interests of the masses in these organizations to the policy of fascism, and to undermine the mass basis of the latter. . . .

7. The communists must take the initiative in establishing anti-fascist mass defence corps against the attacks of the fascist bands, recruiting these corps from reliable, tested elements of the united front movement.

V. THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE COLONIAL COUNTRIES

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the most important task facing the communists consists in working to establish an anti-imperialist people's front. For this purpose it is necessary to draw the widest masses into the national liberation movement against growing imperialist exploitation, against cruel enslavement, for the driving out of the imperialists, for the independence of the country; to take an active part in the mass anti-imperialist movements headed by the national reformists and strive to bring about joint action with the national-revolutionary and national-reformist organizations on the basis of a definite anti-imperialist platform. . . .

In the interests of its own struggle for emancipation, the proletariat of the imperialist countries must give its unstinted support to the liberation struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples against the imperialist pirates.

VI. THE STRENGTHENING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE POLITICAL UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

The Congress emphasizes with particular stress that only the further all-round consolidation of the communist parties themselves, the development of their initiative, the carrying out of a policy based on Marxist-Leninist principles, and the application of correct flexible tactics, which take into account the concrete situation and the alignment of class forces, can ensure the mobilization of the widest masses of toilers for the united struggle against fascism, against capitalism.

In order that the united front may be really brought about, the communists must overcome the self-satisfied sectarianism in their own ranks which in our day is, in a number of cases, no longer an 'infantile disorder' of the communist movement but an ingrained vice. By overestimating the degree of revolutionization of the masses, by creating the illusion that the path had already been blocked in the way of fascism while the fascist movement was continuing to grow, this sectarianism actually fostered passivity in relation to fascism. In practice it replaced the methods of

leading masses by the methods of leading a narrow party group, substituted abstract propaganda and left doctrinairism for a mass policy, refusing to work in the reformist trade unions and fascist mass organizations, and adopting stereotyped tactics and slogans for all countries without taking account of the special features of the concrete situation in each particular country. This sectarianism to a great extent retarded the growth of the communist parties, made it difficult for a genuine mass policy to be carried out and hindered these parties in making use of the difficulties of the class enemy to strengthen the revolutionary movement, hindered the cause of winning over the wide masses of the proletariat to the side of the communist parties.

While carrying on a most energetic struggle to root out all vestiges of sectarianism, which at the present moment is a most serious obstacle to the pursuing of a real mass, Bolshevik policy by the communist parties, the communists must increase their vigilance in guarding against the danger of right opportunism, and must carry on a determined struggle against all its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the right danger will grow as the tactics of the united front are widely applied. The struggle for the establishment of the united front, of the unity of action of the working class, gives rise to the necessity that the social-democratic workers be convinced by object lessons of the correctness of the communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and charges every communist party to wage an irreconcilable struggle against any tendency to gloss over the differences in principle between communism and reformism, against weakening the criticism of social-democracy as the ideology and practice of [class] collaboration with the bourgeoisie, against the illusion that it is possible to bring about socialism by peaceful, legal methods, against any reliance on *automatism* or *spontaneity*, whether in the liquidation of fascism or in the realization of the united front, against belittling the role of the party and against the slightest *vacillation at the moment of decisive action*.

Holding that the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and the success of the proletarian revolution make it imperative that a single mass political party of the working class exist in each country, the Congress sets the communist parties the task of taking the initiative in bringing about this unity, relying on the growing desire of the workers to unite the social-democratic parties or individual organizations with the communist parties. At the same time it must be explained to the workers without fail that such unity is possible only on certain conditions: on condition of complete independence from the bourgeoisie and the complete severance of the bloc between social-democracy and the bourgeoisie, on the condition that unity of action be first brought about, that the necessity of the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of

the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets be recognized, that support of one's own bourgeoisie in imperialist war be rejected, and that the party be constructed on the basis of democratic centralism which ensures unity of will and action and has been tested by the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.

At the same time it is necessary to act resolutely against the attempts of the 'left' social-democratic demagogues to utilize the disillusionment among the social-democratic workers to form new socialist parties and a new 'International,' which are directed against the communist movement and thus widen the split in the working class.

Considering that unity of action is an urgent necessity and the surest way to bring about the political unity of the proletariat, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International declares in the name of all Sections of the Communist International that they are ready to begin immediate negotiations with the corresponding parties of the Second International for the establishment of unity of action of the working class against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialist war, and likewise declares that the Communist International is prepared to enter into negotiations with the Second International directed to this end.

VII. FOR SOVIET POWER!

In the struggle to defend against fascism the bourgeois-democratic liberties and the gains of the toilers, in the struggle to overthrow fascist dictatorship, the revolutionary proletariat prepares its forces, strengthens its fighting contacts with its allies and directs the struggle toward the goal of achieving real democracy of the toilers—Soviet power.

The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the rallying of the world proletariat around it, and the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the turn toward revolutionary class struggle which has set in among the social-democratic workers and the workers organized in the reformist trade unions, the increasing mass resistance to fascism and the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, the decline of the Second International and the growth of the Communist International, are all accelerating and will continue to accelerate the development of the world socialist revolution.

The capitalist world is entering a period of sharp clashes as a result of the accentuation of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism.

Steering a course in the direction of this perspective of the revolutionary development, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International calls on the communist parties to display the greatest political activity and daring, to carry on a tireless struggle to bring about unity of action by the working class. The establishment of the united front of the working class

is the decisive link in the preparation of the toilers for the forthcoming great battles of the second round of proletarian revolutions. Only the welding of the proletariat into a single mass political army will ensure its victory in the struggle against fascism and the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets. 'The victory of revolution never comes by itself. It has to be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory.' (Stalin.)

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH COMINTERN
CONGRESS ON THE DANGER OF A NEW WORLD WAR

20 August 1935

Resolutions and Decisions, p. 35

[Ercoli (Togliatti) introduced the resolution. War against the USSR, he said, had been prepared for 1930-1, 'by some big imperialist Powers, not without the benevolent aid of some of the leaders of international social-democracy'; the reason why it had not broken out was that the Comintern had sounded the alarm and a large number of workers had responded. The war danger now was much greater, and to fight it required tactical changes by the Comintern. 'We do not have to withdraw a single word of our condemnation of the Versailles treaty. But at the present moment . . . it is our duty to face squarely the new situation confronting the proletariat. . . . This is still not understood by everyone, especially by certain groups of pacifists, for whom the struggle against Versailles becomes at times a pretext for closing their eyes to the aggressive policy and war provocation of German national-socialism.' The three fundamental facts in the international situation were the growing power of the USSR, Japanese aggression in the Far East, and the fascist drive in Germany. As a result, relations between the USSR and capitalist States had entered a new phase; Soviet policy had deterred the Japanese; the Comintern would concentrate all its forces against German fascism. Every concession to fascism brought war nearer. There was a group of capitalist States 'which for the most part have preserved a parliamentary regime and which are more or less interested in the preservation of peace. . . . This is one more argument, and by no means a secondary one, for those who ask us why we put the defence of bourgeois-democratic liberties at the centre of our united front and people's front policy.' The United States had no immediate aims of conquest—on the contrary, it was worried by Japanese action; France was 'intelligent enough' to see the threat to its security, but Britain had repeatedly supported national-socialism in order to help Germany prepare for war against the USSR. The Red Army was an instrument of peace because its officers were working class, whereas in other armies they represented reactionary circles and cliques. 'Will not the miners from the Ruhr . . . will not the unfortunate workers in the textile factories of Japan recognize in Comrade Voroshilov and in the other leaders of the Red Army

their class brothers and comrades in arms?', when the time came for 'the historically determined inevitability of the attack of the imperialists against the socialist State'.

The League of Nations, said Togliatti, could be used to postpone the outbreak of war (in the discussion on Pieck's report to the congress, Campbell had said: 'We know that, in a number of individual sections, there was hesitation and confusion for a time on this question of the USSR joining the League of Nations and of the signing of the mutual-assistance pacts'). The USSR had always taken account of the contradictions between capitalist States, which offered the possibility of combining the permanent peace policy of the Soviet Union with the temporary peace policy of other States, as in the mutual-aid pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. 'On this account we are surprised that anyone could find it strange that the conclusion of the mutual aid pact with France was accompanied by a declaration of Comrade Stalin in which he expressed "complete understanding and approval of the policy of national defence pursued by France for maintaining its armed forces at the level corresponding to the needs of its security" .' Even from the theoretical point of view 'the possibility under certain conditions of concluding an agreement envisaging military collaboration between the workers' State and a capitalist State is not open to doubt'. The USSR would do everything to avoid having to face 'a consolidated bloc of capitalist countries'. He criticized those parties which tried to take over pacifist organizations and give them a communist character. The theses of the sixth congress urging young workers not to join voluntary associations for military training were no longer appropriate. 'In the present circumstances it would be a mistake not to join such organizations in all countries in which they have assumed a mass character.' It was also necessary 'to correct the mistake of some communist parties which have adopted decisions for boycotting defence against air attack'. They should demand the best gas-masks, free, for the working population, and protest against shelters for the wealthy only.

Shortly before the congress, Bela Kun wrote that in capitalist countries allied with Russia and at war with other capitalist countries the communists must preserve their class independence: 'the proletariat cannot conclude the usual social-democratic civil peace with the ruling classes. . . . The workers do not boycott the war. They participate in the war. They do not simply "disintegrate" the army which is fighting together with the Red Army of the Soviet Union against the common enemy, but they struggle to win over this army.' They should fight for democratic control over the commanding officers to prevent sabotage, but the only reliable guarantee was the seizure of power by the proletariat.

Marty explained why from the very start the French political bureau favoured the Franco-Soviet mutual-assistance pact, and referred to Lenin's exploitation of contradictions in the imperialist camp. The pact was attacked only by renegades, and by certain French capitalist groups and their fascist agents. The communist deputies had voted against the war credits because they did not trust the French Government to put the pact into operation. Kuusinen spoke of the work of the communist youth leagues in a number of countries. Knorin welcomed the LSI decision of May 1935 urging the mobilization of

world public opinion against Hitler, advocating collective security, and co-operation between the European democracies and the USSR; this, he said, would promote agreement on joint communist-socialist action against war. In an article published at this time Bela Kun explained that many pacifist and religious bodies were now joining in the struggle against fascism, hence against war, and this required a new approach by communists to pacifists; the parties should co-operate with all those prepared to take part in mass action against war. If war should break out, 'the Comintern has from the very outset adhered to the point of view that in a war against the Soviet State the proletariat of the capitalist countries engaged in war against the land of the Soviets must aim not merely at the defeat of their own government, but at the victory of the Soviet Government'. 'The interests of the defence of the USSR,' Manuilsky wrote, 'determine the basic line of the world proletariat in relation to war.']

I. THE PREPARATION OF WAR FOR A NEW REPARTITION OF THE WORLD

The world economic crisis and the shattering of capitalist stabilization have given rise to the extreme instability of all international relations. The intensified struggle on the world market, which has shrunk extremely as a result of the economic crisis, has passed into fierce economic war. A new repartition of the world has in fact already begun.

Japanese imperialism, waging war in the Far East, has already made a start toward a new repartition of the world. The military occupation of Manchuria and North China signifies the virtual annulment of the Washington Treaties which regulated the division of the spheres of influence among the imperialist powers in China and their mutual relations in the Pacific. Japan's rapacious expedition is already leading to the weakening of the influence of British and American imperialism in China, is menacing the position of Great Britain and the USA in the Pacific, and is preparing for a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

All that is left of the Versailles Treaty is state frontiers and the distribution of mandates for colonies. The liquidation of the Versailles Treaty took place as a result of the stoppage of reparation payments, the re-establishment of universal conscription by the Hitler government as well as the conclusion of a naval agreement between Britain and Germany.

Being the chief instigators of war, the German fascists, who strive for the hegemony of German imperialism in Europe, raise the question of changing the boundaries of Europe at the expense of their neighbours by means of war. The adventurist plans of the German fascists are very far-reaching and count on a war of revenge against France, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic states, which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union, and the wresting of the Soviet Ukraine from the USSR.

They are demanding colonies and are endeavouring to stir up sentiment in favour of a world war for a new repartition of the world. All these intrigues of the reckless inciters of war help to intensify the contradictions between the capitalist states and create disturbance throughout Europe.

German imperialism has found an ally in Europe—fascist Poland, which is also striving to extend its territory at the expense of Czechoslovakia, the Baltic countries and the Soviet Union.

The dominant circles of the British bourgeoisie support the German armaments in order to weaken the hegemony of France on the European continent, to turn the spearhead of German armaments from the West to the East and to direct Germany's aggressiveness against the Soviet Union. By this policy Great Britain is striving to set up a counterbalance to the United States on a world-wide scale and, simultaneously, to strengthen the anti-Soviet tendencies not only of Germany but also of Japan and Poland. This policy of British imperialism is one of the factors accelerating the outbreak of a world imperialist war.

Italian imperialism is directly proceeding to the seizure of Abyssinia, thus creating new tension in the relations between the great imperialist powers.

The main contradiction in the camp of the imperialists is the Anglo-American antagonism which exerts its influence on all the contradictions in world politics. In South America, where the hostile interests of Great Britain and the United States clash most sharply, this antagonism led to wars between the respective South American vassals of these powers (between Bolivia and Paraguay, Colombia and Peru), and threatens further armed conflicts in South and Central America (Colombia and Venezuela).

At a time when particularly the fascist states—Germany, Poland, Hungary, Italy—are openly striving for a new repartition of the world and a change in the frontiers of Europe, there is a tendency among a number of other countries to maintain the *status quo*. At the present time this tendency is represented on a world scale by the United States; in Europe, primarily by France; the efforts of these two leading imperialist powers to maintain the *status quo* are supported by several smaller countries (the Little and Balkan Ententes, some of the Baltic states), whose independence is threatened by a new imperialist war.

The victory of German National-Socialism, the most reactionary, the most aggressive form of fascism, and its war provocations have spurred on the war parties, which represent the most reactionary and chauvinist elements of the bourgeoisie, to fight in all countries more vigorously for power and to intensify the fascization of the state apparatus.

The frantic arming of fascist Germany, especially the restoration of military conscription and the enormous increase of the navy and air fleet in Germany, have given rise to a new, intensified race for armaments

throughout the capitalist world. Despite the world economic crisis, the war industry flourishes more than ever before. The countries which have gone farthest in preparing for war (Germany, Japan, Italy, Poland) have already placed their national economy on a war footing. Alongside the regular armies, special fascist detachments are trained to safeguard the rear and to do gendarme service at the front. Pre-conscription training is widespread in all capitalist countries, and even includes juveniles. Education and propaganda in the spirit of chauvinism and racial demagoguery are encouraged in every way, their cost being defrayed by the government.

Although the acuteness of the imperialist contradictions renders the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc difficult at the present moment, the fascist governments and war parties in the capitalist countries endeavour to solve these contradictions at the expense of the fatherland of all the toilers, at the expense of the Soviet Union. The danger of the outbreak of a new imperialist war daily threatens humanity.

II. THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

On the basis of the rapid rise of socialist industry and agriculture, on the basis of the liquidation of the last capitalist class, the kulaks, on the basis of the final victory of socialism over capitalism and the strengthening of the defensive power of the country resulting therefrom, the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries have entered a new phase.

The basic contradiction, that between the socialist and the capitalist world, has become still more acute. But due to its growing might, the Soviet Union has been able to avert the attack that was already prepared by the imperialist powers and their vassals, and to unfold its consistent policy of peace directed against all instigators of war. This has made the Soviet Union the centre of attraction not only for class-conscious workers but for all the toiling people in the capitalist and colonial countries who strive for peace. Moreover, the peace policy of the USSR has not only upset the plans of the imperialists to isolate the Soviet Union, but has laid the basis for its co-operation in the cause of the preservation of peace with the small states to whom war represents a special danger, by placing their independence in jeopardy, as well as with those governments which at the present moment are interested in the preservation of peace.

The peace policy of the USSR, putting forward proletarian internationalism as against national and racial dissension, is not only directed towards the defence of the Land of the Soviets, towards ensuring the safety of socialist construction; it also protects the lives of the workers of all countries, the lives of all the oppressed and exploited; it means the defence

of the national independence of small nations, it serves the vital interests of humanity, it defends culture from the barbarities of war. . . .

III. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

On the basis of the teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin on war, the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International concretely formulated the tasks of the communist parties and the revolutionary proletariat in the struggle against imperialist war. Guided by these principles, the Communist Parties of Japan and China, both directly affected by war, have waged and are waging a Bolshevik struggle against imperialist war and for the defence of the Chinese people. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, confirming the decisions of the Sixth Congress on the struggle against imperialist war, sets the following main tasks before the communist parties, the revolutionary workers, toilers, peasants and oppressed peoples of the whole world:

1. *The struggle for peace and for the defence of the USSR.* In face of the war provocations of the German fascists and Japanese militarists, and the speeding up of armaments by the war parties in the capitalist countries, in face of the immediate danger of a counter-revolutionary war breaking out against the Soviet Union, the central slogan of the communist parties must be: struggle for peace.

2. *The united people's front in the struggle for peace and against the instigators of war.* The struggle for peace opens up before the communist parties the greatest opportunities for creating the broadest united front. All those interested in the preservation of peace should be drawn into this united front. The concentration of forces against the chief instigators of war at any given moment (at the present time—against fascist Germany, and against Poland and Japan which are in league with it) constitutes a most important tactical task of the communist parties. It is of especially great importance for the Communist Party of Germany to expose the national demagoguery of Hitler fascism, which screens itself behind phrases about the unification of the German people but in fact leads to the isolation of the German people and to a new war catastrophe. The overthrow of Hitler fascism is an indispensable condition and prerequisite for the unification of the German people. The establishment of a united front with social-democratic and reformist organizations (party, trade union, co-operative, sports, and cultural and educational organizations) and with the bulk of their members, also with mass national liberation, religious-democratic and pacifist organizations and their adherents, is of decisive importance for the struggle against war and its fascist instigators in all countries.

The formation of a united front with social-democratic and reformist

organizations for the struggle for peace necessitates a determined ideological struggle against the reactionary elements within the social-democratic parties which, in face of the immediate danger of war, proceed to collaborate even more closely with the bourgeoisie for the defence of the bourgeois fatherland, and by their campaigns of slander against the Soviet Union directly aid the preparations for an anti-Soviet war. It necessitates close collaboration with those forces in the social-democratic parties, reformist trade unions and other mass labour organizations whose position is approaching ever closer to that of revolutionary struggle against imperialist war.

The drawing of pacifist organizations and their adherents into the united front of struggle for peace acquires great importance in mobilizing the petty-bourgeois masses, progressive intellectuals, women and youth against war. While constantly subjecting the erroneous views of sincere pacifists to constructive criticism, and vigorously combating those pacifists who by their policy screen the preparations of the German fascists for imperialist war (the leadership of the Labour Party in Great Britain, etc.), the communists must invite the collaboration of all pacifist organizations that are prepared to go with them even if only part of the way towards a genuine struggle against imperialist wars.

The communists must support the Amsterdam-Pleyel anti-war and anti-fascist movement by active collaboration with it and help to extend it.

3. *The combination of the struggle against imperialist war with the struggle against fascism.* The anti-war struggle of the masses striving to preserve peace must be very closely combined with the struggle against fascism and the fascist movement. It is necessary to conduct not only general propaganda for peace, but primarily propaganda directed against the chief instigators of war, against the fascist and other imperialist war parties, and against concrete measures of preparation for imperialist war.

4. *The struggle against militarism and armaments.* The communist parties of all capitalist countries must fight: against military expenditures (war budgets), for the recall of military forces from the colonies and mandated territories, against militarization measures taken by capitalist governments, especially the militarization of the youth, women and the unemployed, against emergency decrees restricting bourgeois-democratic liberties with the aim of preparing for war, against restricting the rights of workers employed in war industry plants, against subsidizing the war industry and against trading in or transporting arms. The struggle against war preparation measures can be conducted only in closest connection with the defence of the economic interests and political rights of the workers, office employees, toiling peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie.

5. *The struggle against chauvinism.* In the struggle against chauvinism the task of the communists consists in educating the workers and the whole of the toiling population in the spirit of proletarian internationalism,

which can be accomplished only in the struggle against the exploiters and oppressors for the vital class interests of the proletariat, as well as in the struggle against the bestial chauvinism of the national-socialist parties and all other fascist parties. At the same time the communists must show that the working class carries on a consistent struggle in defence of the national freedom and independence of all the people against any oppression or exploitation, because only the communist policy defends to the very end the national freedom and independence of the people of one's country.

6. *The national liberation struggle and the support of wars of national liberation.* If any weak state is attacked by one or more big imperialist powers which want to destroy its national independence and national unity or to dismember it, as in the historic instance of the partition of Poland, a war conducted by the national bourgeoisie of such a country to repel this attack may assume the character of a war of liberation, in which the working class and the communists of that country cannot abstain from intervening. It is the task of the communists of such a country, while carrying on an irreconcilable struggle to safeguard the economic and political positions of the workers, toiling peasants and national minorities, to be, at the same time, in the front ranks of the fighters for national independence and to fight the war of liberation to a finish, without allowing 'their' bourgeoisie to strike a bargain with the attacking powers to the prejudice of the interests of their country.

It is the duty of the communists actively to support the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially the Red Army of the Chinese Soviets, in their struggle against the Japanese and other imperialists and the Kuomintang. The Communist Party of China must exert every effort to extend the front of the struggle for national liberation and to draw into it all the national forces that are ready to repulse the robber campaign of the Japanese and other imperialists.

IV. FROM THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE TO THE STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTION

The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International most determinedly repudiates the slanderous contention that communists desire war, expecting it to bring revolution. . . .

The communists, while fighting also against the illusion that war can be eliminated while the capitalist system still exists, are exerting and will exert every effort to prevent war. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into

civil war against the fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism. . . .

At the present historical juncture, when on one-sixth part of the globe the Soviet Union defends socialism and peace for all humanity, the most vital interests of the workers and toilers of all countries demand that in pursuing the policy of the working class, in waging the struggle for peace, the struggle against imperialist war before and after the outbreak of hostilities, the defence of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount.

If the commencement of a counter-revolutionary war forces the Soviet Union to set the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army in motion for the defence of socialism, the communists will call upon all toilers to work, with all the means at their disposal and at any price, for the victory of the Red Army over the armies of the imperialists.

TELEGRAM FROM THE ECCI TO THE LSI SECRETARIAT ON
THE DANGER OF WAR IN ABYSSINIA

23 September 1935

Rundschau, iv, 57, p. 2165, 26 August 1935*

[A further telegram followed on 7 October, after the outbreak of hostilities in Abyssinia, complaining that no reply had yet been received. 'The fact that there was not immediate joint action by both Internationals undoubtedly encouraged the fascist instigators of war to open hostilities. Now that so much time has been lost, it is all the more your duty and ours at the present moment to get hostilities brought to an end and to prevent the extension of the war to other parts of the world. Every further delay in establishing unity of action in the struggle against the war that has begun would be fatal. Whoever, in this grave hour, still refuses or delays to bring together all the forces of the working class and of all working people, or to exert every effort to get Italian hostilities against Abyssinia brought to an end, to prevent the war spreading to other parts of the world and not to become the prelude to a new world slaughter, will bear historical responsibility before the world proletariat.' Britain was said to be 'arming for war against Italy for the possession of Abyssinia'; Germany would take advantage of the war to attack Lithuania, Japan would exploit the opportunity to intensify aggressive action against China and Russia, the League of Nations was once again being condemned to impotence. The only hope of salvation from war lay in the hands of the international proletariat, and Comintern sections were instructed 'to proceed at once to organize mighty actions of all working people against the war'.]

Comrades! War in Abyssinia may break out at any moment. The German fascists are only waiting for this moment to attack weak Lithuania and occupy Memel. Such warlike measures by Italian and German

* *sic*. The previous number of *Rundschau* is dated 25 September, the subsequent number 2 October. The pagination is regular. Elsewhere the date of this telegram is given as 25 September.

fascism would have unforeseeable consequences. They might lead to world war.

The seventh Comintern congress instructed the Comintern Executive to approach the LSI leaders with a proposal to establish an international united front of proletarian action. We know that your Executive has decided to examine thoroughly the decisions of the seventh CI congress before coming to a decision on the question of united action. To give you the opportunity to do so, we would have waited before submitting concrete proposals to you and opening negotiations for this purpose. But the international situation is so tense, the danger of imperialist war so close and threatening, that not a single hour should be lost.

At their last consultations the LSI and IFTU decided on a number of measures against the threatening war. The Comintern welcomes your decision. But everything so far done, from your side and ours, is inadequate in view of the greatness of the danger. The efforts of the two Internationals to maintain peace must be united. The two should proceed jointly, and jointly frustrate the fascist instigators of war.

Joint action by the two Internationals will mobilize the working class and carry with them all the forces for peace in other classes of the population. It would rally entire peoples to the struggle for peace. It would launch such a mighty world movement against war that the League of Nations would be forced to act effectively against aggression by Italian and German fascism. It is still not too late to avert the threatening catastrophe towards which the fascist criminals are driving mankind. Tomorrow it may no longer be possible.

We therefore suggest immediate negotiations between representatives of the two Internationals on the best possible means of carrying out jointly the measures proposed by your International and ours to maintain peace. For this purpose the ECCI appoints as its representatives Comrades Cachin and Thorez, of France, Comrade Pollitt from England, and Comrade Sverma from Czechoslovakia.

We request an early reply.

With greetings,

For the ECCI

Dimitrov, General Secretary.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI STATEMENT ON THE ATTITUDE
TAKEN BY THE LSI EXECUTIVE

5 November 1935

Rundschau, iv, 63, p. 2523, 7 November 1935

[The two ECCI telegrams were considered by the LSI on 12 October. The five parties which objected were those from Britain, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and Denmark; the proposal was rejected unanimously, with one

abstention; individual parties were reminded that they were free to make their own decisions; the LSI, together with the IFTU, had made their own plans concerning the war. This, wrote Gottwald, 'would encourage all fascist war-mongers to start their bloody adventures'. He expressed surprise that communist overtures for a united front should be regarded with suspicion. Thorez, in an article on the proposal for negotiations, referred to the LSI as 'our socialist comrades'. The political bureau of the French CP, meeting on 3 October 1935, 'expressed itself in favour of the application by the League of Nations of the Covenant against Italy'. Peace, it said, could be saved if France, Britain, and Russia united their efforts.

Before the war started, Radek wrote that the French would not object to Italian action in Abyssinia because they hoped to win Italy as an ally against Germany; Britain objected because it feared the results at home if it yielded, and wished to preserve the prestige of the League of Nations, through which it hoped to act as mediator between France and Germany. Moreover, an Italian advance in Africa would threaten the British position in Egypt, the Sudan, and the Red Sea. After the outbreak of war, Dutt wrote that this had happened because Britain and France 'consistently furthered the fascist offensive and did everything to obstruct and weaken a genuine world front for peace'. Britain had been in favour of German rearmament, and by its naval agreement with Germany had broken the Stresa front. Only when it realized that the Italian plans threatened its empire did Britain show opposition. Manuilsky dealt with the Soviet attitude to sanctions against Italy in his report to the Moscow and Leningrad communist organizations on the seventh Comintern congress. The LSI and IFTU, he said, wanted members of the League of Nations to impose sanctions. 'Can they guarantee that all the States belonging to the League will apply such sanctions to Italy . . . without deceit? Of course not. But all the reactionary elements of social-democracy demand of the proletarian State that it should apply sanctions first and foremost.' If the Soviet Union were the only country to apply sanctions honestly, 'who would gain from this? The capitalist States. Who would lose from this? Not Italy, but the USSR. In actual fact the boycott would be turned not against fascist Italy but against the USSR.' The IFTU and LSI demand for the closure of the Suez Canal 'follows the line of the interests of British imperialism. . . . Will it not be better therefore if the communists transfer the main might of their activity to the independent action of the masses under the slogan of "not a single train, not a single ship for the support of the Italian war in Abyssinia".' Padmore wrote later that a number of Negro members of the American Communist Party resigned in protest against the sale of oil to Italy by the USSR. Togliatti wrote that the Comintern supported the use of economic sanctions, but the demand for military sanctions was wrong. 'It would lead to the working class being towed along in the wake of British imperialism, which is preparing for war against Italy under the pretext of military sanctions.' The British bourgeoisie were also anxious to undermine the French position in the League of Nations, as part of their preparations, in conjunction with Germany, to isolate the USSR.]

On 25 September 1935 the ECCI made a proposal to the LSI for united

action in the struggle against the attack by Italian fascism on the Abyssinian people. On 7 October, when war had already become a fact, Comrade Dimitrov, general secretary of the Comintern, repeated this proposal on its behalf.

At its meeting on 12 October in Brussels, the LSI Executive decided to reply to the Comintern proposal in the negative. In view of this decision, the ECCI declares:

First, the LSI Executive decision will cause deep disappointment among all workers, who cherished the hope that after the decisions of the seventh Comintern congress, which did everything possible to establish unity of action of the international proletariat, the Comintern's united front proposal would be accepted. Although the majority of the social-democratic party representatives at the LSI Executive meeting voted in favour of accepting the Comintern's proposal, it was rejected at the categorical request of five parties. . . . At the meeting of the LSI Executive these people did what the reactionary bourgeoisie wanted of the social-democratic leaders who are seeking ministerial posts. In order to keep the confidence of the bourgeoisie, they sacrificed the interests of the working class and of the struggle for peace.

Second, we leave it to the international proletariat to judge the attitude of these people who at the moment when war is flaming in Abyssinia, when Japanese imperialism is reinforcing its military aggression in China, and when the danger of a world war is growing greater, obstruct the establishment of united action by the two Internationals and so pour water on the mills of the instigators of war in the different countries. Under the pressure of the leaders of these five social-democratic parties, the LSI Executive has for the third time rejected the Comintern's proposals for united action, and so gives the most reactionary and warmongering elements of the bourgeoisie a free hand. . . . By yielding to the reactionary aspirations of the representatives of the five parties the LSI Executive, without even one word of condemnation for their attitude, which splits the working class and is profoundly inimical to its interests, placed these reactionary efforts to maintain the alliance with the bourgeoisie above the vital interests of the international labour movement.

Third, since the LSI Executive in its resolution mentions that at a joint conference with representatives of the IFTU on 1 October 'a number of measures were agreed upon for a successful struggle against the Italian fascist attack on Abyssinia and against the danger of war in Europe', the ECCI is regretfully compelled to state that, judging from the information it has received from the LSI Executive, these measures amount to no more than empty assurances of support for the peace policy of the League of Nations and some demands and desires (referring largely to sanctions) addressed to the League. This exclusive concentration

on action by the League of Nations at bottom reflects the desire of the English Labour Party leaders to direct the international labour movement along lines consistent with the foreign policy of the imperialist English Government. But it would be madness to believe that the League of Nations will do everything necessary to guarantee peace and that consequently the masses of the people can remain in a state of passive waiting. It should not be forgotten that within the League of Nations the conflicting interests of the imperialist Powers make it extremely difficult to use the League as a factor for peace. Up till now the League of Nations has taken no serious step to safeguard peace; within the League, however, a few imperialist Powers are trying to reach agreement about partitioning Abyssinia. But even if the League is regarded as a factor which to some degree is in a position to prevent the outbreak of war, that does not mean that the policy of the League can replace the struggle of the proletariat. On the contrary, it is precisely independent and united mass action of the workers and of all honest adherents of peace which is necessary to move the League of Nations to take effective action against the war danger.

Fourth, the ECCI notes with satisfaction that the number of representatives of social-democratic parties who spoke out in favour of accepting the Comintern's proposal increased in comparison with earlier sessions of the LSI Executive, which is an undoubted success for the idea of proletarian unity. The ECCI trusts that those social-democratic parties whose representatives at the LSI were in favour of united proletarian action will without delay act in their own countries to establish or to strengthen the united front, the more so as the LSI Executive decision left it to the social-democratic parties 'to decide for themselves whether they wish to undertake joint action with the communist party of their respective country'. For its part the ECCI instructs communists to do everything in their power to facilitate the achievement of this urgent task. . . .

In accordance with the decisions of its seventh world congress, the Comintern proclaims its readiness to enter at any moment into negotiations for united action. The ECCI calls on all communist parties to multiply tenfold their efforts in the fight for a united front and to establish the closest collaboration with all adherents of the united front in the ranks of the LSI for the common struggle against fascism, imperialist war, and the capitalist offensive. Long live the great cause of international proletarian unity.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MESSAGE TO THE EIGHTH
CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

January 1936

Rundschau, v, 4, p. 167, 23 January 1936

[On 27 July 1934 seven representatives of the SFIO and five representatives of the CPF signed a pact on unity of action against fascism and war, and for the defence of democratic liberties. 'The persistent efforts of our party', wrote Berlioz, 'are at last crowned with success' (although in April the CPF had been congratulated for having resisted the pressure for top-level negotiations with the socialists). The two parties undertook to refrain from mutual criticism during joint actions, but to maintain full independence in other respects. A commission was to be set up to settle conflicts. The *Communist International* wrote in September 1934 that the socialist leaders might have agreed to the pact, which involved many concessions on the communist side, only in order to frighten the bourgeoisie 'and so prepare for a renewal of class collaboration in conditions more favourable to their party'. The pact nevertheless was 'a positive factor'. It did not imply organizational unity, which presupposed unity 'on the basis of the programme and tactics of the Comintern'. Independently of the pact, the CPF would continue an open struggle for its programme, and for the proletarian dictatorship, and would 'endeavour to organize independent mass actions'. The article went on to criticize the French socialist press, which 'alleged that the agreement reached between the two parties signifies that the CPF and the Comintern have adopted new tactics, namely, tactics of collaboration with the socialist party. Is this true? No, it is not true.' The change had been in the sentiments of the socialist workers who had seen that in some countries the bourgeoisie, instead of using social-democracy, had thrown it aside; in most countries social-democracy was still splitting the working class in order to establish unity with the bourgeoisie. In November 1934 the CPF proposed a unity conference with the SFIO, and this was repeated in March and May of the following year, the platform suggested by the CPF including defence of the Soviet Union in all circumstances and by all means, the transformation of imperialist into civil war, proletarian dictatorship on the basis of Soviets, etc.

In March 1935 Thorez introduced the term 'popular front' to cover agreements with the Radical Party; success in the fight against fascism required an alliance (under communist leadership) with the middle classes. A government which took action against fascism would receive communist support, but participation in the government was 'out of the question. There can be no participation whatever in such a government within the bounds of capitalism.'

A joint socialist-communist committee was set up in July 1935 to discuss proposals for unification. At the seventh Comintern congress (where Dimitrov said that the actions of the French CP 'helped to prepare the decisions of our congress'), Thorez said that the CPF was prepared to take part in a popular front government, since its immediate goal was not revolution and proletarian dictatorship, but the defeat of fascism. The entire credit for the united front, he said, was due to the CPF, which had been anxious to establish it since 1922; now the SFIO and CGT had been forced to come in.

Negotiations between the two trade union federations began in October 1934; the CGT proposed that the CGTU should be dissolved, and its members join the appropriate CGT unions; this was resisted. Discussing the negotiations, Piatnitsky wrote in the *Communist International* in November 1934 that it was a matter of practical politics not to insist on the affiliation of an eventually united trade union federation to a political party. In the CGTU the communists had made recognition of CPF leadership part of their platform, and this had given the opposition in the CGTU (led by Chambellon and his committee of 22) the pretext for their campaign for trade union independence. Had insistence on recognition of CP leadership been dropped, the opposition could have been fought more successfully. But the communists would continue to have their fractions.

Talks were resumed in January 1935, when the CGT insisted on the dissolution of communist trade union fractions, and were again broken off. Benoît Frachon went to Moscow to discuss the question of fractions, and on 7 June the CGTU executive published a statement that 'Freedom of opinion and the exercise of trade union democratic rights should not entail the formation of bodies which act as fractions within the unions'. Negotiations were resumed on 27 June, and the two bodies agreed on a joint demonstration on 14 July. The main demonstration on that day was led by Daladier, Blum, and Thorez. The two trade unions federations met independently on 24 September, and then at a joint session which agreed on amalgamation, with proportional representation on the leading committees; a conference to discuss the constitution and programme of the new federation would be held in January 1936; meanwhile a mixed commission would settle questions in dispute. Approximate membership at the time was CGT, 800,000; CGTU, 300,000. In March 1936 the two federations met jointly at Toulouse, and decided to affiliate to the IFTU and to remain independent of any political party. The communist proposal to affiliate to both the IFTU and the RILU, to facilitate unity at the international level, was rejected by a majority of more than two to one.

