

FOURTH CONGRESS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

*Abridged Report of
Meetings held at
Petrograd & Moscow
Nov. 7—Dec. 3, 1922*

Published for the **COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**

by the Communist Party of Great Britain
16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1 OPENING OF CONGRESS	1-7
2 REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	8-100
3 FIVE YEARS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION	101-132
4 THE CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE	132-153
5 THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE VERSAILLES TREATY	153-163
6 THE PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST INTER- NATIONAL	163-181
7 REORGANISATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	181-188
8 THE AGRARIAN QUESTION	189-204
9 THE EASTERN QUESTION	204-224
10 FAMINE RELIEF	224-225
11 TRADES UNION QUESTION	225-235
12 TURKISH QUESTION	235-230
13 COMMUNIST ACTIVITY AMONG WOMEN ...	239-250
14 THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ...	251-257
15 THE NEGRO QUESTION	257-262

Report of Moscow Congress

OPENING OF CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION.

Speakers: Comrades Zetkin, Zinoviev.

Comrade Zetkin, in the name of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, declared the Fourth World Congress of the Communist International open on the day of the fifth anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia. After Comrade Zinoviev had been elected chairman of the Congress, the following were elected members of the Congress Presidium.

Kolarov (Bulgaria).
Scheffo (Scandinavia).
Katayama (Japan).
Maratinia (Italy).
Clara Zetkin (Germany).
Carr (America).
Leckie (England).
Markhlevsky (Poland).
Neurath (Czecho-Slovakia).
Béron and Henriot (France).
Lenin and Trotsky (Russia).

Zinoviev: Comrades, I have the honour to deliver to you the opening speech. The Fourth World Congress of the advanced proletarians of 52 countries is taking place in a country under the rule of the Russian working class, in the Soviet Republic. I think, comrades, that it would be no exaggeration on our part to say that events of equal magnitude and historical significance occur only seldom. We should therefore devote our first words to the memory of those who have fallen during the past five years on the battle-fields in order that Russia might remain a Soviet Republic, and that the flag of the Communist Party should not be torn from the hands of the advanced proletarian fighters of all countries.

Eternal memory to the first fighters of the world proletarian revolution! (All rise from their seats; the orchestra plays the "Funeral March.")

Comrades, five years have elapsed from the moment that the workers of this very city, where we are now opening the

REPORT OF MOSCOW CONFERENCE 1922

Fourth World Congress, overthrew the bourgeoisie and took power into their own hands. It may be said without fear of exaggeration, that every day of these five years has been an important lesson to the proletariat of this country as well as of the entire world. The last year has been to the Communist International in many respects a decisive year.

At the close of the Third Congress our enemies prophesied for the Comintern its extinction, at least eclipse and decay. It was under the barrage of the capitalist offensive during the last fifteen months that the question was solved whether the young International Communist Party, not yet fully strong in many places, would successfully maintain its position. The Comintern now consists of over 60 parties. Some of them have a larger membership than the Russian Communist Party had five years ago, before the outbreak of the revolution. On the other hand there are parties which are yet weak and not quite definitely organised, which are passing through the difficult initiatory stage. This last year has been the most trying year of the systematic offensive of international capitalism throughout the world. During this year the 2nd and 2½ Internationals have joined their forces. It has been a year of famine in Soviet Russia, a year of endless strikes which almost everywhere ended in defeat for the working class. Nevertheless, it was during this very year that the Comintern has laid down a solid foundation and fear no longer the wilds of international reaction. The Comintern is alive and will live to sow fear in the hearts of its enemies. (Applause.)

During this year the programme and tactics of the Comintern, as formulated by our most important Congresses and by the legislative organs of the International proletariat, have been subjected to the test of fire and found correct.

You remember how not so long ago we witnessed big events in Germany. The Independents of Germany had to decide for or against the 21 conditions and joining the Comintern. The Right Independents refused, and we declared on behalf of the Comintern they had thereby gone over to the bourgeoisie, to social democracy and Noske. When we said these words, there was tremendous indignation on the Right Independent benches. They thought this statement to be a vicious and unjustified prognostication. Now it has become the fact. The prediction of the Comintern has come true. The Right Honourable Independents are now in the ranks of Noske, in the ranks of the executioners of the working class.

An analogous and interesting test of the tactics of the Comintern we have seen in Italy, in a country which is now in a certain sense in the limelight of international events. At the time of the Livorno split we warned those who turned away from the Comintern that they had a choice of two roads—either they follow the Reformist Second International and consequently find themselves very soon in the camp of the bourgeoisie; or they will confess their error and will return to the ranks of the Communist International. I know how the

individual leaders of the Italian Socialist Party view the lesson of Italy. On the other hand I know how the great majority of socialist workers in Italy view the situation. The latter at their recent Convention in Rome have admitted their mistake and that the Comintern was right. They now return to our ranks, and of course, we will receive them like brothers. (Applause.)

Comrades, these two examples (I do not wish to enumerate any more), these two glaring instances in the international labour movement have demonstrated quite clearly to all the honest and conscious proletarians throughout the world, that the 21 conditions fixed by the Second Congress are not an invention, nor an unnecessary stricture, but the dogma based upon the collective reasoning of the international proletariat struggling to break the chains of capitalism.

The tactics of the Communist International have been tested and found correct. We have an exact and clear road, we know whither we are going, we know whither we lead the international proletariat, and therefore we guarantee that with greater or less sacrifices, this depends not entirely on ourselves—in a longer or shorter space of time, we will bring the International proletariat complete victory over the bourgeoisie. (Applause.)

One of the most important recent events has been the amalgamation of the 2nd and 2½ Internationals. The prediction made by the Comintern has come true. This amalgamation will only be to the advantage of the revolutionary struggle of the workers. The 2nd and 2½ Internationals are birds of the same feather. Both of them are counter-revolutionary organisations. It is to the advantage of the revolutionary proletarians that there should be fewer disguises.

It should be shouted from the housetops that the amalgamation of the 2nd and 2½ Internationals signifies among other things a new conspiracy of white terror against the workers who are struggling for their freedom. These words of ours will probably now arouse just as much indignation in the Social Democratic camp as our statement at Halle in regard to the future of the Independents of Germany.

Nevertheless, we assume entire responsibility for all that we say before the workers of the entire world. The amalgamation of the 2nd and 2½ Internationals is nothing but artillery preparation for a new onslaught of the international bourgeoisie against the revolutionary workers, an onslaught of unprecedented brutality. It paves the way for a new Galifet, Noske, Mussolini, for new executioners of the working class.

One may say without exaggeration, that the most central task of our days (nay, perhaps even of our entire epoch) is to defeat the Social Democracy, the main factor of the International counter-revolution, the chief obstacle in the way of the victory of the International Working Class. This, above all, should be borne in mind by our Communist Parties which are just starting upon this road. Our fight against International

4

menshevism and the amalgamation of the 2nd and 2nd Internationals is not a struggle of factions within the socialist movement, as some are inclined to think, but the last and decisive fight of the International working class, against the last advocate and agent of International capitalism. (Cheers.)

I think that the Fifth Anniversary of the October Revolution is the appropriate time to announce this to the workers of the world, in no uncertain voice and with all the emphasis at our command.

I will now say a few words on the international importance of the new economic policy.

Comrades, last year at the Third Congress, when the new economic policy was being introduced, we could only give you a theoretical and abstract idea of the part that this new policy was to play in the life of the First Proletarian Republic. Now we have more explicit data, and we must tell you comrades who have gathered here from all countries of the world—many of you, viewing with misgivings the partial revival of capitalism in Soviet Russia, have told us in perfect good faith: "Yes, we understand that you are compelled to introduce the new economic policy, because we, the workers of other countries, are still too weak and are yet unable to come to your assistance."

This, of course, is true. Nevertheless, the argument is insufficient. We have come to the conclusion that the new economic policy is not only the result of the fact that the communists of many capitalist countries are still too weak. No, there is even a greater reason behind it. We must tell you (in an introductory address there is no room for an elaborate exposition on the subject) that the new economic policy is a certain stage through which many countries, even those that are industrially developed and possess an overwhelming majority of the industrial proletariat, will have to pass, and which a few exceptional countries may evade.

It is a policy of tactical wisdom adopted by the First Great Proletarian Revolution in a country with an overwhelming peasant majority. It is the result of the struggle of the working class of the first victorious proletarian Republic which at first took too rapid strides, but which soon was compelled to see the necessity of calling a halt, so as not to lose contact with the vast mass of peasantry, which under certain circumstances is the deciding factor in the outcome of a revolution, and had no other way but to adopt that set of measures which is best known as the new economic policy.

Five years of our revolution have gone by. We are now in a position to sum up some of its results. Maybe we will do it in more detail at to-morrow's meeting. But one thing we would like to say right now. Five years of unparalleled struggle and numberless sacrifices, of numerous obstacles, famine, unparalleled blockade, intervention, etc., have not broken the working class of Russia. The fifth year of the revolution finds the masses, although tired, yet loyal to our Party. We say this in full consciousness of the fact that we have no right

to colour the position before the International Communist Congress, that we have to state nothing but the truth. They are rallying to it with the same intensity as they did during the best days of the revolutionary upheaval five years ago. What we have seen to-day in Petrograd you could see in any city of the Soviet Republic, in any industrial village, at the pithead of any mine. Everywhere the workers and the toiling masses, who are entitled, so to speak, to a brief respite after these five years of terrible struggles, convinced of the final victory of the Soviet Republic. This is the feeling of every one of us who have the great fortune of struggling together with the great working masses of Russia, especially in such wonderful proletarian cities as Red Petrograd. If there have been any elements among the workers who were subject to misgivings and doubts, who were still afraid that we might get defeated, they are now free from such doubts. Our Party feels as never before that it is on the right track, that the working masses follow its lead with implicit confidence. The Communist Party of Russia "presents" to the Fourth Congress, on the day of the fifth anniversary of the October Revolution, a live and vigorous working class, welded together and confident of its power. (Applause.) For this reason we can afford to laugh to-day in the face of the shadows of the past—the S.R.'s, mensheviks, and the Russian Parties of the Second International.

In the present year we are witness to a mighty movement in the East, a movement which has made such big strides forward that there is hardly any Eastern country at present where we do not possess a nucleus, however small, of the Communist Party. But we remember that our "Labour emancipation group" in Russia in 1883 was also only a small group. Its organisation, however, was a sign that a new era had begun in Russia—the era of revolution. The establishment of Communist Parties in such countries as Japan, India, Turkey, Persia and China, which constitute an inexhaustible reserve of the proletarian social revolution—is an historic event. It is a sign that even there the most advanced labour forces are becoming organised and will lead the oppressed masses to the victory of the international revolution. During this year great nationalist movements were also initiated among the oppressed peoples. These are heavy blows to international capitalism. The risings in India, China and Egypt, which are growing in magnitude, will destroy the bourgeois régime.

These movements are on our side. The mole of history is burrowing well. Comrades, if some of those who are present here to-day will be still alive in five years' time to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, they will realise that what we have done hitherto is only child's play.

We shall witness the world shaking by numberless revolts, and tens, nay, hundreds of millions of oppressed peoples rising against Imperialism.

Long live the International revolution!

REPORT OF MOSCOW CONFERENCE 1922

Long live the Russian proletariat who laid the foundation of this revolution, who, perishing under the cross fire of the enemy, understood that it was and is fighting not only for its own country, but in the interests of the international proletariat!

Down with the international bourgeoisie! (Applause.)

Down with its agent—the Second International! Long live the communists of the world! Long live the millions of workers who are rising for the new struggle and who will come to Communism! Long live the Communist International! (All present rise and sing the "International.")

Zinoviev then read the following telegram from Comrade Lenin—

"I deeply regret that I cannot be present at the first session of the Congress, and can only send you a written greeting.

"In spite of the gigantic difficulties standing in the way of the Communist Parties, the Comintern is growing and getting stronger. As hitherto, the chief task consists in winning the majority of the workers. We shall carry out this task at all costs. The amalgamation of the 2nd and 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ Internationals has benefited the revolutionary movement of the proletariat: Less fiction and less deceptions are always good for the working class.

"My best wishes and warm greetings to the Petrograd workers and their new Soviet, which is receiving in its city the Fourth Congress of the Comintern. The Petrograd workers must also be in the foremost ranks of the economic front.

"We heard with great joy of the economic revival of Petrograd. I hope to be able to respond very soon to your invitation to visit Petrograd.

"The Soviet power in Russia is celebrating its 5th anniversary. It is more firmly established than ever. The civil war has come to an end—and we can already see the first signs of the economic revival.

"It is Soviet Russia's greatest pride to be able to help the world proletariat in the difficult task of overthrowing capitalism. The victory will be ours.

"Long live the Communist International."

V. Ulianov-Lenin.

Zinoviev: Comrades, I think that our reply to this can take the form of a short resolution of the Fourth Congress, of all those who are present and of all the workers of Petrograd. Comrade Vladimir Ilyitch wrote to us: "Long live the Communist International." Our reply to this is "Long live the wisest and best of all leaders, Comrade Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin!" (Tumultuous applause.)

Zinoviev: Comrades, the Congress desires to express its approval and convey its greetings to the many communist comrades and revolutionary workers in general, who

are confined in the numberless gaols of Europe and America. Comrade Clara Zetkin will speak in this connection. Comrade Clara Zetkin has the floor.

Clara Zetkin: When the revolutionary vanguard of the Comintern assembles in order to review the past and look into the future, it always remembers those who have fallen in the struggle.

With pride and sorrow we have just honoured our unforgettable dead.

It is also our duty to remember the many thousands of comrades languishing in gaols because they dared to break the chains which bind the proletariat.

Comrades, it is our duty to send fraternal greetings to all those, whoever they may be, and in whatever so-called Fatherland they have suffered—(stormy applause)—send greetings to all who have the courage and strength to fight, and are not guilty for not having succeeded.

We extend them our hearty greetings and are firmly convinced that they, who were sufficiently courageous, to oppose an entire world of enemies, will possess sufficient strength to stand erect and repel the onslaughts of the enemy who is thirsty for revenge. We greet them and believe that their liberation will be the result not of the humanity loving sentiments, of justice and of other beautiful things which the bourgeoisie like to talk about, but will be obtained exclusively by the might of the revolutionary proletarian masses, whose irresistible pressure will break open the prison doors. We express our conviction that this struggle for the liberation of the revolutionary fighters will not only be an act of solidarity on the part of the proletariat, but that it owes a debt to those fighters who were left unsupported by it on the field of battle. We extend our greetings to our brothers and sisters who are held behind iron bars and assure them of our confidence that their determination will not be shaken, that their thought will not be blurred even if the day of liberation will arrive only after the triumphant flag of the revolution, with the Soviet Star in its centre, will wave over a number of countries and over the entire world.

Speeches and resolutions of greeting to "The prisoners of capitalism," "The Italian Proletariat in their struggle against reaction," "To the Red Army and Red Fleet," "To the Workers and Peasants of Soviet Russia," and "The Petrograd Proletariat" came before the Congress and met with enthusiastic approval, and the first session ended.

REPORT U.

SESSIONS HELD, November, 9-12, 1922.

Chairman, Comrade Kolarov.

Reporter, Comrade Zinoviev.

Speakers: Comrades Kolarov, Zinoviev, Vajtauer, Meyer, Varga, Fischer, Neurath, Becker, Radek, Duret, Bodiga, Markhlevsky, Murphy, Haakon Meyer, Bukharin, Carr, Faure, Rosmer, Acebedo, Donsky, Kolarov, Seidler, Landler, Katayama, Markhlevsky, Rakosi, Marshall, Sullivan, Markhlevsky, Vujovich, Malaka, Zinoviev.

The Congress proceeded to approve the agenda. Comrade Humbert Droz was elected Secretary of the Congress.

Kolarov: Comrade Zinoviev will now report on behalf of the E.C. of the Communist International.

Zinoviev: Comrades, first of all I must report on the activity of our Executive during the period intervening between the Third and Fourth Congress, and then discuss the future activity of the Communist International. The Communists are an international party. From its very inception the Communist International made it its task to create an international communist organisation, systematically constructed, and led from one centre on the basis of democratic centralism. In this consists one of the chief differences between the Comintern and the Second International, which even in its best days was nothing but a far from perfect federation of loosely connected national parties.

In summing up the work of the Comintern, we cannot by any means assert that the Third International has already succeeded in fully accomplishing the above mentioned task. The difficulties on this path are still very great. Every worker with any experience of party work knows how difficult it is to establish correct relations between the centre and the local organisations even within the limits of one country. How much more difficult is this task when it is a question of more than 60 parties, comprising the Comintern. The federalist traditions, which the international labour movement has inherited from the Second International, are much stronger than there was reason to believe. It is very difficult to overcome these traditions, and this can only be done in the course of the actual struggle. In the meantime these traditions are a heavy weight which impedes the progress of the international proletariat towards its ultimate aim.

REPORT OF MOSCOW CONFERENCE 1922

Canada	1
Russia	1
Switzerland	1
Finland	1
Japan	1

Moreover, it should be stated that two sessions of the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Comintern took place between the Third and Fourth Congresses. At these sessions the usual number of representatives of all parties was doubled. Enlarged Sessions are not provided for in the rules—force of circumstances brought them into being. Both Sessions brought together the best leaders of the communist movement of all countries and accomplished very useful work. There is no doubt whatever that enlarged Sessions will become a regular feature and will prove very useful.

Not less important is the work of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. In many respects, it was the work of the Presidium which carried most weight. The Presidium of the Executive Committee met 75 times during the period intervening during the Third and Fourth Congresses (the figures are not quite complete, and only refer to the period preceding October 6th). 735 questions were discussed at these sessions. The number of attendances at these meetings was 1,152 including those of representatives of various parties who were specially invited. It should be borne in mind, of course, that many Comrades made repeated attendances, for the number of the Presidium is fixed. The number of members of the Presidium did not exceed 7—9, but frequently 20 and even 30 people were present at the sessions. For the discussion of questions concerning one or other of the parties or countries, a number of comrades from the respective countries were invited to attend, in order to throw more light on the question before the Presidium. The questions discussed in the Presidium may be divided into the following categories:

	Times.
The tactics of the United Front	22
The Profintern	10
The International Young Communist Movement... ..	21
The preparation of questions for discussion by Executive of the Comintern	25
Organisational questions	37
Publishing Business	28
International Workers' Relief	15
The International Women's Section... ..	6
The Sport International	4
The Co-operative Section	4
The S.R. Trial	11
The Preparation of the Fourth Congress of Comintern... ..	7
The Budget	4

The separate parties, chiefly according to countries, were discussed as follows:

	Times.
Great Britain	18
Austria	8
(Bund)	4
Bulgaria	2
Hungary	21
Germany	18
Holland	1
Greece	1
Denmark	6
Italy	27
India	10
Ireland	2
Luxemburg	4
Norway	6
Poale-Zion	9
Poland	7
Persia	8
U.S.A.	9
Turkey	8
Ukraine	4
Czecho-Slovakia	10
South Africa	1
Switzerland	7
Sweden	6
Finland	4
France	33
Esthonia	2
South America	7
Yugo-Slavia	7
(The Congress of the Far Eastern Peoples)	6
Egypt	2
Khiva	1
Bokhara	1

Fifty-four delegations were sent to various countries according to the decisions of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. 129 commissions were appointed according to the decisions of the Presidium of the Comintern Executive Committee in connection with the movement in the various countries. In most cases, these commissions consisted of three to five comrades from the parties of the various countries, and thus they, too, were important international nuclei. In fact, every one of these commissions is if not an International on a small scale, at least an important educational institution.

For the first time, our International Central Committee succeeded in carrying out in a more or less satisfactory manner, three international campaigns of considerable magnitude: (1) The campaign in connection with the tactics of the United Front; (2) the campaign in connection with the S.R. Trial;

and (3) the Russian Famine Relief campaign. These are, of course, only small beginnings, the first timid steps, but what really matters is that a beginning has been made. Moreover, if one takes into consideration the fact that the Executive Committee of the Comintern has many important branches and that its work is closely connected with the work of the Profintern, the Young Communist International, the International Women's Section, the Co-operative Section, the Sports' Section, the International Workers' Famine Relief, the Language Groups, etc., it is quite obvious that the scope of the work is becoming wider.

In the course of its work, our International Central Committee became convinced that various serious reforms are necessary. It will be the business of the Fourth Congress to discuss these reforms. It is more than likely that a series of departments will have to be attached to the Executive Committee: a Department for Agitation and Propaganda, another for the organisational work, etc., on the model of the departments of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. It is also quite possible that the Executive Committee will have to establish an Organisation Bureau and a Political Bureau as has already been done, not only in the Russian Communist Party, but also in a number of Communist Parties in other countries.

The Comintern does not regard its Executive Committee as a conciliation committee but as a leading organ. It is only natural that the Executive Committee had to "intervene" in the affairs of nearly everyone of the parties adhering to the International Federation. The Executive Committee of the Comintern and its Presidium on numerous occasions discussed in detail, most important questions which, during the year covered by the report, caused some trouble and confusion within the French, Italian, Czech-Slovak and other prominent parties. This is clearly shown by the above mentioned figures. The "Record" figures certainly apply to those parties in which serious crises and internal disputes arose.

The Executive Committee of the Comintern took an active part in the preparation of every congress and of every conference of the most important of its parties. The Theses and resolutions which were to be put before the Congresses of the various parties were (according to regulation) previously discussed at the E.C.C.I. or in its Presidium. Representatives of the E.C.C.I. attended nearly all the most important congresses of the sections of the Comintern, giving these congresses the benefit of their advice and guidance. During this period the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. was enabled to get thoroughly acquainted with the personnel of the leading organs of our most prominent parties. The E.C.C.I. endeavoured to give its support to the political initiative of those of its sections which had to contend with exceptionally difficult conditions. The Executive Committee of the C.I. and its Presidium paid special care and attention to the younger parties which were making their first steps on the field of political mass action. With

the assistance of the E.C.C.I., organised communist parties and groups were established during these fifteen months in such countries as Japan, China, India, Turkey, Egypt and Persia—countries where even at the time of the Third Congress we had only a few loosely organised groups. Numerically, these parties are still very weak, but the nuclei have been formed. But the "Emancipation of Labour" Groups in Russia in 1888, was also not very numerous.

The establishment (not in words, but in deeds) of the International Central Committee of the Communist Organisations of the world, is a gigantic conquest. As the struggle with the bourgeoisie becomes more difficult, and the pressure of international capitalism and world reaction become more ruthless, the foremost workers of the whole world begin to appreciate this conquest to the full. The least attempt to reduce the Executive Committee of the Comintern to the role formerly played by the International Socialist Bureau in the Second International, viz., to the role of an ordinary Conciliation Committee or even to that of an information bureau, a mere "letter box," must meet and will no doubt meet with an energetic resistance on the part of the more developed parties of the Comintern. Such attempts to introduce the traditions and customs of the Second International into the Comintern were made lately, for instance, by some elements of the French Party. There is no doubt whatever that the Fourth Congress will energetically resist any attempts of this kind.

It is not possible to conquer the international bourgeoisie without establishing a well organised and effective international proletarian centre. It is impossible to put up any kind of defence against the mad campaign of the capitalists and the wholesale betrayal of social-democrats, if in any important matters the Comintern recedes from the fundamental principles laid down in its most important program documents. The International Communist Movement stands in need of a firm General Staff, of a strong and authoritative International Central Committee. The Communist Parties of the whole world will create and consolidate such a General Staff.

We have now two questions to consider: firstly, whether our Executive has carried out the decisions of the Third Congress in the right way, and secondly, whether these decisions themselves were correct. This is all the more necessary since much material has accumulated during the 15 months, which we had not at our disposal before.

Let us now consider the situation at the end of the Third Congress, which was a determining factor in our entire policy. Immediately after the Third Congress, it became evident that world capitalism had begun a well organised and systematic offensive against the working class throughout the world. The working class was, so to speak, beating a retreat. The economic organisations of the working class have become weaker. There were in 1920, 25,000,000 members in the trade unions. In 1922 the trade unions had only 18,000,000 members, and

I am not quite sure if even this figure is not exaggerated. This fact alone shows us the difficult position of the working class during the period covered by this report.

The position of Soviet Russia during this period must also be taken into account. I need not remind you, that immediately after the conclusion of the Third Congress, famine on a large scale was beginning in Russia. This was not quite evident during the Third Congress, but immediately after its conclusion we had to address the workers of the whole world on behalf of the Executive of the Communist International asking support for the Russian proletariat during the famine year. This fact had enormous political consequences. You are aware that we have been accused of using the International as a weapon of the Russian Soviet Republic. There are even some "friends" who make this assertion. It is, of course, self evident that there is and there ought and must be an interaction between the first proletarian republic and the Communist Party which is fighting against the bourgeoisie. From our communist viewpoint it is perfectly clear that the Communist International is of the greatest importance for Soviet Russia, and vice versa. It is utterly ridiculous to ask who is the exploited, who the subject and who the object. The Republic and the International are as the foundation and the roof of a building, they belong to each other.

The Russian Soviet Republic is such a great international factor, that no one can possibly ignore it. It is only a question on which side of the barricade one takes up his position. Let me give you as an illustration from recent events the letter of Mr. Clynes, the leader of the British Labour Party. I believe that most of you have read that letter. Mr. Clynes, one of the best known Labour leaders of recent years, addressed a letter to the Soviet Republic, which has now been published. In this letter Mr. Clynes proposed that the Soviet Republic should endorse as soon as possible the agreement with Mr. Urquhart (which you all know) in order that the Labour Party should have a better chance of success at the coming general election. Mr. Clynes assured us that he was speaking not for himself alone but on behalf of all his colleagues. Although Great Britain is a big capitalist imperialist power, nevertheless the general election in that country is closely connected with the situation of Soviet Russia. The Labour Party, one of the important or rather the most important Party in the Second International, cannot ignore this situation of Russia and must take sides, but on whose behalf, on which barricade? The answer is—on the side of Mr. Urquhart, on the side of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, we think that when the Second International is accusing the Third International of being nothing but an appendix and a weapon of Soviet Russia we can justly say that neither can the Second International brush aside the Russian Soviet Republic, but must take it into account. The only difference is that the Second International is endeavour-

ing to make use of the proletarian Soviet Republic for the benefit of the bourgeoisie and not for the proletariat.

As I said before, the famine in Soviet Russia served for the 2nd and 2½ Internationals as a starting point for an energetic campaign of all their parties against the Third International, and we are obliged to admit that this campaign was successful to a considerable extent. For the non-party workers, lacking in political training to be faced with the fact that famine reigned in the first Soviet Republic and that the life of the Russian workers and peasants was one of suffering and hardships, it amounted to a great disappointment in the revolution in general. One can be annoyed at this, but one cannot refuse to understand it. Considering the condition in which the working masses found themselves after the war, this was inevitable. It was certainly very dishonest on the part of our opponents to make use of our misfortunes, for they must have known the origin of the famine. They must have known that the traitors in the 2nd and 2½ Internationals and the entire tactics of imperialism were the chief culprits. It was evident, however, from the start that the Second International would make use of this in the struggle which it has been carrying on against us, and it has indeed done so.

The Third Congress for the first time sharply repudiated the tactics of the so-called left elements, such as the K.A.P.D., the semi-anarchic groups on the one hand, and of the right groups on the other hand. We realised then that the formation of truly communist parties had only just begun. The Third Congress then left us the well-known watchword "to the masses," and in the resolution on tactics it set before us the task of winning over the majority of the working class and drawing into the struggle the most important sections.

The slogan of the United Front first formulated by our Executive in December, 1921, was the direct outcome of this general situation. I believe, Comrades, that now, after two sessions of the Enlarged Executive—which were in reality small world congresses—we have progressed so far that even in France the Communists as well as the Syndicalists have given up their opposition to the United Front, so that a lengthy discussion of the matter will not be necessary at this congress. All our strategy has been nothing but the practical application of the United Front to the concrete situation in each country. And I wish to state now that in my opinion this tactic will have to be adhered to during the coming year or coming years.

The United Front was really the first international campaign which the International attempted on a large scale. You know that we have insisted that the Communist International must be an International of action, an International of work, a centralised International Communist World Party, etc. This is an absolute principle, and we must abide by it. But we require years in order to carry it out thoroughly. It is comparatively easy to adopt a resolution to this effect, but it is a much harder task when it comes to practical work.

Even the attempt to carry out an international membership week—an undertaking which really differs very little from similar attempts by the Second International—failed because our Parties are still too heterogeneous, because our Parties are in many cases not yet communistic and have still much of the Social Democratic spirit in them, because their organisation is deficient, because it is a hard task generally to organise international action. During the past year we have attempted several international campaigns. Among these the campaign for the United Front was of special importance. And it must be frankly stated that this campaign did not proceed without much hindrance. We shall speak of this at greater length when we come to the special points of the agenda.

It has appeared that some groups in our Communist International are trying to bring too many of the customs of the Second International into the Third. I believe, Comrades, that we cannot regard what happened in France without protest. At the time when the Communist International should have been a centralised world organisation of the proletariat, when the International was starting a wide campaign against Amsterdam in connection with the United Front, at that time an iron discipline, or, at any rate, ordinary proletarian discipline, should have prevailed in our ranks. This, however, was not the case. I must say that what the French, and partly also the Italian parties have done was a hindrance to the International action which our organisation had planned. We should see this clearly and adopt the necessary measures to meet the situation. This campaign was politically very important, but it was not such as would vitally affect hundreds of thousands of comrades. But when campaigns such as these meet with so many hindrances there is cause to fear that in times of greater crises similar disturbances may occur.

Comrades, I believe that it will be best if in my report on the activity of the Executive, I now take it country by country. Allow me to preface this by the following general observation. The greater the portion of the old social-democratic movement which we had taken over into our ranks, the greater the remainder of centrism and social democratism we have had to contend with in our party. You will be able to see that clearly from my review of the situation.

I will begin with Germany. Germany stood in the centre of our debates at the Third World Congress. The situation of the German Party at the time of the Third World Congress was very difficult, as you know. Our enemies spoke of complete disintegration, and many of our friends were hypnotised by the temporarily difficult situation of the German Party. The Executive is proud that it has been able to render effective help to the German Party in the solution of its severe crisis. I believe that we can maintain in all truth and without exaggeration that our German Party is one of the strongest and best organised parties at this Congress (naturally, comparatively speaking), and has the clearest political outlook. This should

give us encouragement to-day when so many of our larger parties find themselves in similar difficulties. The French Party is the object of the greatest pessimism for many of the members of this Congress. I believe, however, that the example of the German Party should suffice to quiet their fears, and I can say that if this Congress acts judiciously, we will be able to render help to the French Party and strengthen its position.

When I ask myself, which Parties have best applied the policy of the United Front, I find, comparatively speaking, I must answer the German and the Czecho-Slovak Parties. We have often seen that our German Party did not always emphasise sufficiently the independence of our line of action; for with us the insistence upon the independence of communist agitation is the main thing. They were not always successful in this. But in general, the German Party has applied these tactics well. Strikes, such as the railroad strike in Germany, are classical examples of the right application of the policy of the United Front. This strike was also a proof that every economical strike usually grows into a political one. I have read an article of the German "International," stating that the Fourth Congress will have to say clearly what is coming in Germany next? Will it be a period of increasing economic conflicts or of political conflicts? To put the question this way is absolutely incorrect. The coming period will be one of increased economic conflicts, and also of increased political struggle. The railroad strike has shown clearly that almost every economic conflict may turn into a political conflict.

You have heard of the Shop Committees Movement which has just begun and which will doubtless have a great future. The social democrats have accused our Party of intending to call a Congress of the Shop Committees, and then place Germany before an accomplished fact, as the Bolsheviki have done in 1917 with the Congress of Soviets (the Bolsheviki, however, had already wrenched the power from the bourgeoisie). I am sorry to say that the German Party does not merit this accusation, or rather this compliment. The Communist Party of Germany is not strong enough to be able to carry out what the Bolsheviki did in 1917. But this campaign will be of the greatest importance for the consolidation of our ranks.

There are still many questions to be fought out, such as the question of the programme, on which the last session of the Central Committee was not quite unanimous. But on comparing the movement now with what it was fourteen months ago we maintain that the German Party has taken a gigantic step forward. If events are not entirely misleading, the path of the proletarian revolution in Russia leads through Germany. Thus the healing of all feuds in our Party in Germany is of first-class importance. In Germany we have only two Parties. As to the Labour group we prophesy that within a few months it will either go over to the Communists or disappear altogether. We can afford to wait for events to decide. It is clear that in

Germany we have only two parties of importance, and the future belongs to our Party..

I now turn to France. We will yet have some special comment to make upon this subject. But I cannot pass on in my general report without touching upon it. A few months ago I wrote an article under the title of "The Birth of a Communist Party." In that article I stated that the birth of a Communist Party was quite a difficult matter. Yet, on considering the course of events since the Party Congress in Paris, one must say that the birth of a Communist Party in France presents even greater difficulties than might have been anticipated. There you have the formula I have made: "the greater the number of Social Democratic elements won over by us from the old Party, the greater are the difficulties that we have to overcome, in the most concrete form. This you will have occasion to observe also in Norway, and perhaps also in some other countries. In France we suddenly won over to our side the majority of the old Party, and it now requires a good deal of time before we shall have overcome all the ailments arising out of this. The situation was watched closely by the Executive and its representatives, some of whom, like Humbert-Droz, spent half a year in France. This observation goes to show—let us be quite frank about it—that we have to look for quite a lot of elements for a Communist Party in the ranks of the Syndicalists, in the ranks of the best part of the Syndicalists. This is strange, but true.

The tradition of the French movement is such that even now—in 1922, after two years of the existence of a Communist Party—we have to state that we have in France a good number of Communists who will be the best elements of our future Communist Party, who are still outside the ranks of the Party, in the ranks of the Trade Unions. I think it is one of the most important tasks of our Congress and of the French Commission to bring into our ranks these truly proletarian and truly revolutionary and Communist elements. The tradition in France is such that the Party is considered as a Party of "politicians," and it must be regretfully admitted that such a view is not held without reason. (Hear, hear.).

At the Third Congress we did not adopt a sufficiently critical attitude towards the French Party. This proved a disadvantage to the French Party.

The French Party had failed to apply the tactic of the Communist International in a country where it was particularly dictated by circumstances. The bourgeoisie in France is conducting a systematic campaign against the 8-hour day, and it must be frankly recognised that the Executive failed in its efforts to induce our Party to initiate a systematic counter-campaign. Our attempt to inaugurate a campaign in France for the 8-hour day in the spirit of the United Front has signally failed.

Let me recall to your mind the last general strike that took place in France. In this respect also we must freely speak our minds. It was our usual experience in France in the course of 1918 to see a declaration of a strike on the Sunday and Monday of every week. But nobody took any notice of it. Those were in the worst days of Syndicalism, and I believe it should be one of the most important tasks of our Party to eradicate this tradition. Unfortunately, our Party has perpetuated this unwholesome tradition. The general strike to which the French workers were called a few weeks ago was forced by a very small group of anarchists. Our newspaper, "Humanité," the biggest Labour newspaper in France, was made use of to urge the working class to declare the strike at a time when our Party was totally unprepared. We must draw the proper conclusions from the incident, and never again allow repetition. The working class finds itself in a very tragic position. There is really no excuse for a Party which is a section of our Communist International allowing such a strike, and incurring grave responsibility upon itself and upon the International, to take place.

The French Party has again at its last Congress confirmed the 21 conditions. I had somewhat forgotten these 21 conditions, and to-day I had occasion to read them over once more. The first of these 21 conditions stipulates that the Press should be truly Communist. I must declare it openly that this first of the 21 conditions has not been carried out in France. "Humanité" strives to be a Communist newspaper, but it is still far from being such. It has a very large circulation and has rendered brilliant services. In many respects—this should be admitted—but it is not yet a Communist newspaper, and the Fourth Congress should begin by enforcing this first of the 21 conditions, and I hope it will succeed.

In France, as you know, we now have three tendencies and two minor tendencies. I am not going to describe these tendencies in detail. Taken as a whole they amount to centrism. It is mostly the leaders who came over to our side from the old Party, who, while rendering great service to the Communist International have not yet got rid of the old Adam of social democracy. On reading Comrade Marcel Cachin's latest articles on the Trade Unions one must say that these articles are not written any better than the article of Verfeuil whom we expelled at the Paris Congress.

The second tendency pursues a middle course; I refer to the Renault Group. Here we must say that we find among them some very good proletarians, of whom many have criticised the tactics of the United Front from a sincere Left Wing point of view, but who eventually became convinced of the correctness of our tactics and will come back to us.

The third tendency is really Communist. We will accept everything that they have done, although at the Paris Congress they committed big mistakes.

Personally I regard the resignation of our responsible comrades of the Left as a big mistake, but we must say that this group deserves the moral support of the Communist International, and we will not deny it to them. They have made many mistakes, but they were the only ones who really defended the Marxist policy of the United Front in France and brought it to victory.

I must tell you comrades that from our first conferences with our comrades we became convinced that a split was avoidable, and the Comintern will naturally do all in its power to prevent such a split. But this example shows us clearly how difficult is the birth of the Communist Party. Just think of this comrades, the French Party has not yet carried out a single mass action. Think of what will happen when they attempt one. I remind you of the fact that the first real conflict of the German Communist Party came after an action had been attempted. (Very true—from the German benches). Whether the action was good or bad makes no difference, the fact remains that a real conflict began with a mass action. The action was a cure for the Party. It saved it. It was also the beginning of a new conflict within the Party. Prophecies are out of place, but when it comes to a real movement, to a real mass action, when it becomes a question of life and death, then we will see a real crisis in the French Party, then we will see who actually belongs to the Communist Party and who does not.

It is not the task of the Congress to my mind, to spare anybody as the Third Congress did, but to recognise facts and to give moral support to those comrades who are true Communists. This does not mean that we will expel the other comrades from the International, but we must make clear to them what they lack; we must show them clearly what a real Communist is.

Now come to Italy. The example of the Italian Party should be a classical example of the policy of the Communist Parties and the Communist International. If ever a true A. B. C. of the tactics of the Communist Parties is to be written, the most important chapter, the most important example, would be furnished by Italy. It is not the classical land for a Communist movement, but nevertheless we see much happening there with classical inevitability. From that we see that Italy is on the eve of revolution. In the fall of 1920 Italy presented the most advanced Communist movement. Our trouble with Italy at that time was not that we told the Italian Comrades to make a revolution immediately. The Communist International has never demanded this of the Italian Party. Theoretically speaking, it is possible that if our party had won power in the fall of 1920 the case of Hungary might have repeated itself. I do not say that this is certain. I do not know if a blockade were possible. I doubt it, but it is not impossible. It may be that if the workers had seized power in 1920, Italy would have gone the way of Hungary. We have never demanded from the Italian comrades that they must make a revolution. Perhaps it was true that the

time was not ripe for the seizure of power. If the majority accepted this standpoint, we would not have been justified in treating with the Italian Socialist Party on that account.

The fault of our Italian comrades is not, as we see it, that they did not make a revolution in 1920, but that they have permitted accomplices of the bourgeoisie to remain in the Party and betray the working class into the hands of the Fascisti.

You know the policy of the Executive. You know that the question of whether the Party had acted rightly or not at Livorno has been much debated at different congresses. I believe that it is clear now that we acted properly at Livorno and in the following year. Our Italian Communist Party has often acted against the policy of the Executive on the Italian question, I believe, however, comrades, that we were justified, that we could not have acted otherwise, that at the moment it was necessary to break definitely with the Italian Socialist Party, for if we had not done so the Communist International would have been lost. But from the moment we saw that the members of the Italian Socialist Party recognised their faults and wished to rectify them, we could not but do everything to facilitate their return to the Communist International. It is quite clear that whatever happens the majority of the workers will leave the Maximalists and join the Communists in the coming months. And since they will belong to our Party it is our duty to make it easy for them to return to the International. It is the function of the Communist International to smooth the way for any section of the working class, which, having seen its error, wishes to return to the Communist International. Of course, we must demand guarantees, and we will do so. The things that have happened in Italy must never happen again. We must have sufficient guarantees to that effect. Nevertheless we must do everything to reunite with these comrades.

We have appointed an Italian Commission. It will have to deal with two matters: (1) the unification of the party, and (2) organisation of our forces during this epoch of Fascism. We do not know how long this epoch will last, but we must prepare for the worst.

Now about Czecho-Slovakia. In Czecho-Slovakia the Executive, of course with the help of the Party as a whole, has successfully achieved unity. At the time of the Third Congress we had two parties and several groups in Czecho-Slovakia. It was somewhat doubtful as to whether unity could be organised in this country, where national problems play such an important part. But we have succeeded. We neglected certain opportunities in the Trade Unions. Nevertheless, our Party has succeeded in rallying the largest section of the trade unions under the red flag. We must say, that the united front tactic has been most brilliantly applied by the Czecho-Slovakian Party.

If you study the bourgeois Press and follow the development of affairs in the opposition Press you will admit that our Party has manœuvred skillfully and has succeeded in attracting the majority of the workers away from enemy organisations.

We hope, therefore, that the practical application of the United Front tactic will be as brilliantly continued in this country.

As you know there is one point on which we disagree with the Czecho-Slovakian Party. (Perhaps this applies to other parties too, that we shall see later.) It is the exclusion of the so-called Opposition.

We have set up a Commission which will examine this question. Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from giving our point of view on this matter now.

Our fraternal Czecho-Slovakian Party at its last congress, expelled 7 members of the Central Committee, including its former president, Sturk, on account of breach of discipline. This came quite unexpectedly for the Executive, which had not been consulted in the matter. The Executive deemed it its duty immediately to annul the decision. This does not mean that the opposition had been found in the right. The Executive abides by the standpoint of the majority of the party. We must have a disciplined party, but we cannot afford to expel members so readily, however a small group it may be before all other means have been tried. And this has not been done in the present case. We hope that these comrades will understand quite clearly that the Executive did not invite them here in order to pat them on the back and say: You may tread discipline under foot. Nothing of the kind! They have been invited in order that we may try to bring them back to the party and convince them that party discipline is a necessary and admirable thing. Should it be shown that these comrades are unable to observe proletarian discipline, then there is nothing to be done for them. The decision of the congress must be law in this case.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that in Czecho-Slovakia we have already some 600,000 unemployed. The misery and despair of the working class is extreme. The masses are in an angry mood. Now it is easy enough to form a Syndicalist group, then a K.A.P. or a K.A.P.C.-S. (Communist Labour Party or Communist Labour Party of Czecho-Slovakia—Trans.). Just now these Comrades should, therefore, understand quite clearly that they are not to form any such groups which at best might last perhaps for six months, to the detriment of the working class. We have to see the situation as it is. In a country like Czecho-Slovakia, with such a huge number of unemployed, we must do everything possible to prevent the formation of a separate K.A.P. group. The Communist International must do everything to avoid it, and I hope we shall succeed.

I now come to the Norwegian question. I have already said that the more elements we get from the old movement the more difficult is the birth of a truly Communist Party. In Norway we have got the bulk of the old party, with a result that we are experiencing great difficulties there, which I do not intend to conceal. The question is similar to that of France. Of course, there is some difference, but the source of the trouble is the same. In France we have received a legacy of the old party

traditions. In Norway there is a strong Federalist tradition and a peculiar method of organisation. The party was hitherto built upon the trade union organisation. At Halle we had a conversation with comrade Kirre Gret, the leader of the Norwegian Party, and with other comrades who then promised to re-organise the Party. So far this has not been done. Even the name of the central organ has not yet been changed. The Norwegian newspaper still carried the old name "Sozial-Demokrat". (Hear, hear.) The provincial newspapers are also called "Social-demokraten." (Hear, hear.) As you see, it is also high time to take action in Norway so that the demands of the Communist International may be complied with.

We must not be afraid to admit that we are a Communist Party. Yet we have some parties who have not yet got rid of social democratic labels. To be sure, we were born in the lap of the II. International, and we have inherited some of its traditions, which cannot be outlived over-night. But when this night has lasted a couple of years we must demand an acceleration of the process. In our Norwegian newspapers, for instance, you could read articles which lend support to the Scheidemannites against the German Communists. At the same time we have survivals there which are syndicalist in the worst sense of the word. Comrade Tramael used to be in the I.W.W., and still retains some of the Syndicalist tradition. He cannot understand discipline. In an article he writes: "Discipline, discipline, I can't stand the word! It is something degrading to the dignity of a free man." And this is said by a comrade who is by no means an unregenerate highbrow, but an honest and sincere working-class fighter, but, here tradition sways the man. Tradition is so strong that it causes confusion in the mind of one of our best Norwegian comrades. There is also in Norway a band of intellectuals, similar to the "Clarté" group, publishing a magazine which advocates practically the same principles as those of the Levi group. And our party tolerates this without taking action. This year we must act with determination. We have a delegation of the minority of the Norwegian Party here, and I am sure we shall succeed in solving our problems. Norwegian comrades! You must clearly understand that the Communist International will not countenance such conditions as those which have prevailed. We are well aware of the good qualities of the Norwegian movement, and we appreciate them. The Norwegian movement is at one with the working masses. It has comrades who are absolutely devoted to the proletarian revolution. But it must, once for all, shake off the trammels of social democracy. It must understand that it will not become a real Communist Party unless it makes short shift of such evils.

I now turn to Poland. In Poland we have an illegal mass party. The policy of co-ordinating the legal with the illegal is a very important one, and the experience of the past year has shown, to my way of thinking, that this co-ordination is not quite as simple as we had imagined. The Russian Communists

have the experience of 1905—1906. We were then of the opinion that when a legal movement is impossible there should be co-ordination of the legal with the illegal, with the leadership in the hands of the illegal organisation. Now we have to reckon with the experience of various countries, which goes to show that such co-ordination is not quite so simple. It was possible in Poland, and it was practised there. We have an illegal party there which at the same time is a mass party. We have almost no legal movement there, but just a very slight fringe of legality. In Poland this is possible, because the Polish Party has already gone through a revolution, because in 1905 it led the working class, because the illegal leadership has already fought in the front ranks of the working class. The party is universally acknowledged. It has proved its reliability through its activities during the revolution. Therefore, in Poland this method succeeds, while in other countries, e.g., in America, it is much more difficult, because the illegal party there has not yet had occasion to work in the open before the entire working class in a leading capacity and the leaders there are not so well-known. There the co-ordination between legal and illegal is of a quite different kind.

As I have already said, in Poland we have an illegal mass party, an old party with a glorious past behind it. Yet there are also important points in which the Executive of the Polish Party had certain differences of opinion, such as the agrarian question, the question of nationalities, and partly the question of the United Front. The agrarian question we will discuss with our Polish comrades specially. Among our Polish comrades a conception of the agrarian question has prevailed for a long time, which in my opinion is out of date and almost social-democratic. I must recall the stand that was taken by the II. Congress upon this question. At that Congress we adopted a platform wherein we proposed, in order to win over the peasantry, to include a statement of the problem of a re-distribution of land.

We also met with some opposition from the Italian Socialists. The Fascisti have shown that they are able to make use of such a programme for their own demagogic purposes. This mistake of our Italian comrades has cost us much, and the same error may harm us in Poland and other countries. Fortunately the policy of the Polish Party appears to be changing, and we hope that we may be able to come to an agreement with them on the agrarian question and devise a programme of action which will draw the peasantry to the party.

We also had a difference of opinion with the Polish comrades on the question of nationalities. We hope that we have also disposed of this disagreement.

On the question of the United Front, it appears that a minority—and, I believe, a small minority of the Polish Party—was against the United Front. However, it is very grave that such an opposition should have appeared in one of our oldest parties. We are convinced that the Polish Party itself will be

able to reconcile these differences of opinion, and has probably already done so. But this difference of opinion did exist, and it proves how difficult the practical application of the United Front is.

There is not much to say of the Balkans. I must say, however, that our Balkan Federation is functioning poorly. The Balkan Federation is practically non-existent. There are no regular meetings. I believe that we must insist that the Balkan Federation be strengthened, and that the Bulgarian Party give more attention to this question. A few words on Roumania: we wish to tell the Congress that they have fulfilled their duty in spite of all persecution. You know that the whole Congress of the Roumanian Comrades, numbering several hundreds, were taken directly from the Congress to prison. Many of them have been shot; many are still in prison. The Social Democrats have shamelessly co-operated with bourgeoisie in their crushing of the Communist Party. The merit of our Roumanian comrades is all the greater, that they have remained true to the Communist International under the most trying circumstances and have fulfilled their duty in spite of all.

The Yugo-Slavian movement has just gone through a crisis. The question of legal or illegal activity has appeared. This problem has not yet been solved. The party has had great difficulties. Yugo-Slavia is again progressing however. A new movement among the trade unions has begun, and we hope that our party will soon regain its power. A Commission will deal with internal conflicts in the Yugo-Slavian Party.

In England, a most important country for the development of our organisation, we are growing very slowly. In no other country, perhaps, does the Communist movement make such slow progress. The problem of the adhesion of the Party to the Labour Party has been finally solved. The Party has decided to affiliate to the Labour Party. It will be one of the special tasks of the coming Executive, I believe, to give more attention to England. We do not know as yet the causes of this slow development. England is not a country of a large mass organisation. You know that the Communist Party there has not a large membership. We have no organisation there which corresponds with that of the German Party. This is owing to their peculiar traditions. If we take into consideration the great amount of unemployment and the suffering of the English proletariat, the slow development of Communism in England is remarkable. It is practically stagnant, and we must pay more attention to the English movement than we have done heretofore.

We were able to send a delegate to America who remained there for some time. The greatest difficulty with which the American movement has been confronted was the problem of combining together legal and illegal work. The situation is quite different from that of Poland, Yugo-Slavia, Finland or Latvia, where we have already had a revolution and the leaders of the working class have already gained the recognition of the

proletariat. In America we have quite a different situation. There we have a comparatively large trade union movement, and a Communist Party with violent factional strife. Therefore, America is one of our most difficult problems, and must be studied carefully.

In Austria, in spite of all difficulties, our Party has made great progress.

In Hungary, on the contrary, the situation is pitiful. I see many comrades here who have taken part energetically in factional strife and have contributed not a little to make the situation worse. You must permit me to criticise these comrades before the forum of the Communist International. The Executive has made an energetic attempt to surmount these difficulties. I do not wish to speak here of the political emigration. History teaches us that our cause owes much to such emigrés. Perhaps the Italian Party will have emigrations in the near future. We have sometimes thought that political emigration was a necessity. But there are emigrations and emigrations. There are emigrés who have suffered greatly after an unsuccessful revolution, but our Hungarian comrades have emigrated so much that it has become too much. I hope that the Fourth Congress will tell them energetically enough that we do not wish nor shall we allow a repetition of what we have seen. In a single day, a few weeks ago, 170 communists were arrested in Hungary. In spite of the fact that the Communist movement is gaining among the masses, the situation of our party is as bad as can be. It is our duty, at a time when the working class movement is growing and the bourgeoisie is arresting hundreds of our comrades, to conquer the differences of opinion among emigrants and build up a real underground party.

One may say that the combination of legal and illegal work in Hungary will be easy, because the Communists there have an old tradition behind them.

In Japan we have a small party which, with the help of the Executive, has united with the best syndicalist elements. It is a young party, but it is an important nucleus, and the Japanese Party should now issue a programme. The Congress of the Parties and the peoples of the Far East, which met here in Moscow, had great importance, especially for Japan, because, for the first time, it introduced the important question of the Japanese movement.

We have had valuable results in India. I can communicate to the Congress that the work of our comrades during the past few months has been crowned with success. Comrade Roy, with a group of friends, is issuing a periodical, whose task it is to smooth our way in India. Our comrades have been able to gather together the Communist elements in India. They have found entrance into the newspapers; they have entered the trade unions. I believe that this is a great step forward.

This year we have built more or less strong nuclei of our party in Turkey, China, and Egypt. We should have no illusions in this regard; they are very small groups, but nevertheless it is a step forward, and we must help our Comrades there to accomplish a double work. Firstly to increase these proletarian nuclei, and secondly become the vanguard of the whole movement against the bourgeoisie.

Important work has also been started in Australia and other countries.

I will now speak of the Profintern. As you know, Comrades, the Profintern has met with opposition, even in one of the best parties—the German Party. The German Party discussed quite seriously whether the Profintern was not a premature organisation, whether it should not be totally liquidated, etc. This took place under the influence of the Levi group, but it was not only the Levites who fell into this error. This was a most dangerous period for the Profintern. The Executive naturally held it to be its duty to fight against the liquidating tendency. It was our opinion that the Profintern was in no way premature.

The entire anti-Profintern movement has now been defeated in Germany, and I hope in other countries, and the Profintern is on the high road to success. We can prophesy that the Profintern will experience a great growth in the coming years if not even in the next few months. The Amsterdammers wish to bring about a split. They have accomplished this split in France, and have begun it in Czecho-Slovakia. In Germany we face a possible split of the trade unions. We believe it to be our task and that of the Profintern to combat this splitting. We want a united working-class movement; the Amsterdammers want splits. The more influence we gain in the trade unions, the greater will be the desire of the Amsterdammers to split them, and the more energetic must be our fight against this tactic. We must organise and prepare suitable measures for this purpose. Our campaign will be the subject of a special discussion, with regard to the independent unions which they have forced us to organise in France and Czecho-Slovakia, and which we are now being compelled to organise in Germany and other countries. We must proclaim that the new unions, products of the splits, are born with the cry for unity upon their lips. The slogan of these new unions, produced by mass expulsions must be: Trade Union Unity!

When the Czech, German and other comrades are compelled to establish a general, or even a craft union, they must issue the watchword: Unity! Struggle for the unity of the trade union movement. I will deal with this question in greater detail in the later part of my speech.

Our movement made considerable progress in the question of co-operation, and the organisation of the young people. I should like to make special mention of the Y.C.I. The transference of the Y.C.I. to Moscow has proved successful, and all fears in connection with this have proved groundless. The

Y. C. I. has done good work. We must, however, admit in some countries the movement has become rather slack. The young Communist movement in Germany and in other countries has also gone through a difficult period. This is a feature of the general situation of the working class. Nevertheless, the Y. C. I. and the Young Communist movement have remained a vanguard of the Communist International. A Young Communist Congress will be held after our Congress, to which we must pay the greatest attention. The amalgamation of the II. and the 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ Internationals will be of great harm to the social democrats in connection with the young peoples movement. New methods are required in order to influence the young proletarian masses which have become rather indifferent. We hope to be able to do this.

This closes the survey of our activities during the last 15 months. We have, of course, committed many errors, and you must criticise us on that account. We shall discuss frankly whether, and say if we want to retain the 21 points. Our French comrades have, for instance, criticised para. 9 on the basis of which Fabre was expelled. I do not think that any comrade would say that we were wrong in acting thus. The expulsion was absolutely necessary. However, some of our French comrades have objected to it, saying that we had no right to act in this manner, and that we have given a too wide interpretation to para. 9. It will be for the Congress to say if we exceeded our authority in making use of para. 9 in the way we did.

There is still another point. The Executive has resolved that the National Congresses of the Communist Parties should as a rule be held after the World Congress. Exceptions, of course, may be made. I am not going to inquire whether this was absolutely necessary. But what, indeed, was the meaning of this decision? It means that we were determined to be a centralised world party, a party directed from one centre. We want the World Congress to be the leading organ for all the Parties. We do not want the Communist International to be merely a meeting ground for all parties. This point of view has been violently criticised in France.

But what has the French example taught us? What would have been achieved if this Congress had met sooner? As I said before, I am not going to oppose any proposal to modify this decision, and would be quite ready to accept any modifications. At any rate the decision means that we must remain a centralised world organisation. We have been too lax in carrying out the 21 points. You will be quite right in wanting to punish us for it. The 21 points must be more strictly applied henceforth.

Now with regard to our future tactics I hope that the theses I have drafted concerning this question are already in your hands, or will reach you shortly. I shall therefore content myself with a commentary upon the theses.

The first questions we have to consider are the international economic situation, the international political situation, and the position within the labour movements.

As regards the international economic situation, I think it would be superfluous at the Fourth Congress to recapitulate all that we decided at the Third Congress. In my own theses I propose that the Fourth Congress shall simply confirm the theses concerning the economic situation of the world presented to the Third Congress by Comrades Trotsky and Varga. We cannot fail to recognize that the course of events during the last fifteen months has substantially confirmed these theses. There has, indeed, been a transient improvement in the United States, Britain, Japan, and France, and perhaps in other countries as well, but it is quite clear that there has been no permanent change for the better, and Comrade Varga was perfectly right when, in his last pamphlet, he characterized the existing state of affairs as appropriate to the declining phase of capitalism. What we are now living through is something more than one of the periodical crises of capitalism; it is THE crisis of capitalism; it is the twilight, the collapse of capitalism.

The economic position of the world remains, therefore, the same, despite improvements here and there in various countries. Capitalism cannot find a way out of this situation. The only salvation for mankind, the only way of restoring the forces of production, is to be found in the social revolution. In this sense our diagnosis is unaltered, and we can unhesitatingly repeat what was affirmed at the Third Congress, that the objective situation remains revolutionary.

Next we come to the international political situation. Its character, likewise, is such as to entitle us to affirm that the oppositions are being intensified day by day, and that the international situation remains objectively revolutionary. During the last fifteen months the decay of the Entente has advanced with giant strides. What we have been witnessing has been tantamount to a liquidation of the Peace of Versailles, and this decay of the Peace of Versailles is still proceeding. Bourgeois pacifism, whose most notable leader is Lloyd George, is utterly bankrupt. The Genoa Conference and the Hague Conference have affixed the seals to the bankruptcy of bourgeois pacifism. The electoral struggle now proceeding in Britain bears witness to an unprecedented poverty of ideas among the capitalist parties. The nature of the fight between the classic bourgeois parties in the land which was the pioneer in capitalist development, shows that no trace of principle is left to either party. We note an absolute spiritual collapse. The struggle is one between cooties. The capitalist parties are no longer in a position to fight one another on broad grounds of principle.

The colonial and semi-colonial countries which constitute one of the most important factors of the process we denote by the name of the world revolution, have, during this period, raised their combat to a very high level. We see that in quite a number of oppressed countries, despite all the efforts of the

imperialist governments, the liberationist movement makes continual progress. I think that among the Communists no one to-day will contest the assertion that this struggle, although it is neither Socialist nor Communist, is nevertheless objectively considered a struggle against the capitalist regime. The great movements which we have been watching in India and in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are by no means communistic, but dispassionately considered, they rate as an important factor in the fight against capitalism.

Bourgeois democracy, whose decline we have been witnessing for several years, is now perishing more obviously month by month. What is the meaning of the events in Italy? Are they not an unprecedented attack on bourgeois democracy? Italy was one of the countries where bourgeois democracy was most hallowed. The Fascist onslaught is an attack, not only upon the monarchical ideal, but also upon the ideal of bourgeois democracy. Not merely has the King of Italy lost prestige because a band of desperadoes have thrust him aside politically, but the prestige of the whole regime of bourgeois democracy has been lowered. We must keep clearly before our minds that the happenings in Italy are not simply local phenomena. Other countries will inevitably experience what Italy is experiencing, though perhaps in a modified form. If the Fascisti maintain power in Italy (and it seems probable that they will do so during the immediate future), there can be little doubt that similar occurrences will take place in Germany, and perhaps throughout Central Europe. A Stinnes Government in Germany would be somewhat different in form from the Fascist Government in Italy. In substance, the two would be identical. Again, what is now happening in Austria is closely akin to the Italian situation. It, too, is a blow directed against bourgeois democracy, which in Austria has hitherto been defended, not only by the capitalist parties and the Second International, but also by the Two-and-a-Half International.

In Czecho-Slovakia we see the preliminaries to such a counter-revolutionary transformation. Of Hungary it is needless to speak. The Fascisti learned their lesson from Hungary. In the Balkan States, and especially in Yugo-Slavia there are indications that things are taking the same turn as in Italy.

We must look facts in the face. This is essential during a period that will not last very long, but will be a time of trial for our Communist Parties. It is perhaps inevitable that we should pass through an epoch of more or less perfectly developed Fascism throughout Central Europe, and this will necessarily involve that for a considerable period in these regions our Parties will be forced underground, will become illegal Parties. The Executive sent special envoys a few months ago to some of our most important Parties, warning them of the need to prepare for a period of illegal action, just as in Italy to-day. The political situation at the present time, when we are holding our Fourth Congress, unfortunately confirms these anticipations. We must make it perfectly clear to ourselves that this is not to

imply an arrest of the world revolution. It is part of the process of revolution, for the revolutionary movement does not proceed along a straight line. Various episodes may intervene. What we are witnessing in Italy is a counter-revolutionary movement. But when we take a broad view, we see that it is only an episodic intensification, a stage in the maturing of the proletarian revolution in Italy. The same thing may be said of the proletarian movement in quite a number of important countries.

In general terms, then, the international political situation has grown more acute during the last fifteen months. The Third Congress was right in declaring that no equilibrium has been secured in capitalist Europe; and it was also right in pointing out that events of great importance, such as parliamentary conflicts, extensive strikes, etc., might readily lead to revolutionary struggles. The foregoing sketch of the position will have shown that the diagnosis of the Third Congress was sound. Recent events in the Balkan peninsula testify to the growing acuteness of the political situation. In connection with the Greco-Turkish War, the spectre of a new great war loomed ominously for a brief space. We seemed to be witnessing a rehearsal of the coming war. At this very time when I am speaking to you there are renewed complications in the situation, such as might readily lead to disaster. My own estimate of the situation is that war is not yet imminent, but the Balkan flurry was a foreshadowing of what cannot fail to come unless the social revolution breaks out first, thus depriving the capitalist States of the possibility of organising a new war.

The future, therefore, remains uncertain, but the collapse of the capitalist system is also apparent when we confine our attention to the complications in the political field. Simultaneously we note an unprecedented strengthening of the political position of Russia, the only revolutionary State which has been able to maintain itself for five years.

At a moment when the Entente is collapsing, when the colonial and semi-colonial nations are engaging in intensified struggles, when the war spectre hovers over the Balkan peninsula, and when the equilibrium of the capitalist world is trembling—at this very time the position of Soviet Russia is being rendered increasingly stable by the adoption of new economic methods. Thereby Soviet Russia has become a titanic factor in world policy. The star of the first proletarian Republic rises ever higher.

It will be necessary to discuss the new economic policy in detail when we come to consider the Russian question. I will, therefore, not anticipate, but will content myself with recapitulating what I said in my introductory remarks. We have come to the conclusion that the new policy was no chance matter. It was not something forced upon us by the weakness of many of our Communist Parties. It was something greater than this. You are right in saying, with many of the best friends of Soviet Russia, that Russia found it necessary to adopt a new

economic policy was because the German, French, and British workers were too weak to overthrow the bourgeoisie in their respective lands. This is true enough, but it is not the whole truth. We have come to the conclusion that the necessity for the new policy is not something peculiar to our own land, in which the peasants form so large a majority of the population. We now believe that all, or nearly all countries, even those with great proletarian masses, will have to pass through some such political phase. The new economic policy is something more than a result of our weakness, or of the weakness of the world proletariat; it is based upon an accurate recognition of the balance of power between the workers on the one hand and the peasants and petty bourgeois on the other.