At the congress, which was said to represent a membership of nearly 100,000, Thorez said the CPF did not think that 'in modern society there are only two forces confronting each other, two big armies, the army of the bourgeoisie and the socialist army'. This would be a simplified view of things. In January 1936 the popular front election programme—summed up in the slogan 'Pour une France forte, libre, et heureuse'—was published, and Thorez struck a patriotic note: 'The united front, the people's front, the feeling of attachment to our country, the true unification of France—all these questions, already old or still quite new, had to be explained and interpreted by the central committee. . . . We boldly deprived our enemies of the things they had stolen from us and trampled underfoot. We took back the Marseillaise and the tricolour.']

The international proletariat places a high value on your great successes in the fight against fascism and reaction. These successes are the well-deserved fruits of your initiative, persistence, and devoted struggle to strengthen the proletarian united front, to establish trade union unity on

the basis of class struggle, and to rally the broadest masses of working people into one powerful popular front.

The Communist International values the successes you have achieved, which are of great international significance, the more highly as they have given a practical demonstration to the proletariat of other capitalist countries that, by mobilizing the forces of the working class and the working people, it is possible to fight successfully against fascism.

It is indisputable that your influence is growing, that your links with the working people have been strengthened, that tens of thousands of new fighters are streaming into the communist party, the vanguard of the heroic French proletariat.

But, in measuring your successes, you are right to look not only backwards, along the road already traversed, but also forward to the tremendous work which you have still to do. You are behaving as true revolutionaries, working in the spirit of the seventh Comintern congress, when you refuse to cherish illusions because of successes already won, when you carefully avoid any dizziness from success, when you coolly recognize that the French proletariat needs at its head a still stronger and still more effective party. . . .

In this present hour the French Communist party occupies a responsible post in the international labour movement, one of the most important sectors of the struggle against fascism, reaction, and war, the struggle for bread, peace, and freedom, for socialism. . . .

We do not doubt that the correct bolshevik decisions of your congress will come up to the expectations and hopes of the masses, and will help to establish the complete unity of the working class and contribute to the final victory over capitalism.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCI MAY DAY MANIFESTO

April 1936

Rundschau, v, 20, p. 793, 30 *April 1936*

[Dimitrov wrote (in the *Communist International* in May 1936) that it was a mistake to think the approaching war would be directed in the first place against Russia. In Europe it would be directed against France, Belgium, Austria, and Poland, and in the Far East against China, Australia, and the Philippines. There was no point in quoting Lenin on 1914 and saying that all governments were equally culpable and the plea of national defence inadmissible; the situation had changed. In addition to Russia there were other countries whose independence was threatened and who were therefore anxious to maintain peace. The danger could be averted by an international united front. The greatest obstacle to this, said an anonymous writer in the same issue, was right-wing resistance in the LSI and IFTU.

In the French elections of May 1936 the CPF withdrew a number of its

candidates in the second round, in agreement with the socialists and radicals, and the results gave a majority of 381 (out of 618) to the popular front coalition. Communist representation was increased from 10 to 72 deputies; the votes rising from 800,000 to 1.5 million. The central committee announced that 'it would co-operate loyally and closely with the Government', and assured 'the future Government of its complete and unstinting support' on the popular front programme. It would not enter the Government, for this might serve the reactionaries as an excuse to reinforce their attacks and frighten the radicals; the Government would then be a minority government 'doomed to impotence'.

The resolution of the Spanish political bureau of February 1935 consisted largely of a series of questions which it hoped would be discussed at the seventh Comintern congress. Why, since the socialist party was bankrupt, had the CP not established better relations with the socialist left-wing; why had it been so unsuccessful in attracting anarchists, despite the counter-revolutionary actions of the anarchist leaders; why had the CP not had more success in establishing trade union unity; what prevented the spread of communist influence in the Basque and Catalan national movements; what Spanish parties were fascists; how could it be demonstrated that the socialists were 'the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie'; what precisely was the counter-revolutionary part played by renegade groups such as the Trotskyists, and how could they be exposed.

At the seventh Comintern congress Ventura said the Spanish CP had at first distrusted the Workers' Alliance because it was dominated by the socialists, but after October 1934 it had made contact with the socialist party and trade unions. The party had made progress, but had not yet been able to convince the masses that it was the best leader of the working class, nor had it learned how to use language 'that would not hurt the feelings of the socialist and anarchist masses'. Its greatest weakness was the rigidity of its united front tactics, as shown particularly in the 1933 elections. Reversing all previous statements, Ventura said: 'Behind Largo Caballero stands everything that is healthy and revolutionary in the socialist party', although unfortunately he still could not see the need for a broad united front that would overcome the resistance of the socialist right wing. 'On behalf of my party I say to Largo Caballero and his friends that we are ready to co-operate in creating a united front . . . to go on to the creation of a single revolutionary party of the proletariat to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and set up a workers and peasants government. . . . We say the same to our anarchist comrades.'

Negotiations on future amalgamation were being conducted with the UGT (socialist unions) and between the socialist and communist youth organizations; at the end of 1935 the UGT allowed the few and small unions controlled by the CP to affiliate, but they were not represented on the UGT Executive.

In the February 1936 elections in Spain the popular front coalition won 278 seats (of which 16 were held by communists), which gave them a majority against the right wing parties organized as the national front. The popular front did not include the anarchists, but received the anarchist vote. The Spanish CP claimed at this time a membership of 35,000, but is said to have been closer to 10,000. Azana, as prime minister of a republican-liberal Government relying on popular front support, proclaimed an amnesty for all political

prisoners, and dismissed General Franco (who had been active in the suppression of the Asturias rising) as Chief of Staff.

The communist programme for Spain after the election included distribution of land to the peasants, which would bring them over to the workers' side; the use of Church treasures to provide funds for the needy; satisfaction of the national demands of the Catalonians and Basques, and a single trade union federation. In Catalonia the communists and socialists amalgamated into one party, the PSUC, which joined the Comintern.

The ECCI presidium, meeting in May 1936, heard a report from Hernandez (editor of the main Spanish communist newspaper), who said the CP was loyally supporting the Government, and working for closer relations with the anarchists. They were trying to attract unorganized workers into the unions, and were making 'all-round and careful preparations to merge with the socialist party . . . the decisive condition for the successful fulfilment of the great tasks confronting the proletariat and masses of Spain'. The party had proclaimed its opposition to the destruction of churches. The ECCI endorsed the policy of the Spanish CP.

The Soviet pact with Czechoslovakia caused confusion in the Czech CP. On 27 November 1935 *Rude Pravo* urged the communist deputies to vote the new and larger military budget because of the pact and the need to defend the republic against fascism; Gottwald replied that the existing Czech Government could not be trusted to do either; Kopecki attributed this and other mistakes to 'agents of the enemy' who had infiltrated the editorial board, and the editor-in-chief was expelled. Lenski wrote (April 1936) that the Polish CP had been penetrated by Pilsudski's agents. 'The plan of the Pilsudski clique was to gain possession of the CP organizationally and politically, to drive it to a position of national communism, to create a political current in it hostile to the Comintern, and at the right moment, in the event of war, to stab it in the back.' The plan had been frustrated, but the provocateurs had done much harm; prominent among them were Wojewodzki, Zarski, and Sochacki; some of Pilsudski's agents and spies had gone to Russia as emigrés and 'defiled the ranks of the CPSU' (Sochacki had been arrested in Moscow and shot in 1932). On the other hand, 'the sectarian attitude of superciliousness towards national sentiments helped the enemies of the people for a long time to present the CP as a force which was alien to the Polish people'.

After the entry of German troops into the Rhineland, Pollitt asked why Germany, Italy, and Japan were able to create such a menace to world peace. 'Without the slightest hesitation we declare that it is because of the policy of the National Government.' Within a few days of its coming to power Japan had marched into Manchuria, and Britain had prevented the League of Nations from taking action; the National Government had encouraged Mussolini in his African adventure; Germany was rearming 'with the loans, arms, tanks, aeroplanes, and political assistance given by the National Government'; this was done because it hoped German arms would be used against Russia; indirectly the Labour Party leaders were helping Hitler by opposing a united front.

The fourth KPD conference (the first since January 1933, sometimes referred to later as the thirteenth congress), met from 3 to 15 October 1935 (ostensibly

in Brussels, actually in Moscow). About thirty-five people were present, including Pieck, Ulbricht, Florin, and Dahlem. The first two emerged as leaders of the KPD, supplanting Thaelmann's followers. Togliatti attended for the ECCI; he said the ECCI sub-commission and secretariat had discussed the German situation in January 1935, when the majority of the KPD political bureau were following an incorrect line, and the ECCI supported the minority. There was too much self-satisfaction in the KPD; the transition to illegality had been costly; it had lost the majority of its old cadres; before Hitler they had 200,000 members: 'If only now we had even one-fifth or one-sixth of that number.' Its main mistakes had been to underestimate fascism, the failure to make a real effort for a united front with the SPD and ADGB, and beyond them to Brüning's supporters. The KPD's slogans must be the annulment of Versailles, the unification of all Germans not by war but voluntarily, the abolition of the Polish Corridor. Pieck said there would be no attempt by the KPD to use the united front for recruiting, or as an opportunity to expose the SPD leaders. All opponents of Hitler must be brought into the anti-fascist popular front, with the slogan 'freedom, peace, bread'. Even after January 1933 the KPD had not understood this, and had rejected SPD unity overtures; it should have directed its main blow against the Nazis, and fought to defend democratic liberties; it had learnt from the Austrian and French experience. He referred to the resolution of the ECCI political secretariat of 27 October 1934 condemning KPD policy; in December the KPD political bureau was called in for consultation, and on 19 January 1935 the ECCI secretariat had instructed the KPD to approach the SPD *Vorstand* and to work for the restoration of the ADGB unions and the formation of a popular front.

Florin said the basic mistake of KPD tactics was to present the united front as unity within the ranks of the KPD; for this the party leaders were particularly to blame (Neumann and Remmele were again singled out for special condemnation—they had not been invited to the conference). The conference adopted a resolution welcoming the new tactical orientation of the seventh congress, and undertaking to find new roads for winning the masses. Although the KPD would continue to criticize social-democracy as an ideology, the central committee would leave nothing untried to reach agreement with the SPD *Vorstand*. The working class should have only one party, but that party could fulfil its function only by recognizing the need for the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship in the form of Soviets. On 23 November two KPD representatives met two representatives of the SPD in Prague, but their talks led to no result, the SPD arguing that for them democracy was a goal, not a tactical manoeuvre.

In Paris Münzenberg took steps to create a 'popular front' among German emigrés; the initial meeting, on 2 February 1936, had an attendance of 118, including Heinrich Mann, Ernst Toller, Emil Ludwig, and Leon Feuchtwanger; the SPD was represented by Breitscheid and Grzesinski; the SAP was also represented. The committee elected at the meeting had Mann as its chairman; the political bureau of the KPD moved from Prague to Paris.

In Indochina, where the CP held its first congress in 1935, the move towards a popular front was made in the summer of 1936; until then it was said to have

been making 'unnecessary demands' to other groups. In July it invited other groups to collaborate on a programme of equal rights, universal suffrage, lower taxes, the expansion of education, etc. In India the National Congress was now said (in an article by Dutt and Bradley in *Rundschau*) to have 'fulfilled a great task in uniting broad popular forces for the national struggle'; it was 'the most important mass organization' seeking national emancipation, and it was urged to accept the collective affiliation of the CP, as the Kuomintang had done in the 1920's.

A marked feature of the campaign to establish a popular front was the 'appeal to intellectuals', most successful in France, the United States, and Britain, to join in the 'fight against barbarous fascism'. As part of the movement in the United States, the communist party ceased its attacks on the NAACP and disbanded its own 'League of Struggle for Negro Rights'; the Profintern also liquidated its international trade union committee of Negro workers, and the League Against Imperialism was allowed to fade from the picture. In line with Soviet approval of French defence policy, as expressed in the communiqué issued by the two Governments after Laval's visit to Moscow in May 1935, the French CP ceased its public support of the Arab nationalists of North Africa. In July 1935 an 'international congress in defence of culture' was held in Paris; reporting on this at the seventh Comintern congress, Gopner (USSR) made a strong appeal for communist work among intellectuals, who were said to be suffering particularly from fascism as well as from the economic crisis. 'Our task of winning back the intellectuals was made more difficult because we used to ignore the country's past and the special characteristics its history had produced.' As outward symptoms of recognition of 'the country's past', Vaillant-Couturier, then editor of *L'Humanité*, appeared at meetings wearing his war medals; on 4 July 1935 the *New York Daily Worker* carried portraits of Lenin and George Washington side by side; the *New Masses*, a communist literary periodical, ran a competition for the best essay on the theme 'I like America'; and 'The Star Spangled Banner' was played at CP meetings. 'To make our party a party of human beings who live and laugh just as everybody else does still remains a task before us.']

May Day, the day when the revolutionary forces of the international proletariat march in review, must this year demonstrate in strength the unity of the working class and the masses of the people of all countries in defending peace against the warmongers.

Peace is in the greatest danger.

In the West peace is threatened by German fascism which, having sent its troops into the Rhineland and advanced them close to the French frontier, has conjured up an immediate danger of war for France and Belgium, is preparing to annihilate Czechoslovakia as an independent State, to incorporate Austria, to occupy Memel and Lithuania in an attempt to entangle Poland on its side in war, and to create a territorial basis for its attack on the great land of Soviets.

In the East the fascist militarist camarilla of Japan is occupying one

province of China after another, with the aim of subduing all the peoples of Asia, and of annexing the Philippines and Australia, while it gets ready for the decisive contest with the United States and Great Britain for hegemony in the Pacific and directly threatens the Soviet frontiers.

These chief instigators of war, German fascism and the Japanese military camarilla, who support each other's aggressive plans, are out to drag all the countries of the earth into a devastating war.

The magnates of finance capital are trying to save capitalism by setting up dictatorships of the most reactionary, most militaristic elements of the bourgeoisie, the fascists. Where fascism has consolidated its power by bloody terror and put the working people of its country in chains, it is seeking frantically to escape from growing internal difficulties, seeking to save itself from the indignation of the people which is beginning to spring up, by military aggression against other nations which it openly threatens with national subjugation. The fascist rulers may at any moment plunge humanity into the bottomless catastrophe of a new world slaughter. For fascism the maintenance of peace is a deadly danger. Fascism is the enemy of peace. Fascism means wars of conquest. Whoever wants to fight for peace must fight against fascism.

Working people in town and country! All friends of peace! It is not too late to bar the road to the warmongers. Peace can be saved if the masses everywhere, thirsting for peace, pool their immense forces at once for the fight to maintain peace, the fight against the fascist warmongers. The creation of the broadest mass front for maintaining peace is now the central task of the international proletariat and of all friends of peace. This task can be accomplished. If the danger of war is great, so too are the forces which can be brought into action against it.

Anger and readiness to fight against the capitalist offensive, against reaction and fascist violence, are growing steadily among the proletariat, the peasantry, and the working people of the capitalist countries. . . .

Today the situation is not what it was in 1914. Now it is not only the working class, the peasantry, and all working people who are resolved to maintain peace, but also the oppressed countries and the weak nations whose independence is threatened by war. The Soviet Union, the invincible fortress of the world proletariat and the oppressed of all countries, is the focal point of all the forces fighting for peace. In the present phase a number of capitalist States are also concerned to maintain peace. Hence the possibility of creating a broad front of the working class, of all working people, and of entire nations against the danger of imperialist war. It will depend upon the extent to which this world front comes into being and is effective whether the fascist and imperialist warmongers are able in the near future to light the flames of a new imperialist war or whether their criminal hands will be chopped off by the axe of a powerful anti-war front.

Workers! Do not allow yourselves to be persuaded by those reformist leaders and sham pacifists who, on various pretexts, are trying to keep the masses back from independent struggle against the war danger. Do not believe that measures taken by the League of Nations can replace the independent struggle of the masses to maintain peace. The incompatibility of interests among the self-seeking imperialist Powers belonging to the League makes it extremely difficult for that body to take effective steps against aggressors. That was strikingly demonstrated in regard to the application of sanctions against Italian fascism when it fell upon the Abyssinian people; it was demonstrated again in the attitude of the League of Nations to the recent provocation by Hitler fascism. Had the international proletariat acted as one, by strikes and other means, not a single ship or railway truck would have reached or left Italy, and Italian fascism would have been unable to carry on its rotten war in Abyssinia. . . .

The working masses of France and Spain have given the peoples of other capitalist countries a splendid example of how the people's front can successfully bar the road to fascism. In the same way, in the international field, must the front to defend peace be established, which will be able to frustrate the war plans of the fascists.

The agreements on joint action concluded between the communist and socialist parties in France, Spain, Italy, and Austria, the unification of the trade unions in France, and the coming unification of the Spanish unions—all these are great steps on the road of eliminating the split in the ranks of the international proletariat. But the further progress of the united front of the international labour movement comes up against the continuing resistance of reactionary leaders in the Labour and Socialist International and of a few social-democratic parties. To overcome this resistance is the task of the entire working class, above all of the social-democratic workers themselves, and it is a task which cannot be delayed.

On May Day the Communist International appeals to all workers, whatever their convictions and party allegiance, to all social-democratic parties, trade unions, co-operatives, to all workers' organizations, to unite their forces with the communist parties and organizations, with the Communist International, so that they can fight together against the capitalist offensive and fascism, and block the path of the fascist instigators of war. Despite all obstacles and difficulties, the proletariat must proceed, united and resolute, to carry through one international policy in the interests of maintaining peace.

The Communist International calls on the millions of peasants, the labouring intelligentsia, and all sincere friends of peace, to march hand in hand with the proletariat. . . .

Look at the great Soviet country where the proletariat led by the bolshevik party, the party of Lenin-Stalin, has won a final and irreversible

victory for socialism. . . . While fascist reactionaries and barbarians, in fear of the people, abolish the last vestiges of democracy, in the Soviet land true democracy for the working masses is flourishing. The Soviet regime is the most stable, most popular, and most democratic which mankind has ever known. . . . The Soviet land is a great fraternal union of peoples. Surrounded by the love and care of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the working people of all countries, a menace to the aggressors, the invincible Red Army of workers and peasants stands guard over peace and socialism. . . .

Workers and peasants of all countries! Follow the road taken by the workers of the Soviet Union.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE NINETEENTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1936

Rundschau, v, 49, p. 1985, 5 *November 1936*

[There does not appear to have been a Comintern statement on the outbreak of the Spanish civil war in July 1936. Stalin's letter of 4 October 1936 to Diaz, the secretary of the Spanish CP, is quoted in the present manifesto. The Comintern did send a number of its more prominent personnel to that country (these included, at different times, Tito, Gerö, Togliatti, Vidale, Codovilla, Duclos), and the Soviet Government sent a number of political, military, and police advisers. The new left-republican Spanish Government formed on 19 July was supported by the socialists, anarchists, and communists. In September, on Giral's resignation as premier, Caballero agreed to take over the Government if the communists would join it; the Spanish CP central committee, afraid of being compromised by the Government's actions, refused, but the ECCI approved of Caballero's conditions and two communists joined the Government as Ministers of Education and of Agriculture. With the arrival of Soviet military aid in October, the CP became much more influential; direction of the local communists was taken over by the Soviet and Comintern emissaries, who ran their own police force with its own prisons, investigators, and executioners, pushed through the appointment of political commissars in the army, and organized recruitment in other countries for the International Brigades. The initial detachments of the Brigades were composed largely of communists from a number of countries who had taken refuge in Russia. Marty, Gottwald, Ulbricht, and Longo were prominent at the Brigades' headquarters. Kleber and Malinovsky were among the Russian military advisers.

The Spanish CP repeatedly denied that it favoured a revolutionary policy. 'It is absolutely false', wrote Hernandez, 'that the present workers' movement has for its object the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. . . . We communists are the first to repudiate this supposition. We are moved exclusively by the desire to defend the democratic republic established in April 1931 and revived in February 1936.' Diaz said that any attempt to establish a proletarian

dictatorship 'would have narrowed the social basis of the struggle of the Spanish people, and would have made it easier for international reaction to destroy the revolutionary movement in Spain'.

The renewed attack on Trotsky and his supporters both preceded and followed the big public trials in Moscow of Stalin's opponents and critics. At the end of 1935 Gottwald wrote in the *Communist International*: 'Trotskyism is an agency of international counter-revolution, in the real sense of the word. It is a vile, criminal enemy of the working-class movement. It is a counter-revolutionary cesspool. . . . In many countries Trotskyism has become a direct branch of the police, supplying them with numerous agents, provocateurs, and spies to fight against the revolutionary movement.' The execution of the defendants in the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial was said in *Rundschau* to have been greeted with great satisfaction by the workers of Madrid and Barcelona, because in Spain too 'the Trotskyist traitors and murderers are at work'. Dimitrov wrote indignantly of the appeal from the LSI and the IFTU to the Soviet Government: the LSI and IFTU were defending people who had planned to murder Stalin, who worked in league with the Gestapo, and 'cultivated the habits and customs of the fascist executioners who set the Reichstag on fire'; their trial was an integral part of the struggle against fascism; from Hitler to Trotsky and Zinoviev there was a united bloc. Togliatti wrote an article on similar lines. The LSI protest, he said, was intended to discredit the Soviet Government; the social-democratic leaders were sowing discord because they knew that if the united front and popular front succeeded, they would be lost; social-democratic protests had no other purpose but to forward the aggressive plans of German fascism. *Izvestia* wrote that Citrine's book about Russia might well carry Goebbels' imprimatur. After each of these trials, the central committees of all communist parties sent messages of congratulation to Moscow on 'the defeat of the fascist counter-revolutionary spies and traitors'. The Young Communist League of Belgium was severely reprimanded for agreeing to united front action with the Young Socialists on a platform which included the right of asylum for persecuted revolutionaries, including Trotsky. At the ECCI presidium meeting in September 1936 it was said that not all the sections understood how to answer the LSI's attacks on the trials.

The manifesto made no reference to the disturbances in Palestine. The fourth plenum of the Palestinian central committee in 1933 decided on the Arabization of the party, and Zionists were removed from the central committee; the party programme called for the annulment of the Balfour Declaration, an end to the Mandate, an end to Jewish immigration, and the distribution of land occupied by Zionists (without compensation) among poor fellahs. The declared aims of the Arab strike which began on 22 April 1936 were to put an end to Jewish immigration, to forbid the sale of Arab land to Jews, to have a Palestinian Government. These aims were approved by the CPGB, which stated that salvation for the Jews lay in their joining the workers' struggle against war and fascism. On 10 July the Palestinian CP adopted the three demands. Bridgeman (LAI) wrote in *Rundschau* that the British Government was responsible for Arab-Jewish tension. 'It will not be difficult for the Jews and Arabs in Palestine to live peacefully side by side . . . if they have the freedom to

manage their affairs themselves.' On the plan of partition proposed in 1937, the CPGB said it was a crime against both Arabs and Jews; the Arab-Jewish problem had been created by British imperialism; the immigration question would have to be solved by a democratically elected government; the partition danger would bring the Arabs and Jews together to demand an end to the Mandate and the withdrawal of British troops. An independent Arab State would then give the Jews full civil rights.]

The nineteenth year of the proletarian dictatorship was a year of intense struggle by the Soviet Union for peace for all mankind. Everywhere fascism is stirring up the flames of war. The more the fascist aggressors seek in predatory wars a way out, the clearer becomes the leading role of the socialist land in defence of peace. The increasing insolence of the German fascists and the provocations of Japanese imperialism throw into relief the unshakeable and consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union. On the Soviet frontiers stands the invincible Red Army, the army cut in Stalin's stamp, the faithful guardian of the Soviet country, the true shield of the peace of nations. Today the whole world realizes that the Soviet Union is the most powerful bulwark against war and fascism. . . .

Old Russia was the gendarme of Europe; the peoples of the Soviet Union have changed their country into an unconquerable citadel of socialism, freedom, culture, and peace. And that at a time when the countries of the old bourgeois democracy are sliding down into fascism. Remember, workers, the hard lessons of the defeat of the German and Austrian proletariat. Remember that the peoples of the Soviet Union won their tremendous historic victories because at their head stood the united and resolute party of bolsheviks, the party of Lenin-Stalin. This party has always fought mercilessly against opportunism. It cleared out counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, which had become the direct assistant and agent of the fascist bourgeoisie. Under the leadership of this party the working class rallied firmly to its side the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people. This party offers the proletarians of the whole world an example of bolshevik organization, enhanced by iron will and a clear understanding of the great goal of this fight. The peoples of the Soviet Union triumphed because, despite the sabotage of the reformist leaders, it had the support of the international proletariat.

You, workers of all countries, must take to heart these lessons of the great socialist revolution. They impress upon the workers the lesson that the road taken by the Soviet proletariat is the best pledge against fascism and imperialist war, that only the unification of all the forces of the proletariat, only the united front of the working people and of the democratic forces in the anti-fascist struggle, is able to close the road to fascism. For you, heroic proletarians of Spain, this means that unless fascism is completely crushed, the Spanish people will not be able to carry through the democratic

revolution and prepare the final victory of labour over capital. . . .

Everywhere in the capitalist world the fascist bourgeoisie are pushing forward their offensive against the masses, against their organizations and democratic institutions. Having defeated their own peoples, German and Italian fascism are proceeding to attack the peoples of other countries. . . . Fascism seeks war, for peace would mean its decline. Italian fascism has defeated the defenceless people of Abyssinia. German fascism lowers over Austria, Danzig, Memel, and over the frontiers of Czechoslovakia and Alsace-Lorraine; it is mobilizing its forces for a surprise attack. Supported by imperialist circles in England and tolerated by the cowardly 'democrats' of France, German fascism, which has armed the executioner Franco, is trying to crush the popular front in Spain, after which it would turn on France. The heroic defenders of Madrid are giving their lives in defence of democracy in Europe, in defence of all mankind against a new imperialist war. . . .

The Spanish people must triumph. The international proletariat and anti-fascist democracy must ensure this victory by active support of the Spanish people. With greater energy and determination than ever before you must work for united action by all the forces of the working class, the working peasantry, and the democratic intelligentsia; for this unity . . . will rally all the democratic forces of the world solidly to the side of the Spanish people. . . .

Under mass pressure the leaders of the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions have announced their readiness to support Republican Spain. But why do they reject the proposal made by the French Communist Party to convene a conference of all labour organizations in defence of the Spanish people? In so doing, are they not making it more difficult to mobilize the masses against intervention by the fascist governments? Are they not making it more difficult for the workers to fight the hypocritical policy of 'non-intervention', which serves as cover for fascist intervention? But the determination of the workers to unite will overcome these obstacles. Everywhere the united front in defence of the Spanish people is growing broader and stronger. Despite all prohibitions, millions of social-democratic workers are coming out, side by side with their class brothers, the communist proletarians, for the cause of Spanish democracy.

'The Liberation of Spain from the yoke of the fascist reactionaries is not a private concern of the Spaniards, but the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind.'

May these noble words of the leader of the working people of the entire world, Comrade Stalin, become a call to action in the most distant countries and the farthest corners of the world. May the help given to the Spanish people by the working people of the Soviet Union serve everywhere as an example of true proletarian solidarity. May the resolute

actions of the Soviet Union against intervention by German, Italian, and Portuguese fascism find support among the millions of working people whose thought, feeling, and will it clearly reflects.

Working people of all countries! Follow the example of the Soviet proletariat; give effective help to the Spanish people. By mass action against the criminal intervention of German, Italian, and Portuguese fascism, put an end to the despatch of arms to the rebels. Force your ruling classes to raise the blockade of the Spanish Government. Against Germany, Japan, and Italy, which trod underfoot the freedom and independence of other nations, they never imposed such a blockade! The Spanish Government of the united popular front must be assured of all the material means to defeat the fascist rebellion.

RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDIO ON THE
ACTIVITIES OF THE SPANISH COMMUNIST PARTY

28 December 1936

Rundschau, vi, 1, p. 31, 7 January 1936 [1937]

[A week earlier, a letter from Stalin, Molotov, and Voroshilov to Caballero, the Spanish Prime Minister, on the despatch of Soviet military experts to Spain, asked Caballero for his opinion of them and of Rosenberg, the Soviet ambassador in Spain at that time. The letter advised Caballero to pay special attention to the peasants, to protect the urban petty-bourgeoisie against confiscation, in order to ensure their neutrality, to draw the republicans into the Government 'in order to prevent the enemies of Spain from presenting it as a communist republic', and to state publicly that there would be no interference with the property and legitimate interests of foreigners in Spain if they were citizens of countries which were not supporting Franco. Soviet arms began to arrive in Spain in October.

The communists were accused by the right-wing socialists of undermining the authority of the Government (one case cited was the refusal of a Russian military adviser to allow a French officer to photograph a German aeroplane which had been shot down); and by the anarchists of keeping Catalonia short of arms because of anarchist strength in that province. 'Russian arms are political arms, directed against the revolutionary elements of the CNT, FAI, and POUM.' The CP itself was seeking amalgamation with the socialist party, which was unwilling to agree, having concluded that in the PSUC and the youth organization the communists had taken complete control. The CP maintained a constant fight against the POUM, which it identified as a Trotskyist party. The *Izvestia* correspondent described them as 'agents of fascism . . . hiding behind revolutionary slogans in order to carry out their mission as enemy agents'. In December the POUM members were excluded from the Catalan provincial government, but maintained their position in Barcelona, where they enjoyed the protection of the CNT, the anarchist trade union federation. 'The influence of the anarchists', wrote the *Communist International*, 'is the

main weakness of the working-class movement in Spain. . . . The anarchists are even now advocating the establishment of a "new social order" . . . as an immediate practical task. . . . Failing to understand the essence of the events now taking place in Spain and the character of the revolution that has developed, the anarchists are trying to "push" the revolution ahead . . . thus threatening to narrow its social base.' Their proposal to hand over all factories to the trade unions would endanger the struggle against fascism, alienate people who supported the democratic republic and the popular front, and have a fatal effect on the Spanish revolution. They were hindering the establishment of order, discipline, and law, and opposing the centralization of military command. As for the Trotskyists, their role in Spain 'is merely new confirmation of what was disclosed at the Moscow trial'. The 'fascist-Trotskyists' had planned to murder Diaz, Ibaruri, Caballero, and Azana.

A few days after the fighting began, *Rundschau* wrote that the struggle in Spain was not between socialism and capitalism, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism; on 29 July the Spanish central committee proclaimed the party's readiness to defend the republic, democracy, and democratic liberties; at this time it claimed a membership of 117,000. On 18 December it issued a manifesto calling for conscription and a centralized, disciplined army to take the place of the loosely organized and semi-independent militia detachments and troops. To ensure food supplies, the peasants must be reassured and not forced into co-operatives and collectives. 'We are often reproached with sacrificing the interests of the revolution to the aim of winning the war; this is not only perfidious but childish. The fight to win the war is inseparably bound up with the development of the revolution.'

The CP itself refrained from attacks on the non-intervention committee, of which the USSR was a member, until the Soviet Government's note of 7 October to the committee, announcing that it would not be bound by the agreement if other members violated it. An anonymous writer in the *Communist International* at the end of 1936 asked if the Soviet Union could have refused to join the non-intervention committee. 'No, for France, with which the Soviet Union is connected by a mutual assistance pact, insisted on it.' If it had refused, 'this would have united the capitalist countries against the USSR, would have led to direct intervention in Spanish affairs by the fascist countries under the hypocritical pretence that the USSR was inflaming civil war and implanting bolshevism in Spain', which would have suited the fascist warmongers.]

The presidium of the ECCI draws attention to the magnificent heroism and devotion of the Spanish people who, by its defence of the Spanish Republic, its rights and liberties, from bloody fascist barbarism, is defending the cause of peace and the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind. In warmly greeting the heroic Spanish people, their popular front, and their republican army, the ECCI presidium expresses its conviction that the Spanish people, with the support of anti-fascist forces throughout the world, will gain a decisive victory over the forces of Spanish fascism and the German and Italian fascist

interventionists, the instigators of world war, who have invaded Spanish soil.

The ECCI presidium approves the policy of the central committee of the Spanish Communist Party of mobilizing the party members and the masses to fight against the fascists, who are out to annihilate the parliamentary regime and establish a fascist dictatorship; the policy of defending and strengthening the democratic parliamentary republic, the republic of the popular front which guarantees the rights and liberties of the Spanish people, which undermines the material basis for fascism, in which there is no place for fascism, but where the people can express their will and determine their own fate.

The ECCI presidium regards as wholly correct the Spanish party's policy designed to strengthen the popular front in every way, to fuse still more closely all anti-fascist forces, to consolidate still further the fighting community and fraternal relations between republicans, socialists, communists, and anarcho-syndicalists, for complete unity in the ranks of the people's front is the decisive requisite for defeating fascism. The sincere effort of the party to strengthen fraternal relations with the anarcho-syndicalists, which is particularly important, has been facilitated by the fact that the National Trade Union Federation (CNT) has by its recent actions shown its ability to draw the correct tactical conclusions from recent events; it has recognized the need to create a strong republican people's army, has come out in favour of military revolutionary discipline at the front and in the rear, is taking part in the Government, and is willing to co-operate in establishing a single centralized command for all military operations on all fronts. The most vital interests of the Spanish people require unity and resolution in facing the enemy who, by his agents, spies, and provocateurs, is trying to destroy the unity of the people's front from within by undermining mutual confidence and starting fratricidal struggles in the ranks of the parties and organizations comprising the popular front.

The ECCI presidium regards as correct the struggle waged by the communist party and supported by the other organizations of the popular front against the Trotskyists as fascist agents who, in the interests of Hitler and of General Franco, are trying to break up the popular front, waging a campaign of calumny against the USSR, and using every means, every kind of intrigue and demagogic trick, to prevent the defeat of fascism in Spain. Since the Trotskyists, in the interests of fascism, are carrying on subversive work in the rear of the republican troops, the presidium approves the policy of the party aimed at the complete and final destruction of Trotskyism in Spain as essential to the victory over fascism.

The ECCI presidium regards as completely correct the Spanish Communist Party's policy of most active support for and strengthening

of the republican Government of Largo Caballero, a government composed of representatives of all the parties and organizations belonging to the popular front.

The ECCI presidium regards as correct the party's opposition to the summary nationalization of industry; it is at one with the party in believing that nationalization should be determined by the interests of defence of the republic, as against the attempts of enemies of the people to organize sabotage and disruption of the economy, and in the belief that nationalization should be put into effect in those concerns whose owners have taken direct or indirect part in the rebellion.

The ECCI presidium approves the party's policy designed to establish the closest alliance of the working class with the peasantry and other labouring strata of the Spanish people; consequently it approves the transfer to the peasants of land taken from its fascist owners, and the policy of protecting and securing the property rights and interests of small and medium-sized property, of prohibiting requisitions from the working population in town and country. Premature attempts at collectivization of peasant farms can in the present circumstances only make difficulties for the common cause of the people's front in the fight against the fascist rebels.

The ECCI presidium wholly and fully approves the party's policy of working for the ever closer military, political, and economic unification of the entire country into a single, inseparable, fraternal fighting union of all the nationalities of Spain as a way of attaining the most comprehensive unity of direction of all the armed forces of the republic, of the conduct of all actions and operations on all fronts, of securing the highest productivity in the economy to meet the needs of national defence, of securing stable public order and the speediest suppression of sabotage and provocative attacks by the agents of fascism.

The presidium welcomes and wholeheartedly supports the widespread solidarity campaign of the world proletariat and the democratic forces of all countries on behalf of the Spanish people, and appeals for its still greater expansion, utilizing every possible opening, for a still more active campaign of fraternal help for the Spanish people.

The ECCI presidium sends the warmest greetings to the brave International Brigades, units in the single Spanish people's army, wholly and completely under the orders of the Government and army command of the Spanish Republic. The International Brigades, which are fighting heroically on the fronts of the anti-fascist battle in Spain, defending shoulder to shoulder with the Spanish people the cause of peace and freedom against insolent fascist aggression, and giving an example of discipline and unreserved and loyal steadfastness for the cause of the Spanish people's front, are showing by their actions the great value of the

international solidarity of the fighters for democracy and thereby are contributing to the progress in all capitalist countries of the anti-fascist popular front which unites as one communists, socialists, democrats, republicans, and all anti-fascists.

The ECCI presidium hopes that, in view of the increasing military intervention by Hitler and Mussolini against the Spanish people, which also threatens all democratic countries and the cause of peace, proletarian organizations, and above all the communist and socialist parties, the trade unions of all affiliations, and the genuinely democratic people of the various countries, will undertake joint action in support of the Spanish people. The cause of the Spanish people's victory requires of the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions acceptance of the Communist International's proposals concerning co-ordination of their efforts in order to achieve the best possible practical organization of material, political, and moral support for the Spanish people, the best possible organization of the struggle against fascist intervention in Spain, which is conjuring up the danger of an imperialist world war.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE ECCI

April 1937

Inprecorr, xvii, 19, p. 445, 1 *May 1937*

[In his report to the central committee of the Spanish CP at the beginning of March, Diaz spoke of the need to avoid socialist or communist experiments which would only antagonize sections of the anti-fascist forces. What was needed was compulsory national service, unity of command, and the co-ordination of industry. The party should work for the creation of a single party of the proletariat, which would be achieved by unity of action in the war. Their enemies were the fascists, the Trotskyists, and the 'uncontrollables' who called themselves anarchists. The POUM were 'Trotskyists in disguise'. 'It would be a mistake to regard the Trotskyists as part of the working-class movement. They are an unprincipled group of counter-revolutionaries, agents of international fascism, their chief being Trotsky, direct agent of the Gestapo.' Diaz claimed a party membership of 250,000, including the PSUC, and urged amalgamation of the CNT and the UGT. Marty, in an article in the *Communist International*, said that the radical slogans of POUM and the anarchist 'uncontrollables' 'only serve to aggravate the lack of confidence of the European democracies in the Spanish Republic'.

The differences with the anarchists and POUM came to a head in Barcelona early in May. On 25 April the anarchist newspaper in Barcelona published an attack on the CP, and open fighting between CNT-POUM and UGT-CP broke out on 3 May when the PSUC attempted to take over the Barcelona telephone exchange from the CNT forces; most CNT leaders were anxious to postpone the quarrel until the end of the war, and helped to bring about a

cease-fire on 7 May. Anarchist publications were suppressed and the anarchist militia brought into the army. Dimitrov wrote that the 'putsch' in Barcelona showed how the fascists used the Trotskyists to stab the popular front in the back. The CP urged the dissolution and outlawing of POUM, but Caballero refused. At a meeting in April 1937 of the CP central committee with some leading foreign communists, Togliatti had suggested that Caballero, who had been trying to reduce the powers of the communist army commissars, should be replaced by Negrin. Marty wrote in the *Communist International* that the successes in the early part of the year had not been carried forward because the Minister for War, Caballero, had done 'too little, and at times nothing at all', and because the mobilization of reserves had been obstructed by the POUM, the Trotskyists, and part of the anarchists; Caballero had done nothing to enforce the mobilization decree, but had restricted the powers of the political commissars, who were 'the backbone, the heart and soul' of the army, and made their appointment subject to his approval. Marty attributed Caballero's attitude in part to the influence of Adler, LSI secretary, who had recently been in Spain. On 15 May, at a meeting of the Cabinet, the two communist members, having again failed to get Caballero to agree to the dissolution of POUM, left the meeting accompanied by a number of the socialists, including Negrin, Alvarez del Vayo, and Prieto. Caballero resigned on the following day; Azana's intention of forming a new Government without the communists was defeated when Negrin and his two socialist colleagues informed him that this would mean the end of Soviet aid. Negrin became Prime Minister ('His relations with Russia', says the historian of the Civil War, 'resembled those of Faust with Mephistopheles'), the two communists remained in the Government, but the anarchists refused to serve in it. On 14 June forty leading members of POUM were arrested on charges of espionage and high treason, and the organization was declared illegal. A writer in *Inprecorr* hoped that they 'will meet with the same judgment as the Trotskyist spies and saboteurs who conspired against the Soviet Union on the orders of Nazi Germany and Japan'. Nin, the POUM leader, was shot. Shortly afterwards the most prominent Russians in Spain at the time—Antonov-Ovseyenko, Berzin, Stashevsky, and Koltsov, were recalled to Moscow and disappeared in the purges.

At the meeting of the Spanish central committee in mid-November Diaz said that the growth of the CP had gone to the heads of some new members, and the danger became particularly clear after the fall of Caballero's Government 'in which, as everybody knows, our party played a great part. At that time some comrades got the wrong idea that our party could become the only political factor in the situation.' Other communists thought the CP should oppose all other parties. But nothing, said Diaz, should be done that hampered the co-operation of all anti-fascist forces.

The ambiguities of the popular front policy were apparent almost from the outset. In a long article in the Comintern journal at the end of 1936 Thorez explained that the CPF had had to tell the workers the proper time to end strikes 'because the party realized that a more rapid advance on the part of the working class risked its estrangement from the middle classes who were disturbed and made uneasy by the strikes'. He also explained that the slogan of

'French front', issued by the CP in an attempt to appeal to those who would not join a popular front, had caused a strong reaction in the SFIO; therefore, 'in order to avoid polemics . . . we can refrain from using the term "French front"'. Although the CPF disapproved of the Government's Spanish policy, it would vote for it to keep the Government in.

In the German popular front committee in Paris Heinrich Mann complained of KPD 'disloyalty', and other members accused the communists of wanting a popular front 'led and directed only by the KPD'. There was strong disapproval of communist persecution of rivals in Spain, and the arrests and executions in the Soviet Union, in which four members of the KPD political bureau and ten other KPD central committee members disappeared, made collaboration in the committee virtually impossible.

In May 1936 the CCP appealed directly to Nanking for an end to the civil war and for a united front against Japan. In August 1936 the central committee approached the KMT Executive 'proposing the restoration of collaboration'. Dimitrov wrote that the CCP had to distinguish between imperialist agents and 'honest patriots', and make 'the necessary alterations in its policy in the Soviet districts' which would promote a united national front. It would have 'to overcome the resistance of sectarian elements' and at the same time fight those 'who are ready to sacrifice the political and organizational independence of the party and the Red Army'. Wang Ming explained the meaning of the national united front: it was strictly anti-Japanese, 'not an anti-imperialist united front in general'; some communists thought the CCP ought to fight all imperialisms, but the situation had changed, because Japan now threatened not only the Chinese people but also the vital interests of rival imperialist States; there should be no confusion between the anti-imperialist struggle in general and the armed defence of China against Japanese aggression; radical phrasemongers only isolated the Chinese people from their direct and indirect allies in the fight against Japan. 'Communists should not place the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek in the same category as the Japanese plunderers. . . . We cannot regard the whole of the KMT and all its troops as allies and hirelings of Japan.' Successful resistance to Japan required the use of KMT troops; the KMT had influence over millions of Chinese, and many of its officials understood that 'they ought not to fight together with foreigners against the sons and daughters of the Chinese people'; the CCP in 1936 would not make the mistakes of the opportunist leaders in 1927, which were 'one of the main reasons for the defeat of the revolution'; it was now a mass party with its own army and its own territorial base; it would not dissolve the Red Army, which would take over its own part of the front. 'We and Chiang are not personal enemies', and the CCP was ready 'to support the establishment of a united all-Chinese people's democratic republic . . . to save the fatherland'. If this Government were truly democratic and popular, the Soviet districts would join. Wang Ming concluded his article by saying that the policy it outlined was approved by 'the genius and strategist of the world revolution, the leader and teacher of toiling mankind, the banner of the victory of world communism—our Stalin'.

On 10 August 1936 Mao gave a pledge that the communists would not confiscate land or industrial undertakings, nor support unreasonable wage

claims. 'The common interests of both capitalists and workers are grounded in the struggle against imperialist aggression.' In that struggle 'we shall hereafter consider of no importance any difference of opinion on other questions'.

The letter from the central committee to the KMT Executive, dated 25 August 1936, said unless the civil war was ended and a united anti-Japanese front established, the country faced an 'indescribable catastrophe'. 'We declare firmly that the Soviet Government is prepared to take part in a Government of national defence . . . and that the Red Army is prepared to subordinate itself to the command of the united anti-Japanese army.' The letter went on to remind the KMT of 'the glorious history of collaboration between the CP and the KMT during the first great revolution'. It had been so successful that the imperialists in fear 'sowed the seeds of strife between us'. Wang Ming explained the changes that would be necessary in the Soviet areas, where CCP policy had to be given 'an explicitly national character'. There would be no expropriation of the land of traders and artisans who had acquired land from their own savings; large landowners would be compensated, private trade and industry encouraged to ensure supplies to the army and the people; taxation would be revised to encourage trade and industry; civil rights would be expanded to accord with this policy, and parties other than the communist which were not fighting the Soviet authorities would enjoy democratic rights; there were to be no freelance operations against foreign organizations, diplomatic, commercial, religious, or cultural; nobody would be arrested except for violation of the law. In an article on 'The new policy of the CCP', the same writer said the need to create a broad anti-imperialist united front was dictated not only by the strength of the Chinese Soviets and Red Army, but by their weakness; alone, they could not defeat Japanese imperialism, and a large part of the Chinese population still gave their loyalty to the KMT and not to the Soviets.

The move towards a united front was accelerated by the so called 'Sian incident'. Chang Hsueh-liang, the 'Young Marshal' (son of Chang Tso-lin), who had been forced out of Manchuria by the Japanese, had his headquarters in Sian; Chang negotiated a truce with Chou En-lai (who was acting as Chu Teh's chief political commissar), and it was to investigate this situation that Chiang flew to Sian in December 1936; he was taken prisoner by Chang on the 11th. Of the eight points in the ultimatum presented by the Young Marshal to Chiang after his capture, seven had already appeared in the CCP programme. The Soviet press denounced Chang and attributed the abduction of Chiang to Wang Ching-wei and the Japanese. The three-cornered negotiations (Chiang, Chang, and Chou) lasted from 17 to 25 December; agreement was reached on the cessation of civil war, on fighting the Japanese, on the dismissal of pro-Japanese officials, and on political reforms. In his *Random Notes* Edgar Snow writes: 'It now seems possible that the communists had encouraged Chang Hsueh-liang to detain the generalissimo. . . . The [Chinese] Politburo at first meant to exploit it as a means of setting up a national anti-Japanese government in Sian, isolating if not totally discrediting Chiang Kai-shek, their chief internal enemy. Moscow's sudden intervention undercut previous plans and left Mao momentarily without a clear line of support to offer Chang Hsueh-liang. *Pravda's* shattering denunciation of Chang as a traitor and Japanese agent

enormously weakened the Chinese communists in their relations with him, and . . . must have influenced the Young Marshal to make his independent decision to release the Generalissimo. . . . Following Chiang's release the communists were in fact soon again placed at his mercy . . . they were extricated from their precarious position only by Japan's "providential" major invasion of China, which gave Chiang no choice but to shelve any and all plans for another annihilation drive.' Snow suggests that Mao had planned a public trial of Chiang, and bitterly resented Moscow's order to release him. The telegram from Stalin to Mao is said to have threatened that, unless the CP used its influence to release Chiang, Moscow would denounce them as 'bandits' and repudiate them. Chou En-lai is said to have remarked: 'It was the most difficult decision of our whole lives.'

An article in *Rundschau* at the end of the year reported the arrest of Chiang. The rebellion of Chang and his generals, it said, was not in the interests of China, but could serve only Japan. The Nanking Government was now turning to fight Japan, and this coup could only split the anti-Japanese front. Wang Ming wrote in the *Communist International* (April 1937) that at Sian 'the CCP adopted a position entirely determined by a sincere desire for unity among the Chinese people'. The further explanation offered eighteen months later in the *Communist International* (in an article by Chen Tsiu in July 1938), was that 'the Japanese imperialists, through their Trotskyist agents, provoked the open resistance of the discontented government troops sympathetic to the Red Army against the KMT government. They arranged the capture of Chiang Kai-shek and wanted to murder him. At the same time, they advised the KMT government to organize a punitive expedition against the troops stationed in Sian who had refused to subordinate themselves to the central government. By kindling civil war in China, the Japanese wanted to facilitate the conquest of North China and then of all China. . . . The CCP understood the significance of these events. It exerted its full force and authority to settle the conflict peacefully. . . . The Trotskyist bandits suffered defeat.' The official CCP history gives the following account: 'Chang, having entered into an alliance with the CP to organize resistance to the Japanese invaders, arrested Chiang with the object of forcing him to cease his anti-communist war, which was fatal to the country. The CCP thought it essential to settle the incident peacefully, so Chiang was released, and the civil war ceased.'

Negotiations between the CCP and the KMT continued after the Sian incident, but made little progress. On 10 February 1937 the CCP offered, as the price for unity, to cease armed struggle to overthrow the KMT Government, to rename the Soviet areas and the Red Army and place the army under Nanking's control, to introduce a democratic system of government in the Soviet areas, and to stop the confiscation of land. The KMT Executive, which met in the third week of February, put forward its own terms—dissolution of the Red Army and the Soviet Government, cessation of CP propaganda, and cessation of the class struggle. This, said Wang Ming, was playing the Japanese game; the KMT attempt 'to eliminate the red danger' only weakened China. 'To go beyond these limits [of 10 February] would only be harmful for the liberation struggle of the Chinese people. Therefore not only have the communists no

right to go beyond these limits, but honest KMT patriots have no right to demand it.' He answered the critics who said that 'at the end of the anti-Japanese struggle the communists will turn their weapons against the KMT'. 'The Chinese communists not only want to collaborate with the KMT during the period of anti-Japanese struggle but are prepared, together with all honest members of the KMT—true disciples of Sun Yat-sen—to fight in the future as well for an independent, free, and happy future for the great Chinese people.'

The CCP agreed to the KMT's terms on 15 March 1937, and the blockade of the Soviet areas was lifted. (At the Young Communist Conference in April Chiang was elected together with Mao to the presidium.) Chiang and Chou met at Kuling in June to negotiate the terms of co-operation. The negotiations were speeded up by the large-scale Japanese military action in China proper, and the agreement reached was published on 22 September. It recognized the CCP as legal throughout the country. On 10 September the Red Army, with 90,000–100,000 men, had been incorporated into the national army as the 8th Route Army. On the 22nd the CCP formally dissolved the Soviet Republic. The central committee statement on the agreement said that Dr Sun's three principles were fully applicable to the present situation, and the CP would help to put them into effect. 'All policies of violence designed to overthrow the power of the KMT and the movement for the Sovietization of China are abandoned; the policy of the forcible confiscation of landowners' estates is discontinued. . . . With a view to uniting the governmental power throughout the country, the present Soviet Government is abolished and local democratic self-government is established.' In an article in a Chinese communist paper at the end of September (reproduced in the *Communist International* at the beginning of 1938), Mao Tse-tung wrote that 'only at the end of 1936, during the Sian events, did the representatives of the CP and KMT come to the extremely important political agreement which . . . was one of the prerequisites for the formation of the united front between the two parties'. The bases of the united front programme were Sun Yat-sen's three principles and the central committee's proposals of August 1937. To think of these as incompatible was to take a 'purely formal' position. Anti-imperialism was consistent with nationalism; Soviets were consistent with democratism, and the agrarian revolution 'embodies the principle of popular well-being'.]

This year, May First, the day of international proletarian solidarity, is marked by the heroic struggle of the Spanish people for liberty and national independence.

The German and Italian fascists have attacked the Spanish people and their democratic republic without formally declaring war. Mussolini's and Hitler's hordes are trampling Spanish soil, destroying towns and villages, murdering women and children, and covering the country with the blood of the finest sons of the Spanish people. A foul crime is being committed before the eyes of the world with the support of the British Conservatives and the connivance of the bourgeois democracy of France and other capitalist countries.

The Spanish people are victoriously repulsing the attack of the fascists. They are not only battling for their own freedom, but are fighting the German and Italian interventionists for the freedom of all nations. Madrid is making legend; it has become the battle-ground of all advanced and progressive humanity against bestial fascism. The banner of aid for the fighting Spanish people has been raised aloft among the working people of all countries. But the final victory over fascism in Spain has still to be won. New millions in all countries must rally still closer around the working class of Spain, around its people and its republic, so that this victory may be expedited.

The whole working class, not only the communists, but the socialist workers also, are heart and soul with the Spanish people. They are profoundly indignant at the German and Italian intervention in Spain. Like the communist workers, they are opposed to the comedy of non-intervention, which is, in reality, favouring the fascist gang of bandits. But what prevents them demanding the united action of all workers' organizations in defence of the Spanish people? Is it not clear that such united action would multiply the strength of the fighting Spanish people and facilitate their victory? Why do they not demand that the leaders of the Second International and the Amsterdam International should establish international united action in defence of the Spanish democracy? Why do they tolerate the sabotage of men like Citrine and Friedrich Adler, who are sacrificing the lives of the Spanish fighters for liberty and frustrating the will of the working class in the interests of the bourgeoisie? Now, more than ever before, the united action of the entire international proletariat, and of all the organizations of the proletariat against the common enemy, is the supreme demand of the present moment.

Working men and women, raise your voices in protest against the betrayal of the cause of the Spanish people! This May Day unite as class brothers in a mighty demonstration in support of the Spanish People's Front! Compel your parliaments and your governments to support the People's Government of Spain!

By defending the Spanish people, you will defend yourselves, your people and your own liberty against fascism. Remember that around Madrid, on the battlefields of Spain, fascism is kindling the torch of war over the world. Unable to cope with the internal antagonisms that are rending it, fascism is seeking a way out in military adventures and the enslavement of other peoples. Clearing the way for its aggression, German fascism is conspiring against the regime of bourgeois democracy in other capitalist countries. Under the pretext of combating bolshevism, it is everywhere intriguing and plotting, inciting revolt and disseminating counter-revolutionary anarchy. It is striving to subjugate the small nations in preparation for a new imperialist re-division of the world and

new wars. It is blackmailing the governments of these small countries and making cunning use of their capitulatory policy in its own interests. But no policy of capitulation will restrain the fascist marauders. War cannot be averted by prayers and incantation. Only the unity and determination of the working people can prevent it. Only the rallying of all the forces of peace, in close unity with the enslaved peoples of Germany and Italy, who are profoundly hostile to fascism, can stay the hand of the fascist brigands.

Your governments tell you that the savage beast must not be provoked, that we must bow to it so as to avoid its fangs. Does not the example of Spain prove the contrary? Would not Spain have been converted into a second Manchuria if the Spanish people had not opposed the strength of the masses to the violence of the fascists? The defeat of the Italian fascists at Guadalajara has shown the whole world that the strength of the fascist government lies in the weakness of the people being subjugated by them. They can smash a resistance that is feeble and brutally suppress the defenceless. But when people rise against them who are prepared to wage a supreme struggle, all the instability of the fascist regime is revealed. . . .

The fascist beasts of prey are striving towards the colonial countries, so as to carry on the imperialist plunder with even greater ruthlessness. German fascism is reaching out its paw to the colonies with growing insistence. Every worker and every honest democrat is filled with hatred at the thought of the gallows, arson, robbery, and violence to which Italian fascism has subjected defenceless Abyssinia. The fascist militarists of Japan will stop at no provocation and baseness in their violation of the great Chinese people. The modern cannibals stop at no act of brutality in robbing and strangling the colonial peoples.

But the oppressed peoples are beginning to realize that the more they bow their heads, the more savagely they are beaten. The more abject the enslaved, the more aggressive the enslaver becomes. The Abyssinian people have not admitted their defeat, and are again rising against their enslavers. The great Chinese people, who have learnt from bitter experience what are the consequences of a policy of non-resistance to the plunderers, are forging a national front in defence against the Japanese imperialist brigands. The finest people and the foremost parties and groups all over the colonial world are uniting their peoples against alien oppression, against the imperialist plunderers, and in defence of peace and liberty.

Proletarians and working people of the colonial Powers! Peoples of the colonies! Let May Day be a day of fraternity and of joint struggle against fascism, war and the disfranchised conditions of the colonial peoples!

The working people in all capitalist countries are suffering fearful want. The world economic crisis has ruined millions of people. The insatiable rich, the millionaires, took advantage of the crisis to depress

the standard of living of the working people. The worker's wage is a beggarly pittance. Exploitation in the factories has assumed unprecedented proportions. Wholesale unemployment has become a permanent feature. Peasants, artisans, and small tradesmen are staggering beneath the yoke of monopoly-capital. And the more the working people retreated, the more brazen the rich capitalists became. Now that a period of economic revival has begun they are raking in huge profits, but would leave the masses of the people to starve, as they did during the crisis. But the workers are not willing to retreat any more. Wherever, as in the United States and France, they rise in revolt against the regime of starvation and poverty, and demand bread for themselves and liberty for their organizations, they are successfully restraining the capitalist offensive. . . .

Let the May Day demonstration be a mighty weapon that will strengthen the workers' organizations and make for trade union unity, which is the guarantee of success in the struggle for bread and work! Let the example of the French workers, who in the course of a year created a united trade union organization 5 million strong, inspire you to strive for the unity of the national and international trade union movement. Let the example of the People's Front in Spain and France strengthen the will to unity among the workers all over the world. Oppose all who disrupt your unity in the interests of the class enemy. Rid your ranks of the agents of fascism—the Trotskyists, who are rabid enemies of working-class unity, disorganizers and wreckers of the working-class movement, foul provokers of war and masked spies of General Franco's Fifth Column.

The great example of the USSR shows that the working people can successfully throw off the yoke of the exploiters! It was only by a resolute and thoroughly consistent class struggle, fought under the guidance of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, that the working class of the Soviet Union achieved its historic victories. . . .

Thanks to the dictatorship of the working class, a genuine democracy, embodied in the Stalin Constitution, is spreading widely among the peoples of the Land of the Soviets. Every Soviet citizen is guaranteed the right to work, rest, and education.

Thanks to its might and its supreme fidelity to proletarian internationalism, the USSR is a great bulwark of peace and culture, and of the liberty of all peoples.

This is why the fascist warmongers rage against the great land of socialism! But the Soviet Union is a beacon for the millions of working people of the capitalist countries, pointing the true way to the victory of socialism.

The knell of capitalism has sounded. It is an obstacle to human progress, and must be overthrown. Only the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and its replacement by socialism will put an end to the exploitation of man by man and to wars.

TELEGRAM FROM DIMITROV TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
LSI ON HELP FOR SPAIN

8 June 1937

Inprecorr, xvii, 25, p. 572, 12 June 1937,

[On several occasions the ECCI proposed to the LSI the organization of a joint campaign to help the Spanish Government. On 14 October 1936 Cachin and Thorez met de Brouckère and Adler to propose joint action; the socialists preferred parallel action, which would avoid the difficulties of collaboration, with agreements on particular issues. 'Objectively', wrote *Rundschau*, this was a service to fascism. On 21 April 1937 delegates of a number of communist parties met in Paris, and issued an appeal for action to force the British and French Governments to reverse their policy. '... if the democratic countries allow a free hand to the fascist aggressors, against whom the whole of the Spanish people, Republicans, Socialists, Communists, Anarchists and Catholics, are rising, if, under the pretext of saving peace, a terrible war adventure is allowed to be undertaken which to-morrow may spread over the whole world, this is only possible because international unity of action proposed by the communists, has been rejected by the Second International. By uniting their forces they wish to oppose their tremendous power for peace to that passivity which spells danger to them, and they want to demand of the governments of the democratic countries that they do not assist the enemies of democracy.' The LSI replied to these overtures with an assurance that it was itself taking all appropriate action, in conjunction with the IFTU. The appeal also contained an attack on the Spanish Trotskyists; at a communist conference in Valencia in March Diaz called the POUM an agency of fascism because it had suggested inviting Trotsky to come to Catalonia and had spoken out against the Moscow trials. The proposal to establish a committee representing the three Internationals was made in a telegram from Dimitrov dated 3 June, after the receipt of an appeal signed on behalf of the Spanish Socialist Party, Communist Party, and UGT addressed to the LSI, IFTU, and CI. De Brouckère, chairman of the LSI, replied that the LSI was doing its duty on its own responsibility, and that neither the chairman nor the secretary of the LSI had the power to take part in a committee such as that proposed by Dimitrov. In a press interview de Brouckère said that joint action might be advisable in certain cases, but not everywhere; it might create friction and disharmony. He regretted the constant repetition of the proposal, but said the LSI was always ready to meet representatives of the Comintern.]

We have received your reply to the telegram of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in which we, on the basis of the appeal of the Spanish workers' organizations, proposed, with the object of establishing unity of action in defence of the Spanish people, the creation of a contact committee of the three Internationals.

Unfortunately, your telegram does not give a clear answer to the concrete proposal made by us. Your reference to the fact that neither

the chairman nor the secretary of the Labour and Socialist International has the powers to decide a question of creating a contact committee does not seem convincing to us if only because you could request such powers from the corresponding authorities of your International.

Nor can it be assumed that the absence of formal powers is decisive when it is a question of the life and independence of the Spanish people subjected to an attack by German and Italian interventionists.

Nor can we share your opinion that the Labour and Socialist International is fully carrying out its duty, inasmuch as it continues to refuse to unite all forces of the international proletariat for the defence of the Spanish people.

The solidarity movement in favour of the Spanish people is still far from being adequate, chiefly because the actions of the international organizations are disunited. This movement would acquire a tenfold greater force if, in spite of all difficulties, international unity of action could be established. It is precisely with this object in view that we propose the creation of a contact committee of the three Internationals.

If, however, for one reason or another you consider the form of contact proposed by us to be unacceptable, the interests of the common cause of aiding the Spanish people nevertheless demand that you on your part make other concrete proposals for the achievement of this aim. The chief thing for us is not the form, but the essence.

The Communist International, which is doing all in its power to ensure the victory of the Spanish people over the fascist rebels and interventionists as speedily as possible, is ready, without delay, as we stated previously, to discuss any proposals you may make. Together with the Spanish workers' organizations, we have the right to expect your concrete proposals on this vitally important question.

We should also consider it advisable, with a view to speeding-up the realization of the necessary joint action, to have a preliminary exchange of opinions between representatives of the Communist International and the Labour and Socialist International. In the event of your agreement, we await information from you as to the time and place of such a meeting.

JOINT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ECCI AND
THE LSI EXECUTIVE ON HELP FOR SPAIN

21 June 1937

Inprecorr, xvii, 27, p. 608, 26 June 1937

[After the publication of the statement, Cachin wrote in *Inprecorr* of the 'complete agreement of views', which marked a big step on the road to unity of action. The LSI Executive, meeting on 25-26 June, expressed its complete confidence in de Brouckère and Adler, and in their competence to negotiate with

other organizations. (There had been some doubt about whether the two officials had exceeded their authority in signing the statement.) On 26 June Dimitrov cabled instructions to Thorez about negotiating with the LSI and IFTU; he was to bring to their attention the urgent need for all international labour organizations to appeal jointly to the governments and parliaments of all non-fascist States to take action to stop German and Italian intervention in Spain, to raise the blockade, and to recognize the legal rights of the Spanish Government; to appeal to the League of Nations to apply the Covenant, and to urge the workers of all countries to support these demands. De Brouckère's reply of 27 June stated that the LSI had already demanded the withdrawal of German and Italian troops and the application of the Covenant, and was doing all it could to get public opinion to support these measures; it had asked all its organizations to do so. At Annemasse the LSI had agreed to work for joint action on these lines wherever possible, but before it could start on this delicate job, which required much patience if friction was to be avoided, Dimitrov's telegram made different proposals. He had already explained why joint manifestos were impossible. The LSI was prepared to continue on the line laid down at Annemasse. Thorez replied that there was no contradiction between the Annemasse statement and Dimitrov's proposals; the LSI could put forward its own proposals. The two sides met again in Paris on 9 July, and agreed to undertake joint action 'where possible'.]

Louis de Brouckère, the President, and Fritz Adler, the Secretary of the Labour and Socialist International, and the delegation of the Communist International, consisting of Comrades Marcel Cachin, Checa, Gallo, Dahlem and Bonte, met in Annemasse on June 21, 8 o'clock in the evening.

As was agreed, they exchanged opinions regarding the most suitable methods of pursuing their activity in favour of Spain, wherever possible, by means of a joint agreement and in any other form without unnecessary friction.

After the appeal of the Spanish workers' organizations such procedure is more necessary than ever, as these organizations are waging their struggle against the combined fascist world with such splendid courage and are defending with their liberties the liberty and the peace of Europe and of the world.

The exchange of opinions has shown that the two Internationals are pursuing similar tactics in regard to Spain; that they are both demanding the lifting of the blockade, the restoration of international law which has been violated, and the application of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

They are united in the desire that a new conference should take place shortly in order thoroughly to consider the concrete measures for rendering material and moral aid to the Spanish people.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE TWENTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1937

Inprecorr, xviii, 48, p. 1145, 6 November 1937

[Dimitrov wrote on the anniversary that the twenty years had shown that it was possible to build socialism in one country, that it was impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social-democracy in the labour movement, and that the attitude to the USSR was the 'historical dividing line between the forces of fascism, capitalism, and war on the one hand, and the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism on the other. . . . In the present international situation there is not nor can there be any other more certain criterion than one's attitude towards the Soviet Union in determining who is the friend and who the enemy of the cause of the working class and socialism, of determining who is a supporter and who an opponent of democracy and peace.'

Commenting on the Moscow trial of January 1937, the *Communist International* wrote that it disclosed 'one of the most monstrous parts of the hellish mechanism for kindling a new imperialist war, and in particular, a counter-revolutionary war against the USSR'. The defendants had acted under instructions from Trotsky, 'traitor to the country and enemy of the people, who acted in agreement with the German and Japanese incendiaries of war'. The Germans had promised to help Trotsky in return for the Ukraine, the Japanese in return for the Maritime Provinces; Trotsky would, moreover, help Japan to prepare war against the United States. The struggle against Trotskyism was the task not only of communists, 'but of all sincere democrats, anti-fascists, and opponents of war'. The Comintern and the Soviet Union were now so popular that all the conditions existed 'for putting an end once and for all to the criminal work of the Trotskyist gangs and their hangers-on in all countries'. To defend them was to play into the hands of fascism. 'Can we fight against war without fighting against Trotskyism? No, we cannot.' The Spanish Trotskyists were 'the foremost detachment of the notorious "fifth column" of the rebel Franco. . . . The struggle against Trotskyism is part of the struggle for republican Spain.'

In Spain the communist party and a number of right-wing socialists called a meeting of leading members of the UGT who were opponents of Caballero (its general secretary) and set up a rival executive committee. Jouhaux was called in to arbitrate. Caballero resigned, and a new executive was set up with representatives of both sides. Caballero's followers were accused by the communists of 'criminal disruptive activities'. In June 1937 the CP central committee decided to re-open negotiations for unity with the socialist party. The socialists rejected a merger, although a working agreement on joint action was reached in August. On 20 November Cachin and Thorez, on behalf of the ECCI, suggested a further meeting with the LSI; de Brouckère and Adler replied on the 25th that the LSI and its sections were unceasingly active on behalf of Republican Spain; the ECCI's proposal for joint sessions was not part of the Annemasse agreement; the LSI was always ready to consider specific proposals, but wished to avoid unnecessary friction.

In September the Spanish CP appealed to all its members to recognize that unity was the basis of victory; the CP alone could not solve Spain's problems. They were to avoid all unnecessary polemics and friction, and to improve their collaboration with other anti-fascist forces; this applied particularly to communists holding positions of command in the army.

After the Japanese invasion of China proper, Wang Ming wrote that Japan had been encouraged in its plans to conquer China, India, South East Asia and Australia (before turning its attention to Russia, Britain, and America) by Britain's toleration of aggression and American passivity. The Japanese attack could be met only by a united Chinese people, but united action was not incompatible with political and organizational independence; to insist on subordination to the KMT and Nanking would only create difficulties. All Japanese agents had to be rooted out. If the KMT had really decided to fight Japan, 'why are the Trotskyists, those open foul traitors to the Chinese people, still allowed to conduct with impunity their foul, undermining, diversionist, and espionage work at the orders of the Japanese secret service in Shanghai, Nanking, Sian, and other parts?' Many people in the CCP, Wang Ming continued, were confused by the change from civil war to national war, from fighting the KMT to collaborating with it. They did not know how to support Sun Yat-sen's principles without ceasing to be Marxist-Leninists, and would have to be retrained. Many communists 'have no idea of the working-class movement in the big towns'. In an interview given in October 1937 (published in the *Communist International* in March 1938), Mao Tse-tung said that large areas had been lost to the Japanese because of the Government's policy. It would have to be reorganized as a popular front government, democratic-centralist in form and revolutionary in policy. The proposals advanced by the CCP were 'drawn up in the spirit of Dr Sun Yat-sen's three principles'.

In Germany, Ulbricht wrote, the KPD still maintained its sectarian attitude, and failed to understand the new situation. 'What is required is bold initiative for the creation of a German people's front.' Fascist demagoguery was having its effect, and the masses remained passive, but Hitler could be overthrown by the struggle 'to establish a democratic regime of peace, liberty, and progress'. This struggle was still being hampered by the SPD's refusal to form a united front, as well as by Nazi terror. In July 1937 the Italian socialist and communist parties agreed on joint action, during which each party would refrain from criticizing or interfering in the affairs of the other.

Dimitrov's statement that it was necessary to put an end to social-democracy provoked a strong protest from the French socialists, and the committee that was examining the possibility of SFIO-CPF amalgamation adjourned *sine die*. *L'Humanité* attacked the French socialist leaders who had protested against the trials and executions in Moscow—to defend Trotsky and his accomplices was to act as an agent of fascism. The SFIO also objected to the practice of local communist organizations taking over control of all local activities 'in the name of unity'. The trials also had a disruptive effect on the popular front movement among the German exiles; the SAP protested against GPU action in Spain, and were denounced as 'Franco's agents'; Münzenberg resigned from the Paris committee, and was expelled from the KPD.]

Twenty years ago the Russian workers and peasants, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, overthrew the power of the capitalists and landlords and established the proletarian dictatorship, the power of the workers' and peasants' Soviets. The twenty years of Soviet power and of the construction of socialism are a tremendous victory not only for the working people of the USSR, they are also a mighty victory for the workers of all countries, for the peoples of the whole world. . . .

In an unceasing struggle against all the enemies of the people who strove to bring about the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, in a struggle against saboteurs, wreckers, kulaks, Trotskyist-Bukharinist spies and traitors, the Bolshevik Party won new victories on the front of socialist construction. From a poor, backward, agrarian country, the Soviet Union, under the wise direction of Stalin, became transformed into a foremost industrial country, its industrial output occupying first place in Europe and second place in the world. Through the difficulties and dangers which arose in the way, the great Stalin led onward the land of the Soviets and brought its people to the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the USSR. . . .

And ever new millions of people throughout the globe turn their gaze towards socialism. They see that the workers and peasants of the USSR have been victorious because they have been led by the party of the Bolsheviks, which has been guided by such giants of revolutionary thought and deed as Lenin and Stalin. This party led them to the victorious uprising in October, 1917. It gathered around itself the working class which won the leadership of the peasantry. The working people of the USSR have won victory because the working class established the proletarian dictatorship, and made use of it to suppress the resistance of the counter-revolutionary classes, to strengthen the defensive power of the Land of the Soviets, to bring about the victorious construction of socialism.

Could not, however, the working people in the other European countries have followed the same victorious path as the one along which the Bolsheviks led the workers and peasants in 1917? Remember, workers, the days at the end of the imperialist war. Millions of the working people had arms in their hands. The wave of the revolutionary movement rose high in the capitalist countries. Germany and Austria-Hungary were in the throes of revolution. But the reactionary social-democratic leaders, who at that time exerted decisive influence in the leadership of the proletarian mass organizations, led the workers along the road to defeat. They came to the aid of the bourgeoisie, who were terrified at the scope of the revolutionary movement, so as to put a brake on this movement by means of temporary reforms. Together with the bourgeoisie these leaders stifled the proletarian revolutions in Europe, carried through a coalition policy with the bourgeoisie directed against the interests of the working

class. By this policy they split the working-class movement, weakened the proletariat and its power to influence the peasantry and the hard-working people of the towns. They enabled the fascists to organize their forces with impunity, and called upon the masses to retreat before fascism, and ended by capitulating to it.

Now the workers see into what an abyss the policy of the reactionary social-democratic leaders has led them. Fascist dictatorship has been established in a whole number of capitalist countries. . . .

Twenty years after the imperialist war, mankind is again on the eve of a still more horrible world imperialist blood bath. Trading on the tolerance of the bourgeois-democratic Powers, the fascist scoundrels have already hurled a quarter of mankind into war.