Of course, the peasantry in such a country as Russia differs from the German peasantry. Nevertheless, alike in Germany and in the other countries where capitalist development is far advanced and where there is a very numerous industrial proletariat, at the decisive moment the working class will have to adopt a whole system of measures to neutralise the trend of the most influential part of the peasantry. The workers, in fact, will have to use just such methods as we have used in Russia. We shall return to their consideration in connection with the Russian problem.

I now turn to the situation within the labour movement. In this domain the most notable phenomenon is the amalgamation of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals, an amalgamation that will be effected very soon. In Germany the matter has already been settled, and yesterday came the news of a similar settlement in Sweden. Branting has accepted the Left Social Democrats into his party. The same thing will take place elsewhere. In point of organisation, the union is not yet complete, but politically it is an accomplished fact, and it is a fact of great historical importance. The Second International is the enemy of the working class. No detailed proof need be offered in support of the assertion than the Two-and-a-Half International is being absorbed into the Second International; the process is not the other way about. Suffice it to quote the words of Martoff, one of the spiritual leaders of the Two-and-a-Half International, and in many respects the intellectual superior of his associates. He writes as follows in an article in his newspaper, "Der sozialistische Bote," dealing with the problem of the Second International:

"Let us harbour no illusions. Under present conditions, the mechanical amalgamation of the two Internationals signifies the return to the Second International of the parties that detached themselves from that body in the hope of founding a very different International. The return is a defeat of these parties."

Martoff makes no secret of his opinion. It is true that at the close he finds some consolation for the members of the Two-and-a-Half International, saying: "Within the Second International we shall defend Marxism." But, none the less, he admits that the Two-and-a-Half International is returning into

the bosom of the Second International, and that the former has sustained a defeat.

There will, then, be a union of the reformist Internationals. This union will greatly quicken the process of splitting the working class into two camps. We on our side must also say: "Let us harbour no illusions!" The union of the Second and the two-and-a-half Internationals means two things. First of all, it means the preparation of the White Terror against the Communists. The Fascist coup is connected with the world political situation, and so is the coup that aims at bringing governments à la Stinnes to the front. The union of the Second and the Two-and-a-half Internationals is the preliminary to an unprecedented splitting up of the working class with a view to its weakening. I need not waste time in insisting that this union really foreshadows a period of White Terror directed against the Communists. Not by chance is Mussolini, a renegade from the Second International, a sometime social democrat, now at the head of the counter-revolutionary movement in Italy; not by chance are such as Ebert and Noske at the head of the government in Germany, or such as Pilsudsky at the head of the government in Poland. Nor is it a chance matter that the Second International should be playing a decisive role in such countries as Britain and Germany. In such a land as Germany the situation is radically altered when the trade unions form a solid front with the mass of workers. No illusions then! The union of the two Internationals foreshadows the inauguration of the White Terror against the Communist Parties.

In the second place, this union will involve the splitting of the Working Class. We Communists are now advocating the unity of the trade unions. There is good reason for this course. The reformists see plainly enough that the ground is being cut from beneath their feet. Historically speaking, this is inevitable. It is inevitable that the trade unions, should evolution take a normal course, will pass under the control of the Communists. The reformists have a keen scent. They realise what is coming. They see that the influence of the Communists over the working class, the general influence of the revolutionary movement, is growing. Feeling this instinctively, they try to avert it. They behave as if they had been directly commissioned by the bourgeoisie to shatter the trade unions. They are trying to destroy them before they are themselves driven out. I do not wish to suggest that they are directly commissioned to pursue such a policy. We all know that political life is less simple than this would imply. Of course, Stinnes does not issue direct written orders to the trade union leaders as his henchmen. In the general political sense of the term, however, the socialist leaders are commissioned by the bourgeoisie to shatter the trade unions before leaving them. As they go out, they want to slam the doors so violently that all the trade union windows may be broken. This is their real aim.

No one can tell whether these developments will take months or years, but they are a historical necessity, and the "gods of

the Second International" realise it. That is why the same phenomenon is manifest everywhere—a deliberate preparation for a split at the moment when they feel that large masses of the trade unionists are about to come over to our side. They wish to weaken the working class, to pulverise the trade unions; so that when we come into power in the unions we shall find nothing but fragments. That is what they are commissioned by the bourgeoisie to do, and it will be an act of unexampled treachery. In comparison therewith, even the treason of 1914 was perhaps a minor matter. A deliberate act of treachery is now being prepared. They want to disintegrate the working class, so that when the time comes for the workers to form a united front against the bourgeoisie, the workers will find themselves weak, disorganised, and utterly disintegrated. Such is the policy that finds expression in the union of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals.

It follows, comrades, that our tactics of the united front must be regarded as something more than a strategical move against our enemies. Nay more, it is our duty to do so. The policy of the united front, however, is dictated by the historical situation as a whole, by the general position of capitalists alike in the economic and in the political sphere, and by the state of affairs within the working class. If I am right in my view of the policy of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals, if I am right in believing that the tactics of the deliberate splitting of the trade unions and of the working class will be adopted in the near future, then our tactics of the united front are an inevitable and logical consequence. There are many reasons why we must deliberately work against this plan of the Second International.

At the Third Congress we accepted the task of winning over the majority of the workers. Has this task been fulfilled? No, not yet. We must state the fact boldly. In many countries, the influence of our Party has considerably increased. Nevertheless, we could say at the Third Congress that the majority of the workers were on our side, nor can we say at the Fourth Congress that they are on our side. There is much still to be done. In such circumstances, the tactics of the united front are the most important means of winning over the majority of the workers. We must be perfectly clear on the matter. The tactics of the united front denote something more than an episode in our struggle. They denote a period, perhaps an entire epoch. As circumstances change, we may perhaps find it necessary to modify these tactics. In the main, however, inasmuch as the Second International is our chief enemy and is the main prop of the bourgeoisie, we shall have to hold fast to these tactics.

From the economic outlook, capitalism is ripe for the transformation to socialism. The world political situation is one that may be characterised as revolutionary. The Second International is the main prop of the bourgeoisie. Without the help of the Second International and the Amsterdam International,

the bourgeoisie cannot hold its ground. It follows that our relationship with the Second International is something more than a question of party tactics; it is part of the problem of the world revolution, of the tactics of our class as a whole. Inasmuch as the united Second International will for years to come work directly in favour of a split, we shall be enabled to win over the masses of the workers by purposely counteracting by our tactics of the united front, the efforts towards disintegrating the workers. Let me repeat, we are not dealing with an episode, but with an epoch.

The tactics of the united front have already proved advantageous to us in many ways. I do not mean that they have enabled us to win over the majority of the workers. Were that so, the game would already be in our hands. Still, we have gained a great deal. We have gained this, that the working class is coming to realise that the Communist Parties are not the disintegrators, and that it is the opponents of the communists that are working for disintegration. Until recently, the workers held another view, and perhaps they had some reason for doing so. At one time, in our efforts to defend the interests of the workers as a whole, we had to split the old Social Democratic Parties. We should have betrayed the working class had we failed to take this course. It was essential to secure a rallying point for a genuine liberating movement of the working class, and this could only be done by the creation of a Communist Party. At this period we had to accept the role of scissionists, for only by splitting the old social democratic parties could we forge the instrument for the liberation of the working class.

Now, however, we have entered a new historical phase. We have finished the task of the previous phase. There now exist Communist Parties, which do indeed contain vestiges of social democracy, which do indeed suffer from the diseases incidental to childhood, which are troubled with growing pains, and which must be freed from these disorders, but our main problem now concerns the winning over of the majority of the workers in order to save and win over the trade unions, the chief weapons at the disposal of the world proletariat. That is why we have adopted the tactics of the United Front. I do not anticipate any serious disputes about the matter at this Congress. In France, the last of the Mohicans, those who had still fought against the tactics of the United Front have laid down their arms, and, it is an important fact that not only the French communists but also most of the syndicalists have now accepted the tactics of the United Front. Yesterday we had a brief talk with our friends in the United General Confederation of Labour. When we asked: "Are you still opposed to the United Front?" they answered laconically: "We have formed a United Front." Whoever follows the situation in France is well aware that in that country both the centralists and the United General Confederation of Labour have deliberately adopted a United Front, for they could not help

themselves. The needs of the daily struggle of the proletariat have forced the adoption of the tactics of the United Front, both in the industrial and in the political field upon all who wish to defend the interests of the working class. The winning over of the opponents of the United Front in France has been a great triumph, and it shows that we are closing our ranks and that we shall be able to pursue tactics carefully thought out in advance.

What do we mean and what do we not mean by the United Front? We certainly do not mean an electoral alliance. Nor does it mean an organisatory union with the social democrats. The answers we have received from the executive committees of the Italian and of the French Parties show that many of the Comrades have made the latter mistake. But an organisatory union with the social democrats would be the greatest crime we could commit. Everyone of us would rather have a hand cut off than enter into a union with these traitors to the working class, with those who are pre-eminently our enemies, with those who are the last prop of the bourgeoisie. The United Front implies nothing of that sort. The United Front means the leading of the working masses in the daily class war. It means that we are ready to march against capitalism side by side with all workers, be they anarchists, syndicalists, Christian socialists, social democrats, or whatever you please to join forces with them in the daily struggle against the reduction of wages and against the loss of the 8-hour day. We accept the fact that we shall often have to sit at table with the treacherous leaders. The foregoing is what the united front means, and nothing else. I think that the problem is solved as far as the Comintern is concerned, and I think it has been solved even for the French Party, the one where the greatest confusion has hitherto prevailed upon this matter.

We shall also fight for the partial demands of the working class.

We are revolutionists. But this does not mean that we ignore the fact that the position of the working class must be improved, were it only to enable the workers to buy a drop of milk for their children. We are opposed to reformism, but we are not opposed to anything that may improve the lot of the working class. We know quite well that in the extant conditions of capitalism the possibilities for such improvement are extremely restricted; we know that nothing but the revolution will secure a real uplifting of the workers; but we also know that we shall never be able to organise the workers unless we fight on behalf of their partial demands. It is from this outlook that we defend the united front as a tactic which is not simply ephemeral, which is not simply episodic, but which in the existing circumstances of capitalism may last quite a while.

The watchword of the Labour Government has not yet been fully clarified. The tactics of the united front are almost universally applicable. It would be hard to find a country where the working class has attained notable proportion but

where the tactics of the united front have not yet been inaugurated. They are equally applicable in America, in Bulgaria, in Italy, and in Germany. By no means can the same thing be said of the watchword of the Labour Government. This latter is far less universally applicable, and its significance is comparatively restricted. It can only be adopted in those countries where the relationships of power render its adoption opportune, where the problem of power, the problem of government, both on the parliamentary and on the extra-parliamentary field, has come to the front. Of course, even to-day in the United States good propaganda work can be done with the slogan of the Labour Government. We can explain to the workers. "If you want to free yourselves, you must take power into your own hands." But we cannot say, in view of the present relationships of power in the United States, that the watchword of the Labour Government is applicable to an existing fight between two parties, as it has been in Czechoslovakia, as it will be perhaps in Germany, and as it was and may be again in Italy.

The watchword of the Labour Government then is not a general watchword like the tactics of the united front. The watchword "Labour Government" is a particular concrete application of the tactics of the united front under certain specific conditions. It is quite easy to make mistakes in this matter. I think we have to beware of the danger that results from an attempt to regard the stage of Labour Government as a universally necessary one. In so far as it is safe to prophesy in such matters, I myself incline to the view that a Labour Government will only come into existence occasionally, in one country or another, where peculiar circumstances prevail. I think its occurrence will be exceptional. Besides, it is quite a mistake to suppose that the formation of a Labour Government will inaugurate a quasi-peaceful period, and that thereby we shall be saved from the burden of the struggle. The working class must be made clearly to understand that a Labour Government can only be a transitional stage. We must say in plain terms that the Labour Government will not do away with the need for fighting, will not obviate the necessity for civil war. But as long as we recognise the dangers of this watchword, we need not hesitate to employ it.

I cannot refrain from saying a few words concerning the industrial councils movements. I have devoted to this matter a special section of my theses. In this I contend that a Party which has no communist organisation in industrial life, which has no communist nuclei, is not to be taken seriously, cannot be regarded as a serious communist mass party. I contend that a Labour movement which has not yet learned how to support and organise a mass movement within the domain of the industrial councils, is not yet a serious revolutionary mass movement. The statement is applicable to almost all the great labour movements of our day. It is a sign of the times that in Germany, where important and decisive struggles are

probably imminent, the whole vanguard of the movement is led by the industrial councils. Turning to other lands, we must advise our Comrades to devote themselves first of all to founding communist nuclei within the industries, and then to supporting the industrial councils' movement. Not until then shall we have a real mass movement. Many of our Parties have failed to carry out this advice. At the Third Congress we adopted an admirable resolution, drafted by Comrade Kuusinen, to the effect that every Communist Party should devote itself to the formation of nuclei—whatever the general line of its activities might be. But it is futile to adopt excellent resolutions if nothing be done to carry them into effect. We must see to it that the nuclei are really founded. Then our movement will forge ahead.

I must also add a few words concerning international discipline. In the theses concerning the tactics of the United Front, proposed by the Renoult group at the Paris Congress of the French Party, there was a section concerning international discipline. Golden words are here inscribed. The group gave a brilliant theoretical demonstration that nothing could be done without discipline, and that the International would perish unless good discipline were maintained. Golden words, I say. But this same group gave a practical demonstration how wide a gap there can sometimes be between words and deeds. The best proof of international discipline is provided in the realm of action. Our tactics of the United Front are now extremely complex. There exists an International which is closely associated with the bourgeoisie, and which consistently works in opposition to us. If we are successfully to resist its machinations we must be strongly organised, and must have a genuine and rigidly disciplined International. It will be the task of the Fourth Congress to maintain this discipline and to carry it into effect.

Decisive struggles will be upon us in the near future. Many excellent comrades murmur when they hear me say this. They declare that the world revolution has been arrested for a time. The advance will not be resumed until the material position of the Russian workers has so greatly improved that they are better off than the average European and American worker. Then the example of the economic advantages of the Russian workers will arouse a revolutionary impetus, and there will be a renewed surge of revolution.

In my opinion, comrades, there is nothing better than a subtle form of opportunism, though such views are advanced by many who are revolutionarily minded and good soldiers of the International. I will confine myself to a word or two upon the subject. It is an undoubted fact that the position of the Russian workers is on the up-grade to-day, not the down-grade. The upward trend in Russia is slow, but it is unmistakable. No doubt a day will come when the economic position of the Russian worker will be better than that of the European worker, which is on the down-grade. But it is pure opportunism to

say that it is impossible to lead a revolutionary struggle on the part of the workers of capitalist countries so long as Russian conditions remain difficult.

The real revolution will not be made by the workers in various countries because of an example drawn from other lands; it will not be made in any country because the workers there envy those in some other country who have more meat. The revolution will occur because the workers will find themselves in difficulties from which there is no exit without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Consequently we must not allow those tones to become dominant in our agitation which imply that there is an arrest in the revolutionary movement. The Russian workers had far more numerous obstacles to overcome than those which impede the revolutionary progress of the workers in other lands. The revolutionary workers all over the world will have the support of the Russian workers. The Russian workers were the first to rise in revolt, and they were opposed by the entire capitalist world. It is unlikely that the working class of any other country will have such great difficulties to encounter. To the working class throughout the world we must present the picture of the Russian proletariat in its true colours, speak of the blockade, of hunger, and of pestilence, and of the greatness which triumphed over all obstacles. We can now be satisfied that the Russian working class, despite all its sufferings, is past the worst, and that from hour to hour, day to day, and month to month, improvements are coming. Such must be our conception of the Russian revolution; this conception must be the basis of all our tactics. (Applause.)

The Chairman: The matter is now open for general discussion. I have first to call upon the Czecho-Slovakian delegate, Comrade Vajtauer.

Vajtauer (Czecho-Slovakia):—

I propose for the moment to say a few words only anent Comrade Zinoviev's speech concerning Czecho-Slovakian affairs. Yesterday Zinoviev passed judgment on the Czecho-Slovakian question. We were very much surprised that as chairman of the International he had not taken the trouble to gather his information from both sides. He only knows the way to Comrade Smeral, whose touch these observations betray. But what will our workers think when they read Zinoviev's speech, and when they note the points in it which directly conflict with the truth? Zinoviev says that in Czecho-Slovakia the united front has been established in exemplary fashion. Exemplary, indeed, Comrades! The upshot has been that the Party has been completely rent in twain, and the two parts are both incompetent for the struggle.

We are told that the opposition trend is towards anarchism. (Hear, hear.) For all the expelled local organisations and trade unions to organise a great industrial union, is anarchism? When they devote themselves to trade union work in order to protect the unions from the opportunists and in order to carry out

detail work, this is anarcho-syndicalism? To proclaim a general strike is K.A.P.D.-ism (Kommunist-Arbeiter-Partei-Deutschlands)? The wish to make of the Party a fighting force is anarchism once more?

Comrade Zinoviev has been good enough to tell us that our case is not on all-fours with that of Paul Levi. We have this much to say to Comrade Zinoviev: Not merely was there no resemblance between our case and that of Levi; there was no breach of discipline at all. It is the sacred duty of the workers to draw attention to the dangers threatening the Party. It is a sacred duty to steer clear of political chicanery. That is what we did, and we want to let Comrade Zinoviev know that if those be breaches of discipline, we shall commit them just as often as an attack is made on the Party.

Kolarov (Chairman): Will the Comrade kindly state whether he spoke on his own behalf or on behalf of the Czech-Slovak delegation? We must be quite clear owing to the peculiar views expressed by the comrade.

A voice from the Czech opposition: "He spoke in the name of the whole opposition and the expelled comrades."

Ernest Meyer (Germany): Comrades, the German delegation is in accord with the policy of the Executive since the Third World Congress and with the remarks of Comrade Zinoviev, on the most essential points.

The question of the united front, which is occupying our attention at present, and which, according to Comrade Zinoviev's statement, is not to be considered as a mere episode, but as a period of Communist tactics, has been very much discussed in Germany. The only fault I have to find with Comrade Zinoviev's statement is his omission to acknowledge that the discussions and the application of these tactics were greatly furthered by the Berlin Conference. We are in a position to state that this conference has not only duly clarified the situation within our Party, but that it also helped the Party and the Communist International in persuading the non-Communist workers that the Communists were really striving to fight in common with them, and that they were misrepresented by their opponents.

I should like to draw attention to one thing, much as it is to be desired that mistakes should be discussed, in order to avoid them in the future it must be borne in mind that criticism must not make us forget essentials. For instance, the statement of the Czech comrade concerning the mistakes made during the application of the United Front tactics is tantamount to rejection of these tactics. These united front tactics must take various forms according to the situation, and if some comrades consider the attitude of the German party during the Rathenau campaign and during the railway strike as opposed to the factory committee movement, they are labouring under a misunderstanding. The establishment and consolidation of the factory committee movement have resulted from the attitude

taken up by the German party since the Third World Congress. We would not have a factory committee movement such as the present if we had not consistently applied the united front tactics, thus getting into closer touch with the masses—(hear, hear)—and penetrating into the trade unions and industrial concerns; in a word, wherever the workers congregate.

The most difficult question which we had to solve in connection with the United Front tactics—(and which we have probably not yet solved)—is the question of the Workers' Government. We must differentiate between social democratic governments and Workers' Governments. We have social democratic governments in Germany—in Saxony, Thuringia and formerly also in Gotha—governments which we had to support but which have nothing in common with what we understand by Workers' Government. If we desire that the International should support the idea of the Workers' Government, and if we wish that this watchword should be adopted by the brother parties that are working approximately under similar conditions to ours, this does not mean that we expect them to aim at the establishment of social democratic governments and to participate in them, but merely that they should struggle for Workers' Governments, thus making our struggle easier. The chief difference between a Workers' and a social democratic government is—that the former, without bearing the label of a socialist policy, is really putting socialist-communist policy into practice. Thus, the Workers' government will not be based on parliamentary action alone, it will have to be based on the support of the wide masses, and its policy will be fundamentally different from that of the social democratic governments such as those existing in some of the countries of Germany.

To-day Comrade Zinoviev made this distinction between a workers' government and proletarian dictatorship. This was never made quite clear before when this question was discussed. We find the following statement by Comrade Zinoviev on page 123 of the report on the session of the Enlarged Executive:—

"The workers' government is the same as the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a pseudonym for Soviet Government. (Hear, hear.) It is more suitable for the ordinary working man, and we will therefore use it."

According to our conception this is wrong. The workers' government is not the dictatorship of the proletariat (quite so, from the German Delegation), it is only a watchword which we bring forward, in order to win over the workers and to convince them that the proletarian class must form a United Front in its struggle against the bourgeoisie. Should this watchword be followed or adopted by the majority of the working class, and should the latter take up the struggle for this aim in good earnest, it will soon become evident that the attempt to bring about this workers' government (at least in most countries with a big proletarian population) will lead either directly to the dictatorship of the proletariat or to a prolonged phase of very acute class struggles, namely, to civil war in all its forms.

In that respect we consider the slogan of the workers' government as necessary and useful to winning over the masses. It will lead to a sharper class conflict from which the Proletarian Dictatorship will finally arise.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the German Party, however fruitful it may have been, has been hampered by the lack of understanding of our problems shown by our brother parties. In our discussion of the workers' government and the United front we have found our work of agitation hampered by the remarks of the Party Press and of the French Party. We may say here that there are no questions to-day which may be solved on a national basis. All problems are directly dependent for their solution upon the action and the propaganda of our brother parties. The consciousness of the International effect of any party's actions must be insisted upon.

Varga (Hungary): Comrades, Comrade Zinoviev says that the working class of every country is driven to revolution because it can see no other way out of its present misery. What are the facts? The working class of all the capitalistic countries is suffering greatly in this period of the decay of capitalism. The workers are searching for a way out of this situation. There is a conscious revolutionary group, the Communist Party, which points the way. This group says that the way leads through the dictatorship of the proletariat to Socialism. We say—this way means suffering, struggle, hunger. We need not hide this fact. Perhaps you will allow me who am accused of opportunism to point out that I wrote in my pamphlet, "The Economic problem of the Proletarian Dictatorship," that that section of the proletariat which will form the shock-group in the fight, the industrial proletariat, will see its standard of living fall most.

Yes. Comrades, the great mass of the working class who are not yet consciously revolutionary ask: How long will that period of suffering and of hunger last? To this question the Mensheviks answer: "It will last as long as the dictatorship exists." Comrades, due to various circumstances, some of which were unavoidably connected with the dictatorship, others of which resulted directly from the isolation of the Russian dictatorship, and finally due to accidental circumstances, such as the drought of 1920 and 1921, the famine broke out in Russia, and the Russian proletariat was forced to appeal to the help of the proletariat of the capitalist countries. This campaign has had its good sides. But those comrades who live outside Russia must admit that this famine campaign has awakened a great fear of the revolution and the dictatorship in the masses of the workers. It is quite certain when the Mensheviks repeat a thousand times, "You say that a revolution will save us; well, here is the example of Russia, where the dictatorship has existed for five years, and the workers must appeal for our help. Make your revolutions, German, Italian and French workers, and for ten years you will have to demand, to beg help from the proletariat

of those countries which have remained capitalistic"—it will have an effect on the proletarian masses. I say, comrades, that we must dispel this idea from the minds of the workers imprinted by the Mensheviks and by the famine relief that the condition of the Russian worker is very bad. We must combat it because it is not true. I have observed hundreds of thousands of workers on parade, in their homes, in the streets, and I must say that they are better nourished than the workers in Berlin. They are perhaps worse dressed, but they look much more healthy. Comrades, if you have observed the feeling of the masses, 90 per cent. of whom are not affiliated to any party, I would ask you—did you ever see on the streets of Europe a proletariat who looked happier and more satisfied? I will not say that all Russian workers are so satisfied; I have been away from Russia for a long time. But this remains a fact that the worker of Moscow is well fed and happy.

It is another fact that the situation of the Russian worker has improved steadily during the last nine months while that of the worker of Europe has grown worse. In the case of Germany, the fall of the standard of living has been catastrophic. This is what we must keep saying to the unaffiliated masses of Germany in hundreds of articles. We must say that in three or six months' time the Russian worker will be living better than the German. To-day he is already living better than the Austrian. We must destroy the idea that dictatorship is synonymous with hunger.

What I have said is not opportunism but only the recognition of the true facts of the situation in the West European countries. So long as we meet with the objection from the non-Communist masses that dictatorship means hunger and again hunger, we will not be able to carry the masses with us. It is therefore one of the important tasks of the coming year to put an end to this legend of the starvation of the Russian worker.

Ruth Fischer (Germany): Comrades, the report by Comrade Zinoviev furnishes abundant material for discussion. The tactics of the United Front has had a chequered career in Germany. This development started with the Open Letter and has culminated in the Factory Committee Movement. It ought to be clearly understood that our work has to be based on the amelioration of conditions for the workers. It ought further to be said that it is not enough to agitate for these demands, but also the proper basis should be found, by establishing organised foundations within the masses themselves, which alone can render it possible to take up the fight for these demands.

The much-debated question of dealing with the leaders is, after all, a question of expediency and tactics. The mistake begins when one puts the centre of gravity on the dealings with the leaders. The severe defeats, the terrible blows, the bloody experiences which we have gone through, have brought about a state of mind among the German working class which makes

them believe that the sole responsibility for the retreat before the advancing counter-revolution rests upon the various splits and the weakness of the organisation. It is quite a common illusion in Germany to attach the highest importance to the strength of organisation as the only means capable of defeating the counter-revolution. It was by means of this illusion that the German Social Democratic Party captured the Independent Socialist Party; it was by means of this conception of the United Front that all district conferences of the Independent Socialist Party workers were urged to merge themselves into the German Social Democratic Party. It was often proclaimed to be the realisation of the United Proletarian Front.

Between our conception and that of the Mensheviks there is a shade of opinion which seems to have a vaguely conceived conviction that the only way to fight effectively against the counter-revolution is to have the concurrence of the great Social Democratic parties and the general Alliance of German Trade Unions. Thus it is no longer a question of dealing with the leaders, or working jointly with them, but a notion that the Communist Party is altogether weak in the fight without coalition with the Social Democrats. This idea of the indispensability of coalition with the Democrats and the trade union leadership has again been refuted by the arguments in Comrade Zinoviev's speech, where he demonstrated that the Second International and its affiliated parties are our worst enemies. It has also been repudiated by actual facts showing that these parties everywhere have joined in the bitterest offensive against us.

Comrades, let us review the tactics of the United Front from the point of view of practical application. First of all I wish to say that the Railway Strike in Germany was a movement of great scope, which perhaps has not been properly appreciated abroad. This Railway Strike has made perfectly proper application of the tactics of the German Party. We told the masses, then: "The eight-hour day is in danger, the right of coalition is in danger." We threw ourselves into the mass movement, but we advanced no programme contradictory to our views.

It was a different matter during the Rathenau campaign. It must be frankly stated that in the Rathenau campaign it was the negative side of the tactics of the United Front that had come to the surface.

Now, Comrades, I would like to say a few words in conclusion on the question of the factory committee movement which shows the positive side of these mistakes.

The factory committee movement should by no means be over-estimated. I think that its real significance cannot be fully appreciated as yet. To my mind it possesses three principal merits which we should clearly distinguish. Firstly, it has exposed the real nature of all the Social Democratic and Independent clamour for unity and for the sanctity of the big Social-Democratic Party. Instead of recruiting membership for

the great Social-Democratic Party they had to contend against our party; they had to carry on controversies against our slogans and write articles against us. In a word, they had to be on the defensive and were not able to celebrate their Party Congresses with the pompous effect they wished.

Secondly, it has placed again on the order of the day the question of the initiative of the industrial organisations and of the factory committees, after a lapse of two years. Anyone who has an idea of the sad state of the industrial councils in Germany ought to appreciate this success.

Thirdly, and this is the most important, the question of the workers' control over production is being debated again, although still weakly and somewhat clumsily. It is now being debated in the factories not only by Communists who are also greatly in need of such discussion, having forgotten much during these two years, but also by Social-Democratic workers, compelling the "Vorwärts" to carry on controversy against it.

The Communist International and the German Party ought to give this movement their continued attention, regarding it as the forerunner of the militant United Front, thus ensuring the success of this proper form of applying these tactics.

Neurath (Czecho-Slovakia): Comrades, first of all I wish to say that a statement will be presented on behalf of the delegation as a whole on the report of Comrade Zinoyiev. And so I will only give you a few facts in reply to Comrade Vajtauer's statement.

Comrades, some delegates might gather from the statement made by Comrade Vajtauer that there is a left opposition in the Czecho-Slovak Party, which he represents. Comrades, this is not so. The left opposition of the Czecho-Slovak Party carried on a struggle against the opportunism represented by Comrade Smeral previous to the Unity Congress. After this Congress, Comrade Smeral adopted the decisions of the Third World Congress which made collaboration between the opposition and Comrade Smeral possible. The so-called new opposition, which has been in existence since about December, 1921, for eight months failed to formulate any fundamental principles different from those underlying our tactics. It is only a few weeks ago that the opposition formulated something like a programme, and I will put before you some of its provisions. "The two most important weapons of which the working class may and must avail itself are:—

- (1) The boycott of capitalistic products.
- (2) The expansion and centralisation of all productive and retail co-operatives."

Then here is what the Opposition can tell us of their programme of workers' control. I will quote you the following sentence as an example:—

"Firstly, the workers' government must accomplish the following: the creation of a period of culmination, in which

the concentration of production and distribution takes the form of collective capitalism." (Laughter.)

Comrades, I have never understood this sentence, and I verily believe that I shall never understand it.

"(2) The transformation of militarism into a militia system."

"(3) The securing of an understanding with Communist Russia."

We only heard for the first time of a portion of this programme at the National Conference. At the National Conference the representatives of the Third International took the floor and explained to the representatives and supporters of the Opposition that they had not a leg to stand on and had absolutely no chance, politically or otherwise, against the majority. At the National Conference we said, "Now show us what is true in these charges you have made against us." And the Comrades had not a word to say except that they were distrustful of Comrade Smeral. In this conference the motion was made to expel the Opposition. The overwhelming majority of members of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party only took this extreme step after we had been compelled to waste our time for eight or ten months, with an opposition which had never expressed a single thing worth while or shown any desire to work together with us, and which had also never given any proof that they could manage better than we could.

Then the Executive of the Communist International has overthrown and destroyed the authority of the Party Executive. Despite this, we have not merely accepted the decision, but have published it, and have conformed to it. We have conformed to it, comrades, because we are convinced that the majority in this congress will decide to take such steps so that we in Czecho-Slovakia may be permitted to work and to fight on. That this congress, by a majority, should accept a programme which is not fit for a proletarian organisation, but is rather suited to a veteran society, is unbelievable.

We shall permit this kind of opposition no longer. It shall no longer be allowed that the fundamental party power shall be broken and that this Party which has certain tasks to fulfil shall let itself be hindered in so frivolous a manner in the performance of its duties. (Lively applause.)

Becker (Germany): In carrying out the United Front tactics there appears to be two tendencies: one which is afraid that once it is made that it won't last, and the other that is afraid to make the United Front because of the dangers of contamination.

During the United Front actions in connection with the Rathenau crisis, both tendencies showed signs of hesitancy and timidity. The comrades of the right tendency were very timid in their negotiations with the opposition leaders. They seemed to be afraid that the rapprochement with the latter would

not last. This timidity even resulted in the Party not asserting itself as it should have done.

The left tendency, too, showed a great deal of vacillation. I should like to remind you of the Berlin incident, wherein the Berlin Organisation distinguished itself by a "Silent Demonstration," a demonstration without any speakers. This is weak and wrong. In all joint demonstrations, we must see to it that we play the principal role. In answer to the statement made by Comrade Fischer yesterday that the German Party exaggerated the importance of the negotiations with the opposition leaders, I am obliged to say that I did not observe such a tendency in the Party. On the contrary, I spoke of the right passive tendency which was not only passive during the negotiations, but even showed too great reserve in initiating the negotiations. I am of the opinion that we should have had such negotiations much more frequently, as they would have given us an opportunity for revealing the social democratic leaders in their true colours and inducing the masses to repudiate them.

Comrade Fischer said ideas prevailed in the Party on the United Front which were equivalent to amalgamation with the social-democrats. I am ready to admit that such tendencies still exist in the minds of some of our comrades. But the important part is to know if the Party as such is in favour of such tendencies. In this respect I must say that, far from encouraging such tendencies, the Party is combating them. As in all former actions, and probably all future actions, the factory committee movement has had its undesirable elements. Factory committees and trade union officials have sabotaged the policy of the Party for fear that our tactics would lead to the Amsterdam gentry splitting the trade unions. We have got rid of all such elements. The existence of elements with opportunist tendencies in connection with the United Front tactics is by no means a proof that the Party supports them.

There is also another phenomenon which you will experience in all the countries, viz., the mechanical conception of the application of the United Front tactics. It happens that after an action, after some great betrayal by the social-democratic leaders in one or other of the United Front actions, very good comrades immediately betray a desire to put an immediate end to united action and negotiations with the social-democratic leaders. They declare that henceforth they will work for the United Front from below. In answer to such mechanical conceptions we have said: If you can rouse enough activity to be able to say in two months' time that we need no longer negotiate with the social-democratic leaders because they have not the masses behind them, we shall not negotiate. We have applied these methods with great success in the factory committee movement, and have at the same time organised the United Front among the masses themselves.

Comrade Radek (greeted with applause): Comrades, when the Executive brought in their report, we all trembled with fear

of the storms which would be roused by the opposition of the Right and Left wings against the position of the Executive. The Right wing, in so far as there is one, has not yet spoken. Comrade Varga has endeavoured to prove, in his amiable manner, that he does not belong to the Right, and we take his word for it. Therefore I find myself compelled to deal with those points of view which are supposed to be held by the Left, although I believe that in the present condition of the international proletariat, the danger with which we are threatened comes not from the Left but from the Right. (Hear, hear.) The danger from the Right consists principally in this, that it is particularly difficult in a period when there are no popular revolts, to pursue a Communist political policy. During a crisis every worker feels instinctively the necessity of revolutionary action, and the Party is then the leader rather than the driving force. In a preparatory period such as the present—between two waves of revolution—Communist work must consist in a thorough intensive preparatory education of the Party, for, owing to the youth of the Communist Parties on the one hand, and their social-democratic past on the other, it is by no means easy to connect the mass character of the party with its Communist character. If we take, for example, the situation in the French party and in the Norwegian party, the two most typical parties of the Right wing of the Communist international, we find that in the debates upon the condition of these two parties lies the severest labours of this congress. So that if I deal with the two comrades of the Left who have just spoken, it is not that I consider the danger of the drift towards the Left to be grave, but because no one has yet spoken for the Right.

I shall begin with Comrade Vajtauer, the representative of the Czecho-Slovakian opposition. As Party members, we understand more or less what the Left or opposition of the Czecho-Slovakian Party is, although it is difficult to understand it theoretically. Nevertheless, the Czecho-Slovakian Left is worthy of earnest consideration, not because prominent and experienced proletarian elements of the Party, such as Comrade Sturk, are part of it, but because it denotes a very definite danger. There are 600,000 unemployed in Czecho-Slovakia, and, when the tendency suddenly appears in the Party, which produces the following slogan: "We are faced immediately with a struggle for power"—when such a tendency does appear, the question is not whether they have formulated their ideas clearly or obscurely, but whether, in this critical situation of the Party, a portion of the membership is unsatisfied with the position of the Party. They believe that the Party does not fight with sufficient energy, and, even if this section is small to-day, yet with 600,000 unemployed there is always sufficient material for this opposition nucleus to formulate a tactic which will drive the Party into premature struggle. On these grounds, I say, we must deal with these matters seriously.

The following facts are in possession of the Executive of the Communist International:—Until March of the present year the opposition had a majority on the Executive. That is the first fact. The second fact is this—last July a session of the enlarged Executive took place here in which we discussed the question of the Czecho-Slovakian Party. After a good deal of labour Comrade Jelik proposed a resolution declaring that there are no differences in principle in the Czecho-Slovakian Party. That was in July, and in September the Party was in danger, in the dreams of Comrade Vajtauer, of Comrade Smeral selling himself, and the comrades surrounding Zinoviev were frivolous people because they would not believe this dream. (Interruption: "And especially the International.")

Comrade Vajtauer's terrifying threat to leave this International for a special International is not a new threat. If one does not wish to take Comrade Vajtauer's speech humorously, one is compelled to speak to him so that he would not dare to speak a second time in such a manner in a congress of 52 Communist parties. We cannot deal thoroughly with the Czecho-Slovakian question at this phase of the debate. This matter will be examined with the greatest care in the Commission, and those warnings with regard to the state of the party which this comrade has made will be gone into with the utmost thoroughness; for we say frankly, when two honest proletarians raise their warning voices, we have no right, in the present period of the great danger coming from the Right, to pass it by in silence or with a jest. The Executive must submit that the result of their previous work with the Czecho-Slovakian Party shows that, in the main, the policy of the Czecho-Slovakian Party has been right. Therefore we have said to those comrades of the opposition who have raised the banner of rebellion, "You have acted wrongly, but as we do not wish to cast proletarians carelessly overboard, even if they put up senseless criticism, we will try once more to come to an understanding with you." Therefore we have suspended decision on the Czecho-Slovakian Party. When Comrade Neurath says you have abolished and shattered the authority of the Executive, I say that if we have abolished it we cannot shatter it. If we had shattered it we could not abolish it. But the hope remains that this authority will leave this hall stronger than ever, if after the work of the Commission it is shown that the Executive has done everything to make a good fighting party out of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party.

I now turn to the speech of Comrade Fischer. In the course of her speech she mentioned numerous omissions in the Rathenau action, which we in the Executive noted when we received the first detailed news with regard to this development. When voices are raised in the party saying, "In real mass action there should be no secrets in the masses, and under no circumstances should any understanding with the social-democrats be undertaken of which our comrades are not publicly informed in detail," when voices are raised in the

party saying "the Communist standpoint on every occasion, and no weeping over the hopes of Rathenau and crying of 'Republic, Republic, Republic!'" if that is said we can only say that we wish that this were not merely the voice of the opposition but the sentiment of the entire party. (Hear, hear.)

If the criticisms of Comrade Fischer had been confined only to this, then she would have been quite right, but her criticisms went much further. For instance, Comrade Fischer declared among other things that she was not opposed in principle to negotiating with the leaders, nor was she in favour of it, but these things ought to be done with discrimination. This is very well, but her tactics, her criticism of the Party after the action in the Central Committee, consisted not only of these common-places. Her opposition amounted to one thing—you are too much concerned about your own virtue. ("Quite so.")

Comrade Fischer said the railway strike was a brilliant action carried out without the aid of the leaders. We went to the masses over and over again telling them the same things that they themselves were saying, all the time shouting "Masses, Masses, Masses!" No leaders participated in that strike. In the second action the leaders already took part, and although she is not opposed to it in principle, this was a source of evil. (Interruption: "The Congress of the Factory Councils.") I am coming to that.

Comrades, what actually happened? When we get into the position of having to negotiate with the leaders, the opposition with Comrade Ruth Fischer at their head waxed extraordinarily nervous. I have experienced it throughout the conferences of the three Executives. Every day that passed without our breaking up the negotiations with the others was considered by her as lost. With the Rathenau crisis it was the same. Every day the opposition demanded either ultimatum or a break-up. The reason of this is the purely mechanical conception of the comrades of the Left. Our tactics of the United Front cannot be reduced to a fixed scheme. On the whole we know one thing now: We are the weaker side. The greatest obstacles will be put on our way to the masses. Social-democracy seeks to isolate her workers from us. Whenever the pressure of the masses increases, the social-democrats have to deal with us. When conducting such negotiations it is not to our interest to break up until we have compelled them to draw the great masses of workers into the movement, or after it has become clear to everybody that the social-democrats want no action. A premature break just to avoid the spending of another hour or half-an-hour in the company of these people would show that we consider ourselves weaker than we really are. Had the Party Press taken a clear stand from the very outset it would have repeated to the masses all the while: "Yes, we are dealing with the social-democrats, but if you will not take care the social-democrats are certain to betray you." Then we could calmly continue negotiating until the very moment when this

betrayal should have been fully manifested. But instead of seeing to it that the party takes a definite stand in the matter you have only been pulling it by the sleeve, hindering it all along and refusing to let the party negotiate. This is a nervous and strained attitude which can render no good service to the party. Taking it all in all we entered into the negotiation well aware that they will deceive us every time they can. To save our reputation we must tell the masses beforehand. But we must not break up unless we are in a position to do by ourselves what they refuse to do together with us. During our informal talks in the Executive regarding the Rathenau crisis I always put this fundamental question—Could the party risk a single-handed fight against the monarchists? I think that if the party had gone into action alone, the mistake would have been far greater than all the others that have been committed—("Quite true!")—for we have had the experience of the Kapp "putsch," which made clear that the social-democrats were only waiting for the opportunity to throw in their lot with the monarchists against us, and it was not a mistake but a merit that the party prevented this.

At the same time we say to the party, "under such circumstances let not the idea settle forever in your minds that we are to remain weak for evermore." ("Quite true.") We may as a matter of fact win the masses and grow strong at once in the very midst of such united action. The tactical art in such a situation is to proceed with caution and to avoid premature breaches, but always to be ready for them and preparing the masses by political agitation and by the conduct of the entire matter.

On the whole I must say—repeating what Comrade Zinoviev has already said last year in his theses on the United Front—that the tactics of the United Front involve the gravest dangers. The dangers are as follows:—We are living in a period of transition to a new wave of revolution. In the meantime, however, there is no present opportunity for revolutionary action, and a sort of twilight mood may easily creep in among the ranks of the party: a sort of lonely feeling may urge some Communists to walk arm-in-arm with Scheidemann along Unter den Linden. In such a mood the party leadership and the party press may easily be drawn into the social-democratic policy. Such a danger is present, and when any action is undertaken you must bear in mind not so much the danger of walking alone down the street as the graver danger that the Communist Party may disappear among the masses by its hob-nobbing with the social-democrats.

With regard to the demand for a Workers' Government. A Workers' Government is not the Proletarian Dictatorship, that is clear; it is one of the possible transitory stages to the Proletarian Dictatorship. The possibility of such a transitory stage is due to the fact that the working masses in the West are not so amorphous politically as in the East. They are members of parties and they stick to their parties. In the East,

in Russia, it was easier to bring them into the fold of Communism after the outbreak of the revolutionary storm. In your countries it is much more difficult. The German, Norwegian and Czecho-Slovakian workers will more readily declare against coalition with the bourgeoisie, preferring a coalition of labour parties which would guarantee the eight-hour day and an extra crust of bread, etc. A Workers' Party usually arises in this manner, either through preliminary struggles or on the basis of a parliamentary combination, and it would be folly to turn aside the opportunities of such a situation in stubborn doctrinaire fashion.

Now the question arises—shall we recline upon this soft cushion and take a good rest, or shall we rather lead the masses into the fight on the basis of their own illusions for the realisation of the programme of a Workers' Government? If we conceive the Workers' Government as a soft cushion, we are ourselves politically beaten. We would then take our place beside the social-democrats as a new type of tricksters. On the other hand, if we keep alive the consciousness of the masses that a Workers' Government is an empty shell unless it has workers behind it forging their weapons and forming their factory councils to compel it to hold on to the right track and make no compromise to the Right, making that government a starting point for the struggle for the Proletarian Dictatorship, such a Workers' Government will eventually make room for a Soviet Government and not become a soft cushion, but rather a lever for the conquest of power by revolutionary means. I believe one of the comrades has said, "The Workers' Government is not a historic necessity but a historical possibility." This is, to my mind, a correct formula. It would be absolutely wrong to assert that the development of man from the ape to a People's Commissar must necessarily pass through the phase of a Workers' Government. (Laughter.) Such a variant in history is possible, and in the first place it is possible in a number of countries, having a strong proletarian and peasant movement, or where the working class overwhelmingly outnumber the bourgeoisie, as is the case in England. A parliamentary labour victory in England is quite possible. It will not take place in the present elections, but it is possible in the future, and then the question will arise: What is the Labour Government? Is it no more than a new edition of the bourgeoisie-liberal government, or can we compel it to be something more? I believe Austen Chamberlain was right in saying, "If a Labour Government comes into power in England, it will begin with a Clynes' administration and end in a government of the Left Wing, because the latter can solve the unemployed problem."

Thus, Comrades, I believe that the Executive on the whole has taken the right attitude in this question, when on the one hand it warns against the proposition of either Soviet government or nothing, and, on the other hand, against the illusion which makes the Workers' Government a sort of parachute.

Comrades, the questions which we shall have to discuss further will be the detailed outlining of our plans of campaign. You will say a plan of campaign was given by the extended Executive session on the United Front. This indeed is our immediate course. I believe that the experience of the present year should convince even the blind that there is no other course open to us. The way of the United Front is a more difficult one than our policy of 1919, when we said, "Let us strike." It is altogether much easier and pleasanter to strike all together. But when we are lacking the necessary strength to do it and this way is necessary, it has to be followed, while retaining consciousness of the dangers that lurk from the Right, and at the same time in the firm assurance that this road will not harm us, but the social-democrats. It is for this further reason that the Second International is making such hysterical efforts to destroy the bridges ahead of us. We have acted not on the desire to merge with the Scheidemanns, but in order to stifle them in our embrace. (Loud applause.)

The Chairman: The next speaker is Comrade Duret.

Duret (France): Comrades, I speak here on behalf of the tendency which has become known as the French opposition to the tactics of the United Front.

While the centre said, "We are opposed to the United Front because we are a good Communist Party," we said, "We are opposed to the United Front because in France there is no Communist Party to speak of; it is Communist in appearance, but Reformist at bottom."

What are the reasons for our attitude? When the Centre was against the tactics of the United Front, it was because it was at the same time against the principle of the daily struggle for the immediate demands of the working class. In an article by Soutif, in the "L'Internationale" of February, entitled "Worthless Arguments," we read the following about the arguments of the Executive upon this subject:—"Why should we fight for immediate demands, for reforms, while we know that the bourgeoisie will not give us anything except what we shall wrest from it by force? If we possess sufficient force to obtain reforms from the bourgeoisie, we will have enough force to capture the power and establish the Proletarian Dictatorship."

These words came from a member who strongly represented the views of the centre and the majority of the party. It was against this attitude that we took up the opposition.

We have done so in the theses published in the "Bulletin Communiste" and in an article that I have written in reply to that of Comrade Soutif.

We take it to be the task of the French Party to win the majority of the working class for the Communist idea and to conduct the daily fight for the immediate demands, as a sheer necessity for the French Communist Party.

In our theses, while disputing the tactics of the United Front, we declare that we would unmask those who, under the

guise of fighting against those tactics, were merely following the policy of the least resistance, who wanted to pass as immaculate revolutionaries by means of revolutionary phraseology.

We and our friends have thought that in France there is a trend towards unity, an attempt to create a bloc of the working class in opposition to the bourgeoisie, but this would be a bloc of political organisations forming an infinitesimal minority of the working class. If the United Front is to be brought about in France, it will be under the form of factory committees or workers' councils or similar organisations, which would rally the great majority of the proletariat and which would effect the concentration of the proletarian forces against capitalism.

The tactics of the United Front may be conceived in two different ways:—

(1) By extending an invitation to reform its organisations somewhat in the following style: We want to start such and such an action, and we recommend militant and determined action by the masses, such as strikes, etc.

This was the tactic in vogue long before the creation of the United Front; it was the tactics of the open letter, frequently used in Germany.

(2) By addressing ourselves to reformist organisations, but without strict insistence on the orders and forms of the action. An appeal is made somewhat in general terms, proposing to employ methods of action which, properly speaking, are not the habitual methods for a Communist Party. But in course of the actions it is endeavoured to prove that the method is not sufficiently revolutionary, and in this manner the attempt is to be made to go beyond the boundaries of the action that has been started. In other words, the attempt is made to transform a reformist pacifist action into a revolutionary action.

I should say that the second way could be used by Communist parties that are strong, conscious and organised, but not by parties which are Communist only in name.

It is for this reason that we have fought against this second interpretation of the United Front.

There is another side to the tactics of the United Front which, regardless of all my efforts, still passes my understanding. I am speaking of the question of the Workers' Government.

Comrade Talheimer has used five or six pages to explain to me what is meant by a Workers' Government. But I am hard-headed. I failed to understand. Comrade Radek has made an attempt at explaining the same subject in more ample fashion, but still I fail to understand. It seems that I will have to give it up as a bad job.

The United Front should be a call for action. One must clearly understand what is meant by action in the Communist Party. Action in our Communist Party means just the writing of articles.

Several voices: "Well said."

We make speeches in Parliament, but we retain the methods of the old unified Socialist Party of the pre-war days, without any change whatever.

The burdens of the past are still weighing upon a great number of the Communist Parties of Western Europe, but they lie even heavier upon the French Communist Party. Obviously we do not wish to repudiate elections. We do not wish to repudiate the methods of peaceful fighting. But whatever methods of fighting we adopt they can have no influence and no force unless they give rise to action by the masses. We must so contrive our actions that they become the actions of the working masses, of the large masses of the proletariat.

Those in the French Party who recognise mass action are still the minority, and we know that if the tactics of the United Front were to be accepted with the interpretation that has already been given in France—i.e., as a sort of electioneering tactics—it would be directed, above all, against the best revolutionary elements of the French Party.

We will be told—you recognise the masses, you want to lead the proletarian masses under this slogan into the streets, but you know that the reformists do not march. They are not averse to a common action with us, provided that action is pacifist, parliamentary with joint meetings and joint petitions. When it comes to mass action they do not march.

Should we adopt mass action for the French Party which is not truly a Communist Party, it will have to shoulder the responsibility for the defeat of the action.

If we adopt the tactics of a United Front without any guarantees, it would lend new strength to the reformist and opportunist elements of the party.

One must regretfully admit that the reformist and opportunist elements are becoming increasingly numerous in the party as well as in the International.

The disintegration of the Two-and-a-Half-International had its good sides, but it also had its bad sides. One of these bad sides is that a large number of the militants who formerly belonged to the Two-and-a-Half-International will now pass over bag and baggage into the Communist Party.

We already see in this hall our dear Comrade Serrati, true merely as a guest, but probably soon he will be one of our large family. After Serrati, others will come.

They will come into the Communist movement, bringing into it the old prejudices, the old methods of fighting, and their social-democratic methods. This should make us realise that the evil is not on the Left but on the Right. Comrade Radek has already said it. It is always the Left that has to bear the brunt. The Centre never says anything, neither does the Right; yet, in practice, they always do their little job of opportunism.

If the French Party accepts the tactics of the United Front, it should purify itself; it should exclude from its midst all the reformists and the confusionists.

It is only under this condition that it will become a true Communist Party worthy of the Third International. (Cheers.)

Bordiga (Italy): Comrade Zinoviev referred confirmingly to certain fundamental points laid down by the Third Congress, with which the Italian Party is in full agreement.

The first point deals with the interpretation of the Capitalist situation; and declares that the present crisis is not transitory, but involves the decay of capitalism itself, and the final crisis.

The second point states that in order to make revolutionary victory possible in a situation like this the C.P. must extend its influence over wide masses. This can be done by participating in their struggles for their every-day interests.

The Italian Communists, neither in theory nor in practice, have followed the putschist method and never laboured under the illusion that power can be captured by a small revolutionary party. They do not accept, however, the formula of the "majority" of the working class, which is vague and arbitrary. It is vague because we are not told whether it refers to the proletariat alone or includes also the semi-proletarian sections of the politically conscious workers organised in the trade unions. This formula seems to us arbitrary, since nothing can make us believe that the revolutionary attack depends merely upon the numerical relation of forces.

We regard the winning over of the masses as our fundamental aim. But this does not at all mean that this end can be achieved by a process of forced marches. It may come to pass that the Party, without experiencing any growth in numbers, will nevertheless carry on its activity in such a way as would enable us to ultimately win over the masses to our side. Zinoviev said that certain sections of the International increased their influence over the masses in spite of the diminution of their numerical forces.

Evidently we must be equally prepared for either a refusal or an acceptance on the part of the opportunists to join forces with us. But in any case, the responsibility for such action must rest with an organ representing the interests of the wide masses and accessible to party influence. The Communist Party would then be able to get in touch with such an organisation and set the example by putting itself in the lead of the united proletarian action, while at the same time not assuming upon itself the responsibility before the masses for any adverse consequences that might result from methods dictated by a non-communist majority of the proletarian organisations. This is all the more necessary, because in striving to gain influence over the masses, one must take into consideration the responsibilities and the traditions of the parties as well as the political groupings of the men whom the masses follow in action.

As to the watchword of the Workers' Government, if we can be assured—as was the case of the enlarged Executive of June last—that it means nothing else but the "revolutionary

mobilisation of the working class for the overthrow of bourgeois domination," we find that in certain cases it might replace that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In any case, we would not be opposed to it, unless it be used as an opportunistic attempt to veil the real nature of our programme. If this watchword of the labour government were to give the working masses the impression that the essential problem of the relations between the proletarian class and the State—on which we based the programme and the organisation of the International—can be solved by any other means than by armed struggle for power in the form of proletarian dictatorship, then we will reject this tactical method because it jeopardises a fundamental condition of the preparation of the proletariat and of the party for the revolutionary tasks in order to achieve the doubtful success of immediate popularity.

We heard Zinoviev complain about the lack of centralisation and discipline in our international action. We are in favour of the maximum of centralisation and power for the Supreme Central Organs.

But to insure obedience on the part of the various sections of an organisation to the initiative measures of the leading centre it is necessary on the one hand to have something more than a solemn sermon on the virtues of discipline. The measures themselves must be of such a nature as to command respect.

We condemn as detrimental to our ultimate goal the policy of allowing too much liberty to individual sections in methods of organisation and choice of tactics: such matters should be left to the leading centre, and not to the national organisations, in spite of the fact that the latter claim to be better judges of the special conditions in their midst. If too much freedom of choice is allowed, it is bound to result in frequent breaches of discipline which destroy the continuity and the prestige of the revolutionary world organisation. We are of the opinion that the organisation of the International must be less federative in its central organs. The latter must not be based on the representation of the national section, but must take origin in the International Congress itself.

Our International is too frequently considered as something outside the parties which adhere to it; it has happened that these parties or fractions of these parties have entered into public and insolent polemics with the International.

The latter has been reduced to forming for itself fractions within the parties, which ought to be at its orders. This kind of thing seems to be absurd and disastrous.

We find ourselves compelled to liquidate too many questions of organisation and discipline just at the moment when our adversary launches an action which renders practically impossible any negotiations or any procedure which may be necessary in such cases.

I will conclude my statement by quoting Zinoviev: "Let us be a real Communist International Party, firmly centralised and ready for the revolutionary struggle."

Graziadei (Italy): I speak in the name of the minority of the Communist Party of Italy.

There still appears to be room to discuss the policy of the United Front, although nearly a year has elapsed since it became our slogan. Generally speaking, the United Front is a weapon for the conquest of the proletarian masses. Many comrades have not paid sufficient attention to the problem of time. That is why time is now turning against us.

What forms can the United Front take? With the permission of the Congress, I will say that there are two forms of the United Front. The one is the policy whereby a Communist Party tries to absorb in its organisation groups of workers which formerly belonged to the Socialist Parties, and who now accept or think they accept Communist ideas. I recognise that this form is very dangerous. In striving thus to improve our position, we run the risk of creating a state of affairs which in time will continue to get worse instead of better.

However, we cannot reject a policy just because it may present some dangers.

If there are Socialist parties with a working-class membership we should hope to gain them to our side. But if we gained them over, we should absorb them in groups, and not individually, because they were already organised in another party and because they bring with them a moral, and some financial, capital. Their political consciousness is the reason why it is impossible to demand that they come to us as isolated individuals.

Let us pass to the second form of the United Front the form whereby we do not seek to bring new working-class elements, former members of the Socialist parties into the Communist Party, but whereby the Communist Party, preserving its independence of organisation, attempts negotiations and temporary alliances with other working-class parties and with trade unions to draw them into common action.

There are difficulties in the application of the United Front in the second form as well as in the first. Life always presents difficulties. Does not marriage present difficulties. (Laughter.) And nevertheless we get married.

We see then that, like marriage, this policy presents difficulties. Bordiga believes that they can be solved mechanically and artificially. He makes distinctions. We do not want a United Front with the parties, but with the trade unions, because the trade unions are the most natural product of the working-class, and because we can act with more freedom there and without compromising ourselves. He forgets that there are just as many difficulties in the trade unions as in the parties. There are social-democrats there as well as in the parties. (Applause.)

There is, of course, a natural difference between the trade unions and the parties. But the problem of the United Front is both an economic and a political problem. This is why it is impossible to draw distinctions between the trade unions and the parties in the application of the United Front.

Let us pass to the conception of the Workers' Government. It is quite possible that in a country where a large section of the working-class is still imbued with bourgeois or semi-bourgeois democratic ideas, a Workers' Government may find support, for some time, in the trade unions, on the one hand, to which we must attach increasing political importance, and on a parliamentary form on the other. We cannot reject the Workers' Government because it may for a short time take a parliamentary form. This would be a great mistake. In Russia, after the March revolution, the Communists attempted to increase the political power of the Soviets in which they were still a minority, but they did not abandon Parliament when a purely social-democratic government was in power. In Germany, after the fall of the Empire, we found Parliament and the Soviets side by side.

Naturally the Communists must always teach the workers that a real workers' government can only be formed as a result of armed revolt against the bourgeoisie, and that this government must be under the control of its class organisations. They must continually teach the workers that if the dictatorship of the proletariat is not attained very soon, the workers' government will not be able to resist the assaults of the bourgeoisie.

Our Comrade Bordiga has demanded an ever stricter discipline from the Communist International. We fully subscribe to this part of Comrade Bordiga's speech. But we earnestly ask of our Comrades of the majority of the Italian Party not to consider discipline merely as a matter of form, but to make of all the tactics of the Communist International a living actuality in the daily existence of the party. (Applause.)

Markievsky (Poland): Comrade Zinoviev has praised the Polish Communist Party; but he did not spare criticism either. He praised us as old revolutionists who understood especially how to combine legal with illegal activity. The recent elections in Poland can serve as an example of how, in a country where communists are persecuted, Communism can beat for itself a path in the open political field. As soon as our Comrades in the provinces learned from the newspapers that a Central Committee had been formed in Warsaw, automatically there arose in 45 or more districts, local electoral committees. These electoral committees had to gather signatures in order to secure permission to be established, and then later to make up the electoral lists. We do not yet know the results of the elections; the reports from many districts are still to come in. However, 100,000 people voted the Communist ticket in the three districts of Dombrovaz, Warsaw and Lodz. Our appearance at the elections, so that we could publish a perfectly legal electoral

appeal, was a surprise for both the bourgeois and the government. But after a short time everything was prohibited and confiscated. Even our lists, which only contained the number of our ticket, No. 5, were confiscated. Thus advantage was taken even of the faintest legal possibilities.

I would like to speak a few words on the slogan of the Workers' Government. I believe there has been too much philosophical speculation on the matter. ("Very true," from the German benches.) The criticism of this slogan is directed on three lines—the Workers' Government is either a Scheidermann Government or a coalition government of the Communists with the social traitors. It finds support either in Parliament or in the Factory Councils. It is either the expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or it is not. I believe that philosophical speculation is out of place—for we have practical historical experience. What did the Bolsheviki do in 1917 before they conquered power? They demanded "All Power to the Soviets." What did this mean at that time? It meant giving power to the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries who were in the majority in the Soviets. It meant at that time a Workers' Government in which social traitors participated, and which was directed against the dictatorship of the proletariat. But this slogan was a good weapon of agitation in the hands of the Bolsheviki.

It may be that a great revolutionary movement will start at a time when we will not yet have conquered the majority of the proletariat. But when it comes the ferment will enable us to win over the majority of the proletariat much more rapidly than we can now, and the slogan we will then put forward in all probability will be essentially the slogans which the Executive, in one form or another, attempted to formulate. The government we will then demand will be essentially the Workers' Government, but based on the masses. If the Executive has failed to formulate a solution for this question it is because we have mixed our terms and have attempted to give our slogans a definite form when they are really dependent upon revolutionary circumstances.

Murphy (Britain): Comrades, with the main line of the Executive Committee's Report our party is in entire agreement. We agree that the diagnosis of the condition of Capitalism throughout the world is correct. We appreciate the fact that the offensive of Capitalism to-day against the working class is not the offensive of a class which is confident of its power, but an offensive started as the only means of defence. Probably there is no country in the world where this offensive has been more cleverly conducted than Great Britain. But in spite of the attempts, in spite of the cleverness of the capitalists there, they have still proved totally incapable of tackling their own fundamental problems. At this moment we have just witnessed the fall of Lloyd George. This event marks a new stage in the disintegrating process of capitalism in Great Britain, even

though the election which is proceeding is being used as a vehicle for the consolidation of the Imperialist parties, and foreshadows a new period of more violent activity in Britain than what we have experienced hitherto.

Comrade Zinoviev stated in his speech that the Fascisti movement is not confined to Italy. As a matter of fact, when the Fascisti of Italy began their attack on the Communists, the trade unionists, co-operatives, etc., the capitalist papers in London were announcing the regularising of the special police and that these were the future Fascisti for England.

We have heard a great deal about the United Front, and there is no doubt that the opposition to the United Front is steadily disappearing in the ranks of the Communist International. Its introduction in Britain, however, had some rather remarkable effects. It came to the Party in Britain practically as a shock. The Party was young and had no great experience, and at first the demand for the United Front resulted in considerable loss of membership to the Party.

It must be remembered that at the Second Congress of the Communist International there was no Communist Party. There were only a number of small parties, with all shades of Socialist colour from pale pink to brilliant scarlet. These were ordered by the Second Congress to come together, unite, and to immediately proceed with an application for affiliation to the Labour Party. It is one thing to make a demand; it is one thing to unite Socialist parties and call them a Communist Party, but it is another thing to make out of those forces a real Communist Party, and the following months have been months of constant struggle within the Party. The Labour Party issue had divided the parties even before they had come together, and now that formal unity was secured the issue was still a matter of debate within the new Party. This fight was brought to a head by the Labour Party Conference in Edinburgh this year, and really ended the debate inside the Party. The Edinburgh resolutions focussed the struggle between the Communists and the Labour Party and began the process of expelling the Communist from the Labour Party and the unions.

But in Glasgow, Sheffield, Manchester, Birmingham, the Labour Party has been totally unable to put into operation its own resolutions. Furthermore, in other places, Barrow, Battersea, and other local Labour Parties, the Communists have practically got control of the Labour Party organisations.

This attempt to exclude the Communists from the Labour Party only produced further problems for that party which it could not overcome. For example, the fact that the Labour Party is made up of affiliated trade union organisations compelled them to face the issue of expulsion of Communists from Labour Party Conferences. Here they must face the big Labour organisations and not all these will follow their lead. Already at least one Labour organisation, and an important one, has refused to put into operation the Labour Party resolution, and immediately the Labour Party was face to face with

a break-away of a Labour union, a mass organisation. In that they dare not go any further.