And only the Soviet Union rises aloft like a beacon pointing a way out of this abyss to the proletariat and the whole of the working mankind. The brighter the star of socialism gleams in the USSR, the more do the ruling classes rage against the land of the Soviets, against the working-class movement, against any urge towards liberty on the part of their own peoples. But the more solidly the working people throughout the world rally around the USSR. The victory of socialism in the USSR imbues the masses in the capitalist countries with the flame of ardent enthusiasm. It increases their readiness for the struggle. It gives them confidence in their own victory. It calls the workers of the capitalist countries to muster their forces into a united workers' front. It tells them that unless they unite their forces, the working class will be unable to rally behind them their allies, the working people of town and country will prove unable to bar the road to fascism, will fail to prevent war breaking out, will be unable to overthrow once and for all the accursed yoke of capital.

The Spanish people are fighting a heroic struggle in a common front, not only against the fascist rebels, but also against the coalition of fascist States which have hurled themselves against Republican Spain. Inspired by the victories of the working people in the USSR, the Spanish workers and peasants are fighting for a new type of democratic republic wherein the proletariat is the leading force of the nation-wide struggle, where there will be no place for fascism, where its economic basis has been uprooted, and where the material guarantees have been created for the defence of the rights, liberty, and interests of the people.

The four hundred millions of the Chinese people are engaged in the courageous defence of their country against the invasion of the Japanese fascist militarists. The example of the socialist revolution which liberated the peoples of the USSR from the yoke of foreign capital, strengthens the national consciousness of the masses of the people of China who are hammering out a nation-wide fighting front against the Japanese usurpers.

By the powerful People's Front movement the French people are extending the democratic rights and economic gains of the working people, beating off repeated attacks of fascism.

The movement of the People's Front is developing in other capitalist countries as well. Even in the countries of ferocious fascist terror, Germany, Italy, and Japan, the forces of the anti-fascist struggle are steadily maturing. Developing an increasingly resolute mass struggle against fascism, the working class are advancing at the head of the toiling masses to the overthrow of the capitalist system. . . .

The struggle of the Spanish and Chinese peoples for liberty, independence and peace is the vital concern of the international proletariat, of all peoples. Not a single worker, not a single toiler, not a single democrat can fail to assist in bringing about the victory of the Spanish and Chinese peoples. This victory will be a victory of the cause of liberty and peace, a victory of the whole of advanced and progressive mankind. There is no more urgent task facing all sincere supporters of democracy and peace, than in every way to contribute to the defeat of German and Italian fascism in Spain, and of the Japanese fascist militarists in China. The German and Italian interventionists and the Japanese usurpers have placed their own fate at stake here. Let their bloody adventures in Spain and China be the beginning of the doom of fascism throughout the world.

Remember, working people, that it depends on the outcome of the struggle in Spain and China whether the fascist cut-throats succeed in driving mankind into a new world-imperialist slaughter. Following on the onslaught on Spain and China, fascism is preparing new foul deeds against the peoples. A menace hangs over the peoples of Europe, of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Belgium, the Balkans, and other countries. German fascism is sharpening its bayonets against the French people. The peoples of Asia and the countries of the Pacific Ocean are menaced by Japanese imperialism. From both the West and East, the fascist cut-throats are preparing an onslaught on the great land of socialism, the fatherland of all working people.

By defending Spain and China to-day, you defend the cause of world peace, you defend other people against the fascist onslaught, you defend yourselves, your homes, and your children against fascist brigandage.

Workers and working people, do not believe the hypocrites and impostors who tell you that they are saving the cause of peace by their policy of 'non-intervention'. With the aid of this policy they are carrying through the blockade of Republican Spain and China, supporting Franco, assisting the fascist aggressors, and encouraging them in the kindling of new imperialist wars.

Demand of all the Governments of the bourgeois-democratic countries that they carry on a resolute struggle against the fascist aggressors.

Demand that all the necessary pressure be exerted to curb the instigators of war.

Strengthen your fraternal alliance with the USSR for the supreme defence of the cause of peace, of the cause of the liberty and independence of the Spanish and Chinese peoples.

Close your ranks into an indestructible united front in each separate country as well as on an international scale. Do not allow the reactionary leaders of social-democracy any longer to sabotage united action by the international labour movement in defence of the Spanish and Chinese peoples.

Build an international fighting front against German, Italian, and Japanese fascism. Drive the foul, spying, Trotskyist agents of fascism out of all working-class and democratic organizations. The rooting out of this traitorous gang is an inseparable component part of the victorious struggle against fascism, of the struggle for the cause of peace among the peoples.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCI MAY DAY MANIFESTO

April 1938

Inprecorr, xviii, 22, p. 481, 30 *April 1938*

[The report of a meeting of the Spanish CP political bureau on 15-16 January 1938 described the CP as 'the most powerful organization in Republican Spain'. The Madrid section, meeting in the same month, discussed relations with the Madrid socialists who, influenced by Caballero's 'splitting group', refused to re-establish the liaison committee of the two parties. In February the CP opened a campaign against Prieto (he was said to be anxious for a negotiated peace). Dolores Ibarruri attacked him publicly in a speech on 27 February. Prieto was dismissed from the Ministry on 5 April, Alvarez del Vayo made Foreign Secretary, and Negrin took over the Defence Ministry. Negrin's (fruitless) attempts at mediation were kept secret from the communists. There was some disagreement between the Spanish CP and Moscow; the Russians were said to have wanted the communists to withdraw from the Government, as a gesture of goodwill to France and Britain. Hernandez resigned, but Uribe remained in the Cabinet. In March the UGT and the CNT reached agreement on joint action. Their joint programme, published on 18 March, 'favoured the maintenance and strengthening of the institution of military commissars' with 'equitable representation' of all anti-fascist forces, advocated the nationalization of banks, transport, and heavy industry, etc.

The communist parties of Austria, Germany, France, Britain, Switzerland, and Belgium published a manifesto against the occupation of Austria, and the Soviet press wrote that it brought the danger of war nearer; the action was a complete condemnation of Chamberlain's policy, which had encouraged the Nazis, and France had followed London's example. An article by a leading English communist in the *Communist International* in March said it was Mussolini

and Hitler who had demanded Eden's dismissal. 'Hatred of communism, hatred of the popular front, hatred of democracy, are a mainspring of Chamberlain's policy. The National Government . . . wants to buttress fascism.'

The LSI and IFTU had protested to Moscow against the trial of Bukharin and others. An article in *Inprecorr* carried the headline: 'Trotsky, Hitler, Cagoulards, and the Second International in league'. In France relations between the socialists and communists were very strained.

In the spring of 1938 the Polish Communist Party was dissolved by the ECCI. At the eighteenth congress of the CPSU in March 1939 Manuilsky, reporting on the ECCI, said: 'Agents of Polish fascism had succeeded in gaining positions of leadership in the communist party. These scoundrels had tried to drag the party into supporting Pilsudski's fascist coup d'état in May 1926. After they had failed in this, they pretended to repent of their error, made a show of self-criticism, deceived the Comintern in the same way as Lovestone and the police "factionalists" of the Hungarian and Yugoslav parties had done in their time. And it was the fault of the Comintern workers that they allowed themselves to be deceived by class enemies.' Among the Polish communist leaders who disappeared in the USSR at this time were two members of the ECCI, Bronkowski and Lenski, and two members of the ICC, Walecki and Krajewski. From the middle of 1938 onwards there are no references to the Polish CP in the Comintern press. A number of communist refugees from other countries—Hungary, Yugoslavia, the Baltic States—also disappeared in the USSR at this time, including Bela Kun and many of the staff of the Lenin School. Comintern headquarters were removed from the centre to the outskirts of Moscow. In the article on Poland in the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia* (second edition, 1955), it is stated that: 'In 1938, in connection with suspicions, later shown to be unfounded, of large-scale penetration of the leading ranks of the party *aktiv* by hostile agencies, the ECCI decided to dissolve temporarily the Polish Communist Party.' In February 1956, during the twentieth congress of the CPSU, the central Polish communist newspaper, *Trybuna Ludu*, published a declaration signed by the central committees of the Soviet, Polish, Italian, Bulgarian, and Finnish Communist parties that the charges made against the Polish party in 1938 were devoid of foundation.

In July 1936 an IFTU conference agreed to open negotiations with a number of national trade union federations not affiliated to the IFTU, including the Soviet unions. The proposal that the two trade union Internationals should amalgamate, supported by the Norwegian, French, Spanish, and Mexican representatives, was rejected, on the ground that apart from the Russian unions the RILU had no real existence. The RILU was in fact dissolved at the end of 1937. In November 1937 an IFTU delegation went to Moscow to discuss terms. On its return the question was discussed by the IFTU Executive, which voted by 4 to 1, with 2 abstentions, to refer the question to the next meeting of the IFTU Council in Oslo (some affiliated organizations had said that if the Russian unions were admitted, they would leave). At Oslo in May 1938 the voting was 16 to 4 with 1 abstention, against the admission of the Russian unions, and it was agreed to discontinue the negotiations. Florin wrote: 'The reactionary bourgeoisie followed with the most profound apprehension the

development towards an international trade union bloc . . . to the greatest dismay of the workers, the efforts of the capitalists succeeded once more.'

Throughout the year the KPD continued its campaign to bring the SPD into a united front; the absence of this united front was given as the chief reason why the German workers continued to tolerate the fascist dictatorship; other reasons were the Nazi terror and the fact that some workers were getting 'a comparatively tolerable wage'. In September 1938 the central committee published an appeal for the unity of all opposition groups as 'an independent and recognized ally of democratic forces throughout the world'. They had to show the world 'the other Germany'; they would oppose Hitler's war policy, but if war broke out they would work inside and outside Germany to put an end to the war and to Hitler's tyranny as quickly as possible, and establish a new German republic on democratic lines. 'The popular front leaves the religious convictions and political principles of the particular groups and individuals united in it untouched.' In April 1936 Thorez invited Catholics to join the popular front 'because you are our brothers'. The argument that religious beliefs were no bar to collaboration was also put by Browder at the tenth congress of the United States CP. He 'extended the hand of brotherly co-operation to the great mass of democratic Catholics'; he wanted talks between communists and Catholics to be 'on the plane of that Christian brotherhood and charity which we of no religion appreciate as social virtues'. Many Catholics, he said, were joining the CP. 'There is no cause for conflict, because communists uphold and respect religious freedom. . . . In practical life both communists and Catholics seek justice, truth, and goodwill among mankind.'

The Fourth International was founded at a conference held near Paris in September 1938, attended by 21 delegates. The programme and resolutions were drafted by Trotsky. He and his followers had been discussing the advisability of founding a new International since the collapse of the KPD in 1933 and the endorsement of the KPD policy by the ECCI. Stalin, said the Germans attending the conference, was revising Marx and Lenin not with the pen of the theoretician, but with the jackboots of the GPU.]

Not at any time since the end of the world war has the international situation been so tense. A fourth part of mankind is once more in the grip of war. Fascist governments, having robbed and enslaved the masses of their own people, are bursting into the territory of others. By attacks upon other nations, by armed robbery abroad, they attempt to stifle the rising indignation of the working people within their own countries. . . .

In the Far East the fascist military clique of Japan are waging a war of conquest against the Chinese people for lordship over Asia, for domination of the Pacific. Cities of ancient culture are laid in ruins, thousands of villages given to the flames, tens of thousands of the peaceful population of China shot down by the Japanese executioners.

But the heroism of the four hundred millions of the Chinese people is not to be broken by the executioners. Rallying ever closer together in a united national front, the Chinese people are inflicting severe defeats

on the Japanese aggressors. Defending themselves, the Chinese people have made of their bodies a living shield for all the nations of Asia, and are inspiring all the colonial peoples for struggle against their oppressors.

In Spain the hordes of the German-Italian intervention are raging. Powerless to break the stubborn resistance of the Republican Army, they are basely wreaking vengeance on the peaceful population of Spain, raining death from the air upon thousands of women and children. For nearly two years the Spanish people have been fighting with epic courage for their independence against the fascist Powers in coalition—with tacit support from reactionary Tory circles in Britain.

Abandoned by bourgeois-democratic governments, the Spanish people staunchly defend their democratic republic against the combined forces of world reaction. Defending their liberty, they defend the cause of the whole of advanced and progressive mankind.

Emboldened by the impunity with which it could carry on intervention in Spain, German fascism occupied Austria. By their suppression of the armed struggle of the workers in 1934, by depriving the working people of elementary liberties, the ruling classes of Austria had prepared the ground for the invasion of German fascism.

Already German fascism, without having succeeded in firmly settling itself upon Austria, is preparing an attack on Czechoslovakia. Together with Polish fascism, it strives for the occupation and partition of Lithuania. It is crouching for a spring upon the Balkans, menacing their existence as States and their national independence. It threatens Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries. It surrounds France with a fascist ring and reckons to take it unawares with a sudden blow. Like a beast of prey, it scours far and wide to procure raw materials, and material resources, and human reserves for a large-scale war against the land of socialism.

Whose is the responsibility for this brazen insolence and murderous activity of fascism, for the war conflagration they have raised in various parts of the globe? The responsibility lies with the reactionary clique of British Conservatism. Not a finger did they raise when the Japanese militarists attacked China. They are only waiting for the military exhaustion of Japan to raise the question of the partition of China. With Italian fascism they have made an arrangement—to bring about the strangling of the Spanish people. To German fascism they lent their aid, giving it the possibility of rearming. For them it is a bloodthirsty ruffian, a 'strong-arm man', to be used against the international working class and the democratic movement of the people.

They gave their blessing to its invasion of Austria. Stealthily, covertly, they direct it towards the East, against the land of the Soviets.

Responsibility also lies with the French reactionary bourgeoisie. By

capitulating to German fascism they helped to give it strength. Like the conspirators of Coblenz in the days of the French Revolution, the French reactionaries have plotted with German fascism against their own people. These dark forces dictated to the Blum Government the policy of the blockade of Republican Spain. The bloc of British and French reactionaries dragged in the wake of its pro-fascist policy the leaders of the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals, who remain inactive in the face of the German and Italian intervention in Spain.

The responsibility for the blood, suffering, and sacrifice of the Spanish people, for the bandit onslaught on China, for the military occupation of Austria, lies not only with the fascist scoundrels, but also with those who tolerate and assist them.

Fellow-workers!

The ruling classes basely deceive you when they say that it would be in the interests of the maintenance of peace to reconcile yourselves to the strangling of the Spanish people, the enslavement of China, the subjugation of Austria. It is not by permitting the war instigators to plunder and slaughter other peoples that wars are avoided. Wars are averted by a firm policy of curbing the fascist brigands in good time.

You are being told cynical lies when it is stated that the Governments of Britain, France and the USA are 'powerless' to put a stop to international fascist banditry. To stop this banditry is well within their power. But this requires the adoption of the proposal of the USSR for joint action of all States interested in maintaining peace against the instigators of war.

They must reinforce their action by measures of economic pressure. Let them deprive the fascist bandits of credits, let them refuse to provide them with the raw material necessary for the conduct of war, let them close the channels of trade to them, let them put under blockade not Republican Spain, but those who have attacked it. Let them open the frontiers and furnish the Spanish people with the possibility of freely purchasing arms, and this will be enough to ensure that fascism draws back like a whipped cur.

Put no faith, comrades, in those who assert that you have not at your disposal the means whereby to make governments conduct a policy of struggle against the aggressors. The working class, filled with the consciousness of struggle, is a tower of strength. It, and it alone, carries on the work of pits and plants, of fields, factories, and workshops. Without the working class no train is moved, no steamer sails, no ship is laden, no one can hush the voice of hundreds and thousands of demonstrators.

But, brother proletarians, for your strength to be brought into action requires working-class unity. It requires that in your organization there be no treachery at headquarters. It requires that your struggle be not broken by those Labour leaders who are agents of the British bourgeoisie.

Your strength will be multiplied manifold, if all the units of the labour movement fight shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy, fascism. Uniting the struggle internationally, you will secure new, unparalleled strength. . . .

It is to this path of struggle that the Communist International calls the working people. It has repeatedly called upon the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals to establish an international fighting front. But a clique of reactionary British leaders have obdurately turned down these calls, disrupting united action by the international proletariat. By their splitting policy they have sought to undermine the confidence of the working class in its own strength, to disarm it in the face of the enemy, and thereby they have encouraged the fascists to undertake further acts of aggression.

Working parallel with these leaders went the Trotskyist-Bukharinite agents of fascism, the spying 'Fourth International'. It was they who wished to restore capitalism in the USSR, to dismember the land of the Soviets, to hand over its peoples to be enslaved by fascism. It was their brood who opened the fronts to the fascist interventionists in Spain, and delivered blows at the rear of the Republican army. It was these who, on the orders of the Japanese Intelligence Service, conduct work of diversion and espionage in China. It is these who operate far and wide as wreckers of the labour movement and, in the interests of fascism, join with Citrine in the effort to prevent united action by the international working class.

These are the infamous spies, wreckers, and murderers, whom such people as Dan take under their wing, making of them a banner for the continuation of their ruinous, splitting policy. By crushing the Trotskyist-Bukharinite gang of warmongers, these base hirelings of Japanese-German fascism, the Soviet people have rendered an inestimable service to the cause of peace, the cause of working-class unity, the cause of anti-fascist struggle. . . .

In the name of millions of workers, in the interests of defending the Spanish people, the Communist International again proposes to the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals to establish a united international working-class front.

To help Republican Spain, to defend China, means to fight against world war, to defend your hearths and homes, the liberty and the independence of your countries, against the fascist butchers. A people that would permit the strangling of Republican Spain or China would, with its own hands, be preparing the fascist yoke for itself, would strengthen the chains of its own capitalist slavery. . . .

Demand the application of economic, political, and other sanctions against the fascist miscreants! Working people, join forces with the

proletariat in a mighty People's Front against fascism and imperialist war! Peoples of Europe, America, and Asia! Join with the great people of the Soviet Union in building the international peace front against the fascist cut-throats, the incendiaries of wars of plunder.

GREETINGS FROM THE ECCI TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE SPANISH COMMUNIST PARTY

July 1938

World News and Views, xviii, 36, p. 854, 23 July 1938*

[The central committee of the Spanish CP, meeting in November 1937, called for 'a radical change in judicial practice'; Diaz said that persons accused of treachery were 'still being treated with benevolence'. The communists had published a great deal of material purporting to prove that the POUM were acting on behalf of Franco. On 12 December the Minister of Justice was replaced by a former under-secretary whose appointment was approved by the CP. In October 1938 the POUM leaders were brought to trial; they were acquitted of the charges of treason and espionage, but condemned and imprisoned for their activities in Barcelona in 1937 as prejudicial to the war effort.]

On behalf of the million-strong army of the world party of the revolutionary working class, the Executive Committee of the Communist International sends ardent, fraternal greetings to you and all fighters for the cause of the freedom and independence of Republican Spain.

For two years already the Spanish people have been waging a heroic struggle without parallel against the traitorous generals and against the Italian and German fascist invaders who seek to destroy their national independence.

It is with indomitable will, heroic courage and determination that the people of Spain are fighting against barbarous fascism for their freedom and for the liberation of their country from the foreign invaders.

The struggle waged by Spain is a struggle for the cause of all mankind, for peace, democracy, and progress throughout the world. In the trenches of Spain there is being fought out a big battle, the consequences of which will be of world-historic significance.

Two years of stubborn resistance by the Spanish people have frustrated the predatory plans of the fascist warmongers and dealt a telling blow to their policy of provoking the conflagrations of war. Two years of stubborn resistance by the Spanish people have tremendously strengthened the determination of the working masses in other countries to resist fascist

* *World News and Views* replaced *International Press Correspondence* on 2 July 1938; the numbering of issues was not changed.

aggression and have led to a great upsurge of the anti-fascist democratic movement.

The struggle is a bitter one; the enemy is cruel and barbarous. The Spanish people face an enemy superior in technical equipment. The struggle against such an enemy requires the concentration of all forces of the Spanish people.

The decisive guarantee of the victory of their just cause lies in the unity of the Spanish working class, in the all-round consolidation of the People's Front, in closely rallying around the legitimate Government of the Spanish Republic, in continuously strengthening their People's Army and in mobilizing all the forces of the people for the successful organization of resistance.

It is with profound indignation and abhorrence that the Communist International turns against those who under the hypocritical mask of 'non-intervention' operate a blockade against Republican Spain, callously look on at the terrible destruction being wrought on the country and its cultural treasures, at the mass murder of defenceless women and children, and by their policy aid and abet this barbarity.

We denounce the pro-fascist Conservative clique in England, and their allies in the camp of French reaction as sharing the responsibility for the fascist aggression, for the terrible sufferings and countless victims among the Spanish people.

The resolute fight being waged with exemplary energy by the working class of Spain against the Fifth Column of fascism, against the traitors to the cause of Spain and against the fainthearted advocates of defeat and surrender evokes the enthusiastic support of the working people of the whole world.

The complete extermination of the Trotskyist POUM gang will constitute one of the most important prerequisites for the victory over the fascist murderers and vandals.

The whole world witnesses how the Spanish people are defending their homeland, their freedom and independence, and democracy and progress against fascism.

If the fascist warmongers in their unbridled fury have countered this by increasing their forces of intervention, then all the more is it the duty of the parties and organizations of the world working class to join forces in showing active solidarity and in giving all-round support to the Spanish people. All the forces of democracy should regard the Spanish people as the defenders of their own interests as well, and are in duty bound to close their ranks to help the Spanish people. For, as Comrade Stalin declared in his telegram to José Diaz:

The liberation of Spain from the yoke of the fascist reactionaries is not the private affair of the Spaniards, but the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind.

On the second anniversary of the heroic struggle, the Communist International assures you that it is doing all within its power to ensure that the world working class fulfil their duty towards their Spanish brothers so as to achieve and hasten on the victory of the Spanish people over fascism, the scourge of humanity.

EXTRACTS FROM A RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDIUM
ON THE POLICY OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

July 1938

World News and Views, xviii, 35, p. 831, 16 July 1938

[The conflict and rivalry between Mao Tse-tung and Chang Kuo-tao had come to the surface during the long march, and had given Mao the victory. Chang Kuo-tao claims that his dispute with Mao in 1937 arose from their different attitudes to the alliance with the KMT. Mao, he says, was concerned only to advance and improve the communist position, whereas he—Chang—believed in a genuine alliance on the lines of the September 1937 agreement. An indecisive discussion of the question in October 1937 was finally settled by Moscow's endorsement of Mao's leadership. In an article in the *Communist International* in May 1938 Wang Ming wrote that collaboration with the KMT had not yet reached the level desired by both parties. In both there were some who did 'not understand that to weaken a friendly party . . . is equal to weakening one's own forces, rendering aid to the enemy'. Relations between two parties that had entered into an agreement 'cannot be built on the basis of the domination or subordination of one party to the other'. To those who said collaboration was only a manoeuvre, and then the communists would turn their weapons against the KMT, he said that the CCP wanted collaboration with the KMT not only against Japan, but 'in fighting for a free, independent, and happy future for the great Chinese people'. The abandonment of the slogan of Sovietization 'is no temporary move, no temporary manoeuvre or game; it is a serious turn in the policy and tactics of the CCP'. This echoed the statements in a CCP central committee manifesto of 25 December 1937, on the party's readiness 'to join with the KMT in building the new China after victory has been achieved'. The manifesto urged the Government to strengthen its position by drawing in capable representatives of other parties, and condemned the 'traitors, spies, and Trotskyite bandits' who were trying to undermine national unity. In February 1938 Mao stated that the CCP was 'not today putting forward the demand for participation in the Government'; but a stronger Government would increase the people's confidence.]

1. The presidium of the ECCI declares its wholehearted agreement with the political line of the Communist Party of China and the solidarity of the Communist International with the liberation struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders.

2. The presidium confirms the expulsion from the Communist Party

of China of Chang Kuo-tao, former member of the CC of the party, who betrayed communism and the cause of the united anti-Japanese front and sold himself to the enemies of the Chinese people. The presidium is confident that the treacherous conduct of Chang Kuo-tao will meet with utter condemnation and disgust not only in the ranks of the CP of China, but also among all sincere adherents of the united anti-Japanese front.

3. The presidium of the ECCI declares that:

The heroic struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders evokes the warm sympathy of the international proletariat and of wide masses of people in all countries. All progressive mankind realizes that the great Chinese people are defending against barbarous violence not only their hearths and homes, not only their liberty and independence, but also the cause of the liberty and peace of all peoples. Should the Japanese fascist militarists succeed in subjugating the Chinese people, this would mean an extraordinary intensification and extension of fascist aggression both in Asia, in the Pacific, as well as in Europe and other parts of the world, whereas China's victory will constitute a severe blow to the plans of conquest of all the fascist aggressors. Thus the war of liberation conducted by the Chinese people is a most important component part of the general struggle of the world proletariat and of progressive mankind as a whole against the violence of barbarous fascism.

Directly following from this is the need and duty of the international labour movement and of all the forces of democracy and peace to render all possible support to the struggle of the Chinese people, while at the same time developing successful aid for the Spanish people. This international support is as yet insufficiently organized; its extent far from corresponds to the wide scope of the existing mass sympathy for the Chinese people. This sympathy should be directed towards energetic action and matters should be so organized as to achieve:

Firstly, the rendering of both political and moral as well as material aid and support to China.

Secondly, an increase in all sorts of difficulties and obstacles in the way of the Japanese militarists in the conduct of their aggression in China.

To this end, the ECCI addresses itself to the international proletariat, to all sections of the Communist International, and to all sincere adherents of democracy and peace, with the call primarily to fulfil the following tasks:

(a) To intensify in every possible way the international campaign in aid of China. . . .

(b) To develop a wide movement of protest against the bandit drive of the Japanese fascists in China, by organizing meetings, demonstrations, etc. and directing the indignation of the people also against bribed pro-Japanese newspapers in the various capitalist countries.

(c) To organize and extend mass sanctions against the Japanese

aggressor (the movement to boycott Japanese goods, the refusal of workers to unload Japanese goods and to load cargoes of munitions and other materials for Japan, etc.). . . .

(f) In agreement with the Chinese Government to send authoritative delegations to China from various countries so as afterwards to employ them for intensifying the international campaign in support of the Chinese people.

Should the international working-class and democratic forces of all countries develop effective support for China, there can be no doubt that the heroism of the united Chinese people will lead it to complete victory over the barbarous Japanese militarists and will establish a free, independent, democratic Republic of China, which will serve as one of the most important bulwarks of peace, democracy, and progress throughout the world.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE ANNIVERSARY
OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1938 *World News and Views*, xviii, 53, p. 1203, 5 November 1938

[Comment in the communist press on the Munich agreement concentrated on the argument that Britain and France had yielded to the aggressor out of fear of the armed masses who, on the outbreak of war, would appear on the scene; Daladier and Chamberlain preferred capitulation to victory, because victory could have been won only with the USSR. Dimitrov wrote that the policy of the democracies was determined by 'reactionary imperialist circles' guided by the fear of revolution in Europe and of national liberation in Asia, and by hatred of the USSR. They 'sacrificed to fascism the interests of their own peoples. They supported German fascism because they want in its person to have a European gendarme that strangles every democratic anti-fascist movement.' The working class could frustrate the aggressors by resisting reaction at home, by helping Spain and China. There should be an international conference of all workers' organizations. An editorial in the *Communist International* asked the LSI what it intended to do, and continued: 'In the difficult days of the struggle for Czechoslovakia the Comintern, after careful consideration, refrained from making a direct proposal for joint action to the LSI, as a refusal would have strengthened the hand of the plotters against peace and freedom.' In the last issue of the journal for 1938, however, Dimitrov wrote: 'A few months before Munich, and also directly preceding the Munich plot, the representatives of the CI approached the chairman of the Second International with the proposal to establish permanent contact between the leadership of the international organizations of the working class and urgently to take joint action to ward off the fascist blow aimed at Czechoslovakia.' All their proposals, he said, were turned down.]

Comment on social-democracy reverted to the style in use before the popular front. An article in the same periodical at the end of the year said the international united front could not come into being 'unless the predominant influence of social-democratism is eliminated', and another article in the same issue ended with a quotation from Stalin; 'It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without having first put an end to social-democratism in the working-class movement.' The editorial article said: 'The reactionary cliques of the English and French upper classes knew very well how easy it would have been to force Hitler to draw back. But they knew also that a political defeat of Hitler would shake the very foundations of fascism and call into being a mighty upsurge of the anti-fascist freedom movement. . . . The protection of their class interests was more important to them than the protection of the vital interests of their own nations and of humanity as a whole. . . . It is becoming clearer and clearer that Munich was the result of a secret, previously agreed, and scandalous plot.'

The breakdown of the popular front policy was shown also in the attack on pacifism. 'It is absurd and at the same time distressing that the fear of war felt by the nations goes to increase the war danger, that pacifism is pouring oil on the flames kindled by the warmongers. . . . While fascism fosters the ideology of a war of conquest, the accomplices of fascism in the democratic countries attempt to set up cowardice as a philosophy. . . . The French Trotskyists . . . have coined the term "Better a slave than dead". . . . This contemptible principle is being put forward by the agents of the Gestapo with the object of emasculating the working class. . . . It is contrary to the innermost essence of the working class. . . . Freedom is more precious than peace.' The 'total pacifists' believed in friendly relations with gangsters; peace, they thought, could be saved by weakness, arguing that 'nothing could be more dangerous than to bar the way to fascism with an overwhelming superiority of military forces'. The intention behind the pacifist proposals was to weaken the democratic States so far that they would no longer be able to offer resistance to aggression, but would have to 'submit to German fascism without a struggle and without conditions'. The article ended with a quotation from Lenin: 'Pacifism and abstract peace propaganda are ways of misleading the working class.'

In September 1938 the KPD central committee appealed for the amalgamation of all groups and parties opposed to Hitler. Wieden wrote (*Communist International*, August 1938) that fascism was not 'a quantitative modification of bourgeois democracy'; it was 'qualitatively different'; under bourgeois democracy the working class could organize and fight. It was 'the Trotskyist agents of the Gestapo' who denied the essential difference between fascism and bourgeois democracy. 'During the last three years the communists of all countries have proved themselves to be the most stubborn and tireless defenders of bourgeois-democratic liberties.' Kautsky was opposed to SPD-KPD collaboration. 'Should the Russians reach agreement with Germany and Japan, then communists everywhere would become auxiliaries of the fascists.' In Paris the German popular front committee collapsed in the autumn of 1938.]

To-day the Soviet people marks the twenty-first year of its great

Socialist Revolution, of its heroic struggle, of its world historic victories.

At the time when the peoples of the Soviet Republic are completing the construction of a classless socialist society and are advancing full of confidence towards communism, the capitalist world is in the throes of an ominous war fever.

The second imperialist war, a robber war for a new repartition of the earth, has in fact already begun. It is already raging in various corners of the globe. In Spain and in China the fascist butchers are doing their abominable work. Over five hundred million human beings have been hurled into the abyss of bloody destruction. War threatens to spread to new territories and to involve new peoples. Hundreds of millions of people are menaced with attack by the fascist beasts-of-prey.

Never yet, as during these days of fascist brigandage, have the masses of the people of the capitalist countries had such a strong and profound feeling of their blood-bond with the great land of socialism. The peoples see in the USSR the bulwark of their struggle for liberty and independence, the embodiment of their age-old aspirations. They see that the Soviet people, thanks to the proletarian dictatorship, have withstood a host of enemies, have maintained and consolidated their independence, have built socialism. . . . Conscious of its strength the Soviet land pursues its path with resolute and tranquil step. The justness of its cause constitutes its greatness. Its hand is formidable to enemies and will not fail to succour friends. Its Stalinist word is inviolable. It is with confidence that it looks into its future. . . .

The Soviet land will yield to no one its achievements, its inexhaustible riches. The frontiers of the Soviet country are inviolable.

On the borders of the USSR there stands unyielding the strongest army in the world, the Red Army of Socialism. By the lesson it taught the Japanese cut-throats at Lake Hasan it provided a clear example of how the cause of peace should be defended. By wiping out the gang of Trotskyist-Bukharinite spies, the Soviet people teaches how one should conduct the struggle against traitors, capitulators, and enemies of the people.

By its unswerving loyalty to the obligations it had undertaken, the Soviet Government, during the Czechoslovak crisis, showed how agreements should be kept and collective security defended. Only the Soviet people supported and continues to support the Spanish people against the violence of the plunderers and the treachery of their accomplices. Only the Soviet Union stretches out a helping hand to the Chinese people. Only the land of the proletarian dictatorship supremely upholds, with Stalinist courage and stalwartness, the cause of liberty throughout the world. . . .

In their mortal hatred of socialism, of the international working class, of every democratic movement, the imperialist cliques of Britain and

France concluded a counter-revolutionary alliance with German and Italian fascism. The Munich agreement was not only a blow at Czechoslovakia. It is a far wider imperialist conspiracy. It is a conspiracy against the small nations which Britain and France are betraying to the fascist plunderers. It is a conspiracy against the Spanish Republic, whose heroic people they wish to place in bondage to the German and Italian violators. It is an onslaught on the French people around whose neck German and Italian fascism are drawing the noose ever tighter. It is an onslaught on the British people against whom war is being prepared by its age-old enemy German imperialism. It is a treacherous blow against the German people, whose enslavement becomes severer the greater the concessions made to the hangmen of the working people of Germany. It is against the People's Front movement, against the breast of the international proletariat that the Munich conspiracy is directed. It is against world peace that the blow is directed by the Munich conspirators, who come forward hypocritically in the role of 'saviours of peace'.

Not peace was saved by the British and French reactionaries; what they did was to save German fascism from collapse. They strengthened Hitler's position for the conduct of a major war.

Workers! Was it possible to preserve peace and avert the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia?

Yes, comrades, it was!

Neither from the military nor the economic point of view was Hitler Germany ready for war. It was lacking in raw materials, foodstuffs, and financial resources. Its fortifications were not completed. Its army did not possess trained personnel in sufficient quantity. The rear of German fascism constituted a terrible danger to it. The German people had no desire for war. They were filled with deep discontent. A wave of popular indignation threatened, if war broke out, to sweep away the fascist adventurers.

Ranged against Germany were forces on whose side was the overwhelming preponderance. Czechoslovakia possessed an excellent army and was protected by a system of first-class fortresses. The British and French fleets were in a position to ensure the blockade of Germany. Action by the Soviet Union would have given rise to a powerful wave of the anti-fascist movement in defence of the just cause of the peoples. Faced by such forces, German fascism would have had no alternative but to retreat. But the British bourgeoisie who dragged France in the wake of their policy did not want to permit this political defeat of the fascist gendarme of Europe.

Britain and France did everything possible to compel Czechoslovakia to capitulate. By exerting unheard of pressure, by supporting the German blackmail, by threatening to take the side of Germany, they succeeded in

getting the Czech Government to accept the bandit ultimatum of German fascism.

The Munich conspiracy took place because the reactionary bourgeoisie decided to resist by every means the formation of an international peace front together with the Soviet Union. Not at any price would they permit a powerful movement of the peoples against fascism. Having in advance come to agreement with the German fascists, and having distributed the roles, the British reactionaries organized the deception of the peoples with the aid of the farce of ostentatious military mobilization in Britain and France.

The Munich conspiracy was able to take place because the hypocritical advocates of French 'democracy' preferred cowardly capitulation to a policy of resisting the aggressor, because the capitulators broke the determination of the peoples to struggle by sanctimoniously preaching the pacifist creed of peace at any price. The Munich conspiracy was facilitated by the fact that the working class, as a result of the splitting, capitulatory policy of the leaders of the Second International, was unable to muster its forces so as to frustrate the criminal conspiracy of German fascism and of British reaction.

Now, when millions of people are asking themselves what is the way out of the situation created by the Munich conspiracy, we communists say: The policy of capitulation did not and does not save peace. It has already led to war. Abyssinia and Spain, Manchuria and China, Austria and Czechoslovakia—such are the bloodstained landmarks of this policy, of the policy of concessions to fascism. By weakening the peace forces, by strengthening the fascist aggressors, it helps them to unleash new, even more destructive wars, brings closer a monstrous conflagration of world imperialist war. There is only one way by which to save peace, namely, the way of resolute struggle against the fascist aggressor.

He who does not fight for peace, cannot avert war.

To fight for peace means that in each country the liberty of the people must be defended against the reactionary bourgeoisie. Just as the feudal nobility during the period of the collapse of feudalism plotted with the enemies of France against the French Republic, so now in the epoch of decaying capitalism, the reactionary bourgeoisie in alliance with German fascism are brandishing the sword over the heads of their own peoples.

A successful fight for peace cannot be conducted unless ruthless blows are dealt at those who betray their country and their people. The fascist aggressors, who have cast off all restraint, cannot be curbed unless a resolute struggle is undertaken against the capitulators in one's own country.

The peoples cannot entrust the fate of their countries to governments

which conspire with foreign fascism against their own peoples. They cannot entrust either the defence of the country, or armaments to such governments. It is against the working class, against all labouring people, against the liberation struggle of other peoples that these reactionary governments will direct their guns.

The condition for a successful struggle to strengthen the cause of peace is to replace the governments of national treachery and shame in the countries menaced by fascist blows from without, by governments that are ready to repulse the fascist aggressors. A government of real national salvation cannot pursue the ruinous path of capitulation. It will conduct a ruthless struggle against capitulators and agents of foreign fascism. It will ruthlessly crush the fascist machinations of reaction at home. It will purge the army of the fascist enemies of its own people. It will establish real control by the working class over the defence of the country. It will disarm the fascist leagues and make the working-class organizations the mainstay of the country's defence. It will conduct a consistent policy of collective security and will not shrink from employing sanctions against the aggressor. With the aid of such governments, that are ready to use armed force in defence of the liberty and the independence of their peoples, it will be possible for a firm front of the peoples to arise which will compel the fascist aggressors to respect frontiers and keep the peace.

Only through the medium of an alliance of peoples conducting a self-sacrificing struggle for the cause of peace is it possible to frustrate the criminal plans of the instigators of war. A defence cordon of armed peoples who have joined their forces with the great Soviet people will doom fascism to impotence and hasten on its defeat and its inevitable ruin.

At the time when fascism has already set about the repartition of Europe, when it is crippling other peoples and tearing them to pieces, the task of the working class now is to head the liberation struggle of the enslaved nations and the defence of the peoples threatened by foreign domination. The nation is not the gang of fascists, reactionary financiers and industrial magnates who rob and betray the people. The nation is the many millions of workers, peasants, and working people generally—the people that is devoted to its country, cherishes its liberty, and defends its independence. Just as in Spain and China where the people are fighting with arms in hand, and in Austria and Czechoslovakia—so also in all countries menaced by fascist invasion from without, only the working class can rally, rouse, and lead the people to a victorious struggle for national liberation. The working class is the backbone of the nation, the bulwark of its liberty, dignity, and independence.

Workers! Do not let yourselves be led astray by the treachery of the bourgeois politicians to the People's Front. Let the traitors break with the People's Front movement—their departure will only be a gain to

it. You are faced with a big and noble task, namely, not only to strengthen but also to extend the front of the people. New people and new sections of the population, who do not barter the fate of their country and their people, will join with you in the struggle against reactionary traitors, in the struggle to save the people.

Who can hammer out this broad front against fascist brigandage? Only a united working class.

The working class is the greatest force in modern society. It is the real master of the world, if it is united.

In face of the international conspiracy of fascism, international working-class unity has become a matter that brooks no delay. The Communist International carries on an unceasing struggle for this unity. It has repeatedly made the proposal to the Labour and Socialist International to establish united action by the international working class. Millions of workers throughout the world demand unity. Unity is desired by many social-democratic and trade union organizations.

But this unity is not wanted by the reactionary leaders entrenched in the leadership of the Second International and in a number of social-democratic parties and trade unions. They systematically disrupt the formation of a united, anti-fascist, working-class fighting front. It is they who, while retreating step by step before fascism, conduct a shameless slanderous campaign against the land of socialism. It is they who gather up with a solicitous hand from the cesspool of fascism, the Trotskyist agents of the Gestapo, whom they allow to do wrecking work in the labour movement with impunity. It is they who by their policy of non-intervention have helped the hangmen who seek to strangle Republican Spain. It is they who without protest accepted the Munich ultimatum, hypocritically declaring it to be a supreme victory for the cause of peace. It is they who after Munich continue the same policy of splits and capitulation, the policy of disintegrating the labour movement.

Without a daily and resolute struggle against these enemies of working-class unity, these agents of the bourgeoisie, it is impossible to achieve the cohesion of the ranks of the proletariat. Now it is not enough to declare oneself a supporter of unity; now one must boldly put it into immediate practice on a local scale, as our Spanish brothers have done. . . .

Proletarians of all lands, unite, so as to lay the foundation of unity of the peoples against fascist aggression!

Proletarians, working people of all countries, strengthen the fraternal fighting alliance with the great Soviet people!

EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCI MAY DAY MANIFESTO

*April 1939**World News and Views*, xix, 24, p. 473, 29 *April 1939*

[At the eighteenth CPSU congress in March 1939 Manuilsky, reporting as chief Soviet representative on the ECCI, criticized the application of popular front tactics. These had given rise to opportunist tendencies, 'a tendency to idealize the role of the so-called democratic States, and to gloss over their imperialist character. . . . The communists of the capitalist countries are not sufficiently prepared for the abrupt turns in events, and have not yet mastered the forms of struggle dictated by the tense international situation.' The Spanish Republic might have been saved if the LSI had accepted the CI's proposals for unity of action (the last Comintern representatives left Spain in March 1939), and this would also have averted the occupation of Austria and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia; it would have made Munich impossible, defeated the Italians in Abyssinia and the Japanese in China. 'But the capitulators of the Second International did not want this to happen because they feared the victory of the people's front more than they feared the victory of fascism.' War could still be avoided by isolating these capitulators and destroying their influence—'they are the agents of fascism in the labour movement'—and if the democracies, so much stronger than the aggressors, exerted economic pressure. But the ruling classes of Britain and France were 'obsessed with the idea of being able to use German fascism as the mailed fist of reaction against the Soviet Union and as a gendarme against the international working class, the popular front, and the national liberation movement of the enslaved peoples'. The United States, on the other hand, was anxious to organize active resistance to fascist aggression. Manuilsky also reported that, because of arrests of Japanese communists, and the activities of the Japanese secret police in smuggling their agents and spies into the party, the composition of the central committee had been changed four times since 1934. In 1940 Nozaka went to Yen-an, where he directed psychological warfare against the Japanese forces in North China, and ran a school for Japanese prisoners of war.

Dimitrov, writing on May Day, said that with a policy of collective security Britain and France could repel aggression, but were in fact encouraging fascist appetites by 'their endeavour to kindle a most criminal, counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union'. There was no crime to which they would not resort 'to reach agreement with the fascist aggressor, to buy off its colonial claims and to transform it into the watchdog of world reaction'. But in the fascist armies, and in their rear, there were 'hundreds of thousands' of soldiers filled with hatred of fascism, and this represented a great danger to the aggressors.

At the end of January 1939 the KPD held a conference (later sometimes listed as its fourteenth congress) ostensibly in Berne, actually outside Paris; it was attended by about 25 members, including Koplenig (Austria); the Austrian CP had wished to amalgamate with the KPD, but the proposal was rejected by the ECCI. The resolution adopted called for the establishment in Germany of 'a new democratic republic with a popular government freely elected by the entire people'; it called for unity with the Catholics, the Centre Party, and the

Christian trade unions in opposition to Hitler, and for a campaign to 'expose the Trotskyist agents of fascism'. In April the communist parties of Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia published a joint manifesto against the occupation of Czechoslovakia. *Rundschau* took up the proposal in the May Day manifesto for a joint meeting of the CI, LSI, and IFTU, and pursued it in a number of articles and appeals.

At the IFTU meeting in Zürich in July 1939 the proposal to invite the Russian unions to affiliate to the IFTU was defeated by 46 votes to 37. At the beginning of August Thorez and Cachin wrote to the chairman of the LSI urging negotiations between the three Internationals on unity of action in face of the danger of war. The chairman replied that he had no reason to believe the LSI Executive had changed its views.

Manuilsky gave the membership of the Comintern (excluding the CPSU) as 1,200,000. This was an increase of more than 300,000 since the previous CPSU congress in 1934; the increase was concentrated in China, France, and Spain. In 1939 the Latin American parties claimed a total of 90,000 members. The Cuban party's slogan was 'with Batista, against reaction'. Batista, presidential candidate of the bloc which included the CP, 'was elected by a landslide. . . . Behind Batista stand the workers and peasants.']

. . . Never before has the star of socialism shone with such brilliance as to-day. At the 18th Congress of the Bolsheviks, the great continuer of the work of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the leader and teacher of the working people of all countries, Comrade Stalin, turned over a new page in the history of mankind—the completion of the construction of a classless society in the USSR and the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

In the annals of the momentous victories of socialism, the people of the capitalist countries, languishing in the chains of slavery, fascist terror, and war, see the living proof of the invincible might of the working class. They curse their present lot and in communism see their future. In a bond of fraternal friendship, in unison, the peoples of the Soviet Union are building the lofty edifice of communism, an edifice flooded with sunshine and light, abounding in human happiness and joy.

Their great experience is a clarion call to all the oppressed and destitute throughout the world, to follow the path of Lenin and Stalin, the path of socialist revolution, the only path leading to the emancipation of working humanity.

Boundless is the suffering imposed upon the working people of the capitalist countries. For them the present day brings with it crisis, unemployment, and poverty. It brings from the gang of fascist oppressors mockery, prisons, and concentration camps. It brings a chain of crimes, committed by the fascist rulers, against the liberty and independence of the nations. It brings sanguinary imperialist slaughter, unleashed by the fascist freebooters.

For almost three years the Spanish people fought heroically against the fascist marauders who invaded their country. The British and French reactionary bourgeoisie were strangling the Spanish people with the noose of 'non-intervention'. With the support of the capitulators in the leading circles of the Second International, world reaction organized the defeat of the Spanish people. It wrested the sword of victory from this people, who defended with their lives, not only the independence of their own country, but also the independence of other nations.

Having struck down the Spanish people, who were holding the forces of the fascist aggressors in leash, the carrion circle of reaction has added fuel to the flames of the second imperialist war. It is converting Spain into an outpost of the robber plans of German and Italian fascism. It would surrender the peoples of Europe to be slaughtered, raped, and pillaged by fascism.

In the Far East the Japanese militarists are striving in vain to enslave the 400 millions of Chinese people. The Chinese people are fighting like lions against the Japanese invaders. They are harassing the enemy behind his own lines. They are putting a cordon of fire around the towns seized by the Japanese. They are exhausting the enemy by a protracted war. The courageous and self-sacrificing struggle of the Chinese people serves to revolutionize the working people of Japan, and shatters the morale of the Japanese army. The Japanese invaders have failed in their attempts to pull off a lightning war, they are powerless in their efforts to conclude the 'peace' they desire. In desperation they are driving headlong against Great Britain and France, drawing ever nearer to the colonial possessions of these Powers.

Fascism rages through Europe like a mad beast; it has swallowed Austria and Czechoslovakia, occupied Memel, annexed Albania. It is throwing its noose around Poland, it is making a drive for the Balkans, threatening Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Greece. It is stealthily creeping upon Switzerland, Holland, and Belgium. It demands a re-division of colonies and is stretching out to Latin America.

It has cast off all restraint, has become emboldened as a result of the favourable 'situation' created by the connivance of the reactionary bourgeoisie of other countries. It is bringing pressure to bear upon the small nations, bullying them and banking on the treachery of the reactionary elements in the major capitalist countries. It is working with feverish haste, plunging headlong into adventures, for it fears the growing resistance of the peoples.

It is letting loose the mercenary gang of Trotskyist spies and provocateurs, who, acting on the instruction of the fascist espionage services, seek to undermine the labour organizations from within, to disarm them in face of the advancing enemy and betray them completely to fascism.

The British and French reactionaries are now paying the price for their policy of instigating war against the USSR. Was it not they who accommodately threw open the doors of Austria and Czechoslovakia to fascism, in order to direct its drive to the East? Was it not they who allowed fascism to seize Spanish ore, the Austrian and Czechoslovakian gold reserves, its Skoda works; who offered Rumanian oil and Hungarian wheat, so as to strengthen the fascist aggressors for war against the land of the Soviets? Was it not they who freed the hands of the fascist criminals, thereby facilitating the latter's seizure of Spain?

But they have called forth spirits that have turned against them. They have armed the fascist robbers against themselves. By their policy they have exposed their own peoples to the blows of the fascist Powers. The masses are realizing, with increasing clarity, that Munich, far from saving peace, has served to accelerate and facilitate further fascist aggression. The indignation of the masses against the policy of Munich, against those who have involved the nations in war, under the hypocritical flag of saving peace, is becoming ever greater. The voice of the people, demanding the removal from power of the politicians who bear the responsibility for the Munich plot, is swelling louder and louder. The peoples have no faith in the reassurances of the fascist warmongers, nor in the declarations of their accomplices. It is not words, but deeds, that the people need. They demand a determined stand against the fascist aggressors.

We communists have always laid bare the truth to you, no matter how bitter it was. The communists showed you the true path of struggle against fascism and war. Did they not warn you that the policy pursued by the leaders of the Second International leads not to socialism, but to fascism, to war? Did they not tell you, at a time when fascism was only making its way to power in Germany, that the social-democratic policy of endless concessions to the bourgeoisie, the policy of splitting the ranks of the working class, the policy of slandering the communists, only paves the way for the defeat of the working people? Was it not the communists who proposed to the Second and Trade Union Internationals to establish a united workers' front, at a time when it was still easy to inflict a deadly blow against fascism? Was it not the communists who insisted upon the urgency of uniting all the forces of the working class in order to avert war? Was it not the communists who exposed the Munich agreement as a plot against peace and the security of nations?

Who has profited from the split in the ranks of the working class? The fascist aggressors. The reactionary bourgeoisie fear the unity of the working class more than hell-fire itself, for they know only too well that by their joint action the millions of workers could grip fascism in an iron vice, disrupt its predatory wars and accelerate the downfall of the fascist regime.

Proletarians, do not believe those who assert that it is impossible to restrain the fascist war instigators. The fascist criminals are attacking other nations not because they are strong. They are unleashing war because they themselves are being strangled by the contradictions of the regime at home. They look to war as a salvation from the approaching political and economic bankruptcy of the fascist dictatorship. They want to smother the outburst of indignation among their own peoples by the clamour around their diplomatic and military 'victories'. But the more territory they seize, the more they undermine the ground on which they tread. Resorting to violence they demolish the established economic and political relations between States, thus intensifying the chaos and the break-up of the entire capitalist system. The more it enslaves other nations, the more menacing is the rear it creates for itself and for its armies. Under the surface of fascist dictatorship develop hidden revolutionary processes of unprecedented force.

But fascism will not collapse unless it is overthrown by the working people. Upon their militant determination, their courage, their readiness to make sacrifices, depends the historical moment of the downfall of fascism and the overthrow of capitalism.

Never will the fascist hangmen crush the Czechoslovakian people, who are mustering their forces to rise against their conquerors. Never will the peoples be reconciled to the fascist bondage imposed upon them by force of arms. Fascism's first serious encounter with a strong military adversary will shatter to pieces the rotten system of fascist 'alliances' and 'protectorates'. The seeds of national revolutionary wars are maturing behind the lines of the fascist robbers, the idea of taking the citadel of capitalism by revolutionary storm is maturing in the minds of the oppressed masses.

Never shall that miscreant Franco subjugate the proud and peace-loving Spanish people, who have acquired the great experience of a national war against foreign invaders. This people ousted Napoleon. They overthrew the monarchy. They smashed the fascist dictatorship of Primo de Rivera. They will sweep away the power of this hated Italian satrap. The people's duel with fascism is not over. The masses of working people of Spain know that their struggle is an integral part of the growing movement of the anti-fascist forces of the entire world. The war which the fascist rulers are unleashing will be the grave also of Spanish fascism. Spain, with its blood-soaked soil, will once again become an anti-fascist bastion. . . .

Upon whom does the unity of action of the international working class now depend? Upon the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals. Should their leaders so desire, unity can become an accomplished fact tomorrow. The international working class will become a force exercising decisive influence on the march of events. By its unity of action it will launch a

powerful people's front movement in all capitalist countries. This will mark a serious setback for fascism, the beginning of its downfall.

Do you want this, Labour and Socialist workers? If you do, then break the resistance of your leaders to united action of the working class, and strengthen unity together with your class brothers, the communists.

Expressing the will of the working class of all countries, the Communist International proposes to the Executives of the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions immediately to commence negotiations regarding the establishment of a united front for struggle, against the instigators and incendiaries of war.

The Communist International proposes to the Labour and Socialist International a platform for unity of action—defence of peace on the basis of a determined repulse to the fascist aggressors, the organization of collective security, the struggle in each capitalist country against the treacherous policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie who seek agreement with the fascist aggressors, to the detriment of the liberty and independence of their own nation.

The Communist International proposes that a conference of labour organizations of the whole world be convened to draw up a concrete plan of action to map out the ways and means of struggle, to devise a single organ for the co-ordination of joint action.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCI MANIFESTO ON THE 22ND
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

November 1939 *World News and Views*, xix, 53, p. 1073, 11 November 1939

[When the Soviet-German treaty of August 1939 was announced, Gitton (CP of France) wrote in *Rundschau*: 'We applaud this triumph of the great Socialist Republic's peace policy, which means a retreat on the part of the incendiaries of war in Europe and hence serves to consolidate an all too uncertain peace.' The pact was 'an admission of Hitler's weakness'. Marcel Cachin wrote to Blum: 'The Communist Party of France affirms that, should Hitler declare war on France, he will have against him the entire French people, with the communists in the front rank . . . that we approve the measures taken by the Government to protect the frontiers of France . . . the CPF will do nothing to hamper the unity so indispensable for the defence of the country.' In the Chamber of Deputies the communist fraction voted the war credits, approved total mobilization, and expressed 'the unshakeable will of all communists to resist Nazi fascism, to defend liberty, national independence, democratic principles, and civilization. . . . In face of aggression by Nazi fascism, whose most clear-sighted and resolute enemy was and will remain the communists, they will be the best defenders of democracy and the independence of France.' The German-Soviet pact had 'shattered the bloc of the warmongers',

and the fraction denounced those communist deputies (21 of a total of 72) who had resigned from the CPF because of the pact. There were many other resignations, including Julien Benda and Paul Nizan—Thorez denounced the latter as 'a police informer'. On 24 August the CGT Executive, by 18 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions, condemned the Soviet-German pact. The KPD central committee statement of 25 August welcomed the pact as 'a step towards peace'; it called on the German people to continue the fight against the Nazi dictatorship; it referred to Germany's 'plans of imperialist aggression', and said the pact showed that Germany could get what it wanted by peaceful trade; it urged the conclusion of similar pacts with Poland, Rumania, France, and Britain; 'If nevertheless Hitler should plunge the German people into the catastrophe of war, then every German must realize that national-socialism is guilty of the war.'

Among British communists it was argued that the pact 'greatly eases the situation . . . of Great Britain and France. It sets free their forces and thereby enables them better to resist the aggressors in Europe.' If the British Government stood up to Hitler 'this will in the main be due to the Moscow non-aggression pact'. J. R. Campbell wrote that if war broke out 'the British people must fight to secure the overwhelming defeat of fascism'.

The Belgian CP said the pact had 'prevented the plans for a new Munich to the detriment of Poland'. An anonymous article in *World News and Views* said that the pact would 'instil confusion in Hitler'. The situation it had created 'could not be more favourable as regards peace . . . the war preparations in Great Britain and France have as object to bring back to these countries the credit for the preservation of peace which is really the achievement of the Soviet Union'. An article signed J. A. said the pact had dealt the Nazi regime 'the heaviest blow it has ever suffered', but did not attempt to reconcile this with the statement later in the article that Hitler had been eager to sign this pact.

Very little attention was paid to China in these years in the Comintern press; McLane notes that *Bolshevik* carried no articles on China between 1940 and 1944, while the *Communist International* had none between June 1941 and its final issue two years later. The possibility that the Nazi-Soviet pact might have undesirable complications for the Chinese CP is suggested by Mao's comment in October 1939 that the CCP 'must prepare itself fully for any sudden emergencies' so as not to be taken unawares; officially it was welcomed. Chou En-lai went to Moscow in the autumn of 1939. The neutrality pact between the USSR and Japan in April 1941 was said by the Chinese CP to be 'a great victory for the foreign policy of the USSR'; it was 'in keeping with the interests of the working people and oppressed nations of the whole world'; the CCP statement said the pact would not restrict Soviet aid; the USSR would continue to help China; the return of Manchuria to China 'is our personal affair. In no circumstances can we entertain the hope, as certain speculators do, that the USSR will start a war with Japan and that we shall be able to take advantage of this.'

On the outbreak of war J. R. Campbell wrote that the British people would reject Nazi peace offers and see the war through to the end, and Pollitt wrote a pamphlet entitled *How to Win the War*. To those who asked why a pact with

Hitler which sacrificed Poland was more worthy than a pact with Hitler which sacrificed Czechoslovakia, the reply (in *World News and Views* on 23 September) was that Russia had saved the Poles from the Nazis. Those who thought it part of a preconceived plan between Russia and Germany were mistaken. This was a new blow struck against fascism by the USSR.

By the end of September a new line had emerged. Under the heading 'Must the war go on?' an article signed J. A. argued that if a workers' and peasants' government were set up in Poland 'it would be very difficult to induce the masses in Western Europe to wage a bloody war simply in order to restore to power and privilege the Polish landowners and bourgeoisie'. The British and French bourgeoisie were out to destroy their rivals in Germany and Italy. Were the masses to fight for this? The article ended with an appeal to 'put an end to the imperialist war'. The editorial in the Comintern journal explained that Britain and France had declared war after the German-Soviet pact because Hitler had broken his promise to attack the Soviet Union; it was to put him in a position to keep this promise that he had been given Austria and Czechoslovakia. In an open letter to Blum in the same issue Marty wrote that the French working class 'viewed with the greatest enthusiasm the march of the Red Army to bring peace, order, and socialism . . . to the people of eastern Poland. . . . They followed with joy the marvellous reception given to the Red Army by the Polish workers.' Florin wrote that the war criminals had to be fought in Berlin as well as in London and Paris; it was not Hitler that Britain and France wanted to overthrow—their capitalists were the enemy of any German regime; the SPD was on the side of British and French imperialism because it saw in it 'the strongest guarantee against a revolution in Germany'; it hoped to use British and French bayonets to prevent the German workers overthrowing the German capitalists. If the 'Soviet peace offer' were accepted, said the CPGB at the beginning of October, this would mean 'an equal check to the aims of Nazi expansion and to the aims of British and French imperialism'. At the meeting of the central committee, which lasted 9 days, R. P. Dutt 'stressed the decisive change in the world situation arising from the rejection of the Peace Front by Britain, France, and Poland. . . . The responsibility for the war lay, in consequence, not only with the Nazi aggressors but also with the reactionary Governments of Britain, France, and Poland'. Their aim had been 'to prevent a stable peace . . . and to promote war between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. These aims had been defeated by the Soviet-German non-aggression pact. . . . The forces of the working class need now to be directed towards the speediest end of the present war.' The resolution adopted by the central committee said, *inter alia*: 'Nazi aggression has been checked and limited by the power of the Soviet Union, and today the Nazi leader is suing for peace. It is the ruling classes of Britain and France who demand the continuation of the war. . . . The struggle of the British people against the Chamberlains and Churchills is the best help to the struggle of the German people against Hitler. We demand that negotiations be immediately opened for the establishment of peace in Europe.'

Two members of the central committee, Pollitt and Campbell, voted against the resolution. A statement accompanying the resolution said: 'The manifesto

of 7 October corrects the declaration issued on 2 September . . . the central committee decided it was incorrect, since it failed to take into account the basic changes in the international situation. . . . The present war is not a just defensive war, but an unjust and imperialist war. . . . There is no truth in the suggestion that H. Pollitt has resigned from the CPGB. In view of the differences of opinion, the central committee decided that H. Pollitt should not continue as General Secretary.' At the beginning of December Pollitt and Campbell published a statement explaining that their judgment had been so clouded by hatred of fascism that 'they did not see in time the true role of British imperialism, and saw only German fascism as the main enemy of the British working class'. In a pamphlet entitled *Why This War?* Dutt wrote of the British and French claim to be 'fighting Hitlerism' that it was part of their intrigue 'to replace Hitler by Goering or some other Nazi leader who they hope may carry out their wishes'. He added: 'Poland was deliberately sacrificed by the British and French statesmen in order to provide the occasion for their predatory war. . . . The only help to the suffering Polish people was given by the Soviet Union.'

The CPGB announced its support for the Congress Party in India, which had resolved that Britain could not drag India into the war without its consent. An Indian CP manifesto early in 1940 said the war gave them 'undreamt of possibilities' for striking a decisive blow against Britain; if the opportunity was not seized, 'history will never forgive that crime'. Some hundreds of Indian communists were arrested in the early months of 1940. At the end of the year Pollitt wrote that Churchill's Government was determined 'to intensify the war against Hitler while putting into operation in Britain the basic features of Hitlerism'. The Essential Works Order, the CPGB stated in May 1941, was 'a return to the conditions of serfdom'; a day before the German invasion of Russia it said, of Churchill's Government: 'There never was a government held in such contempt . . . You hear it being sneered at all the time.' On the same day, in *World News and Views*, it was suggested that 'the Anglo-American group' were only waiting for Hitler to march into the Ukraine before beginning peace negotiations with him.

The central committee of the KPD argued that the war could be ended only by 'the solidarity of the international labour movement'. This, with the overthrow of the Nazis 'by the power of the masses of the people of our country', would lead also 'to the extermination of the imperialist warmongers'. The SPD had allied itself with British and French imperialism 'for the purpose of throttling the German people's revolution'. The tactical line laid down by the KPD at the end of 1939 was 'to develop a broad popular movement of working people—including national-socialist working people—to defend the interests and rights of the popular masses, to consolidate and strengthen friendship with the USSR, and to end the imperialist war in the interests of the *Volk*'.

In France, where a number of communist deputies had been arrested and their party declared illegal, the arguments ran on similar lines, after the return of Guyot from Moscow on 20 September. 'It was in order to prepare war that the leaders of the radical and socialist parties, obeying the orders of reaction, broke up the popular front, destroyed unity of action, and provoked a new split in the CGT.' Reaction, with Blum's help, had strangled the Spanish Republic,

surrendered to Hitler, and obstructed the peace front proposed by the USSR. 'The present war is being conducted on both sides for imperialist aims that are wholly alien to the interests of the workers.' After the Soviet-German treaty the CPF had made serious mistakes; it did not protest against the war but voted the war credits; this had made for confusion and weakened the mass struggle against war, against the treason of the socialists and the renegades from the CPF. 'Hitler having abandoned the idea of war against the USSR, the imperialist provocators of Paris and London entered on the path of armed conflict with Germany.' Only the capitalists wanted the war to go on. The CPF slogan was to be 'Down with the imperialist war. Make peace at once.' The CPF campaign against the socialist leader Blum was peculiarly violent. He was said to be an agent of the British intelligence service, and to combine in himself 'the cruelty of Pilsudski, the savagery of Mussolini, the cowardice . . . of Noske, and the hatred for the USSR of Trotsky'. He was 'a moral and political monster'.

Izvestia on 9 October wrote that the collapse of Poland 'eliminates all reasons for continuing the war in Western Europe'. Hitler's proposals provided a practical basis for negotiations to end 'the war waged by Britain and France against Germany'. Respect or hatred for Hitlerism was 'a matter of taste'. In a speech on 31 October Molotov said: '. . . formulas which we employed very recently, and to which many people are so accustomed, are now obviously out of date and inapplicable. We must be quite clear on this point so as to avoid making gross errors. . . . One may accept or reject the ideology of Hitlerism as well as any other ideological system; that is a matter of political opinion.'

At the seventh Comintern congress Knorin had said: 'We do not know how and when and in what circumstances war will break out if our efforts are unsuccessful, but we do know that the fascists are the organizers of war . . . we know that a fascist victory would set back the progressive development of human society'; at the same congress Dutt had said that even in an inter-imperialist war 'we are vitally concerned in the defeat of the fascist offensive'. After the war, in a speech on 9 February 1946, Stalin said that the war 'assumed from the very beginning an anti-fascist liberating character, having also as one of its aims the re-establishment of democratic liberties'.]

To-day the working people of all lands are greeting the 22nd anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution. To-day the peoples of the USSR are summing up the epoch-making results of the victories of socialism, won under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the glorious party of Lenin and Stalin. Completing the construction of classless socialist society the Soviet people is advancing to communism. . . .

Absolutely different are the conditions in which the working people of the capitalist countries greet this noteworthy anniversary. They greet it in the midst of the second imperialist war, begun by their governments.

For over two years already the Japanese imperialists have been tearing the flesh of China, which is fighting for its independence. War is being waged in the very heart of Europe. The ruling circles of England, France, and Germany are waging war *for world supremacy*.

This war is the continuation of the many years of imperialist strife in the camp of capitalism.

Three of the richest States—England, France, and the USA—hold sway over the most important world routes and markets. They seized possession of the main sources of raw materials. In their hands are huge economic resources. They hold over one-half of mankind in subjection. They cover up the exploitation of the working people, the exploitation of the oppressed peoples, with the false phantom of democracy, so as the more easily to deceive the masses.

Fighting against their world supremacy, and for their own mastery, are the other capitalist States, which came later on to the arena of colonial expansion. They want to divide anew, to their own advantage, the sources of raw materials, food, gold reserves, and the huge masses of people in the colonies. Such is the real meaning of this war, which is an unjust, reactionary, imperialist war.

In this war the blame falls on all the capitalist governments, and primarily the ruling classes of the belligerent States.

The working class cannot support such a war.

The communists have always been in opposition to such a war. They repeatedly warned the working people that the ruling classes were preparing an annihilating, sanguinary butchery for hundreds of millions of people.

The bourgeoisie prepared this war for years. They prepared it by their agreements, conferences, and blocs, using pacifist, allegedly peaceable phrases to cover up their brutal imperialist nature. They prepared it by their intrigues and provocation against the land of the Soviets. They prepared this war by the onslaught on Abyssinia, by the intervention in Spain, by the invasion of China. They directly prepared this war by the Munich Pact.

The bourgeoisie began this war because they became hopelessly entangled in the insurmountable contradictions of the capitalist system and are endeavouring to solve these contradictions by means of new wars.

For over two decades the Soviet Union has conducted an increasing unceasing struggle for the maintenance of peace.

It displayed supreme restraint and firmness in face of unceasing acts of provocation on its frontiers. It proposed general and partial disarmament, and the organization of collective security. It did everything in its power to help the establishment of a stable peace front. But the bourgeois governments rejected all its proposals. They continued their crazed policy of isolating the USSR.

However, despite all machinations, the Soviet Union continued to uphold the cause of peace. And even when it became clear to everybody that war was already inevitable, the Soviet Union made a last effort to

save peace. It undertook negotiations with the Governments of England and France. But the provokers of war were aiming at something else. They were striving to utilize the negotiations to lull the vigilance of the masses, to rid themselves of the responsibility for the war prepared by them. They were inciting Poland against the land of the Soviets. While engaged in negotiations with the USSR, they were trying surreptitiously to hound Germany against the USSR.

By concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany, the Soviet Union foiled the insidious plans of the provokers of anti-Soviet war. By this pact it placed its peoples beyond the bounds of the sanguinary slaughter and narrowed the arena of the European war conflagration.

And when the Polish State—that real prison of peoples—fell to pieces, the Soviet Union gave a helping hand to the fraternal peoples of West Ukraine and West Byelorussia. It wrested 13 million people from the slough of war, liberated them from the oppression of the Polish landlords and capitalists. It gave them the right themselves to determine their political and social order and guaranteed them freedom of national self-determination.

By its mutual-assistance pacts with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the USSR defended these countries from the plunderous designs of the imperialist States. By all its might it has rendered secure their independence and strengthened the security of the Soviet frontiers. By handing over to Lithuania the city of Vilna, which was seized 20 years ago by the Polish generals, the USSR gave an unparalleled example of respect for the national rights of small nations.

By its declaration in favour of the cessation of the war, by its amity and frontier pact with Germany, the Soviet Union has made a new contribution to the cause of peace. It is hindering the provokers of war from drawing the Danube States and the Baltic countries into the war. It is frustrating the machinations of those who are striving to transform the European war into a world war. The working people of all countries will never forget this great service rendered by the Soviet Union.

However, the dark forces of war continue to rage. They want war 'to a victorious finish', they want war to the fulfilment of their imperialist aims. For this they are determined to sacrifice the lives of the peoples.

But what, proletarians and working people, do you stand to gain from this war?

Now already reaction is everywhere undertaking a furious offensive. Now already the bourgeois dictatorship is cynically casting off the 'democratic' mask, crushing the movement of the working people, and establishing a regime of military terror. Now, already, the bourgeoisie are worsening your conditions, both in the warring and non-warring countries. Now, already, they are depriving you of the remnants of your rights and

achievements. They are shamelessly plundering you by lengthening the working day, cutting wages, raising the prices of articles of prime necessity. They are still further throttling millions of peasants with taxation. They are laying villages waste, leaving the fields uncultivated, by taking the peasants' sons away to the war. Your blood and suffering are a source of enrichment for the parasitic gang of speculators and war freebooters.

The bourgeoisie of the so-called neutral States are also warming their hands at the fire of war. Under the pharisaical mask of 'neutrality' they are growing rich on war orders. The American bourgeoisie are interested in the further spread of the war, they are repealing the embargo on the export of arms to the warring countries because war orders guarantee huge, enormous profits to the uncrowned kings of the war industry, and the manufacturers of guns, airplanes, and other types of military supplies.

The Italian bourgeoisie are only waiting for a suitable moment to hurl themselves on the vanquished and snatch their share of the booty.

All the governments of the 'neutral' countries are using the war to plunder the masses of the people, to intensify reaction, to crush the working-class movement.

Workers! Don't believe those who wave the flag of national unity. What can there be in common between you and those who profit by war? What unity can there be between exploited and exploiters?

Don't believe those who are calling upon you to support the war under the false pretext of the defence of democracy. What right to speak of democracy have those who oppress India, Indo-China, the Arab countries, who keep half of the world in the chains of colonial slavery?

By their loans the bankers of London and Paris have in the past saved, and continue now to save, the worst reactionary regimes in Europe. The lords of Britain maintain reaction on all the five continents of the earth. The belauded democrats of France throw communist deputies into jail, destroy the communist press, abolish political liberties.

It is not for the freedom of nations that they are fighting, but for their enslavement. Not for the salvation of democracy from fascism, but for the triumph of reaction. Not for a stable peace, but for new imperialist conquests, fraught with new wars.

But the bourgeoisie could not have begun or have waged this war had they not been aided by the treacherous top leaders of the social-democratic parties. These leaders are now coming forward as the pioneers of reaction. It is they who are taking up the bankrupt anti-Comintern banner. It is they who are now calling on the workers to die in order to restore the reactionary regime of the Pilsudski clique.

It is the Blums who, at the dictates of reaction, disrupted the united working-class and people's front in France. It is on the demand of Blum that members of the communist parliamentary group are being court-

martialled, that communist municipal councils are being disbanded, and that communists are being arrested in thousands. It is Blum, together with Jouhaux, who—on orders from the magnates of finance capital—is splitting the French trade unions. It is the Blums, together with the British Labour leaders, who prevented united action of the international proletariat.

Proletarians and working people! More than ever before you need active unity for the struggle against war, reaction, and the capitalist offensive. But now this unity is only possible apart from, and against, the leaders of social-democracy, who have crossed over wholly and completely to the service of the imperialists.

There can be neither a united Workers' Front, nor a People's Front, with them, or with the leaders of the other petty-bourgeois parties that are supporting the war.

Now working-class unity, and the united people's front, must be established from below, in a struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie, against the top leaders of the social-democratic and other petty-bourgeois parties, who have gone bankrupt and have crossed over to the camp of the imperialists, in a struggle to stop the imperialist war, that is bringing ruin, starvation, and death to millions of working people.

Hundreds of thousands of social-democratic workers now stand at the parting of the ways.

Where is their place, in the camp of imperialist reaction, or with their class brothers waging a struggle against it? With the instigators of imperialist war, or with the millions of workers and peasants who are thirsting for peace? With the stranglers and butchers of liberty, or with those who are self-sacrificingly defending it?

Their place is in the common fighting-front of the great army of labour which is fighting for peace, bread, liberty. In a ruthless struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the treacherous social-democratic leaders, will the communist and social-democratic workers hammer out unity in their ranks.

The working class, while exposing the plunderous character of the present war and convincing the widest masses that they should not support it, comes forward as the defender of the vital, fundamental interests of all working people of town and country, who bear on their backs all the burdens and sacrifices of the imperialist war, begun by the ruling classes.