Hence we can see that policy of the United Front has been strengthening the Communist Party.

Equally important has been the progress in the industrial movement. At the Trade Union Congress, for example, by pursuing the policy of putting forward a programme for the consolidation of the union movement, we have been able to parade all the union leaders before the masses and expose them.

With regard to the actual struggles in the factories or in the union movement we have won considerable influence. In the Engineer's lock-out it was the Communists and the supporters of the R.I.L.U. who waged that struggle and made whatever fight was made.

Here I must take exception to one point in Comrade Zinoviev's report, and it is his statement on the factory committees' movement. He said that "no Communist Party can be considered a bona-fide, formally established mass party that has no stable influence in the factories and workshops, mines, railways, etc. In the present circumstances no movement can be considered a well-organised proletarian mass movement of the working class if its organisations do not succeed in establishing factory and workshop committees."

To this we take exception. We think it has been written with eyes too closely fixed on Germany. In England we have had a powerful Shop Stewards' movement. But it can and only does exist in given objective conditions. These necessary conditions at the moment in England do not exist. How can you build factory organisations when you have 1,750,000 workers walking the streets. You cannot build factory organisations in empty and depleted workshops, while you have a great reservoir of unemployed workers.

The movement under these conditions takes other forms. It takes the form of minority movements in the unions and throws up a great unemployed workers' committee movement. In the Engineers' lock-out it was these organisations which conducted the fight and rarely those who were actually locked out workers from the factories.

Hence the Communist Party must adapt itself to the various forms of the struggle thrown up by the given historical conditions. In one country the conditions make possible a drive into the factories and the creation of factory committees. In another minority movements in the unions and unemployed workers' committees are the order of the day. That Communist Party which is deeply rooted in the struggles of the masses and adaptable to the varying forms of mass organisation which the conditions make possible is a bona-fide Communist Party whether the form of mass organisation is that of factory committees or some other form.

Let us face also the International implications of this policy as expressed by the demand for the United Front. Since

the Conferences of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals what have we seen? We have seen a number of struggles taking place in this country and in that country. At the time of the engineers' lock-out in Britain there were seven countries in which occurred disputes of the metal workers, and the Communist Parties of these countries did not know what each other were doing. They did not put forward the same slogans, and no measures were taken to make even a United Front of the Communist Parties. In this direction the Communist International has much to do to improve the situation.

Further, we have heard much of the awakening peoples of the East and the colonial populations. We hear of a rising movement in India, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and we have a revolutionary movement developing in Ireland, yet little has been done to bring together the parties of those countries which control and subjugate these peoples, into live contact with the problems of the struggling masses. Let us remedy the defects in these directions, and we shall make possible a wider application of the United Front and develop the Communist International in the process.

Haakon Meyer (Norway): Comrades, I have a few words to say anent Comrade Zinoviev's casual remarks in his report concerning the doings of the Executive. In the view of the majority of the Norwegian delegates, who upon this question do not see quite eye to eye with the Communist International, the matter is above all one (as Zinoviev puts it) of the birth of a Communist Party in Norway. This is mainly a problem of organisation, but it is also pre-eminently a tactical question for the Party.

He says: "In Norway, all the Party newspapers are still termed Social Democratic." The Norwegian Party is a strong one, comparatively speaking. It is a party which has not originated out of another great party; it is a great party which has captured nearly all the newspapers. In a small country like Norway, to be able to publish more than 40 newspapers which have for five years defended the Russian revolution and maintained revolutionary ideals, represents a strength which cannot be nullified by a name. As Comrade Zinoviev is aware, a proposal from the Central Executive awaits the consideration of our Party. A proposal on this subject would have been considered at the Party Conference in September, had not the International itself demanded the postponement of the Party Congress until January. The Executive knows perfectly well that the names will be altered in January.

In the discussions at this Congress the question of the Labour Government has come to the front a good deal. As yet the matter has been very little discussed in the Norwegian Party; it would hardly be too much to say that it has never been discussed at all. It is, however, sufficiently clear that there are elements in the party whose deliberate policy it is to work

for the formation of a Labour Government based on the united front—a united front which is to contain bourgeois groups as well as Labour Parties. If we oppose this trend, it is not merely because we believe the policy to be unsound.

In the last letter but one from the Executive of the Communist International to our party, we were told that the position taken up by the parliamentary group in this question fell under the stigma of parliamentary opportunism. But in its last letter the Executive informs us that this is a difficult tactical question. If in such a situation the group decided we ought to accept the compulsory arbitration law on behalf of the workers, that recommendation was not given solely with an eye to the welfare of the trade union organisations. It was also an outcome of the opportunist policy of the group, which had found expression long ere this. Another reason for the support given by the group to the compulsory arbitration of law was the wish of the group to support the liberal government (or, indirectly—so we are informed—to support ministerial socialism) in order to avoid the coming to power of a more conservative government.

Since from time to time the parliamentary group has pursued a purely opportunist policy, we naturally regard it with suspicion when it advocates a policy tending to promote the formation of a Labour Government, and when this Labour Government is to be one embracing, not workers alone, but groups attached to the bourgeois parties.

A majority of the Norwegian Executive are against this last letter of the Executive of the Communist International, and if the resolution adopting the Executive report remains unaltered, the three representatives of the Norwegian Executive will refrain from voting.

Comrade Bukharin (greeted with applause):

Esteemed Comrades, first of all I wish to say that it seems strange that at this International Communist World Congress not a single speaker so far has spoken of the International situation as a whole, of the situation in all the Parties. Every speaker—without exception—spoke exclusively of the situation in his own Party; even our red-hot comrade from the Berlin organisation, Comrade Ruth Fischer, dwelt almost exclusively on the matter of the Berlin organisation, or at best on the subject of the German Party, although our present discussion follows the report of Comrade Zinoviev which analyses the situation of the International as a whole. After this analysis we were entitled to expect from our friends, the representatives of the various fraternal Parties, that they would discuss the general situation. As you all know, we shall later on in our proceedings discuss questions dealing with the situation in the respective parties, and it will then be opportune to discuss separate questions. This shows that we are still too social-democratic, we are still unaccustomed to analyse the situation upon an International scale. I would like, therefore, to analyse the general

tactics of the Executive and its bearings upon the various groups and tendencies.

We have to say, whether the Executive of the Communist International has acted properly or not. This may be divided into two main questions: (1) Whether the International has rightly judged the various tendencies within the Communist International, whether the internal political tactics were properly carried out? (2) Whether it has rightly or wrongly defined the general line of tactics. These are the two main questions to which we should receive the answer. Within the International I can distinguish various tactical currents and tendencies. I would like first of all to enumerate them: Firstly, the Centrist tendencies; secondly, the semi-reformist tendencies, parading under the mask and phraseology of the Left Wing; thirdly, various transitory forms partly reformist, or perhaps embodying the two currents at one and the same time; and fourthly, the Left Wing proper. By the Left I understand such groupings that commit the so-called "Left" errors. After these we have the proper kernel of the International, which, as we hope, is pursuing the right policy.

The Centrist tendencies have been expressed in their crudest form in the general activity of the International and at the Congress, through the delegations from two parties, firstly by a section of the French Party and secondly by a section of the minority of the Norwegian Party, the representatives of which have spoken here. The French Centrist tendencies are a survival of the former social democratic ideology, and they also pass under the mask of pretending to accept everything that is proposed to them. They are offered the 21 conditions, and they will accept them. Some good resolutions on Party activity may be suggested to them, they will accept these unanimously without even discussion, and with acclamation. (Laughter.) Yes, it is always like this. They are ready to assent to anything that the so-called Moscow Dictatorship may desire. Later, of course, they will abuse the Moscow Dictatorship with characteristic communist vigour, but they subscribe to everything that is asked of them. Outwardly this looks perfectly loyal, but the great danger consists of the fact that all this exists only on paper. As a rule after the acceptance of such good resolutions, nothing is done. Those tactical deviations which are real and which really take place have never yet been formulated. The attempt has never been made to elucidate the standpoint underlying these deviations.

With regard to the Norwegian Party, we have heard even a comrade of the Right Wing speaking here. What did he tell us? He told us that the name of the Norwegian paper, "Social-Democrat," was nothing else than a jumble of letters. (Laughter.) But why do we call ourselves Social-Democrats? Possibly our Norwegian comrade thinks that it is due to our liking for particular letters. Nevertheless, we take it that the name is a symbol which defines our methods at the very start. We have tolerated the social democratic newspapers for two

years, and do you think that this has no influence on the contents of the papers? We can and will prove that by their contents also these papers are partly semi-social-democratic, and in these papers one at times comes across articles which are written in a spirit of hostility towards the Communist International. This is the absolute truth, and when our comrades here tell us that this is only a minor matter, that things will be put right in January—after two and a-half years—I say that this has been promised many times, but never done. Then again, what about International discipline? The comrade is entirely oblivious of that. We have repeatedly and unequivocally stated the decision of the International and of the Executive that our Congresses will not tolerate such a situation, and yet they come along here and tell us that this is a matter of little importance. No, comrades, this is not a minor matter.

Let us take our French comrades. Their main tactical course is one of pure passivity. They do not support strikes, and so forth. But they also wear a cloak: the dangers of the United Front. They say: What can we do with such miserable fellows who are really not socialists at all? We had an illustration of this in the speech of our extremely Left Comrade Duret. Some time ago Comrade Duret spoke against the expulsion of Verfeuil and Co. He was, and continues to be, in favour of trade union autonomy, and at the same time he comes here to accuse us of opportunism. A few days ago he was against the expulsion of Verfeuil. Verfeuil is an out-and-out bourgeois wretch. And now Comrade Duret tells us: What an opportunist International we have, that it demands from us the United Front, the welcoming of Serrati, etc. What does it mean? It means, Comrade Duret, that also in your person the International has a survivor of reformism, and that your phrases are meant to deceive. (Applause.)

Let us examine the substance of Comrade Duret's arguments in so far as I have been able to crystalise his more important points. His first point was that our Party was unable to manoeuvre. This was the first argument against the United Front, and it has already been brought up by our friend Bordiga. But I say that this is wrong to believe that a party must first be built up to the last man before manoeuvring because it is in the process of manoeuvring that real parties are built. If we were to wait until we get perfect parties, we would be falling into the tactics of passivity which has been consistently criticised by the French Party. The Left point a finger of scorn at the Centrist comrades and accuse them of being passive people who will not do a stroke of work, yet they themselves repeat the same mistakes when they wish to wait until they get a perfect party. No, the Party is produced in the course of the struggle, and the same thing will have to happen to France.

Comrade Duret raised another argument, the socialist opportunists are unwilling to march together with us. This is indeed a smashing argument. Just fancy, you must at once

give up your communist virtues for the reason that the socialist-opportunists refuse to march with you. What a strange argument! If you cannot come to an agreement, it is your duty to expose them, to write against them, to agitate against them, and so forth. This is the only sensible way of making use of the sins of the social-patriots. But here again you are handicapped by their confounded passivity. You are too lazy, that is what I would like to say to you. (Applause.)

The third and extremely comical argument was, that for Germany, of course, the tactics of the United Front was an excellent thing. This is what the Reformists usually say. Even during the war it used to be said in Germany: Why, of course, we support the revolution in Russia, but in Germany it is quite a different matter. You are arguing in a similar way. In Germany, you say, the masses are organised, in our country they are not. Therefore, in Germany the masses can be won by the tactics of the United Front, and in France they cannot. But, in the name of common sense, where is the proof or shade of proof of such an argument. In France, just as in Germany, the movement cannot depend upon the organised workers alone. The unorganised, too, should turn to you for guidance. The growth of the numbers of your organised comrades would bring you a corresponding increased following among the unorganised. Your argument is really an extraordinary one. Not being a parliamentarian, I would simply call it piffle. (Laughter.)

Now, comrades, let me turn to another category who are so to speak half way between the Left and the Reformists, and whose typical representative is Comrade Vajtauer. He declares himself an adherent of the Left Wing Opposition in Czechoslovakia. Comrade Vajtauer appears to me to be one who appears to be at his wits' end endeavouring to invent an ideology for the Left Wing Opposition. I maintain that all criticism should not come from the Right, but from the Left. What Comrade Vajtauer proposes has really nothing to do with Communism, but has much in common with petty bourgeois Proudonism from beginning to end. The Labour Movement in Germany knows of a certain Dr. Bernstein who, for the purpose of fighting against capitalism, advocated a strike against child-bearing, because it would mean that no new children would be born, and without children militarism cannot exist. (Animation and laughter.) Vajtauer comes along with a proposal to deal capitalism a mortal blow by advocating a boycott of goods of capitalists who are callous towards the working class. This is not Marxism; it is theoretically wrong from A to Z. This fallacy that the worker is more exploited by merchant capital than by industrial capital, betrays such profound ignorance that I would advise Comrade Vajtauer to join an elementary Marxian preparatory school. (Laughter.) This theory is not only ridiculous, but it is also absolutely opportunist.

I would like now to say a few words on the so-called mistakes of Leftism, and in the first place with regard to the

speech by Comrade Ruth Fischer. Her principal mistake was in exaggerating dangers. In some cases the criticism was proper, and Comrade Radek, who can by no means be described as a Leftist, has declared this criticism was justified. But the mistake begins when Comrade Ruth Fischer says: "Here we have Reformism and Revisionism in full bloom." This is an exaggeration, an entirely undialectical treatment of quite concrete situations and action. This is her mistake, which should be frankly pointed out.

Another mistake I noticed in the speech was, when she said the following phrase which I put down in writing: "The idea of strong organisation is a survival of the social democratic spirit." No, it is not in any way a survival of the social democratic spirit. We should not frame our policies on the assumption that the strength of organisation means nothing to us, while the whole bourgeoisie devises even new forms of organisation. Fascism is not merely a form of organisation that the bourgeoisie had possessed previously, it is a newly invented form, adapted to the new movement, calculated to drag in the masses. In other words, the bourgeoisie sees the necessity of having a mass party, which unfortunately even Comrade Bordiga fails to understand. If it is a question of the form of organisation, of course, we cannot take upon ourselves to dictate the form of organisation which should be adopted. On the contrary, it is the masses that have to decide. But we have the nucleus of the form of organisation, and this is a problem not only for a social democratic party, but for every militant party. (Hear, hear.)

Now we come to the third point. Comrade Fischer said that the Putschist tactics has been the subject of much strife within the German Party, and has brought about a certain state of depression in the Party. That may be so. But it is a known fact that in the battle of life not every point can be defined and described beforehand. It would have been much worse for the Party if there had been no vigorous campaign against Putschism.

Now to Comrade Bordiga. Comrade Bordiga told us in his introductory remarks, that he accepts the spirit of the tactics of the United Front. This was said very nobly, very idealistically and spiritualistically. But your spirit, Comrade Bordiga is too ephemeral. (Laughter.) Indeed, we have no use for such ephemeral spirits, we need something more tangible. The chief mistake of Comrade Bordiga is that instead of the known realities, he clutches at the unknown. Says Comrade Bordiga: First of all we should calculate all possible eventualities, and only after that should we work out the necessary precautionary measures to prevent our spiritual downfall. (Laughter.) But life is a complex thing, and one cannot make priori calculations; therefore, Comrade Bordiga is enforced to abide his time in idleness.

Comrade Bordiga says further: "The elasticity and eclecticism," etc. Comrade Bordiga uses these two words as syno-

nymic expressions. What does it mean? It means that Comrade Bordiga considers as synonymous with deficiency of principle and bourgeois cynicism the very things which the Russian Party considers as the greatest conquest. This, of course, is a grave mistake. Such ideas are surely no reliable guide through life's hardships. Comrade Bordiga went on to say, with regard to the tactics of the United Front: First the Party, and then the action of the Party. It is the same mistake of which I have already spoken. Comrade Bordiga applies his spiritual abilities also to the interpretation of international discipline. He tells us: Yes, I am opposed to federative centralisation, which means representation of parties, but I am in favour of an absolutely centralised Executive. Then he goes on to say: But we are not soldiers, the International is no military barracks, the army should not be transplanted into the International. We need greater national autonomy for the parties. Comrade Bordiga had much to say about dialectic contradictions. What we have here are not contradictions, but sheer nonsense. Here we have also a little cloak, naturally of much finer texture. International discipline cannot be interpreted to mean that the International nominally holds power, while the national parties are perfectly autonomous and free to do as they like.

I have yet a few other remarks to make. Look at the situation in Italy to-day. Everything cries aloud for the unity of the proletarian forces. The most important problem in Italy is the problem of organisational unity with the Socialist Party. Yet Comrade Bordiga has not a word to say about this important problem. His entire speech was an essay of the most abstract Bergsonesque philosophy of action, which is no action at all. But not a single word on concrete problems. This is another outpouring of his meagre spirit, which in reality is not a sound instrument of the proletarian struggle. It is the survival of purely dogmatic sectarianism. The Italian Party, having done some very good work, has also committed mistakes in the agrarian question, in the question of the "Arditi Del Popolo," etc. All the mistakes of the Italian Party are the logical outcome of the fallacious ideas that have found expression in the speech of Comrade Bordiga.

Comrades, in dealing with these questions and in correcting the errors of Leftism, the Executive did not act upon the standpoint of either "right," or "left," but on the standpoint of the proper proletarian tactics. The proper proletarian tactics need not be either Right or Left, all it has to do is to adapt itself to the concrete conditions of the proletariat of the respective countries. I, therefore, invite you to consider the tactic of the Executive as your very own, to test it, and to continue to support it until we shall become the real power with the entire proletariat on our side. (Applause.)

Carr (U.S.): Comrades, although Comrade Bukharin thinks it is a mistake for the delegates of the various Parties to concern

themselves in the matter of this report, solely with the affairs of their respective Parties, I shall continue the same fault.

Let me say at the outset that my utterances this evening are those I have been commissioned by the delegation to make on behalf of the Party. Let me say, then, in the name of the Communist Party of America, that we are in full agreement with the tactics of the Executive during the past year. This applies, not only to the general trend, but also to the concrete decisions made by the Executive in America.

The Third Congress issued the watchword, Back to the Masses! It is true that in America there was lacking for a long time a clear view as to the tasks of a Communist Party. So thoroughly, however, has propaganda been carried on under this watchword that there are now very few comrades in America who do not understand that it is the Party's task to work among the masses.

The second watchword, that of the United Front, has also been a good one for America. In the States, however, the situation is somewhat different from that in European countries. When the watchword of the united front first came to America, it was only to be expected that there would at first be certain misunderstandings in the Party as to the matter. Some of the comrades interpreted it as a command that we should make a nice little agreement with the politicians and leaders of the Socialist Party and other organisations. It was even proposed that when we had put forward a candidate for the elections, we should withdraw him in favour of the yellow Meyer London, and that we were to support the latter at the election. Such views no longer prevail in the Party. Every member understands that this is not the meaning of the united front, but that what we have to do is to engage in activities in which we can make common cause with all the workers and with all working class organisations against the bourgeoisie.

I come, now, to concrete questions. As you know, in America we have an illegal Communist Party, whose branches are secretly organised. At one time there were two parties, but they were amalgamated in May, 1921. After the union, the question came to the front as to how the Party was henceforward to work among the masses. How were we to realise the slogan of the International, the slogan which the process of events was spontaneously commending to us all?

Many of the comrades were convinced that it was essential to organise a legal Party, for the better permeation of the masses, to secure the possibility of working among the masses. The party split over the question whether a legal party should be organised, and if so, how. The problem was discussed here in Moscow. Theses were composed on the subject, and in these theses it was recommended that a legal party should be organised. Watchwords were formulated, and partial demands were specified. It was, moreover, definitely declared that we must guard against the danger of the party being completely broken up. The underground party was to be continued and

strengthened, but, in addition, a legal Party was to be constructed, as an instrument of the Communist Party, that we might be able to work more effectively among the masses. These theses were sent to America, and were hailed with delight by the great majority of the members. Voices were, however, raised against them, from the extremists of either wing. The Left opposition, which was outside the party, was averse to the proposal, for it was a defeat to their propaganda. But now these disputes are at an end. The questions that were agitating the Party last summer were settled at the Party Congress, with the valuable aid of the representative of the Communist International, who attended the sessions. Perhaps we shall hear something more of the matter in this place. I believe myself to be justified in saying, however, that nine-tenths of our members consider them to be in conformity with contemporary U.S. conditions, and are satisfied that they lay down the right lines for the work of the Party in America.

Faure (France): The French Party has been much calumniated. I have no hate against those who have done it, even against our most violent critics. This criticism proves that much is expected of us; and one is justified in this expectation. But one should take into consideration that we are not to be blamed for the fact that our country is ruled by the National Bloc, by the clique of M. Poincare, supported by a powerful army, that France has become the mad dog of reaction, the enemy of all revolutions, beginning with that of Germany. The same army that menaces Germany also menaces our Communist movement. This does not mean that the courage to do our duty will fail us, but when we consider the possible situation of to-morrow, when we consider the efforts of the bourgeoisie, which is aware of the dangers menacing its interests, we have the right to ask the International to give us its confidence, and to realise the enormity of the difficulties we are labouring under. We likewise request that the efforts we have made to abide by the resolutions adopted and our determination to continue our efforts in order to become one of the best Communist Parties in the International—that all this be taken into consideration.

The realisation of the United Front is our first task. If we cannot do it now we will not be capable of defending ourselves. Why, then, the indecisions? Why those discussions on the lesser or greater revolutionary worth of this or that organisation? We are not accustomed in France to the idea of organic alliances. But such an organic alliance has actually taken place in Havre. Communists and syndicalists have had a taste of unity in the prisons of the French Republic. It would be preferable, of course, that such a union be made to serve as a defence against the French Government rather than being resorted to under its punishment. History proves the validity of this argument. We need only recall the experience of the Commune to lose all illusions as to the bourgeoisie.

Its police, its Citizens' Union, its army will be directed against us. This is why we believe that the French Party will accept unanimously the policy of the United Front of all revolutionists.

After the realisation of the United Front we will have greater credit with the masses, and it will be easier for us to make them understand that they must unite for the defence of their interests. This must turn to our profit, for we shall be able to show the working class the intentions of its reformist leaders.

This, in brief, is our position. It is also the position of the International concerning the relations between the Party and the Trade Unions and the United Front of all workers. This declaration was necessary. I have preferred to make it rather than answer to the attacks upon the French Party.

Rosmer (France): At the end of his speech, Comrade Faure expressed a lively regret on account of the attacks which previous speakers had made on the French Party. This is a grave statement, inasmuch as it does not represent Comrade Faure's opinion alone, for we know quite well that it is widely diffused in France even among the comrades who are responsible for the management of the Party. We know that any intervention by members of the Communist Parties or by representatives of the C.I. are apt to be regarded as improper and intolerable intrusions into the life of the French Party.

Such a conception of the C.I.—at once false and dangerous—underlies all the difficulties that have so frequently arisen during the last 15 months between the C.I. and the French Section.

We are communists here. The special problems confronting the French comrades are not of interest to these latter alone; they are of concern to the comrades of other countries, all the more because France has occupied a position of importance since the imperialist war. Everywhere the French army has been the tool of the counter-revolution. Our comrades in the other Parties are well advised in criticising here, in so far as they think it necessary, the actions of the French Communist Party.

Comrade Duret said yesterday, that when the tactics of the United Front came to be discussed in France there was an almost universal movement on the part of the French workers against this tactic. He added that this was a healthy reaction against very dangerous tactics. I think that in this connection I shall do well to supplement Comrade Duret's exposition.

Why was there this almost unanimous antagonistic movement among the French workers?

The explanation is quite simple enough if we recall how the tactics of the United Front were presented to the French workers. They were presented as implying the renunciation of communism, a return to reformism, the abandonment of the principles which had hitherto been the foundation of the C.I. There was talk of the revolution being disarmed, and other things of like importance. It is not surprising that the French workers were uneasy, and that they said to themselves: "We absolutely refuse

to accept tactics likely to lead us to reconciliation with the dissentients, and the abandonment of communism."

Thus the great majority of the French workers were marshalled against the United Front, and then the existence of this formidable opposition was made an excuse for telling the Communist International that it was impossible to apply the tactics in France.

The opposition to the United Front has been weakening, though by slow degrees. The remarkable feature of the whole thing has been that at the very moment when the United Front was being realised, it was being achieved by the organisations on their own initiative (inasmuch as they recognised that unity was imperatively demanded in existing circumstances). Meanwhile the French Comrades were saying: "This is an insignificant matter. We will size up the situation six months hence."

Of course, the tactics of the United Front, like any other tactics, are not free from numerous dangers which have to be guarded against. In France we have Democratic traditions. This entails for the Party the danger of a union with the dissentients for the reconstitution of unity. But even if we were to refuse to adopt the tactics of the United Front, could we be sure of avoiding these dangers. We know them well enough, anyhow!

Comrade Ruth Fischer, whom the French opponents of the United Front have attempted to annex, has shown us that her position is very different from theirs. She has pointed out some of the dangers of these tactics in certain special forms they may assume. This was a useful warning. We must continually be criticising our own course of action, must ascertain in what way we have been mistaken, precisely where we have gone wrong, so that subsequently we may profit by our experience. But because this is necessary, it by no means follows that we are justified in completely rejecting the tactics.

In 1920 the Communist International saved the international working-class movement by forbidding revolutionists to leave the reformist unions. With the tactics of the United Front it has again saved the working-class movement, at a moment when the circumstances had completely changed, and when the workers' forces had been scattered.

I shall now proceed to examine paragraph 9. It is very remarkable that the French Party should have been the one to raise this question, and that it should be the French Party which shows so much interest in the rules of the Communist International. The rules and constitution of the Communist International have not been very widely read in France, nor are they well known there and paragraph 9 has been discovered because of the Fabre affair. Since it was difficult to put up a fight about the Fabre affair, paragraph 9 was chosen as the bone of contention. The text is not perfectly clear. We read

that the Communist International can expel a member of any branch. However, the French comrades have said: "The Communist International has no power to expel a member," and they add that paragraph 9 gives unique power to the Executive, and that this rule must be revised.

The very same comrades who have raised the question of paragraph 9, have also brought forward objections to the proposal that henceforward national congresses shall be summoned after the International Congresses. Seizing their chance they have said: "The Communist International claims that the affairs of the national sections can be discussed in the International Congress; in that case, the national sections will themselves have nothing to discuss." They will meet after the International Congress, and their sole function will be to enforce the latter's decisions. We are told that this is unacceptable, that the Communist International belongs to the masses, and that the masses must rule it themselves.

That is what was said in France. The French Communist Party is made up of various fragments of heterogeneous origin representing different conceptions which have been imperfectly harmonised. Nothing but its tie with the Communist International could make the French Communist Party a going concern. Nevertheless, the Communist International has been slandered, has been described as an intolerable creature reducing the national sections to a state of absolute passivity, the one function left to them being the elaboration of principles or the application of tactics transmitted from the centre.

The Comrades who have held such views in France realise to-day that their activities have been very dangerous to French communism. Comrade Duret has changed much since he left Paris. We hardly recognise him. But Comrade Bukharin, who had never seen him before, has shown that he knows him very well, and has specified Duret's position in such a way that I think it would be superfluous for me to return to the matter now.

Duret: Why not?

Rosmer: Because the Chairman tells me that my time is up.

I should like to speak very briefly with reference to a matter on which Comrade Zinoviev's report is not perfectly clear. I refer to the factory and workshop councils. In the French translation of the report we read that it will be impossible to take the Communist Party seriously until it has established factory and workshop councils. Comrade Murphy has done well to underline it by saying that it was not enough for a Communist Party to have the wish to establish such councils, for a number of other conditions were essential. I fully agree. He has shown how the turn of the matter took in Britain. It has taken the same turn in France, and there can be no doubt that the difficulty of establishing factory and workshop councils will be just as great in France as in Britain, though for different reasons. The few attempts that have been made in this direction have been isolated, so that we are not entitled to say that these contribute anything towards the realisation

of this desideratum. It is impossible to form a sufficiently clear idea of the constitution of these factory and workshop councils to enable us to speak of them as a phenomenon interesting the party as a whole.

Several Voices: They will be founded.

Rosmer: Of course, it was necessary to stress the foregoing point.

In a draft resolution which has been submitted to us, we read:

"The Fourth Congress of the Communist International approves the decision of the Executive Committee on the crisis in the French Communist Party."

I have no time left in which to touch, however briefly, upon the question of the French Party. This matter will come up for discussion later. We shall then show why the decisions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International have been incompetent to solve our crisis, and why the crisis which came to a head during the last Congress of the French Communist Party is of such fundamental importance. (Applause.)

Acabedo (Spain): The Spanish Delegation is in complete accord with Comrade Zinoviev's statement, except with the part dealing with the Workers' Government. I am particularly pleased that the Executive had applied severe but just criticism to the question of the French, Italian, Norwegian and Czechoslovakian Parties. This is the only way for the Third International to maintain its tactics.

Although we were formerly against the tactics of the United Front, our representative in the Executive of the Third International, together with the representatives for the Italian and French Parties signed an agreement to carry out the United Front tactics in their respective countries. In spite of this agreement the United Front tactics were systematically sabotaged in France, while in Spain, where the difficulties were much greater, especially owing to the syndicalists, the utmost was done to carry out these tactics in good faith. At the time of Comrade Humbert-Droz's visit to Spain, the Spanish Communist Party sent an open letter to the socialists, the reformist and the syndicalist anarchists, proposing common action in connection with a reduction of wages. The secretary of the Miners' Federation thereupon proposed to the employers to add one hour to the working day in lieu of this reduction. This proposal would have jeopardised the most valuable achievement of the working-class—the 8-hour day. Thereupon the Spanish Communist Party took up the struggle along the lines of the United Front tactics, and a three months' strike was carried out. This strike resulted in the workers returning to work with only a 5 per cent. reduction in wages. This is a clear proof that the United Front tactics can be successful in staying the capitalist offensive.

Whatever the resolutions of the Congress may be, the Spanish Party will always remain faithful to the Third International, and will observe International discipline.

Dombaky (Poland): On the problems raised in Comrade Zinoviev's speech I would like to say the following: The United Front has been much tried out in our country in the course of the last six months. We have already accumulated a good deal of experience, and I believe that this experience is not encouraging to the adherents of the tactics of the United Front, as it has been applied of late. Of course, every time one says something against the United Front one gets the reply: But you do not understand that we must have the majority behind us! And in Moscow one hears at times even a sharper answer: It is only an ass who fails to understand, etc. Of course, this is rather a sharp argument. Such an argument would kill an elephant. (Laughter.) But it is altogether irrelevant to the question. Of course, we ought to win a majority of the proletariat, but it has to be a majority for a Communist Party, not for a hotch-potch of hazy and nebulous ideas.

We, in Poland, have also had some experience with the tactics of the United Front. Comrade Markhlevsky has already spoken about it. We have addressed ourselves to the various factions, inviting them to a joint demonstration. In Warsaw we have given up our own demonstrations, in Cracow fifteen of our Comrades were brutally maltreated by the P.P.S. It was indeed gratifying tactics. It has its saving grace in the fact that the Party Executive was absent from the demonstrations. (Laughter.)

The failure is due to the fact that in Poland we had no basis for these tactics of the United Front. In Germany we had that basis; in France the demand for the tactics of the United Front has only aggravated the crisis in the Party without bringing any advantage, at least so far.

As regards the workers' government, I was in the same boat as my friend Comrade Duret, I could not understand the meaning of workers' government in our tactics. At last I have heard a clear definition of this government. Comrade Radek has solaced me in private conversation that such a government is not contemplated for Poland (Comrade Radek: I never said that). Oh, then Poland will also have to bear the punishment of this sort of government. It is thus an international problem. Comrade Radek says that the workers' government is not a necessity but a possibility, and it were folly to reject such possibilities. The question is whether if we inscribe all the possibilities on our banner we try to accelerate the realisation of these possibilities. I believe that it is quite possible that at the eleventh hour a so-called workers' government should come which would not be a proletarian dictatorship. But I believe when such a government comes, it will be the resultant of various forces such as our struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, the struggle of the social-democrats against it and so forth. Is it proper to build our plans on such an assumption? I think not, because

I believe that we should insist on our struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

This does not mean to say that we ought not to make any partial demands.

We should draw up partial demands, and we have done so in every struggle, inasmuch as these were necessary for the struggle of the working masses for the improvement of their lot, and to weaken the chains of bondage.

This war can end in victory only when our slogans and our ideology are perfectly clear and well understood by every soldier. Only in this manner can the working class carry on the struggle consistently towards the ultimate goal.

Kolarov: I am going to address you on behalf of the Balkan Communist Federation.

Comrade Zinoviev said that our Federation has hardly functioned during the past year. Unfortunately this is true. Our efforts to make the Federation a political centre for the Balkan Parties have been only partially successful. The work is only just beginning, and it will require the continued united efforts of the Balkan Parties and the effective assistance of the Executive of the International to bring the work to a satisfactory conclusion. Now that the Rumanian Party has been put on its feet, and the Yugo-Slav Party is in course of reorganising itself by adapting itself to the conditions of illegality in which it finds itself, there is every reason to believe that the Communist Balkan Federation will soon become an important factor in the Balkan revolutionary movement.

I want to emphasise the fact that the Balkan Parties are in full agreement with the general lines of policy of the Executive Committee since the Third Congress. They are of the opinion that the resolutions of the International Congresses were rightly interpreted by the Executive which acted according to the spirit of these resolutions. As to the tactics of the United Front, the Balkan Parties accepted them from the very first. The Bulgarian Communist Party studied and laid down the manner of the application of these tactics in Bulgaria in a detailed resolution which was put before its last Congress. The same thing happened at the recent Conferences of the Yugo-Slavian and Roumanian Parties. The Constantinople Turkish Communist Party has also accepted these tactics. In addition to the theoretical adhesion to the tactics of the United Front, the Balkan Party has endeavoured to put them into practice. The Bulgarian Communist Party had occasion to use them repeatedly, and with very good results. It is owing to these tactics that the Party was able to make an impression on the government clerks and officials, the most inert proletarian section of the country, and to draw it into the struggle under the effective leadership of the Communist Party. In Yugo-Slavia and Roumania the bourgeois and the petty bourgeois parties, which were hitherto the leaders and protectors of these proletarian elements, see their influence dwindling. The social-democrats have categorically refused to form a United Front with the

Communist Parties in these countries, which does not prevent the latter from enjoining the masses to be united in their struggle. The experience of the Balkan countries proves that the United Front tactics, if wisely interpreted and applied, is an effective means of revolutionising and uniting the masses even in the industrially backward countries.

The problem of the workers' government does not arise in the agricultural Balkan countries, and therefore I will not dwell on it.

In view of the great importance of certain steps taken by the Executive, notably its intervention in the internal affairs of the French, Italian, Czecho-Slovak and Norwegian Communist Parties we generally approve the viewpoint adopted by the Executive Committee on this matter.

Such intervention, although painful at times, will be always necessary and useful as long as there will be parties within the International which are in many ways unsatisfactory.

It is self-evident that a rigorous discipline is a vital necessity for the International as well as for its sections. All the Communist Parties recognise this fact and are loud in proclaiming it. However, the only real guarantee for the observation of international discipline is the united opinion of all our sections on all the great sections of the program, the organisation and the communist tactics. Differences of conception cannot help resulting in lack of discipline. A proof of this is the example of the French, the Italian and other parties. One of the essential tasks of the Communist International is to create and to foster unanimity.

Seidler (Czecho-Slovakia): Comrades, on behalf of the Czecho-Slovak Delegation with the exception of Comrade Vajtauer, I declare our complete accord with the activity of the Executive since the Third Congress.

On various occasions, when the situation was serious, the Executive intervened very successfully in the development of the Communist movement in Czecho-Slovakia. This country is inhabited by proletarians of the Czecho-Slovakian, German, Polish, Hungarian and Ukrainian Nationalities. The formation of a united international and, organisationally centralised party may be considered to be the greatest success of our last year's activities. We had several Comrades who feared that it would be impossible to overcome all the difficulties in view of the fact that we had to work among a working class of various nationalities with different traditions, national prejudices and illusions, which were rendered more complex by the language difficulty. We are able to state to-day that these problems have been solved. That this is so, is greatly due to the decisions and advice which we receive from the Executive. The decisions of the Executive concerning the organisational shortcomings of the Party, the United Front and the question of trade union tactics, have been especially useful.

Landler (Hungary): Comrades, Comrade Zinoviev spoke very briefly and very diplomatically on the Hungarian question, I mean on the Hungarian movement, and remarkably energetically against the emigrés. He demanded that the Congress should take up an energetic attitude towards this question of emigration. I am of the opinion that such an attitude is too diplomatic. I am quite sure that no one in the hall has understood anything about this matter.

The situation is as follows: A group of leaders of the Communist Party working at present in Hungary (according to authentic reports) will probably be put forward before a special court, and will be sentenced to death. The majority of this group of leaders are emigrés and belong to the faction to which I had the honour to belong at that time. These emigrés returned to Hungary some 12 months and others 9 and 7 months ago. At a time when our factional struggle was at its height, and our factional group had taken up an isolated position, they worked singlehanded against the social-democratic and the Horthy regime without saying a word about the factional struggle. They worked with heroic self-abnegation, with devotion to our cause and with great success. They published in Budapest a weekly illegal paper, ten consecutive numbers of which appeared. Not a single social-democratic public meeting was allowed to pass without a demonstration for the Third International being made. On the question of political influence, I should like to refer to the fact that there was not a week, nay even a day on which the organ of the social-democratic Party did not protest against our agitation. In spite of persecutions and social-democratic denunciations the emigrés leaders remained at their post and worked to the last minute. I say it once more that neither in the press, in the agitation, nor in the entire work was the factional struggle ever mentioned, although it raged within the ranks of the emigrés. They sent regularly reports to the Executive by a confidential official, who also belonged to the former anti-Kun group. The Executive did not reply to any of these reports. (Hear, hear.)

Under such circumstances I must protest energetically against the way in which the emigrés were treated here by Comrade Zinoviev. To bring up the question of the emigrés when since the Session of the Enlarged Executive, namely, for nine months, no factional struggle has taken place, is to say the least out of place.

I have, therefore, to ask the Congress to adopt the following resolutions: (1) To admit the delegation of the Hungarian illegal organisation in addition to the delegation of the Hungarian Communist Party nominated by the Presidium.

The Hungarian organisation have at present only one representative from Hungary, but the emigrés have delegated two more delegates. The two representatives who belong to the emigrés were not allowed to come to the Congress because they belonged to our former faction. I ask you to decide that they be admitted to the Congress.

2. "To include in the agenda of the Congress the Hungarian question, the question of the organisations established in Hungary, to appoint a commission for the discussion of this question, the composition of the commission to be the same as that for the other commissions."

3. "The Congress protests against the criminal atrocities attending the examination of the recently arrested Hungarian Communists, and against their being brought before a Star Chamber in order to be condemned to death. The Congress expressed its admiration of and sympathy with the courage with which the Hungarian Comrades work for the revolution despite the tortures inflicted on them by the white terror."

Comrade Katayama (Japan): The Japanese Communist Party has approved the report of Comrade Zinoviev. I will speak here only of the United Front as applied to Japan. The Japanese Communist Party is underground and is still young, but we have been working openly through the Trade Unions and by other means. Our unions are fighting unions, having no traditional difficulties. When we started the propaganda movement against the Washington Conference all the trade unions co-operated to fight and make propaganda against this bourgeois, capitalistic, imperialistic conference at Washington. Then when the Government introduced a bill against all radical movements in Japan the trade unions of all shades, Anarchist, Syndicalist, Communist and Moderate, came together to make effective propaganda so that the Government finally backed down.

We have started a movement under the name of "Hands off Russia," which was similar to that organised in England and now all trade unions and all radical associations are co-operating to fight against intervention and for the recognition of Soviet Russia. We could not do anything for the Russian famine, but with the change of government we started the Russian relief work and now not only trade unions, radical associations, but also even the petty-bourgeoisie co-operated to aid the Russian famine.

The united front policy will strengthen the Communist movement and enable us to gain our ends.

Rakosi (Hungary): Comrades, I must confess to you that I do not very willingly limit myself in the discussion to the Hungarian question.

Comrades, what is the Hungarian emigration? It is that portion of the Hungarian Communist Party and the Hungarian working class movement, which has had to seek refuge abroad. What has been the nature of the Hungarian Communist Party? It had an energetic and swift period of fruition, which lasted only four months. In four months it seized power, which it retained four and a half months. These eight and a half months could, of course, not suffice to thrash out the various differences of opinion, on matters of, and tactics involved in the upbuilding and consolidating of a Communist Party. The Hungarian Communist Party went into emigration, where the many practical and

theoretical differences of opinion could not be passed through the test of actual practice in the daily struggle, neither could they be settled by activity, mass action or daily contact with the workers.

These differences continue to exist, and manifest themselves mainly in personal strife and abuse.

The Executive has occupied itself for ten months with this question and has taken great trouble in solving the fundamental doctrinal differences as soon as possible. Because these theoretical differences were of too petty a nature, no adequate steps could be taken. This fact remains, however, that the political emigrants engaged in a quarrel during ten months, pamphlets were published which were a rare tit-bit for the social-democrats, who published long leaders in the "Vorwaerts," in which they threw mud upon our revolution, our Soviet Dictatorship, the Communist Party, and the Communist International. The Executive had to take a position with regard to this matter, which occupied the first enlarged session of the Executive. In such a situation it was not only the right but the duty of the Executive to remove this cancer with a keen knife. For a hard knot, a sharp plane is needed. After such a scandal, the Executive could do nothing else than extirpate this malignant growth, with all possible energy. These are the main outlines of this factional struggle.

I am in complete accord with the last part of Comrade Landler's speech in which he proposes that the World Congress express its sympathy with martyrs protesting against their persecution. I also wish to say that the Communist International lost no opportunity of aiding the Hungarian proletariat whenever possible. You, comrades, know well that we have succeeded in releasing 400 Hungarian Comrades from Horthy's dungeons; and I can also state that the Executive immediately took steps to free the present group of arrested comrades from the vengeance of white "Justice." We have nothing against an investigation of the Hungarian question. I would, however, energetically, protest against handling this question as one of factional struggle, even in disguised form. As Comrade Landler has suggested, the matter must go either to the Executive or to the Congress. The Hungarian Party, and the Hungarian emigrants have contributed sufficient material for the Second and Two and a half Internationals, and that which Comrade Landler has put before us to-day is nothing more than digging up offal which had already been buried. I am absolutely opposed to having this matter considered from the point of view of factionalism. (Applause.)

Marshall (America): Comrades, as representative of a group in the American Party which has been accused by Comrade Carr of having failed to harmonise its actions with the decisions of the Executive of the Communist International, I would like to declare that this group agrees completely on every question with the policy of the Executive.

What conflicts have developed in the American Party within recent times? The International decided on the application of

the United Front. The question before the American Party was a clear judgment of the situation, and an appropriate application of the policy. The judgment of the majority of the Executive of that time was opposed. The Executive declared that the application of the United Front in America did not mean, politically, the union with other more or less revolutionary groups and parties, because such groups and parties did not exist. In America, the United Front meant that we should awaken the proletarian masses to political consciousness and then lead them into the struggle. The capitalists themselves helped us in such a solution of the problem. They began the offensive against the working class with all weapons at their disposal. The worker who went on strike to-day found himself opposed tomorrow by the police, the militia, the State government and the national army. You have all read how a judge in Chicago settled the recent railroad strike simply by forbidding it. This use of political weapons against the working class awakened them to the consciousness of their common interests. Till then, such consciousness had not existed among the masses. They had lost their identity in the two great bourgeois parties, the Democratic and the Republican. But now resolutions are pouring in from the large workers' organisations, as the Brotherhood of Railway Workers, with a membership of half a million, the miners, whose Miners' Federation numbers half a million members, the machinists' organisation, with 200,000 members. In these resolutions, and at their congresses, the workers of the United States demand that an organisation be created which will represent them as a class in the political struggle. Such resolutions attest two things: first, in their origin, they point to the awakening political class-consciousness of the workers; second, the number of such resolutions shows the attempt of their leaders to destroy this spirit.

What is the duty of the Communists in this situation? It seems to me that three paths stand open to us; oppose this spirit, which will finally result in the creation of an independent working class party; remain passive in the face of such a spirit; or assume the leadership of it. The former majority of the Central Committee decided for the last, that is, it decided to direct this movement, to take the initiative for the benefit of the masses. This was the fundamental conflict which developed in the American Party on the question of the United Front. Comrade Carr characterised this not as propaganda, but as treason to the Party. These views and this appreciation of the situation do not conflict in any way with any of the theses, resolutions, or orders of the International. If we have erred it is the duty of the Fourth Congress to point out our error.

In concluding, I would like to say a few words on the question of the support of Meyer London's candidature. Comrade Carr, as an honest man, dared to say that there was a group in the party which favoured the withdrawal of the Communist candidate out of friendship for Meyer London, so that the latter might be elected. What is the truth of the matter? Meyer

London is the only candidate of the Socialist Party, who had begun to gain a footing among the Jewish working masses. However, we were not strong enough yet to compete with the Socialist Party which finds its strongest support in this element. What did we do then? We put up a candidate, conducted our campaign as Communists against the Socialist Party, but at the last moment we withdrew our candidate with a declaration to the workers that we did not withdraw because we believe Meyer London a good representative of the workers, but because we had not yet been able to convince the workers of that district that Meyer London was not a good representative, and we wished to give his constituency the opportunity of seeing this with their own eyes. I believe that this was the only possible policy, the one that should have been carried out. Comrade Carr and his friends opposed this policy, but they were too modest to propose any other. However, this is no time for modesty. We have a problem before us to solve. Either we solve this problem, or we abdicate as Communists and as Marxians. (Applause.)

Sullivan (America): Comrades, you have heard two representatives from America. Yesterday you heard the representative of the Centre, Comrade Carr. He at least has good intentions. I do not agree with them. He has some very pleasant illusions—the illusion, for instance, that in the American Party the Right Wing and the Centre can work together for Communism. I consider these illusions as harmful. But still he is honest. Just now, you heard another representative of the American Party, Comrade Marshall of the Right Wing. He is the representative of the Mensheviks. He is not honest. He wears a mask over his face. He comes here before you, revealing a little of his real face, saying that we must elect Meyer London, the social patriot to Congress, if not, then the Communist movement will vanish from America.

I happen to represent the Left element in the Party, 4,000 of whom were expelled and 1,000 themselves left the party last January. We were expelled by the faction of Marshall that ruled the party up to September this year.

I have a criticism to make on the work of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. The Executive Committee of the Comintern has supported the Right Wing of the American Communist Party too much. And the result of it we see in America to-day—the Party is going down. If there is unity achieved now, it is only partial unity, and artificial unity. It will not last because the Right Wing and Centre cannot work together and cannot stay for long in one organisation. I criticise the Executive Committee for having forgotten to apply the 21 points in America. Otherwise, we would not have heard the representative of the Right Wing here. To show you the kind of propaganda that was conducted by the Right Wing, I will give you some quotations. These quotations are from the official organ of the Party—the official legal organ of the Party under control of the Party, under the control of Marshall and his Executive

Committee. The first is on the Genoa Conference. The official organ of the Party that was conducting Communist propaganda wrote as follows:

"Nevertheless the Genoa Conference is the first honest attempt of the European rulers to repair the damage of the war."

In the name of Communism, Mr. Marshall praised the Genoa Conference of the imperialistic bandits.

Marshall: Did I write that?

Sullivan: You were on the Executive Committee and you were responsible. The organ was under your control. You did not contradict it. It was an official editorial of the Party. "The first honest attempt of the European rulers." That was the kind of Communist propaganda put out in the name of the Third International. There is another still better. I will ask the Presidium if it will be possible to put among the pictures where Caplan is shown shooting at Lenin, to put among the social revolutionary pictures one copy of the official organ of the American Party, that was published by Marshall—he is responsible for the policy. He says:

"Besides the political situation at the present time would make it more than foolhardy to undertake to punish acts committed in the first revolutionary period too severely."

Was this a policy of Communism?

Marshall: Will you produce those papers?

Sullivan: I will produce them in the American Commission. You do not think that I have them, but you know it is so. (Interruption.)

Chairman: I ask that you will not interrupt the speech, because the speaking time is limited.

Sullivan: If it gets under the skin of some people here I cannot help it, I am very glad of it.

Marshall did not care to say that he and the Right Wingers in the Party insist that the illegal party must be liquidated. It conducted a campaign in order to liquidate the underground Communist Party, and have just the legal organisation to remain with a programme within the lines of bourgeois legality, just as the old Russian liquidators of 1906 and after did. They were for the same big mass party. They promised a big mass party in America with 100,000 members, and now it has come down to only 14,000 members according to their own figures, a centrist-menshevik party that is a small sect.

Well, I cannot say all I have to say because there is not time, but, so long as the Communist International will not say that the Right Wing Mensheviks must be expelled from the Party, you will not see a healthy Communist movement in America.

Vujowick (Young Communist International): Comrades, the Young Communist International has always approved and still approves the policy of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It is of the opinion that during these fifteen months the Executive Committee has carried out the decisions of the Third Congress in the spirit and in the letter.

The Young Communist International, on whose behalf I am addressing you, wishes to emphasise one particular point of Comrade Zinoviev's speech. I refer to the formation of Communist nuclei in all the workshops and factories. It is of the opinion that the time has come to put into practice the theses adopted on this particular point by the Third Congress.

Another point seems to us equally important, and that is the centralisation of the Communist International and discipline within the Communist International.

The Young Communist International has already shown by the activity of its organisations in the various countries that it believes in discipline and Communist centralisation.

In France and in other countries where the Executive Committee met with a certain amount of resistance on the part of the Communist Party, the Young Communist Leagues were always the first to give the necessary support to the attitude of the Executive Committee within the Communist Parties.

The Young Communists severely condemn the various breaches of discipline which took place during the period covered by the report of the Executive Committee. We trust that such things will not happen in the future, and that all the Communist parties will show that the theses and the resolutions, which formed the basis of the Communist International, which were accepted everywhere in various resolutions in the course of several congresses, will be respected not only in words, but every section will show in all future revolutionary struggles that Communist discipline exists and is really applied.

Malaka (Dutch Indies): On behalf of the Communist Party of Java, I wish to speak on the importance of the question of the United Front for the oppressed masses of the East. I should like to put several questions to Comrades Zinoviev and Radek. Perhaps Comrade Zinoviev did not mean that Java must have a different United Front. Perhaps our United Front is different from the others. However, the decision of the Second Congress of the Third International means that we must form a United Front with the revolutionary nationalists. Thus, our United Front is not a United Front with the social-democrats but with the revolutionary nationalists. Two of the most popular forms of nationalist tactics against imperialism are the boycott and the liberation struggle of the Moslems—of Pan-Islamism. It is on these two forms that I should like to put the following question: Firstly, should we or should we not support the national boycott movement; secondly, should we support Pan-Islamism? If so, how far shall we go?

I am ready to admit that a boycott is not a Communist method, but it is a method which under the political and military enslavement of the East is one of the most effective weapons, and we have seen that the 1919 boycott in Egypt against British imperialism, and the great Chinese boycott in 1919-1920, were crowned with success. The last boycott movement took place in British India. We may assume that this year or next year another form of boycott will be applied in the East. We know, of course, that the boycott is not our method but rather the method of the petty bourgeoisie and of the nationalist bourgeoisie. We are confronted with the question, should we or should we not support these tactics? And how far shall we go? Pan-Islamism is a long story. First of all, I will deal with our experiences in India where we collaborated with the Islamists. We have in Java a very large union comprising many very poor peasants, viz., Sarakat Islam. Between 1912 and 1916 this union had one million members, perhaps it had three or even four millions. It was a very large proletarian union which sprung up spontaneously, and was very revolutionary. Until 1920 we collaborated with this union. Our Party, consisting of 13,000 members, went to the National Assembly and carried on propaganda. In 1921 we succeeded in making Sarakat Islam adopt our programme, and it went into the villages agitating for the control of production and for the watchword: "All power to the poor peasants and to the proletariat." Thus, we carried on the same propaganda as our Communist Party, only sometimes under another name. However, a split occurred in 1921, owing to the tactless criticism of the leaders of the Sarakat Islam. The government, through its agents, made use of this split, and also of the decision of the Second Congress of the Communist International to fight against Pan-Islamism. The government agents said to the simple peasants that the Communists did not only want to create a split among them, but also that they wanted to destroy their religion. This was too much for a simple Moslem peasant. The peasant thought to himself that he had already lost everything in this world, and that he was not willing to lose heaven as well.

Therefore, the question of Pan-Islamism is very important.

It is also very important to understand the meaning of Pan-Islamism. Once it had a historic meaning and meant that Islam must conquer the whole world with the sword. At present Pan-Islamism is a nationalist liberation struggle, because Islam for the Moslems is everything; not only religion, but also the State, the economic system, the food, in fact everything. Thus Pan-Islamism now means the fraternity of all Mahomedan peoples and the liberation not only of the Arabian, but also the Indian, Javanese and all other oppressed Mahomedan peoples. This fraternity is called the liberation struggle against the British, French and Italian capitalists, consequently against world capitalism. Therefore, I ask once more if we should support Pan-Islamism in this sense, and in how far we are to support it. (Loud applause.)

Comrade Zinoviev: Comrades, you will allow me to discuss in some detail the question of Workers' Government. It is not yet quite clear to me whether there are serious differences of opinion with regard to this question, whether this question has been completely ventilated, or whether a good deal of our differences were caused by variations in terminology. In the course of the Congress, and during the working out of the resolution on tactical questions, with which we shall deal after the question of the Russian Revolution, this will become clear. As far as I am concerned, the question has nothing to do with the word "pseudonym" which has been quoted here. I am quite willing, under these circumstances, to give up the word. But the main thing is the significance. I think, comrades, that the question will be made clear if I express myself as follows: It is clear to us that every bourgeois government is a capitalist government. It is hard to imagine a bourgeois government—the mule of the bourgeois class—which is not at the same time a capitalist government. But I fear that one cannot reverse that saying. Every working class government is not a proletarian government; not every workers' government is a socialist government.

This contrast is radical. It reveals the fact that the bourgeoisie have their outposts within our class, but that workers have not their outposts within the capitalist class. It is impossible for us to have our outposts in the camp of the bourgeoisie.

Every bourgeois government is a capitalist government, and even many workers' governments can be bourgeois governments according to their social composition. I think that the main point is, there are workers' governments and workers' governments. I believe that one can imagine four kinds of workers' governments, and even then we will not have exhausted the possibilities. You can have a workers' government which, according to its composition, would be a Liberal workers' government, for example, the Australian Labour Government. Several of our Australian comrades say that the term workers' government is incorrect because in Australia we have had such workers' governments of a bourgeois nature. These were really workers' governments, but their composition was of a purely Liberal character. They were bourgeois workers' governments, if one may so term them.

Let us take another example: The general elections are taking place in England. It is not probable, but one may as well accept in theory, as a possibility, that a workers' government will be elected which will be similar to the Australian Labour Government, and will be of a Liberal composition. This Liberal workers' government in England can, under certain circumstances, constitute the starting point of revolutionising the situation. That could well happen. But by itself, it is nothing more than a Liberal workers' government. We, the Communists, now vote in England for the Labour Party. That is the same as voting for a Liberal workers' government. The English Communists are compelled, by the existing situation, to vote for a Liberal

workers' government. These are absolutely the right tactics. Why? Because this objective would be a step forward; because a Liberal government in England would disturb the equilibrium and would extend the bankruptcy of capitalism. We have seen in Russia during the Kerensky regime how the position of capitalism was smashed, despite the fact that the Liberals were the agents of capitalism. Plekhanov, in the period from February to October, 1917, called the Mensheviks semi-Bolsheviks. We say that this was an exaggeration. They are not semi-Bolsheviks, but just quarter-Bolsheviks. We said this because we were at war with them, and because we saw their treachery to the proletariat. Objectively, Plekhanov was right. Objectively, the menshevik government was best adapted to make a hash of capitalism, by making its position impossible. Our Party, which was then fighting the mensheviks, would not and could not see this. The parties stood arrayed for conflict. Under such conditions, we can only see that they are traitors to the working class. They are not opponents of the bourgeoisie, but when, for a period, they hold the weapons of the bourgeoisie in their hands, they make certain steps which are objectively against the bourgeois state. Therefore, in England, we support the Liberal workers' government and the Labour Party. The English bourgeoisie are right when they say that the workers' government will start with Clynes and finish in the hands of the Left Wing.

That is the first type of a possible workers' government.

The second type is that of a Socialist government. One can imagine that the United Social Democratic Party in Germany forms a purely Socialist government. That would also be a workers' government, a Socialist government, with the word—Socialist—of course in inverted commas. One can easily imagine a situation where we would give such a government certain conditional credit, a certain conditional support. One can imagine a Socialist government as being a first step in the revolutionising of the situation.

A third type is the so-called Coalition government; that is, a government in which Social-Democrats, Trade Union leaders, and even perhaps Communists, take part. One can imagine such a possibility. Such a government is not yet the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it is perhaps a starting point for the dictatorship. When all goes right, we can kick one social-democrat after another out of the government until the power is in the hands of the Communists. This is a historical possibility.

Fourthly, we have a workers' government which is really a workers' government—that is, a Communist workers' government, which is the true workers' government. I believe that this fourth possibility is a pseudonym for dictatorship of the proletariat, that it is truly a workers' government in the true sense of the word. This by no means exhausts the question. There can be a fifth or sixth type, and they can all be excellent starting points for a broader revolutionising of the situation.

But, in order to construct a workers' government in the revolutionary sense, one must overthrow the bourgeoisie; and that is the most important. We must not forget that we have here to distinguish between two things: (1) Our methods of agitation; how we can best speak to the workers, how we can enable them best to understand the position. For that purpose, I believe the slogan of "Workers' Government" is best adapted. (2) How will events develop historically, in what concrete forms will the revolution manifest itself?

We must look at the question from all sides. It is nevertheless difficult to make any prediction. If we now look at the slogan of the workers' government from this new standpoint, as a concrete road to the realisation of the proletarian revolution, we may doubt whether the world revolution must necessarily pass through the stage of the workers' government. Our friend Radek said yesterday that the workers' government is a possible intermediary step to the dictatorship of the proletariat. I agree, it is a possibility, or more exactly an exceptional possibility. This does not mean that the slogan of the workers' government is not good. It is a good instrument of agitation where the relation of forces makes it possible. But if we put this question: is the workers' government a necessary step towards the revolution? I must answer that this is not a question that we can solve here. It is a way, but the least probable of all. In countries with a highly developed bourgeois class, the proletariat can conquer power by force alone, through civil war. In such a case an intermediary step is not to be thought of. It might take place, but it is useless to argue here about it. All that is necessary is that we see clearly all the possible ways towards the revolution. The workers' government may be nothing more than a Liberal Labour government, as it might be in England and in Australia. Such a workers' government can also be useful to the working class. The agitation for a workers' government is wise, we may gain many advantages therefrom. But in no case must we forget our revolutionary prospects. I have here a beautiful article by the Czecho-Slovak minister, Benisch. I will read you a passage.

The "Tschas," organ of minister Benisch, writes, on September 18th: "The Communist Party is building the United Front of the workers on a slogan of a fight against unemployment.

"We cannot deny that the Communists are clever. They know how to present to the workers the same thing under different forms. For instance, some time ago, the Communists began a campaign for the formation of Soviets. When they saw that this campaign was unsuccessful, they stopped their agitation, but resumed it a year and a half later under the mask of United Front committees. The United Front of the proletariat might become a tremendous force if based on progressive ideas, but the ideas of Moscow are not progressive."

This bourgeois is right, I believe. We Communists who deal with the masses intellectually enslaved by the bourgeoisie,

must make all efforts to enlighten our class. I have said that a workers' government might be in reality a bourgeois government. It is our duty to enlighten in all ways the more receptive sections of the working class. But the contents of our declaration must always remain the same.

Another thing, comrades, Soviet government does not always mean dictatorship of the proletariat. Far from it. A Soviet government existed for eight months in Russia parallel with the Kerensky government, but this was not a dictatorship of the proletariat. Nevertheless, we defended the slogan of the Soviet government, and only gave it up for a very short time.

This is why I believe that we can adopt the policy of the workers' government with a peaceful heart, under the only condition that we do not forget what it really amounts to. Woe to us if we ever allow the suggestion to creep up in our propaganda that the workers' government is a necessary step, to be achieved peacefully as a period of semi-organic construction which may take the place of the civil war, etc. If such views exist among us, we must combat them ruthlessly; we must educate the working class by way of telling them—"Yes, dear friends, to establish a workers' government, the bourgeoisie must be first overthrown and defeated."

The International must adopt the right tactics, but there are no tactics by means of which we could outwit the bourgeoisie and glide smoothly into the realm of the workers' government. The important thing is that we overthrow the bourgeoisie, after which various forms of the workers' government may be established.

I shall now dwell upon the most important parties, following the same order as in my first speech.

Accordingly, I shall begin with Germany. Comrade Fischer, who after all appeared much less terrible than some would have imagined—(laughter)—reproached us by saying that the Third Congress had not had a wholly good influence upon the German Party. This accusation she should have advanced against the Third, but not the Fourth Congress. However, we are the successors of the Third Conference, and we stand ready to render account. I do not believe that the reproach was justified. We do not need to exaggerate and say that we have saved the German Party. It is not we who have saved it, but the German proletariat itself. Nevertheless, I believe that the Third Congress acted correctly—"Quite true!" Some say that the Levi question was not correctly handled. Permit me to say that this is not so. Do not forget that during the Third Congress even the best militants were doubtful in this question.

This same doubt prevailed among our Russian delegates. Some of them thought that after all Levi was a clever fellow. Perhaps he can settle the question better than we can. It appeared, however, that this task and the duty of the Third Congress was to see that Levi be the only one to pass over to Noske, or at least that he go in very small company. Geyer and company are not of much importance. We let him have

them willingly, and a few more with them. But the danger existed that he could take away with him part of our Party. In this matter the Third Congress has given a certain amount of assistance to our Parties and has enabled them to take up the right attitude and to save the best elements for the revolution. Thus, in this respect, Comrade Ruth Fischer was somewhat in the wrong.

As to the Rathenau affair, Comrade Radek already emphasised that we regard this part of her criticism as justified. At the time of the Rathenau assassination, we sent a confidential communication to the German Party when the action had already begun, expressing to our Central Organisation in Germany our opinion on this matter.