By coming forward as the basic force of the united people's front of struggle against war and reaction, the working class thereby upholds the interests of all working folk, of the entire people, for whom the war means countless hardships and the intensification of capitalist oppression. By conducting a struggle against the warmongers in its own country, the

working class hammers out unity between the proletarians of all lands, hammers out the most unfailing instrument of its victory.

Brother proletarians! The Communist International calls you to show your opposition to the imperialist war. It calls on you 'to be true to the end to the cause of Proletarian Internationalism, to the cause of the fraternal alliance of the proletarians of all countries'—(Stalin).

The Communist International calls you to its ranks under the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. The Communist International calls on you to strengthen the fraternal alliance with the toilers of town and country, with the enslaved peoples of the colonies. It calls on you to defend the Chinese people against the imperialist plunderers.

Proletarians, Working People! By your joint efforts put a stop to the war of the imperialists. Come out against those who stand for the continuation of the war! Expose them as abettors of the imperialists who are hurling millions of people to destruction for the sake of their mercenary interests.

Demand the release of the imprisoned vanguard fighters of the working class! Demand the arrest of the war freebooters and profiteers! Fight for the freedom of your organizations, of assembly and of your honest working-class press! Defend every inch of your rights and your achievements!

Do not allow the bourgeoisie to throw all the burdens of the war on to your backs. Wives, mothers, and sisters, don't furtively wipe tears from your eyes, but demand—for all to hear—that your husbands, sons and brothers are saved from the horrors of war.

Rally closer, working people, around the great land of socialism, render support to its socialist peace policy, aimed at the well-being of all nations.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ARTICLE BY DIMITROV ON THE TASKS
OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE WAR

November 1939

World News and Views, xix, 53, p. 1079, 11 *November 1939*

[The article was signed 'George Dimitrov (secretary of the ECCI)', and was referred to later in the communist press as 'a fundamental document of the Comintern'.]

Throughout all the years following the first world imperialist war the communists, basing themselves on the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, incessantly explained to the working people that capitalism, by its very nature, gives rise to wars, that the contradictions between the imperialist countries were not eliminated by Versailles and by other imperialist peace treaties, but, on the contrary, that these contradictions would break out after some time with new and still greater force.

Lenin taught that wars are the inevitable accompaniment of imperialism. The plunder of foreign lands, the conquest and spoliation of colonies and the seizure of markets serve as the cause of wars between the capitalist States. Stalin repeatedly uttered warnings of the danger of a new imperialist war, and disclosed the causes giving rise to it. . . .

The events of the recent period completely confirm the correctness of these far-sighted warnings uttered by Stalin. They also show how correct the communists were when they pointed out that the peoples would in the very nearest future be hurled into the flames of war if the international working class should fail, by its united and resolute militant actions, to curb in time the instigators of war. They also show how timely were the tenacious efforts of the Communist International towards the establishment of a powerful fighting front against war.

The second imperialist war, which began with the onslaughts on the people of Abyssinia, Spain, and China, has now developed into a war between the biggest capitalist States. The war has been transferred to the heart of Europe, and threatens to become a world slaughter.

In its character and essence the present war is, on the part of both warring sides, an imperialist, unjust war, despite the fraudulent slogans being employed by the ruling classes of the warring capitalist States in their endeavour to hide their real aims from the masses of the people. The character of a war, as Lenin taught, 'depends not on who attacked and on whose side the enemy is, but on which class is waging the war, what policy is being continued by the given war'.

Now, as in 1914, the war is being waged by the imperialist bourgeoisie. This war is a direct continuation of the struggle between the imperialist Powers for a new repartition of the earth, for world domination. Only the blind can fail to see, and only out-and-out charlatans and deceivers can deny, that the present war between Britain and France, on the one hand, and Germany on the other, is being waged for colonies, sources of raw material, for domination over sea routes, for the subjugation and exploitation of foreign peoples. . . .

The clash of arms between the warring States is for hegemony in Europe, for colonial possessions in Africa and in other parts of the globe, for oil, coal, iron, rubber, and not at all in defence of 'democracy', 'liberty', 'international law', and the guarantee of the independence of small countries and peoples, as is said by the bourgeois press and the social-democratic deceivers of the working class.

The interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie also determine the position of the majority of the capitalist States not directly participating in the war. Their neutrality policy is hypocritical through and through, and above all is this true of the neutrality of the biggest capitalist State—the USA. The American bourgeoisie did not lift a finger when Japan attacked

China. What is more, they are in actual fact the chief contractors of war supplies to Japanese imperialism. Under the flag of neutrality the American imperialists are inflaming war in the Far East so as to enfeeble Japan and China, and then, basing themselves on their might, to dictate their conditions to the belligerent countries and to establish themselves firmly in China.

Under the flag of neutrality the American bourgeoisie are encouraging the further inflammation of the European war, becoming in fact an arms factory for Great Britain and France, and raking in enormous war profits at the expense of the blood of the peoples of the warring countries. They are aiming to drive their rivals out of the world's markets, to strengthen their imperialist positions and to consolidate their domination on the seas and oceans.

Just as hypocritical in character is the neutrality of the other non-belligerent capitalist countries. Their bourgeoisie are doing everything to pile up as big profits as possible out of the war. Therefore, even if they stand for peace for their own country, they encourage war between the other States. They use their neutrality as a commodity with which to haggle, endeavouring to sell it to the highest bidder.

Many of the neutral countries, and above all, Italy, are waiting for the time when, as the war goes on, the chances of victory for one side or the other become clear, so as to take the side of the strong, and to dig their teeth into the vanquished and to tear away their share of the booty. Thus, the position both of the belligerents and of the 'neutral' states shows with the utmost clarity that the responsibility for the war lies with the bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries and primarily with the ruling circles of the belligerent States.

Two stages can be clearly discerned in the course of the second imperialist war.

In the first stage, Italy, Germany, and Japan came forward directly as aggressor States. They took the offensive, while the other capitalist States—England, France, and the USA—retreated, in the endeavour to avoid a decisive clash with their rivals and to turn their expansion in another direction against the land of socialism.

Now, on the other hand, the imperialists of Britain and France have passed over to the offensive, have hurled their peoples into war against Germany, endeavouring in every way to win a number of other States to their side.

Whereas previously the above-mentioned European States were divided into aggressor and non-aggressor Powers, i.e. into those who were directly the warmakers, and those who for the time being did not come out openly as aggressors, although behind the scenes they encouraged aggression against other countries, now this division does not correspond

to the real position. This difference has disappeared. What is more, it is the British and French imperialists who now come forward as the most zealous supporters of the continuation and further incitement of war.

What has caused this change in the position of the chief imperialist rivals, a change of very substantial significance to those who wish to understand the events now taking place?

As is well known, present-day Germany grew up on the basis of slogans of revenge against Versailles and of being the shock troop of international reaction against 'world bolshevism'—against the USSR. The national-socialist regime received every kind of support from British and French imperialism, so that it could fulfil its 'historic' anti-bolshevik mission. It made wide use of the constant concessions given by Britain and France, and, taking the law into its own hands, liquidated the Versailles Treaty, created an armed force, laid its hands on Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Memel, and won certain positions in Spain.

As long as the British and French imperialists hoped to turn Germany's expansion eastwards, they in every way encouraged its aggressive strivings, doing this at the expense of other peoples under the excuse of 'non-intervention' policy. They renounced collective security and transformed the League of Nations—their own creation—into a laughing-stock. They also accepted with great satisfaction the conclusion of the much-noised 'anti-Comintern' Pact between Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the establishment of the so-called Berlin-Rome-Tokio 'triangle'. The culminating point of this policy was the well-known deal at Munich, whence the heads of the British and French Governments returned home as the 'saviours of peace', exultant that they had at length succeeded in turning the aggression of Germany against the USSR.

But by that time the Soviet Union constituted a gigantic force. Rallied around the tested and victorious party of Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet people by successfully fulfilling two huge Five Year Plans, established a powerful socialist industry, carried through the transfer [transformation] of small peasant economy to socialism, and achieved the consolidation of the collective-farm system.

By this there was guaranteed the indestructible defensive capacity of the USSR, resting on the moral and political unity of its people, on the splendidly equipped Red Army and the most profound Soviet patriotism. By the construction of socialist society and by its wise Stalinist peace policy, the Soviet Union immeasurably increased its importance in the international arena and won tremendous confidence and love among the masses of the people of all countries, including Germany itself.

Therefore when, in the opinion of the imperialists, a suitable moment had arrived for Germany to fulfil its role as shock troop against the USSR, Germany could not make up its mind to do so. It had first to

reckon with the economic and military might of the Soviet Union, and with the moral unity and solidarity of the Soviet people, ready to defend their socialist country to the last drop of blood and capable of crushing any enemy; secondly, the rulers of Germany were compelled to take account of the fact that they would fail to rally the majority of their German people to a war against the great Land of Socialism.

In such a state of affairs Germany was faced with the dilemma—either to fall into the position of underling of British and French imperialism, to go to war against the Soviet Union and risk its neck in this war; or to make a decisive turn in its foreign policy and to take the path of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. As the facts show the leaders of Germany selected the second path. . . .

The Soviet Union, operating a socialist foreign policy, by concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany, frustrated the insidious plans of the provokers of war, ensured peace between the two biggest States in Europe, and strengthened its influence over the entire course of international development.

After the conclusion of the German-Soviet Treaty, the bourgeoisie of Britain and France, no longer having any hope of war by Germany against the USSR, turned to the path of armed struggle against their chief imperialist rival. They did this under the pretext of defending their vassal, Poland—the very Poland which the British and French imperialists had established as an outpost against the land of the Soviets and by whose hands they wanted, in 1920, to strangle the young Soviet Republic; the very same Poland whose potentates deprived Lithuania of Vilna and who not so long ago tore a piece out of the territory of Czechoslovakia. They staked on Poland, but here, also, they lost.

The Polish State, which constituted a prison of peoples with its regime of reaction and terror, oppression and plunder of millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Polish working people themselves, at the very first military blow disclosed all its internal rottenness and fell to pieces in two weeks.

In these conditions, the Soviet Union, pursuing its own independent policy, a policy dictated by the interests of socialism, which coincide with the interests of the working people of all lands, undertook resolute measures to ensure peace throughout the East of Europe.

By the entry of the Red Army into Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, the Soviet people rendered aid to their brothers groaning under the yoke of the Polish gentry, extricated 13 million working people from sanguinary slaughter, emancipated them from capitalist slavery, opened up before them the road to a happy life and secured for them freedom of national and cultural development.

By concluding the Germano-Soviet 'Amity and Frontier' Treaty, the

USSR not only eliminated the immediate danger of war for its peoples but also created a barrier against the extension of the imperialist war.

By concluding mutual-assistance pacts with the small Baltic countries which were constantly in danger of falling victim to the big imperialist States, the USSR established the guarantee of their national independence, secured their defence against imperialist aggression, and strengthened the defensive capacity of its own country.

The transfer of the city of Vilna and the Vilna Region to Lithuania once again clearly shows the attention displayed by the land of socialism towards the national interests of small peoples. There never has been, nor is there to-day in the world, any State other than the Soviet Union that has, of its own accord, ceded a whole region to a small people living on its borders, out of regard for the national interests of this people.

At a time when imperialist war is raging in Europe, when the bourgeoisie are inflaming chauvinism, inciting one nation against another, the Soviet Union established good-neighbourly relations with the surrounding States, being guided in this by the Stalinist policy of peace and the friendship of nations. By its entire policy the USSR is rendering an inestimable service to the cause of world peace, in which the people of all lands are interested.

But the imperialists of Britain and France, having taken the path of war, do not want to leave it. On the contrary, they are dragging the peoples further and further on to the fields of battle, covering up in every way the real character of the war. With this end in view, they are setting into motion all the means of the ideological deception of the masses.

The older generation of workers who experienced the first world imperialist war, well remember how at that time the press of Britain and France sought day in and day out to prove that the governments of these countries were waging war only in 'defence of democracy' against 'Prussian militarism', while the German press in its turn sought to convince people that the war was being waged against 'Russian Tsarism'. In actual fact, however, as is well known, what was taking place was a struggle between two groups of imperialists for the repartition of the earth.

Now the ruling classes of Britain and France, who to-day, as at that time, are pursuing imperialist aims, have altered the means and slogans of ideological deception in accordance with the situation of today. Speculating on the anti-fascist sentiments of the masses, they put forward the slogan of 'Anti-Fascist' war, and proclaim that their war against Germany is a 'War of Democracy against Fascism', a war against 'Hitlerism', a war for the freedom of nations.

But what fine apostles of 'anti-fascist' war these are, who for so many years gave every indulgence to those against whom they are fighting today, and disrupted the united front of the peoples' struggle against

fascism and war, when the entire international situation advanced [proclaimed] this struggle as the most important task of the moment. What fine 'fighters for the freedom of nations' these are, who for centuries have kept millions of colonial slaves in bondage and who play with the fate of small nations as bargaining counters in their imperialist deals! What fine 'defenders of democracy' these are, who, in their own countries, are destroying the last remnants of the democratic rights of the popular masses, closing down their newspapers, removing their elected representatives, and persecuting all who raise their voice against the present anti-popular war.

The French bourgeoisie are now reviving the days of counter-revolutionary terror. Since the days of the suppression of the Paris Commune, France has not experienced such a drive against the working class. The banning of the Communist Party of France, the arrest of the revolutionary representatives of the French proletariat in Parliament—the most consistent fighters against reaction of every kind—serves as clear proof of how false and hypocritical are the declarations about the democratic anti-fascist character of the war.

The bourgeoisie hurl themselves against the communists because they fear the truth about the war more than fire, because the communist party is the only party that can organize the struggle of the proletariat and all working people against the imperialist war. The bourgeoisie are doing everything to compel millions of people to go to war and to die for a cause that is alien to them. But the proletariat, the working people, have nothing to defend in this war. It is not their war, but the war of their exploiters. It brings them suffering, privation, ruin, and death. Were they to support such a war, they would merely defend the interests of their enslavers and oppressors, would be supporting capitalist slavery.

For the working class there is only one true stand, namely, irreconcilable, courageous struggle against the imperialist war, struggle against the culprits and vehicles of this war, primarily in their own country, struggle to end this predatory war. This is the justest of causes, one dictated by the fundamental interests of the proletariat and all working people. . . .

Everywhere in the capitalist world, not only in the warring countries, a furious reactionary drive is taking place against the working class and the toiling masses. Thus, that which in the period preceding the present war was characteristic of the regime of the fascist countries, is becoming—during the war let loose—increasingly prevalent in the countries of so-called bourgeois democracy.

In these changed conditions the tasks facing the working class also assume a new character. Whereas formerly the task was to concentrate all forces on the struggle to avert the imperialist war, to curb the warmongers, now the mobilization of the widest masses for the struggle

against the war already being waged, and for bringing the war to an end, is the first task of the moment.

Whereas formerly it was a question of barring the road to the onslaught of capital and fascist reaction, now the working class is faced with the task of conducting a most resolute struggle against the regime being established of terror, oppression, and plunder of the popular masses; it is faced with the task of ensuring that the ruling classes are prevented from placing the burden of the war on the backs of the working people.

Whereas formerly the efforts of the working class were directed primarily to the defence of the daily interests of the working people and to guarding them against the plunder and licence of the capitalist exploiters, and it was impossible, by virtue of the absence of the necessary preconditions, to place the abolition of capitalist slavery on the order of the day, now, to the extent that the crisis called forth by the war grows deeper, this task will face the working class with ever-growing acuteness.

The changed situation and the new tasks of the working class also demand a corresponding change in the tactics of the communist parties. The united proletarian and people's front tactics, pursued in recent years, made it possible for the proletariat and the labouring masses temporarily to hold up the offensive of capital and imperialist reaction in a number of countries. It helped the Spanish people to conduct an armed struggle for two and a half years against internal reaction and the foreign interventionists. It made it possible for the proletariat of France to secure considerable social gains.

The People's Front Movement awakened wide masses of people in town and country to activity, and rallied them to the struggle to uphold their own interests against the reactionary cliques. This movement rendered it possible to postpone for a time the outbreak of the European war. The tactics of the united people's front are fully applicable, even now, in China and also in colonial and dependent countries, the people of which are conducting a struggle for their national liberation.

But these tactics, in the form in which they were conducted before the present war, are no longer suitable for other countries. The necessity of changing the tactics is conditioned by the change in the situation and the tactics [tasks] facing the working class and also by the position occupied in connection with the imperialist war by the leading circles of the parties that previously took part in the popular front.

The tactics of the united people's front presupposed joint action by the communist parties and the social-democratic and petty-bourgeois 'democratic' and 'radical' parties against reaction and war. But the top sections of these parties are now openly supporting the imperialist war.

The social-democratic, 'democratic', and 'radical' flunkeys of the bourgeoisie, are brazenly distorting the anti-fascist slogans of the Popular

Front, and are using them to deceive the masses of the people and to cover up the imperialist character of the war. Under the flag of 'national unity' they have, in fact, established a common front with the capitalists, a front stretching from the Conservatives to the Labour leaders in England, and from the Cagoulards to the Socialists in France. The foremost leaders of the social-democratic parties and the reformist trade unions shamelessly took up front rank posts in the camp of the imperialists, from the very first day of the war. . . .

. . . They direct the poisonous sting of their slander against the USSR, and the revolutionary workers and the communist parties. The leading circles of the Second International are fulfilling the most criminal role in the slaughter machine of the war. They are deceiving the masses by their homilies regarding the anti-fascist character of the war, and are helping the bourgeoisie to drive the peoples to the slaughterhouse. The ruling classes well know that the masses of the people will not believe the British and French capitalists and their press when they try to convince them of the anti-fascist character of the war, and allege that it is being waged in defence of Poland and in the interests of their own peoples. . . .

It clearly follows from the above that the communists can have no united front whatsoever with those in a common front with the imperialists and support the criminal anti-popular war. The working class and all working people have nothing in common with the social-democratic, 'democratic', and 'radical' politicians who are betraying the vital interests of the popular masses. Between the masses of the people and these lackeys of imperialism lies the abyss of war.

But in the war and the crisis which it has called into being the need for working-class unity and for rallying the masses of the working people around the working class rises more acutely than formerly. Millions of working people in the capitalist world, and, above all, in the warring countries, are vitally interested in bringing about militant working-class unity, and establishing a real popular front against the war let loose by the capitalists, against raging reaction and the unbridled plunder of the masses. And the communists will not only not cease the struggle for unity of the proletarian ranks and for rallying together the masses of the working people, but will also increase their efforts tenfold in this direction.

However, the question now of bringing working-class unity about and of creating a united popular front is raised in a new way. In the period preceding the war, the communists strove to bring about united working-class action by agreements between the communist and social-democratic parties. Now such an agreement is no longer thinkable.

In the present situation, working-class unity can and must be achieved from below, on the basis of the development of the movement of the

working masses themselves and in a resolute struggle against the treacherous principal leaders of the social-democratic parties.

This process will be facilitated to a great degree by the comradely relations that have been established in recent years between the communists and a considerable section of the social-democratic workers in their joint struggle against reaction and the warmakers. It will also be facilitated by the fact that the social-democratic parties, under the weight of the criminal policy of their leaderships, will increasingly disintegrate, and the healthy proletarian sections of these parties will join with the communists in taking the path of struggle against the imperialist war and capitalism.

In the preceding period the communists strove to secure the establishment of a united popular front by agreement with the social-democratic and other petty-bourgeois 'democratic' and 'radical' parties in the person of their leading bodies on the basis of a common platform of struggle against fascism and war. But to the extent that the principal leaders of these parties have crossed over wholly and completely into the camp of the imperialists, while certain of them, such as the French radicals, are directly in charge of the conduct of the war, there can be no question of such agreements.

Now the mustering of the working class, of the peasantry, of the urban working folk and of the progressive intelligentsia can and must be brought about apart from and against the leadership of these parties, on the basis of the struggle against the imperialist war and reaction in a united front from below.

Such a united fighting front of the masses cannot be brought about without a most resolute struggle against the social-democratic, 'democratic', and 'radical' flunkies of imperialism, for the elimination of the influence of these agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement and for their isolation from the masses of the working people.

History now faces the working class of the capitalist countries with tasks of enormous importance. They have to extricate millions of people from the abyss of war, to save their countries and peoples from ruin, devastation, and destruction. Only the working class, taking the lead of the basic masses of the peasantry and the working people of the towns, is in a position resolutely to resist the bourgeoisie and imperialism, to put an end to their criminal work and to do away once and for all with the causes giving rise to imperialist wars. These tasks, which face the working class, are quite capable of fulfilment. Now the forces of the international proletariat have grown immeasurably by comparison with the first imperialist war.

Its vanguard detachment—the working class of the USSR—has established an impregnable fortress of socialism. The existence of the Soviet Union multiplies the might of the working class of all the capitalist

countries and strengthens their confidence in their own strength. As distinct from the first imperialist war, the trust of the working masses in the bourgeoisie, in capitalism, has already at the beginning of the present war been considerably undermined, and will continue increasingly to be undermined.

The social-democratic leaders will not succeed for long in deceiving the masses, as they were able to do during the first imperialist war. Their treacherous policy, their anti-communist, anti-Soviet drive is already causing acute discontent in the ranks of the social-democratic parties themselves.

As the war goes on, the indignation of the masses will grow and the anti-war movement will become increasingly extensive. The most furious persecution by the bourgeoisie will not hold up and stifle the struggle of the working people against the imperialist war. The historic role of the communist vanguard of the working class is at the present moment to organise and take the lead of this struggle.

If the communists are to be able successfully to fulfil this role of theirs, they must show an example of the correct understanding of the essence of the present war and utterly smash the legend regarding its allegedly anti-fascist, just character so assiduously spread about by the social-democratic leaders.

Explain, explain, and once again explain the real state of affairs to the masses. This above all at the present moment is the most important condition for the mobilization of the masses for the struggle against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction.

The unfolding of a really wide movement against the imperialist war and reaction can only be successful if the communists act and conduct the struggle in the very midst of the masses, keep a sharp watch as to their state of mind, take careful heed of their voice, and take their needs and sufferings to heart. The communists must not run ahead. They must put forward slogans that correspond to the concrete situation, slogans that can be understood and grasped by the masses, must always take the lead of the movement of the masses, and lead them on to the solution of the maturing new tasks.

The present exceptionally serious situation demands of the communists that they do not give way at all to repression and persecution, but come forward resolutely and courageously against the war, against the bourgeoisie of their own country; that they act in the way Lenin taught, in the way taught now by the great, wise leader of the working people, Stalin.

The communist parties must rapidly reorganise their ranks in accordance with the conditions of the war, purge their ranks of capitulatory elements, and establish bolshevik discipline. They must concentrate the

fire against opportunism, expressed in slipping into the position of 'defending the Fatherland', in support of the fairy-tale about the anti-fascist character of the war, and in retreat before the acts of repression of the bourgeoisie.

The sooner the communist parties achieve all this the better will they be able to carry through their independent leading role in the working-class movement and the more successfully can they fulfil the tasks now facing them.

As the war goes on all the communist parties, all working-class organisations, all active workers, are put to the supreme test. Individual weak elements, faint-hearts, will drop away at the sharp turns. Elements alien to the working class, careerists, renegades, who have tacked themselves on to the communist party will be thrown overboard.

The communist parties as a whole will undoubtedly stand the test. They will become better, still better steeled in the coming battles. New hundreds of thousands of fighters for the working-class cause will fill the ranks of the army of communism.

The communist parties and the working class of the capitalist countries will be inspired by the heroic example of the Russian Bolsheviks, by the example of the party of Lenin and Stalin, which in 1914-18 showed the proletariat the true way out of the war and subsequently secured the victory of socialism over one-sixth of the globe. By holding aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism, and strengthening the bonds of fraternal solidarity between the working class of all countries, the communists will thereby help all working people to fulfil their historic mission.

The imperialists of the warring countries have begun the war for a new partition of the earth, for world domination, dooming millions of people to destruction. The working class is called upon to put an end to the war after its own fashion, in its own interests, in the interest of the whole of labouring mankind and thereby to destroy once and for all the fundamental causes giving rise to imperialist wars.

EXTRACTS FROM A MESSAGE OF GREETINGS FROM THE
ECCI TO STALIN ON HIS 60TH BIRTHDAY

December 1939

World News and Views, xix, 60, p. 1176, 30 *December 1939*

[A statement by the CP of Finland in mid-November 1939 called for 'an end to war provocations' against Russia, for a negotiated settlement that paid 'due respect to the particular interests' of the two countries, and for the liquidation of fascist and anti-Soviet organizations in Finland. On the outbreak of war between the USSR and Finland, the Finnish CP issued a statement, dated 30 November 1939, that the war, long prepared, had been provoked by the Finnish

reactionaries. Why had not the Finnish Government followed the example of the Baltic Governments, which had reached agreement with Moscow strengthening their security, 'and these countries have not lost one iota of their independence'. Communist propaganda during the time of the Soviet-Finnish war presented it as a civil war—the revolt of the Finnish people, who had set up their own Government under Kuusinen, and were supported by the Soviet Union in their struggle against the White-Guard Government in Helsinki. Kuusinen, in a pamphlet entitled *Finland Unmasked*, wrote later: 'The central committee of the Finnish CP called on the people to rise against their criminal government, and an insurrectionary "People's Government of Finland" [with himself as President] with a democratic programme of action, was set up in eastern Finland'; had the Finnish people supported that Government, it would have been spared great calamities, but terror and chauvinism isolated its supporters.

Within the Comintern at this time and for some years past adulation of Stalin was a commonplace at meetings and in all writings. In 1939 the communist parties of France, Britain, Germany, Italy, and the United States published a joint statement on the importance of reading and studying the *History of the CPSU, Short Course*, of which he was said to be the author, and articles were published to celebrate the anniversary of its appearance. In sending greetings to Molotov, the ECCI wrote that he had been 'inspired by the classic works of the supreme theoreticians of our epoch, Lenin and Stalin'. The publication of the *Short Course*, stated a resolution of the CPSU central committee, 'is the greatest event in the ideological life of the bolshevik party'. When, at the ECCI presidium meeting at the end of 1935, Kuusinen said the parties were not doing enough to expose Trotskyism, he added: 'Anyone who attacks the personality of Stalin, the great leader of the international and Soviet proletariat, is serving the interests of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.' On the twentieth anniversary of the revolution the ECCI, in a letter of greeting to Stalin, addressed him as: 'Infinitely beloved leader, friend, and teacher, dear to the hearts of millions of working people. . . . You are the brain and the will to victory of the working people.' One British communist, attempting to answer 'anti-Stalinist slanders', reduced them to the following three: That up to Lenin's death he was little known and of little importance; that he had gained his position by 'Asiatic intrigue' and by betraying Leninism; that he had converted the proletarian dictatorship into 'a savage personal dictatorship'. A leading member of the KPD wrote: 'The gigantic intellectual creative work performed by Stalin, the magnificence of his conceptions and his far-sightedness, his brain, his creative forces—without all this the Soviet system would be unthinkable. . . . An attack on Stalin is an attack on the Soviet Union.']

To the leader, teacher, and friend of the working people of the world. To you, dear Comrade Stalin, great leader, sagacious teacher, and supremely beloved friend of the working people of the whole world, the Executive Committee of the Communist International conveys its ardent bolshevik greetings on the occasion of your sixtieth birthday.

Your glorious and heroic path of dauntless revolutionary, great theoretician, and leader of the socialist revolution, serves and shall always serve as a splendid example for the proletarian revolutionaries of all countries. . . . Together with Lenin, at the head of the Bolshevik Party, you led the working class of Russia to the victory of the great socialist revolution which for the first time in history has converted the exploited and oppressed into sovereign masters of their own destiny, into builders of a new socialist society. The victory of the working class of the land of Soviets strengthens the faith of the workers of the world in their own forces, imbues them with bright hopes and inspires all working people to take up the struggle against their exploiters.

Under Lenin's and your leadership, Comrade Stalin, the land of Soviets has become a powerful and impregnable bulwark of the liberation movement of the workers, peasants, and enslaved nations of the whole world. Everywhere, in all corners of the earth's surface, the oppressed and disinherited, in rising against their oppressors, inscribed on their banners the names of Lenin and Stalin. Together with Lenin you stood at the cradle of the Communist International, born in storm.

The Communist International grew, gained strength and developed on the basis of the immortal doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin, on the basis of your own works of genius and great historical experience of the bolshevik party.

You defended the bolshevik party and the Communist International against the multitude of enemies who sought to distort Lenin's doctrine and divert us from Lenin's path; you enriched, supplemented, and developed the great doctrine of Lenin in conformity with the new conditions of class struggle of the international proletariat. . . .

From you the communists of all countries learned and learn to be true to the end to the cause of proletarian internationalism, the highest manifestation of which is the victory of socialism in the USSR. From you they learned and learn that effective proletarian internationalism which welds the working people of all countries, nations, and races into fighting legions.

From you the communists learned and learn how to fight against imperialist wars, for peace, happiness, and freedom of the peoples.

For many years your prudent policy, Comrade Stalin, saved mankind from a new imperialist war which menaced it.

When the dark forces of capitalism unleashed their criminal war you did not allow the imperialist robbers to involve the Soviet people in this sanguinary carnage; you thereby defended the cause of peace and frustrated the efforts of the warmongers to plunge many European nations into this war.

You heeded the voice of the working people of Western Ukraine and

Western Byelorussia languishing under the foreign yoke and on your noble initiative the Soviet people fraternally extended their helping hand to them.

When the plutocratic clique of the Mannerheims and Tanners embarked on war provocations against the USSR, when the working people of Finland established their own People's Government, the Soviet people, under your leadership, responded to the call of the Finnish people and came to its aid in the struggle against its hangmen, the agents of foreign imperialism.

Millions of working people the world over support and shall continue to support the policy of the Soviet Union which is inspired by you, for this policy conforms to their interests and facilitates their struggle for emancipation.

They know that you, Comrade Stalin, have no other aims save that of serving the emancipation of humanity, that you have no other life, save the life devoted to the well-being and happiness of the working people. By expressing the sentiments and thoughts of millions of people the communists of all countries vow to you, our dear and beloved Comrade Stalin, that they will convert your great teachings into deeds and will devote all their strength to achieving the triumph of communism, to the cause of Lenin and Stalin.

May the immortal doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin live and conquer!

May Comrade Stalin, the great leader and teacher of the international proletariat, live many, many years to the happiness of the working people!

MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE ECCI

April 1940

World News and Views, xx, 18, p. 261, 4 May 1940

[The communist campaign against the Allies became more explicit in 1940. At the end of 1939 the German, Austrian, and Czech parties published a joint manifesto saying they would not allow themselves to be used either by British and French imperialism or by their own bourgeoisie. In February 1940 Ulbricht, in an article in *Die Welt* (published in Sweden, replacing *Rundschau*), attacked Hilferding for 'wishing to see the victory of France and England'; Hitler had signed the pact with Russia because otherwise Germany would have become a vassal of English imperialism; the workers of Germany did not wish to 'exchange the present regime for a regime of national and social oppression by British imperialism. . . . Whoever intrigues against the friendship of the German and Soviet peoples is an enemy of the German people and will be denounced as a lackey of English imperialism. . . . The working class, the peasants, and the labouring intelligentsia of Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland will become the strongest guarantee of the Soviet-German

pact and the greatest obstacle to England's plans.' In March SPD exiles in Britain and France were said by the KPD to be collaborating in broadcasts to Germany 'in their concern for the fate of capitalism'; they hoped for soft jobs 'as bailiffs in the service of the foreign imperialists and German capitalists'. Hitler was said to fear the 'mass movement of German workers'; anti-capitalist sentiment was growing, and the KPD increasing its influence. In France the communists argued that, once the CPF was attacked, there could no longer be any talk of defending democracy against fascism; the only correct policy was to fight against the war. The CP would fight French imperialism by helping the colonial slaves in their liberation struggle, and by action in the factories and the army. When France was invaded, the CPF wrote that peace and liberty, and the security and independence of France, required the overthrow of 'the government of the 200 families which dragged our country into the present adventure'. A government 'based on the masses' would 'come to an immediate agreement with the Soviet Union to re-establish peace throughout the world'.

On the fall of France, an editorial in the Comintern journal said that Daladier and Blum 'were secretly working to hand over the workers of northern France and Paris, the most revolutionary, most advanced and most militant section of the working class, to be overrun and plundered by foreign military forces'. A CPGB manifesto called on the workers to organize a movement for the formation of a government representing the working class. A KPD leaflet expressed sympathy for the workers of France, Belgium, Norway, etc. and called for an early end to the war; it did not use the word fascist or Nazi. On the annexation by the USSR of the Baltic States and other areas, the *Communist International* (1940, no. 9) wrote in its editorial: 'The increase in the number of the Soviet constituent republics from 11 to 16 is not only a striking indication of the increased might of the Soviet Union, but also a brilliant confirmation of the correctness of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin.' The 'indescribable enthusiasm' of the masses in the Baltic States, Bessarabia, and North Bukovina when the Soviet regime was established in those countries and they joined the USSR showed how deeply they loved socialism. After the armistice had been signed, the CPF announced that French imperialism had been defeated. For the French working class this was a victory; it had one enemy the less. 'Looked at this way, it follows that the struggle of the French people had the same goal as the struggle of German imperialism against French imperialism.' But Lenin had taught them that if the occasion demanded it, the workers could ally themselves even with the devil. It was only 'the City financiers' who wanted the French people to continue the war. Those 'who pushed France into war' should be put on trial by a 'popular democratic government' which would work with the USSR to maintain peace, 'a policy of peace which would happily complement the Soviet-German pact'. It was wrong of Vichy to treat Blum, Reynaud, and their colleagues as political prisoners; they were merely traitors. If the occupation authorities allowed *L'Humanité* to be published it would, among other things, 'denounce the efforts of the agents of British imperialism who want to drag the French colonies into the war'. 'The self-styled champion of "free" France, General de Gaulle', was working for 'his paymasters, the British Empire'.

France, wrote Marty in the *Communist International*, in the spring of 1940, would have had a friendly neighbour in a Spain ruled by a popular front government had it not been for Blum, Daladier, Bonnet. Czechoslovakia, too, would have been an ally but for these three, who preferred to give to the 'Polish gentry' millions which were 'immediately transformed into bestial orgies'. Profits from the sale of Lorraine iron ores to Germany yielded their 'special commissions for Messrs Daladier, Bonnet, Blum. . . .' Blum was the 'murderer of popular Spain', acting for 'the London City, the Paris Bourse, and the Second International'. In the same issue of the periodical Manuilsky wrote: 'Never during the two decades the Comintern has been in existence has the question of the liquidation of social-democratism in the working-class movement been so acute an immediate practical task as it is at the present time.'

In Britain the CPGB organized a 'Peace Council' with local branches which declared their opposition to the continuation of the war. 'The British people will not tolerate the continuance of the war for the subjection of Germany and the German people will quickly remove the fear of Hitler coming here.' The people of Britain, France, and Germany could 'force an armistice against the will of their rulers'. When Churchill became Prime Minister *World News and Views* stated: 'This is the worst Government that has ever ruled Britain.' At the time of Dunkirk the CPGB central committee called on the workers to take over the Government and 'find the way out of the war'. The workers' rights and standards were being reduced not for war needs, but 'to rivet the dictatorship of the big capitalists, moneylenders, and arms profiteers on the people'. It published a manifesto: 'No self-respecting British citizen can respect or support the Churchill Government. . . . The interests of the people require the speediest ending of the war, not by surrender to fascism at home or abroad, but by the strength of a free people organizing their own defence and leading the way to peace and unity with the working people of all countries.' The communist press derided 'the comfortable belief that the Soviet Union will sooner or later and somehow or other come to the assistance of Britain'. The incorporation of the three Baltic States in the USSR was said to show the British workers how they too could break the power of the old regime and pass over to socialism. Such organizations as the Women's Voluntary Services (WVS) were condemned as 'dangerous and reactionary'. 'The rich have provided themselves with luxury shelters . . . But they still refuse the shelters that can alone give protection to the people.'

The Comintern press made very few references to Germany or the KPD. The index to the *Communist International* for 1940 has only one item listed under 'Germany'; there are ten for France, seven for Britain.

The CPGB founded a movement for a 'People's Convention' to organize a fight against the Government (originally called the 'People's Vigilance Committee', started after the fall of France). It met in January 1941, and elected a committee to organize the campaign. Explaining its aims, D. N. Pritt wrote that the dilemma of capitulating to Germany or fighting Germany was a false one. If there were a 'People's Government' in Britain it would offer peace on terms that meant neither conquest nor capitulation. 'Is it not clear that Hitler and the ruling class of Germany would be unable to persuade their

workers to carry on the war against a British Government which no longer held any menace for them?' The French, Austrian, Czech, and other workers would also throw off their oppressors. The aims of the Convention included the establishment of a People's Government, the development of friendship with the USSR, work for a 'people's peace', and the protection of living standards, trade union rights, and civil liberties. One participant in the Convention wrote afterwards: 'I worked . . . as a sort of Public Relations and Press officer for that congeries of loud-mouthed committees called the People's Convention. . . . Much of the activity of the organization consisted in . . . an attempt to avert a split between the dupes and the fellow-travellers'.