With your permission, I will put before you a few quotations from this letter. The letter is dated June 18th, and was therefore written when the fight was at its height:

"As to the attitude of the Party, we have followed as much as possible all that is going on in Germany. We have read your report very carefully and are grateful to you for the details which it contains. The tactics of the first days, as described in the "Rote Fahne," are, in our opinion, weak. One should not adopt as a slogan, "The republic! the republic!" in a situation such as this. One should, on the contrary, put evident proof before the masses from the very first that the present Germany is a republic without republicans. One should show to the wide working masses, which are less concerned about the republic than about their economic interests, that the bourgeois republic, far from being a guarantee for the class interest of the proletariat, is on the contrary the best weapon for the oppression of the working masses in the present situation. We must not blow the horn together with the Social Democrats and the U.S.P. The independence of our agitation work should never, never, never, be sacrificed to the United Front policy. This is for you a condition sine qua non. We are willing to negotiate with the S.P.D. and the U.S.P., but not as poor relations, but as an independent power, retaining its own character and putting before the masses the full programme of the Party." I believe that this question is a sufficient proof that we warned our German Party in a good time against this weak point of the Rathenau campaign. We went even further than that, for we asked if the German Party could not take up a more energetic attitude. Of course, it did not behove us to tell the German Party that it should at once begin an action, declare a strike, etc. This kind of thing must be decided upon by the Party itself. We did, however, raise the question of the possibility of an immediate, independent and energetic action by our Party. I am convinced, as far as I can judge the situation, that there was no possibility for such action. It would have resulted in nothing but bloodshed. The Central Committee did not commit such a mistake, and in spite of many shortcomings, it made the best of the situation.

Now I turn to our French comrades. I regret to observe that not all shades of opinion in the Communist International

have found full expression in the debate. Many remained silent, and this was not praiseworthy. Comrade Duret was perfectly right when he said that whenever the boys of the Left Wing have something on their minds, they promptly say it openly, and at times with excessive candour. This is a good trait of the Left; but the other comrades who sit a little further to the Right are persistently silent, and this is bad. On considering what has been said in this hall one cannot help seeing that a Centrist semi-Democratic mood is present in the ranks of the Communist International, or at least in its close vicinity.

But we intend to speak not only about the things that have been said here openly, but also about the things that have been left unsaid, because it is only in this way that a real picture of the situation can be obtained. I regret that it is not possible for me to select a single speech made by a French comrade of the Centrist camp which could serve as a theme for discussion. It is to be hoped that this will be possible later on in the course of the Congress.

With regard to the speech of Comrade Duret, I believe that Comrade Bukharin has taken him to task somewhat too severely.

Nevertheless, his arguments will have to be examined a little more closely. Some of them have already been disposed of. He said that the masses in Germany are organised and in France they are not, that the United Front is applicable to Germany, but not to France. Comrade Duret should be told that he entirely ignores the real significance of the idea of winning over the majority of the workers. It is certainly a loose mass, like the sand on the sea-shore. This is our handicap. We must combine this loose mass and mould it, and this is much easier to do in France, just because the movement there has no traditions. In Germany, the worker, in order to change his membership card, has to undergo quite a big internal struggle. That is not the case in France. At the very beginning of the Communist International we said that the social democracy is the greatest obstacle to the revolution. It can be argued that the stronger the social democracy, the more difficult it is to organise the United Front. You in France are lucky that social-democracy has not been so strong. It is for this very reason that you will succeed more readily, if you will but prosecute a truly revolutionary policy, if you will build up a truly Communist Party. It was further said, that in France the United Front was immediately interpreted as an electoral combination for political purposes. Perhaps that is so. But why did you not start in the sphere of trade unionism, why not in the economic field? In both of these fields there is no possibility of opposition in principle. The only opposition in principle comes from Comrade Bordiga, but he is wrong. Why did you not take up the question of the eight-hour day? Now you come and tell us that your Party is too weak, etc. You are too weak because you have misconstrued this question.

In this connection, I would like to say a word or two in response to Comrade Rosmer, in order to conclude with the

French question. This morning he quoted my words to the effect that a party that was not active in the trade unions was not to be taken seriously and that a party which did not understand the trade union movement as a revolutionary movement is also not to be taken seriously. Rosmer said he agreed with the first proposition but he did not agree with the second one. He thought he should take into consideration the objective difficulties which were quite insurmountable. Nevertheless, I must insist that it is a very important question; the trade union movement is the present time movement. No doubt there are objective difficulties which should by no means be under-estimated. For instance, the Shop Stewards' Movement in England has in many places gone to sleep, which goes to show that a revolutionary mass movement had not yet arisen in that country. But we must see quite clearly that when there is a real revolutionary party it is bound to bring about such a movement in a short time. I am firmly convinced that when our Party in Germany will become sound it will within six months achieve the beginning of a serious trade union movement. Strikes take place; we have the strikes at Le Havre, which have lasted for three or four months. At Le Havre the masses were almost unorganised. The Party did nothing in the beginning. In the face of such strikes as these it is quite possible for a Party like ours, having a central organ with 200,000 subscribers, to initiate a trade union movement in a short space of time. I therefore think we should fight shy of such weak-kneed elements who always say: Alas, it is difficult, there are obstacles. Of course there are obstacles, but a great deal depends on ourselves. Therefore, I think that I ought to insist on my second proposition.

There is yet another thing I would like to emphasise in the speech of Comrade Duret. He said that after the split of the Centre there was a danger of some of them coming over to us and swamping us. In this he was right. It is because of this that we rejected them when they wanted to join us. But they joined among themselves and declared: We are forming our own International. That was the 2½ International. First there was a split, now there is a junction of the majority of these elements with the Second International, but a part of these gentlemen will knock at our door, and we will then have to be careful to keep the door shut tight and flourish the 21 conditions once more before their noses. We may even have to say then: These 21 conditions do not suffice for these fellows! We may have to present to them 42 conditions. (Hilarious approval.) Otherwise, all these fellows will sneak in, and to-morrow we shall have the same crisis over again.

I now come to the situation in Italy.

This in particular has been the most painful side of the whole of our discussion. One feels convinced that the Party led by Bordiga is at bottom a sound workers' party, a revolutionary workers' party which has accomplished a great deal of good, and yet one is often constrained to combat them theoretically and politically. This is the painful side. But party duty compels

us to tackle this painful matter. Comrade Bordiga started by arguing against our thesis of winning the majority of the working class. He said that it was a vague formula, that one could not understand what is really meant by it, and he demanded that we strike out of the resolution all reference to winning a majority of the working class.

This was the subject of the first fight between Comrade Lenin and Comrade Terracini. I must confess to having felt a sort of pity for Terracini at the time, it seemed to me that Comrade Lenin had handled him somewhat too roughly. It seemed impossible that these people could really be in opposition to the majority. Meanwhile the Fascisti have been victorious, the Italian Socialist Party is broken up, and a multitude of other events of world importance have taken place. Yet even now Comrade Bordiga gets up on the platform and says: "The majority is a vague formula." I must now confess that Lenin was right. These people were apparently afraid of the majority. Bordiga quite seriously put the question: How shall the majority be counted? In our resolution it was stated that we should bring the majority of the working class under the influence of Communists. How shall we know that we have won the majority? We will not call in a chartered accountant for the purpose. We will not even ask Comrade Bordiga to find for us a suitable Italian notary or a witness furnished by Mussolini to certify that Communism has the majority in Italy. I believe that the trade unions should be the first standard to go by; also other standards would be found to indicate to us when we have won the majority. This does not mean to say that we should postpone our fighting until we have organised the majority of the workers. This is considered by Bordiga as a sort of bargain-hunting. He labours under the impression that to-day the Executive faces towards the Right, and to-morrow towards the Left. This I must say is an error which should be eradicated. If this is not done, the Party is simply lost. How can the Party start work without possessing the requisite energy, without being conscious of its principal aims? This is surely not a vague formula. Bordiga takes exception to my statement that some parties have increased their influence, although remaining weak numerically. Nevertheless, it is a fact. The whole thing lies in the question of influence. To organise the majority of the workers immediately is a matter of impossibility; it will be possible only after the conquest of power by the proletariat. Even in Russia, only now, in the fifth year of the revolution do we claim to have organised the majority. In other countries it cannot yet be thought of. But the Communist Party can secure influence over the majority now. Yes, there are parties which are backward numerically, although they have strengthened their influence. I will quote to you an instance of a distant country, New South Wales. There we had a Party which numbered 500 members. After we had accepted it into the Communist International, it increased its membership to somewhere between 900 and 1,000. But this small Party has brought

the trade unions of that country—a quarter of a million workers—completely into the Profintern, with great discipline and with great enthusiasm. This is a good example. We will not say: Please organise the majority. We know only too well how to value the initiative of the minority. It is certainly a splendid group of 500 workers that has managed to influence 250,000 workers.

Just a few words more about the Italian trade unions. I read lately an article which was probably written by Comrade Terracini. He deals with the Fascist trade union movement. The Fascisti are establishing all over Italy their own trade unions—a new and very important phenomenon. They want to become a mass organisation. As to the attitude of the workers, it can be illustrated by the following example. In one large factory the owner dismissed all the workers and declared that henceforth he would take none but Fascist workers. After a little consideration the workers obtained Fascisti cards and were taken on again. Soon after, an election of the factory committee took place in this factory, with the result that the Fascisti obtained one per cent. of the votes, while an overwhelming majority of those elected were Communists. This was a very clever move on the part of the working masses, who had a very good idea of what really was at stake. They said to themselves, we will procure the cards in order to avoid brutal treatment, but we will nevertheless remain revolutionary. But we must consider what we must do while the Fascisti are capturing or organising trade unions. It goes without saying that we must penetrate into Fascisti trade unions in order to win them over to our side. And yet what do we see? Our comrade publishes an article in which he explains the nature of Fascism, syndicalism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The article is full of very clever arguments, only one thing is missing: the soul, the live masses, the only things which we should say and bring into the trade unions in order to overcome the bourgeoisie. The only necessary idea was missing in this article, and therefore the watchword was still-born. I believe this article was reprinted in the "International Correspondence." Read this article, and try to find in it a live watchword by which the man in the street will learn how to penetrate into the stronghold of the enemy. You will not find any such watchword in it. This is just an illustration of what is really wrong with our otherwise splendid and brave Italian Communist Party.

A few more words about Spain. I think that Comrade Accebedo's speech was extremely interesting. His most important statement was—that Spain has been very successful with the United Front tactics. The Spanish comrades were against these tactics. At the Enlarged Session of the Executive one of the Spanish comrades voted against the United Front tactics together with Comrade Renault. Experience has shown that our comrades in Spain have also been very successful as far as the syndicalists and anarchists are concerned. This should be a

good example for us, and I advise our friends of the French Party to follow it.

I am coming now to Czecho-Slovakia. I am not going to castigate Comrade Vajtauer once more, for he has already been severely punished. All I wish to say is that as far as we are concerned, the matter cannot be considered as ended simply because Comrade Neurath has proved that the programme of the opposition is perfectly worthless. I am ready to admit that the opposition is helpless. It is very easy to realise this. Moreover, it is even very easy to prove scientifically that they are followers of Proudhon, although one cannot be sure that many of them have read Proudhon or have even heard his name. But this does not solve the question, which must be dealt with as a live question just as it stands.

As you know, our Comrades in the Central Committee of the Czecho-Slovak Party are complaining that it was wrong on our part to reinstate the opposition, and some German Comrades are supporting them in that complaint. It was said that by this action we have undermined the authority of the Czecho-Slovak Central Committee. I do not think that this is so. I trust that the authority of the Czecho-Slovak Central Committee and of the Czecho-Slovak Party is so firmly established that it cannot be undermined even by such an erroneous step. I am of the opinion that Comrade Vajtauer's speech will increase the authority of the Central Committee, and will explain the whole matter to the workers. But working people, even though they be devotees of Proudhon without knowing it, should not be expelled at once. We should on the contrary have patience with them and should endeavour to persuade them. Comrades from all the countries must take part in this. You must bear in mind that this was sprung on us a month before the World Congress, and took us entirely by surprise. Why should we therefore be too hasty over this matter? It was our duty to put the whole matter before the International. We had a notion that they had perhaps worse things than Proudhonism in store for us. I therefore, trust that workers with an International spirit will think this matter over twenty times after the Congress will have spoken before they sever connection with the Party.

Matters have become more complicated than we expected. It is not a question of authority, but of something much more important. It is a question of the interest of the Party as a whole, and of the interests of the International as a whole, and I am of the opinion that at this Congress we must endeavour to solve this question in such a way that these workers should remain with us in spite of all the errors which they may have committed. Nothing, of course, can be done with those who do attach more importance to the philosophy of a Vajtauer than to the International. I trust, however, that the majority will take a different view in this question. They will remember at the decisive moment that we are not an International such as Vajtauer represented it, but that

there is only one proletarian International which is of the greatest importance for every worker. I am convinced that it is precisely these left wing workers who will have such a conception as will bring them back to us.

I am coming now to the Poles and to the speech of our Comrade Dombsky. I cannot quite forgive Comrade Dombsky that he committed a grave political error already before the Third Congress. It was Dombsky who, during the Russo-Polish war, wrote an article which contained the following passage: To bring the Red Army and the bayonets of the Soviet Government to Poland is not a communist policy (interruption by Comrade Dombsky). Comrade Dombsky, I have known you for the last nine years and know that you find it difficult to keep quiet when you are being criticised. Nevertheless, I would ask you to remain calm. You adopted, at first in a letter and subsequently in the "Rote Fahne," an attitude which we termed at the time as the most genuine nationalism. Every proletarian with any common sense will admit that in the event of the bourgeoisie of one country holding down the proletariat with bayonets, the latter will be only too glad if a red army, be it a Hungarian, Italian or even French red army came to its assistance. This would be the opinion of every worker. (Applause.) Of course, Comrade Dombsky is not a nationalist. This was only a small remnant of the past which many a comrade imbibed with his mother's milk, it is a remnant of the P.P.S. ideology. The Polish intellectuals as a whole are afflicted with nationalism, even some of our best Comrades are tinged with it. Comrade Dombsky committed this error fifteen months ago. I am not saying this in order, so to speak, to demand his head. If he has something to teach us to-day, we are quite willing to learn, but, nevertheless, we will bear in mind that he has been guilty of that political error.

Now I am coming to the lesson which he taught us to-day. I have already discussed what Comrade Dombsky said about the majority. We are perfectly aware that we have not yet the majority in Poland. We cannot take the elections, recently conducted by Pilsudsky as a criterion. We know that Pilsudsky is an opponent and that the bourgeoisie has falsified the election. We are perfectly aware of all this, but we also know that we are not very far from a majority. We have not got it yet, but we shall probably have it in the very near future.

He also said that the United Front was all right in all the other countries, but not in Poland. This is the same kind of ideology of which we had an example to-day.

In all the other countries the Executive may assume the role of a dictator and may apply the United Front tactics, but in my country it is a different matter, the conditions are different, and so is the working class and the Party. To this I say that the United Front tactics are most suitable in a country like Poland. I notice in the Central Organ of the P.P.S. in Warsaw a daily column with the heading "Long live the Workers and Peasants' Government." I can read it to you in Polish.

In Cracow we learned some Polish from Comrade Domb'sky. What does this mean? It means that the watchword of the workers' government finds an echo in all the sections of the masses. You said that we carry on this demogogy because this watchword promises to be successful with working masses. Comrade Domb'sky says we must be against the workers if these watchwords are already so popular with the masses that even the social traitors are having them continually on their lips. This is all the more reason for us to insist on the watchword of the United Front. We must keep the watchword continuously before the masses. We know that the Polish workers and peasants are not in favour of a bourgeois government, but that they are in favour of a workers' government. Therefore, although you are their representatives, we propose to work for a workers' government and a United Front. This shall be the slogan in the agitational campaign. The situation in Poland has certain features of its own, but it is precisely for this reason that we want to apply the United Front tactics there more than anywhere else.

Now a few words about Norway. I say that there were twelve papers in Norway that call themselves Social-Democratic, and Comrade Haakon-Meyer told me quite maliciously that there were forty such papers. Probably they all bear the title "Social-demokrat." Our Party in Norway is strong, and therefore much is expected of it. When we heard the short statement by the young academician, we said at once to ourselves that the comrades were mistaken. One section of the Mot-Dag group is good, but the other is not under the control of the Party. It comprises young academicians, of whom it may be said that up to 25 years, they are rabid revolutionaries, at 26 they begin to change, and at 30 they are well established barristers and opponents of the working class. We are afraid of these academicians. Those who have really learned something should accept the Party discipline and should go to the workers in order to help them in their struggle for emancipation. It cannot be tolerated that after having been eighteen months in the movement they declare the Communist International not to be sufficiently independent. We must insist on coming to a very definite conclusion on the Norwegian question, and I trust that we shall succeed in this.

Comrade Varga's speech showed very conclusively that it is better to eat one's fill than to be hungry, that bread is better than hunger and that the legend about the hunger must be done away with. But this is not the question, for, firstly, it was a severe famine, so we had to tell the working classes. Things are now somewhat improved, and naturally we shall tell the working masses that the Russian toilers are no longer starving—I am in agreement with Comrade Varga on this matter. We shall tell them that the position of the Russian worker is improving daily. We shall not rejoice overmuch, until it has become a definite fact. We shall go to the workers with facts and figures. Step by step, we shall ameliorate the conditions of our workers;

and then tell the workers of other lands of this. But this is not the matter under dispute, but something quite different. There is no longer famine in Russia. But we must admit that, in other countries, the dictatorship of the proletariat may cause a famine. Shall we refuse to tell the workers this bitter truth? We cannot avoid it. We must tell the workers just how the matter stands. In Russia we had five terrible years; in other countries the period might be shorter. The dictatorship does not necessarily imply famine; this depends upon various factors. But in many lands it would be probably accompanied by a famine. It would be opportunism and cowardise not to say this to the workers. We can't say to the workers: "To-morrow everything will be fine; you will have meat and a good home." This would be laying ourselves open to attack by the reformists. The question is not whether I should tell the workers of other countries that there is no more famine in Russia; it is whether they will be visited by famine. They must be told this fearlessly. And the worker knows what life is, he knows the advance guard of the working class must tell him this quite frankly.

I wanted to spare the Congress a sterile debate, but Comrade Landler's speech makes this impossible. Comrade Landler has expressed himself as though I had shown myself to be against all political emigration. Comrades, you heard my speech. Was that really the case? I said that our Italian friends would probably not be able to avoid organising emigration centres. The Finns had such, and we, the Russians, also had them. I know well how to appreciate an emigrant organisation which looks after its people. We should never dream of speaking of them in the same tone as that in which Comrade Herr Ebert has spoken of the political groups abroad. But, Comrade Landler, you have overshot your mark. There is also a type of emigration which harms the movement and poisons it; and we had such a case in a portion of the Vienna emigrés, whose representative stands here to-day upon the platform in the person of Comrade Landler.

There are 4,000 Communists in Hungary, says Comrade Landler. I hope there are more. However, I would very much like to know the opinion of these 4,000 comrades; whether they are with the Communist International Executive, or whether they are for the Vienna clique, which has been so ably represented here by Comrade Landler. I hope they will be for us, and not for the Vienna clique.

Comrade Landler spoke in the name of those who are in prison in Hungary. Unfortunately, we cannot speak with these comrades. It might be possible to have them brought to Moscow. But we have here people who come to us from Hungarian prisons, and who were sentenced to death or to life-long imprisonment. We rescued them and brought them to Russia. What do these comrades say? Are they for Comrade Landler? No! They are against Comrade Landler, they are against the whole Viennese affair, and they are for the International. We did every-

thing we possibly could to clear up the Vienna mess. It was a fine spectacle for the Two-and-a-Half International. The German, French, English and other Comrades will all remember how the papers handled this affair and how much it damaged us. That was a real treat for those people; it was a real Vienna schnitzel for Friedrich Adler. (Laughter.) And it was Comrade Landler who did this, and now he wants us to do it all over again. We are opposed to such a commission, we have had enough commissions. The International gives you its word that it will clean up the situation, but only on condition that there be no new emigration affairs of this kind; and the comrades must be told this, firmly and clearly. All honour to the emigrés who support the movement, but down with such emigrés as feed the Second-and-a-Half International with propaganda material. We have had enough of that kind.

I would just like to put one more question. Comrade Radck said that danger threatened us from the Right and not from the Left. I would like to emphasise these words, and express myself in full agreement with them. It is not a matter of the goodwill to the various comrades and groups, but it concerns the objective situation. We must see this clearly. Still worse times could come and so we must strengthen the Communist International and maintain it as the advance guard of the proletariat. Only in so far as we have a genuine international organisation which will fight every trace of opportunism by word and deed, can we hope to win. To-day I said in a commission, that we sometimes hear from our friends that in principle they are in agreement with all that the Executive does. That is how it always begins, so I quoted a few words from Bismark, who once said: "Whenever we old diplomats say we are for a thing in principle, we are against it in reality." We do not need this sort of thing in the Communist International. Whoever is against the tactics of the Communist International should now say so clearly. Whoever is for them should be so with all their heart and soul. Then we shall build up a real International, that will light up the obscurity of the world, such an International as will at the first opportunity lead the working class to battle and to victory. (Loud applause.)

101

"FIVE YEARS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION"

SESSIONS HELD, November, 13-14, 1923.

Reporters, Comrades Zetkin, Lenin, Bela Kun and Trotsky.

Comrade Zetkin (Germany): Comrades—As five years ago, so to-day the Russian revolution stands before us as the most formidable historic event of the present period. Scarcely had this giant stretched its mighty limbs, and had plunged into the stubborn and passionate struggle for his existence and further development than cleavages occurred within the working classes of all countries, which were more acute than they had ever been before. "Long live Reform," "Long live the revolution!" Such was from all sides the reply to the call of the Russian revolution. This situation gives to the Russian revolution a quite definite and far-reaching significance.

About the middle of the 90's of last century, a definite political orientation had arisen within the working class which was so to speak the ideological sediment of the imperialist capitalism and of its repercussion on the conditions of the working class. Theoretically, we called this orientation—revisionism, and in practice it was opportunism. What was its nature? Its opinion was that the revolution had become superfluous and avoidable. The revisionists, the reformists of to-day, asserted that capitalism produces within itself the organisational forms which overcome or at least palliate the imminent economic and social conflicts, thus neutralising the theories of impoverishment, crises, and catastrophes. This, on the outbreak of war, led to the ignominious failure of the Second International. The proletariat did not respond to the lesson of the world war by an International alliance for world revolution and for a general settlement of accounts with capitalism. On the contrary, it responded by the alliance of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie of their respective so-called fatherlands. When at the conclusion of the world war capitalism proved itself incapable of overcoming the catastrophe, when the bourgeoisie showed that it was incapable and unwilling to reconstruct the world out of the chaos which had been created, the opportunist leaders of the working class clung all the more tenaciously to their theory of reformism. They gave it a new interpretation. They said that Socialism and Communism will arise not out of the collapse of Capitalism, but out of its reconstruction and its revival.

Comrades, in this stifling atmosphere the Russian revolution acted like a thunderstorm. The Russian proletariat was the first, and unfortunately is, up till now, the only one (apart from

that in the small Soviet republics which sprung up within the former Russian Empire), which drew logical and practical conclusions from the imperialist war and from the collapse of Capitalism. The Russian revolution commenced the actual liquidation of revisionism, of reformism, the liquidation which will be finally accomplished by the world revolution

Thus the Russian revolution is to the world proletarian masses the supreme expression of the life, the strength and the firmness of the social factors of historic development, of the conscience, the will, the action and the struggle of the proletarian masses for the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism.

It has been asserted that the fact of the proletarian revolution having begun in Russia is due to the weakness of the Russian bourgeoisie. It is said that it is only owing to the weakness of the bourgeoisie in Russia that the revolution has taken the formidable and menacing form it has. This is true, but only to a certain extent. I venture to say that the strength of the revolutionary will and of the revolutionary actions of the Russian proletariat, which, imbued with the revolutionary spirit, and having received its ideological training from the Bolshevik Party, became the arbiters of the world's destiny, were more important factors in making Russia the birth-place of the revolution than the weakness of the bourgeoisie.

In history the seizure of power by the Soviets under the leadership of the Bolsheviks appears as a brilliant isolated deed, as though it were accomplished at one stroke. But such was not the case. This intrepid deed was preceded by months of the most zealous and tenacious propaganda and organisation work by the Bolsheviks among the masses. Not only was the support of the broad masses assured them through this struggle, but the Bolshevik war-cries were understood by the masses and they made them their aims of struggle. So the act of revolution was not a revolutionary acrobatic feat of a daring little party, but a revolutionary deed of the great revolutionary masses.

Comrades, as soon as the Russian workers, supported by the Russian peasants, had seized political power and were proceeding to build up their dictatorship through the Soviet system, another historical truth came to light. It was the truth which Engels expressed in a letter to Bebel of December 11th, 1884, in complete refutation of the babblings of the reformists of all countries, that democracy is the only road by which the emancipation of the proletariat may be attained. He wrote: "Pure democracy in the period of revolution may assume new importance as the last safety anchor. That is why the so-called feudal bureaucratic forces (in the period from March to September, 1848) supported the Liberals in order to keep the revolutionary masses down. In any case, our only enemy in the day of crisis and afterwards will be the reactionary forces grouped around the pure democracy; and this I believe should not be lost sight of."

This "pure democracy" was regarded by the Russian proletariat since the revolution as the class rule of capital, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The solution advocated by the democrats in their struggle against Soviet rule, was the Constituent Assembly as opposed to the Soviets.

The petty bourgeois Socialists, the reformists, in alliance with the bourgeois parties in all countries, demanded the Constituent Assembly. This demand found an echo even in our own revolutionary ranks. I wish to remind you that no less a person than the great theoretician of Communism, Rosa Luxemburg, at one time put forward the same demand, namely, the Constituent Assembly and the Soviets as backbone of the proletarian State. The significance of this demand may be seen from the fact that it made its appearance again a short time ago. During the Kronstadt uprising a section of the social revolutionaries, and even the leader of the Cadets, Milukov, raised this cry for the Constituent Assembly and Soviets; but naturally Soviets without Communists, in other words the body without a soul, words without action. The Constituent Assembly declared from the very start that it did not intend to co-operate with the Soviets, but to oppose them. It denied the right of the Soviets as a State power, thereby denying the revolution itself. The existence of the Constituent Assembly beside the Soviets would have given the counter-revolution a legal rallying point to carry on its illegal and legal work against the revolution. Therefore, down with the Constituent Assembly, all power to the Soviets! This was the only possible slogan if the political power were to remain in the hands of the proletariat.

The first word of the Soviets was the word of peace. But not peace in a pacifist sense, as I will show later. Soviet Russia demobilised, retired from the world war. But what was the answer it received to its word of peace? The armies of the German Imperialists in whose ranks were the Social-democrats with the Erfurt programme in their knapsacks, hurled themselves on Petrograd and invaded the Ukraine and other territories. The Entente launched an attack upon the Soviet power and rendered political, financial and military assistance to the counter-revolution. A Red Army had to be created if the Soviet power was to be saved. It meant the organisation and use of force against force. Besides the Red Army, which was one of the forms of the force called for the defence of the existence and independence of the workers' government on the battlefield, there was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the Terror. Both these forms of force were an unavoidable historical necessity, as harsh weapons of self-defence if the Soviet State was to survive and develop.

Because of the influence of reformist leaders there are still large masses of the working class who do not understand the historical necessity and the real nature of terror. They abuse the Red Army as an expression of Soviet Imperialism; they were especially indignant over the "barbarism" of the Terror. But let us look at things as they really are. The Red Terror

was the answer of the Russian revolution to the White Terror of the more powerful bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie not only attempted to destroy the political power of the workers by plots and insurrections, it also used its whole influence to prevent the reconstruction of the social and economic life of the country. The Soviet Terror was nothing but an unavoidable policy of self-defence. None of the reformists mention the facts that were it not for the severe measure of the revolution, millions and millions would still be suffering from the barbarian capitalist oppression and exploitation, the prey of misery and death.

Utterly erroneous, however, is the contention of our reformist and bourgeois opponents that the Soviet power exists thanks to force alone. The state cannot maintain power for long with only the aid of bayonets. The eight months of Coalition government in Russia and especially the months of the Kerensky regime of Social Revolutionists, gave ample proof of this. The statement applies especially to an epoch of revolution, in which days count as months and years as decades or centuries. The Soviet Power had to justify its existence by an active policy.

Among the first decrees of the provisional government came an appeal to other governments and nations on behalf of peace. This appeal made it perfectly plain that those who issued it were not under the spell of bourgeois pacifist illusions, but were demanding peace as a revolutionary act of the proletariat, as the first step to the world revolution. The workers of Germany, Great Britain and France were specially reminded that they had already done great and valuable services for humanity, and that it behoved them, therefore, to do their duty now by the deliverance of mankind from the miseries of war.

The appeal of the Soviet Republic for peace by war of the proletarian revolution was lost in the void.

The Soviet Republic was forced to make peace with the Zwei-bund—the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. This Peace greatly accentuated the difficulties of the internal situation of the young proletarian State. The Social Revolutionists, the most compactly organised power of the counter-revolution in Soviet Russia, made this peace the pretext for scandalous incitements against the Soviet Power, declaring that the Soviet Power was responsible for the military collapse and the strengthening of German Imperialism. But in reality Brest-Litovsk was for German Imperialism the direct route to Versailles and the Peace of Versailles. The victory mania of German Imperialism flamed fiercely. All the forces of the Central Powers were staked upon the war. Then ensued the collapse of German Militarism and German Imperialism. Now, among the forces leading to this collapse we must unquestionably number the Russian revolution and its example as one of the strongest factors in undermining the will to war of the German and Austrian armies. For the time being, however, there was no fulfilment of the hopes of the Russian revolutionary leaders that the world revolution was going to run a rapid course. The counter-revolutionaries twitted

the Bolsheviks for their conviction that the Russian revolution was merely to be the prelude of the imminent world revolution.

Comrades, mockery is easy enough, but there is no justification here for the jibe. The leaders of the Russian revolution recognised very clearly the trend and the aim of the incipient world revolution. As to the tempo, they may have been mistaken. Why? The aim and the trend of any historical development are plainly perceptible. They are displayed by the work of the objective forces of society. But the tempo depends mainly upon the subjective energies of the historical process; that is to say, in the case we are now considering, upon the revolutionary consciousness and activities of the proletarian masses. In the estimate of this factor so many imponderabilities are concerned that it is impossible to prophesy confidently concerning the tempo of the world revolution. But what the wiseacres of universal history stigmatised as an error of calculation has become one of the strongest motive forces maintaining the persistent energy of the Russian revolution. This error of calculation has been ten times, a hundred times, more fruitful in its influence far beyond the boundaries of Soviet Russia than all the would-be clever recipes of the self-satisfied calculators. The inviolable conviction that the world revolution must progress, that it would complete what had been begun on Russian soil—this conviction gave the Russian proletarians the confidence, the religious faith in the world revolution and in the revolutionary solidarity among the workers of all lands which still keeps the masses of Soviet Russia fresh, enthusiastic in the fight, eager for work, bold and resolute, after five years of fierce struggle.

Let us pass from the peace policy of the Russian revolution to its economic policy. The economic policy was to create the steadfast energy of the revolutionary proletariat. It was to revolutionise society.

From the first, the revolution turned its proletarian side outwards. Its economic policy had to manifest a tendency towards the Communistic goal. If the political Soviet Power aimed at realising Communism, it must abolish private property in the means of production. Nor would this suffice. It must reorganise the whole economic structure of society, purposely in the Communist direction. This was a mighty task, and the attempt to solve it has exposed the tragic side of the Russian revolution. The tragedy lies in this, that there is a contrast between the clear and passionate will to realise Communism here and now, in all its perfection, and the weakness and backwardness of the existent economic and social conditions under which this will has to operate.

In view of the numerical strength of the peasant population of Russia, it is impossible for the revolution to make good without an agrarian policy that should commend itself to the peasant masses in Russia. Eighty per cent of the population are small peasants, nine-tenths of whom are estimated to be working peasants. The revolution, the seizure of political power by the proletariat, would have been absolutely impossible in defiance

of the will of those masses. I will go further, a revolution would have been impossible without the active support of those masses. Whoever desired the proletarian revolution in Russia must perforce swallow the Bolshevik agrarian policy. You could not have the one without the other.

Agriculture in Soviet Russia is characterised by the small peasant farms. At the beginning of the revolution, the only big agricultural concerns worth mentioning were to be found only in Poland, in the Baltic provinces and in some parts of the Ukraine. What does this mean for the solution of the agrarian question as recommended by the old Socialist prescriptions? There was no apparatus for agricultural production capable of carrying on agriculture on a large scale. As things stood (taking also into consideration that the Central Power was not very strong at the beginning), the agrarian reform had to be, strictly speaking, the work of the peasant masses themselves, and could not help being chaotic.

Is it true that the Bolshevik agrarian policy is putting unsurmountable obstacles in the way of the development of agriculture in the direction of Communism? I cannot admit this. Notwithstanding the new policy, the land has not become the private property of the peasant. It has remained the property of the proletarian State. The peasants receive it for use, but can neither sell it nor leave it to their heirs. The exploitation of hired labour is prohibited. Moreover, the small peasant farms have been linked up with the general national economy, not only by the food tax, but also by a number of decisions, regulations and instructions concerning the agricultural exploitation of the land. The Soviet Government is deliberately and systematically directing the development of agriculture along co-operative lines. This is also partly done by the initiative of the peasants themselves who, under the pressure of last year's famine, showed inclination to establish artels and co-operative societies. Neighbours' Leagues have been formed for the joint purchase and use of machinery, horses, etc. The Soviet Government is also endeavouring to establish a number of Soviet estates and to encourage the establishment of co-operative estates and agricultural concerns. It is true that the Soviet estates and co-operative concerns with up-to-date agricultural organisations are like small islands in a huge ocean of small peasant farms, which are estimated to number twelve millions. However, they can play an important role as industrial, technical and social model institutions, and there are proofs that they have already to a great extent fulfilled this role.

This brings me to the following conclusion: Even though the Bolshevik agrarian reform has not been able to solve the agrarian question in a way leading to immediate realisation of Communism, it has in no way turned the agrarian development away from the goal of a Communist society. On the contrary, it has introduced innovations which, economically, socially and culturally head the small peasantry towards Communism, and will continue to lead it along the path.

unions and of the co-operatives in all the conflicts of the workers with the industrial, trade and business capital.

There is one more fact. I venture to say that Soviet Russia is to-day, notwithstanding its poverty and the disorganisation of its economic system, the State with the most advanced labour protection and social welfare legislation. Trade unions and co-operative organisations in conjunction with the Soviet organs are entrusted with the supervision of the proper application of the labour law and of social insurance; and also with their improvement and development. They are the real executors of the social reforms. The activity of the trade unions and co-operative organisations in relation to social reform was formerly considered by the reformist groups as a threat to Capitalism and so prevent revolution. Practical experience shows that the reformers were right in asserting that effective social reforms, with the assistance of the trade unions and co-operative organisations, are out of the question before the conquest of political power by the proletariat. It is only after the conquest of the political power by the proletariat that the activity of these organisations can be used as an effective means for leading the entire economic system towards Communism.

The Russian Revolution need feel no shame at the alleged smallness of its accomplishments. The Russian Revolution has accomplished more than any revolution before it. It has not remained stationary, it has developed far beyond its original purpose. With fire and sword, Russia has been cleared of its old feudal institutions, with a thoroughness which no bourgeois revolution has known. Look at England, the cradle of the bourgeois revolution, in spite of long years of bourgeois class rule, there still remain strong traces of the old feudal order. Look at Germany, the country of the latest bourgeois revolution. The first victory of the revolution, and the republic which followed, a happy patch of an Ordesch manufacture. In Soviet Russia, Czarism could never return, nor even a modern capitalist State. The proletarian revolution has brought into the consciousness of millions so many germs of a new productive life that this life can never be destroyed. Soviet Russia will remain as a proletarian State. It is the first type of a proletarian State in its period of transformation from Capitalism to Communism. As such, all it does and does not do, all its accomplishments, well as its mistakes and its weaknesses, are fruitful of lessons for the world proletariat and for the world revolution. The proletariat of Russia and the Russian Communist Party have paid dearly to learn how political power is conquered and maintained. They must suffer now to learn how a proletarian State, abandoned by the world proletariat, can transform itself slowly into a Communist society.

So is forged the sword of the World Revolution, which will free mankind from the ruins of the world war, let new life flourish. In this period the highest, most powerful, most fruitful

Lenin summed up the situation in 1917. What, he asked, were the immediate economic tasks after the conquest of the State power? They were the socialisation of the great industries, the means of transportation, the banks, the State monopoly of foreign trade, and the control of production by the workers. The proletarian revolution went forward beyond these measures under the pressure of the opposition of the bourgeoisie in Russia and outside Russia. It had to defeat its enemies by further measures of confiscation. Thus the Russian Revolution was carried beyond the limits of its immediate aims.

When people now whine that the revolution is beaten, that it is in flight, it is untrue. The Russian Revolution has retired to its initial position in good order, retaining all the advantages which it originally wished to possess. Certainly Capitalism returns, that Capitalism whose might was broken. It returns not merely in the form of the petty proprietor, but also as the lessee and concessionaire. It is obvious that these gentlemen have no disinterested desire to take part in the progressive Russian economic life, to build it up and to serve it through cultural methods. They follow a "realistic" aim, that of making profit, the greatest possible profit. But, comrades, the Capitalist returns to Soviet Russia no longer the absolute master of his own enterprise. He is no longer master of the State. The Soviet State reckons itself as the trustee, appointed by the proletariat, of all the means of production, all natural resources, and all human labour power. The interests of the proletariat are supreme law to the State. By legal conditions, the State renders it impossible for foreign or home capitalists to plunder natural resources. The capitalist is also prevented from increasing his profits, however large they may be, through extreme and inhuman exploitation. The proletarian State is fully conscious that the greatest wealth of Soviet Russia is its toilers, who produce all values. It is fully conscious that the Russian proletariat is not going to stay at its present level of living and working. No, it will raise to a far higher level its physical, spiritual, and professional capacities, and its ethical and cultural activity, in order to become the creators and the defenders of the complete Communist society.

Therefore, in the inevitable conflicts between Capital and Labour in the leased and concessional industrial concerns, the trade unions and co-operative organisations will play again a very important role as the fighting organs of the proletariat, and will carry on a very fruitful activity. What will, on the other hand, happen in the non-Soviet countries in which the capitalists are also the political masters? In such countries, the State power is only an obstacle to the activities of the trade unions and co-operatives. It interferes in the conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and this interference always benefits the capitalists, unless the working class be strong enough to hold the State power in check. In Soviet Russia, on the other hand, the State power will be always at the back of the trade-

and most creative form of historical development is the Revolution, the expression of the proletarian masses. (Prolonged applause.)

Lenin: Comrades, I was put down as principal speaker on the list, but you will understand that after my prolonged illness I am not in a position to make a lengthy report. I can only give the introduction to some of the more important questions. My remarks will have to be quite brief. The theme of "Five Years of the Russian Revolution, and the Perspectives of World Revolution" is altogether too comprehensive and too big for one speaker to exhaust in one speech. I therefore will pick out only a small part of the subject, namely, the question of the New Economic Policy. I choose solely this small part advisedly, in order to introduce this matter, which is—at least to me—the most important of all, because I am engaged on it just now. I will therefore speak of how we started the New Economic Policy and what results we have achieved by it. By confining myself to this question I hope to be in a position to give you a general survey and a general conception of the subject.

To begin the story of how we started the New Economic Policy I must recall to you an article written by me in 1918. In that year, in discussing the subject, I touched upon the question of how we would have to tackle the problem of State Capitalism. I wrote then:

"Compared with the present economic policy of the Soviet Republic—i.e., the economic situation of that time—State Capitalism represents a step forward. If we could, for instance, introduce State Capitalism here in the course of half a year it would be a tremendous success and the best guarantee that within a year socialism will be strong and invincible in this country."

This was said at a time, of course, when we were much more foolish than now, but not so foolish as to be unable to tackle such problems.

In a word, in 1918, I was of the opinion that State Capitalism represented a step forward in comparison with the economic situation of the Soviet Republic at the time. This sounds rather strange and perhaps contradictory, for at that time our Republic was a Socialist Republic; at that time we carried out day by day in rapid succession—perhaps in far too rapid succession—all kinds of new economic measures which we could not term otherwise than socialistic. And yet I declared at that time that State Capitalism would be a step forward compared with the then prevailing situation of the Soviet Republic. I therefore found it necessary to illustrate my point by enumerating the elements of the economic structure of Russia. These elements I represented then as follows: (1) A patriarchal, that is, an exceedingly primitive system of land tenure; (2) petty production of commodities; to this group belonged the majority of the peasants who deal in grain;

(3) private capitalism; (4) State Capitalism; (5) Socialism. All these economic elements were represented in Russia at that time. I took the trouble of explaining the co-relation between these elements, suggesting that we might perhaps put a higher value on the non-socialist element, namely, on State Capitalism, than on socialism. I repeat that it sounds rather strange to declare a non-socialist element of greater value than socialism in a Republic which had declared itself socialist. But it becomes quite conceivable if we bear in mind that the economic situation in Russia at that time could by no means be considered as uniform and of high standing. On the contrary we were quite aware of the fact that in Russia we had a patriarchal system of agriculture, i.e., the most primitive form, and parallel with it a socialist form of agriculture. What part was State Capitalism to play under those circumstances? I asked myself again, which of these elements predominates. It is clear that in a petty bourgeois environment the petty bourgeois element would be on top. The question as I put it then—it was in connection with special discussion that has nothing to do with the present question—was this: What is our attitude towards State Capitalism? And I promptly replied: State Capitalism, although not a socialist form, would be more favourable for us and for Russia than the present form. What does it mean? It means that we do not overestimate the basis and structure of socialist economy, although we have already accomplished the social revolution. Already at that time we had, to a certain degree, come to the conclusion that it would be better for us to establish, first, State Capitalism, and through it to march on to socialism.

I must lay particular stress on this part, for I believe that it explains in the first place the essence of the present economic policy, and in the second place it demonstrates the very important as well as practical consequences which the Communist International might draw from it. By this I do not mean to say that we at that time already had a fully conceived plan of retreat. Far from it. At any rate these few lines of polemics by no means represent a plan of retreat. For instance, not a word is mentioned here about the freedom of commerce, which was an important point, and of fundamental significance to State Capitalism.

At all events there was already a general and vague idea of the retreat. And I believe that also we, as a Communist International, and not only as a country that was and has remained backward in its economic structure, must take that into consideration, particularly the comrades in the advanced countries of Western Europe. Just now, for instance, we are busy with the construction of a programme. I for one believe that it would be the wisest action on our part if we discuss all these programmes in a general way, if we take something like a first reading of them and have them all printed and discussed, but not to have the programme finally established this

year. Why? First of all because I think that we have hardly examined them all. Secondly, because we have as yet given almost no consideration to the idea of the retreat and making the retreat secure. Yet this is a question which merits our utmost attention in dealing with so great a change of the world as the overthrow of capitalism and the building up of the socialist system. It is not enough for us to be merely conscious of how we are to assume the offensive in order to be victorious. In revolutionary times this is not all the difficulty. In the course of the revolution there will always be moments when the enemy loses his head. If we attack him at such moments we may score an easy victory. But such a victory would not be decisive, because the enemy, after calm consideration, after due concentration of his forces, etc., may very easily provoke us into a premature attack in order to throw us back for many years to come. I therefore think the idea of the necessity of preparing for the emergency of a retreat to be of supreme importance, and that not only from the theoretical standpoint. From a practical standpoint also all the parties that are contemplating an offensive against capitalism in the near future should right now think of how to make the retreat secure. I believe that this lesson, in conjunction with all the other lessons of our revolution, will surely do us no harm, and most probably a vast amount of good in many instances.

Having thus emphasised that already in 1918 we considered State Capitalism as a possible way of retreat, I will pass to a review of the results of our New Economic Policy. I repeat at that time it was still a very vague idea. Yet in 1921, after having emerged victoriously from the most important stages of the civil war, Soviet Russia came face to face with a great—I believe the greatest—internal political crisis which caused disaffection not only of the huge masses of the peasantry, but also of large numbers of workers. It was the first, and I hope the last, time in the history of Soviet Russia that we had the great masses of the peasantry arrayed against us, not consciously, but instinctively, as a sort of political mood. What was the cause of this unique and, for us, naturally disagreeable situation? It was caused by the fact that we had gone too far with our economic measures, that we had not made our base secure, that the masses were already sensing what we had not yet properly formulated, although we had to acknowledge it a few weeks afterwards; namely, that the direct transition to pure socialist economy, to pure socialistic distribution of wealth, was far beyond our resources, and that if we could not make a successful and timely retreat, if we could not confine ourselves to easier tasks, we would go under. I believe that the crisis set in in February, 1921. Already in the spring of that year we unanimously resolved—we had no considerable differences on that score—to pass to the New Economic Policy. To-day, after a lapse of a year and a half, at the end of 1922, we are in a position to draw comparisons. What are the results? Has the retreat benefited and really

saved us, or has it failed and the results indefinite? This is the principal question I put to myself, and I believe that this question is also of supreme importance to all the Communist Parties, because if the answer should be in the negative then we shall all go under. I believe that we can in good conscience give the answer to the question in the affirmative, namely, in the sense that in the course of eighteen months that have elapsed we have positively and absolutely demonstrated that we have successfully passed the examination.

This I am now going to prove. To this end I must review briefly all the component parts of Russian economy. First of all let me take up the system of finances and the famous Russian rouble. I believe the Russian rouble may justly be called famous, if only for the fact that its number has already gone beyond the quadrillion (laughter). This is something to start with. This is quite an astronomical figure (laughter). I am sure you do not even realise what that figure means. But really from the standpoint of economic science these figures of the rouble are not important, for one can always strike off the noughts (laughter). We have already done something towards the solution of this economic puzzle, and I am convinced that as we go along we will achieve even more in this particular art. The really important thing is the question of stabilising the exchange rate of the rouble. For this we are working and applying our utmost efforts, and to this task we attach decisive importance. If we succeed in stabilising the rouble for any length of time, and subsequently finally stabilising it, then we have won. These astronomic figures, these trillions and quadrillions will then be of no consequence. We can then put our economy upon a firm foundation and go on with its further development. In regard to this question I believe that I am in a position to submit to you some fairly important and decisive facts. In the year 1921 the period of stabilisation of the paper rouble lasted less than three months; in 1922, i.e., in the present year, although it has not yet closed, the same period has already lasted over five months. I believe this to be sufficient for the moment. Of course, it is not enough if you wish to determine beforehand the ultimate solution of the task in all its details; but this in my opinion is well nigh impossible. The fact just mentioned goes to show that we have made progress since last year, when we started with our new economic policy. If we have assimilated this lesson, and if, as I hope, we will not commit the folly of ignoring future lessons, then we are bound to make further progress along this way. The essential thing is commerce, our greatest need is the circulation of commodities. The fact that in the course of two years time, although we are still in a state of war—Vladivostok has been retaken but a week or so ago—although we are just beginning our systematic and prudent economic activity, we nevertheless succeeded in lengthening the period of the stabilisation of the paper rouble from three

months to five, in my opinion gives us sufficient reason to be gratified. We stand alone. We did not, and do not, get any loans; we get no assistance whatever from the mighty capitalistic states which have been carrying on their capitalistic economy so "well" that even now they do not know whither they are going. In consequence of the Peace of Versailles they have created a financial system of which they themselves cannot make head nor tail. If the great capitalistic states are managing things in such a manner, then I do believe that we, the backward, the uneducated, may already congratulate ourselves on having conceived the all-important question of the stabilisation of the rouble. This is not demonstrated by any theoretical analysis, but by actual practice, and I think this is more important than all the theoretic discussions in the world. Practice has shown that we have achieved something decisive, namely, by moving our economy in the direction of the stabilisation of the rouble, and this is of the highest importance for our commerce, for the free circulation of commodities, for the peasantry, and for the great mass of petty producers.

I now turn to our social aims. The most important, of course, are the peasantry. In 1921 we were confronted with the discontent of a large mass of the peasants. Next we had the famine, which meant the severest trials for the peasantry. All the bourgeoisie abroad were naturally jubilant: "This is the outcome of socialistic economy" they said. Of course, they kept quiet about the fact that the famine was the terrible result of the civil war. All the landowners and the bourgeoisie who had attacked us in 1918 tried to misrepresent the situation as though the famine was the result of socialistic economy. It was certainly a grave and a great calamity, a calamity which almost destroyed all our work of revolution and organisation.

What is the situation now, after this unusual and unexpected calamity, after we have introduced the new economic policy, after we have given to the peasants the freedom of trade? The answer stands out clearly to all who wish to see, namely, that the peasants have managed in the course of one year not only to do away with the famine, but also to pay their taxes in kind so well that already we have hundreds of millions of poods of grain, and that almost without the application of force. The peasants are content with their present position. This we can claim with satisfaction and we believe such proof to be far more important than any statistical data. Nobody questions the fact that the peasants are the decisive factors in this country; and it is the peasants that are now in such a condition that we need fear no hostile movement from those quarters. We say this without the slightest fear of exaggeration. This has already been achieved. The peasantry may be dissatisfied with us in one respect or another, it may complain—that is natural and inevitable—of the inefficiency of our State machinery and management, but any serious discontent on the part of the entire peasantry is absolutely out of the question. This we

have achieved in one year, and I believe it to be a great deal indeed.

I now come to the light industries. We should distinguish between the light industries and the heavy industries, because these two kinds of industry are not in one and the same condition. With regard to the light industries I can safely declare here we have an all-round revival of production.

I am not going into details. It is not my business to-day to quote statistics; but the general impression is based upon actual facts, and I can vouch that there is no untruth and no inexactitude behind it. We have to record a general revival of the light industries and the consequent improvement of the lot of the worker in Petrograd as well as in Moscow. It is less the case in other districts where heavy industries predominate, so that this fact should not be generalised. Nevertheless I repeat the light industries, which show an absolute revival and an improvement of the lot of the worker in Petrograd and Moscow, is the result of it. In both these cities the workers were discontented in the spring of 1921. All that discontent has completely vanished now. We who watch the position and the mood of the workers day by day can make no mistake on that score.

Now, as to the heavy industries. Here I must say that the situation is still difficult. Nevertheless some small improvement has taken place between 1921 and 1922. This entitles us to the hope of improvement in the near future. The means to that end we partly possess already. In a capitalist country the improvement of the situation of the heavy industries would absolutely necessitate the borrowings of hundreds of millions, without which no improvement could be thought of. The economic history of capitalist countries tells us that the upbuilding of heavy industries in a backward country can be accomplished only by means of long-term loans of hundreds of millions of dollars or gold roubles. So far we have received no loans of this kind. All that has been written so far about concessions and such like remains almost entirely on paper. Much has been written about these things lately, particularly about the Urquhart concession. Nevertheless it seems to me that our concession policy is an excellent one. At the same time it ought to be taken into consideration that we have not yet arranged for any real big concession. Hence the situation of the heavy industries is for our backward country a really very difficult question, since we cannot count on any loans from the wealthy states. In spite of all this we see perceptible improvement. We also find that our trading activity has already brought us some capital. This also is of rather modest dimensions, amounting to no more than twenty million gold roubles, but a start has been made. Our trading yields us the means which we can apply to the upbuilding of the heavy industries.

At the present moment, however, our heavy industries are still in a very difficult position; but I believe that we can already

afford to spare something for this purpose, and this we will continue to do even if we have to do it frequently at the expense of the population. We must be thrifty now. We are endeavouring to cut down State expenditure by curtailing the machinery of the State. As to that I will say a few words later on. At all events we must diminish State expenditure, and affect economy as far as possible. Thus we are saving on everything, even on schools. This has to be done, because we know that without the saving and reconstruction of the heavy industries we cannot hope to upbuild any industry, and without them we cannot hope to exist as a self-sustaining country. This we know quite well. The salvation of Russia lies not only in a good harvest for her peasantry; nor in the good condition of light industries which cater for the requirements of the peasantry, but we need also the heavy industries; but the reconstruction of the heavy industries will require the work of many years.

Heavy industry requires subsidies from the State. Unless we have them then, merely as a civilised country (to say nothing of a socialist country), we are foredoomed to perish. In this matter we have now taken the decisive step. We have obtained the means requisite for putting heavy industry upon its own feet. The sum that we have hitherto obtained is, indeed, less than 20 million gold roubles, but we have it; it will be definitely applied to raising the level of our heavy industry.

I think that I have now presented to you in general terms and cursorily, as I announced, the most important elements of our economic system. I believe that enough has been said to enable us to draw the conclusion that the new economic policy has already shown something to the credit side of the account. We have proof now that as a State we are able to trade, to safeguard the strongholds of agriculture and industry, and to advance steadily forward. Our practice has proved this. I think that is enough to get along with. We still have a lot to learn--and we know that we have a lot to learn. We have retained power for five years, and for the whole of these five years we have been at war. Thus we have made a success of things.

This is comprehensible, because the peasants have been on our side. It would have been hard for us to find more zealous supporters than the peasants. Behind the figure of the guard they saw that of the landowner looming, and they hate the landowners more than anything in the world. That is why they were so enthusiastic as supporters; that is why they were so faithful to our cause. It was not difficult to secure that the peasants should defend us against the Whites. The peasants, who had hated war, were now in favour of the war against the Whites, did everything conceivable to support the civil war against the landowners. Nor was this all, for this merely involved the question whether the power was to be in the hands of the landowners or of the peasants. That was

not enough for us. The peasants realise that we have seized power on behalf of the workers, and that our aim is to upbuild the socialist order with the aid of this power.

Herein consisted the most important question for us, the economic preparation of the socialist economy. We could not prepare this in direct fashion, but we had to do it indirectly. The State capitalism we have established is a peculiar form of State Capitalism. It does not correspond to the ordinary conception of State Capitalism. We have all authority in our hands; we have the land, which belongs to the State. This is of immense importance, although our opponents are apt to declare, falsely, that it is of no importance at all. From the economic outlook the ownership of the land by the State is of great importance; it has immense practical significance from the economic point of view. We have achieved this, and I must emphasise that our further activities must lie within this framework. We have already ensured that the peasants are satisfied with us, and that industry and commerce are on the upgrade.

I have already pointed out that our State Capitalism is distinguished from State Capitalism in the literal sense of the term, inasmuch as we not only have all the land in the hands of the Proletarian State, but also the important departments of industry. Above all, while we have farmed out a certain amount of small-scale and medium-scale industry, the rest of the industry remains in our hands. Regarding commerce, I should like to insist upon the point that we are endeavouring to establish, and indeed have already established, mixed companies—that is to say, companies in which part of the capital belongs to private (foreign) capitalists while the rest belongs to us. In the first place we learn in this way how to carry on commerce and retain the possibility of dissolving the company whenever we think it necessary, so that we may be said to incur practically no risk. But from the private capitalists we are learning, and we are seeing how we are to work our way upward and what mistakes we are making. I think I have said enough about these matters.

I should like to allude to a few minor points. It is beyond question that we have made an enormous number of foolish mistakes, and shall make plenty more. No one can possibly be a better judge of this than myself; no one can see it more clearly than I do. (Laughter).

Why did we commit these follies? The reasons are plain. First, because Russia is a backward country; secondly, because it is almost uncultured; thirdly, because it has no helpers. Not one of the civilised countries gives us any assistance. On the contrary, they are all working against us. A fourth reason is the nature of our State apparatus. One of our misfortunes was that we had to take over the old State apparatus. The State apparatus often works against us. It is a matter of history that in the year 1917, when we had seized power, the State apparatus practiced sabotage against us. We were greatly

alarmed, and said: "Please come back to us"—and they all came back. That was our misfortune. We have now an enormous mass of officials, but we still lack a sufficient quantity of trained energies to keep them under proper control. In actual practice we often find that here at the top, where we exercise the powers of the State, the apparatus works all right, whereas lower down the officials do as they please, and what they please to do is to work against our measures. At the top we have a few—I do not know the exact number, I am sure it is only a few thousand, or at a maximum a few ten thousands—of our people; in the lower grades we have hundreds of thousands of officials bequeathed to us from Czarist days or taken over by us from capitalist society. To some extent deliberately, and to some extent unconsciously, they work against us. It is perfectly clear that we can do nothing to remedy this in any brief period. We shall have to work for years in order to modify and perfect the apparatus and in order to attract new energies. We are doing this at a fairly rapid pace, perhaps too rapidly. We have founded Soviet schools; workers faculties have been established in the universities; several hundred thousand young persons are learning, perhaps too quickly. But anyhow the work has been begun, and I think it will bear fruit. If we do not try to go too fast, then in a few years we shall have a mass of young people who will be in a position to modify the whole apparatus fundamentally.

I have said that we have committed a large number of follies; but I must in this connection say something concerning our opponents. When these read us a lecture saying, "Lenin himself recognises that the Bolsheviki have committed an enormous number of follies," I should like to answer them thus: "But you ought to know that our follies are of an essentially different kind from yours. We have just begun to learn, and we are learning so systematically that we are satisfied with our progress. When our opponents—I mean the capitalists and the heroes of the 2nd International—insist that we have committed follies, I should like to make a comparison, modifying slightly the words of a celebrated Russian writer so as to give them the following aspect: When the Bolsheviki commit follies this amounts to saying that the Bolsheviki say 2 plus 2 equals 5; but when our opponents, i.e., the capitalists and the heroes of the Second International, commit follies this amounts to saying that they declare 2 plus 2 equals a wax candle. (Laughter.) That is not difficult to prove.

Take, for example, the Treaty with Koltchak, the Treaty between America, England, France, and Japan. Are there more highly cultured and more powerful States in the world? What was the upshot? They had promised Koltchak to help him, without calculating, without thinking, without watching. This was a fiasco which hardly seems to be humanly credible.

Here is another example, an even more telling one, that of the Versailles Treaty. What have the victorious powers done? How can they find any issue for the present confusion?

I do not think that I exaggerate when I repeat that our follies are as nothing in comparison with the follies committed by the capitalist States, the capitalist world, and the Second International in conjunction. That is why I think that the prospects of the world revolution (this is a theme upon which I propose to touch briefly) are good, and in certain conditions are likely to become even better. It is upon these conditions that I propose to say a few words.

At the Third Congress of 1921 we adopted a resolution concerning the organisatory upbuilding of the Communist Parties, and concerning the method and the substance of their work. It was a good resolution. But the resolution is almost exclusively Russian; it was wholly derived from a study of Russian developments. That is the good side of the resolution, but it is also the bad side. It is the bad side of the resolution because hardly any foreigner (I have read the resolution over again before expressing my conviction) is able to read it. In the first place it is too long, for it contains fifty or more paragraphs. Foreigners are apt to find it impossible to read anything of this sort. In the next place, even if a foreigner should manage to read it through, it is too Russian. I do not mean because it was written in the Russian language, for there are excellent translations into the various tongues, but because it is permeated with the Russian spirit. Thirdly, if by a rare chance a foreigner could understand it, he could not possibly carry it out. That is the third defect.

I have talked matters over with some of the delegates, and I hope that in the later course of the Congress I shall find it possible (not at the Congress itself, for in that I am unfortunately not able to participate) to talk matters over in full detail with a larger number of delegates from various lands. My impression is that we made a great mistake in the matter of this resolution, thereby blocking our own advance.

Let me repeat, it is an excellent resolution. I myself endorse every one of its fifty or more paragraphs; but we did not really know what we were about when we turned to foreigners with our Russian experience. Everything in the resolution has remained a dead letter. If we fail to understand why, we shall make no progress.

I think the most important for us all, Russians and foreigners alike, is that after five years of the Russian Revolution we should set ourselves to school. Now for the first time we have the possibility of learning. I do not know how long this possibility will last. I do not know how long the capitalist powers will give us the opportunity of learning in peace and quietude; but we must utilise every moment in which we are free from war that we may learn, and learn from the bottom up.

The whole Party, and Russia at large, show by their hunger for culture that they are aware of this. The aspiration for culture proves that our most important task consists in this, to learn and to go on learning. But foreigners, too,

must learn, though not in the sense in which we have to learn, namely, to read, to write, and to understand what is read. This is our lack. There is much dispute as to whether such things belong to proletarian culture or to bourgeois culture. I leave the question open. This much is certain, that our first task must be to learn reading and writing and to understand what is read. In foreign lands this is no longer necessary.

Foreigners need something different. They need something higher. First of all they have to learn how to understand all that we have written about the organisation and upbuilding of the Communist Parties, which they have subscribed to without reading and without understanding it. You foreign comrades must make this your first duty. This resolution must be carried into effect. These things cannot be done between one day and the next. That is absolutely impossible. The resolution is too Russian. It is a reflection of Russian experience. That is why it cannot be understood by foreigners, and why foreigners are not content to treat this resolution as a miraculous picture which they are to hang on the wall and to pray to. That sort of attitude will not help us forward. You will have to make a portion of Russian experience your own. How can it be done? I do not know. Perhaps the Fascists in Italy will do us a good turn by showing the Italians how. After all, they are not so highly cultured that the development of Black Hundreds in Italy has become impossible. This may have a good effect. We Russians must look for means of explaining to foreigners the elements of this reason. Otherwise it will be absolutely impossible for them to carry it out.

I am confident that in this sense (we have to say, not only for the Russians, but for foreigners as well) that the most important thing for us all in the period now opening is to learn. We Russians have to learn in the general sense. You have to learn in the special sense that you may gain a genuine understanding of the organisation, structure, method, and substance of revolutionary work. If you do this I am confident that the prospects for the world revolution are not merely favourable, but splendid.

(Loud and long-continued applause. A general acclamation, "Long Live Comrade Lenin.")

Bela Kun: After the reports of Comrade Lenin and Comrade Clara Zetkin, it is now my task to point out the subjective factor of the Proletarian Revolution, to describe the role of the Russian Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution, even if only in fragmentary outline. Comrades, you will permit me in this connection to draw a parallel between the great Russian Revolution and the abortive Hungarian Revolution.

I do not intend to enlarge upon the international and internal political causes which were favourable to the Russian Revolution, and which on the other hand were detrimental to the

Hungarian Revolution. I will only point to the fact that in Hungary we failed to provide, not only what Comrade Lenin described as a plan of retreat, but even a line of retreat. In regard to the Russian Revolution I think that the circumstance which has belied all the Thermidor prophecies about Soviet Russia was the following: In Russia there was a centralised, disciplined, and self-sacrificing Workers' Party in the shape of the Russian Communist Party. The absence of such a party or of anything approaching it in Hungary was the cause of the inevitable collapse of the Proletarian Revolution, notwithstanding all the sacrifices and enthusiasm of the Hungarian Proletariat and poorer peasantry. We in Hungary did not have the benefit of a mature Communist Party, and I am safe in saying that at the time we could not have such a Party. In Hungary influence was brought to bear upon the masses of the proletariat, by the fusion between the class conscious active and determined minority and the social democracy, which together led the masses to the conquest of power. On the other hand, in Russia there has been, and there is now, a Communist Party with years of fighting experience, whose influence in the critical moments of the Russian Revolution was enormous.

This Party, this General Staff, this nucleus, this fundamental group was built up during the long years of struggle. During these struggles the opportunist elements were swept out of the Party, not only mechanically, but also by deliberate elimination. On the other hand, the Russian Communist Party in the course of its struggles not only developed its nucleus, became welded to the nucleus. It has become a party really capable of organising and leading the masses. The characteristic feature of the five years of the Russian Revolution was that all the menshevik and social revolutionist elements who were really faithful to the workers and to the working class were gradually absorbed by the Russian Communist Party. The influence of the Communist Party over the large working class masses, with the State under Communist control, is naturally exercised not only by means of propaganda, but also by the authority of the State and of the administration.

The Soviet organs, through the Communist Party, have become the organs of proletarian democracy, and not vice versa. A comparison with the history of the Hungarian Soviets will show this clearly. In Hungary we have had Soviets, such Soviets as Gorter or the German Independents would have them, but without Communistic leadership. The organs elected by the suffrage of the large masses of the proletariat did not really become the organs of the working class. They were not the expression of the will of the proletariat. It was a struggle between the Soviets and the Trade Unions, and the Trade Unions could claim with right that they represented to a greater extent than the Soviets the opinions of the large masses and the class character of the proletariat. There resulted a

conflict between the reformistic, social democratic Trade Union leaders and the Soviets. The workers went more willingly into the Trade Unions, which were lead by Labour leaders, even though reformists, than in the Soviets, where no Communist leadership existed. In Russia, with the help of the Communist Party, the Soviets became a real popular institution, an organ of proletarian democracy. In Hungary we could not achieve this because there was no Communist leadership.

But how is it possible to achieve united action in such a large country with so many State organs, with so many Labour organisations? How is it possible in a country where there are single portions much larger than France, Germany, and England together a unified Party leadership which could be felt even in the smallest village?

The iron discipline of the Russian Communist Party was what made it possible to carry on their elastic policy. I do not intend to say why this policy is elastic. The cause and source of the elasticity is well known to all. There is no body in the world where Marxism has been so completely incorporated as in the Communist Party of Russia; but the best Marxian analysis remains only an historical document when there is no organisation sufficiently elastic to act in accordance with this analysis. Without a strict discipline, without well organised cadres, the accomplishment of such a policy would be impossible. At the present time, in the sixth year of the Revolution, the Communist Party of Russia is being faced with its greatest problem since the beginning of the Revolution. It is, how to apply the economic policy under the leadership of a working class political party so that the realisation of this policy might not bring into the party certain petty bourgeois elements. The Communist Party of Russia has stood the test, thanks to its discipline and its elastic organisation. Centralisation and centralised discipline are the greatest lessons which we have been able to learn in the Russian Communist Party. Some of the best theses of the Comintern, it seems to me, are those of the Second Congress on the role of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution. These theses have had the same effect, on a less intense scale, than the Communist Party of Russia has had in the Russian Revolution. The activity of the Communist Party of Russia should be a subject of study for every leader and organiser of the western parties, so that they may make critical use of the Russian experience in the western situation and prepare their parties for the conquest and maintenance of power. The application of this experience is not the least problem of the International Revolution.

Trotsky: Comrades, the conquest of political power is the chief political aim of every revolutionary party. To use philosophical terminology in the Second International this aim was

a "regulative idea," which means an unsubstantial entity having little relation to practice. It is only within the last few years that in the intellectual sense we have been learning to make the conquest of political power a practical aim. The extent to which that aim has passed beyond the realm of philosophical regulative ideas, the extent to which it has become practical, is proved by the fact that in Russia on a definite date, November 7th, 1917, we, as a Communist Party leading the working class, conquered the political powers of the State. As the course of events was to show later, this did not signify the end of the civil war. On the contrary, it was not until after the conquest of political power that the civil war assumed extensive proportions. As soon as the bourgeoisie began to understand what it had lost through the loss of political power it endeavoured to mobilise the potential reserves of the counter revolution, and naturally turned in the first instance to the nobility, to army officers of noble birth, etc. Thus did it come to pass that the long drawn-out civil war was the historical penalty for the ease with which we had conquered power.

All's well that ends well. We have been able to maintain power during these five years; but as far as the Western European Parties are concerned, as far as concerns the labour movement of the whole world, we can now decide with fair confidence that the Communist Parties in other lands will have a far more difficult time of it before the conquest of power and a far easier time of it afterwards. In Germany all possible forces will be mobilised against the proletariat. It is almost superfluous to mention Italy, where to-day we see a completed counter revolution before a complete revolution has been achieved. Mussolini and his Fascists owe their present position of power to the fiasco of the Italian revolution, to which nothing was lacking, except a revolutionary party.

I will not probe the matter more deeply, for it is beyond my present scope. In France, in Britain, everywhere we see that the bourgeoisie put on the alert by the Russian example, and by all the historical experience of the lands of capitalist democracy is arming, organising, and mobilising everything that can be mobilised. This proves that all the before-mentioned forces now block the advance of the proletariat, and that, in order to seize power, the proletariat, with the scanty means at its disposal, must neutralise, paralyse, fight, and conquer them. But as soon as the proletariat has conquered power the bourgeoisie will have no reserves left. In Western Europe and elsewhere in the world, after the conquest of power the proletariat will have far more elbow room for its creative work than we in Russia.

In Russia the civil war was something more than a military phenomenon. The pacifists must forgive me for saying that it was a military phenomenon! Of course, it was that, but it was something more. Fundamentally it was a political

phenomenon. It was the struggle for the political reserves, and in the main it was the struggle for the peasantry. The proletariat won the game, thanks to its determined tactics in the civil war, thanks to the logical and resolute revolutionary strategy which made the peasants understand that there was only one choice open to them—the choice between the nobility and the proletariat. After long vacillation between the bourgeoisie, the democracy, and the proletariat, at the last moment, when no alternative remained, the peasants cast in their lot with the proletariat, defending it, not with democratic votes, but by force of arms.

After the conquest of political power there comes, not only defence by the methods of civil war, but also the upbuilding of the New State and (still more difficult) the new economic system. Much that I had intended to say anent this matter has been rendered superfluous by the admirable speech which Comrade Zetkin delivered, and I shall content myself with a few necessary expansions.

The possibilities of the upbuilding of a socialist economic system, when the essential conquest of political power has been achieved, are limited by various factors: by the degree to which the productive forces have been developed; by the general cultural level of the proletariat; and by the political situation upon a national and upon an international scale. We have learned in the elementary school of Marxism that there is no possibility of making one leap from a capitalist society to a socialist one. Nor did any one of us believe that it would be possible with one leap to move from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. Not one of us ever believed that a new society could be built twixt night and morning.

You will ask whether we had no expectation of transcending this stage without any extensive rearward movement, whether we did not think it would be possible to advance from this stage more or less directly towards communism. I have to admit that at this period we really did hope that revolutionary developments in Western Europe were going to move more swiftly. Even to-day, we are entitled to say with confidence that if the proletariat in Germany, France, and elsewhere in Europe, had gained to power in 1919, the whole course of events would have assumed a different complexion.

Such were our hopes, but no one can tell whether this development would have proceeded quickly or slowly. Even the Two-and-a-Half International, in the year 1919, recognised the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our hopes were not entirely utopian, regarded from the standpoint of the actual epoch, and not merely from the general outlook of that trend. Let us forget for a moment that we made a leap forward, to be followed by a leap backward. Let us suppose ourselves to be reporting events to an International Congress. We should do so in the following fashion. In March, 1917, czarism was overthrown. In October, 1917, the proletariat seized power; then

it began to defend its power, and at the same time to organise its State and its economic system. In the course of these five years the land, the most important industrial undertakings, all the railways and other means of transport, became State property. Only the enterprises of minor importance (of these I shall speak in fuller detail presently) have been left in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The State controls commerce, and has the decisive voice in all commercial transactions. From the peasants, who cultivate the State-owned land, the State receives a tax in kind, and uses the proceeds of this tax in order to develop industry at the cost of the State and for State purposes.

It is absolutely erroneous to suppose that a socialist economy can be inaugurated in accordance with a priori statistics, that we can simply blue-pencil capitalist methods and then juggle socialism into the world upon a calculus of the needs to be satisfied and the material elements available for the purpose. No such procedure is admissible. We have then to avail ourselves of the capitalist methods, the material apparatus of production that already exists, the extant organisation of economic life, the extant distribution of products, and the extant assignments of labour power.

We see, therefore, that between capitalist anarchy and such a state of affairs as I have just been outlining, lies the phase wherein an incipient socialist economy has to work with capitalist means. Such is our present situation. I am not inclined to describe it by the term "State capitalism." Lenin has said that we ought only to employ this term with certain reservations, for obviously there is a great difference between the extant phase of our economic life and what is properly known as State capitalism. The reformists have always declared that socialism will be realised through a progressive nationalisation (i.e., State socialisation). In France, this was Jaures' program. Our view, on the other hand, has always been that by this route we can never get beyond State capitalism, for so long as the bourgeoisie remains in power, State capitalism, as the collective instrument of the bourgeoisie, will continue to serve for the oppression and exploitation of the working class.

In Russia to-day, the position is very difficult. Here the workers' State has gained control of industry, and is carrying on the industry by the methods of the capitalist market, of capitalist calculation.

We began applying the new policy in the case of the peasants. The political reasons for the N.E.P. have been explained by Lenin. But we are here concerned with something which is only a part of the general task of applying labour power and the forces of production within the framework of a national economic system. Precisely because the problem of the peasants was especially difficult owing to the economic dismemberment of the peasant population, and owing to the peasants' low level of culture, we found it necessary to apply our new economic policy first in this field.

But we are not concerned solely with a concession to the peasantry. What we witness is a necessary phase in the socialist development of the proletariat. Take, for example, the railways. The Russian railway system was already to a great extent nationalised under capitalism, and was for the major part, owing to the technical conditions prevailing in this industry, already to a considerable degree normalised and centralised. We, therefore, took over the larger moiety from the capitalist State and the lesser moiety from the private companies, and we are now in possession of the whole system.

But we have nothing at present but capitalist calculations to guide us in the distribution of railway carriages, trucks, labour power, etc. Only by having every journey, every act of freightage paid for, only by keeping a profit and loss account, can we be informed concerning each individual railway line and the transport system as a whole, which is subsequently to be centralised. In these respects, therefore, we have had, in a sense to beat a retreat, and to deal with individual railway lines or groups of railway lines for the present as more or less independent entities.

The foregoing considerations show that we cannot transcend certain economic stages in the evolution from capitalism to socialism simply because we have abstract technical aims and needs, though these are in themselves thoroughly justified.

The new economic policy makes it possible for us to carry on calculations of the kind required, for this policy is nothing else than a slower upbuilding of the socialist economy by the workers' State with the aid of the book-keeping methods and the ways of adjusting the purposiveness of undertakings that have been created in the course of capitalist developments. This is the manner in which we have been led to re-establish the market.

Inasmuch as we are now allotting our productive energies in accordance with capitalist methods, it is obvious that all our difficulties must tend to assume the aspect to which our experience of capitalist society has accustomed us. Metallurgical enterprises, for example, lack industrial capital. What does this mean? It means, above all, that we are exceedingly poor, and that in the process of reviving industry we must begin by applying our technical and financial energies where they are most urgently needed. Now the most urgent need is where consumption begins—among the workers, the peasants, and the Red soldiers. It is clear that such means as we possess must find their first use there. Not until industry has been further developed will there be a possibility for a satisfactory development of heavy industry. Light industry is now working for the market. This means that it has entered the arena of competition among the various State and private undertakings. Only in this way will people become accustomed to work well. Such an end cannot be secured by moral education or sermonising. It cannot only be secured merely by a centralised economic

system. It can only be secured through every manager of a factory being controlled, not only from above, by the State, but also from below, by the consumer; by the question whether the products of the factory find a market, whether people are willing to pay for them, whether the wares are good. This constitutes the best check upon the conduct of the entrepreneur and upon his methods of management. In proportion as light industry makes it possible for us to produce real wealth in the country, in proportion as it proves profitable, we shall acquire a basis for heavy industry.

We perceive, then, that the financial crisis of manufacturing industry is the outcome of the whole development of our economic life.

No one can deny that the N.E.P. (new economic policy) involves great dangers, for if you give the devil an inch he will take an ell. The market, competition, free trade in grain—what is the upshot of all these? First of all, a revival of the importance of trading capital, a continuous accumulation of trading capital. As soon as trading capital comes into existence, it worms its way into productive life, into manufacturing forces of capitalism (whose malign tendency it is to grow continually in virtue of the accumulation of capital), we run a permanent risk of being completely conquered by capitalism.—Bauer tells us that this is the only saving prospect, the only way of avoiding ruin.

Considered in the abstract there was a possibility that Kolchak or Denikin might conquer Moscow. We were at war, and when we were asked whether there was not a danger that Kolchak might enter Moscow, or at an earlier date that the Hohenzollern regiments might enter Moscow, we answered: "Of course, there is a possibility that our troops may be defeated. But our aim is victory, not defeat." What is the position of affairs to-day? Once again we are at war. But agriculture is the battleground. Whereas in the civil war there was a struggle for the soul of the peasantry, a fight between the Red Army on the one side and the nobles and the bourgeoisie on the other, to win over the peasants, so now the struggle between the Workers' State and capitalism is in the main, not indeed for the soul, but for the market of the peasants. We know quite well as Otto Bauer that economics are the foundation of reconstruction. Inasmuch as the new economic policy gives free play to the industry, it leases industrial enterprises from the State. As a sequel to this, the accumulation of capital now goes on in manufacturing industry as well as in commerce.

Consequently, real capitalism (for the speculators, the middlemen, the lessees of enterprise, etc., are the real capitalists in the Workers' State) grows continually stronger, gains control of an ever larger part of the national economic system, destroys the beginnings of socialism, and will in the long run be enabled to control the State power.

These two processes thus run their opposed courses concurrently. Nevertheless, they reinforce one another. Private capitalism groups itself around our State trusts, competes with, and yet is nourished by them. The Workers' State holds the trump cards. Of course, it may lose them. But when we analyse the existing situation, we see that all the advantages are on our side, all at least, with one exception. Private capitalism, which in Russia is now for the second time passing through the phase of primitive accumulation, is backed up by world capitalism.

It is often contended that world capitalism is in an extremely critical condition, and has need of Soviet Russia—that Britain urgently requires the Russian market for her manufactures, that Germany wants grain, and so on. Abstractly considered, this seems quite true. But we see nothing of the sort. Why not? Because we live in a critical epoch when the economic balance has been upset, and because capital is not in a position to form and to realise great economic designs.

Because of the uncertainty of the future, the economic policy of the capitalist governments can look no further than one day ahead. This fact dominates the world situation. Inasmuch as the capitalist powers are aware that Russia cannot bring them salvation to-morrow, they are perpetually postponing the promised concessions, loans, etc. There is absolutely no reason to suppose that these concessions could bring ruin to Russia.

The danger that real capitalism, whose development is inevitable if a free market is conceded, will grow too strong for the workers' State, is much less imminent than the possibility that the working class in Central and Western Europe will conquer the power of the State. Russian policy must be one of patient endurance until the working class of Europe and the world conquers the State power.

In some such fashion, I think, must be phrased the answer to the wiseacres of the moribund Two-and-a-Half International. Otto Bauer devoted a pamphlet to our anniversary. In this document he recapitulated in a quiet, logical way all that our enemies in the social democratic camp have been accustomed to say concerning the new economic policy. In the first place he tells us, of course, that the new economic policy is a capitulation, but he adds that it is a good capitulation.

In conclusion, the man who has worked such wonders in Austria—(laughter)—solely declares: "Take notice, capitalism cannot flourish under the dictatorship of your party." Just so. That is why we maintain the dictatorship of our party! (Laughter and applause.)

There remains, however, one important problem which I have not yet considered. I refer to the problem of productivity, the field of labour.

Socialism is one kind of economic system, capitalism is another. The advantage of socialism are not to be proved by

talking about them, but by the increased field of labour. Just as the capitalist economic system had the advantage over the feudal system of making human labour more efficient, socialism possesses the corresponding advantage over capitalism. We are now exceedingly poor; that is a positive fact, and if attention be concentrated upon it, our enemies can find plenty of arguments against us. Both agricultural and industrial production in Russia are considerably less now than they were before the war. The agricultural produce of the last year was about three-quarters of the yield of an average pre-war year; industrial products last year totalled about one-quarter of the yield of the pre-war period.

Still, we have not yet proved by facts that socialism is a better economic method than capitalism, for Russia is poorer than before the war and even than before the revolution. This is a fact. It is explicable by another fact, namely, that revolution as a method of economic transformation is a costly affair. All revolutions have taught this. Consider, for instance, the great French Revolution. The impoverishment of France began to become serious after the ninth of Thermidor, i.e., after the beginning of the counter-revolutionary era. Ten years after the opening of the revolution, when Bonaparte was First Consul, Paris received a daily supply of flour ranging from 300 to 500 sacks, whereas the minimum normal requirement of the city was 1500 sacks. Thus Paris, having at that time a population of half a million, was able in the tenth year of the bourgeois revolution to secure only from one-third to two-fifths of the most important of the necessaries of life.

There is another example. At the same epoch, in the ninth and tenth years of the French Revolution, there had been a decline in population in 37 out of the 38 departments, the decline being due to famine, epidemic disease, etc.

In ten years, please note. We are just at the beginning of the sixth year. Russia's position at the present time is not wholly enviable, but it is far more favourable than was the position of France ten years after the beginning of the bourgeois democratic revolution. We have to realise that history pursuing her aim of intensifying the capacity of human labour, sometimes works with the method of devastation. Such disharmonies are the fault of history; we are not responsible for them. We have to ask our friends (and they will grant it) to give us another five years. Then in the tenth year of the revolution we shall be in a position to prove the superiority of socialism to capitalism in the economic field, not by speculations merely, but by hard facts.

If, however, the capitalist world is going to endure for several decades, then this would signify a death sentence for Soviet Russia. But in this respect there is no need to distrust or to modify the views, demonstrations, and theses of our Third Congress. Lord Curzon, British Minister for Foreign Affairs, speaking on November 9th, the birthday of the German Republic, gave an excellent summary of the world situation. Many of

you may not have noticed it, so I propose to read you a few sentences. Curzon said:

"All the Powers have emerged from the war with weakened and broken energies. We ourselves are suffering from a heavy burden of taxation which weighs upon the industry of our country. We have a great number of unemployed in all branches of work. As regards France, her indebtedness is immense, and she is not able to secure the payment of the war indemnities. Germany is in a condition of political instability, and her economic life is paralysed by an appalling currency crisis. Russia still remains outside the family of European nations. It is still under the Communist flag." The noble lord differs, apparently, from Otto Bauer—(laughter)—"and continues to carry on constant propaganda all over the world"—of course, this is untrue—(laughter)—"Italy has traversed a number of shocks and government crisis"—has traversed! I should say is still traversing—(laughter)—the Near East is in a condition of absolute chaos. The situation is a terrible one."

Even the Russian Communists would be hard put to it to conduct better propaganda upon a world-wide scale. One of the best-known representatives of the strongest realm in Europe assures us on the fifth anniversary of the Soviet Republic that "the situation is a terrible one."

Capitalism is in a historical crisis. The working class is not yet ready to end this crisis by seizing political power. Let me remind you that at the Third Congress we endeavoured, both in our speeches and in our theses, to draw a sharp distinction between the historical crisis of capitalism and a casual crisis. You will remember the discussions on this topic, some in the commissions and some in the plenum. There are strong practical reasons why we ought to confirm the theses on this particular point. It would seem that a good many of the comrades, when this idea of the historical crisis of capitalism was invoked, represented it to themselves as meaning that the crisis, automatically undergoing intensification, would revolutionise the proletariat by rendering its methods of attack more vigorous and by inciting it to make a direct onslaught. We insisted that cyclical waves, casual oscillations, inevitably occur within the limits of the historical crisis of capitalism. We said that the acute casual crisis which began in the year 1920, though it made the situation of capitalism worse for the time being, would certainly be followed by a partial recovery, by more or less improvement from the capitalist point of view. We should have made a great mistake had we been guided by those comrades who wanted us to recognise the principle that a crisis is always a more revolutionary factor than prosperity, who wanted us to admit in our theses that there was no reason for anticipating the possibility of an improvement in the economic position of capitalism. We were right, and we stand armed against our opponents of the Second and Two and a Half Internationals. When we adjudged the epoch to be revolutionary, it was not because

a casual crisis in 1920 had swept away the fallacious prosperity of the year 1919, but because our general view of the world situation led us to our outlook. It seems to me that many of the comrades will have to take note of these facts. I think we have strong reasons for confirming the Theses of the Third Congress.

The prospect we now have to face is the outcome of the fact that in the year 1919 we did not effect the International overthrow of the bourgeoisie. It was in this situation that we had to develop our campaign for the conquest of the great masses of the proletariat and for the development of our organisation and methods; here, too, we had to inscribe upon our banners the partial demands of the working class, and in this likewise to lead the workers. What is the difference between ourselves and the social democrats of the old type, inasmuch as we, too, advocate partial demands? The difference consists in our respective estimates of the character of the epoch. Before the war, the bourgeoisie, as a dominant class, was able to make concessions. The XIXth Century, considered as a whole, may be regarded as an epoch in which the bourgeoisie made concessions to the working class, or to special strata of the working class. These concessions were always such as could be made with an eye to bourgeois advantage; nothing must be conceded that would threaten bourgeois dominion.

The new epoch, we can now say with confidence, does not date its beginning from the end of the war. It began in the years 1913-14. The crisis of the year 1913 was not one of the casual crises, with which we are familiar, following upon a period of prosperity. It was the opening of a new epoch of capitalism, in which the productive forces had outgrown the old framework. The bourgeoisie was no longer in a position to make concessions. The war has accentuated the tensions of the situation. Still, this does not give us the right to conceive that our progress will be automatic, or to take a fatalistic view of the future. Even in the new revolutionary epoch, one party or another may pass into a state of stagnation, and a campaign for partial demands may well be regarded as tending towards stagnation.

At the Third Congress, the majority called to order those elements of the International whose behaviour made the danger imminent that the vanguard of our movement, advancing prematurely, would encounter the passivity or immaturity of the great masses of the workers, and would be broken against the still firm forces of the capitalist State. Fifteen months ago, that was our greatest danger, and the Third Congress issued a warning against it.

In so far as this involved any retreat, that retreat ran parallel with the economic retreat of Russia. Some of the comrades interpreted the warning as implying that the whole attitude of the Communist International was concentrated upon the avoidance of the left-wing danger. Of course, this is an utterly erro-

neous view. What has been termed the left-wing danger is merely the danger of mistakes that we are all liable to make. The danger of the right wing, on the other hand, was and is the danger that the Communist Parties may be rendered stagnant owing to the influence of the whole of bourgeois society, an influence which can be understood in the light of our characterisation of the preparatory epoch. In the year 1919, when great waves of dissatisfaction were rising in all lands, and when the whole of political life was a reflection of this revolutionary movement, the bourgeoisie was in a state of political disorganisation. To-day, in comparatively tranquil times, when we have to strive to enlist the sympathy of the workers even by putting forward partial demands, there has arisen a situation in which the capitalist world has once more great opportunities for establishing its agencies even within the framework of our own world-wide revolutionary Party. It is, therefore, not merely our right to appeal to the revolutionary character of the epoch, but it is also our duty to quicken up the pace. This will be done by a thorough purging of the Communist International, so that when the great moment of struggle comes our organisation may be perfectly equipped and ready for battle.

The difficulties which the Western European Parties have to overcome are incomparably greater than those which we had to overcome in the Russian revolution. For instance, pacifist and reformist illusions are far from being dispelled. In France a blossoming period of pacifism and reformism is inevitable, unless the revolution should come sooner than now seems possible, thanks to a combination of circumstances which at present elude our ken. After the illusions of the war and of the intoxication of victory, the petty-bourgeois illusions of pacifism and reformism will win to power in the form of a coalition of the parties of the left. To-day, too, there is considerable likelihood of large sections of the working class becoming infected with the same illusions. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the French Communist Party should promptly rid itself of all those who might act as the introducers of pacifist and reformist illusions into our own ranks.

Similar considerations apply to Britain. I do not know what the result of the British elections is going to be. But if the conservatives and the national liberals should return to power, their reign will be short. England will inevitably experience the substitution of a pacifist democratic trend for a conservative trend. Get this picture into your minds. Suppose that in France there is a coalition of the left, forming a pacifist democratic government, and suppose that in Britain there is a Labour Government allied with the independent liberals. What will happen in Germany in that case? There the social democrats will draw a deep breath. We shall see a revival of Wilsonism on a broader basis.

There is absolutely no safeguard against the coming of a new period, imposing in its way, wherein the working class

will be stupefied and benumbed by pacifist and reformist trends. Since the era is revolutionary, since the oppositions are irreconcilable, and since the internal contradictions of capitalism are so extensive, this epoch can be nothing more than the last flickers of a candle that is burning itself out. Imagine the revolution postponed until this pacifist tide has risen to its height; will not the French and British workers, in the throes of an intense psychological crisis, look around for a political party which has never tried to deceive them? They will look for a party which has continued to tell the truth, the naked, brutal truth throughout this period of pacifist mendacity. The Communist Party must be able to answer to this description.

(After prolonged applause, the delegates rose to their feet and sang the International.)

"THE CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE"

SESSIONS HELD, November 11, 16 & 17.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Report by Comrade Radek.

Speakers: Radek, Bordiga, Smeral, Pullman, Urbans, Ravenstein, Webb, Rosmer, Radek, Zinoviev.

Kolaroff: The Session is now opened.

Comrade Radek: Comrades, all the debates on tactics which we have carried on here, and which we shall still conduct revolve really around one question, namely, the capitalist offensive against the proletariat and the measures of defence to be adopted by the proletariat.

In discussing the capitalist offensive we have confined this question within two narrow limits. Firstly, because under the capitalist offensive first prominence has been given to the lowering of wages and the lengthening of the working day; and, secondly, because the entire history of the world revolution has been divided into two mechanically separated phases—the proletarian offensive and the capitalist counter-offensive. I think, therefore, it will help us to better understand the position and the attitude which the Communist International should adopt if we briefly review the development of the world revolution in its concrete forms. I will endeavour at the risk of being too cursory, to recall the most important facts to your mind.

The Russian Revolution, which we discussed in detail on the previous point of the agenda, has been recognised by the proletariat as an event of international moment. There is no doubt, however, that the world bourgeoisie taken as a whole has under-

stood better than the proletariat that the Russian Revolution was the first act of the international proletarian offensive.

Much irony has been expressed at the illusions under which the Communist International laboured at its inauguration with regard to the world situation. The former leaders of the Centre and present members of the Second International spoke of how optimistic and short-sighted we were when we founded the Communist International and based its policy on the victory of the world revolution. I will read you a document by Mr. Lloyd George about the time the first Congress of the Communist International. This document was kept in secret until the former Prime Minister of Italy, Signor Nitti, revealed it in his book, "Peaceless Europe," published this year. In this secret memorandum addressed to the leaders of the Versailles Conference, Lloyd George says the following:

"The situation to-day has quite changed. The Revolution is still in its swaddling clothes. The cruellest terror still reigns in Russia.

"Europe is filled with revolutionary ideas. A feeling not of depression but of passion and revolt reigns in the breast of the working class against the conditions of life that prevailed before the war. The whole of the existing system, political, social and economic, is regarded with mistrust by the whole of the population of Europe. In some countries, like Germany and Russia, this unrest is leading to open revolt and in others, like France, England and Italy, it is expressed in strikes and in a certain aversion to work. All signs go to show that the striving is as much for social and political changes as for increase in wages."

"A considerable part of this unrest should be welcomed. We shall never achieve a lasting peace if we aim at re-establishing the conditions of life that prevailed in 1914. If we do, we stand the risk of driving the mass of the European population into the arms of the radicals, whose basic idea is that the renaissance of humanity lies in the complete overthrow of the present social system. In Russia these people have secured victory on this basis, but the cost of such a victory has been terrible. Hundreds of thousands of the population are no longer among the living. Railways, towns, the whole edifices of the Russian State have been ruined, although in many ways they have succeeded in retaining the following of the mass of the Russian people and, what is more important, they have succeeded in organising a great army which appears to be well led, well disciplined, and the greater part of which is prepared to sacrifice their lives for their ideals.

"If we allow another year to pass, Russia, inspired with fresh enthusiasm, will forget its needs for peace because it will be the only country that has an army at its disposal which has confidence in the ideas for which it fights."

After this brief description, which is worthy of being brought to the knowledge of the vast masses of the people, Lloyd George then goes on to describe the real danger which then confronted

the capitalist system. This description can serve as an indictment against the social democratic parties in general and the German Social Democratic Party in particular. He goes on to say:

"The greatest danger that can arise at the present moment would be that Germany may attain a position in which it would place its fate in the hands of the Bolsheviks, putting its wealth, its spirit and its superb powers of organisation at the disposal of these fanatics whose dream is to conquer the world for Bolshevism by force of arms. This danger is no mere phantom. The present German government is weak, it commands no respect and little authority, and yet holds. Its breakdown would mean the coming of the Spartacus, for which Germany is not yet ripe. But the argument which the Spartacists know how to use and the effect of which never fails is that it alone is capable of liberating Germany from the intolerable conditions into which the war has plunged it."

He then says further:

"If Germany goes over to the Spartacists it is inevitable that it will bind its fate with that of the Bolsheviks. If this should happen, the whole of Eastern Europe will be swept into the maelstrom of the Bolshevik revolution, and in the course of one year nearly three hundred million men led by German generals and trained German instructors, equipped with German guns and German machine-guns, will be formed into a mighty army ready at any moment to resume the attack upon Western Europe."

Comrades, this picture drawn by the cleverest leader of the European bourgeoisie, was not drawn merely to frighten Clemenceau and the other statesmen. It is a true portrayal of the position as it was in this second phase of the proletarian revolution at the beginning of the German revolution. World capital met this position by taking up a defensive position in the West and opening the first capitalist offensive in the East.

If you study the strike statistics of 1919—I will not quote them here—you will see that the waves of attack of the proletariat arose not in Germany but in England and America. In 1919 the English workers forced wages up to a point higher than at any time during the war, when its labour was absolutely necessary to save European capitalism. While during the war they secured an increase in real wages of seven shillings per week, in 1919 alone they secured increases of one pound a week. They secured reductions of hours of labour from three to four hours a day for seven million persons. The eight-hour day and in some cases even a shorter day was introduced in 1919 and affected from 60 to 80 per cent. of the English workers. The demand for the nationalisation of the mines was met by the British Government by the appointment of the Sankey Commission which in principle accepted it. In America, not only was one strike followed by another, but, what is characteristic of the situation in this classic land of individualism, the nationalisation of the railways was seriously discussed.

Among the whole of the Western line of industrial capitalism, the bourgeoisie kept to the defensive for fear that greater resistance on its part might drive the workers of Europe and America into the arms of the Communists.

At the same time the bourgeoisie began its first offensive against Soviet Russia which we know as Entente Intervention. Thus the first clash of arms between the world proletariat and the world bourgeoisie consisted, not only in that the Russian proletariat made the first breach in the world capitalist system, but that it alone fought in this breach while the proletariat in Western Europe confined itself to fighting for an improvement in its position. As an isolated detachment of the Central European proletariat, the Hungarian proletariat undertook a relief offensive to ease the position of Soviet Russia and emancipate itself. In this attempt it was defeated and the Hungarian Soviet Republic was destroyed.

Comrades, Soviet Russia not only repulsed the attack of world capital, but in 1920, at the junction between the two main epochs of the development of the world revolution and at the turning point of two economic periods, it passed from the defensive to the offensive. There is no need for me to conjure up phantasies about what the world situation would have been if the Russian proletariat had been victorious at Warsaw. I have only to recall the fact that, simultaneously with this advance of the Russian proletariat, the first large section of the Western European working class commenced its offensive; the Italian workers occupied the factories in Italy. It is worth while to ponder for a moment over the consequences of the extension of the frontiers of the first proletarian State across the Vistula and the capture of power by the proletariat of Italy. It would have put the agrarian countries in East and South Europe between the vice of two proletarian States placing them at the disposal of the industrial proletariat of Europe. When we to-day wish to realise the significance of a defeat of Soviet Russia and of the Italian workers in 1920, we must ponder over the possibilities that lay in the situation that prevailed at that time.

The collapse of the military offensive of Soviet Russia against Warsaw and of the proletarian offensive in Italy had different causes. Soviet Russia proved itself weak militarily, while the Italian working class proved itself weak politically. There is not the slightest doubt that these defeats marked a turning point in the history of the first phase of the world revolution. They coincided with the close of the period of apparent prosperity which had made possible the concessions made by world capitalism to the Western European workers in 1919-1920, and marked the beginning of the world economic crisis.

I now come to this phase. The economic crisis has started in all countries and the importance of this economic crisis in its relation to the policies of world capitalism in its opposition to the proletariat, can be explained in the simple words which a leading organ of English Capitalism, "The Westminster

"Gazette," the mouthpiece of Mr. Asquith, uses in its summing up of the situation:

"The working class can be quite sure of this, that no power on earth can save them from the lowering of their standard of living, so long as there are starving men struggling among themselves for the right to live. The existence of such people implies a condition under which any standard of living may be lowered."

This appeared in the "Westminster Gazette" at the beginning of the economic world crisis, and it described the fundamental fact which has enabled Capital to strengthen itself the world over. Our words are proven true by the capitalist class, which says: The reconstruction of capitalism is only possible at the expense of the workers. This method is the plan of international capital. The worse the economic situation becomes, the clearer is it that world capitalism, contrary to its condition at the end of the Napoleonic war, is not in a condition to overcome the world crisis.

If you will read the memorial which Robert Owen addressed to Metternich, you will find that he poses the following question: Will England overcome its economic breakdown?—which question he answers himself by saying that England introduced machinery after this crisis. Thus productivity was increased so that England was in a condition to master the crisis and develop industrially into a first-class power. World capital is at present in a position where it requires tremendous wealth and material for its reconstruction. With a tenth part of the Italian war costs, Italy could be freed to-day of its war debt to England and the United States; but this tenth part is not to hand.

The second method for the overcoming of the crisis would be the expansion of the export market; but this is impossible. On this ground the capitalist offensive is not a matter of temporarily taking advantage of the weakness of the working class, but is a well-developed plan intended to extend over a decade.

Should the offensive fail, then the workers, at least those in the leading European countries, will overthrow the power of capitalism. This issue is one of life and death to the workers. The struggle cannot be fought to a finish simply by means of a strike on the part of the workers, or on the part of the owners by means of lock-outs, lowering of wages, or lengthening of the hours of labour.

This leads me to the question as to what form the political offensive of capitalism will assume.

If world capital is determined to throw the worker back to his pre-war level of existence, if it is determined to force the workers to their knees, then it is obvious that the leaders of world capital will have to devise tactics that will combine the national struggle against the working class with the international struggle. The prerequisites for the carrying out of the plan underlying the capitalist offensive were disclosed at Genoa and

at the Hague. In England it proved possible to nullify the attempts of the workers to nationalise the main branches of industry. During the last year, the English workers have no longer been fighting to secure the nationalisation of the mines; they have simply been fighting upon the wages question. Even upon this field they were defeated. In the United States, the vestiges of the nationalisation movement were swept away. In Germany there was a great hubbub among the Socialists in the year 1919, when it was proposed to arrest the advance of the workers. To-day the sale of the State railways to private owners seems imminent. The only State in which industry is in the hands of the working class is Russia.

Consequently the campaign against Soviet Russia, the campaign which aims by the power of the financial boycott at compelling us to surrender our factories, is not fought by the capitalists simply because they have an eye to the possibility of making large profits in Russia. This campaign is an essential part of the capitalist offensive. Nay, more; the capitalist world-wide offensive demands the solution of the German problem in the following sense. First of all, capitalism must be saved upon German soil, and secondly, German capitalism must supply the means for the capitalist reconstruction of the Entente countries. German capitalism seeks a way out through the sale of State property upon which to raise loans in the United States and Britain. But French capitalism has other ideas. The militarist section have in mind the occupation of the Ruhr, the creation of a buffer state on the Rhine, the annexation of the Ruhr coal and coke. The industrialist section seeks to form a Franco-German steel and coal syndicate, and this would fall in with Stinnes' plan. Nor is this plan limited to Germany. In Mussolini's Fascist programme we read: "We must not forget that to hamper production with an enormous direct tax upon capital is tantamount to the indirect taxation of the lower class; and it is a particularly disastrous form of indirect taxation, for hindrances to the capitalist economy entail unemployment and reduced wages for the workers. Nothing could be more mischievous than the demand that the rich should be taxed in order to spare the poor."

Again, in Britain, Bonar Law's first act was an attempt to abolish the Ministry of Labour, with a declaration that the State ought to interfere as little as possible with economic life. There we have a pendant to Mussolini's declaration that as far as economics are concerned, he is an "old liberal" in the strict sense of the term—the State must have nothing to do with economic life. Of course, this means that capitalism is to be allowed to make an unrestricted use of its powers against labour.

This policy is pursued far more consciously by counter-revolutionary conspiratorial organisations. There can be no doubt whatever that the German counter-revolutionaries, led by the rich peasant class, are in close relations with the Russian monarchists, with Horthy's Hungary, and with Mussolini, and

that with the French militarist party they have ties that will one day come to light. If we study the moves of the right wing of the counter-revolution, we see that the counter-revolutionaries are aware of the following facts:

The counter-revolutionaries know perfectly well that in Central Europe there are three possible foci of the proletarian revolution—industrial Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, and Italy. This is why they propose to erect barriers between Germany, Czecho-Slovakia and Italy. Attempts to create a counter-revolutionary stronghold in Bavaria go hand in hand with attempts to place Austria entirely at the disposal of the counter-revolutionaries. The Geneva Treaty, the abolition of the Austrian parliament, the doing away with the militia (the weak remnants of proletarian armed forces in Vienna), have made a beginning. At the moment when the counter-revolution openly established the Wittelsbachs upon the throne, a link with Austria will be formed by way of Tyrol, and the regime of Horthy's Hungary will be extended into Central Europe. The victory of the Fascists in Italy represents the deliberate development of this policy, but is partly a spontaneous outcome of the situation. I regard it as of importance that the Communist International should understand the Fascist victory and its essential significance.

In my opinion, the victory of Fascism is something more than a mechanical victory of the Fascist arms. I regard it as the greatest defeat which Socialism and Communism have sustained since the opening of the epoch of the world revolution. It is a greater defeat than the overthrow of Soviet Hungary, for the victory of Fascism is the outcome of the temporary spiritual and political bankruptcy of Italian Socialism and the whole Italian labour movement. The contention that the Fascists represent the bourgeois counter-revolution needs no proof; whatever breaks up labour organisations and stabilises bourgeois power is counter-revolutionary. But if we content ourselves with the trite statement that the bourgeoisie has gained a victory in Italy, we renounce the task of trying to understand something that will perhaps, even within the next few months, be of the utmost importance to our movement in Germany and Czecho-Slovakia. (Very true.)

What we have to ascertain is, how was the victory of Fascism rendered possible, upon what was it based, and what precisely does it represent in the European counter-revolution?

Let us recall the facts. What were Fascists and how did they originate? The lower strata of intellectuals returned from the war—the chemists' assistants, the elementary school teachers, the veteran surgeons and so on—who had all played a social part in the war. They returned from the war as discouraged Nationalists, for, despite the victory, Italy did not receive all that the Nationalist programme had demanded—the Adriatic had not become "an Italian lake." They returned to a land where economic ruin was complete, and where the State was not

in a position to care for them. They witnessed the growth of a revolutionary labour movement. They were hostile to this labour movement, not only because it was a labour movement, but also because, as interventionists and members of the pro-war faction, they had an old quarrel with the Social-Democratic Party. And the Socialist Party did everything to alienate these strata, and not them alone, but the disabled as well. When we read that many Socialist communes left the disabled in the lurch in the year 1919, refusing them aid because they had been in the war, and when we realise that the Socialist Party was incompetent to turn to practical account the widespread feeling that something new was in course of preparation and that it was impossible to continue in the old rut, we find little difficulty in explaining the birth of Fascism.

The Socialists were defeated because they did not follow up words with deeds. Mussolini felt that his militarist organisations and the great masses he had attracted to his side would turn against him unless he seized power. It was the incompetence of the Socialist Party to lead the masses to battle that engendered the power of Fascism. When the workers occupied the factories, when the Italian bourgeoisie was so impotent that Giolitti said "I cannot send the soldiers into the factories, for if I do I shall be murdered in the streets," and when, with the aid of the Italian reformists, the workers had subsequently been persuaded to leave the factories, the Italian bourgeoisie was no longer afraid, and it plucked up heart to assume the offensive.

The question now arises why was this not done by means of the State apparatus, the carabinieri, the bourgeois law-courts, and the bourgeois parties? Because the bourgeois parties are disintegrated. They led the war, they ruined the State and the economic life of the country; the soldiers, the officials, and the petty bourgeoisie no longer heeded their words. But the Mussolinis, the Nationalist petty-bourgeois intellectuals, represent a new will-to-power. The Fascists come forward with a new faith, saying "Socialism was not competent to bring anything new, but we are going to mediate between the workers and the capitalists. We are going to compel the capitalist to satisfy the needs of the workers. But you workers must work. You must build up the nation."

There can be no doubt that in the rural districts and in the small provincial towns the workers have been won over to Fascism, not only by force of arms, but also to some extent by the demagogic arts of the new movement. The most notable effect of its attack was the growth of reformism.

At Leghorn the reformists were quite a small group. At the last trade union Congress, 500,000 votes were cast in favour of a coalition with the bourgeoisie.

Comrades, when Fascism has now gained the victory without the slightest resistance on the part of the working class, we may say that we have reached the nadir of developments in Italy.

The Fascists represent the petty bourgeoisie, which has come to power with the support of the bourgeoisie, and which will be compelled to carry out, not the programme of the petty bourgeoisie, but the programme of capitalism.

The seeds of death are contained in the very thing upon which the strength of Fascism depended. It is because the Fascists are a petty-bourgeois party, that they have a broad front, that they have been able to show so much enthusiasm in attacking us. But precisely because the Fascists constitute a huge petty-bourgeois party, they will not be able to carry out the policy of Italian capitalism without revolts in their own camp. A few years ago, Comrade Serrati protested against our agrarian programme. Now the revival of the Italian Party will depend on whether we know how to organise the peasants against Fascism. If our Italian friends, the Communists, want to be a pure and little party, let me tell them that a pure and little party can very easily find itself behind prison walls. There they will be able to devote themselves to the pure culture of the spirit. But, if the Italian Communist Party wants to become a power, it will have to organise the proletarian and petty-bourgeois masses against Fascism. Theoretical resolutions and the United Front will not suffice, nor will theoretical disquisitions concerning Fascism; nor even will the reforms of a small band of Communists. We must voice the cry of the masses for liberation.

Comrades, in view of the capitalist offensive, whose intensity is increasing along the whole political and economic front, and whose climax has certainly not yet been reached, the question arises: What prospect of success has such an offensive? Are we faced with a wave of counter-revolution which is the reflection of the revolutionary wave, as happened in the year 1849? Is the cycle of revolution and counter-revolution completed? This is the fundamental question. The answer to it provides the foundation for our future tactics. To enable us to answer, it suffices to recall that the victory of the counter-revolution in 1849 had as its basis the economic revival which set in with the opening of the Californian gold-fields.

The wave of counter-revolution which is now spreading round the world can best be characterised by saying that it is not the outcome of a period of general economic revival, but represents an attempt to effect the forcible arrests of economic decay.

The counter-revolution cannot bring bread and peace. We have therefore to do now with a counter-revolutionary wave, with an offensive, which has no prospect of victory however ruthless it may be. Its duration depends upon the question, how far we shall be in a position to undertake a counter-offensive. The social basis of this counter-revolution is certainly narrow. It lacks the élan, it lacks the affiliations, and it lacks the foundations which would render possible a long and victorious campaign.

What is our plan for defence? To clear up this matter will simultaneously provide the solution of our tactical problems. The period of the proletarian onslaught was distinguished by the fact that larger and ever larger masses advanced to the attack upon capitalism. There can be no doubt that the most characteristic feature of this epoch when the workers were advancing to the attack was that they were fighting for power. The characteristic of the present epoch is that, although the crisis of world capitalism continues, the broad masses of the proletariat have lost faith in the possibility of the conquest of power within any time they can foresee. They have been forced to adopt a purely defensive attitude.

Such being the situation, when among the masses of the workers there is no longer any vigorous thought of fighting for power, and when the great majority of the workers are oppressed with a feeling of impotence, the conquest of power is not an immediately practicable aim. This is a historical fact. We must make it our first business, therefore, to fight for those things which seem most immediately pressing to the masses of the workers: wages, hours of labour, housing, and all the other concerns of daily life of the working class.

In this we see that the masses of the workers are united on such points, irrespective of party. Inasmuch as the workers feel this, the policy of the Communist Party has to furnish them with an answer to the question, "What does the Party propose to do in view of the fact that the workers are united in their demands, despite all differences of political outlook?" Comrades, the difference between the Second and the Third International does not consist in the fact that we advocate the dictatorship of the proletariat, and they do not; but in the fact that they are unwilling to fight, even for a little bread for the workers. When we have compromised them in the eyes of the masses, when we have proved to the workers that these leaders will not fight, and have shown why they will not, then the way to the United Front will have been cleared from beneath.

What was the attitude of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals as regards the defence of the simplest and most urgent interests of the proletariat in Western Europe? When we spoke of the fight for the eight-hour day, or of the fight against the reduction of wages, they did not answer with a straight refusal. They said: "We cannot work with you unless you dissolve the R.I.L.U." What does that mean? It meant that the reformists will not work with the Communists until the Communists abandon the struggle against the trade union bureaucracy, which in Britain on Black Friday betrayed the miners, which has surrendered the eight-hour day all over the world, which is not merely retreating on all fronts but has actually capitulated. To the Socialist, the political significance of the failure of the negotiations in Berlin is this: We came with plans for a united defence; the others demanded that the Communist International and that section of the working class which supports the Communist International should renounce the idea of fight-

ing at all. That was the Socialist significance, as was made plain in the matter of the World Congress of the Workers. The leaders of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals were not willing to fight. That was what frustrated our attempt to establish the United Front from above.

If our pressure has not been strong enough, we must increase it. We may fail at first to compel the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals to march with us, especially now that they are joining forces. But that does not mean that we ought to abandon negotiations with the leaders. We must concentrate our energies upon the countries where we can exercise most pressure. Of course we do not know whether these tactics will be effective on the international scale. If they do not succeed, so much the worse for the Second International, whose death-warrant it would imply for failing to recognise that it must detach itself from the bourgeoisie under pain of falling with it into the abyss. The task is a big one, and may take much time, but there is no other way of rallying the masses under the banner of Communism.

In the concluding portion of my speech, Comrades, I propose to deal briefly with the watchwords of the struggle.

Agreed, that the starting points of our activities must be the demand for higher wages, the demand for the retention of the eight-hour day, and the demand for the development of the industrial council movement. But these demands do not suffice. Workers who belong to no political party at all can and do demand the daily wage of one thousand marks, whilst five hundred marks will not procure them the necessaries of life. But they see that to increase their wages in paper money provides no issue from their troubles. To begin with, such watchwords may suffice; but the longer the struggle lasts, the more essential does it become to proclaim political watchwords, the watchwords of social organisation. When the time is ripe for the voicing of such demands, it is time to move from the defensive to the offensive. We must put forward in these circumstances the demand for the control of production and make clear to the workers that this is the only way out of economic chaos.

Now I come to a question which plays a great part in our resistance to the capitalist offensive. I refer to the question of the Labour Government. The important point for us in this connection is, rather than classification, to propound the question: What are the masses of the workers, not merely the Communists, thinking of when they speak of Labour Governments? I confine myself to countries in which these ideas have already been considered; Britain, Germany and Czecho-Slovakia. In England, think of the Labour Party. Communism there is not yet a mass power. In the countries where capitalism is decaying, this idea is intimately associated with that of the United Front. Just as the workers say that the meaning of United Front is that the Communists and the Social-Democrats must make common cause in the factory when there is a strike, so for the masses of

the workers the idea of a Labour Government has a similar significance. The workers are thinking of a government of all the working class parties. What does that mean for the masses practically and politically? The political decision of the question will depend upon the fact whether the social-democracy does or does not go to its doom with the bourgeoisie. Should it do so, then the Labour Government can only take the form of the dictatorship of the Communist proletariat. We cannot decide for the Social-Democrats what their policy should be. What we have to decide is this. When we lead the masses in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, are we ready to fight on behalf of such a labour coalition government? Are we or are we not ready to bring about the conditions essential to its realisation?

That is a question which for the masses would only be confused by theoretical calculations. In my opinion, when we are concerned with the struggle for the United Front, we ought to say bluntly that, if the social democratic workers will force their leaders to break with the bourgeoisie, then we are ready to participate in a labour government, so long as that government is an instrument of the class struggle. I mean, if it is ready to fight beside us shoulder to shoulder.

When we are thinking of the struggle against the capitalist offensive, what we have in mind is not a parliamentary combination, but a platform for the mobilisation of the masses, an arena for the struggle.

As far as we are concerned with the broad front of the proletarian struggle for freedom, the watchword of the labour government is necessary to supply us with a directive; it is a watchword that whets the edge of our political weapons. The moment when the workers find themselves simultaneously engaged in the fight for the labour government and in the fight for the control of production, will be the moment when our fundamental offensive will begin, the moment when we shall cease to content ourselves with trying to defend what we have, and shall advance to the attack on new positions. Our offensive will begin as soon as the masses of the workers are ready to fight for these two watchwords.

The Communists cannot artificially foster this offensive. The great defect of the March action lay in the attempt to substitute for the fighting energy of the masses the readiness of our own party to fight. The readiness of our party for the fight must show itself in the agitation and organisation of the masses. It is extremely significant of the present position of the labour movement that, even in the countries where we have the best developed parties, our agitation still exhibits an abstract character, that it is not yet instinct with the passion of persons convinced that they are fighting for aims realisable in the near future. All their work produces the impression of pure agitation. If we desire that our debates shall not die of anaemia, and that our congresses shall not resemble party conventicles in which nothing but theoretical evolutionary tendencies are discussed,

the parties must pursue in practice a very different policy from that which they have pursued in the past. There must be a change, not merely in political aim, but also in the energy of the struggle.

The Communist International is not merely the party for the conquest of power, it is the party for conducting the fight. It is nonsense, therefore, to say: "These are piping times of peace, so the party cannot fight." Such a view would make of the Communist International a parasite upon the proletarian world revolution instead of a combatant on its behalf. The watchword must be, not one of disillusionment and of waiting for the revolution, but one of fighting wherever there is a chance to fight. All our discussions are devoid of meaning unless we understand that we can only form Communist Parties upon condition that their main activity is not to be in the rooms where resolutions are passed and studied, but on the battlefield where our aims find practical fulfilment, in the united front of the proletariat, in the fight along the lines that are made actual by contemporary history. One who can see no difference between the formation of the united front and the process of unifying and strengthening the Communist Parties, does not understand the alphabet of the Communist International, and does not understand that, just as we must have strongly integrated parties if we are to be the banner bearers on the united front, so also must we fight valiantly on behalf of the united front of the proletariat if we are to secure the existence of strongly integrated Communist Parties. (Loud cheers.)

REPORT ON FASCISM IN ITALY.

Bordiga (Italy) said that the Fascist movement was a classical example of the offensive of capitalism. Fascism was founded by the Irredentists, but the economic crisis of the post-war period greatly favoured its development. Fascism began its offensive in several of the agrarian districts where Socialist municipalites, strong trade union organisations, and the strong organisation of the Socialist Party had almost realised the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. These villages and small towns could not defend themselves against the military expeditions of the Fascisti. Later the Fascisti introduced into the industrial centres the terror, incendiarism, and the expulsion or murder of working-class leaders. The League of Italian industrialists and large farmers, the landowners, officers, petty bourgeoisie and the business men—and even part of the semi-proletarians—supported them. Bourgeois unity has been realised, but proletarian unity has not been achieved. Fascism claims to be negation of the class struggle, and claims to represent the struggle for national unity. It is supported by three factors: (1) The State itself which, during the demobilisation crisis and its pseudo-democratic concessions, found time for the organisation of the Fascisti, the royal guard and other militarist organisations. Where Fascism could not conquer the workers, the State disarmed them. Giolitti and Nitti were the embodiments of this false democracy of the

revolutionary period. (2) Large capitalists and landed proprietors afforded them every support. (3) Perhaps the most important factor consists of the skilful organisation of the disillusioned middle class. The bourgeois parties had never understood how to organise really serious political bodies such as the Fascisti founded. As a matter of fact, Fascism has no really positive programme; it only presents the old bourgeois policies through new men and methods.

The Fascisti trade unions, which are supported by the employers, use the most unscrupulous Nationalist demagogical methods. The principal teaching of the Fascisti is that, during a revolutionary period, the machinery of the State is not sufficient for the defence of capitalism, but that the bourgeoisie must find other strongly organised forces. Through internal party crises, and the exhaustion of its funds, Fascism has been forced to undertake rapid attempts at power. The speaker described thoroughly the development of the Fascist counter-revolution, and related how, in the editorial offices of the Communist official organ, the heroic chief editor, Togliatti, was nearly shot. In spite of this, Togliatti continued his work for the Party.

The situation is now clearer than during the period of apparent democracy. The bourgeoisie parties support Mussolini, and the Turati group makes pacts with them. France also supported Mussolini with money, not only during the war, but at present. The old State apparatus has come to a compromise with Fascism. Now Mussolini wants to demobilise the Fascisti.

So far, the Mussolini government has not yet done away with the pretence of democracy. Freedom of the Press continues officially, but organs such as the Communist "Ordina Nuova" and "Lavoratori," are at present appearing illegally. It is a lie of the reformists that the Communist Party is dissolved. The Party has received severe blows, but is still working and will recover. The trade unions continue to function although working under great difficulties. But the future perspectives are favourable. Fascism cannot solve the difficult problems of Italy's economic crises. The only change that has taken place is that there are new men for old policies, and, therefore, disillusionments will soon ensue. However, the struggle will be a severe one, as Fascism is in control of the state apparatus, which it uses against the proletariat. The preliminary condition for success in the struggle against the bourgeois parties is the firmest discipline and forceful tactics in the party organisation.

Smeral (Czecho-Slovakia): We are now entering a Fascist period in Czecho-Slovakia. At present we are in the midst of an economic and political crisis. The state has the industrial machinery, the apparatus and the labour power to supply 60 to 70 million consumers. It has only 14 million inhabitants. The Czech bourgeoisie, therefore, planned, not only a 50 per cent. cut in wages, but also the closing down of a part of Czech industry. The artificial rise in the value

of the Czech crown is one of the means to this end. The terrible economic crisis has resulted in great social discontent. At the same time, the Czech government is menaced by the nationalist minorities and the growing strength of the Communist Party. At the next elections it is highly probable that there will be no Czech Nationalist majority in parliament. This must lead to a parliamentary crisis. The present government is the last mask of the Czech bourgeoisie. This government knows that it is engaged in a life and death struggle with the bourgeoisie which, supported by the White Guard legionaries (Sokolists), is making towards a dictatorship within the state. The tactics of the United Front and the slogan of workers' government, facilitate the alienation of the working masses from the national Socialists. Otherwise these masses could have been used for the support of a Fascist government. Our main task is the winning of the masses. But, for this purpose, the internal consolidation of the Communist Party is necessary. The opposition should not undermine the authority of the Party executive through their lack of confidence.

Pullman (America): Comrades, American capitalism having reached the highest state of its development and having created the most efficient system of production, has been forced to find an outlet in two directions: first, the emigration of finance capital to the industrial backward countries, and secondly, the expansion of foreign markets. American capitalism has thus become involved in a desperate competitive struggle with European capitalism. American capitalists will thus bring to bear an additional pressure upon the working class of America. In future, the struggle of the workers, particularly in the metal trade and the mining industry, will change its isolated character. The achievement of co-ordinated and joint action of American and European miners and metal workers will enable the workers to take the offensive. The present moment finds the workers deeply dissatisfied. Never before has the government so clearly exposed its class character to the workers. We may expect, therefore, that the industrial conflict which will break out in the immediate future will assume a more revolutionary and political character.

The party must be ready for this struggle, it must develop its membership, it must win the confidence of the masses by consolidating and developing the strength of the workers in their struggle for their immediate demands.

The party must intensify the activity of its members in the trade unions and take an active part in the daily struggles, in their fight against the union bureaucracy and prepare them for political action. The party should establish its nuclei in every plant, mine and workshop and by attracting into its ranks all militant elements gain the leadership of the revolutionary struggles.

These we believe are the most important tasks facing the Communist Party in America.

Urbans (Germany): Comrades, first of all, allow me to state that I represent here the views not of the majority but of the minority of the German Delegation.

Both **Comrade Zinoviev** and **Comrade Radek** have said that the chief task of this Congress was to define the danger from the right. It is my opinion that **Comrade Radek** has not done any too great service to the Congress of the International by his speech. He gave the centrists and their friends the opportunity to use his arguments in support of their own position. It seems to me that **Comrade Radek** has been carried away by the fascination of his theme. He put too much emphasis upon the offensive of capital, intense though it is, and forgot that this ruthless offensive also brought about the counter offensive of the proletariat.

It is impossible for the German Communist Party to fight together with the Independents and the Social-Democratic Party, as the Social Democratic Party is not capable of fighting. **Comrade Radek** has given too much weight to the negotiations with the leaders, but we can only realise the United Front of the working class through the struggles of the masses themselves. We can only force the reformist organisation to work with us for a while. The conditions for an active advance of the proletariat are at hand. The German factory council movement and the committees for workers' control are good examples of it.

Ravenstein (Holland): Comrades, one could not demand the floor to debate on **Comrade Trotzky's** report without being suspected of disagreement with the important, as well as forceful, arguments of one of the leading spirits of the Russian Revolution. Nevertheless, these arguments call for some remarks, not so much on the main part of **Comrade Trotzky's** report, but on the part where he spoke about the prospects of the World Revolution and the probable political developments in Western Europe. **Comrade Trotzky** drew attention to the danger of reformist and pacifist illusions in the Western Parties. Well, in the light of the experiences of last year, there can be no two opinions on that score. But he went on to say that the political background for such illusions would probably be extremely favourable for some time to come. This view he based on the assumption that the political developments of the Western countries will quite easily lead to a bloc, and consequently to a government of petty bourgeois pacifist elements, a bloc of the left, so to speak, which would lay claim to the support of the Labour Parties. In such a contingency there would be considerable danger of such a bloc gaining support from Communists, or at least an inclination to such support, but I am of the opinion that the time has gone by for these blocs of the left, and they will never come back again.

Democracy is being shattered by the "right." This is the dominating factor of present-day politics in all the old bourgeois countries, like England, France, Belgium and Holland.

It should be borne in mind that, particularly in these countries which have still maintained a stable currency, the imperialist interests insist upon such a policy. In England or Holland, for instance, the necessary funds could not be raised for an aggressive imperialist policy, without cutting down the expenditures on social legislation.

This development of events knocks out the bottom of the labour parties and even of the reformist and pacifist bourgeois groups. Thus we have seen in the last elections in Holland a small but effective example of an imperialist country, where such men as the head of the Royal Dutch Shell Petroleum Company, are complete rulers of the country in spite of universal suffrage and democratic institutions.

This seems to me to be the trend of events also in England. The Labour Party is being brushed aside and pressed against the wall, so to speak. Can anyone expect a Henderson or a Clynes to succeed where the much more capable men such as Troelstra in Holland have failed, namely, to come to the helm by the aid of the petty bourgeois catholic centre, which forms the strongest party in our country, and has hundreds of thousands of workers under its influence. This is entirely out of the question now as well as in the future, so long as the imperialist state and imperialist interests maintain their positions.

The same trend of development we witness in France. Also there, in my opinion, the time has gone for a bloc of the left and will never come back again. The radical-socialist party there disappeared even before the war. During the war the openly reactionary parties gained considerable strength. There are no signs even in the Western countries for a revival of bourgeois reformism, radicalism and pacifism.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that it is an altogether mistaken idea to expect either Henderson and Clynes in England or Longuet and Blum in France, to be able to form a government relying upon the bourgeois reformist elements. The Hendersons and Clynes, Longuets, Vanderveldes and Troelstras could only serve their highest purpose as ministers in an imperialist United Front. But the imperialist United Front could certainly not be brought within the strict definition of the terms of Workers' Government.

I, therefore, come to the conclusion that the proletarian United Front is the great tactical line of guidance in all capitalist states, where the proletariat has not yet been victorious without any distinction of their respective history, culture and tradition. On the other hand, the workers' government can be considered only for special circumstances that may arise in Central Europe and perhaps in other countries. For these countries it has its greatest value. But only under the method of the United Front of the entire proletariat can the Communist International fight and win throughout the world.

Storn (Austria), declared that the capitalist offensive was the last desperate attempt of the bourgeoisie to save

capitalism. In Geneva, the world bourgeoisie came together to help Austria. An international action of the Comintern is necessary in this question. Austria shows that even a small Communist Party can apply the policy of the United Front with success. The slogan of the workers' government is a counter move against the slogan of a coalition government. The United Front is no longer a measure of defence, it has already become a weapon of offence.

Webb (England): Comrades, I want to speak upon the offensive of capitalism, not only from the point of view of the development of the capitalist offensive in Britain, but also from the point of view of the offensive of capitalism in other countries. In England, the capitalist offensive during the years 1921 and 1922, has been more intensified than in any other country in Europe. In 1921 we witnessed a combination of the government and the mineowners to defeat the miners and divide the forces of the working class. The triple alliance upon which the workers placed great hopes failed them.

During these days 1,600,000 tons of coal were imported into Great Britain. (Comrade Radek: From America.)

The Amsterdam International, along with the Second International, proved their complete bankruptcy by their inability to rally the industrial forces to the aid of the miners. Frank Hodges, of the Miners' Federation, speaking at the recent Trade Union Congress, when the question of affiliation to the Red International was at issue, declared that he had made efforts to get joint action to prevent the coal from being imported into Britain. Hodges had to admit the total incapacity of the Amsterdam International to measure up to the situation which then existed. At the same time we members of the Communist International must fully recognise that there is something as yet very defective in our own International machinery, for, when in those days the Amsterdam International was incapable of meeting the situation, the Communist International, with its influence in the Red International of Labour Unions, was also incapable of rallying the workers. It is true that in those days the Red Trade Union International had only just been born, but the fact remains that there was not the co-ordination between the Communist parties in existence, and between the revolutionary workers that there might have been.

(Radek: There was not the power to act.)

The capitalist offensive in 1922 was reflected in the great engineering lock-out just as it was reflected in the miners' lock-out in 1921. These are the outstanding instances of the heavy offensive of capitalism against the British proletariat. At the very moment when the engineers in Britain were fighting against the capitalist offensive there were proceeding in seven European countries the struggle of the metal workers against different sections of the international capitalist class. But this year, 12 months after the period of the miners' lockout, when there had been a considerable measure of advance with regard to the

upbuilding of the Communist parties, we still find that there is that same lack of co-ordination between the Communist parties where sections of the proletariat were fighting against the capitalist offensive. We now find in England that the capitalist class, having delivered their blows against the miners, having broken the resistance of the engineers, are about to turn their attention to the transport workers. The most centralised organisation, the most powerful section of the transport workers' movement in Britain, is the National Union of Railwaymen.

Now we find that the spokesmen of the capitalist class, the economists of capitalism, are brutally and frankly telling the working class that the railwaymen's conditions must come down to the level of the miners and engineers.