In the United States a similar organization, known as the 'American Peace Mobilization', was set up in September 1940 at a conference in Chicago to campaign against United States entry into the war; the Roosevelt Administration was 'dominated by warmongering imperialists'. The disaffiliation of the United States Communist Party from the Comintern in 1940 in compliance with the provisions of the Voorhis Act was described as another step 'designed to coerce the people into submission to the entry of the United States into the imperialist war'.

In 1948, during the exchange of letters between the Soviet and the Yugoslav Communist Parties, it was stated that in 1940 Yugoslav communists had been instructed to rent a villa in Zagreb 'in which to place the radio station of the Comintern'.]

Proletarians and working people throughout the world! May Day, day of international solidarity, is being celebrated by the working people in the ominous surroundings of a new imperialist war. Never yet has the idea of international proletarian solidarity been of such vital significance for the workers of all lands as during these days of the war conflagration that has enveloped Europe and Asia.

The war in Europe has already lasted eight months, but the end of it is far from being in sight. The theatre of military operations is extending even further. The imperialist potentates are forcibly drawing into the war the colonial peoples under their sway.

The longer the war lasts, the clearer does it become that the small neutral countries are bagatelles in the hands of the imperialists.

In answer to the gross violation by England and France of the neutrality of the Scandinavian countries, Germany led its troops into Denmark and occupied strategic positions in Norway. England and France, in their turn, landed troops. The territory of Norway became a theatre of war.

Belgium and Holland are threatened. Yet another war base is being prepared in the Near East. The struggle of the imperialist Powers for the Balkans and for supremacy in the Mediterranean threatens to draw additional capitalist States into the war.

Preparations to intervene in the war are being made by Italy, which has strengthened its positions in Spain and the Balkans.

In the Far East, Japan for almost three years has already been waging a war of conquest against China. It wants to transform that great country, with its population of 400 million people, into its colony. Ruined and exhausted by the war, it is hastening to force its predatory 'peace' on China, so as to have its hands free to participate in the further repartition of the world.

The strife between the imperialists in the Pacific threatens to develop into new wars. A dispute has already begun between Japan, England, and the USA over the Dutch East Indies.

The bourgeoisie of the USA are, as a beginning, stretching out their hands to Iceland, Greenland, and the possessions of Britain and France in the Caribbean Sea.

The capitalist miscreants are dragging the peoples into a new world imperialist carnage.

Facing the capitalist world, which is in the throes of the fever of war, stands the great land of Socialism. The British and French warmongers and their social-democratic lick-spittles are furious at the fact that the Soviet Union occupies a position of neutrality towards their imperialist war. They are in a rage at the fact that the USSR is increasingly growing and gathering strength, whereas they are in the throes of imperialist contradictions and war. They are furious because the USSR has secured the benefits of peace for its peoples, is living at peace with Germany, just as it is also desirous of living at peace with other States that do not infringe on its rights. They are in a rage because the USSR, by its policy of honest neutrality, hinders the spreading of military conflagration to other countries. They are overcome with fear at the fact that the peace policy of the USSR is strengthening the urge for peace of their own peoples. The warmongers are in a fury because their provocation in Finland fell through, when the glorious Red Army did away with the base prepared by them long ago for war against the USSR. They are furious at the fact that the USSR, by concluding peace with Finland, has brought the Anglo-French provocators of war into the light of day, compelled them to show their hand, and exposed their real designs to the peoples.

The capitalists would like the USSR to conduct a policy that suits them. But the USSR pursues its own policy, one dictated by the interests of socialism. The USSR upholds the interests of its great people, who are completing the construction of classless socialist society. Thereby it defends the interests of the working people throughout the world, the interests of all peoples.

The capitalists need imperialist conquest and plunder. The USSR needs creative labour, socialist prosperity, a happy and joyous life for the working people.

Proletarians throughout the world are justly proud of their vanguard, the great land of socialism.

Working people of the capitalist countries! The war has already brought you incredible privation and suffering. There have been no big battles yet, but the earth is already covered with the blood of the fallen. Thousands upon thousands of sailors have gone to their death in the seas and oceans. In Europe alone 20 million men have been placed under arms. They have been torn away from productive labour, from their hearths and homes. Hunger and want are knocking at the doors of families whose breadwinners have been driven to the war by the bourgeoisie. The wives, mothers, and children of the men who have been mobilized have been cast to the mercy of fate. The hungry and the poor are plundered by the bourgeoisie, by increased prices for articles of first necessity. The people have their food rationed by the bourgeoisie, while the rich men spend their money like water and gorge themselves to the full.

The workers are made to work like convicts in the chain-gang, they are enslaved in the factories. By the unexampled lengthening of the working day, by monstrous wage-cuts, by terrific intensification of exploitation, the bourgeoisie sap the last drops of blood out of them. By calling the sons of the peasants to the war, they bring desolation to the countryside. By requisitioning horses, cattle, food supplies and fodder, they are ruining millions of peasant farms. Those who by the sweat of their brows till the land are deprived by the bourgeoisie of the fruits of their labour.

The young generation of to-day is being doomed to death and destruction for the sake of the interests of the moneybags. Grievous thoughts torment the soldiers in the trenches as to what the morrow will bring them, as to what will happen to their families tomorrow.

The rear, however, is the scene of the disgusting orgy of the war pillagers and profiteers, who are piling up profits from the poverty of the people. For them, war is a rainfall of gold. Human blood and tears are transformed by them into shares, dividends, and fabulous profits.

But the bourgeoisie, employing the slavish services of the Blums, Jouhauxs, and the British Labour leaders, are not only conducting a furious offensive on the living standards of the working people. In all the capitalist countries they are establishing a reign of reactionary obscurantism, arbitrary practice, terror, and disfranchisement for the working people. They are making use of the war so as to deprive the industrial workers and the toilers of town and country of the last vestiges of their rights, where they still remain. They answer the will of the masses for peace with the court-martial, sentences of hard labour, and shootings.

The communists, the foremost fighters for the freedom and happiness of the people, are placed beyond the pale of the 'law' by the bourgeoisie.

They imprison, cast into concentration camps hundreds of thousands of communists, Spanish refugees, political émigrés.

Such is what the war brings to-day, such is the bourgeois system of to-day.

And what, working people, are the bourgeoisie preparing for you tomorrow, if you do not put an end to the war, if the capitalists continue further to hold sway over you?

Europe and Asia, and perhaps other continents as well, will become transformed into the arena of sanguinary battles, the like of which the history of mankind has never seen. The war brings in its train millions of killed and crippled, millions of widows and orphans. Unbearable loads of new annexations and indemnities. A wastage of material wealth and immeasurable ruin for the peoples, on a scale such as even the world war of 1914-18 did not bring.

The bourgeoisie will place all the enormous costs of the war on your backs, working people. They will still further increase the already intolerable burden of taxation hanging round your necks. The trust magnates, bankers, and Stock Exchange sharks will enslave you still further, will make of you, your wives, and your children their forced payers of tribute. They will establish for you a regime of brutal exploitation such as they have till now only applied in the colonies.

Under the flag of 'Federated Europe' and 'A new organization of the world', the imperialists are preparing to dismember big States and annex small countries, still further to intensify colonial oppression and to enslave the peoples of Europe. They will carry national oppression to such limits as were even unknown by the great empires of the past, which rose up on the bones and blood of subjugated peoples.

Proletarians and working people! Who helped, and are now helping, the bourgeoisie to deprive you and your children of your last crust of bread, to throttle you with the terror regime of bourgeois dictatorship? Who, along with the bourgeoisie, prepared the sanguinary heinous crime of which we are witness?

The leaders of social-democracy and of the reformist trade unions.

Would the world be the spectacle it is now if they had not helped the bourgeoisie to crush the movement of the working people against capitalism that followed from the world war of 1914-18? Like dogs on the leash they defended the capitalist system, and are defending it now. It was their Noskes who shot workers down. It was their Bauers who dulled the workers' heads with the dope of 'bourgeois democracy'. It was their MacDonalds who smashed general strikes. It was their Blums who, together with world reaction, openly called, and are now calling, for a crusade against the land of socialism. By their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie they prepared the way for the present arbitrary rule of

the capitalists. By capitulating and surrendering to the bourgeoisie the achievements won by the working class, they assisted in bringing about the present orgy of reaction. By their complicity in acts of imperialist conquest they contributed to the outbreak of the present war. By the policy of 'non-intervention' they opened the floodgates to the deluge of war in Europe. By their betrayal of Republican Spain they made the collapse of the People's Front in France a foregone conclusion, and cleared the way for reaction throughout the capitalist world. By their shameless support of the present imperialist war they are helping the bourgeoisie to fasten on the people chains of still worse slavery.

But the wishes of the bourgeoisie and their social-democratic hangers-on will not come to pass. However much the ruling class may rage, they will not escape responsibility for the present war before the peoples. They rage because the working people want freedom and not slavery, peace and not war, socialism and not capitalism.

The working people are coming to understand with ever-growing clarity that there is no other salvation from the tribulations into which they have been dragged by the bourgeoisie than by a self-sacrificing, resolute struggle against imperialist wars, reaction, and capitalism. They know that this struggle brings sacrifices in its train. But the sacrifices demanded of them by the bourgeoisie for the sake of maintaining their domination are a hundred times greater. Millions of people at the front and in the rear are talking in an undertone as yet of what the communists are saying for all to hear.

Now it is not individual heroes who are opposing the imperialist war, but tens of thousands of advanced workers in all corners of the globe are raising aloft the sacred banner of proletarian internationalism.

It was courageously raised on high by the French communist Deputies as they were being court-martialled. Fighting under this banner are hundreds of thousands of obscure French workers. This banner is in the firm grip of the heroic fighters of Republican Spain. Under this banner the foremost workers of England are demanding peace.

Against the imperialist war, for peace, stands an army of 5 million young people in the USA; peace is the desire of the German workers and peasants, Japanese soldiers are thirsting for the end of the war.

There is a growing and extending movement against imperialist oppression in the colonial and dependent countries. A sturdy struggle for the independence of their country is being waged by the foremost workers and peasants of India. A gallant fight is being fought for the national liberation by the great Chinese people against the Japanese invaders.

In all capitalist countries the working people want to put an end to the imperialist war, to the arbitrary rule of bourgeois reaction, to the mockery

it makes of them. They are demanding the restoration and extension of their political rights and liberties, of human conditions of existence, a reduction of the working day, increased wages, increased pay for soldiers and allowances for their families.

Peace, bread, and freedom—such is the battle cry of the many millions of the army of labour.

But the mass movement is as yet divided; the bourgeoisie are attempting to hold it back by their military and police terror. To break the barriers set up by bourgeois reaction, the proletarians and working people need united action. They need it so as to merge the as yet divided and scattered movements into one mighty current. In each separate country they need a united workers' front, a popular front of the working people, established from below by the masses.

To conduct the struggle against the imperialist war the proletariat needs united action on an international scale.

Proletarians, working people, colonial peoples! The guarantee of the success of your struggle lies in the unification of your forces. Hammer out the United Front of Labour against the offensive of capital, the front of freedom against reaction, the front of peace against imperialist war, the front of the exploited and oppressed against their exploiters and oppressors.

Only in a ruthless struggle against the social-democratic leaders, against the treacherous top leaders of the Second International can the working people establish such a fighting front. Close your ranks with the great land of Socialism. Defend its peace policy, which expresses the innermost aspirations of the peoples of all lands. Demonstrate on May Day for peace, against the provocators and incendiaries of war.

Mothers, wives and sisters! Demand for all to hear, before it is too late, the return of your sons, husbands, and brothers.

Working people! Fight for the financial burdens of the war to be placed on the backs of the rich! Demand the confiscation of war profits! Demand freedom for your press, organizations, and meetings! Demand the liberation of the gallant French communist Deputies and all fighters against imperialist war and reaction.

Prison for the war pillagers and profiteers! Freedom for the captives of capital!

The Communist International calls on you, workers, to take your stand under the glorious banner of proletarian internationalism, under the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, for only under this banner will you win victory.

Down with imperialist war! Down with capitalist reaction! Peace to the peoples!

Long live the USSR, the bulwark of peace, freedom, and socialism!

Long live the fraternal alliance of the workers of all lands!

MAY DAY 1942

May 1942

World News and Views, xxii, 18, p. 217, 2 May 1942

[After April 1940 the Comintern did not issue its customary manifestos celebrating May Day and the anniversary of the revolution. Apart from the continued publication of its periodicals, there was virtually no outward and public sign of Comintern activity. 'We were waiting for the Comintern secretariat to tell us what we should do', Delgado wrote, 'but nobody bothered about us. The Comintern is merely a building, a name, and a few hundred employees who move papers around, nothing more.' After the war it became known that in the summer of 1941 the Bulgarian and Yugoslav parties were bitterly opposed to each other over the question of Macedonia, particularly whether the Bulgarian party had the right to absorb the party organization in what had been the Yugoslav part of Macedonia. The dispute was referred to the ECCI, which decided in favour of the Yugoslav party, referring in its reply to the correctness of the Yugoslav party's policy of partisan warfare. It was at the eighth conference of the Balkan Communist Federation early in 1929 that it had been agreed to refer disputes between the parties in the Federation to Moscow.

The text which follows is taken from the editorial article in the *Communist International*, as reproduced in *World News and Views*.

When Hitler attacked Russia the communist parties promptly reversed their policy. Instead of the People's Convention due to meet in August 1941, the CPGB organized a series of conferences to discuss ways of increasing production. It would turn its energies to 'mobilizing opinion to deal with every form of interference with the joint war effort'. 'It is necessary for British workers not only to support government measures for aid to the Soviet Union, but to act themselves to secure maximum production.' Communist candidates standing in by-elections were withdrawn 'to avoid misunderstanding'. It was essential to form 'the broadest national united front around the Churchill Government for the common aim of the defeat of German fascism'. It was essential 'to have a completely different approach to persons and organizations with whom we have been in conflict in the past'. The ILP, which put up a candidate in a by-election against the National Government candidate, was said to be 'playing Hitler's game'. In July 1941 the CPGB began a 'second front' campaign. In a statement on the colonies and the war, it said the colonial peoples could help in winning the battle for freedom: 'They will understand the need for the immediate building of a great united front for the defeat of Hitler. This takes precedence over every other issue at the present moment.' It deplored Gandhi's 'narrow' and 'unrealistic' spirit in continuing to emphasize the struggle against British rule; opposition to the war was 'detrimental to the true interests of the Indian people'.

The French CP, after 22 June 1941, declared: 'For us there is no division into communists, socialists, radicals, catholics, or de Gaulle followers. For us there are only Frenchmen fighting Hitler and his agents.' The earlier slogan, 'Neither Churchill nor Hitler', was dropped in favour of 'Vive l'Angleterre.' Padmore refers to the 'effrontery' of the American CP in 'appealing to the Negroes to

suspend their agitation for employment in war industries, for the principle of equal pay for equal work, and for the abolition of racial segregation in the armed forces'—this they condemned as 'sabotage of the war effort'. The American socialist leader, Norman Thomas, who urged continuation of the struggle for Negro rights and liberties, was called in the New York *Daily Worker* a 'fifth columnist and spearhead of fascism'. A prominent American communist wrote: 'There are no economic classes in America. There is only one class, the American people.' The American Peace Mobilization changed its name to American People's Mobilization, and shortly afterwards dissolved itself. Browder said he considered it 'the greatest honour' to be called a strikebreaker; strikes were 'stabs at our armed might'. The central committee of the Indian CP, 'meeting openly for the first time in its history' in September 1942, issued a manifesto: 'India for the Allied Cause'. At its first congress, held in Bombay in May 1943, it claimed 16,000 members. For May Day 1943 the leading article in the Comintern Journal celebrated the victory at Stalingrad and the growth of resistance movements. It called for 'decisive military operations in the European theatre of war'. The 'overwhelming majority of German working people are still serving Hitler. . . . It must be frankly said that the strength of the Hitlerites lies in the meekness of the German masses, and primarily the German workers.'

In October 1941 Comintern headquarters were moved to Ufa (where it was known as 'Scientific Institute no. 205'); a Comintern school was also established at Ufa on the lines of the Lenin School; the ECCI members at Ufa included at different times Manuilsky, Togliatti, Marty, Pieck, and Florin.

A new Polish Communist Party was started in Warsaw at the end of 1941; in one of its earliest documents it announced its aim to be the creation of a national non-sectarian party, not linked to the Communist International].

May Day, 1942 comes in a year of greatest historic decisions. This year May Day is more than a day when the working class reviews its forces. It is a day of the mobilization of every force of the nations embattled against Hitler in a life and death struggle.

This year, 1942, the peoples address their first May Day greetings to the Red Army, to the great Soviet people upon whom their eyes are fixed, to the people which holds the outposts in this war of liberation against the mechanized savagery of the Nazi murderers.

The issue at stake is not only the destiny of any one nation or any one class. The liberty and independence of all nations are at stake. It is a question of saving them from the mortal foes who are thrown into fury at the very sound of such words as the rights of man, liberty, and democracy.

This struggle for the very foundations of human development is forging a new and powerful realization of the solidarity of all nations. In the past when the workers demonstrated on May Day for the ideal of international solidarity, when their call to the unity of all toilers rang across the frontiers, this idea often evoked misunderstanding and indeed hostility among other sections of the population. Today the idea of the world front of struggle

for liberty and progress is beginning to penetrate the most remote corner of the earth.

The worker who is tending the machine, the scientist secluded in his study or the research worker in the laboratory, the peasant and writer, the teacher and handicraftsman, the physician and artist—all are beginning to realize with growing clarity that Hitler imperils their very lives and existence, and that it is a question of saving from the barbarity of German fascism the fruits of their labour, the free spirit and progress in all fields of human endeavour. On the shores of the Seine and Mississippi, the Yangtse and the Thames, the people are becoming ever more aware that the air they breathe can only be purified, and man rejoice in life, when German fascism is utterly destroyed and reduced to nought.

In their own vital interests the peoples must do everything within human power to achieve victory. . . .

The interests of all nations imperatively demand that 1942 become the year of the final decision. The militancy of the working class on May Day will serve as a message to all who still wait and hesitate. 1942 must become the year of the debacle of Hitlerism. The nations must enter 1943 without Hitler and without Hitler's war. The time of waiting is past and the hour for action has struck.

We must say to all cautious calculators who are for ever counting up the reserves of man-power and resources, concocting all manner of combinations in time and space only to come to the conclusion that Hitler is doomed anyway, so why should we precisely at this moment risk our lives, to all those past-masters of passivity we must say: certainly the reserves of man-power and raw materials are of enormous importance and indeed space and time are vital factors, and as far as Hitler is concerned the war is hopeless. But do not forget: if the reserves are kept back too long and space and time are not utilized for struggle, all these factors may well lose their importance. And those who are repelled at the thought of sacrifices entailed in the struggle, those who place all their hopes on dragging out the war, may themselves turn out to be the victims of this procrastination, of the famine, mounting hardships, and endless torment of the harassing war.

Lessons should be drawn from the example of the Red Army and the great Soviet Union. The vast and inexhaustible reserves have indeed greatly helped the Soviet people in the struggle and have proved fatal to Hitler, but only because the Soviet people, under any circumstances and in any situation, never gave up the fight, only because every minute was used for bold and dauntless, skilful and heroic battle with the enemy. . . .

No one doubts that the American and British workers will, on May Day, pledge themselves to vie with their Soviet comrades in war production, to produce more tanks, aircraft, and weapons against Hitler. No one doubts

that they will strive for the highest degree of organization and unity in order to mobilize every section of the working people and every section of the population for victory over Hitler. No one doubts that they will affirm their resolution not only to produce arms but to use them against the foe, not only to forge arms, but also to bear arms in their people's cause.

The workers in the Hitler-occupied countries will affirm their determination to fulfil their proletarian and national duty. Every ounce of energy and every bit of skill will be concentrated by them to disrupt war production and the transport of military supplies for their malignant foe. By diverse means, including fires and explosions, they will destroy machinery and equipment working for the invaders. They are aware that the time has come for active struggle of the masses, for the organization of a powerful strike movement against the fascist enslavers. They will realize, lastly, the need and real possibility of the masses offering armed resistance to the enemy. In Yugoslavia the guerrilla struggle is assuming the character and scope of a real popular war. In Northern Norway guerrilla detachments have undertaken a series of successful operations. A guerrilla movement is arising in France, particularly in the Seine and Loire departments.

Thus reality itself is clearly refuting the totally incorrect assertion that a guerrilla war allegedly requires definite natural conditions—woods, bogs, impassable mountains, and that guerrilla warfare in densely-populated sections of Europe is unthinkable. This contention is all too similar to the treacherous lies of French capitulator generals who would have the people think that an open city like Paris cannot be defended. Yet the Soviet people have demonstrated to the world that every open city becomes a powerful buttress if its defenders are stout-hearted and brave. The same is true of guerrilla warfare which in every occupied land can greatly undermine the power of the enemy by opening the way for the armed insurrection of the people. The tempo and scope of the armed resistance of the people to Hitler's butchers will, to a large extent, depend on the working class of the occupied lands. . . .

This year there is a special message to the German working class. Let the German workers on this May Day hear the voice of their class brothers, let them hear the constantly repeated warning, the burning question which comes from all corners of the world: where is the German working class, where are the German workers? There was a time when you marched in the foremost ranks, when you reflected the great ideas of Marx and Engels. Among your leaders were Bebel and Liebknecht. In your mighty hands we felt the proletarian force and solidarity. But today? With your hands Hitler is waging war against the socialist State of the workers and peasants. With your hands you are manufacturing the weapons for the bloodthirsty murderers of the workers. Can it be that you

German workers deem it compatible with your honour, your conscience, and your vital interests to tolerate the system of Gestapo, concentration camps, and the degradation of the working class to the status of mute cattle, obediently following the criminal Führer and his avid and rapacious adventurists. . . .

It is both necessary and possible that the German workers, carrying with them the widest sections of the German people, enter the path of decisive struggle against Hitler's war and against the Hitler regime. It is both necessary and possible that the German workers refuse to bear this tormenting servitude for the sake of war, that they work slower every day and sabotage production. It is both necessary and possible that they utilize the shortage of raw materials and wear of machinery to cause hundreds and thousands of stoppages in the work, that they organize militant action and strikes in industry.

Terror is not an insurmountable obstacle. No one would dare to claim that the Nazi terror is milder in Norway and France than in Germany proper. Yet the Norwegian and French workers find the courage to wage by every means the struggle against the Nazi executioners. If the German workers really understand to what a doom Hitler is dragging the German nation with such feverish haste, they must come to their senses. They will come to their senses and show the German people the path to salvation, to the termination of war, to a new and happy Germany.

The German workers and the German people can be confident that Hitler's defeat and the overthrow by the German people of the shameful fascist tyranny will spell Germany's salvation. The workers of the whole world and the nations are determined once and for all to win a lasting and durable peace and seek only to destroy Hitler fascism. The workers of all countries await and desire to see Germany enter the commonwealth of the world's nations, which see their salvation and the salvation of the German nation not in war and destruction but in constructive labour.

May Day 1942 will recall to the German workers the glorious days of the past struggles and will serve to call the German working class to resolute combat against Hitler's war and Hitler's slavery. . . .

For a whole generation May Day was a day when the worker fortified his faith in his own strength and felt himself at one with the millions of his class brothers, a day when he felt conscious of belonging to a mighty militant body. The significance of May Day 1942 is incomparably greater: this year it is a day of rallying all people, of uniting all honest men who cherish freedom for the struggle in defence of their decent existence, for the sacred liberation war against fascism, for the cause of all mankind. On this day the sense of human dignity, courage, and determination of every fighter must overcome all apprehensions. The magnificence of the common task must relegate to the background all petty egoistic motives.

Unity of all progressive and freedom-loving forces must lead to the supreme determination to act.

Unity of the working class, unity of the peoples uniting the struggle of the peoples with the unparalleled struggle of the Soviet people and its Red Army—such is the battle cry and the slogan of May Day 1942.

RESOLUTION OF THE ECCI PRESIDIUM RECOMMENDING THE
DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

15 May 1943

World News and Views, xxiii, 22, p. 169, 29 May 1943

['Hey! Listen!']—'What?'—'The Comintern's been dissolved.' This conversation took place at Comintern headquarters, in the office occupied by the Spanish section of the ECCI. The speakers obtained the information from the Soviet press. The *Communist International* ceased publication. Shortly afterwards a new periodical, in Russian and other languages, appeared, entitled *The War and the Working Class* (after the war its title was changed to *New Times*). On their return to Moscow after the dissolution, a large proportion of the Comintern staff was distributed among the 'national committees', the foreign-languages broadcasting services, and various propaganda, press, and publication departments of the CPSU. Interviewed on the dissolution by Reuter's chief Moscow correspondent, Stalin said:

'The dissolution of the Communist International is proper and timely because it facilitates the organisation of the common onslaught of all freedom-loving nations against the common enemy—Hitlerism. The dissolution of the Communist International is proper because:

'(a) It exposes the lie of the Hitlerites to the effect that "Moscow" allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to "Bolshevise" them. An end is now being put to this lie.

'(b) It exposes the calumny of the adversaries of Communism within the Labour movement to the effect that Communist Parties in various countries are allegedly acting not in the interests of their people but on orders from outside. An end is now being put to this calumny too.

'(c) It facilitates the work of patriots of all countries for uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp of national liberation—for unfolding the struggle against Fascism.

'(d) It facilitates the work of patriots of all countries for uniting all freedom-loving peoples into a single international camp for the fight against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, thus clearing the way to the future organisation of a companionship of nations based upon their equality.

'I think that all these circumstances taken together will result in a further strengthening of the United Front of the Allies and other united nations in their fight for victory over Hitlerite tyranny. I feel that the dissolution of the Communist International is perfectly timely—because it is exactly now, when the Fascist beast is exerting its last strength, that it is necessary to organise

the common onslaught of freedom-loving countries to finish off this beast and to deliver the people from Fascist oppression.']

The historic role of the Communist International, which was founded in 1919 as a result of the political union of the great majority of old, pre-war working-class parties, consisted in upholding the principles of Marxism from vulgarization and distortion by the opportunist elements in the working-class movement, in helping to promote the consolidation in a number of countries of the vanguard of the foremost workers in real working-class parties, and in helping them to mobilize the workers for the defence of their economic and political interests and for the struggle against fascism and the war the latter was preparing and for support of the Soviet Union as the chief bulwark against fascism.

The Communist International from the first exposed the real meaning of the 'Anti-Comintern Pact', as a weapon for the preparation of war by the Hitlerites. Long before the war, it ceaselessly and tirelessly exposed the vicious, subversive work of the Hitlerites who masked it by their screams about the so-called interference of the Communist International in the internal affairs of these States.

But long before the war it became more and more clear that, with the increasing complications in the internal and international relations of the various countries, any sort of international centre would encounter insuperable obstacles in solving the problems facing the movement in each separate country. The deep differences of the historic paths of development of various countries, the differences in their character and even contradictions in their social orders, the differences in the level and tempo of their economic and political development, the differences, finally, in the degree of consciousness and organization of the workers, conditioned the different problems facing the working class of the various countries.

The whole development of events in the last quarter of a century, and the experience accumulated by the Communist International convincingly showed that the organizational form of uniting the workers chosen by the first congress of the Communist International answered the conditions of the first stages of the working-class movement but has been outgrown by the growth of this movement and by the complications of its problems in separate countries, and has even become a drag on the further strengthening of the national working-class parties.

The World War that the Hitlerites have let loose has still further sharpened the differences in the situation of the separate countries, and has placed a deep dividing line between those countries which fell under the Hitlerite tyranny and those freedom-loving peoples who have united in a powerful anti-Hitlerite coalition.

In the countries of the Hitlerite *bloc* the fundamental task of the working class, the toilers, and all honest people consists in giving all help for the

defeat of this *bloc*, by sabotage of the Hitlerite military machine from within, and by helping to overthrow the Government who are guilty of the war. In the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the sacred duty of the widest masses of the people, and in the first place of the foremost workers, consists in aiding by every means the military efforts of the Governments of these countries aimed at the speediest defeat of the Hitlerite *bloc* and the assurance of the friendship of nations based on their equality.

At the same time the fact must not be lost sight of that separate countries which are members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition have their own particular problems. For example, in countries occupied by the Hitlerites which have lost their State independence the basic task of the foremost workers and of the wide masses of the people consists in promoting armed struggle, developing into a national war of liberation against Hitlerite Germany. At the same time, the war of liberation of the freedom-loving peoples against the Hitlerite tyranny, which has brought into movement the masses of the people, uniting them without difference of party or religion in the ranks of a powerful anti-Hitlerite coalition, has demonstrated with still greater clearness that the general national upsurge and mobilization of the people for the speediest victory over the enemy can be best of all and most fruitfully carried out by the vanguard of the working-class movement of each separate country, working within the framework of its own country.

Already the seventh congress of the Communist International, meeting in 1935, taking into account the change[s] that had taken place both in the international situation and in the working-class movements that demand great flexibility and independence of its sections in deciding the problems confronting them, emphasized the necessity for the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in deciding all questions of the working-class movement arising from the concrete conditions and peculiarities of each country, to make a rule of avoiding interference in the internal organizational affairs of the communist parties. These same considerations guided the Communist International in considering the resolution of the Communist Party of the USA of November 1940, on its withdrawal from the ranks of the Communist International.

Guided by the judgment of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, communists have never been supporters of the conservation of organizational forms that have outlived themselves. They have always subordinated forms of organization of the working-class movement and the methods of working of such organizations, to the fundamental political interest of the working-class movement as a whole, to the peculiarities of the concrete historical situation and to the problems immediately resulting from this situation. They remember the example of the great Marx, who united the foremost workers in the ranks of the Working Men's International Association, and, when the First International had fulfilled its

historical task, laying the foundations for the development of the working-class parties in the countries of Europe and America, and, as a result of the matured situation creating mass national working-class parties, dissolved the First International inasmuch as this form of organization already no longer corresponded to the demands confronting it.

In consideration of the above, and taking into account the growth and political maturity of the communist parties and their leading cadres in the separate countries, and also having in view the fact that during the present war some sections have raised the question of the dissolution of the Communist International as the directing centre of the international working-class movement,

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in the circumstances of the World War not being able to convene a congress of the Communist International, puts forward the following proposal for ratification by the sections of the Communist International.

The Communist International, as the directing centre of the international working-class movement, is to be dissolved, thus freeing the sections of the Communist International from their obligations arising from the statutes and resolutions of the congresses of the Communist International.

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International calls on all supporters of the Communist International to concentrate their energies on whole-hearted support of and active participation in the war of liberation of the peoples and States of the anti-Hitlerite coalition for the speediest defeat of the deadly enemy of the working class and toilers—German fascism and its associates and vassals.

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International
(Signed):

G. DIMITROV	O. KUUSINEN
M. ERCOLI	D. MANUILSKY
W. FLORIN	A. MARTY
K. GOTTWALD	W. PIECK
V. KOLAROV	M. THOREZ
J. KOPLINIG	A. ZHDANOV

The following representatives of communist parties also append their signatures to the present resolution:

BIANCO (Italy)
DOLORES IBARRURI (Spain)
LEKHTININ (Finland)
ANNA PAUKER (Rumania)
MATTHIAS RAKOSI (Hungary).

MOSCOW, 15 May 1943.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE ECCI ON THE
DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

8 June 1943

World News and Views, xxiii, 25, p. 197, 19 June 1943

[The central committee of the CPGB adopted unanimously a resolution endorsing the proposal, which 'would reinforce national and international unity'. The Czechoslovak central committee said dissolution was in the interests of the broader unity of all forces both domestic and international in the decisive battle against Hitlerism; the Spanish central committee welcomed and approved the proposal. 'The dissolution of the International, which frees us from the obligations arising from its statutes and decisions, will still further reinforce the national character of the Spanish Communist Party and facilitate the unification of all Spanish patriots both within Spain and in emigration and so stimulate the development of all national forces in the struggle to recapture the freedom and independence of Spain.' The KPD said the decision would cut the ground from under the feet of the German fascists, who alleged that Moscow interfered in the affairs of other States; the Italian central committee said the dissolution would remove the misunderstandings and difficulties which still existed among the workers and make it easier for them to unite. The Chinese CP central committee expressed its full agreement; the Comintern had fulfilled its historical mission in protecting Marxism from distortion, in helping progressive forces to unite, in supporting the Soviet Union and fighting fascism, and it had done all in its power to bring about co-operation between the KMT and the CCP; in its organizational form it had now outlived itself. The CCP had received much help from the Comintern in its revolutionary struggle, but the Chinese communists had now for a long time been free to decide independently on its policy and put it into effect.]

At its last meeting on 8 June 1943, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International considered the decisions received from its Sections in connection with its proposals of 15 May 1943, on the dissolution of the Communist International, and decided the following:

1. That the proposal on the dissolution of the Communist International has been approved by:

The Communist Party of Australia, Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of the Argentine, Communist Party of Belgium, Communist Party of Bulgaria, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Hungary, Communist Party of Germany, Communist Party of Ireland, Communist Party of Spain, Communist Party of Italy, Communist Party of Canada, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia, the Communist Party of China, the Communist Party of Colombia, the Revolutionary Communist Union of Cuba, the Communist Party of Mexico, the Workers' Party of Poland, the Com-

munist Party of Rumania, the Communist Party of Syria, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Uruguay, the Communist Party of Finland, the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Chile, the Communist Party of Switzerland, the Communist Party of Sweden, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party of the Union of South Africa, the Communist International of Youth (which is incorporated in the Communist International with the full rights of a Section).

2. That not one of the existing Sections of the Communist International sent in any objection to the proposal of the Presidium of the EC.

In view of all this the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International declares:

1. That the proposal for the dissolution of the Communist International has been unanimously approved by all Sections able to send in their decisions, including all the most important Sections.
2. It considers that as from the 10th of June, 1943, the Executive Committee of the Communist International, the Presidium and Secretariat of the Executive Committee, as well as the International Control Commission, have been dissolved.
3. It entrusts to a committee composed of Dimitrov (as Chairman), Manuilsky, Ercoli, and Pieck to carry out the actual winding up of the affairs of the organs, apparatus, and property of the Communist International.

(Signed) on behalf of the Presidium of the ECCI

DIMITROV.