Not only do we get the brutal offensive of capitalism, naked and unashamed in these days of 1922, but we also get the Amsterdam leadership and the leaders of the Labour party who are amongst the chief representatives of the Second International informing the working class that these economic conditions are what they should expect. Mr. Henderson has propagated the idea of an industrial truce based upon an economic status which is considerably worse than pre-war days. They are making frantic efforts to assist the bourgeoisie to standardise the slavery of the working class upon a lower level.

Comrade Zinoviev and others have characterised the capitalist offensive also in political forces like the Fascists. Britain, along with the United States of America, has always claimed that the representative democratic institutions would enable the working class movement to satisfy its demands without travelling the path of revolution as in Russia. We find at this moment on the statute book the Emergency Powers Act. The law enables the government of the ruling class to declare in any acute crisis a state of emergency which entitles them to call upon the army reserve, the naval reserve and to organise special defence corps, mobilise the middle class forces and make all preparations to cope with a situation of civil war. The use of the Black and Tans in Ireland clearly indicates that when English capitalism is threatened to the extent that capitalism in other countries has been threatened, it will apply even more severe measures than have been applied elsewhere.

Now I want to say a word about the requirements of the Communist parties in Europe and the International. The International should insist upon mutual representation on the executive committees of the parties in Western Europe in particular, so that the Communist parties of Britain, Germany, France, Italy and Scandinavian countries, can secure the mutual consideration of problems and a real United Front, that will enable the workers to make a real defence against capitalism. Furthermore, it is necessary that the Communist International should do more to co-ordinate the Communist groups that are being established in those countries where there is a revolutionary nationalist movement. They should speedily tackle the

co-ordination of Communist groups in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Palestine and Persia because the roots of the social-democracy have not been planted there.

The Communist International agrees that social-democracy is the chief stumbling block, with its opportunism and treachery, to the development of the world revolution. I would urge that the Communist International insist that the elements that are within the Communist parties and which are still on the reformist parliamentary path shall be excluded. I say in the name of the Communist Party of Great Britain that we stand unreservedly for the 21 points, and that the International must not weaken the conditions which distinguish the Communist International from the Reformist International of the past.

Hörnle (Germany), speaking for the majority of the German delegation, declared they were in agreement with Comrade Radek's views. The German opposition thwarted the application of the United Front because it involves danger, but we owe it to this policy that we finally got rid of the K.A.P.D.

Rosmer (France): Comrades, I ask permission to say that a telegram from Warsaw states that Comrade Etienne Rybacki, elected to Parliament by the vote of 32,000 miners from the Dombrova basin, has just been arrested by the police on the strength of Czarist laws, which are being applied to-day in Poland. Also

Comrade Etienne Krolokowski, elected in Warsaw by 27,000 votes, is also in prison. This violation of the will of tens of thousands of working class voters is a new link in the long chain of infamous persecutions which the Communist movement in the democratic republic of Poland has been suffering.

The Polish Government, after its judicial crime against Comrade deputy Dombal, who had courageously proclaimed his adhesion to Communism, continues its crimes against the elected representatives of the revolutionary proletariat, sent to Parliament in spite of the white terror.

The Congress of the Comintern condemns before the working class of the world these acts of barbarism of the Polish Government, the flunkey of International capital, and expresses its admiration of the Polish proletariat, courageously defending the cause of liberty and humanity under such extreme hardships.

Kolaroff (Chairman): Any objections to this proposition?
Adopted unanimously. Comrade Radek will now reply to the discussion.

Comrade Radek said in reply to the discussion that not only dangers from the right, but also from the left menace the Comintern. The danger from the right is great. Referring to Comrade Urbans' views he said that the latter's appreciation of the world situation was incorrect. The counter-offensive of the proletariat has not yet begun, it may even be that the capitalist offensive has not yet reached its height. The shop councils' movement in Germany, the fight of the French workers

for the eight-hour day, are only defensive fights against the catastrophic depreciation of their standard of living.

So long as we represent the weaker section of the working class movement we will have to treat with the social democrats, although we know that the leaders of the social democracy are conscious enemies of the revolution. But it may happen that the social democrats should betray the bourgeoisie instead of the working class. The internal opposition against the United Front prevents the organisation of our fighting front and may harm the party. Should the pressure of the masses force the social democrats to give up their coalition policy, we will be ready to fight our common enemy, the bourgeoisie, together with them. We must not only maintain our ideological purity; we must take part in the daily struggles of the workers. We are always faced with the danger of "Otsovism," which always expects the revolution to break out at once. The Communist Parties must act all the time and they must unite all the revolutionary forces against the dangers from the right.

Upon these dangers I wish to say a few words. The British delegate, Comrade Webb, spoke here and admonished the Executive to keep to the 21 conditions. I heard to-day for the first time that our good Comrade Webb was robbed of his sleep for fear that there might be 20 conditions. I can reassure him. Comrade Zinoviev said that at the next negotiations with groups coming from the right, there will be 42 conditions. Perhaps this will satisfy Comrade Webb. However, the party which he represents is not as radical as he is. We are obliged to criticise a little the party which he represents in connection with a serious error of action. I have before me the election address of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

How does the British Communist Party apply its United Front tactics? It says: "We are a section of the working class, namely, its left wing. Nevertheless, we want to stand together with all the other workers' parties." Whither Naomi goes thither goes Ruth also. I do not mean Comrade Ruth Fischer—(laughter)—but, the kindhearted biblical Ruth. And then the election address goes on "What is the Labour Party? The workers are fine fellows, they want to fight, but the leaders are not quite so fine." And then it says: "In the past as in the present there was treachery on the part of the leaders. Such treachery might happen once. But, nevertheless, the Labour Party is against the capitalists." By jove, if this is a sample of unity tactics, perhaps we had better leave them alone. The Executive has shown in its manifestos to the workers that the entire policy of the Labour Party is nothing but a continuous betrayal of working class interests. But the Executive also said to the workers: "If the Labour Party is victorious and forms a government, it will betray you in the end and will show to the workers that its aim is the perpetuation of capitalism. Then the workers will either desert it, or the Labour Party will be compelled to fight owing to the pressure of the workers, and in that case we shall back

it. We issued a definite watchword: vote for it, but prepare to struggle against it." If, thereupon, Comrade Wehh comes here and warns us against the opportunists, we can only say to him: "Comrade Webb, book your berth as quickly as possible and return to England, in order to fight against opportunism there, and you will have our heartiest support."

Our policy is laid out for the coming period, but we never lose sight of the more distant future. We must continue our negotiations with the social democrats as long as we are not the decisive factors in the working class movement. The way of the United Front leads ultimately to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Zinoviev (Chairman): Comrades, I have just received a telegram from Comrade Walton Newbold, of Glasgow, saying that our party has won the election in Motherwell, Scotland. (Applause.)

An independent candidate of our English party has been elected there. We do not overestimate the value of parliamentarism, but this victory has nevertheless a significance for our principles. The Red Star appears to be rising in this most capitalist of all countries. I believe that under present circumstances in England this election is not an unimportant victory of the Communist International. (Applause.)

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE VERSAILLES TREATY

SESSIONS 25 & 26, November 28 & 29, 1922,

Chairman: Comrade Markhlevsky.

Speakers: Comrades Cachin, Gennari, Smeral, Radic, Murphy, Keller, Connolly, Friedlander.

Cachin: Comrades, we shall examine the consequences of the Versailles Treaty and of the other Treaties which followed it.

From the first we may observe that these treaties—and especially that of Versailles—appear to be impletable and to have wrought grave misfortune on Europe.

It is truism that we are by no means certain whether the results of the Versailles Treaty have not been worse than those of the war itself.

These treaties show such an ignorance of the economic and political necessities of the present time that the Entente bourgeoisie is now compelled to consult together for the third time

in Lausanne in order to try and modify these texts which they thought were decisive. And this is by no means the last effort of this kind.

Above all, I would like to deal with the attitude of one of the Entente countries, which since 1918 has shown the most grasping proclivities and, at the same time, a profound misunderstanding of actual needs. I wish to speak of France.

The political rulers of France maintain that it is the most stable country in Europe, suffering less than any other from social convulsions. The French bourgeoisie officially present an attitude of mental tranquillity and serenity.

But, in reality, France is ravaged by the economic and financial aftermath of the Versailles Peace.

One can easily foresee that within three or four years the French budget will hardly suffice to pay the interest on the total National Debt.

In order to understand the evil which afflicts modern capitalist France, one should understand the illusions of her bourgeoisie.

They have always thought—and the official economists and financiers have not disabused them of this notion—that they would be able to extort sufficient sums from Germany to enable them to pay the capital of the National Debt.

We remember the unheard of sums which France demanded from England up to the time of the Treaty of London in May, 1921; they told the credulous folk of France that something like three or four hundred milliards of francs would be obtained from Germany by a continual pressure exerted until they had received the last sou. The Ministers of Finance contended that the whole policy of the country should be exerted towards one supreme end: to make Germany pay in silver and gold.

In May, 1921, they began to reduce the mad claims with which they had started.

They then fixed the definite figure of the sum which they said Germany should pay, namely, 132 milliards of gold marks of which 52 per cent. was to go to France, that is to say, 80 milliards.

And this payment has been until recently the only theme the only leit-motiv of the Ministers of the Republic, the servile press and all the public opinion which has been encouraged in this belief.

Then, little by little, when they saw that no money was forthcoming they began somewhat to modify their original conception. When they realised that until this year, 1922, not a single gold mark had come to France, that there were no payments in specie, and that the sole gold payments which Germany had made, amounting to a little more than one milliard, had been paid to Belgium and England, and that France had not received anything, then the public began to doubt that Germany would pay her debts.

Up to the present France has paid about 80 milliards as advances on payment for war indemnities. Since December, 1918, she has maintained an army on the Rhine of 90,000 men, which has cost her 12 milliard gold francs.

Under these circumstances, one understands how it is that France, misled by the stupidities of officialdom, has commended to lose faith in the dogma that Germany will pay.

Capitalist France finds itself hard pressed. A violent campaign has been initiated by the worst of our jingoes, by French employers and those of the capitalists who fear to let slip from their hands the exploitation of reconstruction activities in the north which they wish to reserve for themselves. Therefore, they are carrying on an energetic campaign against the Stinnes-Lubersac agreement.

In fact, one of the most influential experts in France has declared that our armies at present occupy that portion of the Ruhr in which there are 45 steel mills, and that by extending our occupation of the right bank to a small extent we should have under our guns, not merely 45, but 60 plants. "And," he continued, "if you establish a strict customs barrier on the further side of those 60 plants, you will break up the relationship of the German metal industry, you will sever the artery of the greatest German industry."

But it is not only these consequences of the Versailles Treaty upon which we should dwell. There are others which are obvious to all and of which our comrades from other countries can bear witness. French capitalism has not wished to extract from Germany only money and commodities; it also wishes to dismember her. At the same time France wishes to profit by her victory by securing economic and political hegemony over those little European countries, of which she created a whole patchwork after the war. These countries have neither an independent economic life nor a free political existence.

It would be gratuitous for me to remind you here of all the consequences, so well known to all communists nowadays, of the Versailles Treaty and of all those treaties which accompanied it or followed it. The essential thing is to emphasize the impossibility of European Capitalism to extricate itself from these accumulative ruinous results.

Naturally, in the face of these facts and their consequences, the class struggle becomes sharper in all its forms. On us in France it imposes the duty of making a most energetic campaign against the Treaty of Versailles as such, to point to the concrete results of it, to show the growing influence of the militarists in our country, and to struggle in even more forceful fashion against this militaristic development, to demand the immediate liberation of the six million Rhinelanders who are under the heel of our militarists. We must combine more and more frequently the actions of the two great working classes most directly concerned: the French and the German. We have met together only two or three times and until recently, especially in France, we have



been so absorbed by internal disturbances, that we have not been able to give to this most necessary measure that care which it imperiously demands.

As a result of this Congress there should be a more intimate union and a more stable and detailed understanding between the two delegations representing German and French Communism. It will be necessary to increase the number of demonstrations in the two countries, to send more and more French militants to Germany and have more German militants come to France, in this way to ensure the reciprocal interchange of propaganda between the two parties.

We believe it possible to bring before this Congress a clear and simple resolution which shall be practical and concrete in its conclusions. It is this concrete plan, capable of immediate realisation, which I beg to submit to this Congress. (Applause.)

Chairman, Clara Zetkin: Comrades, I have a pleasant surprise for you. Our Italian Comrade Gennari has just arrived after having been persecuted and wounded by the Fascisti. I am sure that the Presidium voices your sentiments by bidding him welcome and inviting him to take his place in the Presidium. (Loud Applause.)

In general we greet the brave, persecuted, and maltreated Italian proletariat, which, in the face of the white terror, is preparing to rally all its revolutionary forces for a new advance against capitalism and for ultimate victory. Comrade Gennari, we bid you a hearty welcome! Long live Communism in Italy! Long live the Italian proletariat! (Loud applause.)

(While Comrade Gennari was ascending the platform, all those present stood singing the International, and broke out into renewed storms of applause.)

Gennari (Italy): Comrades, allow me to express my thanks for your hearty welcome, particularly since it applies to all the other comrades, to all the revolutionary Italian workers who have struggled for many years under terrible conditions, to all those who were beaten and wounded and who in spite of all this never left the trenches of the social revolution.

When the Congress will sit in judgment over the conduct of the Italian Communist Party, it will have to point out the mistakes which were made, but it will also have to bear in mind under what conditions the comrades were fighting in Italy.

I can assure you all that in spite of the fact that the political situation in Italy has grown worse, the Party has remained intact. The Communists and the revolutionary workers are still ready to fight together with you for the cause of the world proletarian revolution. (Applause.)

Smeral (Czecho-Slovakia): The Versailles Peace Treaty has brought into being the Czecho-Slovakian State. For this reason, a large part of the population of Czecho-Slovakia is labouring under the illusion that the Versailles Peace is a factor of social progress and the basis and guarantee of national self-

determination and national emancipation. The Czech Communist Party has done fairly successful work from its inception, and will continue the work of freeing the Czecho-Slovak proletariat from this illusion, which is nothing but a bourgeois lie. The decisive factors in the formation of the Czecho-Slovak State were not the economic interests of the population, but those of militarism and imperialism.

Only military and imperialist considerations prevailed in Versailles. When the States of Central and South-East Europe were being formed, no attention was paid even to those economic conditions which it would have been logical to consider even from a capitalist point of view. The chief cause of the world war was the fact that even the big States were too small for the development of the productive forces. This war ended in the Balkanisation of the territory of Central and South-East Europe instead of bringing about its economic unity. While a number of States are undergoing a severe economic crisis owing to the lack of manufactured goods, Czecho-Slovakia has a good technical industrial apparatus capable of supplying 70 million consumers, while the country has only 14 million inhabitants. The ruling bourgeois clique, instead of endeavouring to escape from its state of isolation by an orientation towards the East and Russia, is ready, by orders of the Entente capitalists to destroy at least half of its splendid technical apparatus instead of developing it.

The Versailles Treaty has not carried out in Czecho-Slovakia the bourgeois principle of national self-determination for minorities. Neither has it solved the national question for the Czech nation which is ruling to-day. Even in the national circles of the Czech bourgeoisie a feeling of uncertainty exists about the future of the country and of the nation. The bourgeoisie is aware that by its alliance with the principal forces of reaction and counter-revolution, it has landed the small nationality in the cul de sac and has exposed it to the danger of being crushed in the great social storms which have reached their most acute stage and will decide the future fate of Europe and of the world.

The Czech workers are beginning to realise that the Versailles Peace Treaty has not solved the national problem, and that it has brought only misery to them as a class.

The national problem will be solved only when the forces of capitalist anarchy and industrial competition inevitably leading to armed conflicts will have been overcome. A reconstruction of Europe, which will systematise production and will make free and peaceful co-operation between nations possible, will arise from the ruins of the Versailles Peace Treaty. It will not be an isolation and a "sovereignty," which to-day is only another name for vassal dependence of the small States on the big Powers, but a universal federation of the United Soviet Republics of the world.

Radice (Yugo-Slavia): The numerous Conferences of the Entente States since 1919 have shown the impossibility of carrying

out the Versailles Peace Treaty, which was to assure the hegemony of French imperialism in Europe, and of British imperialism in the Near East and on the seas. The Peace Treaties are entirely in a state of liquidation.

All these treaties strain the relations not only between the different nationalities, but also between the races that make up a nation. A classical example is furnished by Jugo-Slavia, where the struggles between the Serbians and the Croatians, although they are of the same race, have reached such a stage that the strongest Croatian parties are demanding complete independence. The grounds for this demand are not only political. The Serb bourgeoisie are interested in the integral carrying out of the Treaties of Versailles, Teuilly and Tranon because of the reparations they guarantee to Serbia. This causes them in this question to go hand in hand with France and blindly follow the French imperialistic policy. The bourgeoisie of Croatia and the other regions of Jugo-Slavia which are not directly interested in the question of reparations stand in strenuous opposition to the Government. This found its most acute expression during the Genoa Conference, when the Croatians presented a separate memorandum to the Conference.

All these new states, financed and founded chiefly by France for the purpose of furthering her imperialistic interests, are totally dependent on French capital and are in the position of French colonies. France makes use of these states to carry on her policy of domination in Europe, and is trying to have the Versailles Treaty enforced. French interests against Soviet Russia are taken care of by Poland and Rumania. Jugo-Slavia watches over French interests against Italy in the Near East; Czecho-Slovakia against Germany. Their common dependence upon France, their common interest in the rigid enforcement of the Versailles Treaty, as well as the common danger which threatens them from the side of Hungary, were the principal reasons for the military alliance between Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia and Rumania under the aegis of France, which not only finances the militarism of these States, but actually organises and controls it. Poland is also in close League with these States.

But in spite of the alliance there are differences between these States, which frequently come to the surface. The Banat district is a constant bone of contention between Jugo-Slavia and Rumania. In the same manner the Czech question aggravates the situation between Poland and Czecho-Slovakia. All this goes to show that the equilibrium of these States is unsettled.

We must tell the proletariat and the semi-proletariat of the Balkans and of the Danube region, that their national, political and economic emancipation can only be achieved by revolutionary fighting under the banner and leadership of the Communist Parties, and that the guarantee of peace and normal development, as well as the solution of all the controversies in the Balkans and in the Danube Basin, can be found only in a Federated Soviet Republic of the Danube and Balkan countries.

Murphy (Britain): Comrades, the issue on the Versailles Treaty is inseparable from the struggle of Imperialism for world power. It is not a treaty of peace, but a treaty of war, continuing the military conflict of 1914-18 in the domain of economics and politics. If we attempt to approach this subject from any other angle than this we shall be involved in the same difficulties as the leaders of the Second International. Their attempt to deal with the Versailles Treaty has shown them to be nothing more nor less than instruments of allied imperialism. For example, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, voicing the Labour policy, as expressed in the Amsterdam and Frankfurt Conferences of 1921 and 1922 respectively, states: "The principles upon which the Labour policy regarding reparations are founded are briefly as follows:—

"(1) The amount and form of reparations required two sanctions—the first that of justice, the second that of economics.

"(2) The sanction of justice must be limited by the pre-Armistice negotiations.

"(3) The sanction of economics is limited not only by what Germany can pay, but by what we can receive without damage to our own people and by what forms indemnity can safely take."

This language is essentially the language of liberals among the capitalist countries which have been victorious, and not the language of the working class which has suffered all the consequences of the treaty in both victorious and defeated countries. It is further based upon the assumption that Germany alone was responsible for the war, a theory already exploded even by leaders within the fold of the Second International.

It may be very interesting to prove that the guns went off on their own, but even that does not help us with regard to the struggles arising out of the Treaty of Versailles. We can only view it as a continuation of the imperialist war, and the Communist International has no alternative but to offer the same unrelenting opposition to the treaty that it offered to the war. Just as it was the task of the Communists to transform the imperialist war into civil war, so it is the task of the Communist International to utilise every political and economic consequence of the treaty as a rallying force among the masses and as a means of developing international mass action against, not only allied imperialism, but world imperialism. The justification for such a policy is quite clear to us.

The war of 1914-18 started with Britain and Germany as the principal contestants for world power. The military conflict ceased in 1918 with new protagonists in the field. Britain had not only to face a defeated Germany, but a victorious France, America, Japan, and the proletarian revolution. Mr. Wilson came to Europe carrying the twig of peace, but the predatory instincts of the participants in the Versailles Conference were not in the least modified. It was not a meeting of friends but a meeting of thieves keenly reaching for spoils. The big chiefs were Clemenceau and Lloyd George, who made short

work of Wilson's dream of a league of nations under the hegemony of America, and produced instead, a caricature of a league as an instrument of the Allied Supreme Council for the purpose of side-tracking the dreamers and bluffing the workers as to their real objectives.

Having dismissed the idealists they proceeded to defend themselves against the revolution. For this purpose they "Balkanised" Central Europe and created a number of small states and called them a "cordon sanitaire," to prevent the spread of the revolution from Russia to Western Europe.

Then Mr. Lloyd George forced the pace on behalf of the British Empire. He secured the transfer of the German colonies in East Africa and the mandates for Palestine and Mesopotamia to Britain. Australia secured the German possessions in the Pacific south of the Equator, and New Zealand got the island of Samoa.

All these things are not incidental to the conference, but the deliberate pursuit of a definite policy which had been formulated in the minds of the leaders long before the conference.

If we can just grasp the significance of these mandates and transfer of territory, we can take the measure of the efforts that are made to bring the great dreams of British Imperialism to fruition. Their deeds pave the way not only for a Cape to Cairo railway but its continuation to Calcutta, joining up the continent of Africa with the continent of Asia, and driving all the time towards those new markets of the East upon which both America and Japan and the rising capitalism in China have got their eyes. Coincident with this expansion is the development of industrial capitalism in India and also the difficulties which are facing British capital at home.

The last twelve months or more have witnessed a tremendous export of capital to India and the rapid growth of industries. Within twelve months manufacturers of textile machinery in Lancashire have increased their export to India some 400 per cent., whilst the British papers have openly announced that Cammell Lairds, well known as steel magnates of Britain, will lay plant in India to produce the cheapest steel in the world.

In these developments there is a two-fold aim, one in the direction of the markets of the East, and the other against the proletariat of the West. The East offers untapped markets in the Malay Archipelago, whilst to capture the markets in the West it is necessary to utilise the cheapest labour possible. Where can they find cheaper labour than exists in the countries of the East? Hence, while the proletariat of Britain and Europe is pushed downward in its standard of life, capital sweeps towards the East, and utilises cheap labour there, as a means to capture markets and to defeat the proletariat in their own countries.

But this is not all the story. There are more imperialists than Britain. There is opposition both from France and America. Britain may turn to the cornfields and cottonfields

of Egypt, and the oil wells of Mesopotamia, as a means of relieving herself of her dependence on America for her corn and cotton and oil, but someone else is looking to the East and seeking to prevent the development of the British Empire according to the dreams of the British Imperialists. Clemenceau, standing for French Imperialism, also looked towards the East and continued the struggle which has been going on for many years, ever since Britain wrested parts of India from French control, and ever since England got control of the Suez Canal. The Near Eastern crisis of to-day and the Lausanne Conference are the modern setting of the difficulties which reach back to the early struggles of French and British Imperialism.

In 1875 the British Government purchased a large number of shares in the Suez Canal. Then the Canal practically became the property of British Imperialism, and her gateway to the East. "The Times," of November 26th, 1875, declared:

"It is impossible to separate in our thoughts the purchase of the Suez Canal shares from the question of England's future relation with Egypt, or the destinies of Egypt from the shadows that threaten the Turkish Empire Should insurrection or aggression from without or corruption from within bring a political as well as a financial collapse of the Turkish Empire, it might become necessary to take measures for the security of that part of the Sultan's dominions with which we are most nearly connected."

On December 18th, 1914, England declared Egypt to be a British protectorate. So, when we come to the Versailles Treaty, France, struggling against the development of British Imperialism and equally anxious for oil, secured the mandate for Syria and made more difficulties for Britain with regard to the development of her Empire.

Thus the Lausanne Conference continues the war intensified by the Versailles Treaty. This struggle in the Near East for gateways of Empire, for oil fields and markets, is directly related to the struggle in Western Europe. France not only secured a mandate for Syria by the Versailles Treaty, but also acquired Alsace-Lorraine and Morocco.

France has become by means of the Versailles Treaty potentially an industrial as well as an agricultural country. She can now see herself becoming the second steel-producing country in the world. The first is America. The second will be France. By the development of her industrial forces, she is becoming a factor in the markets of the world, a keen rival to England in the place of Germany.

These movements and struggles have not taken place without affecting the masses of the population. The East has been awakened by all these tremendous changes of the last few years, and brought the problems of the East into closer relationship with the proletariat of the West. The important problem before the Communist International, therefore, is to transform the unconscious process to a conscious process and to make the workers

of the West and East conscious of the unity and mutuality of their interests. We have to draw all these forces of the East nearer to those of the West and strive to produce a situation where we can get simultaneous action against imperialism.

Still further. The repercussions arising from the application of the Versailles Treaty to the countries of the West give rise to equally important mass movements.

By means of this treaty, Britain took away from Germany her navy and her merchant fleet. She sold 2,000,000 tons openly in the market at 11 pounds a ton. Shipbuilding at 25 pounds a ton could not compete with that. There immediately followed a tremendous drive downwards in the standard of living of the workers of Britain. The repercussion to this was a further drive on to the standard of the workers of Europe. Equally disastrous was the effect of reparation coal. Two million tons a month has to be supplied to France by Germany under the Treaty. The immediate effect of this was to inundate France with coal. The British export coal trade collapsed. Then followed a violent attack upon the miners, who were forced downwards to terrible social conditions. Immediately after the *débâcle* in England when the miners' wages were drastically reduced, what do we find in France? Pits closing, attacks upon hours, attacks upon wages, and the whole market glutted with British and Reparation coal.

Nor does it end there. Immediately the miners are crushed in France, Britain and Germany, there followed an attack upon the miners of America. There are no limits to the effects of this Treaty, with regard to the economic disintegration of the world, and in the development of the movement of the masses.

Hence we re-affirm that the struggle against the Treaty of Versailles is inseparable from the struggle against imperialism. To end it is to end imperialism, and the only weapon to end imperialism is world revolution.

Keller (Poland): French Imperialism is for the Poles only a substitute for Czarist despotism. For Western Imperialism Poland serves merely as a weapon against Soviet Russia. For this reason, Great Britain and France have supplied arms and munitions to Pilsudsky's Army, which is also used against Polish workers and peasants. Upper Silesia, Danzig, East Galicia, Teschen and Vilna are new areas of conflict. French capital is buying up all Poland. National minorities are oppressed. The French-Polish military convention implies the armed counter-revolution. The main object of Polish Imperialism is to erect a barbed wire fence around Soviet Russia. The Polish bourgeoisie support all counter-revolutionaries. When the Polish proletariat struggles against the regime of Pilsudsky, they are conducting a struggle both for Soviet Russia and for their own freedom at the same time.

Gonnolly (Ireland): The bourgeois Irish Nationalists believed in Wilson's Fourteen Points. But the Versailles Peace

brought no self-determination for Ireland. After two-and-a-half years of civil war, Lloyd George made an agreement with the Irish capitalists. He only, however, satisfied the large capitalists, therefore the Irish revolutionists split. The poor peasants, workers and petty bourgeoisie are maintaining the struggle. The British-Irish Treaty places the executive power in the hands of the English Governor-General, and places the Irish seaports under British control. The Free State Army now fulfils the function of an English army of occupation. The Irish civil war will finish as a class war.

Friedlander (Austria) stated that the Treaties of St. Germain, Trianon and Neuilly have brought about political and economic chaos. The social-democratic fulfilment policy has brought about shipwreck. The counter-revolution, disguised as the League of Nations policy, is now proceeding against the working class of Austria. International reaction wishes to annihilate the achievements of the working class. They wish to make Austria a basis for counter-revolutionary activity, and to secure an alliance of the reactionary powers of Bavaria, Yugoslavia, Italy and Hungary. The representatives of the League of Nations are building up the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through the strengthening of the gendarmes and police, the dissolution of the proletarian militia, taxes, tariffs and the leasing of State enterprises. The Communists fight alone against the Treaty of Geneva. The Communist Parties of those countries which guarantee the Geneva Treaty must support the struggle against it.

The resolution on the Austrian question was unanimously adopted.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SESSIONS 14 & 15, November 18, 1922.

Chairman: Kolaroff.

Speakers: Bukharin, Thalheimer, Kabatcheiev.

Bukharin (Russia): Comrades, the fact that we have placed so important and difficult a question as that of an international programme on the agenda of the World Congress is in itself the best evidence of our mighty growth. We may express our perfect confidence that the Communist International will also solve this problem, whereas in the camp of our adversaries of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals we observe complete theoretical impotence. (Comrade Clara Zetkin: Perfectly true.)

Generally we may distinguish three phases in the development of the Marxian theory and its ideological construction. The first phase was the Marxism of Marx and Engels themselves.

Then followed the second phase, which was the Marxism of the Second International. At the present time we have the third phase of Marxism, the Bolshevick or Communist Marxism, which is to a large extent reverting back to the original Marxism of Marx and Engels.

This was the child of the European revolution of 1848, and therefore possessed a highly revolutionary spirit.

This revolutionary character of the Marxian theory is explained by the fact that the doctrines of Marx and Engels were evolved at a time when the whole of Europe was in the throes of revolution and the proletariat as a revolutionary class was entering the arena of world history. Then followed a different period with a different ideological tendency. Following the revolutionary epoch of the middle of last century, an entirely different historic epoch in the development of the capitalist system set in. It was the epoch of the gigantic growth of capitalism. This growth was chiefly based upon the colonial policy of the bourgeoisie, and the stupendous development of continental industry which was chiefly stimulated by the exploitation of the colonial peoples. This created a certain community of interests between the continental bourgeoisie and the continental proletariat which was the basis for a great psychological and ideological tendency manifesting itself within the working class and, ergo, within the Socialist Parties.

Then came the second phase in the development of Marxism, namely, the phase of Social-Democratic Marxism, the well-known Marxism of the Marxist theoreticians. The struggle between the orthodox tendency and the reformist tendency, the great struggle between orthodox social democracy represented by Kautsky on the one hand against the Revisionists as represented by Edouard Bernstein on the other. I support the thesis that in this struggle, which took place a long time before the war, so-called orthodox Marxism, i.e., the Marxism of Karl Kautsky, surrendered to Revisionism in the most fundamental theoretical questions. This we failed to notice. Now we see clearly and distinctly, and thoroughly comprehend the underlying reasons of this phenomenon. Let us for instance consider the question of the impoverishment theory! You are all aware that Kautskian Marxism argued this question in a milder form than that stated by Marx himself. It was asserted that in the epoch of capitalist development the working class suffers a relative deterioration of its condition. Marx, however, in his theory analysed an abstract capitalist development which leads to a deterioration of the condition of the working class. What did Kautskian Marxism do? It limited the term working class to the continental working class. The condition of these strata of the proletariat went on improving, but Kautskian Marxism did not realise that this improvement in the condition of the continental working classes was bought at the price of the annihilation and spoilation of the colonial peoples. Marx was speaking of capitalist society as a whole.

Then take, for instance, his varying opinions on the general strike in his book on "The Social Revolution," where Kautsky asserts that if we are in a position to make the general strike then we need no general strike. If not—we do not need one either. What does it mean? It means nothing but pure opportunism, which we did not quite notice before, but which we see quite clearly now.

Let us take the third theoretical question, namely, the theory of the State. Here I shall have to speak at somewhat greater length. On the outbreak of the war we thought that Kautskianism had suddenly betrayed its own theories. This is what we thought and wrote at the time. But we were wrong. We can now quite calmly admit that we were wrong. Quite the contrary happened. The so-called betrayal by the social-democrats and the Kautskians were based on the theory which these theoreticians had already maintained before the outbreak of the war. What were their statements about the State and the conquest of political power by the proletariat? They represented the case as though there was some object which had been in the hands of one class, and later passed into the possession of another class. This was also the way Kautsky saw it.

Let us now take the case of the imperialist war. If we now consider the State as a homogeneous instrument which changed hands in passing from one epoch to another, i.e., as almost a neutral thing, then it is perfectly conceivable that we should protect this instrument on the outbreak of war when the proletariat has the prospect of conquering the State in this manner. During the world war the question of protecting the State was brought to the forefront. This idea was thought out to its logical conclusions, and it was quite a logical consequence of this theory when Kautsky raised the question of national defence and answered that question in the affirmative.

The same with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even in debate with the Revisionists, Kautsky never developed this question. He almost failed to say a single word upon this most important question and most important problem during the whole of that controversy. He said something to the effect that this question would be solved by future generations. That was his way of "stating the problem."

Comrades, when we examine these mental excursions and attempt to discover in them the sociological equivalent, we must declare that we have here an alleged Marxian ideology that was based on the aristocratic position of the continental workers, whose improved condition was secured by the spoliation of the colonial workers.

They are unable to analyse the revolution, they cannot produce an analysis that would furnish the basis for practical revolutionary decisions. They are evasive when they say: There is no logic in the events of our time.

Let us take for instance the theory of the crisis. With regard to this theory, Kautsky asserts that in our present theoretical consideration of the development of the capitalist system, we

should admit quite frankly that the theory of crises should assume "more modest dimensions" in our argument. What does it mean? It means that Kautsky asserts that the capitalist world has become more harmonious in recent times. This assertion is naturally the embodiment of pure stupidity. The facts prove the opposite. We now find complete vindication of the theses and the theory of crises. They have been proven up to the hilt. We can even maintain now that the war itself was a specific form of economic crisis, and it is this specific form that we should theoretically conceive and theoretically analyse.

Let us now proceed to the theory of the State. This theory of the State has now been transformed by all the theoreticians of the Second International without exception into a direct plea for a bourgeois republic. In this respect there is absolutely no difference between the bourgeois liberal scholars and the social democrats. On reading the writings of Cunow, for instance, we find that some of the bourgeois professors, like Franz Oppenheimer and others, notably those of the Gumplovitz school, are much nearer to the Marxian position than he. Cunow in his book claims the State to be a sort of universal welfare institution, a good father to all its children, whether of the working class or of the bourgeoisie. So the matter stands. I once said that this is a theory that was represented by the Babylonian king, Hamurabi. And this is the theoretical level of the representatives and principal sages of the Second International.

But there are theoretical betrayals which are even more flagrant and ignominious. I refer to the conception of Kautsky with regard to the proletarian revolution and to the coalition government. To write such stuff one has indeed to lose the last vestige of theoretical consciousness. Take for instance Kautsky's theory about the revolution. Do you know what is his latest discovery on this question? (1) The bourgeois revolution has to act by violence. (2) The proletarian revolution, precisely because it is a proletarian revolution, must not employ violence, or as another of these gentlemen has said, violence is always a reactionary force. We know what Engels has written about the revolution, in an Italian article entitled "Dell Autorita." He wrote: "The revolution is the most authoritative thing in the world; for revolution means an historic event, when one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part of the population by means of bayonets, guns and rifles." Such was the conception of revolutionary Marxism. And now we hear what the miserable Herr Kautsky has to tell us: "Bayonets, guns and other means of violence are purely bourgeois means. They have not been invented by the proletariat, but by the bourgeoisie. The barricade is a pure bourgeois institution." (Laughter.) In this way one could argue almost anything. Kautsky might, for instance, say: "Before the bourgeois revolution the bourgeoisie fought with ideas; consequently this is a purely bourgeois method. It would follow then that we must discard all ideas." Perhaps Kautsky has discarded all ideas now.

(Laughter.) It would be really ridiculous to adopt such a method of reasoning.

Now we come to the question of the coalition. Here we reach the apex of all the discoveries of Kautsky. Kautsky believes himself to be the representative of orthodox Marxism. Marx maintained that the spirit of his teaching consisted of the doctrine of the proletarian dictatorship. There is a passage in Marx which reads: "The class struggle was known to many others before me, but my teaching consists of the knowledge that the development of capitalism leads inevitably to the dictatorship of the proletariat." This was the way Marx himself conceived his theory. This is the sum and substance of the Marxian doctrine. Now listen to what Kautsky writes: "In his famous article on the criticism of social-democratic programme, Marx wrote: 'Between the capitalists and the communist society intervenes the revolutionary stage of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the State can be nothing else but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.'" So said Marx.

And Kautsky, what has he to say? Let me quote him literally: "This sentence we should now modify on the basis of our recent experiences, and on the question of Government we should say: 'Between the time of the pure bourgeois and the time of the pure proletarian democratic State, there is a period of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the government as a rule should take the form of a coalition government.'" (Laughter.)

This is indeed not a form of transition from Marxism to Revisionism, but it is even worse than the purest Revisionism.

I now turn to another question. Having disposed of the theoreticians of the Second International, I wish to say a few words on the new analysis of the present epoch, with particular reference to a point which has not been as yet fully elucidated. I think that the capitalist development as a whole should be considered from the standpoint of the expanded reproduction of capitalist contradictions, and it is from this standpoint that we ought to consider all the processes of capitalist development. We have now reached a stage of development when capitalism is breaking up. To some extent we already consider capitalist development in retrospect, but this does not prevent us from considering all the events of the capitalist epoch, including even the prognosis, from the standpoint of the steady and constant reproduction of capitalist contradictions. The war is the expression of the contradictions inherent in capitalist competition. We ought to explain the meaning of war solely as the expanded reproduction of the anarchistic structure of capitalist society. If this accentuation of the contradictions has already led to the impossibility of continued existence of capitalist society, this standpoint can also serve the purpose of elucidating all the other questions, such as the grouping of the working class, the social divisions of society, the position of the working class and the structure of modern society.

The second question to my mind is the question of imperialism. Political economy in the past, including also the Marxian theory, treated the subject of capitalist contradiction as something peculiar to industrial capitalism. It was an epoch of competition between the various industrialists whose methods consisted of lowering the price of commodities. This is almost the only sort of competition mentioned by Marx. But in the epoch of imperialist capitalism we find many other forms of competition wherein the method of reducing prices is of no significance. The main groups of the bourgeoisie are now in the nature of trustified groups within the framework of the State.

It is quite conceivable that such a form of enterprise, such a construction of competing groups, should resort chiefly to violent methods of competition. The policy of low prices is almost an impossibility. Thus arise the new forms of competition which lead to military attack by the State.

I would now like to touch upon a third point that ought to be mentioned in the programme, namely, the emphasising of the role of the State in general, and the role of the State at the present moment in particular. We should admit quite frankly that the Marxian theory, and even orthodox Marxism, did not investigate the question of the State quite thoroughly. The role of the State is very important from all points of view, from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie as well as from the standpoint of the proletariat. On the other hand we are to destroy an organisation, and it is therefore important for us to know the situation as it existed previously so that we may create something of economic relations. All these circumstances should urge upon us the necessity of emphasising the question of the State and giving it prominent place in our programme.

I would further urge that we include in our programme something about the monopoly of education by the ruling class. We used to ignore this question in discussing our programmes in the past, but now, when the proletariat is striving for power and for the reorganisation of society, such questions as the training of our officials and administrators, the standard of education of our leaders before and after the conquest of power, must play an important part. All these questions are of great importance, yet they were never discussed before, because they did not appear to us to be practical questions. Now they have become absolutely practical questions, and for this reason we should give more place to this question than we have given before.

I think that in our programme we should touch upon the question of the specific symptoms of the maturing of Socialism within the capitalist society. It is a classical passage in the Marxian doctrine that the germs of the new society are generated in the womb of the old. But this theory has caused so much confusion in the ranks of the Second International that we should state the question more concretely than we did before. I cannot touch upon the question in its entirety, but this much I would like to say: We all know that the proletarian revolution imposes

many demands upon us, that the proletarian revolution is at times accompanied by deterioration of productive forces. This is an inherent law of proletarian revolution. But our opponents want to tell us that this is due to the fact that capitalism is not yet ripe for Socialism. This is their main theoretical thesis in which they confuse the maturing of capitalism within the feudal system with the maturing of Socialism within the capitalist society. But we want to emphasise the difference of principle between the two phenomena. The proletariat can become the leader of society as a whole, the real creative genius of society, only after the dictatorship. It cannot be in any other way. This is the cardinal difference between the maturing of capitalism and the development of Socialism that we ought to emphasise.

I would further like to touch upon one more point which has not been sufficiently analysed, even in our literature, namely, the problem of growing into the Socialist state. The revisionist conception was that the capitalist state would gradually evolve into Socialism. We say that it begins only after the proletariat has established its dictatorship. The proletariat should first of all destroy the old bourgeois state and capture the power, and by this means change the economic relations. There is yet another point which has direct bearing on the preceding question, namely, the question of the national types of Socialism, as a form of production, of course. Before the revolution we discussed methods of systematic production, collective economy, etc., without having any concrete idea. Now, particularly after the experiences of the Russian Revolution, we see that we have before us a long period of various national types of Socialist production. Socialism can grow exclusively upon that which is already in existence, and therefore it may be assumed that the various Socialist forms will in a certain sense be the continuation of the previous capitalist forms, but under a different aspect; which means that the specific features of capitalism of the different countries will find their expression in the specific forms of Socialist production in those countries. Later on, of course, these differences will be obliterated by the onward march of proletarian rule. If we take all this into consideration, we may then pass to the discussion of other questions, such as the question of the new economic policy. This is the eighth point upon which I intended to say a few words here. This new economic policy may be viewed from totally different standpoints, from the standpoint of revolutionary tactics or from the standpoint of economic rationalism. These are two standpoints which do not always appear to be identical. From the tactical standpoint we have already heard the views of several comrades, including Comrades Lenin and Trotsky. I would like to examine this question from the standpoint of economic rationalism.

I maintain that the proletariat of every individual country, after gaining political power, will be confronted by the important problem of economic organisation, the problem of proportion between the forms of production, which the proletariat should organise upon a rational plan. This is the most important

economic problem with which the proletariat will be confronted. If the proletariat fails to fix this proportion aright, if it undertakes too much, it will eventually be confronted by the situation in which the productive forces will not be developed, but rather hampered, and lead to a gigantic administrative machine, with too many officials and functionaries to take the place of these small producers, small peasants, etc., in their economic functions.

The new economic policy is on the one hand a specific Russian phenomenon, yet on the other hand it is also a universal phenomenon. (Quite true!) It is not exclusively a strategic retreat, but it is also the solution of a great problem of social organisation, namely, the proportion between the various branches of production which we should nationalise, and the branches of production which we are not able to nationalise. Could we, for instance, proceed right away with the organisation of the American farmers? Of course not! For such strata the free economic movement should remain. The same would be the case in Germany. Do you believe that the victorious proletariat would at once be able to organise a communist basis all the bourgeois economies, particularly in Bavaria? Of course not! But this problem is also connected with yet a different problem. It happens that in a revolution the principle of economic rationalism clashes with another principle that is of equal importance to the proletariat, namely, the principle of the pure political expediency. Of this I have frequently quoted examples. For instance, if for the purpose of erecting barricades you saw down telegraph posts, it stands to reason that you are not thereby increasing the productive forces. (Laughter.) The same thing happens in a revolution. Here we get the unrational thing, which is economically inexpedient, but which from the standpoint of the political struggle and the triumph in the civil war is quite a means to an end. These two standpoints, economic rationality and political expediency, are not at all identical, frequently they come into collision. The prime consideration, however, should be political expediency, if only for the reason that it is impossible to build up Socialism without previously establishing the proletarian State.

I now come to the fourth sub-section, which I designate as the new universal tactical problems.

Firstly, quite briefly, on the question of the colonies. For this question we must devote more space in our programme than we have done hitherto. (Quite right.) We are now making the attempt to write an international programme. We must therefore deal with this question far more exhaustively than has been the case hitherto.

The second tactical problem is that of National Defence. This problem was to us Communists quite clear from the outbreak of the war, and our attitude was almost a flat rejection of the national defence, but now we see something modified and more complex. The essential complicating factor in this question is the fact that in one country we have a proletarian dictatorship,

and the existence of a proletarian state changes immediately the whole situation.

When the bourgeoisie speaks of the national defence, it means the defence of the bourgeois state; and when we speak of national defence we mean the defence of the proletarian state. It ought therefore to be stated clearly in our programme that the proletarian state should and must be protected not only by the proletariat of this country, but also by the proletariat of all countries. This is the new situation of the question where it differs from the situation at the outbreak of the war. The second question is: Should the proletarian states, for reasons of the strategy of the proletariat as a whole, conclude any military alliances with the bourgeois states? Here there is no difference in principle between a loan and a military alliance. And I maintain that we have already grown so big that we are in a position to conclude a military alliance with a bourgeois state for the purpose of destroying some other bourgeois state with the help of the bourgeois ally. What would happen later on, under a certain readjustment of forces, you can easily imagine for yourselves. This is a question of purely strategical and tactical expediency. In this manner it should be stated in our programme.

Under this form of national defence, i.e., the military alliance with bourgeois states, it is the duty of the Comrades in every country to aid this alliance to victory. If in its subsequent phase of development, the bourgeoisie of such a country should be overthrown, then other questions arise—(laughter)—which it is not my duty to outline here, but which you will readily conceive.

Next we should make mention of a technical point, of the right of Red Intervention. This is to my mind the touch-stone for all Communist parties. There is a widespread outcry about Red militarism. We should make it plain in our programme that every proletarian state has the right of Red intervention. (Radek interposes: You are the Honorary Chief of a regiment, and that is why you talk like this! Laughter.) In the Communist Manifesto we were told that the proletariat should conquer the whole world. Now this could not be done with our bare hands. (Laughter.) This has to be done with bayonets and rifles. For this reason the spread of the system on which the Red Army is based is also the spread of Socialism, of the proletarian might, of the revolution. This gives the basis to the right of Red intervention under special circumstances which makes the technical realisation of it possible.

Now I have done with the various problems, and I will now pass to a general survey of our problem. The programme of the national parties should consist at least of two parts:

(1) A general part which is suitable to all parties. The general part of the programme should be printed in the membership book of every member in every country. (2) A national part, setting out the specific demands of the labour movement of the respective countries. And possibly also (3), but this is really not a part of the programme—a programme of action

which should deal with purely tactical questions, and which might be altered once every fortnight. (Laughter.) Some Comrades want us to define in our programme also the tactical questions, such as the capital levy in Germany, the tactics of the United Front, or even the question of the workers' government. Comrade Varga said it would be mental cowardice to protest against it. (Radek interposes: Quite right!) Nevertheless, I maintain that the desire to settle these questions is nothing but the outcome of the opportunist proclivities of the respective Comrades. (Laughter.) Such questions and slogans like the United Front or the workers' government, for instance, or the capital levy, are slogans that are based on very shifting ground. This basis consists of a certain depression within the labour movement. These Comrades want to make this defensive position of the proletariat a plank on the programme, which would make it impossible to assume the offensive. Against such a proposition I will fight with all means at my disposal. We will never allow the adoption of such planks in our programme. (Radek, interposing: "Who is the "we"?) We, that is, all the best elements of the Communist International. (Laughter and cheers.)

Comrades, I think that in the theoretical part we should include the following sub-sections. First a general analysis of capitalism, which would be of particular importance to the colonial countries. Then we should have an analysis of imperialism and the decay of capitalism, and, further on, the analysis of the epoch of the social revolution.

In the second part of the programme we ought to have a sketch of the future Communist society. I take it that a picture of the Communist society in the programme would be necessary in order to show what Communism really means and the difference between Communism and the various transitory stages.

The third part should contain the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the struggle of the proletariat for power.

The fourth part should be devoted to general strategic questions, not such questions as the workers' government, but such basic questions as, for instance, the attitude towards social democracy and the trade unions.

Because these two questions are not of a fluctuating nature, the statistical and technical questions can be laid down in the programme.

With regard to the national part of the programme, it is not my task to touch upon these problems, for a special investigation will have to be made according to the country and the programme.

I conclude my lengthy report with the hope that we will emerge from the Fifth Congress with an effective, truly revolutionary orthodox Marxian programme. (Prolonged cheers.)

Chairman: Comrade Thalheimer has the floor.

Thalheimer (Germany): Comrades, I do not wish to repeat Comrade Bukharin's excellent speech to prove the theoretical

bankruptcy of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals; I only wish to bring out a few typical examples.

First of all I would like to point out that in his programme, Kautsky rejects even the fundamentals of the Marxist conception of capitalist economics. For instance, one of our basic conceptions is that the regulating law of capitalism is the production of surplus value. Suddenly, Kautsky discovers that capitalism is based upon the needs of consumption. There could be no more absolute, no more fundamental capitulation to capitalist economics than this.

To-day, Kautsky totally agrees with Bernstein on all points. He has accepted all Bernstein's reformistic proposals and declares them to be the true Marxism. I will not discuss these things any longer theoretically, but practically. What is the purpose of these proposals? They go along the well-known paths of Municipalisation, and secondly of Guild Socialism, a new importation. To prove his new theories as Bernstein, Kautsky, who is usually a very sober thinker, writes the most fantastic nonsense. For instance, take Guild Socialism. The Guild Socialists believe that, without the conquest of political power, the trade unions may introduce Socialism step by step, so to speak, behind the back of capitalism. One need only look at the trade unions and realise their financial situation in the disruption of capitalism to see that this is a pure phantasy. At a time when the trade unions had the greatest difficulty in gathering strike funds, who can expect them to introduce Socialist economy behind the back of capitalism?

Another favourite hobby-horse of the reformists is Municipal Socialism, Municipalisation. Anyone who has any knowledge of the situation in the West knows that the most striking characteristic of the Western countries is the bankruptcy not only of the State, but also the municipalities; and this is the problem of to-day for the municipalities; not the transformation to Socialism, but the defence against the attacks of capitalists who wish to gain control of the municipal industries.

A third point. To render the transformation more easy, it has been proposed to take over capitalist property, and pay compensation. You all know that Karl Marx has said that eventually the English landowners would be bought out. But he did not mean this in the sense that this could take place before the conquest of Power, but only after the proletariat had captured political power. Everyone knows that the first requisite for the reconstruction of the Socialist Society is the liquidation of the tremendous weight of debts which weighs upon industry. This mild method of buying out the capitalists is just as much a Utopia as Kautsky's idea of Guild Socialism or Municipalisation.

A few more remarks to bring out more clearly what Bukharin said on the theoretical capitulation, especially as it appeared in the programmes of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals and the Görlitzer programme. All that Bukharin has emphasised and argued here as if he were lecturing to a class

of boys, the dismissal of the impoverishment theory, of the crisis theory, etc.; all this has appeared clearly in the commentaries on the Górlitzer programme.

Comrades Kampffmeier, Bernstein, Stäpfer, have shown clearly this capitulation.

Now, with regard to debatable questions, I will deal with the following:—

(1) The basic section—the theoretical explanation of imperialism in connection with the theory of accumulation.

(2) The question of temporary measures, of partial demands before the conquest of power, which I consider as the main question for the preparation of a general programme, as well as the programmes of the individual parties.

(3) A few brief remarks on economic measures after the conquest of power, war and communism, and N.E.P.

(4) The form and construction of the programme.

I will speak at once on the first point, the theoretical explanation of imperialism. There were two main questions which entered here: first, the more important, is imperialism an inevitable phase of capitalist development? The second question is a theoretical explanation of this inevitability of imperialist development.

When we say imperialism, we do not mean only the colonial expansion of the capitalist States, but the special form of expansion under the present imperialist conditions. Comrade Luxemburg formulated this special form of expansion as follows:

"In the Imperialist era, we are confronted with a struggle for the rest of the non-capitalist territory, for its new division, and finally, in connection with this, with the expansion of the capitalist and political basis of power."

These facts have been known for a long time and cannot be contradicted.

So the question presents itself in the following manner: Can capitalism expand without limit, or are there certain necessary theoretical bounds to this growth? Some people have objected to this theory of accumulation as a sort of fatalism, according to which capitalism reaches a point when it breaks down mechanically. What it actually means is something different. It means that capitalism is forced into an imperialist phase which sharpens the class antagonism, that it is forced into the most severe political and social catastrophes. It follows therefrom that it is not this limit which will determine the end of capitalism, but the severe crisis into which imperialism leads it.

This is one side of the question. And now, comrades, let us examine for a moment the opposite position occupied by the staunchest opponents of this theory. Hilferding, dealing with the Marxian theory in his book "Financial Capital," says that capitalism has in it the possibilities of unlimited expansion. As to Bauer—not to miss the Austrian head of the school—he

has advanced a remarkable theory, namely, that capitalist development is conditioned and regulated by the increase of the population. This means turning upside down the Marxian theory of population, which says exactly the opposite.

What is behind all this? It is the idea that it is possible to direct imperialism backwards to free trade and its theoretical consequences. The toiling masses must not struggle forward towards socialism, but backward, allying themselves with the corresponding sections of the bourgeoisie, following the same course. The fullest fruition of this theory was reached in an article by Hilferding, in the beginning of 1922, in which he claims that the period of imperialistic antagonisms had come to an end, and that now the era of imperialistic harmony was beginning.

I now come to the point relating to the general program and the programs of the individual parties. Here I stand in sharpest opposition to Comrade Bukharin on the question of the demands of the minimum program. Comrade Bukharin takes the position that one must separate the transitory or immediate demands from the program proper. He assigns them to a separate room, on the door of which he affixes the inscription, "Program of Action." Here, one may commit all kinds of iniquities. (Comrade Bukharin, interrupting: But admission is free!) Free admission is all right. Then let us open the door and see what things programmatically admissible we are going to find there. (Interruption: What do you consider admissible things?) That is just the point. We had opposition in Germany to the inclusion of the transitional demand for the conquest of power in the program. In this, some have seen, as Comrade Bukharin has, a certain danger of opportunism. We must, therefore, very carefully examine the question as to how far it is possible to separate the tactical principles from our general principles and aims. I am of the opinion that those who see any guarantee in this division of tactics, principles and aims are in great error, and are exposing us to just those dangers that certain of these which they seek to avoid will be neglected. (Hear, hear.) One need only look at the history of the Second International and its decay to realise that it was precisely this division of the tactical clauses of the program from the ultimate aim which accelerated its deterioration into opportunism. How did this process start in Germany? In the Bernstein Kautsky debates on tactics, the final goal remained. And to-day, when we wish to emphasise the difference between communists and social reformists, we say: We differ in our final aims; we want socialism and communism, while they do not want it. How do we prove this statement? By pointing to the tactics and the road which these people followed and which are quite different from ours. That is the principal point. I claim, therefore, that specific difference between us and the reformist socialists lies not in the fact that we keep our immediate aims to a separate compartment, apart from our program but in the fact that we bring

our immediate aims and preliminary demands into the closest relationship with our principles and final aims.

Comrades, the question of these transition demands and the minimum program is not new. This question was already fought out once even on Russian ground, and I think that it will be of interest to read the documents bearing on it. It was in the autumn of 1917 that the question of the Russian Party program was discussed. The question arose then, should the Russian Party, which was on the eve of assuming power, retain only the maximum program and eliminate the minimum program. I believe that it will be as well to quote Comrade Lenin's statement in this connection. Comrade Lenin said then—you will excuse me if the question is rather long: "Our entire program would be nothing but a scrap of paper if it were not to serve us in all eventualities and in all the phases of the struggle by its application, and not by its non-application. If our program is the formulation of the historic development of society from capitalism to socialism, it must naturally also formulate all the transition phases of this development, and must be able to explain to the proletariat at any time the process of the transition towards socialism. Hence, it follows that the proletariat must not be put in such a position where it would be forced even for a single moment to abandon its program or be itself abandoned by it.

This fact finds expression in the fact that there is not a single moment in which the proletariat having by force of circumstances assumed the power should not be obliged to take some measures for the realisation of its program, which would be in the nature of transition measures of a socialist nature. Behind the assertion that the socialist program may during some phase of the political domination of the proletariat, fail to give any directions for its realisation, colours unconsciously the other assertion—that the socialist program in general can never be realised.

From the general or fundamental part of the program, we shall now go over to the program.

We are going into the battle, i.e., we are struggling for the conquest of the political power by means of our Party. This power would be a dictatorship of the proletariat and of the poor peasantry. When we assume this power, we are not only not afraid to go beyond the limits of the bourgeois order, but we declare, on the contrary, quite openly and precisely that we will go beyond these limits, that we will march fearlessly towards socialism and that our way towards it leads via the Soviet Republic, the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, workers' control, obligatory labour, the nationalisation of the land, confiscation of the big estates, etc., etc. It is in this sense that we formulated a program of transition measures towards socialism.

But we must not brag while going to battle. We must not eliminate the minimum program, for this would be tantamount

to bragging. (Hear, hear.) We do not want "to demand anything from the bourgeoisie, but we must create everything ourselves, and our work must not be a tinkering within the limits of the bourgeois order."

Such an attitude would be nothing but empty bragging, for, first of all, one must conquer power, and we have not yet done that. In the first instance we must put the transition measures towards socialism into practice and we must lead our revolution to the final victory of the international socialist revolution. It is only "when the battle is won" that one can put aside the minimum program as useless.

I shall now give you yet another quotation which will be useful for our further discussion of the program. Comrade Lenin continues:

We do not know if we will be victorious to-morrow or a little later. I, personally, am inclined to think that it will be to-morrow (I am writing this on October 5, 1917), and that we might be too late in taking over the power. However, to-morrow is to-morrow, and not to-day. We do not know how soon after our victory the revolution will come in the West. We do not know if after our victory there will not be periods of reaction and of counter-revolutionary victories. There is nothing impossible in that. Therefore, we shall, after our victory, construct "a triple line of trenches" against such eventuality.

As yet we do not know and we cannot know anything about this. No one can know it, and, therefore, it is ridiculous to throw out the minimum program, which is very much needed as long as we are still living within the bourgeois order, as long as we have not destroyed this order, have not laid the foundation for the transition to socialism, have not beaten the bourgeoisie and having beaten it, have not totally destroyed it. All this will come and will probably come much sooner than some of us expect. I am myself of the opinion that it will begin to-morrow, but to-morrow is not yet with us.

Let us deal with the minimum program on the political field. It is intended for the bourgeois republic. We add that we do not confine ourselves to its limits, but that we begin at once to struggle for the higher type—the Soviet Republic. We must do this. We must march towards the new republic with boldness and determination, and I am convinced that we will do so. However, the minimum program must not be thrown out on any account, for the Soviet Republic is not yet with us. Moreover, the possibility of "attempts at restoration" are not excluded, and we must go through with it and remove it. It is also possible that during the transition from the old to the new, "combined types" of government will make their appearance as pointed out in the "Rabochi Put" a few days ago; for instance, the Soviet Republic as well as a constituent Assembly. All this must be outlived, and then there will be ample time to throw out the minimum program.

And, in conclusion, there is the following statement:

"The same is the case on the economic field. We are all agreed that the fear to march towards socialism is tantamount to ignominious betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. We are also all of us agreed that the first steps in this direction must be measures such as the nationalisation of banks and trusts. Let us first of all bring into being these and similar measures, and then we can consider further steps, for experience will have broadened our outlook. Practical experience is worth a million times more than the best programs. It is quite possible and even probable that even here we shall not be able to do without "combined types" for the transition period. For instance, we cannot at once nationalise the small industrial concerns, employing a few workers, neither can we put them under a real workers' control. These concerns may be tied hand and foot through the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, but there is no reason for throwing out the minimum program, as long as there are even small relics of bourgeois conditions. As Marxists, who enter boldly into the greatest world revolution and yet take a sane view of facts, we have no right to throw out the minimum program.

"If we were to throw it out now, we should only prove that we have lost our heads even before we could achieve victory. But we must not lose our heads, neither before nor during nor after the victory, for if we lose our heads, we shall lose all."

Comrades, thus wrote Lenin, on October 6th, 1917, at a time when he could say: "The proletarian dictatorship, our victory, is a thing of to-morrow, but we are not yet there, it is still to-day with us." Comrades, looking at it on a world scale, we are certainly justified in saying that the victory of the world revolution is not a matter of to-day. Perhaps, it is not even matter of to-morrow, at least not in the sense as this was said in 1917. If we consider things on a world scale, we are obliged to say that the interval between the present state and the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship on a world scale must be measured by years, and perhaps even by decades, at least if we include in addition to the big capitalist countries also the colonial and semi-colonial countries. For the enormous field which lies before us we must lay out exact land marks, and I am asking myself what kind of land marks and fundamental rules we should have. Comrade Bukharin's chief objection consisted in the assertion that we cannot include concrete everyday demands in the general program, because the latter are only temporary and might change every month or every week. He also said that these concrete everyday demands vary in the various countries, and that we cannot, therefore, bring them under one heading. My answer to this is: We need not bring into the general program nor into any national programs the concrete everyday demands in all their details, but we must give the fundamental tactical rules,

the tactical principles and the methods (if you will allow me to say so) from which all these concrete separate demands may be unmistakably drawn.

Comrades, a second important matter relating to the transition period is our relation to bourgeois democracy. I find in the program submitted by Comrade Bukharin an admirable critical analysis of bourgeois democracy, but do you regard the Communist International as a solid whole, so that it suffices for all its Parties, let us say from India to Soviet Russia? (Bukharin: No! Not by a long way!) First we must have a guide as to the relations of the Communists to the democrats in those countries where bourgeois democracy has not yet been established, that is to say, where the struggle must still be against absolutist and feudal forms of the State. Secondly, we must have some direction for the policy of the Communists in such a situation as that in Germany, in connection with the defence of the republic against monarchist attacks. And, thirdly, we must have some guidance for the Communists in a situation similar to that which prevailed in Germany in November, 1918, when there was an opportunity of breaking up the democracy and establishing a dictatorship. I repeat that all these transitional phases must be dealt with in their general fundamentals, not in detail. And that this is quite possible, is proven by the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Take, for example, the last chapter, which deals with the relation of Communists to other parties, to bourgeois democracy, to the petty-bourgeois, etc. In a few pithy sentences the path is indicated.

I now come, finally, to the construction of the program. I would like to remark here that, on the whole, one can agree with Comrade Bukharin's proposals. We have ceased analysing the capitalist system in our program. We have begun to analyse its imperialistic stage. We have come to the conclusion that this analysis is necessary and must be undertaken.

I believe that it will be necessary to consider the proposition of Comrade Varga; and also to return to preface our program by an analysis of the pre-capitalistic methods of exploitation. If we really want an international Communist program, we shall have to do this.

I agree that it is absolutely necessary that the program should be short, perhaps even shorter than that of Comrade Bukharin. It should also, of course, be as simple as possible. And we also admit that the German program needs improvement.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasise that we must make our Communist program invulnerable. But we cannot hope for this if we leave a long stretch of our revolutionary path unilluminated, or, to use another term, if we omit a substantial portion of our road from our chart. (Loud applause.)

Comrades, we are faced with the question whether the Communist Party should have a maximum and minimum program for the period of transition. The Communist Party cannot

accept a minimum program such as that of the social democratic parties before the war, because the Communist Party bases itself on the conception that capitalism has entered a severe crisis, which inevitably and rapidly will cause its final disruption. The duty of the proletariat to-day is not adaptation—for this was the sense of the old minimum program—but to accelerate the downfall of capitalism and the victory of the revolution.

Furthermore, political demands in the minimum program cannot be realised so long as the bourgeoisie maintain their power by a class dictatorship. Even the minimum program cannot be realised because of the economic crisis, the high cost of living and the destruction of capitalism.

The Communist Party believes that capitalism has entered the revolutionary crisis and that we are witnessing the beginning of the proletarian world revolution.

This is why the main task of the proletariat and of the Communist Party is the conquest of political power and the realisation of the Maximum program.

Can the Communist Party have a Minimum Program?

This is the question before the conquest of power—which now seems longer than in 1918 and 1919—may the Communist Party renounce all demands within the limits of capitalism? Of course not. But these demands have not the same significance nor the same importance as in the old minimum program. They are only transitory demands from which the working class will rise to the larger demands of the maximum program. To-day, these demands have revolutionary significance; they are a step in the growth and intensification of the proletarian struggle.

Among these demands some are of a more temporary nature and depend upon the momentary condition of the struggle. They must be put up as slogans (demands of the hour).

The others are more durable. They contain the more important demands for which the Communist Party will fight until the conquest of power; they have a place in the program. But, being of a temporary nature, they do not determine the maximum demands and the conditions of the struggle. On the other hand, since the struggle for their realisation always brings us inevitably to the question of the conquest of power, and the realisation of maximum demands, we cannot give these major minimum demands an independent place in the program. They must be added to the maximum program and come at the end of the maximum demands.

In the program we must give the general lines of our tactics, taking into consideration the principles of the Communist Party and the conditions of the present historical epoch, but we cannot now designate the special application of these outlines at any given moment.

In conclusion, it is true that no programs are worth anything without a real revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

On the other hand, it is also true that every proletarian movement, which has no substantial theoretical basis and a clear revolutionary aim, is condemned to impotence, and to be a tool in the hands of the capitalists.

Kolaroff (Chairman): Comrades, we have heard the three reports on the Communist program. The next question is, what will be our procedure? Shall we open general discussion, with the object of leading to a vote by the Congress on a proposed program? Or shall we postpone the discussion of the program and the decisive vote until the next Congress?

The Congress decided to postpone further discussion.

REORGANISATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SESSIONS 26-27, November, 29-30, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Markhlevsky.

Speakers: Comrades Eberlein, Bordiga, Grün, Katayama.

Comrade Eberlein: Comrades, the committee appointed by the Congress to report on the reorganisation of the Executive took it to be self-evident that the organisation of the Communist International must be put to the test at every World Congress, in order to make sure that the organisation and the machinery of the Communist International are quite equal to the tasks entrusted to them.

It was from this standpoint that the Committee dealt with this matter. We have resolved to submit to you substantial modifications in the organisation of the Executive, modifications which should indicate the way that is to lead towards the appointed goal of a centralised World Party.

That this is necessary is an obvious thing to the Communist International. The Second International was to us a constant warning example in this respect, and an International that was rather a federation than a centralised body, an organisation whose activity in the main consisted of regular or casual conferences at which the finest speeches were delivered and the finest resolutions adopted, but which nobody ever thought of putting into action. This is a thing which does not suit the Communist International, and which should teach the affiliated parties to consider the central leadership of the International as a real central leadership.

That we are a long way from this the last year's experience is sufficient to make clear. Some sections did not carry out the

decisions of the Second and Third Congresses with the necessary vigour and goodwill. In some cases even the appeals of the Comintern have not been published. Then we have had leading comrades, when in disagreement with the discussions, deserting the field and resigning from their posts.

These kind of things should be done away with in a real World Party.

The Commission considered also the question of the Party Conferences of the sections, which was the cause of a debate. The Comintern, through its Executive, passed a resolution last year to the effect, that in future the Party Conferences of the sections shall take place after the World Congress. Some parties opposed this resolution, demanding that the Party Conference should be held before the World Congress. They asserted that only by holding the Party Conferences before the World Congress itself would there be furnished a clear picture of the attitude and activity of the individual sections. The Commission was of a different opinion. Firstly, because it would make it more difficult for the World Congress to arrive at an understanding on the individual questions after the various parties had already made up their minds on this question at their conferences. Secondly, it would create difficulties for the parties in question if the World Congress, taking place after the Party Conference, should adopt other decisions than those adopted by the Party Conference, putting before the Party the alternative of either submitting to international discipline and annulling the decisions of their Party Conference, or of putting themselves in opposition to the decisions of the International on the ground of their Party decisions. As International discipline must be our chief concern, we are of the opinion that the best solution for the future would be to hold the Party Conferences of the various sections after the World Congress.

There is another evil which has become evident at the present World Congress, namely, that several sections have sent their delegates to the World Congress with an imperative mandate. The Commission rejects this kind of mandate, and requests you to lay down that imperative mandates should not be recognised as valid at future Congresses. It is intolerable and entirely against the spirit of the Communist International for some delegations to come with an imperative mandate and to refuse to listen to explanations, discussions, or attempts to arrive at an agreement on the plea that the delegates are under the obligation not to vote against the instructions of their respective parties. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the Congress must declare in future imperative mandates as void, and annul them.

But, comrades, this strict centralist lead of the Communist International can only be instituted if, at the same time, we endeavour to make the leadership of the Communist International a body consisting of people who are really capable of taking upon themselves the enormous responsibility for the

leadership of the Communist International. The Commission is, therefore, of the opinion that in the future the Presidium and the Executive of the International should consist of the representatives of the various parties as heretofore, but with the difference that these representatives should no longer be delegated to the seat of the Executive, as hitherto, by the various sections, but that they should be elected here by the World Congress, thus becoming, as the elected representatives of the Executive, the truly responsible workers and leaders of the Communist International.

We trust that this will contribute to making the various sections take a keener interest in International affairs in the Communist International. In fact, it has been a great drawback in many of our actions that the best comrades have confined themselves within the boundaries of their own organisation, working exclusively for the party without taking sufficient interest in International work as a whole. It is absolutely necessary that the various sections should show a keener interest in the International work, and be more ready to collaborate in it than heretofore.

Basing ourselves on this viewpoint, we propose that the composition of the leading organ of the Communist International shall be as follows:

We propose that you elect a chairman and an Executive of 24 members, including two representatives from the Young Communist International, these 25 representatives to be elected at this World Congress! The various sections have, of course, the right to send in nominations. But the final elections must be carried out here by the World Congress. As it may happen that some of these members of the Executive should have to return to their sections on important political business, or be sent by the Communist International to do work in other sections, we further propose to elect ten substitutes, who will remain in their respective countries until they be required as deputy representatives of their countries.

The Commission also proposes that the Plenary session should elect a Presidium out of this Executive. The number of members for the Presidium has not yet been definitely decided upon, probably there should be nine to eleven members. It is the duty of the Presidium, which is at the same time a kind of political bureau, to solve the political problems of the International. It will establish an organisational bureau, which will probably consist of seven members. It has been proposed that two members of the Presidium should form part of this organisational bureau. This bureau will have new tasks before it, and will deal with matters to which the Communist International and its leading organ have not paid much attention hitherto. It has become evident that the Communist International must exercise more influence on the organisational form of the various sections, that it must assist them with advice and otherwise at the establishment of their organisational bureau.

We are of the opinion that this task is a very important one, for many of the sections at present attached to the Communist International, do not as yet have the organisational apparatus needed for becoming Communist Parties in the full sense of the word. There are still many sections, the organisational apparatus of which does not differ very much from that of the old social democratic electioneering society. This must not be allowed to go on. We do not require any electioneering societies within the Communist International, but fighting organisations. All the sections must endeavour to become such organisations. The Executive of the Communist International must concentrate next year on the organisational structure and consolidation of the various sections, and must assist them in this work by word and deed.

The organisation bureau has also another task to fulfil, which is of the greatest importance, viz., the organisation of the illegal work in the various sections. Former Congresses repeatedly adopted resolutions concerning this question, but as far as we know, very little was done in this direction by the various sections. Therefore, the organisation bureau will have to pay much more attention to this work.

We further propose the establishment of a general secretariat, as an auxiliary organ of the Presidium, with a general secretary, who is to be elected by the Enlarged Executive, and who is to have at his disposal several assistant secretaries. The general secretariat itself has not the right to arrive at binding decisions. It is an auxiliary organ of the Presidium, and must not be anything else. We further propose the establishment of a department for agitation and education. This department should be under the direct control of the Presidium, and should endeavour to centralise and unify as much as possible the agitational work in the Communist International, at the same time assisting the various parties with counsel and instructions.

The same task will confront the education department, which should be in close connection with the agitation department. It must endeavour to issue instructions and co-ordinate the educational work within the Communist International.

One other department, about which we must arrive at a definite decision, is the Eastern department. The work on this field has greatly increased during the last year, and the political significance of the East has been recognised more and more within the Communist International, so we are of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to have a special Eastern department, the head of which must be a member of the Presidium taking an active part in the entire work of the International.

We also propose an enlarged Executive. Last year's experience has shown that the sessions of the Enlarged Executive have done very useful work. Moreover, it is desirable that in connection with important political decisions, a larger circle of responsible party workers from the various sections should meet, in order to decide on important political questions. The

Enlarged Executive shall meet twice a year, with an interval of four months between its sessions. Thus, in addition to the World Congress, two sessions of the Enlarged Executive would be held during the year.

In our opinion, the composition of the Enlarged Executive should be as follows: 25 members of the Executive, plus three representatives each of the parties of Germany, France, Russia, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and Italy, as well as three representatives of the Young Communist International and of the Profintern, provided the decisions arrived at by the Congress of the latter are not such as to cancel the present form of collaboration. To these there are to be added two representatives each from Great Britain, Poland, America, Bulgaria and Norway, and one representative each from all the other sections of the Comintern with a right to vote. In connection with the composition of the Presidium and the Executive, we took great care in the Commission that there should be a proper distribution of work among the members of the Executive, in order that the representatives sent here by the parties should be made to feel that they are not only representatives of their respective parties, but responsible members of the Executive. It shall not be obligatory on all the 25 elected representatives of the Executive to remain permanently attached to the seat of the Executives. According to our proposal, 15 representatives must be permanently present, while the remainder may be sent by the Executive to do work in other parties. They can also be sent as plenipotentiaries, and are also free to return to their own parties in order to work within them.

The Commission proposes still another innovation to the Congress, namely, its proposition that the Executive be given the right to send plenipotentiaries to the various sections. The experience of the last year has shown that correspondence and the despatch of delegates to Moscow are not sufficient, and that it is absolutely necessary to empower the Executive to send its plenipotentiaries to the various sections.

We also put before you the proposal to change the composition of the present control commission. We propose that two sections should elect alternately the control commission every year, the next World Congress appointing two other parties from which this control commission is to be formed. The Executive must confirm the members of this control commission. For this year, the Executive proposes that the German and French Party should be asked for this control commission, each party electing three representatives. We are of the opinion that in this way the commission will be enabled to do better work.

Another question contained in these theses is that pertaining to the matter of communications. We recommend that the bigger parties should have a mutual exchange of representatives. This, naturally, applies only to the more important and biggest parties. It is quite impossible that all the 61 parties adhering to the International should have their representatives within

all the other parties. We are not proposing a binding resolution, but the wish of this Congress should be expressed, that we are in favour of the great parties establishing such mutual relations.

We further propose that the parties shall, in the future, be obliged to send minutes of the proceedings of their central organs to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in the same manner as they send in their reports for the sections—although, unfortunately, in many cases this has not been done—so that one may be informed as to the current work of the various sections. These minutes must be so drawn up that persons not directly connected with the central committee of the section may also clearly understand them.

We have, furthermore, a proposal to put before you, which forbids the resignation of members of central Executive Committees of the various parties, but makes such resignation conditional on the decision of the International Executive, and, even when these Central Party bodies are willing to accept such resignations, they can still only be considered as valid after the International Executive has endorsed them.

Finally, I wish to mention that we advise the International Executive to have two representatives of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International. Thus we shall have an exchange, by which the representatives of the Young Communist International will have advisory votes in the Presidium and the Executive, and full votes in the Enlarged Executive, and the Executive of the Communist International will have its representatives of the Executive of the Young Communist International in order to secure harmonious co-operation.

A representative of the International Communist Women's Secretariat shall be elected here. The International Communist Women's Secretariat shall remain in its previous location.

It is hard to say just at present as to what extent our relationship with the Profintern shall extend, as the Profintern Congress has not yet dealt with these proposals, and we can only deal seriously with this matter when their resolutions come before us. However, it appears to us to be very important that, as it becomes more apparent that we must relate the economic struggle closely to the political struggle, there should be close contact between the Communist International and the Red International of Labour Unions in the future.

With regard to the holding of the World Congress, we propose to hold the World Congress again next year. Whether it will be possible, within the next few years, to increase the interval between Congresses must be taken up next year. We believe it may be possible to hold such large and unwieldy Congresses, such as this, less often, perhaps every two years in the future.

The number of participants in the Congress shall be fixed, as previously, according to the numerical strength and political

situation of each party. So far, these are the proposals which the Reorganisation Commission wish to lay before you.

Another question came up on the Commission as to whether it might not be advisable to revise the statutes of the Communist International. This proposal was unanimously recognised as justified, but we do not believe it possible to undertake a thorough revision of the statutes so soon after the conclusion of the Congress. We, therefore, propose that the Executive assume the task of the preparatory work for the revision and extensions of the statutes, and that they transmit their proposals to the various sections of the International, so that the next World Congress may be in a position to adopt them. Until then, of course, the present statutes are recognised as the only binding rules for the conduct of our affairs.

Bordiga (Italy): I find the organisation proposals very satisfactory throughout. They are satisfactory inasmuch as they eliminate the last remnants of the Federalist method of organisation prevailing in the old International.

But there are two questions I must raise.

First, we must consider the question of the resignations. I agree that resignations must be prevented. But it would be as well to adopt the method which our experience in Italy has proved very successful. Our method is to immediately accept all resignations with the provision that the resigned member cannot be reinstated for a year or two. I am of the opinion that the resignations would not be as plentiful under such a system.

Second, there is the proposal to hold the World Congress every other year.

Comrade Zinoviev, in an article published at the beginning of the Congress, indicated the final goal of the reorganisation of the Executive. The Executive should be transformed from its present federative form into a strictly organised Central Committee of one great International Communist Party. The proposal made by the German delegation in the Organisational Commission asked for the immediate creation of this Central Committee. But this is quite impossible for the present. We have not got yet the consolidated International Party that could have a strictly centralised committee composed without consulting the different parties.

The proposals worked out by the Organisation Committee, which are submitted to the Congress, represent the transition from the present system, under which the Executive is made up entirely of representatives of the Sections, to the final goal of the uniform Central Committee, which should be composed, not according to the wishes of the Sections, but in accordance with the wishes of the International Congresses.

The proposals of the Commission are for us a groundwork which halfway meets our needs and which, with a certain amount of diligence and application, may be converted into that which the future demands.

Katayama (Japan): Comrades, we agree with the proposals made by Comrade Eberlein. I want to impress upon the Comrades here the necessity for the unification of the work of the Comintern and for the economy of its forces. We want the centralisation of the work of the Comintern. Many communist parties of the West do not look beyond their national borders. That is not the idea nor the principle of the Comintern. That is why we support this organisation of the Comintern.

When you elect 25 Executive members at this Congress and ten substitutes I want you to elect men who are acknowledged to be strong communists, men who can be executive members of the Comintern, not only for their own countries, but also for all other countries. Strong communists are a necessity, but at the same time they must be men of large vision and wide horizon.

Eberlein (Germany): Comrades, I gather from the discussion that no proposals for the alteration of our theses have been made. We may, therefore, conclude that you are in agreement on the whole with our proposals.

A word with regard to the proposals that were made during the debate. I believe that Comrade Bordiga misunderstood me when he said that he thought we would hold Congresses every two years from now on. No, our resolution was to have a Congress next year, but to consider, in the meantime, whether it would be suitable later on to have longer intervals between Congresses.

If I have understood Comrade Bordiga rightly, he said, with regard to the question of resignation, that in his opinion resignations should be accepted by the Executive and that the resigning members should be suspended from the party for a certain time—one or two years. In other words, they should be punished for their resignation.

We are not in agreement with this point of view. For one reason, we have not a superfluity of political ability in the International so that we can suspend members in this way. Besides, on the grounds of discipline, our Comrades must learn to subordinate themselves to the will of the whole, even if on one or two questions their individual opinions conflict with accepted ones.

Resignations are not generally forbidden in our resolution; we only state that the agreement of the International Executive must be obtained. We believe that this will provide the possibility of ascertaining the nature of the grounds for this action on the part of those comrades wishing to resign as to whether the reasons are political or personal, for instance.

Therefore, I shall not propose in the Commission that Comrade Bordiga's proposal be accepted.

We shall, of course, examine once more in the Commission the few proposals which were made here during the discussion, and we ask you to carefully examine once more the theses, which will be put before you to-day or to-morrow, and to endorse subsequently the proposals of the Organisation Commission.

THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

SESSION 21, November 24, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speakers: Comrades Varga, Renaud Jean, Teodorvitch, Joss, Ricux, Pauker.

Comrade Varga (Hungary): The Agrarian question was thoroughly discussed at the Second Congress of the Communist International. We adopted theses then which even now form the basis of our work. The program of action proposed by the Agrarian Commission is not a change from these theses, but are complementary to them. These additions are made necessary by the historical changes which have taken place in the last two years.

It is not sufficient to draw up a good program to approach the peasantry; it is absolutely necessary to convince them of our interest in their welfare and to destroy their distrust of the Communist Party by participating in their daily struggle. For that purpose it is necessary primarily to win over the agrarian proletariat and the poor peasantry, that is, such peasants as do not possess sufficient land to provide them with a living, but are partly dependent on wage labour.

The second group to win over, is the poorer section of the small peasantry. To win them over, it is first necessary to remove them from the intellectual leadership of the large land owners. This is a very hard task in Europe. The European peasantry is not such a large loose mass as the Russian peasantry before the revolution. They are organised politically, economically and co-operatively, and the large land owners have the leadership of these organisations. It must be our work to connect up the interests of the poor peasantry with ours and remove them from the influence of the large land owners. This task is exceedingly difficult. These difficulties arise primarily from the nature of the European Communist Parties.

This work of participating in the daily struggles of the various sections of the agrarian workers also presents great objective difficulties. The greatest of these is the vagueness of the class divisions of this section of the population. There is a constant passage from one class into the other.

I would like also to point out the quantitative difference which exists between industry and agriculture in respect to the size of the middle class. In the cities, we can practically ignore the oscillating mass of the petty bourgeois, the petty shop-keepers, the petty manufacturers, etc. In certain countries, on the other hand, the agrarian proletariat is very small, and the small and middle peasantry constitutes the great majority

of the population. This forces us to give this rural middle class greater attention than we do to the urban middle class.

I would like to say a few words on the economic cause of this vague division of classes in agriculture. The cause of it is that the most important means of production of agriculture, the land, is easily divisible. It can be divided without producing a noticeable decline in production. The industrial worker could never think of dividing up a railroad, an electric station, a large wharf or a machine shop. It is quite apparent that this would be ridiculous because it would destroy production. In agriculture, however, the chief means of production, the land, may be divided up without any noticeable diminution of production. Landed estates can be diminished or increased by sale or purchase and may be divided up by legacy. This easy division of the means of production is the cause of the division of classes among the peasantry according to kin.

Another great difficulty lies in the different conditions prevailing in the various districts in various countries. While the problems of the industrial proletariat, the conditions on which it lives are very much the same in all countries, agriculture presents profound differences. We may distinguish three main types. First, the colonial country with an oppressed native peasantry. In those districts the struggle against imperialism is, at the same time, the struggle of the oppressed peasant against his own feudal lord; and the struggle for national liberation is also a struggle for the liberation of the peasantry from their old social bondage.

A second type is formed by the countries where considerable relics of feudalism still exist, where the bourgeois revolution has not yet accomplished its work. These relics of feudalism still exist in Germany, and they increase as we go eastward to Poland, to the Balkans, to Rumania, to Asia Minor.

The third type is found in purely capitalist countries, as in America, where agriculture is a branch of capitalist production, as also in the British colonies, like Canada and Australia, and in England itself. There the relation is the same as in industry: exploiters and exploited. Jugo-Slavia shows exceptionally well the confusion of conditions prevailing in agriculture. In the newly acquired sections of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the peasants live practically in a state of serfdom in relation to their old Turkish feudal lords. Serbia itself is a purely democratic land of peasants; and in the newly acquired sections of Hungary, i.e., South Hungary and Croatia, we find a fully developed capitalist agriculture, large land holdings with modern equipment, so that in this small country we have three different political and social types existing side by side. This makes our propaganda in the country especially difficult, because our slogans must be quite different in old Serbia from those in Bosnia, or capitalistically developed Croatia and South Hungary.

The second great difference arises in the land problem. There are countries where the demand of the peasantry for

land is the chief point of interest, while in others the land question plays absolutely no role. For instance, in Poland and in certain sections of Germany and Italy, the most important question is that of land, while in America or Canada this problem does not arise, because there is plenty of land. The same applies to France, where the population increases slowly. The million and a half peasants fell in the war, so that there is no acute shortage of land at the present time. In Bulgaria, where a shortage of land exists, the absence of large land holdings makes a demand for land absolutely paramount. The chief characteristics of the poorer peasantry is their paucity and the instability of their class position. This fact governs also their political role. They vacillate from one side to the other. This is a direct result of the instability of their lot; at another time, of prosperity they feel nearest to the large peasantry. They are a varying element that must be energetically dealt with, with tactics varying with the conditions of the moment.

On the other hand, I also see certain dangers from the left. Certain comrades seem to entertain an actual fear of the peasantry, a sectarian insistence on the idea that only the proletariat, industrial and agricultural, can be the active fighters for the revolution, for which the poor and small peasant classes have no interest. I believe this to be a big mistake, for there is a great number of countries where the proletarian revolution is impossible without the active support of these classes. I might say that with the exception of England there is no single European country where the dictatorship of the proletariat can maintain itself if the bourgeoisie, the rich peasantry, the middle and small peasant classes, are opposed to it. Thus, I consider the fear of the collaboration of the peasants the source above all of the possibility of revolutionizing the wide peasant masses, a political mistake just as great as the neglect of the interests of the rural workers. The matter is quite clear, only the rural proletariat will give us reliable and permanent fighting forces, as soon as the revolutionary movement has been initiated, the widest possible sections of the working rural population will be drawn into it. If this is not done, it will be impossible in many countries for the workers to exercise power, and in other countries it will be impossible to maintain the proletarian dictatorship without their active support.

We are not concerned with the question of how to represent the various sections of the peasantry. Our program of economic demands with the dependence of the peasantry on capitalism, in its various forms. This dependence on loan and usurers, on the dependence on speculative capital which buys the products of the small peasants at low prices in order to sell them at high prices to the urban population, the dependence on the industrial capital which through monopoly artificially raises the prices of manufactured goods, the dependence on financial capital, which, as in the case of America, for example, 60 percent of the proceeds from the sale is frequently absorbed by the stock

transport. Perhaps there are comrades present here who have read the interesting novel by Norris which contains the following information: In America the railway companies change their tariffs every week or every fortnight. If a poor fellow, who worked himself up from a proletarian to a small hop grower by dint of very hard work, asks the manager how he fixes his tariff, he will get the reply: "We fix it as high as the traffic will bear." Thus, they take everything beyond wages.

I am of opinion that our chief work must consist in supporting the various demands of the peasant population in their struggle against capitalism. This also raises the solution of the difficult problem of price. Of course, we must not say "Yes, the peasants must receive high prices for their produce," but we must make use of the question of prices in order to draw the peasantry into the struggle against capitalism. We must say: "Capitalism must be compelled to provide the peasantry with cheap means of production, cheap machinery, artificial fertiliser, etc., in order to enable them to sell their produce at low prices." We must not say that we want to fix a definite price, but that the capitalists should provide the peasantry with all manufactured goods which they need for their production at low prices.

But, Comrades, the chief factor of our work must be our attitude on the land question, for, land-hunger is the most active factor of all revolutionary movements in the rural districts. The question is put quite clearly; should or should not the Communist Party support the movement of the poor peasantry for the acquisition of more land within the capitalist system? Should it oppose this movement or should it declare itself in favour of it? No evasion of this question is admissible. In most countries this question is put so pointedly that the Communist Party must say either yes or no. And I say, Comrades, that the Communist Party must come forward with a definite yes. The Communist Party must give active support to all the efforts of the working peasantry to obtain more land. Our tactics must consist in putting our revolutionary solution of the agrarian question against the bourgeois agrarian reforms and direct the activity of these strata of the population in our favour. The land-poor peasants, such as the small and partial leaseholders, demand a reduction in rent. The Communist Party cannot put itself in opposition to this. It must say that it is for it, but at the same time it is obliged to tell the peasantry that this is not a solution of the problem, and that the only solution is the expropriation, the revolutionary confiscation of the land which it is now leasing.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about the organisational measures contained in our programme of action. Comrades, it is, of course, our task to organise the rural proletariat into trade unions, wherever this was not done already, and also to form communist nuclei in these agricultural unions, in order to bring them under our influence. I must also point out that

it is in our interests to develop the agricultural unions into industrial federations, in order to organise within them all those industrial workers who are permanently employed within the agricultural system, such as locksmiths, blacksmiths, woodworkers, builders, and mechanics on the large estates. Thus, these trade unions will afford us greater support.

On the other hand, it is to be desired that Communists living in the country enter the yellow, the bourgeois, the fascist, the counter-revolutionary trade unions in the country, form communist factions within them, and work to destroy them by showing that these trade unions do not accomplish their purpose, that they conduct no fight against the employers. In the same way, the Communists must enter the various organisations of the small peasants, agricultural and co-operative, form factions there also, and bring these organisations under the leadership of the Communist Party. It is self evident that the Communist Party should attempt to take the leadership in the activities of the poor peasantry. They must try to direct the struggle, to give it a more and more revolutionary purpose in order to prove to the rural population, to the proletariat, and to the poor peasantry that the Communist Party represents the interests of all the workers in the country not only in their programme, but also in their actions.

Jean: Various sections of the Communist International have published statements on the agrarian question in their respective countries. It appears that Communist work in the rural districts presents certain special difficulties. But in building up a revolutionary movement it is impossible to leave out of account the peasants, at least in countries like France where nearly one half of the population live from working the land, for this would mean to relinquish the revolution.

Therefore, the Communist International should consider work among the peasants—propaganda, agitation, extension of Party membership—as one of its essential tasks. The French Communist Party realised this ever since its foundation. The Party Congress at Marseilles last year discussed and adopted an agrarian programme which had already received the approval of the Executive.

The majority of the French peasants have become conscious of the fact that our present political and economic institutions are effected by a grave crisis. A large number of them accept the probability of revolution without fear, and often with sympathy.

This fact, based not merely on my own experience, but also on the reports received from a great number of rural federations, explains the position taken by the French Party in the question of the agrarian programme. While in some other countries the agricultural worker can be led to the ideas of revolution only through the stake of minor demands, such as working conditions, taxation problems, etc., the French peasants, for reasons which we are about to discuss, are inclined to dispense with these preliminary stages.

The agrarian question in France presents another peculiarity. It is possible to win over to Communism not merely the agricultural proletariat, but also the well-to-do peasants who own their fields, houses and machinery.

It is true that the landless peasants have a special incentive to organise for the overthrow of the present system, taking the same attitude as the wage earners in industry and commerce. Dispossessed of tools, land, cattle and the buildings necessary both for living and working, they are proletarians in the same sense as their comrades of the factory and shop, notwithstanding all the exaggerated notions spread by the bourgeoisie concerning the wealth of the peasants.

In 1906 the number of agricultural wage earners was estimated at 1,300,000. At the end of the war, how many of these remained? Perhaps 1,000,000 or 800,000. If one adds to this total the hundreds of thousands of small farmers and tenants, the number of agricultural workers would be for 1920 about 3,700,000. We see then that the agricultural proletariat forms one-third of the total rural population. To about one-third of the French peasantry the question of private property presents itself in the same way as it does to the city proletariat.

Last year we attended the birth of a new union movement, in the departments of the South-West. It is impossible to tell how this movement will develop, but its particular nature gives us a curious example of the solidarity between various categories of landworkers. A conflict had arisen between the large landholders and the tenants and farmers over the division of choice livestock.

On the ground that the war constituted force majeure and of the impossibility of foreseeing the sudden variations in prices, the large landholders refused to honour their signed contracts. Therefore the tenants and farmers took part in this struggle.

Out of this, organisations grew up in which small landowners, farmers, tenants and labourers were united. It was a real peasant bloc, a union of all the exploited against the exploiters. And this was not an isolated case. The same thing appeared in other parts of France.

To sum up, for varying reasons the agricultural proletariat and the small peasants in France may be won over to the revolution. Therefore the Communist Party should conduct a special agitation among them, it should seek to form a bloc of all kinds of land workers and to connect them with the city proletariat.

It is possible to win over a large number of peasants to the revolution within a short space of time, be they wage-earners, small landowners or tenants. Disabused of their faith in universal suffrage and parliamentarianism by three-quarters of a century of experience, they hardly believe any longer in reforms and in the declarations of the different political parties. In order to lead them to Communism, however, it may be necessary

to show them that they will enjoy an improved existence after the struggle will have been won.

It is after an examination of peasant psychology and of the material conditions of French agriculture—analysed in the report transmitted to the commission appointed by the Executive—that the French Communist Party has drawn up an agrarian programme which, like that which you are about to adopt, seems to answer the principal demands of Communist agrarian policy.

Teodorovitch (Russia): Comrades, the success of our revolution was greatly due to the fact that the movement of the industrial proletariat of the cities was splendidly backed by a grand agrarian movement. On the other hand the agrarian movement was victorious in Russia because it was supported by the organised proletariat led by the Communist Party. The revolution at one blow solved the fundamental problems of the village. You know that in 1917 we were even the first to carry out the nationalisation of the land, exactly fifty years after the Lausanne Congress of the First International in 1867, which had proclaimed this idea. We confiscated the land from the squires, from the monasteries, the imperial estates and the crown lands, and handed over to the peasantry a fund of land valued at five billion gold roubles. At the same time, we annulled the peasant mortgages which (without including Siberia) amounted to 1—1½ billion gold roubles. We relieved the peasants from paying rent, which (without including the Ukraine, Circasia and the Caucasus) amounted to 200 million gold roubles per annum. Finally, we handed over to the peasantry live stock and equipment to the value of over 300 million gold roubles. This was how we succeeded not only in neutralising the peasantry, but also in getting its active support to the revolutionary conquests of the Republic. By the united efforts of the proletariat and the peasantry, all the attacks of the counter-revolutionary bands organised by landowners and capitalists were beaten back. Realising that the conquest of power will make it possible to create conditions enabling the workers and peasants to work for themselves instead of working for the exploiters, our Party acted as it did in the full knowledge that we were to have a temporary decline of production. We knew that our peasantry, owing to its backwardness, would not adopt the method of large scale capitalist farming on the confiscated large estates, but will rather proceed to parcel out the land. Indeed, we witnessed a scene which cannot be characterised otherwise than was done by a certain Russian scientist, who describes it as the transformation of the land into a molten state. It resulted in a peculiar cutting up of the land into very small lots. Statistical data indicate that in Russia at the present time the number of farms exceeding eight desiatins of cultivated land does not exceed two to four per cent. On the other hand, the group of the totally landless peasants has been greatly diminished. In the Central, Western and Eastern provinces we have an average farm area that does not exceed four desiatins per homestead and the Southern provinces not over eight desiatins. Thus the land represents a

picture resembling a honeycomb—petty producers who already at the time of the French Revolution had advanced the slogan: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" (For this is truly the slogan of the petty producer.) This parcelling out of the land has resulted in curtailed production of grain. At the same time a situation was brought about which made the proletariat feel the power of the peasantry as the owner of the means of subsistence. It was the period of the revolution when the country was in a precarious food condition, as a result of the imperialist war and the civil war imposed from the outside. The difficult food situation compelled us to resort to the food levy, to which the peasantry reacted in a peculiar fashion, i.e., by reducing the area of cultivation. Reducing the area by 30 per cent. as compared with 1916, the peasantry at the same time began to sow chiefly grains, while rye took the place of wheat and oats the place of barley. The peasantry confined itself to the preceding period. The peasantry reduced the cultivation of vegetable fibre plants and neglected the cultivation of seed. It is true that it was not all the result of deliberate calculation, but rather to the destruction of the productive forces of the countryside by the imperialistic war, by the civil war, bad harvest, etc. Nevertheless, the fact ought to be stated that the peasantry did not grasp the magnitude of the proletarian ideals. The situation was precarious, with the land parcelled up, with production on a decline, and with the peasantry breathing discontent against proletarian struggle. It was at this stage that the proletariat, led by the Communist Party, resolved to revise the principles of its policy and to create the new form of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. The situation was fully summed up by Comrade Lenin when he said: "Capitalism is an evil when compared with Socialism. But Capitalism is a blessing and a step forward when compared with Medievalism." Since the Russian village was permeated by the most glaring of medievalism, the admission of capitalistic production in the village meant the creation of facilities for combating these survivals.

Now, after two years' operation of the new economic policy, we may summarise some of the results. I base my summary of the latest statistical data on the latest budget investigations. First of all we notice an equalisation of prices. Until the arrival of NEP, commercial cultures became worthless as compared with rye, and Russia became a veritable rye country; now we witness the tendency of equalisation of prices, which is a fact of colossal importance by creating the foundation for the intensification of agriculture. Intensification in its turn solves the fundamental problem of our peasant economy during the transition period towards Socialism. The second tendency observed as a result of the new economic policy, may be characterised as the slowing down of the process of reducing the areas under cultivation. Another tendency is the discontinuance of the exodus of population from the city to the village; on the contrary, we see the first symptoms of the town again attracting

the surplus population from the villages. Another tendency is the development of small-holding. Already in 1917, when promulgating our land laws, we proclaimed the principle of complete freedom of choice as to the forms of land tenure. Nevertheless, the peasantry went in for land re-distribution, and there was no sign of any tendency to the break-up of the old village commune. Now this tendency becomes fully manifest, and it may be said to be closely related to the process of intensification, of which I have already spoken. It stands to reason that the petty proprietors will prefer that form of agriculture which is the most flexible, and which will give him the greatest possibility of manipulating his produce in the market. Such a form of agriculture is that of small-holdings, and not of communal land tenure.

Finally, we see a tendency of differentiation among the various groups of the peasantry. Under conditions that are determined by the fluctuations of the market, we have to take a certain attitude. For instance, our decree against usurious mortgaging of harvests, which shows that we are determined to control and guide this elemental process, preventing the exploitation on the one hand and of backwardness on the other. All the tendencies I have enumerated are the direct results of the new economic policy.

Our agriculture is in an advantageous position on account of the overthrow of the dictatorship of the exploiters. There is a total absence of the artificial factors of economic exploitation. On the other hand, the co-operative activities of the population are controlled by the workers' and peasants' governments, which means that our co-operation has been emancipated from the bondage of bourgeois ideology prevailing in capitalist countries, where co-operation is used as a weapon to stultify the class struggle. In our country it is a form of Socialist construction. All these economic and political factors entitle us to the confident hope that this process of banishing the survivals of mediavalism in our country will be a painless one. (Cheers.)

Joss (England): Comrades the question of the agrarian problem in relation to England has two aspects. One national, and the other international in character. During the past 150 years the development of the industrial resources has gone on at the expense of the development of agriculture. Today, 80 per cent. of our people are engaged in industrial pursuits, and only a matter of 20 per cent. are engaged in agriculture and the production of food. Therefore, we find that the problem of to-day in relation to the possibility of the proletarian revolution in England is such that we will either have to develop the resources inside our own country or else become greatly interested in the agrarian development of other countries.

We have in England and in different parts of Scotland a great demand on the part of the workers who formerly were agricultural workers to be resettled on the land. Many of these workers who were soldiers during the period of the war and who

were told that after the war there would be a land fit for heroes, have, as a result of the non-fulfilment of these promises, seized the land in these areas. In those particular areas in which are the agricultural workers the task of the Communist Party is either to press for the development of the resources nationally or the extension of smallholdings for these landless people.

The majority of the agricultural workers are agricultural proletariat. They stand on the same basis as the industrial proletariat, they act in common through the trade union movement, and voice their demands through it, and therefore the linking up of the industrial and agricultural proletariat is a simple matter as far as England is concerned. The cost of living in England to-day is 80 per cent. above pre-war level. The wages of the coal miners, iron and steel workers and agricultural labourers have been reduced from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent. above the pre-war level, demonstrating that they are about 60 per cent. worse off. We find the bourgeoisie beginning to understand that here is a problem that they must tackle. The deputy chairman of Lloyds Bank, one of those massive organisations which control industrial capitalism in England, said, when looking up the figures of the census of 1921, that if England did not get back the trade she had in 1913 there was only room in Britain for a matter of 15,000,000 people. It is because of this fact that we insist when dealing with the agricultural problem not only of maintaining our close relationship with the agricultural proletariat of England, but also of retaining our contact with the agrarian workers on the international field. While Prof. Varga has told us that no country in Europe, with the exception of England, can have a revolution without the peasant proletariat, we are faced with the problem that when we do have the revolution we want to have the necessary means of retaining it. The retaining of that proletarian revolution in England will be dependent upon the success of the Communist Party in relation to their agrarian problem, nationally and internationally.

Rieux (France): I do not agree with the exposé of Comrade Renaud Jean. Or at least with that part concerning the communist and the revolutionary capacity of the French peasant. Comrade Renaud Jean wishes us to believe that the French peasants are revolutionary. As long as the small landowners enjoy better conditions of life, we will only be able to neutralise them by promising them that the revolution will not take their land, but in no case will they become revolutionary and participate in the revolutionary struggle for power as the workers of country and city. Comrade Renaud Jean still claims that he would be able to draw the peasants along the path of revolution by means of anti-militarist propaganda.

I do not believe this to be true. I believe that Comrade Renaud Jean does not recognise the necessity of civil war, of armed conflict, without which the working class will not be able to overthrow the bourgeoisie and conquer power.

Comrade Renaud Jean declares that the peasant more forcefully opposes the expropriation of life than the expropriation of the land. During the war, the French peasants as well as all the other peasants agreed to send their sons to death; they allowed themselves to be robbed of their children, but not of their money; while they have given their children without compensation, they only lent their money upon interest.

I believe that we must strive especially to draw to our side the rural wage workers (by fighting for their interests in the question of wages, of housing, etc.). They possess nothing, and we should give them as a slogan the possession of the land upon which they work. Our second task is to neutralise the small landowners; but above all we must apply all our strength for the conquest of power. To conquer power, we must set into action the working masses of city and country.

PAUKER (Rumania) Comrades, Comrade Vargo stated that especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries the question of transport and railways, which are in private hands, are of particular importance owing to the fact that the private capitalists are clever enough to deprive the peasants of part of their earnings by regulating the railway tariffs according to the rise and fall of the corn prices.

There is a similar situation in Rumania. The Rumanian bourgeoisie reckons with the fact that the Rumanian peasants export most of their produce, Rumania being a corn exporting country.

As to the question of the rural propaganda in general, I believe that our conception may be correct, although we have not as yet practical experience. We must certainly pay more attention to this question, because we can exist as a party and as a revolutionary movement only if we know how to approach the rural population. Therefore, the important question for us is to find out which section of the rural working population is amenable to revolution and which only to neutralisation, and on this point we find it impossible to agree with Comrade Renaud Jean. In fact, I believe that there must be some misunderstanding on this point. What Comrade Renaud Jean told us here about the details of the question is quite correct. It is possible to win over the peasantry through anti-militarism, and to get the small peasants to side with us by promising them that the revolution will not deprive them of their land. But in plain German this means—neutralising the peasantry. The peasants will not take the revolution by the throat, they will not oppose it if they can say to themselves that they have nothing to lose by it. But neither will they take the bourgeoisie by the throat, which means that they will not be an active element previous or during the revolution, that they will not be among the barricade fighters. I mean, of course, the peasants who have enough land to keep themselves and their families.

Comrade Kosozawa: Comrades, I wish to discuss the agrarian question from a special standpoint. I wish to draw the

attention of the Congress to the disproportion between what we say—particularly between what the most eminent and penetrating spirits of our International have to say on the importance of the rural population during the revolutionary period—and the theoretical and practical attitude of our Communist Party upon this question.

Lenin told us at the Second Congress of the International that the most essential and profound problem of the present time, and of every revolution—not only of the Russian revolution, but of every social revolution—is the problem of the revolutionary alliance of the workers and the peasants. These words of Lenin did not meet with sufficient response in our International.

I think I am right in saying that the slowness with which the idea of the revolutionary alliance of workers and small peasants has made headway in our Communist International is the indication of the slowness with which our Young Communist Parties transform themselves into real general staffs of the revolution. For the general staff of the revolution ought to face all these problems and to understand all these questions in their entirety.

It was for this reason that the agrarian theses of the Second Congress have in a sense remained a dead letter to us. These theses have not sufficiently influenced the practice and activity of our parties.

Every time we take up the agrarian question we are immediately confronted with the tendency of restricting its scope by declaring that in the villages, just as in the cities, we must rely solely on the proletariat, that is, on the hired labourers.

Comrades, the essential task of every Communist Party is to organise the proletariat of the cities and villages. This is only a problem of organisation, and is quite clear. But there is a political problem which is quite different. It is the problem of finding the means of approaching other strata of the oppressed population, a problem we have always tried to evade.

When we speak of the possibility of winning a part of the peasantry for the revolution, what do we mean by it? It means that the period of disintegration of capitalism creates conditions that increase the discontent of the peasant masses, render the class antagonism in the village more acute, and bring a part of the peasantry close to the workers. To increase and to encourage this discontent, to point out to the peasants the identity of their essential interests with those of the workers, is what we mean by winning them to the revolution. Let us not forget that the stability of the bourgeois regime rested always on the immobility and the complete inertia of the villages. To shake this inertia is to shake the foundations of the present regime.

It is a difficult problem. We should take advantage of every political opportunity to accomplish this task.

Comrade Katayama (Japan): Comrades, we, the Japanese delegation, approve the report of Comrade Varga. Japan is a

new capitalist country, and, as I reported before, it is still dominated by the agricultural population. Sixty-three or sixty-four per cent. of the entire population are engaged in the agricultural industry. Of these, 3,750,000 families out of 5,500,000 families cultivate less than two and a half acres of land each, which shows that they are very small cultivators. Of these, about 1,500,000 families own the land. The rest are mostly tenants or half tenants. They are exploited because they must pay high taxes, consumption taxes, income tax and other local taxes. These poor peasants have no political rights; they have not even the parliamentary franchise. We must take these facts into consideration when we consider the work of revolutionising Japan.

The Japanese poor peasants are connected with the industrial workers. This is greatly due to the fact that Japanese industry has been built up only within the last 40 to 50 years. The Japanese revolution will be conducted not by the proletariat alone, but by the peasants and agricultural workers of Japan as well.

Varga (Hungary): Comrade, the discussion which has taken place here has not come up to expectations. It would have been the right thing for the comrades of the various countries who have done actual work among the rural population to put before us the methods, the obstacles, and the results of this work for our mutual benefit. Instead of this, the discussion concerned itself mostly with generalities.

In surveying the various expressions of opinion, I find that those perils from the right and from the left, to which I referred in my report, have been fully confirmed. The fact is that many comrades are quite unfamiliar with this question. The chief reason for this is that the Communist Party came mostly into being in the cities as a party of the industrial proletariat. There is a certain ideology which seems to follow only the interests of the industrial proletariat, and is quite wrongly of the opinion that the industrial proletariat, which is destined during the period of dictatorship to have a decisive influence on the policy of the state, will also be able to accomplish the revolution by itself and without the support of the rural population. This is certainly an error. We cannot carry out a successful revolution in any country of Europe without the collaboration of the rural proletariat, and without the support of considerable sections of the poor peasantry, the small farmers, and the poorer sections of the small peasantry. Neither can we retain power without their assistance.

There was a strange clash of opinions on the question as to whether the peasants are revolutionary or counter-revolutionary! The discussion on this question as applied in France, between Comrades Renaud Jean and Ricux assumed an acute form. I should like to say that one cannot treat a question in this fashion. One cannot approach a subject in this uncompromising, unhistoric and undialectic fashion as was done

by Comrade Rieux, who asserted that Comrade Renaud Jean was wrong, and that the French peasant was not revolutionary, but conservative and counter-revolutionary. This is not correct. The chief characteristic of the peasant population is its vague and always shifting class attitude. At certain historic periods it is counter-revolutionary. One cannot say once and for all, as Comrade Rieux did, that the French peasant is conservative or counter-revolutionary.

To say this is tantamount to a denial of the possibility of our own revolutionary activity. How are we to approach the rural population if we are ourselves of the opinion that nothing can be done with it, that these people are counter-revolutionary or conservative, and that at best we can only neutralise the small peasantry. I venture to say that this is an absolutely unhistoric conception, which at the same time is a great obstacle to our own work. Therefore, I am of the opinion that fear and distrust of the peasantry and the small peasantry has no justification whatever. We must bear in mind that the peasantry, as Comrade Koscheva quite rightly said, is not the corps d'elite of the revolution, but at certain historic periods, it is the great reservoir of revolutionary forces from which we can replenish our ranks and take whatever can be taken.

For this reason, I should like to lay special emphasis on the statement made by Comrade Koscheva that we cannot proceed to attract the rural masses without a continuous and exhausting analysis of their conditions. If we omit to do this, we shall arrive at an uncompromising conception of Comrade Rieux, and partly also of Comrade Renaud Jean, one of whom says that the peasant is revolutionary, while the other says that he is conservative. It is impossible to work in this fashion. One must continuously study the attitude of the rural population, submit it to a careful analysis, and draw the rural masses into movements when they are politically sympathetic to them.

For this reason I am not at all inclined to condemn the work of Comrade Renaud Jean as some comrades seem to be inclined to do. Certainly, some of the opinions expressed by Comrade Renaud Jean are not quite communistic. Nevertheless, we must admit that he is doing good work among the rural masses, that he is winning over people for the revolution. He is organising sections which it is difficult to approach, and this is certainly very important work. I am also of the opinion that what he said theoretically about the peasant having emerged from the war with a changed psychology, is a very important statement. It is wrong to take up an uncompromising attitude and to say: The peasant has always been like this and he will always remain the same. We must, on the contrary, take facts into account and treat the question from a historic viewpoint.

I will deal quite briefly with the various statements, but wish to make special reference to our British Comrade's speech,

102

which was to this effect: The question of revolution is made very difficult in our country by the fact that Great Britain could not hold out longer than a few months without the importation of food. In this connection, I should like to say that Great Britain's position is not so desperate as statistical data seemed to imply.

The German professor, Oppenheimer, once showed in a treatise, that even if the imports of food into Great Britain were completely cut off, it would by no means be doomed to starvation. He mentioned, particularly, that there are large tracts of uncultivated land in Great Britain, a portion of which could be altered within a year. He pointed out that there are always large stores of food in Great Britain, that it has a great food reserve in its cattle and that it has limited possibilities to supplement its food stocks. If Great Britain were cut off from the rest of the world, it could easily maintain itself; of course, not at the standard of living of the English people, but, for instance, according to the standard of Italy. Therefore, I maintain that it is dangerous to spread the legend throughout Great Britain that the country must not think of revolution because it is land-hungry. (Interruption by Comrade Radek: No, it is not.) Naturally, there would be an extensive shortage of food, but the people in Great Britain would not die of hunger if the dictatorship were left for a time to its own resources.

The Rumanian comrade was the only one to make certain objections to the program of action. He pointed out that we did not want to take up a definite attitude in the Commission on his proposal against the export tax levied by the Rumanian State. I was very much against it, for what would be the result if it were said in Rumania: "We do not want the State to levy a tax when it is exporting necessities of life."

I am not going to deal with the economic theoretic question of who pays this tax, the foreign buyer or the home seller, but I assert that in both cases it is the foreign buyer who pays the tariff to protect against this tax. If the tariff is paid by the foreign buyer and this is the property of the Rumanian State, the abolition of this tax would mean that the Rumanian State would have to impose new taxes on the workers. On the other hand, if it affects the home prices, it affects the revenue of the big peasants and big landowners from the sale of corn, but it does not affect the revenue of the workers and of those sections of the peasantry who have not much surplus provisions to sell.

Comrades, there is not much in the fact that we have drawn up a program of action.

It will become a reality when the various parties will have come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary for the success of the revolution to win over to our side wide sections of the rural population; when the parties will not accept the

hints contained in the program mechanically, but will take them in conjunction with the continued analysis of the political situation, as well as of the situation of the rural population. (Applause.)

THE EASTERN QUESTION

SESSIONS, 19-20, November 22-23, 1922.

Chairmen: Comrades Kolaroff, Carr.

Speakers: Comrades Van Ravenstein, Van Overstraaten, Roy, Katayama, Tahar Boudengha, Webb, Liu-Yeu-Chin, Hosn-el-Orah, Earsman, Saferot, Nik-bin, Radek, Numbert, Dovz, Bunting.

Ravenstein (Holland): Comrades, our incomparable pioneer and theorist, Rosa Luxemburg, has proved in her greatest and best theoretical work, that the process of the accumulation of capital is impossible without non-capitalist surroundings, which it proceeds to destroy.

The entire colonial policy of capitalism from the 15th to the 20th century is a long series of proofs. The destruction of primitive economy, as well as of all pre-capitalist forms of economy is one. Capitalism is using various ways and means, and the ever-increasing taxation is everywhere one of the most important of these means, as in British India, in the Dutch Indies, in the French North American possessions and in all the new colonial countries. This development has also taken place in the Turkish empire. The well-known radical British writer, Brailsford, in his excellent work of "Macedonia," came to a Marxian conclusion. He described the struggles of the revolutionary Slav nationalities in Turkey under Abdul Hamid. He says, for instance:

"In so far as European influence succeeded since the Crimean war to press on the Turks an illusory semblance of culture, it has only furthered weakness and disintegration."

And he adds:

"An even greater influence was perhaps exercised by the so-called capitulations, which created for the subjects of the so-called cultured Powers a State within the State."

The position of these foreign capitalists does not differ in the least from the privileged condition of the nobility in the old aristocratic monarchies previous to the bourgeois revolution. The nobility was also exempt of all taxation, and among other rights, had also the right to crush the common people underfoot. The only difference is that this modern capitalist

aristocracy in Turkey, as well as in the other Eastern countries, consists of elements alien to that country. This state of affairs would have been introduced after the war by the West European capitalism also in Russia, if it had succeeded in crushing the proletarian revolution. In fact, the capitulations are so to speak the crux of the domination of foreign capitalism over the East, which it not only exploits but also debases.

It is self-evident that the new Turkey, which with the support of the peasant masses has won a victory over the hirelings of European capitalism, will demand at the peace negotiations, the abolition of the capitulations, and make the fulfilment of this demand, so to speak, a condition sine qua non.

As long as they are not annulled, the state of abject subjection to European capitalism remains.

But the Turks, who, according to the English statesman, Asquith, had been for ever banned from the European paradise, are now returned. The national rivalries in the Balkans are as bloody and as terrifying as ever. Once again Bulgaria has been overthrown and humiliated, the slave of European capitalism. And when one considers the situation of the other Balkan peoples, one notices only one apparent difference between now and 1913—their position is much worse and far more insecure. Greece has been once more crushed to death by her latest war against the Turks which her bourgeoisie forced upon her.

Comrade Radek has recently given us a description of the contemporary financial and economic situation of that country, which gave us a clear view of its present ailment. One may obtain a clear historical view of the situation by comparing the present condition of Greece with its conditions previous to the Balkan war. In 1890 Greece had borrowed 570 million francs, of which she only received 413 million. Every inhabitant of this small and poverty-stricken land was burdened with a share of this debt amounting to 260 gold francs. This debt necessitated in 1893 a fund of 58 million per year in gold francs, and as the total national income was much lower, bankruptcy appeared to be inevitable.

A new war, that unhappy war, which, in 1897, Greece declared against Turkey, and which burdened the country yet more heavily, gave an opportunity to international finance once more to fasten upon Greece the financial shackles from which she had previously freed herself. An International Financial Commission was formed with full control over the fixing and imposition of taxes which had become necessary for the payment of the national debt, as well as for the payment of war indemnity to Turkey. Thus the Greek people were once more flung into indebtedness. Nowadays, Greece has a shattered economic life, is financially helpless, and is burdened with an atrocious indebtedness and with a population of ragged refugees from Anatolia and Thrace. In fact, the country is now in a state far worse than any in which it found itself since the War of Independence. Such are the results of imperialism and the war for one of the victors of 1912-13.

Turning to Palestine and Mesopotamia, which in name are mandatory countries of the League of Nations, they are in reality under British domination. However, it cannot be said that imperialism, and especially British imperialism, has hitherto derived much satisfaction from these new conquests.

The occupation of Mesopotamia, which was the inevitable consequence of the war, has created for the British Empire a situation against which Brailsford uttered a warning even during the war, in his book, "A League of Nations," in which he said: "The occupation of Mesopotamia would weaken Great Britain strategically and politically."

There is every reason to believe that Great Britain is endeavouring to establish at all costs its supremacy on the mighty Arabian Continent. A well-known explorer, Mrs. Rossita Forbes, who is in the service of the British Government, left recently for the Arabian desert, carrying secret instructions. Probably her business will be to drive the Bedouin chiefs into a renewed alliance with Great Britain by means of gold and costly presents. In the Arabian Continent, nothing less than the route with India will be at stake during the next few years for Great Britain. If during the next few years the Arabian tribes and the Arabs in general desired to get rid of the British guardianship, the strategical bridge, which took Great Britain two hundred years to build, would collapse.

Such mighty questions are now at stake in the Near East.

Imperialism cannot endure unless the imperialists retain their political dominion over the Asiatic peoples, unless they can continue to exploit the Mohammedans, the Hindoos, the Chinese and the other nations of the Far East. Why is this? Because the liberation of the Mohammedan and other Oriental peoples will imply the cessation of the tribute they pay to European capitalism, and without this tribute the accumulation of capital cannot continue.

Now an arrest of accumulation is the most deadly wound that can be inflicted on capital. It cuts off the blood supply, as we have been taught once more by the happenings of the last two years.

The movement, the revolution, which is now affecting the whole of the East, both Near and Far, and which will bring complete political independence to these regions, is irresistible.

The Mohammedan peoples aspire towards economic as well as towards political emancipation. That is why the movement among them is such a menace to Western capitalism.

For some decades there has been in progress a powerful movement throughout the Mohammedan world. From time to time it has been so extensive as to bridge material and racial differences. I refer to the Pan-Islamic movement.

Stoddart, one of the most recent historians of Islam, has pointed out how greatly the events of the years immediately preceding the world war increased the sense of

solidarity among the Mohammedans and stimulated their hatred for Europeans.

"We must not," writes Stoddart "allow ourselves to be misled by the fact that the revolts of the Mohammedan peoples of the Near East during the years from 1918 onwards have at first sight a nationalist aspect. Mohammedan Nationalism and Pan-Islamism, however different they may be, are identical in their aspiration towards the complete freeing of Islam from European political control. Islam is capable of constituting a sort of unity as against the capitalist world; for the bond which unites all the Mohammedans is something more than a religious bond. Islam is more than a religion; it is a complete social system; it is a civilisation with its own philosophy, culture and art. In the course of many centuries of struggle with the rival civilisation of Christianity it has become an organic and self-conscious whole."

This bourgeois student of Islam is at one with the most noted Mohammedan men of learning in his conclusion, "The relationship between Western capitalism and the Eastern world, which for a century has been passing through its age of renaissance (a renaissance which may be said to have begun in Arabia at the opening of the 19th century of our era) the relationship between a capitalist world which is exhausted and undermined by the excess of its labours and the deepness of its wounds, which is profoundly disintegrated and has an enemy within its own household, the revolutionary proletariat, and a Mohammedan world which in every respect, alike religious, cultural, political, and economic is rising out of the abyss of decay into which it has sunk during the eighteenth century—this relationship is once again as greatly strained as it was in the days of the Crusades, when, after the appearance of the Turks in the Moslem world of the eleventh century, one hundred years' war ensued between East and West."

In the century of warfare during the middle ages, the West bore off the palm of victory, and gathered strength from the struggle; even though deep and incurable wounds were inflicted on world civilisation.

Now the relationship has been reversed. Decadent Western capitalism is faced by the menace of the young and increasingly vigorous world of the East and of Islam, where countless millions have for decades been debased, misused, and exploited by imperialism, until at length they turn in revolt.

The West is weakened in energy and diminished in greatness. It has a foe within its own household, the revolutionary working class, which would have overthrown the whole structure long ago but for the support given to the tottering edifice by the socialist traitors. Nevertheless, the contrast with the years before the war is notable. Prior to the war Czarism was quite as dangerous as Western imperialism to oriental freedom, to the freedom of the Mohammedan peoples. But Czarism has been destroyed, and prole-

tarian Russia has taken its place; proletarian Russia, the friend of genuine self-determination of the freedom of oriental nations.

The international proletariat, therefore, acclaims the political aspiration of the Mohammedan nations towards complete economic, financial, and political enfranchisement from the influence and dominance of the imperialist States; acclaims it as an aspiration which, even though it may not aim at the abolition of wage slavery and at private ownership of the means of production in Mohammedan lands, none the less menaces the foundations of European capitalism.

Roy (India): Comrades, at the Second Congress of the Communist International the general principles concerning the struggle for national liberation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries were laid down. The general principles were formulated by which the relations of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian movement of the industrially and economically advanced countries to the national struggle of the backward peoples, should be determined and the experience that we had in 1920, that is, at the time of the Second Congress of the Communist International, did not permit us to develop those principles to any great extent. But since those days, during the last two years, the movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries has gone through a long period of development, and in spite of all that has been left undone, and in spite of all that ought to have been done by the Communist International, and particularly by the Communist Parties of the Western countries, to establish closer relations with these movements, and to develop them, we are, to-day, in a position to speak with more knowledge and more experience and understanding of these movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The task before us to-day in this Fourth Congress is to elaborate those fundamental principles that were laid down by the Second Congress of the Communist International.

With this in view all the Eastern delegations present at this Congress in co-operation with the Eastern section of the Communist International have prepared a thesis which has been submitted to the Congress. In this thesis the general situation in the East has been laid down and the development in the movement since the Second Congress has been pointed out and the general line which should determine the development of the movement in those countries has also been formulated.

At the time of the Second Congress, that is, on the morrow of the Great Imperialist War, we found a general upheaval of the colonial people. This upheaval was brought about by the intensified economic exploitation during the war.

This great revolutionary upheaval attracted the attention of the whole world. We had a revolt in Egypt in 1919, and one of the Korean people in the same year. In the countries lying between these two extreme points there was to be noticed

a revolutionary upheaval of more or less intensity and extensiveness. But at that time these movements were nothing but big spontaneous upheavals, and since those days the various elements and social factors which went to their composition have clarified, in so far as the social economic basis has gone on developing. Consequently we find to-day that the elements which were active participants in those movements two years ago are gradually leaving them if they have not already left them. For example, in the countries which are more developed capitalistically, the upper level of the bourgeoisie, that is, that part of the bourgeoisie which has already what may be called a stake in the country, which has a large amount of capital invested, and which has built up an industry, is finding that to-day it is more convenient for its development to have imperialist protection. Because, when the great social upheaval that took place at the end of the war developed in its revolutionary sweep it was not only the foreign imperialist, but the native bourgeoisie as well, who were terrified by its possibilities. The bourgeoisie in none of those countries is developed enough as yet to have the confidence of being able to take the place of foreign imperialism and to preserve law and order after the overthrow of imperialism. They are now really afraid that in case foreign rule is overthrown a period of anarchy, chaos and disturbance, of civil war will follow that will not be conducive to the promotion of their own interests.

This, naturally, has weakened the movement in some of the countries, but at the same time this temporary compromise does not fundamentally weaken the movement. In order to maintain its hold in those countries, imperialism must look for some local help, must have some social basis, must have the support of one or other of the classes of native society.

The temporary compromise between native and imperial bourgeoisie cannot be everlasting. In this compromise we can find the development of a future conflict.

So, the nationalist struggle in the colonies, the revolutionary movement for national development in the colonies, cannot be based purely and simply on a movement inspired by bourgeois ideology and led by the bourgeoisie.

This position brings us face to face with a problem as to whether there is a possibility of another social factor going into this struggle and wresting the leadership from the hands of those who are leading the struggle so far.

We find in these countries where capitalism is sufficiently developed that such a social factor is already coming into existence. We find in these countries the creation of a proletarian class, and the penetration of capitalism has undermined the peasantry and is bringing into existence a vast mass of poor and landless agrarian toilers. This mass is being gradually drawn into the struggle, which is no longer purely economic but assumes every day a more and more political character. So also in the countries where feudalism and the feudal military clique are still holding leadership, we find the development

and growth of an agrarian movement. In every conflict, in every struggle, we find that the interests of imperial capital are identical with the native landowning and feudal class, and that, therefore, when the masses of the people rise, when the national movement assumes revolutionary proportions, it threatens not only the imperial capital and foreign overlordship, but it finds also the native upper class allied with foreign exploiters.

Hence we see in the colonial countries a triangular fight developing, a fight which is directed at the same time against foreign imperialism and the native upper class, which directly or indirectly strengthens and gives support to foreign imperialism.

And this is the fundamental issue of the thing that we have to find out—how the native bourgeoisie and the native upper class, whose interests conflict with imperialism or whose economic development is obstructed by imperial domination, can be encouraged and helped to undertake a fight? We have to find out how the objective revolutionary significance of these factors can be utilised. At the same time we must keep it definitely in mind that these factors can operate only so far and no further. We must know that they will go to a certain extent and then try to stop the revolution. We have already seen this in practical experience in almost all the countries. A review of the movement in all Eastern countries in the last few years would have helped us to develop our point, but the time at our disposal will not permit that. However, I believe most of you are fairly well acquainted with the development of the movement in those countries. You know how the movement in Egypt and India had been brought to a standstill by the timidity, the hesitation of the bourgeoisie, how a great revolutionary movement which involved the wide masses of the peasantry and the working class and which constituted a serious menace to imperialism, could not produce any very serious damage to imperialism simply because the leadership of this movement was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Hence it is proved that although the bourgeoisie and the feudal military clique in one or other of these countries can assume the leadership of the nationalist revolutionary struggle, there comes a time when these people are bound to betray the movement and become a counter-revolutionary force. Unless we are prepared to train politically the other social element, which is objectively more revolutionary, to step into their places and assume the leadership, the ultimate victory of the nationalist struggle becomes problematical for the time being. Although two years ago we did not think of this problem so clearly, this tendency remained there as an objective tendency, and to-day, as a result of that, we have in almost all Eastern countries communist parties, political parties of the masses. We know that these communist parties in most of these countries cannot be called communist parties in the Western sense, but their existence proves that social factors are there, demanding

political parties, not bourgeois political parties, but political parties which will express and reflect the demands, interests, aspirations of the masses of the people, peasants and workers, as against that kind of nationalism which merely stands for the economic development and the political aggrandisement of the native bourgeoisie.