APPENDIX

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

INFORMATION about the composition of the ECCI is very scanty: the only complete lists appear to be the following:

I. MEMBERSHIP AFTER THE ELEVENTH PLENUM

1. PRESIDIUM

Arnot	Katayama	Prukhniak
Barbé	Kolarov	Randolph
Cachin	Kun	Remmele
Chemodanov	Kuusinen	Sillen
Chuan-Piu	Lenski	Smeral
Ercoli	Lozovsky	Stalin
Foster	Manuilsky	Su
Garlandi	Piatnitsky	Thaelmann
Gottwald	Pieck	Thorez
Guttman	Pollitt	Zetkin

Candidates

Boskovic	Florin	Knorin
Bratkowski	Furini	Koplenig
Browder	Furubotn	Müller
Celor	Gusev	Neumann

2. POLITICAL SECRETARIAT (ELECTED 15 APRIL 1931)

Chuan-Piu	Lenski	Pollitt
Ercoli	Manuilsky	Randolph
Guttman	Piatnitsky	Thaelmann
Knorin	Pieck	Thorez
Kuusinen		

Candidates

Arnot	Celor	Furini
Bratkowski	Chemodanov	Lozovsky

II. MEMBERS ELECTED AT THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

I. ECCI

Bronkowski	Gottwald	Okano
Browder	Green	Pieck
Buck	Heckert	Pollitt
Cachin	Ichikawa	Prestes
Chang Kuo-tao	Köhler	Queroz, Antonio
Chou En-lai	Kolarov	Rakosi
Diaz	Koplenig	Raymond
Dimitrov	Kun	Salim Abud
Dimitriu	Kuusinen	Stalin
Duclos	Lenski	Stefanov, Boris
Ercoli	Linderot	Thaelmann
Florin	Manuilsky	Thorez
Foster	Mao Tse-tung	Wang Ming
Gallacher	Marty	Yezhov
Garlandi	Moskvina, M.A.	Zhdanov

Candidates

Belevsky	Frachon	Popov
Blas Roca	Furini	Prukhniak
Bo Gu	Ghioldi, R.	Schalk
Bradley	Gopner	Sharkey
Campbell	Gorkic	Siroky
Chemodanov	Jaquemotte	Stoinov
Dahlem	Kon Sin	Sverma
Dernberger	Krumin	Tuominen
Dolores	Lozovsky	Ulbricht
Dutt, Palme	Lövlien	Varga
Ford	Michal	Zapotocky

2. INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

Angaretis	Kerrigan	Sirola
Anwelt	Krayevsky	Smeral
Dengel	Maggi	Stasova
Eberlein	Minor	Tu Ho Sin
Ferdi	Monmousseau	Tskhakaya
Grzegorzewski	Senander	Walecki
Iskrov	Shkiryatov	

3. PRESIDIUM

Cachin	Koplenig	Okano
Dimitrov	Kuusinen	Pieck
Ercoli	Lenski	Pollitt
Florin	Manuilsky	Stalin
Foster	Marty	Thorez
Gottwald	Moskvin, M.A.	Wang Ming
Kolarov		

Candidates

Bronkowski	Heckert	Lozovsky
Browder	Köhler	Michal
Gallacher	Kon Sin	Raymond
Garlandi	Linderot	Tuominen

4. SECRETARIAT

Dimitrov (General Secretary)	Manuilsky	Marty
Ercoli	Pieck	Gottwald
	Kuusinen	

Candidates

Moskvin, M.A.	Florin	Wang Ming
---------------	--------	-----------

SOURCES

- | Full title | Abbreviated title |
|--|--|
| Aaron, D., <i>Writers on the Left</i> . New York, 1961 | |
| Alexander, R. J., <i>Communism in Latin America</i> . Rutgers University Press, 1957 | |
| Bahne, S., <i>Der Trotskismus in Deutschland 1931-1933</i> . Inaugural doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Heidelberg, 1958 (unpub.) | |
| Barker, E., <i>Macedonia: Its Place in Balkan Power Politics</i> . London, 1950 | |
| Bolloten, B., <i>The Grand Camouflage</i> . London, 1961 | |
| Borkenau, F., <i>The Communist International</i> . London, 1938 | |
| Brandt, C., Schwartz, B., Fairbank, J. K., <i>A Documentary History of Chinese Communism</i> . London, 1952 | |
| Brimmell, J. H., <i>Communism in South East Asia</i> . London, 1959 | |
| Burmeister, A., <i>Dissolution and Aftermath of the Comintern</i> . New York, 1955 | |
| Castro Delgado, E., <i>J'ai perdu la foi à Moscou</i> . Paris, 1950 | |
| Cattell, D. T., <i>Communism and the Spanish Civil War</i> . University of California, 1955 | |
| Cockburn, C., <i>Crossing the Line</i> . London, 1958 | |
| <i>Communist International</i> . Periodical publication of the ECCI | |
| Dimitroff, G., <i>Communism and the War</i> . London, 1939 | |
| X ^e Session du Comité Exécutif de l'Internationale Communiste. Paris, 1929 | |
| Draper, T., <i>American Communism and Soviet Russia</i> . New York, 1960 | |
| <i>Fifteen Years of the Communist International</i> . New York, n.d. [1934] | <i>Fifteen Years of the</i>
[CI] |
| Flechtheim, O. K., <i>Die KPD in der Weimarer Republik</i> . Offenbach a.M., 1948 | |
| Gross, B. L., 'Die Volksfrontpolitik in den dreissiger Jahren', <i>Das Parlament</i> (Bonn), 24 October 1962 | |
| <i>Guide to the XII Plenum ECCI</i> . London, n.d. [1933] | |
| Gyptner, R., 'Das westeuropäische Büro der KI (1928 bis 1933)', in <i>Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung</i> , no. 3, 1963 | |
| Howe, I., and Coser, L., <i>The American Communist Party</i> . Boston, 1957 | |
| Hu Tsiao-mu, <i>Tridtsat let KPK</i> (translated from Chinese). Moscow, 1952 | |
| <i>International Press Correspondence</i> . English edition of ECCI periodical. From 1938 continued as <i>World News and Views</i> . | <i>Imprecorr</i>
<i>Imprekorr</i> |
| <i>Internationale Presse-Korrespondenz</i> . German edition of ECCI periodical. Berlin. From July 1932 continued as <i>Rundschau</i> (Basel) | |
| Isaacs, H. R., <i>The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution</i> . London, 1938 | |
| <i>Iz Istarii Mezhdunarodnoi proletarskoi solidarnosti; Dokumenty i Materialy</i> , vol. vi. Moscow, 1962 | |
| Kara-Murza, T., <i>Strategiya i Taktika Kominterna v Natsionalno-Kolonialnoi Revoliutsii na primere Kitaya</i> , ed. by P. Mif. Moscow, 1934 | <i>Strategiya i Taktika</i>
<i>Kominterna</i> |
| <i>Khrestomatiya po noveishei istorii</i> , vol. i. Moscow, 1960 | |
| Kochanski, A., and Tych, F., 'Le Parti Communiste Polonais 1918-1938'. <i>Annali dell' Istituto Giangiacomo Feltrinelli</i> . Milan, 1960 | |
| Koloskov, I. A. and Tsyulnikov, N. G., <i>Narod Frantsii v borbe protiv fashizma</i> . Moscow, 1960 | |
| <i>Kommunisticheskii Internatsional pered VII vsemirnym kongressom</i> . Moscow, 1935 | <i>Materials</i> |
| <i>Kommunisticheskii Internatsional v Dokumentakh</i> , ed. B. Kun. Moscow, 1933 | |
| Leonhard, W., <i>Child of the Revolution</i> . London, 1957 | |
| McLane, C. B., <i>Soviet Policy and the Chinese Communists 1931-1946</i> . Columbia University Press, 1958 | |
| Matthias, E., 'Der Untergang der alten Sozialdemokratie', <i>Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte</i> (Stuttgart), 1956, nos. 2 and 3 | |
| Matthias, E., and Morsey, R., <i>Das Ende der Parteien 1933</i> . Düsseldorf, 1960 | |
| Mif, P., <i>Sovety v Kitae</i> . Moscow, 1933 | |
| Molotov, V. M., <i>Na novom etape</i> . Moscow, 1930 | |

- | <i>Full title</i> | <i>Abbreviated title</i> |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Murphy, J. T., <i>New Horizons</i> . London, 1941 | |
| North, R. C., <i>Moscow and Chinese Communists</i> , 2nd ed. Stanford University Press, 1963 | |
| Overstreet, G. D., and Windmiller, M., <i>Communism in India</i> . University of California, 1959 | |
| Padmore, George, <i>Pan-Africanism or Communism</i> , London, 1958 | |
| Pelling, H., <i>The British Communist Party</i> . London, 1958 | |
| Piatnitsky, O., <i>World Communists in Action</i> . London, n.d. [1930] | |
| — <i>Die Arbeit der KP Frankreichs und Deutschland und die Aufgaben der Kommunisten in der Gewerkschaftsbewegung</i> . Moscow, 1932 | |
| — and Knorin, V., <i>Beiträge zur Geschichte der K.I.</i> Moscow, 1934 | |
| Pieck, W., <i>Der neue Weg zum gemeinsamen Kampf für den Sturz der Hitlerdiktatur</i> (Brüsseler Konferenz der KPD, 1935). Berlin, 1954 | |
| <i>Problemy Kulaya</i> . Periodical, Moscow | |
| <i>Problemy rabochevo i antifashistskovo dvizheniya v Ispanii</i> . Moscow, 1960 | |
| <i>Programmye Dokumenty Kommunisticheskikh Partii Vostoka</i> , ed. by L. Magyar and others. Moscow, 1934 | |
| Rieber, A. J., <i>Stalin and the French Communist Party, 1941-1947</i> . Columbia University Press, 1962 | |
| Rossi, A., <i>Les communistes français pendant la drôle de guerre</i> . Paris, 1951 | |
| — <i>Physiologie du P.C.F.</i> Paris, 1948 | |
| — <i>Les Cahiers du Bolchévisme pendant la campagne 1939-40</i> . Paris, 1952 | |
| Rothschild, J., <i>The Communist Party of Bulgaria</i> . Columbia University Press, 1959 | |
| <i>Rundschau</i> —see <i>Internationale Presse-Korrespondenz</i> | |
| Schüddekopf, Otto-Ernst, <i>Linke Leute von rechts</i> . Stuttgart, 1960 | |
| Schwartz, B., <i>Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao</i> . Harvard, 1951 | |
| XVII S' ezd VKP(b). <i>Stenograficheskii Otchet</i> . Moscow, 1934 | |
| <i>VII Congress of the Communist International: Abridged stenographic report of proceedings</i> . Moscow, 1930 | |
| <i>Seventh World Congress of the Communist International: Resolutions and Decisions</i> . Moscow, 1935 | Resolutions and
Decisions |
| XVI S' ezd VKP(b). <i>Stenograficheskii Otchet</i> . 2nd ed., Moscow, 1931 | |
| Shubin, P., <i>Revolutionnyi Pod'ём v Indii</i> | |
| Snow, Edgar, <i>Red Star over China</i> . Rev. ed., New York, 1938. | |
| — <i>Random Notes on Red China</i> . Harvard, 1957 | |
| <i>Soviet War News</i> (Soviet Embassy, London), 31 May 1943 | |
| <i>Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute</i> , <i>The</i> . London, RIIA, 1948 | |
| <i>Sovremennaya Yaponiya</i> , <i>Sbornik pervy</i> , ed. by P. Mif and G. Voitinsky, Moscow, 1934 | |
| Spector, I., <i>The Soviet Union and the Muslim World, 1917-1958</i> . Seattle, 1959 | |
| Stampfer, Friedrich, <i>Die vierzehn Jahre der ersten deutschen Republik</i> . Karlsbad, 1936 | |
| Stern, Carola, <i>Ulbricht</i> . Cologne, 1964 | |
| Swearingen, R., and Langer, P., <i>Red Flag in Japan</i> . Harvard, 1952 | |
| <i>Thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI: Theses and Decisions</i> . Moscow, 1934 | Theses and
Decisions |
| Thomas, Hugh, <i>The Spanish Civil War</i> . London, 1961 | |
| Trotsky, L., <i>Was Nun?</i> Berlin, 1932 | |
| <i>Twelfth Plenum of the ECCI: Theses and Resolutions</i> . Moscow, 1932 | Theses of the
Twelfth Plenum |
| XVIII S' ezd VKP(b). <i>Stenograficheskii Otchet</i> . Moscow, 1939 | |
| Walter, G., <i>Histoire du Parti Communiste Français</i> . Paris, 1948 | |
| Weyber, H. (ed.), <i>Der deutsche Kommunismus: Dokumente</i> . Cologne, 1963 | |
| <i>World News and Views</i> —see <i>International Press Correspondence</i> | |

INDEX

- Abyssinia, war in, 378-82
 Adame, M., 245f.
 Adler, F., 330, 340, 401, 406, 409
 Afghanistan, 23, 25, 43
 Agrarian question, 188
 Alsace-Lorraine, 103, 155, 218-19
 Alter, H., 276
 Alvarez del Vayo, J., 401, 417
 American Federation of Labour (AFL), 9, 14, 265, 286, 350
 Anglo-American rivalry, 10, 18, 24, 40, 46, 70, 98, 105, 112, 158, 342, 373
 Anti-fascist congresses (1929), 23; (1932), 239-41; (1933), 264-5
 Arab communist parties, 78, 83
 Arab nationalism, 79-84
 Arnot, R. P., 91, 156
 Arroyo, V., 244, 329
 Asturias, rising in, 329, 338
 Austria, 150, 262, 306-9, 323, 351; Socialist Party of, 267, 307-8; occupation of, 417, 420; Communist Party of, 434
 Azana, M., 244f., 329

 Balkan Communist Federation, 150, 471
 Balkan Pact, 150
 Barbé, H., 64, 218
 Barbusse, H., 23, 239, 264
 Bauer, O., 276, 283, 323
 Bedacht, M., 9
 Belgium, Communist Party of, 440
 Bell, T., 8, 65, 91
 Benda, J., 440
 Benes, E., 292
 Berenguer, General D., 180
 Berlin May Day 1929, 26, 29, 47
 Berlioz, J., 218, 313, 332
 Bittelman, A., 8
 Blum, L., 276, 292, 384, 421, 443, 446-7, 463
 Bordiga, A., 68
 Borodin, M., 85
 Brand, H., 39, 211
 Brandler, H., 103, 213, 255
 Brandler-Thalheimer group, 27, 49, 67f., 143, 287
 Brazil, Communist Party of, 356
 Breitscheid, R., 166, 213, 249, 388
 Brockway, A. Fenner, 20, 269f.
 Bronkowski, B., 211, 317, 418
 Browder, E., 8, 419, 472
 Brüning, H., 215
 Bukharin, N., 8, 27, 36, 41, 67-69, 102, 104, 157, 211

 Bullejos, J., 245f.
 Bund, 212

 Caballero, L., 181, 183, 244f., 329, 345, 386, 393, 396, 401, 412, 417
 Cachin, M., 149, 164, 218, 330, 409
 Campbell, J. R., 90, 351, 371, 440-2
 Cannon, J. P., 15
 Capitalism: crisis of, 11-12, 18, 25, 91, 98, 104-8, 112, 149, 157-64, 247, 277, 298-9, 317; stabilization of, 18, 42, 209, 211, 221-3, 298
 Catalonia, 387, 396
 Celor, P., 218
 CGTU (Confédération Générale de Travail Unitaire), 57, 103, 143, 153, 155, 204, 219, 292, 384
 Chamberlain, N., 417, 427
 Chang Hsueh-liang, 178, 403
 Chang Kuo-tao, 425
 Changsha, battle of, 135
 Chattopadhyaya, V., 99, 221
 Chernodanov, 149
 Chen Tu-hsiu, 2, 73, 84-85, 136, 171, 311
 Chiang Kai-shek, 179, 310, 402
 Chile, 294
 China, 44, 85-89; Soviets in, 1, 45, 87, 114, 116, 136, 139, 160, 170, 174-6, 220, 278, 318-19, 356-7; Red Army of, 1, 117, 139-40, 170, 174-5, 200, 294; and the Powers, 3, 73; agrarian question in, 4, 31-36, 139, 174-5; trade unions in, 6-7, 168, 172-3, revolutionary movement in, 169-71; war with Japan, 294, 300, 413, 426-7, 436
 China, Communist Party of (CCP), 1, 5, 41, 87-89, 114-20, 135-41, 151, 167-76, 229-30, 241-2, 294, 311-12, 321, 351, 425-7; and KMT, 5-6, 310, 348, 402-5, 425; and 1939-45 war, 440
 Chinese Eastern Railway, 73-76, 88, 103, 177; sale to Japan of, 269, 276
 Chiu Pang-hsien (Po Ku), 136
 Chou En-lai, 136, 220, 403, 440
 Chu Chiu-pai (Tsiu Vito, Strakhov), 1f., 41, 85, 136
 Chu Teh, 1, 294, 310
 Churchill, W., 464, 471
 Citrine, W., 393, 406
 'Class against class', 36, 216, 341, 350
 Collective security, 295, 372, 385, 434
 Colonies, nationalist movement in, 2, 18, 20, 44, 99, 109, 119, 125, 319, 377

- Communist International (CI): opportunism in, 12, 19, 27, 36-37, 48, 50, 102, 107-8; membership of, 17, 38, 102, 187-9, 210, 280, 316, 346, 349, 435; relations with LSI, 26, 275-6, 328-31, 333, 338, 339-41, 345, 352-3, 378-82, 409-12, 433-4, 438-9; budget of, 38, 150, 210, 284; dissolution of, 476-81
- Communist parties, 162-4, 295, 301-6, 346; bolshevization of, 19, 49; disputes in, 41, 67; in illegality, 51, 280; deviations in, 189, 280, 236-7, 264, 274, 350, 353, 367-8; relations with socialist parties, 210-14, 216f., 274, 287, 347, 356, 368-9; in bourgeois governments, 347, 356, 383; and 1939-45 war, 448-59, 462-70, 471-6
- Congo, 392
- CPGB, *see* Great Britain, Communist Party of
- CPSU, *see* Soviet Union, Communist Party of
- Cook, A. J., 20, 55, 78, 94
- Cuba, 294, 348, 435
- Cyprus, Communist Party of, 150
- Czechoslovakia, 292-3, 342; trade unions in, 143; German minority in, 154, 157; Socialist Party of, 293; occupation of, 435
- Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of, 49, 102, 187, 273-4
- Dahlem, F., 334, 388
- Daladier, E., 384, 427, 463
- Danzig, 212, 240, 300, 342
- Darsono, 157
- Dawes Plan, 40, 208
- De Gaulle, General, 463, 471
- Delgado, C., 471
- Democracy, bourgeois, 224-6, 296-7, 343, 350, 354, 358, 369
- Dengel, P., 8, 39
- Diaz, J., 392
- Dimitrov, G., 239, 333, 347, 355, 358, 411, 427
- Dollfuss, E., 279, 307
- Doriot, J., 41, 155, 204, 307, 313, 322, 341
- Dreiser, T., 239
- Dual unions, *see under* Trade Unions
- Duclos, J., 218, 332, 392
- Dutt, C. P., 221, 295
- Dutt, R. P., 99, 190, 286, 316, 357, 441
- East Prussia, 240
- 'Eastern Locarno', 336
- ECCI, *see* Executive Committee of Communist International
- Eden, A., 418
- Egypt, Communist Party of, 78
- Einstein, A., 239
- Enderle, A., 27
- Ercoli, *see* Togliatti, P.
- European Peasant Committee, 188
- Ewert, A., 28, 69
- Executive Committee of Communist International (ECCI), 149-50, 351-2; West European Bureau of, 23, 27, 95; Latin American secretariat of, 70; Eastern secretariat of, 77; composition of, 150, 483-5; Russian control of, 269
- Factory cells, 141-9, 188-9
- Factory committees, 58-59
- Fascism, 25, 30, 40-41, 44, 288, 355, 359-60, 366-7; nature of, 121, 149, 151-2, 208, 251-2, 273, 283, 286, 296-7, 428; spread of, 347, 390, 436
- Ferrat, A., 41, 218
- Feuchtwanger, L., 388
- Fimmen, E., 55, 79
- Finland, 151, 155-6, 459-60
- Fleming, P., 294
- Florin, W., 334, 357, 388
- Flyg, 38
- Ford, J. W., 124
- Foster, W. Z., 8
- Four Power Pact, 263, 265, 295
- Fourth International, 269-70, 298, 369, 419, 422
- Frachon, B., 42, 155, 384
- France, 164, 292, 314-16; elections in, 218 385; Socialist Party of, 292; trade unions in, 292, 384, 440
- France, Communist Party of, 42, 65, 103, 155, 187, 217-19, 229, 291f., 321, 351, 358, 401; collaboration with French Socialist Party, 274, 291f., 313-16, 331-3, 341, 358, 383-5, 413, 418; and 1939-45 war, 439, 442-3, 463-4, 471-2
- Franco, General, 329, 387, 438
- Frölich, P., 27
- Fukumoto, 194
- Gallacher, W., 90f., 295
- Gandhi, M. K., 21, 99, 221, 316, 471
- Garcia, H., 331
- Garlandi, M. (R. Grieco), 38, 68
- Germany, 40, 212-17, 281, 287, 301, 340, 372-3, 451-2; trade unions in, 27-28, 103, 142, 153, 236, 335; Social-Democratic Party of (SPD), 45-46, 100, 102, 106, 213, 215, 255-6, 266-7, 275, 279, 290, 361, 441; National-Socialist Party of (NSDAP), 100, 153, 214, 255-6, 265, 360, 438, 475; elections in, 120-3, 210, 214-15, 217, 248, 250; Socialist Labour Party of (SAP), 213f., 388; re-armament of, 275, 343, 373; and Poland, 293, 317, 326

- Germany, Communist Party of (KPD), 27-28, 101-3, 120-3, 151, 187, 212-17, 228, 248-63, 275, 279, 283-4, 289-90, 303, 312, 322, 350f., 387-8, 402, 413, 428, 434, 464; relations with NSDAP, 249; relations with SPD, 249-51, 333-5, 357, 388, 419; and 1939-45 war, 440, 442, 463, 474-5
- Gerö, E., 392
- Gitlow, B., 9, 36f.
- Gitton, M., 439
- Gopner, S., 389
- Gorki, M., 239
- Gottwald, K., 38, 217, 230, 273, 292, 387, 392
- Great Britain, 290, 326-7, 387, 420; Labour Government of, 45-46, 66, 73, 80, 91-94, 106; Labour Party of, 90, 387; elections in, 219
- Great Britain, Communist Party of (CPGB), 89-95, 100, 187, 219-20, 229; and ILP 268-73; and Labour Party, 291, 336, 356, 358; and 1939-45 war, 440-2, 463f., 471
- Great power rivalry, *see* Imperialism, contradictions of
- Gruber, 306
- Gupta, B., 79
- Gusev, S. I., 38, 100, 143
- Guttmann, J., 293
- Guyot, R., 218
- Hatta, M., 79
- Hayama, 193
- Heckert, F., 65, 78, 123, 254f., 334
- Henlein, K., 342
- Henrykowski, S. G., 211
- Hernandez, J. (Ventura), 293, 386f., 417
- Herriot, E., 280, 291
- Hilferding, R., 462
- Hindenburg, President, 214f.
- Hitler, A., 214-15, 249, 254, 257-8, 261-2, 275, 287, 322, 333, 342
- Ho Lung, 1, 89
- Holland, Communist Party of, 39
- Hoover, H., 10, 165
- Horner, A., 91, 282
- Humbert-Droz, J., 27, 36f., 68f., 156, 209, 284
- Ibarruri, D., 329, 417
- Iceland, Communist Party of, 150
- IFTU, *see* International Federation of Trade Unions
- ILO, 2, 7
- Imperialism, contradictions in, 40, 81, 103, 112-13, 140, 158-9, 166, 177, 191, 194, 223, 240, 296, 326, 443-4, 451
- Independent Labour Party (ILP), 79f., 219, 268-73, 284, 291, 303, 471
- India, 20-23, 99-100, 156, 160; trade unions in, 20, 22; workers' and peasants' parties of, 20-21; National Congress of, 21, 45, 79, 99, 156, 161, 220, 316, 389; and 1939-45 war, 442, 472
- India, Communist Party of, 99, 156, 220-1, 230, 356-7
- Indochina, 118, 150, 161; Communist Party of, 316, 388
- Indonesia, Communist Party of, 39, 99
- International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), 7, 55, 112, 142-3, 192, 281; and RILU, 276, 418; and Russian unions, 419, 435
- Italy, 450
- Italy, Communist Party of, 68, 101, 335, 413
- Japan, 193, 199, 202-3; policy in China, 73; invasion of Manchuria, 176-9, 190-1, 193-5, 200-1, 223, 239-44, 265
- Japan, Communist Party of, 95-98, 176, 192-203, 229, 242, 294, 321, 434
- Jewish Socialist Party (Poale Zion), 77, 81f.
- Jilek, B., 27, 36f.
- Jouhaux, L., 153, 412, 447
- Kamenev, L. B., 68
- Kang Sin (Kon Sin), 294, 312
- Katayama, S., 95, 276, 294
- Kautsky, K., 190, 428
- Kazama, 193
- Kellogg Pact, 43
- Khitarov, S. R., 38, 90
- Kilbom, K., 38
- Kleber, General, 392
- KMT, *see* Kuomintang
- Knorin, V., 215, 217, 250, 281, 284, 286, 292
- Kolarov, V., 40
- Kopecki, V., 387
- Koplenig, J., 434
- Korea, 118
- Kostrzewa, W., 39, 152, 211f.
- KPD, *see* Germany, Communist Party of
- Krajewski, W., 418
- Kun, B., 8, 41, 231, 264, 276, 287, 292, 371, 418
- Kuomintang (KMT), 3-4, 73, 84-89, 167-70, 177-8, 294, 310
- Kutepov, General, 165
- Kuusinen, O., 8, 21, 39f., 99, 149, 155, 210, 219, 285f., 289, 295, 460
- Labour aristocracy, 13, 41, 143, 358
- LAI, *see* League Against Imperialism
- Latin America, 9, 52, 294, 348

- Laval, P., 389
 Lawrence, T. E., 23
 League Against Imperialism, 20, 70, 77, 78-79, 124, 157, 389, 393
 League of Nations, 18, 42, 165, 177, 179, 190-1, 195, 240, 248, 275, 278, 285, 296, 301, 326, 371, 380, 382, 391
 Ledo, Amerigo, 38
 Leipart, T., 261
 Lenin, N., 260-1
 Lenin School, 142, 230, 418
 Lenski, J., 38f., 149, 211f., 230, 293, 307, 336, 418
 Lerroux, A., 329
 Li Li-san, 135, 137-41, 168, 171, 310, 312
 Little Entente, 150
 Lo Chang-lung, 171
 Löbe, P., 261
 'Long march', 310
 Lovestone, J., 8, 36f.
 Lozeray, H., 218
 Lozovsky, A., 9, 22, 52, 125, 142f., 168, 281, 315, 337
 LSI, *see* Second International
 Ludwig, E., 388
 Luhani, G. A. K., 21
 Lytton Commission, 239

 MacDonald, J. R., 45, 80, 91, 290
 Macedonia, 471
 Malinovsky, General, 392
 Manchuria, Japanese invasion of, 176-9, 190-1, 193-5, 200-1, 223, 239-44, 265
 Mann, H., 388, 402
 Manuisky, D. Z., 22, 27, 36, 39, 68, 70, 90, 98, 100, 149, 168, 181, 208f., 212, 219, 288, 290, 313, 315
 Mao Tse-tung, 1, 89, 173, 220, 294, 310f., 402, 405, 413, 425, 440
 Marty, A., 218, 245, 282, 292, 314, 371, 392, 401, 441
 Martynov, A., 41, 251, 287
 Maurin, J., 182, 186
 Maxton, J., 20, 79, 94
 Mejlis Islam, 80f., 83
 Mensheviks, 241
 Merker, P., 28, 103, 153, 255
 Mexico, 70-72
 Meyer, E., 27
 Mif, P., 114, 135f., 167, 311
 Minor, R., 125
 Minority Movement, 53, 93f., 231, 282, 350, 352
 Molotov, V. M., 8, 16, 28, 40, 74, 91
 Monatte, P., 153
 Mongolia, Inner, 188, 300
 Monmousseau, G., 57

 Morocco, 321
 Muna, A., 27
 Munich agreement, 427, 429-31, 437
 Münzenberg, W., 23, 79, 157, 239, 312, 388, 413
 Murphy, J. T., 90f., 219-20

 Nabeyama, 193
 Negrin, J., 401, 417
 Negroes, 10, 124-35, 380, 389, 471-2
 Nehru, J., 21, 41, 99, 156f., 316
 Nenni, P., 275f.
 Neumann, H., 37, 120, 153, 213, 255, 282-3, 388
 Neurath, A., 27
 New Deal, 265, 286, 293
 Nizan, P., 440
 Non-aggression pacts, 286
 Noulens, M. and Mme, 220
 Nozaka (Okano), 238, 294, 434

 Pacifism, 31, 295, 372, 376, 428
 Palestine, 76-84, 393-4
 Pan-Europa, 165
 Pan-Islamic congress, 78
 Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, 2, 20, 74
 Papen, F. von, 216, 249, 313
 Parti Ouvrier et Paysan (POP), 155
 Pepper, J. (J. Poganyi), 8
 Péri, G., 156
 Piatnitsky, O., 1, 74, 90, 103, 124, 181, 231, 250f., 290, 315, 333
 Pieck, W., 28, 53, 250, 283, 285, 289, 333f., 350, 388
 Poland, 441, 445, 452; Communist Party of, 39, 187, 211-12, 336, 387, 418; Socialist Party of, 39, 212; minorities in, 154, 157, 212
 Polish Corridor, 240, 388
 Pollitt, H., 8, 91, 98, 231, 285, 290, 336, 440-2
 Popular front, 341, 346, 351, 354, 364f., 375, 383, 388, 401, 408, 416, 419, 428, 432, 434, 455
 POUM (Party of Marxist Unity), 397, 400, 409, 423
 Prestes, C., 348
 Prieto, I., 401, 417
 Primo de Rivera, General, 180f.
 Profintern, *see* Red International of Labour Unions
 Proletarian hegemony, 117, 135, 160, 168, 172, 176, 242
 Prukhnjak (Prochniak), E., 212
 Prussia, referendum in, 153-5
 PSUC (United Socialist Party of Catalonia), 387, 396

 Radek, K., 85, 99, 121, 216, 239, 263, 313, 342, 380

- Rakosi, M., 345
 Rapallo, 40
 Raskolnikov, F., 23
 Red International of Labour Unions (Profintern, RILU), 52, 56, 63, 77, 98, 109-10, 114, 142-3, 147, 153, 162, 234, 281-2, 336, 418; and IFTU, 339, 345, 349
 Reichstag fire, 250, 264, 290
 Reimann, P., 28
 Remmele, H., 27, 40, 214, 216, 282-4, 388
 Renaudel, P., 292
 Renner, K., 323
 Revolution, course of, 119, 209, 226-8, 231-2, 247
 Rhineland, reoccupation of, 387
 Riazanov, D., 156
 Richter (Schubert), 283, 289, 333f.
 RILU, *see* Red International of Labour Unions
 Rivera, Diego, 70
 Rolland, R., 239
 Roosevelt, F. D., 265, 274f.
 Rosenberg, M., 396
 Rothstein, A., 90
 Roy, M. N., 8, 20, 221
 Russian revolution, 17, 247, 394, 414
 Rust, W., 90f.
 Rykov, A. I., 67
 Saar plebiscite, 342
 Safarov, G. I., 85, 311
 Samuelson, O., 38
 Sanjurjo, General, 244
 Schleicher, General von, 249, 313
 Second International (LSI), 24, 79, 106, 112, 117, 191, 252-4, 324-5, 361, 391, 433, 437; hostility to USSR, 75-76, 161, 166, 241, 263-4, 266-7, 295, 456; and Nazis, 275
 Semard, P., 28, 42
 Serra (A. Rossi), 36f., 68f., 77
 Severing, C., 166
 Shubin, P., 21, 95
 'Sian incident', 403-4
 Sinclair, U., 239
 Sinkiang, 263
 Skrypnik, N., 21, 317
 Sneevliet, H., 39
 Snow, E., 403
 Sochacki, J., 317, 387
 Social-democracy: communist attitude to, 16, 30, 41, 47-48, 66, 328, 428; as ally of imperialism, 17, 19, 30, 44, 286; development into social-fascism, 27-28, 30, 36, 44, 54-55, 102, 151-2, 159, 267, 286-7; and working class, 151, 154, 161-2, 180, 211, 248, 258-61, 277, 279, 297-8, 414-15, 434, 468-9
 Social-fascism, *see* Germany, Social Democratic Party of; Social-democracy
 Soviet Union: capitalist hostility to, 24, 43, 113; policy towards kulaks 37; progress of, 37, 43, 51, 91, 105, 111, 123, 151, 157, 164-5, 209, 221-3, 268, 277, 286, 359; defence of, 111, 123-4, 166-7, 210, 241, 321, 342, 373, 375, 378; forced labour in, 165; foreign policy of, 280, 285, 370, 374, 444-5; and 1939-45 war, 466, 471-6
 Soviet Union, Communist Party of (CPSU), 28, 143, 322-3, 346; disputes in, 9, 27, 67, 103, 110-11, 161-2, 319
 Soviet Union, relations with: China, 73; Poland, 212; France, 239, 280-1, 291, 342, 351, 371; Germany, 263, 269, 280, 295, 439-41, 445; Czechoslovakia, 387; Japan, 440; Baltic States, 445, 453, 463f.; Finland, 459-60
 Spain, 160, 182, 184-6, 244-6, 328-31; trade unions in, 181, 245, 386; Socialist Party of, 183; anarchism in, 183, 397, 401; elections in, 293, 386-7; civil war in, 392, 395, 396-400, 405-7, 409-11, 413, 421, 423-4, 436
 Spain, Communist Party of, 156, 180-7, 244-6, 293, 386, 396-400, 417, 423-5
 SPD, *see* Germany, Social-Democratic Party of
 Spector, I., 36f.
 Stalin, J. V., 8f., 115, 149, 213, 218, 275, 306, 322-3, 325-6, 392f., 395, 414, 424, 435, 443, 460-2, 476
 Stampfer, F., 216, 350
 Stefanski, A., 39, 211f.
 Strakhov, *see* Chu Chiu-pai
 Strikes, communist policy on, 57-58, 63-64, 107, 230-8
 Sudetenland, 274
 Sun Yat-sen, 120, 405
 Sun Yat-sen, Mme, 239
 Sweden, Communist Party of, 38-39
 Takahashi, 193
 Tanaka, S., 95, 193
 Tapsell, W., 90f.
 Thaelmann, E., 27f., 52, 67, 100, 123, 149, 213f., 216, 230, 322, 345
 'Third period', 42, 98, 103, 317
 Thomas, N., 472
 Thorez, M., 155, 218, 240, 291, 313, 330, 332, 341, 383, 409, 419, 440
 Tito, J. B., 392
 Togliatti, P. (Ercoli), 37f., 283f., 288f., 330, 348, 370, 380, 388, 393, 401
 Toller, E., 388
 Tomsky, M., 67

- Trade unions: communist policy in, 41, 51, 52-62, 108, 234-8, 336, 365-6; dual unionism, 52-53, 60-62, 142, 153, 212, 234-5, 339, 347; communist fractions in 56f., 145, 203-8
- Trials, in USSR, 393, 402, 412f., 418, 422
- Trilla, G. L., 245f.
- Trotsky, L. D., 1, 42, 115, 136, 154, 168, 182, 213, 217, 245, 249-50, 255-6, 263, 269, 283, 289, 298, 311, 332, 393, 409, 412, 419
- Trotskyism, 14, 84, 89, 108, 111, 137, 171, 186, 212, 287, 292, 312, 329, 394, 397f., 408, 417, 436
- Tsiu Vito, *see* Chu Chiu-pai
- Two-and-a-half International, 270-1
- Ulbricht, W., 8, 37f., 68, 91, 204, 334, 357, 388, 392, 462
- Unemployment, 12, 53, 102, 104, 233
- United front from below, 159, 227-8, 233-4, 259, 267, 303, 333, 350, 447, 456-7; *see also* Communist parties: relations with Socialist parties
- United front tactics, 37, 66, 217, 252-4, 284-7, 331, 344-5, 348-9, 356, 361-5, 391, 455
- United States of America, 8-9, 11, 14, 44, 71-72, 104, 449-50
- United States of America, Communist Party of, 14, 187, 229, 389; trade union policy of, 8-9; and 1939-45 war, 465, 471
- Uribe, V., 417
- Vaillant-Couturier, P., 389
- Vandervelde, E., 330
- Varga, E., 38, 39-40, 152
- Vasiliev, B. A., 280, 287
- Vega, E., 245f.
- Ventura, *see* Hernandez
- Versailles Treaty, 120, 158, 254, 259, 263, 290, 326, 370, 372, 388, 451
- Vilna, 453
- Voitinsky, G. N., 73f., 85
- Walcher, J., 27
- Walecki, M., 418
- Wang Ching-wei, 310, 403
- Wang Ming (Chen Shao-yu), 136, 220, 276, 294, 311, 356, 402, 413
- War: danger of, 13, 24, 29-30, 42, 223-4, 265, 288, 295, 299-301, 370-8, 389-90, 419-20, 429; and capitalism, 18, 448-9; on Soviet Union, 27, 30, 43, 64, 73-74, 105, 149, 158-9, 164-7, 178, 180, 194-5, 238-44, 277-8
- War, 1914-18, 17, 321, 453
- War, 1939-45, 440-3, 444-59, 462-76
- Warski, A., 211f.
- Washington Agreement (1922), 208
- Wels, O., 46, 255, 261, 266, 290
- Wijnkoop, D., 39
- Wojewodzki, S., 387
- Wolf, F., 249
- Wolfe, B., 9
- Wollenberg, E., 249
- Yamamoto, M., 193
- Young Communist League (YCL), 242
- Young Plan, 40, 42, 100f., 105, 111, 120, 158, 208
- Yugoslavia, Communist Party of, 150, 465
- Zamora, A., 181, 246
- Zarski, T., 387
- Zionism, 76-84, 257