We have to develop our parties in these countries in order to take the lead in the organisation of its United Front against Imperialism. Just as the tactics of united proletarian front leads to the accumulation of organisational strength in the Western countries and unmasks and discloses the treachery and compromising tactics of the Social-Democratic Party by bringing them into active conflict, so will the campaign of united anti-imperialist front in the colonial countries liberate the leadership of the movement from the timid and hesitating bourgeoisie and bring the masses more actively in the forefront, through the most revolutionary social elements, which constitute the basis of the movement, thereby securing the final victory.

Katayama (Japan): Comrades, I rise to present the Japanese case and also the case of the Far East. Japan occupies a very important place in the coming socialist revolution. Japan is important in the revolutionary movement of the world because in the near future the workers of Japan may rise against the capitalists. This is the reason why I want your serious attention. We all know, and I do not need to tell you, that we must protect the Russian revolution. Soviet Russia is menaced by Japanese Imperialism, and for this reason alone the Fourth Congress and the Communists of the world should pay more attention to this subject than it has done hitherto. During the Congress Japan is represented here in order to make progress in the social revolution of the world. This is the reason I want to read what I presented in my report on Japan and Japanese conditions. I want to give you a few facts. They are facts which will give you some idea of what Japan is:

Population	56,000,000
Wealth estimated at	87,000,000,000 yen
Products, 1917	8,372,000,000 "
" 1918	5,608,000,000 "

Japan is the most industrialised country in the Far East. The following figures show how the workers are classified:

Workers	Men.	Minors.	Women.	Total.
Government Employees	133,000	—	43,000	176,000
Factory employing 10 or more	706,000	—	314,000	1,520,000
Miners	353,000	—	112,000	465,000
Forestry	561,000	—	147,000	716,000
Fishery	617,000	20,000	170,000	808,000
Railway Workers	2,373,000	20,000	1,180,000	3,860,000
Agrarian Workers	1,550,000	55,000	1,402,000	3,293,000
Grammar School Teachers	173,000	—	53,000	226,000

These are wage workers, exploited in some cases very much. The work-day in the spinning factory consists of 11 and 12 hours and there are also night shifts. Women and young girls work these hours in the factory. Besides this there are 4,160,000 families of poor peasantry and combined tenantry.

In 1920 there were 838 unions, with a membership of 269,000, and in 1921 671 unions, with a membership of 246,000, and 229 tenant unions, with a membership of 24,000. There has, of course, been an increase since that time. The land-owners' union which is really a peasant proprietors' union, has a membership of 1,422,000. There are also mutual aid associations. In 1920 there were 685, with a membership of 2,000,000. These unions aided 3,169,000 persons, with money amounting to 1,551,000 yens.

Comrades, these are bare facts based upon a government report. Of course, as to the labour unions, the government has tried to minimise their number; we have more. The Japanese workers are organised and exploited by the militarist government. They are suppressed whenever they start a liberal movement, but they are awakening.

Our union leaders understand the capitalist conditions and are showing the workers that the capitalist system cannot remedy the unemployment problem.

I want to say a word now about the women's movement, because it has been somewhat neglected at this Fourth Congress. Japanese women workers are very much exploited. They are prisoners in the companies' dormitories and they work twelve hours, both in day shifts and night shifts. Formerly, Japanese women were prohibited from attending political meetings and forming political associations. But these restrictions have now been abolished. Japanese women are being educated in the highest educational institutions in the country, and they are utilising their education for the improvement of their position. They are not only taking part in the political life of the nation, but many have already joined trade unions. There are several thousand women members in the Japanese Federation of Labour. When a strike occurs the women are very active.

The Japanese imperialism has become very unpopular amongst the Japanese workers, but is still very strong. I will give you an instance. Formerly, when a Japanese mother wanted to frighten her child she would say that she would put him to prison, but to-day she threatens that she will make a soldier of him. The imperialists are preparing for the next war. Therefore, we in conjunction with the Chinese Delegation propose that this Fourth Congress of the Communist International should pass a resolution against the occupation by Japan of Northern Saghalin, and encourage the Japanese revolutionary workers to fight against imperialism, and to prepare for the coming revolution in Japan.

Tahar, Boudengham (Tunisia and the French colonies):
Comrades, I do not think that it is necessary to read to you my report, as each of the various language groups have received

a copy; I will therefore limit myself to elaborating certain points.

French imperialism has colonies not far distant from the Homeland, which enables it easily to recruit its forces either for future wars or for stifling the proletarian revolution in France.

At the same time there is an insurgent in North Africa. The communist nucleus, which was formed in Tunisia after the Conference, has taken advantage of this movement. Owing to the seriousness of the situation which may arise in the event of a proletarian revolution, it is doing its utmost to prevent French capitalism from getting the native population of North Africa entirely into its power. In order to accomplish this task, we have approached the workers and peasants, either through our Arabian dailies or through public meetings. We were so successful that the government became alarmed and made domiciliary visits and arrests. It even proclaimed our Party illegal, which forced us to carry on underground work. I must admit that this act of the government as well as the suspension of our Arabian papers has done us great harm, for our activities were not limited to Tunisia, but extended throughout the whole of North Africa.

Here I must complain of the French Communist Party, both for its lack of assistance and the character of its press articles dealing with our struggles.

I trust that the French Comrades, regardless of any tendencies, will set to work immediately after the World Congress, in order to initiate a policy of communist action in the colonies by the establishment of a central organ and the collaboration of colonial Comrades in the Managing Committee.

The French Comrades must understand once and for all that a proletarian revolution in France is bound to fail as long as the French bourgeoisie will have at its disposal the colonial population. Likewise, the liberation of the latter will only be possible when there will be in France a Party of revolutionary action and not an opportunist Party.

The Communist International must also take the matter in hand by attaching to itself a permanent representative of the French colonies.

I am also of the opinion that the British party has not done everything which should have been done. What has the British party done in order to support the revolutionary movement in India and in Egypt? The Communists must not limit their actions to their home territory while ignoring the thousands of people who are oppressed by their bourgeoisie and groan under the yoke of their own imperialists. I am of the opinion that to abandon peoples whose liberation and future depend on a communist party, as is the case for the British party, is nothing but cowardice.

On the other hand, Comrade Malaka was not quite sure the other day if he should support Pan-Islamism. You must

not be as diffident as all that. Pan-Islamism at the present juncture is nothing but a union of all the Mussulmans against their oppressors. Thus, there is no doubt whatever that they must be supported.

On the other hand, questions of a religious nature came to oppose the development of communism. In Tunis, we had the same difficulties as you in Java. Every time people came forward to discuss with us the non-assimilation of communism with Islamism, we invited these mischievous people to meet us in public debate. We proved to them that the Mussulman religion prohibits the exploitation of labour, this being the principal basis of this religion. Secondly, we told them that if they are so religious, they must begin by applying the religious principles and paying one-tenth of their fortunes, including capital and interest, for the benefit of those who are not able to work. I can assure you that every time they debated with us by bringing forward their religious principles, they came off second best.

I think that Comrade Malaka's fears are unfounded. The progress of our ideas among the Mussulmans has exceeded all expectations. We have received from all parts of the Mussulman world, especially when we still had our Arabic papers, numerous letters of congratulation for our methods of applying communism in Mussulman countries.

I trust that the Congress will accept the conclusions of my report, which are necessary if the communist idea is to triumph among the oppressed peoples.

I conclude my statement by greeting the Congress of the International. (Applause.)

Webb (England): Comrades, at the risk of again incurring criticism from Comrade Radek because of my reference to the 21 points on this important question—the oriental question—it is my intention to refer to them again and especially No. 8, as presented by the Second Congress of the Communist International.

It reads as follows:—

“In the colonial question and that of the oppressed nationalities, there is necessary an especially distinct and clear line of conduct of the parties of countries where the bourgeoisie possess such colonies or oppress other nationalities. Every party desirous of belonging to the Third International should be bound to denounce without any reserve all the methods of ‘its own’ imperialists in the colonies, supporting not in words only but practically a movement of liberation in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of its own imperialists from such colonies and cultivate among the workmen of its own country a truly fraternal attitude towards the working population of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, and carry on a systematic agitation in its own arm against every kind of oppression of the colonial populations.”

Such was the decision of the Second Congress of the Communist International. Since those days we have had the development of the revolutionary nationalist movements in Egypt, in Persia, in Mesopotamia, in India and in Turkey. Yet it is safe to say that even the most mature Communist Parties, not these small parties or these revolutionary groups which are in the process of becoming Communist Parties, but the most developed Communist Parties affiliated with the Third International have not fulfilled these obligations to the revolutionary nationalist movement in the ways enumerated.

It is true that a criticism has been levelled at the Party which I represent with regard to its attitude to the national and colonial question. It is within the framework of the British Empire that you have the liberation movements of Ireland, Egypt, and of other parts of Africa apart from Egypt, and India as well as the colonies making up the British Empire. But our sins of omission can in the main be attributed to the fact that our party is only a very small party and a very young party which has been faced with numerous internal difficulties which it was necessary to overcome before we could pay the necessary attention to the colonial problem.

Comrade Trotsky, in the book he wrote prior to the Russian Revolution, criticised the strongest section of the Second International, the German Social Democratic Party, and pointed out that the Social Democracy had developed into socialist imperialism.

I will stress the note this morning that we must do everything to prevent those elements coming into the Communist International which would endeavour to make the Communist International an International for Communist Imperialism equivalent to the Socialist Imperialism which characterised the social democracy.

In a recent number of the "Fortnightly Review," there was a very significant article. In this article entitled "Kemal, the Man and the Movement," the Review says: "There can be no doubt that while the Kemalists are sincerely pursuing nationalist aims, the Bolsheviks are taking advantage of Turkish nationalist aspirations in order that Western civilisation might be attacked at its weakest point, and that amid fresh commotions revolutionary activity might be renewed in an exhausted Europe." It concludes by saying that England and the Allies may hand over Constantinople to the Turkish nationalist Kemal Pasha, but before doing so they must prove to the world that Kemal Pasha is no longer a pawn in the hands of Soviet Russia. A statement of that description from an authoritative capitalist periodical like the "Fortnightly Review" proves that the bourgeoisie are awake to the dangers of the transformation of a revolutionary nationalist movement into a revolutionary proletarian movement directed against the bourgeoisie. Therefore, these points in the theses spoken to by Comrade Roy in reference to the need for helping the proletarian elements in these countries

themselves, but also by those Communist Parties that belong to these countries that are oppressing the countries in which these movements are operating at the present time.

Lin-Yan-Shin (China): Comrades, owing to the limit of time I have at my disposal, I can only give you a general idea of the present situation in China.

First, I must speak of the political situation. From May of June of this year we have witnessed the downfall of two governments in China.

First was the downfall of the Southern Government, that is, the revolutionary government headed by Sun Yet Sen. This government was overthrown by a subordinate military member of the government, a member of the Nationalist Party. The downfall came owing to the differences of opinion between the leader, Sun Yet Sen, and this subordinate member concerning the plan of military expedition against the North. This signifies the complete failure of the military plan of revolution. The Kuomintang Party, the nationalist revolutionary party in China, entertained for years a scheme of making military revolution. That means that by military conquest of the provinces they could realise a democracy in China. They did not carry on mass propaganda in the country. They did not organise the masses. They only strove to utilise military forces to achieve their aim. Before they had conquered Kwantung in 1920, they established a government, and they wanted to exhaust all the resources of the Kwantung province to raise an expedition against the Northern Government which is the government of the feudal militarists and the agent of world imperialism.

Civil war was waged during April and May in the North between two factions of the feudal militarists. One faction of the militarists was pro-Japanese, the other pro-American. This ended in the victory of the pro-American group.

The Chinese Northern government was dominated for about five years by the Japanese imperialism. This imperialism maintained its influence by lending money to the Northern Government to strengthen it in the civil war. The Japanese Government bribed officials to secure rights and interests in the Chinese mines, the right to construction of railways in Shantung, etc. Hence the Chinese population maintained a hostile attitude towards Japanese imperialism and the pro-Japanese agents in the Northern government. Owing to their deep hatred of the Japanese imperialism in China, they tended to be more and more in favour of giving support to the American imperialism. Owing to the fact, also, that the Northern government is more reactionary and this government is headed by Chan-so-Lin, the people are more and more sympathetic to the militarist group—the Wu-pei-fu group, the more progressive one which advocates the reduction of the army and the abolition of the tuchunate, i.e., the feudal division of the provinces, and who have the support of the Americans.

Second, I must mention the labour movement. This movement in China this year progressed very rapidly. At the beginning of this year we witnessed the Hongkong seamen's strike, which lasted more than fifty days, which was first limited to economic demands and soon became a nationalist factor against British imperialism. This strike was at first only limited to the seamen, but it became a general strike against British imperialism in the Hongkong colony, involving a spread to the North. There was the Peking-Mukden railway strike, and the trouble then spread to the centre of China. There was a strike in the iron and steel works in Hongkong, of the textile and tobacco industries in Shanghai, and another in the mines. All these strikes succeeded each other very rapidly. The spread of revolt against the capitalist class indicates the awakening of the labouring masses. This shows that the mass movement in China is not a dream of the Socialists, but that it has already come into being. It also shows that the Communist Party can be successful in agitating among the masses. It shows that the Communist Party in China will progress favourably, unlike in the previous years, when it was merely a study circle, a sect. This year we can witness our Communist Party developing within the masses.

Hosni el-Orabi, speaking in Arabic, said: The Egyptian worker suffers under the capitulations; he suffers under the yoke of British imperialism, foreign companies, and his own bourgeoisie.

Egypt is now ripe for the advent of Socialist ideas. One proof which I can give you is the growth of the Egyptian Socialist Party. The Party was legally established in August of this year, and during the few months of its existence has attracted 1,000 members to its ranks. In view of the ripeness of Egypt for the reception of Socialist ideas, we are anxious that no obstacle shall be placed in the way of a steady inflow of Communist propaganda and a development along Communist lines. We feel that if Egypt is left out of the brotherhood of the Communist International and her present eagerness allowed to run to waste, her backwardness may interfere with the development of the revolution in the East and may greatly retard the advent of the revolution in the West.

The marvellous uprising of 1919 and 1920 shook the power of British imperialism and taught the Egyptian capitalists a salutary lesson. Alarmed by these events, the British Government, in collaboration with the Egyptian capitalists, grandiloquently granted the complete independence of Egypt. But the people were not deceived by these hollow promises. What did they amount to? First, the protection of communications; this was conceded because Great Britain wished to safeguard her passage to India. Secondly, a co-government of the Soudan; this was to provide England with another source of raw cotton to feed the Manchester cotton mills. Thirdly, the protection of the minority populations. Fourthly, abolition of the capitulations.

The last two claims were advanced in order to give Great Britain a legal right to interfere in Egyptian affairs.

The Egyptian capitalists now formed a Liberal Party, whose object was to protect the new constitution and to ratify the treaty between Egypt and Great Britain. In order to do this, they had to draw up a programme and to select candidates to represent this opinion in a parliament—the elections to which are likely to take place in January next.

We intend to utilise the coming elections to the first Egyptian parliament. In the weeks that must still elapse before the events, we are going to prepare the soil in the hope of seeing some of the Comrades elected to represent the workers in the new body. If we are successful in winning one or two seats it will give an added prestige to Communism in the East and will consolidate the basis of our Party in Egypt.

Earsman (Australia): There are two points in the theses which have been drawn up and submitted to the Congress on which I wish to speak.

The first is the developing of the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries, particularly those oppressed in the Near and Far East.

The second point, the one we are particularly interested in, is the problem arising from the conflict which is developing in the Pacific. The most outstanding difficulty that we have to overcome is the prejudice arising amongst the white workers from the fear of cheap coloured labour. We find that in the countries most concerned, Australia, America and Canada, they have laws prohibiting the immigration of coloured labour into those countries, the workers believing that the importation of this labour is to be used against them for the breaking down of the conditions and the standards of living which have been set up in those countries.

Those of you who have given any attention to the Pacific must realise the danger of another world war in the Pacific. And if you realise that you will come to this conclusion: that the "fear of a Yellow invasion," would be sufficient to gather behind it numbers unequalled in the past. Because of that, it is our particular mission at the present time and in the next few months to have these slogans broken down, to get the workers to fully realise them and understand what they mean.

In the theses is made a proposition which we believe will be most successful in combating the work of the capitalists in those countries, and the Trade Union Congress in Melbourne this year passed a resolution deciding that the best method of bringing about a solid understanding between the workers of the North and South Pacific would be by the calling of a Pan-Pacific Congress. Such a Congress would bring the workers of Japan, China, Malay, India, America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand together, and then they would be able to thrash out the problems that they are faced with and arrive at understand-

ings which would be the means of getting the workers to realise how reactionary their past ambitions had been as far as coloured labour is concerned.

In making that proposal in the theses we hope and trust that every assistance will be given to the workers in these countries will be held and a definite programme worked out in a practical fashion.

Our first duty is to unite all the national revolutionary movements in the colonies into a united anti-imperialist front. In these backward countries the elements furthering the petty bourgeois development have not yet sufficiently separated themselves from the feudal elements, and these feudal elements are partisans of foreign imperialism. The struggle against the agrarian feudal regime is necessary. In Persia this struggle is taking place conjointly with the struggle against imperialism.

At the time of the Second Congress we had no Communist Parties in those countries.

The Second Congress of the Comintern declared that we must support the independent working class movement in the most backward countries in all its forms. We have followed this policy. The small Communist Parties have already become a political force. They are capable of organising the revolutionary nationalist movement and of pushing it forward.

We must organise the working class of these backward countries because the proletariat of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples is of vital importance for the victory of the proletarian world revolution. (Applause.)

Okhran: Comrades, the Third International has recognised the liberation movement of the colonial peoples as being of capital importance to the world revolution. It is quite inexplicable, therefore, why the Communist Parties of the West have not till now devoted to the Eastern and colonial questions as much attention as they should.

As startling proof of this, we greatly regret to say that the British Communist Party has not as yet inserted in its programme of action the special plank concerning the work of Communist Parties in the colonies.

In order that the masses may be led to understand the significance of the anti-imperialistic United Front, the situation must be visualised and made concrete by inserting the practical demands of the masses, such as agrarian reform, administrative and taxation reforms, parliamentary reform, etc.

Taking into consideration the fact that the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, now see themselves obliged to take a stand against imperialism in the West and the East, the anti-imperialistic front must be proposed to the opportunist European parties on the basis of the independence of the Oriental and colonial countries.

It should then be proposed to the British Labour Party that it exert pressure upon its government in order to (1) compel the Lausanne Conference to formulate peace terms in conformity

with the National Pact; (2) immediate evacuation of Constantinople and all of Thrace; (3) the settlement of the question of the Straits in conformity with the Russo-Turkish Treaty and with the participation of all states bordering on the Black Sea; (4) to publish articles on this question in working class periodicals; (5) the evacuation of Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine, and the recognition of the nationalist independence of all colonies and semi-colonies.

The Communist Parties of those countries which possess colonies and semi-colonies, and particularly those of France and Great Britain, should support every revolutionary movement for independence, and should aid by every possible means the Communist Parties of those countries and should endeavour to assure their legalisation.

The following are the essential tasks of the young Communist Parties of the Eastern countries:—

(1) To support the movement for national emancipation by all means, and unite all forces in an anti-imperialistic United Front. To exert the most careful vigilance so that the movement for national freedom be not sabotaged by the ruling class.

(2) To demand democratic reforms for the broad working masses. These tactics will bring to the Party the sympathy of all labouring classes, and will transform the Communist Party into a mass party of the people.

Nik-bin (Persia): Comrades, Persia is at present in the transition stage from the patriarchal order to capitalism. In Persia there is dual power. The Communist Parties there have not only to struggle against their own feudal lords, but also against the imperialists, especially with the British who have allied themselves with the Persian feudal lords and who are impeding Persia's transition to the capitalist order. The world economic crisis was reflected in Persia in the sense that the Persian market was to a certain extent neglected by the capitalists. This led to the development of the native home industries, and with it to the awakening of the working class. For this and various other reasons, the Communist Party came into being in Persia. At present, this organisation has 1,000 members throughout Persia. There are also trade unions with a membership of 15,000 throughout Persia, Teheran, the capital, claiming 12,000 of it. The Persian Communist Party has the following policy. From a strictly party point of view, it would be wrong to organise in Persia a wide Communist Party. The organisation there has a strong nucleus, mostly consisting of workers. On the other hand, there are in Persia organisations on the model of trade unions and also trade unions which are entirely under the influence of the Communist Party. The Party directs the policy and has a great influence on trade union activities.

The Persian Communist Party has proved to be stronger even than the bourgeois parties. The bourgeois parties, as

represented by the so-called social-democrats, who have a democratic programme, are themselves seeking to form a bloc with us. It is safe to say that in the very near future the Persian Communist Party will be very successful.

Radek (Russia): Comrades, our way of dealing with the movement in the East, since the Second Congress, should now be subjected to the test. You will recollect how at the Second Congress of the Comintern we discussed the Theses on the great revolutionary importance of the movement in the East and on the necessity for the Comintern to support that movement. Our attitude at that time caused a clamour not only in the world of capitalism, but also in the parties of the Two and Two-and-a-Half Internationals. While the entire Two and Two-and-a-Half Internationals are helpless against capitalism, the struggle in Turkey has upset the equilibrium of the whole of Western Europe. This is the answer to the question whether the movements in the East are of revolutionary importance in the fight for the overthrow of capitalism or are merely the political game of Soviet Russia and the Communist International.

Now there is an important point raised by our Turkish Comrade. Our theses stated that the exploited East must and will fight against international capitalism, and that for this reason we ought to assist it. Now, we find at the head of the oriental national movements neither Communists nor even bourgeois revolutionaries, but for the most part representatives of the decayed feudal cliques belonging to the military and bureaucratic classes. This fact brings our aid to the Eastern peoples into contradiction with the question of our attitude towards the ruling elements. The question was brought to a head by the persecution of Communists in Turkey and by the military suppression of Chinese strikers by Wu Pei-Fu troops. As Communists, we may clearly and frankly state our attitude upon such matters without resorting to diplomacy. In promising our aid to the awakening East, we did not for a moment lose sight of the class struggles that will yet have to be fought out in the East.

The persecution of Communists in Turkey is part of the class struggle which is only beginning to develop in Turkey. There is bound to be a struggle not only between the working class and the young bourgeoisie, but also within the camp of the ruling clique. It is no secret that the Minister of the Interior, Rauf Bey, and Refar Pasha are primarily responsible for the Communist prosecutions, and that they were the ones who favoured compromise with the Entente and opposed the dethronement of the Sultan. We tell the Turkish Communists: "Let not the present moment obscure your outlook on the near future!" The defence of the independence of Turkey, which is of paramount international revolutionary importance, has not yet been achieved. You should defend yourself against the persecutors, you should deal blow for blow, but you should also realise that the fight for freedom is not yet over, that you have a long road before you which you will have to follow together

with the other revolutionary elements of Turkey for some time to come.

Let us now turn to the situation in China. Comrades, recall to your minds the march of events. When Wu-Pei-Fu defeated Chang-So-Lin he gained possession of the Yang-Tse arsenal, but he failed to gain possession of the railways in the North, which were in the hands of Japanese hirelings. What did he do? He asked the Young Communist Party of China for support, and it gave him commissaries who kept the railways clear for his troops during the revolutionary fight. Everyone who fights against Japanese imperialism in China fights for the revolutionary development of the country. This was understood by the Communists, and they kept the working class alive to the realisation of the importance of the fight for independence. Later on the workers presented their demands to Wu-Pei-Fu, and partly won them. Our comrades in Northern China have won their influence over the historic mission, which was as yet bound up with the mission of the revolutionary bourgeois forces. When the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals continually chide us with our undue confidence in the Enver-Pashas and Wu-Pei-Fus, our answer is: "Gentlemen of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, as there is a petit-bourgeoisie of which you are a part, it will be vacillating between capital and labour, and you who call yourselves socialists and have already a thousand times betrayed the working class, and yet after every betrayal we still come to you and try to win you for the United Front, which you oppose. It is the irony of history that you are being whipped to advance whether you like it or not, although you have betrayed us in the past, you will have to come along with us once more and serve our cause.

We, therefore, say not only from the standpoint of Soviet Russia, but also of the Communist International: You need have no anxiety. We do not stake on the ephemeral policy of this or that clique, but on the great historical stream which is bound to bring together the toiling masses of Western Europe with the awakening peoples of the East in the fight against world capitalism.

Comrades, I will now say a few words anent the reports we heard here about the conditions of our parties and their activities in the East.

I will start with my usual warning: Comrades, do not indulge in too rosy expectations, do not over estimate your strength. When our Chinese comrade told us here: "We have struck deep roots in China," I must tell him: "Esteemed comrade, it is a good thing to feel confident of one's strength when one starts to work." Nevertheless, things have to be seen as they are. Our Chinese party has developed in two parts of China in relative independence from one another. The comrades working at Canton and Shanghai have failed to associate themselves with the working masses. For a whole year

we have been arguing with them, because many of them said: How can a good communist waste his time on such trivial things as strikes. Many of our comrades out there locked themselves up in their studies and studied Marx and Lenin as they had once studied Confucius.

In the first instance, it is the duty of the Chinese comrades to take into consideration all the possibilities of the Chinese movement. You must understand, comrades, that neither the question of Socialism, nor of the Soviet Republic are now on the order of the day. Outside of our ultimate aim, for which you must stand up with all the fervour of your communist faith, the immediate task is the uniting of the forces which are beginning to come to the fore within the working class, for two special aims:

- (1) To organise the young working class, and
- (2) To regulate its relations with the revolutionary bourgeois elements, in order to organise the struggle against European and Asiatic Imperialism.

We are only beginning to understand these tasks. Therefore, we must recognise the necessity of adopting a practical programme of action, by means of which we shall gain in strength. The Communist International orders the Western communist parties to go into the masses, and the first thing we must tell you is: Get out of the Confucian study room of communism, and go to the masses and coolies, and also to the peasant masses, which are in a state of ferment, caused by present day events.

Now as to Japan and India. In both these countries the grouping of the forces is very similar. In Japan, as well as in India, there is already a strong working class. In both countries there is a great social crisis, and struggles for power between the various sections of the bourgeoisie and of the nobility, and, nevertheless, we have not yet a communist movement in these countries. This is a fact. You have only to study the manifestoes which Comrade Katayama published recently in the "Communist International" about the situation in Japan. They are very interesting, for you will find in these manifestoes, which were legally published by various groups of workers, a whole rainbow of shades, from Tolstoyanism through syndicalism and communism to the simplest social reform. And I must admit that in this concert of voices, the voice of communism is still the weakest.

Why? Hitherto we did not know how to take advantage of the mood of the workers (who were going through similar experiences as the British Chartists) in order to prepare them for the tasks with which they are now faced. These tasks consist in the organisation of the working class as a power which could intervene in the class struggle in Japan, in order to establish, first of all, a democracy. I am of the opinion that the development in Japan will not be a mere repetition of the development of Great Britain.

A hundred years have passed, and it is self-evident that the tempo of the development in Japan will be more rapid. History is being concentrated, and even in this bourgeois revolution, now brewing in Japan, we shall probably have soviets established, not as organs of power, but as organs which will unite the working class. But now we must establish trade unions, and a Communist Party, and adopt a program clearly defining the immediate tasks of the working class. The immediate task before us is—to lead the working class into the struggle as an organised body.

In India we have already an ideological centre; I must say that Comrade Roy has succeeded in achieving a big piece of work during the last year in the Marxist interpretation of Indian conditions given in his admirable book, and also in his organ. In no other Eastern communist party has this kind of work been done. It certainly deserves to be supported by the Communist International. However, it must be admitted that as yet we have not done much in connection with the great trade union movement in India and the large number of strikes which convulsed the country. We have not yet understood to make use of the rights which our British overlords are compelled to concede to us. The reception accorded there to Comrade Roy shows that there are some legal opportunities there. But we have not even taken the first steps as a practical workers' party. And all this means that: "It is a long way to Tipperary."

Comrades, I trust that we will succeed at this Congress to put the work which our Eastern section has done, with your assistance, on a practical basis, and that we will then be able at the next Congress to put before you practical organisational achievements. When this will have been achieved, the International will not only recognise the great importance of the Eastern question, but will also have the conviction that you are doing the work which is commensurate with the enormous significance of this question.

FAMINE RELIEF.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speaker: Comrade Münzeberg.

Comrade Münzenberg reported on the famine and economic relief. The famine, he said, affected 40 million people, 3 million of whom died. The famine was not liquidated by the relief from abroad, but almost entirely by Soviet Russia itself. The relief from the entire world amounted only to 33 million poods of food stuffs, while Soviet Russia alone provided 196 million poods, viz., 6 times as much as the whole world. The famine relief produced a remarkable solidarity in the working class ranks, which gave remarkable evidence of self-sacrifice. This resulted as follows:—

1. The reactionary governments were obliged to change their attitude towards Soviet Russia,

2. The Amsterdam International, under the pressure of the working masses, supported Soviet Russia politically and economically.

The Amsterdam International assumed an anti-Soviet Russia attitude as soon as the pressure of the masses wained. At the same time the efforts of the International Relief also relaxed. The Social Democratic Parties made use of famine for a savage campaign against Soviet Russia. The Communist Press has not done its full duty in connection with this campaign. The agrarian relief was made use of for counter-revolutionary propaganda. Likewise the relief of the Amsterdamers. The Amsterdam representative travelled for weeks throughout Russia in order to collect expressions of political sympathy from the starving people, although the sum collected by the Amsterdamers for famine relief amounted only to 1,400,000 Dutch guildens, while the Dutch Communist Famine Relief Committee collected 500,000 gulden in Holland alone. The difference in the collections was as striking in Switzerland. The Communist Workers' Relief collected by itself 25,000,000 dollars. The workers committee combined famine relief with reconstruction. This constituted the great difference between this committee and other relief committees.

At present the famine relief is liquidated, and we must only fight against the consequences of the famine. In America 20,000 people (and in Europe as many) have been enlisted for further help. It is quite out of the question that political support for Soviet Russia can be replaced by economic relief. Economic assistance can never be of very great importance. The speaker was decidedly against mass immigration in Russia. He said that no more collections will be made for economic relief. He hoped, however, that they would succeed in raising as soon as possible 40 million gold roubles for the reconstruction of Soviet Russia by means of loans. The undertaking of the workers' relief gave at times employment to 30,000 workers. There was no doubt whatever that the dollar loan will be over-subscribed before next spring.

TRADES UNION QUESTION

SESSIONS HELD, November 20-21, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speakers: Comrades Lozofsky, Clark, Lansing, Kucher, Heckert, Sturm, Taska, Lauriden, Pavlik, Garden, Rosner, Lozovsky.

Lozovsky (Profintern): The Profintern, which is fighting against the destruction of the Trade Union movement, opposes equally any movement which would liquidate its organisations. We must realise that the capitalist offensive and

the policy of the Trade Union reformists, have resulted in a great diminution of Trade Union membership. The Amsterdamers courageously defended the interests of the bourgeoisie, but they lost courage when it came to fighting for the interests of the proletariat, and the more cowardly they are before the bourgeoisie, the more courageously they attack the Left. Events in France, in Czecho-Slovakia and in Spain prove that the Amsterdamers are trying to split the Trade Unions. For instance, the correspondence of the A.D.G.B. (General German Trade Union Federation) shouts that the enemy stands left and deduces therefrom the "necessity of a clean-up in our ranks." The Miners' Union in Germany prefers to co-operate with the Catholic and Polish-national federations than with the "Union of Hand and Brain Workers."

The Russian Trade Union Federations have been excluded and expelled from the International Unions of their industries because of their membership in the Profintern. The anarchist-syndicalists who in France, Italy, Spain, Holland and America have opposed the Profintern and set against it their slogan of Trade Union independence, who demand the strict separation of party and Trade Union and are attempting to create a new Trade Union International, unite everywhere with the reformists. Anarchism is a petty bourgeois ideal. The anarchists are nothing but a small group of political vegetarians. Their political ideals are best represented by the bandit leader Machno. The anarchists and the syndicalists do not recognise the role of a revolutionary party. Many of them, however, recognise the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We are ready to form the United Front with these elements in spite of our theoretical differences.

The relations between the Trade Unions and the Communist Parties must naturally be fitted to the different conditions of the individual countries. The policy of the German Party, for instance, must differ from that of Belgium, America or England.

Consider Britain, for instance. Here we have a country with a gigantic trade union movement, old anti-political and anti-socialist traditions, and with a very small Communist Party. As far as Britain is concerned, to speak of relationships between the Party and the trade unions, in the full sense of the word, is almost meaningless. The trade unions are hostile to the Party. In such a land we must speak not of relationships between the Party and the trade unions in general, but of relationships between the Party and that part of the revolutionary unions, which is growing upon the soil of the developing class war. In this respect in each country the practical problem is a different one. As far as Britain is concerned, we see clearly that it would be disastrous if the Party were content to organise its forces only within its little Party nuclei. The aim here must be to create a more numerous opposition trade union movement. Our aim must be that our Communist groups should act as a point of crystallisation round which the opposition elements will

concentrate. The aim must be to create, to marshal, to integrate the opposition forces, and the Communist Party will itself grow concurrently with the growth of the opposition. There must be established a relationship between the Party organisation and the opposition, which by its very nature is heterogenous—in such a manner that the Communists could not be charged with striving to mechanically dominate the entire opposition movement. This goal—i.e., the goal of winning the working masses for Communism—we must work for under these circumstances with the utmost care, definiteness and staying power.

The French Communist Party and the French Trade Unions may settle their relations according to their relation of forces. But the members of the French Party must remain Communists in the Trade Union also. In France, we have the situation that the Trade Unions form nuclei in the Party, instead of the Party in the Trade Unions. This is an absurd situation which must be changed. We must organise party nuclei, not only in the French and Italian General Federations of Labour, but in the Fascisti Trade Unions also.

The Communists have fought against splitting in the Unions where expulsions have already taken place; they must do more, they must demand the reunion of split Trade Unions. Those workers who have been expelled from the Trade Unions must be speedily reorganised under the slogan of reunion of the old organisation. However, if Amsterdam continues to expel the Red Trade Unions from the International Industrial Unions, we will be compelled to organise Red Revolutionary Industrial Federations. We oppose not only splitting in the Trade Unions but the voluntary exit of Communists from the Trade Unions.

The Party press must pay the greatest attention to the problems of the Trade Union movement. The adhesion to the Profintern is possible and advisable only when the majority may be won over to our organisation. Where this is not the case we must insist on a longer stay in the old Federations. The Comintern is only a union of Communists; but the Profintern should include every revolutionary worker who is willing to fight against capitalism and reformism. This is why the liquidation of the Profintern would be a crime. Amsterdam is the last stronghold of capitalism. We must win over those workers who to-day still adhere to the Amsterdam International. This can be accomplished, not by splits from the Trade Unions, but by the penetration of our ideas into the working masses.

Clark (England): Comrades, in speaking on behalf of the British Delegation, I have to say that, as far as the general theses that have been presented here are concerned, we are in complete agreement. But I want to say a few words with regard to the Amsterdam leaders and the British Trade Union movement. There seems to be a great misunderstanding regarding the position that the British Trade Union movement occupies in relation to the Amsterdam International,

but, it must be understood that the whole of the British Trade Union movement is organised into one British Trade Union Congress, and, by virtue of being members of the Trade Union Congress, each and all of us organised in the Trade Union movement are affiliated to Amsterdam.

I should like also to say a word as regards the Shop-Steward movement and the Workers' Councils in Britain. Some 30 years ago in the British Trade Union movement we organised a Shop-Steward movement, and following this period of organisation we found that, when the war broke out and the officials of our trade unions refused to allow the machinery of those unions to operate, we had to call into being our Shop Stewards and our Workshop Committees.

There has been a great deal of criticism at this Congress of the inactivity of the Shop-Steward movement in Britain at the present time, but, comrades, let me tell you that this is a result of the fact that over 35 per cent. of those who are normally employed in the great engineering and shipbuilding industries are now unemployed. It is impossible to have a Workers' Committee when so many members of the working class who understand the meaning and the functions of the Workers' Committees are unemployed. But, comrades, we are reorganising our forces. We are endeavouring to get them together not only inside the workshops, but, for the first time in the history of the British Trade Union movement, we are taking our revolutionary propaganda into the unions.

The observation has been passed here that, although there has been a great trade union movement in Britain, we as a Communist Party are few, and that we have practically no control within the unions. That is quite true, but there are many things that could be said in explanation of it. But by the activity of the Communist Party after having decided within the last twelve months, or since the last Congress of the Red Trade Union International, to enter the fight and permeate the whole trade union movement, we have within our ranks 140 branches in the industrial belt of Scotland of the various trade unions that have affiliated. We have almost 200 of the branches of the different unions in the London area affiliated to us. In every industrial belt and coal field the forces of the Red Trade Union movement are being slowly organised and they are gaining a power they have never hitherto obtained in the proletarian movement.

Lansing (America): Comrades, after Comrade Lozovsky has dealt with the labour union question in such a thorough manner, there are only a few points regarding the tasks of the Communists in the trade unions in America, that I want to touch upon. In America, as you perhaps know, despite the highly developed state of capitalism and the militant traditions of the workers, we have a very reactionary, a very backward labour movement. The leadership of these unions has remained

in practically uncontested control for years. Despite their reactionary character these unions have not been spared the capitalist offensive in the United States. They became the centre of violent attack with the avowed object of their complete destruction. They have suffered both in loss of membership and deterioration of conditions. The organised labour movement has now dwindled to less than four million organised workers out of a total of 110,000,000 population, of whom at least 30,000,000 are wage earners.

The unions suffered defeat upon defeat. In the spring of this year a marked change took place; then the workers actually began to resist the capitalist offensive, and even forced the reactionary leaders to come out in open resistance.

Much has been demonstrated in the last strikes of miners and railroad men. These struggles furnish extremely valuable lessons for the American Communist Party. The strikes demonstrated very clearly that the masses of workers possessed the will to fight and that their tremendous latent energies can be utilised if given proper leadership.

The injunction which was issued against the railroad workers, actually prohibiting participation in any kind of strike activity, has tended a great deal to show the workers their class position in society. Many labour unions and central bodies demanded a general strike, which would mean a strike against the Government. But this was rejected by the Executive Council of the A.F. of L.

These rapidly developing objective conditions furnish the basis and possibilities for the creation of a broad left wing movement.

As a matter of fact, the left wing movement is now established in the United States and is making its influence felt throughout the unions. Of course you can readily understand that in America we have had to adopt slogans of the most elementary nature. These slogans of unification of labour's forces based on better forms of organisation and better methods of struggle have been endorsed to-day by eleven State federations assembled in convention, and by two international unions, by thousands of local unions and many central labour bodies. The ideological struggle against Gompers and his reactionary policies is thus developing rapidly.

In making such survey we find that in America the struggle of the Communists against the bureaucrats is in its first stage of development and the methods of expulsion for revolutionary activities have not as yet been adopted as a definite policy. Therefore when Communists or militants are expelled for such activities, they should refuse to recognise the validity of these expulsions. They should call upon the militants within the unions to remain there and to carry on the struggle for their reinstatement, and in that fight utilise all the means afforded by the constitution of the union.

In some European countries the independent revolutionary unions have become a solution in the struggle against expulsion. In America they are yet a problem.

We have a number of independent unions more or less revolutionary. It is one of the most vital problems for the American Communist Party to find a satisfactory combination of all revolutionary forces and make the most effective use of the militants who are now in the independent unions and in organisations where larger masses can be reached. At the first Congress of the Profintern a programme was outlined which has been adopted by our party—a programme of unification of labour forces to the end that there be only one united union within each industry. This is the programme we now have to carry out in actual practice.

Garden (Australia): Comrades, speaking on behalf of the Australian delegation, I may say that we affirm the theses as given by Comrade Lozovsky. Although the Australian Communist Party is a small party, I believe it has found the keynote to organisation so far as the Anglo-Saxon movement is concerned. The Communist Party in Australia has a membership of nearly one thousand, and yet it is able to direct just close on 400,000 workers—that is, including 237,000 in the State of New South Wales—all organised workers—and 110,000 organised workers in Brisbane, Queensland.

The Communist Party is based in Australia on the nuclei system. Every union has its nuclei from 20 down to 2. Every nucleus leader must meet once a week with other nucleus leaders from the unions and discuss the problems of their organisations and the problems of the working class of Australia.

The Communist Party, along with the leaders of the nuclei, formulate the policy. On every burning question that affects the working class you will find that the nuclei leaders are the first in the field to give direction to the working class how to meet the situation.

The Labour Council of New South Wales constitutes 120 unions. Yet the Communist Party has full control of the Executive. Out of the 12 members of the Executive eleven are members of the Communist Party and they direct these 120 unions and the policy of each union.

We have the same basis of organisation in the Labour Party of Australia as in the English Labour Party—that is, the party is based on the Trade Union Movement; and we have the same difficulties confronting us as the English Party has. When we quarrelled with the Australian Labour Party in 1919, when we were beaten by six votes at the conference, we isolated ourselves, took no part in politics whatsoever, and directed all our energies to the industrial field. Everybody set out for the organisation of the workers, to break down craft barriers and make one union in every industry. The moment we decided to make political activity there was the

A.S.P., S.L.P., and the Breakaway section of the Labour Party to contend with. The A.S.P. called a conference of all militant workers of New South Wales to come together to form a Communist Party. The trade union movement decided to be represented and sent delegates.

In June, 1921, the Labour Party put out a signal of distress. They called upon the workers to give all their aid, and we decided that we would attend this conference called by the Labour Party. In Melbourne in June, 1921, the largest conference that has ever been held in Australia assembled and there were present delegates representing 700,000 workers. What did we find? We found that we were able to change the policy of the Labour Party. The Labour Party believed in the maintenance of a White Australia, believed in nationalisation. We changed the objective from nationalisation to socialisation of industry by revolutionary political and industrial action. But the Labour Party was not satisfied—they went aside from the conference and called a conference of their own in October, 1921. They deleted the words "by revolutionary political and industrial action" and inserted the words "by constitutional means." Another congress was held in June of this year, and the Trade Union movement, along with the Communist Party, said to the Labour Party that they would only endorse the policy of the June Conference of 1921. The 1922 Conference endorsed the policy of June, 1921, and went further—they instructed the Labour Party to throw open their doors for the affiliation of the Communist Party with freedom for the Communist Party for propaganda and organisation.

Again, when the capitalist attacks against the workers were launched, we got all the workers together and, instead of allowing one section to go down one after another, we said, "The working class of Australia must stand solid, speak with one voice and act together." We decided on these lines. The employers appealed to the Government. A conference was decided upon. Some of the Unions objected. We authorised delegates to go to the conference, and our of eighteen delegates from Australia the workers' side found nine Communists from different parts of Australia. And what were the results of that conference? The employers left the conference. They said that all that we were doing there was enunciating the doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky. We were nothing more than in the pay of Russia and that we were not there for the good or the benefit of the working class of Australia. We came back with the propaganda message to the masses. The masses rallied round our banner, and Australia is the first country in the world that was able to withstand the offensive, and able to say, "No longer will you reduce our wages, no longer will you tamper with our hours, no more will you lengthen our hours. We will shorten our hours instead of lengthening them." It was the only country in the world which resisted the capitalist offensive, because the masses rallied round the slogan "Hands off wages

and hours." And the whole policy was directed by the Communist Party in Australia—small in numbers but strong in power and influence.

The result of this militant activity has been the linking up of the union forces into one big union which is breaking down all craft barriers. We believe that if the Anglo-Saxon countries—England, America, Ireland, etc.—develop the same lines of policy that we have developed, it will be found that the Anglo-Saxon Communists will have the power to direct the future policy of the masses in those countries.

Rosmer (France) stated that the Lozovsky resolution pointed out the proper way for regulating the relations between the C.G.T.U. and the French Party. The C.G.T.U. has greater influence on the masses than the Party. There are still theoretical differences between the Party and the C.G.T.U., but this agreement is the first step on the way of recuperating the French Party.

Comrade Kucher (America): Comrades, I am not here to tell you any long story but present a few facts as briefly as possible. As a matter of fact, I requested the privilege of speaking only because the speaker who claimed to represent the American labour movement absolutely misrepresented the situation and distorted the facts, whether through lack of understanding or deliberate intent, I leave it to your judgment.

I would like to have it understood that I am not here as an opposition force from America, but as the representative of a distinct movement—the Independent Unions—and on behalf of the United Labour Council of America, I am here rather to protest against the opposition of the propaganda group who have come here claiming to speak for all American labour.

The Independent Unions, who are industrial unions in structure and activity, are being accused of being the cause of weak trade union movement in America because the militants are within them. You are informed "dual unionism" is the root evil—even if that were so, the unions now known as Independents are not the cause of this, in so far as they are in no way "dualist."

In their origin they are partly the results of countless expulsions for many years of militant individuals and minority groups who, unable to get back to the Federation Unions, were forced to combine and form themselves into organisations.

In order to unite and combine the activity of all these groups it was necessary to form the United Labour Council. The existing Independent Unions have never followed the policy of "splitting" or inducing minorities to withdraw from the so-called "general movement." To say, in the face of these facts, that the United Labour Council of America can only expand at the expense of federation unions, proves the lack of knowledge of these self-appointed spokesmen from America.

We are in accord with the programme as laid down by the R.I.L.U. and protest against certain elements in America distorting the intent of the programme to serve their own ends.

I wish to state that, as far as the Independents are concerned, we applied for admission to the Red Trade Union International when it was formed.

Another point that should be emphasised is this: It has been mentioned by a previous American speaker that the independent unions should disband, liquidate, and go into the American Federation of Labour. The slogan they use is "Go to the masses." But we do not find the masses in the American Federation of Labour. The previous speaker on the American question stated that there were 36,000,000 eligible workers. Yet at no time have there been more than 4,500,000 workers in the American Federation of Labour, and to-day you will hardly find much above 2,000,000 workers, if that. The masses will not join the Federation. They are opposed to the Federation. Any thought of reforming the Federation is futile.

The Independent Unions must be given sole responsibility for the activity amongst the Independent unions and amongst the unorganised workers. With such an alignment, the Trade Union Educational League proving itself by activity within the Federation, and the Independents prompted and backed in their activity amongst the Independent and unorganised workers carrying on activity in their respective groups, ultimate unity becomes a possibility.

That is our viewpoint, and we think that the entire problem should receive a thorough consideration, especially in the face of the development in other countries where the splitting of the movement is taking place, and it is a problem that we will have to face in America just as well as in Europe.

Heckert (Germany) said that the Union of Mental and Manual Workers at first opposed the formation of Communist fractions in their organisations. But the recent agreement forms a favourable basis for the co-operation of Communists with the Union. The French Communist Party had neglected to form Communist fractions in the trade unions when the time was ripe for it. We see now that this was a great mistake. The Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia is on the way to making the same mistake. The speaker advocated the formation of Communist fractions in every trade union. The Congress must forbid inter-union squabbles among the revolutionary trade union organisations.

Herter Sturm (Germany) declared that the capitalist offensive affected the women workers most of all. They were the first to suffer from the reduction of wages, the prolongation of working hours. The Communist movement has not yet reached the working women. Only about 10 per cent. of the membership of the Communist Party are working women,

in spite of the fact that it is easier to win over and organise them than the men.

Taska (Italy), speaking in the name of the Italian Delegation, declared that they were in agreement with the resolution of Comrade Lozovsky on the activity of the Communists in the trade unions. The speaker expressed the idea that the Communists should enter Fascist Trade Unions in order to destroy them from within. He protested, however, against Article 20 of the Lozovsky resolution dealing with the relations between trade unions and the Communist Party in France. We should not withhold from the French Communists the right to influence the trade unions. A Communist must remain a Communist in the trade union also. Every compromise in this respect is very dangerous.

Lauridan (France) criticised the attitude, policy, and activity of the French Communist Party. The French Communist Party, he said, had forgotten its best traditions. Since the Congress of Tours, the Party had been totally unconcerned about what was going on in the trade unions. This indifference of the Party strengthened the anti-Communist elements in the working class movement. The attitude of the Party during strikes, at the time of the trial of the social-revolutionaries, and at the time of the Saint Etienne Congress, was below all criticism. The only real solution of the crisis in the French Party would be to unite the best elements of the C.P. and the real Communists in the C.G.T.U. (Unified General Federation of Labour).

Pavlik (Czecho-Slovakia) expressed the opinion that the Lozovsky resolutions were not sufficiently clear. The Amsterdamers are trying to split the Czecho-Slovakian unions, and in many cases they have already succeeded. The Congress must state clearly what the Communists should do in this matter. He defended the Czech Party against Comrade Heckert's accusations.

Wertschik (Czecho-Slovakia) stated that the Red International of Labour Unions followed no clear-cut policy in the Czecho-Slovakian question. The refusal to pay dues into the trade union treasury was a poor measure. The Congress should realise that the split in the Czecho-Slovakian Trade Unions is unavoidable.

Lozovsky stated that he was able to announce the unity of the Congress on this question. There were differences of opinion on some minor organisational questions. Comrade Lauridan's speech was an expression of outraged Communist dignity. The French Party feels its inferiority to the trade unions. The French Party had only good resolutions on the trade union question, but no policy.

Marcel Cachin interrupted the speaker, declaring that the Chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Party was Comrade Tommasi, an adherent of the left group.

In answer to the interruption, Comrade Lozovsky said: "It does not matter in the least if anyone belongs to the left or to the right group, for whoever does not do his duty must be eliminated"; and the whole party, and not this or that group, is responsible for the trade union policy. The French Party has many good traditions. All honour and homage is due to the memory of Comrade Jaurés. Nevertheless, his trade union policy was not a Communist but an opportunist policy. The French Party must retain its glorious traditions and must get rid of the bad traditions. In our opinion, the traditions of the highly industrial North are of more value than the traditions of the petty bourgeois South. The speaker defended paragraph 20 of his resolution, and stated that Comrade Tascos is wrong in seeing the spectre of opportunism. Disagreeing with the statements of the Czech delegates, he stated that the tactical line of the Red Trade Union International on the trade union question was perfectly clear and did not lend itself to various interpretations. However, the Czech Party was afraid of the majority in the trade unions. The Red Trade Union International always wanted and still desired to prevent a split in the Czecho-Slovakian trade unions. If, however, this split does occur, the responsibility for it will rest with the reformists. The Communists must take into consideration that an error committed by a party in one country does harm to the interests of the other parties and to those of the entire International. We are a Communist International because we hold international interests to be of greater importance than the national interests of the separate parties.

TURKISH QUESTION

SESSION 18, November 19, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speaker: Comrade Orhan (Turkey).

Orhan (Turkey): Comrades, you have read in the received. Over 200 Comrades have already been imprisoned. In Constantinople. In order that you may well understand the significance of this new turn in the policy of the Kemalists and of these recent persecutions in particular, I find it necessary to inform the Congress of the general activities of the Communist Party of Angora and of Constantinople as well as the policies of the Nationalist Government.

The Turkish Communist Party was formed at the time when the bourgeois Nationalist Government, initiated by the workers

Turkish
Questions
235-
239

and peasants, took a position detrimental to the vital interests of the toiling masses. The Turkish Communist Party therefore, at the time of its formation, found itself faced by two enemies—imperialism and bourgeois nationalism. The Party, considering that the struggle against imperialism, our greatest enemy, was of world-wide importance, decided to support the government so long as it fought imperialism, while demanding democratic reforms for workers and peasants and trying to organise them. These decisions were in conformity with the resolutions of the Second Congress concerning nationalist and colonial questions. The Party has not changed this policy from the time of its formation until the present. As proof of this, I might refer to the proclamation issued by the Party to the army, and to the workers and peasants, summoning them to the struggle for the final victory. In another Party proclamation addressed to the Greek army and working masses, the latter were invited to rise and to disorganise their army, which was fighting only for the Greek bourgeoisie and British imperialism.

Still another proclamation was issued by the Party calling upon the people of Constantinople to form a united front against reaction and imperialism, and not to allow the Sultan to escape but bring him before the supreme tribunal of the people.

The government of the Great National Assembly, born out of the struggle for independence and proclaiming that it is fully for the "National Pact" and against imperialism, has shown during the last three years by its conduct that its policy has been one of betrayal. The following facts are instructive in this respect:—

- (1) When their relations with the Soviet Government were just started, the representatives sent by the government to Moscow stated that there was a large Communist Party in Turkey, that this Party had a numerous following among the peasants, and that peasants' soviets were already functioning in several localities.
- (2) In the first period of its existence, trying to deceive Soviet Russia, the government formed, under the name of the Green Army, a would-be Bolshevik Party consisting exclusively of bourgeois elements.
- (3) After the arrival of the first soviet ambassador at Angora the government formed an official Communist Party composed of the remainder of the Green Army, high government officials, and intellectuals.
- (4) The delegation sent by the government to the London Conference, to please the imperialist Powers, announced in all the European capitals through which it was passing on its way, that a score of Communists, among whom were our brave Comrades Soubhi and Ehdn Nejat, had been slaughtered and that they were going to put an end to all the other imprisoned Comrades, so that the plague of Bolshevism would no more infest the country.

(5) The agreement with the French in 1921 proves that the government is betraying the East, and that it has given away the "National Pact."

(6) Finally, we have the recent persecution directed against the Communist Party and the Turkish Labourers' Union, coinciding with the convocation of the Lausanne Conference.

As to its home policy, the activity of the Angora government consisted in checking all free activity on the part of all parties and groups favouring democratic reforms, in annihilating all opposition before it had time to crystallise, and in deceiving the people by solemn promises. This policy has found its concrete expression in the following facts:—

(1) The government strangled the "People's League," which had been formed within the great National Assembly and which advocated a programme of extensive reforms.

(2) It rejected the electoral system of occupational representation proposed in the original draft of the constitution.

(3) In order to stifle the opposition in the Great National Assembly, the government organised the "Group of Solidarity," and, in order to ensure its domination over the masses, it formed in all parts of Asia Minor groups, so-called Defence of Law and Order groups, composed exclusively of capitalists, landholders and speculators.

(4) In spite of its promises, the government inaugurated no reforms for the benefit of the working masses. On the contrary, it prevented by every means the establishment of working class organisations, and it is crushing the peasants under an unendurable burden of taxation.

The slogans advanced by the Party found an echo among the masses of wage-workers and exploited masses, of whom the most enlightened are joining the Party. In spite of the campaigns of persecution which the government has launched against the Party, the workers and peasants supported it in ever greater numbers. Within a very short time the Party had gained important victories. During the period of its activity from March to October, 1922, it did good work of education and propaganda and advocated also the Red International of Labour Unions and the Young Communists. Because of its influence on the masses, the government felt it necessary to put an end to its activities.

I wish to say a few words on the working class movement in Constantinople, and on the influence of the Communist group in that city where the government has recently dissolved the Turkish Labourers' Union on the ground that it was conducting Communist propaganda. But, in spite of all these difficulties, in spite of the terror, the Communist Group of Constantinople, working illegally for two years, has attained great influence among the masses by forming nuclei within the factories, workshops, and everywhere where there are workers, by publishing legal and illegal pamphlets, magazines, manifestoes and leaflets,

and by distributing Communist publications which they receive regularly from other Communist organisations.

In summing up the new orientation of Kemalism, we may say that the ~~imperialist~~ bourgeoisie which at the London Conference was full of hatred against imperialism, anticipating now the possibility of getting its share in the exploitation of the toiling masses of Turkey, has changed its policy of relentless warfare into a policy of concessions and treason. Since the London Conference the nationalist bourgeoisie is no longer revolutionary.

At the opening session of the Congress, when Comrade Clara Zetkin condemned the execution of Communists in Italy, Poland, Roumania, Greece, Latvia, etc., we were already in receipt of the telegram which informed us of the barbarous repressions carried on by the government of Mustapha Kemal against the Communist Party of Turkey. We cannot describe these repressions otherwise than barbarous, because police officers armed with razors and iron nails tortured their prisoners.

The government of Mustapha Kemal, in carrying out wholesale arrests, has accused our imprisoned comrades of espionage on behalf of Soviet Russia, and consequently of high treason. The arrests are still going on, according to the latest news received. Over 200 comrades have already been imprisoned. In no other country was there so large a number of arrests made in time of peace. But notwithstanding the repressions and terrorism, the workers and peasants, having learned to distinguish their true friends from their enemies, have rallied to their Party with increased devotion. In proof of this we may mention the following new facts:—

(1) During the arrest of Communist workers at an Angora ammunition factory, the non-Communist workers demanded the reason for these arrests. On being told that our Comrades were arrested for being Communists, they declared: "Since you arrest those who defend the interests of the proletariat, you arrest us too. Until now we were not Communists, but now we have become Communists too."

(2) The proclamation of protest against this brutal act, calling upon workers to rally to the Communist Party, was supported by the majority of the workers present. A scuffle occurred, and the police had to work hard to restore order.

(3) During the arrests among the peasant organisations the latter offered formidable resistance.

(4) At Constantinople, in spite of the combined terror of foreign imperialism and the native bourgeoisie, the Communists remained at their posts.

Comrades, the Turkish delegation proposes to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International to send, on behalf of the world proletariat, an open letter to the toiling people of Turkey languishing under the dictatorship of imperialism and

the treacherous national government, and to the imprisoned comrades who in their dungeons courageously await the imminent breaking of the dawn.

(Letter is reprinted in separate volume with the resolution and theses of the fourth Congress.)

REPORT ON COMMUNIST ACTIVITY AMONG WOMEN

SESSION 24, November 27, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speakers: Comrades Zetkin, Sturm, Smidovitch, Kasparova.

Clara Zetkin: Comrades, before I begin my report on the activities of the International Women's Secretariat and the development of Communist activity among the women, allow me a few short remarks. They may seem unnecessary, for they only repeat much that has been said and decided before; nevertheless, they are necessary because our work is still misunderstood not only by our opponents but even by our own comrades. They misunderstand the work of the Communist among the women and the tasks of the national sections and of the International in this connection. This is with some the remains of an old view, and with others it is wilful prejudice because they do not sympathise with our cause, and even partly oppose it.

The International Women's Secretariat is not as many believe, the union of independent organisations of the women's movements, but a branch of the Executive of the Comintern. It conducts the activity not only in constant co-operation with the Executive, but under its immediate leadership. What we usually designate as the Communist women's movement is not an independent women's movement and has nothing to do with any feminist tendencies. It exists for systematic Communist propaganda among the women. This has a double purpose; first, to incorporate within the national sections of the Comintern those women who are already filled with the Communist ideal, making them conscious co-workers in the activity of those sections; second, to win over to the Communist ideals the indifferent women and draw them into the struggles of the proletariat. The masses of working women should be mobilised for these fights. There is no work in the Party, no struggle of the movement in any country in which we women do not regard it as our first duty to participate. Moreover, we have the ambition to take our place in the Communist parties and the international where the work is hardest and the bullets fly thickest, without shunning the most menial, most modest everyday work.

One thing has become apparent: we require special organs to carry on the Communist work of organisation and education among women and to make it a part of the life of the Party. The Communist agitation among the women is not only a woman's task, it is a task of the whole Communist Party of each country, of the Communist International. To accomplish our purpose it is necessary to set up party organs as Women's Secretariats, Women's Departments, or whatever we may call them, to carry on this work.

During the last year we have had evidence of the good and bad sides of Communist work among the women. We have seen the good sides in those countries where the Communist sections of the International have created such separate bodies, as in Bulgaria and Germany, where the women's secretariats have carried on the work of organising and educating the women Communists, mobilised the working women, and led them into the social struggle. In those countries, the Communist women's movement has become one of the strong points of the general life of the Party.

In those countries we have many women members and militants in the Party and still larger masses of women as Comrades in arms outside the Party. This is also true for the country which for its importance should be mentioned first—Soviet Russia. In Soviet Russia the Women's Department of the Communist Party, acting with and under the leadership of the Party, have proved how important the co-operation of the women is, especially in this difficult period of economic and social transition to Communism. The problems and the tasks which the Communist Party and the proletariat of Russia has to face will be forced upon the Communist Parties and the proletariat of other countries which are still suffering under the capitalist rule. This is why the report of Comrade Smidovitch on the activity of the Women's Department of the Communist Party of Russia is especially important.

And now, Comrades, let me give you a few examples of the bad effect of the lack of special organs for work among women in Communist Parties. Whenever there are no women's secretariats or similar bodies, we have observed a falling-off in the participation of women in the life of the Communist Party and the withdrawal of the feminine proletariat from the struggle of their class. In Poland the Party has refused until now to set up special bodies for work among women. The Party was content to allow women to fight in its ranks, and participate in strikes and mass movements.

In England organisation for conducting systematic agitation among the feminine proletariat are altogether lacking. The Communist Party of England excused itself by its weakness and has continually refused or has postponed the setting up of a special body for systematic agitation among the women. All the exhortations of the International Women's Secretariat have been in vain. No women's secretariat was established; the

I will give you a single example of this. We have in Czecho-Slovakia, for example, 36,000 women members, which makes 20 per cent. of the total membership; Germany, with 25,000 women members, has 11-12 per cent. of the total membership.

In the Norwegian Party there are 15,000-16,000 women members, forming 15 per cent. of the total membership. Contrary to this example there is a whole group of parties, including France, Italy, England and Belgium, which shows us quite different results. In France there are only 18,000 women members, making 2 per cent. of the total membership; in Italy there are from 3,500 to 4,000 members—a percentage of one and a half. In England the number of women members is not definitely ascertained, but it is undoubtedly very small. In Belgium about 300 women members form 6 per cent. of the whole Party.

I can make this even clearer by showing how the proportion of women members varies, not only from party to party, but also in various districts according to the amount of organisation and activity. For example, in the biggest sections in Berlin the women make 20 per cent. of the membership as against the national average of 16 per cent. On the other hand, in some districts where organisation is weak and party policies are not clearly defined, the percentage is below. Similarly, in Czecho-Slovakia, of the German speaking district of Aussig, which has for long had a well-organised women's movement, the women formed 50 per cent. of the membership, as against the general average of 20 per cent., while in Czech and Slovakian districts there are many party sections with much less than that average.

It is evident then that the more intensive the work of the Communist Party, the more firm and definite the stand of the Party or of any particular branch, the stronger is the influence of the Party on the women, and consequently the larger the number of women in the Party organisations.

What shall we conclude from these facts? And what lesson shall we draw from them to guide our future work?

The organisation of the women of the proletariat has not been considered by the Communist Parties as a task of first importance. On the contrary, one had to fight rather vigorously within the ranks of the party for its recognition.

Still another lesson is to be drawn from the way in which our women members are recruited. They are partly politically unschooled fighters. The great majority of them are not workers but housewives, the wives of our comrades, who have joined the Party less out of conviction than because they were persuaded to do so. By their very nature such elements are passive, they lack the experience and the training for any agitation, and first of all they are out of touch with the mass of the women workers of the factories and of the Trade Unions.

This makes it all the more necessary to make systematic use of these weak forces, to organise them in such rational

fashion as to obtain the greatest amount of work from the expenditure of energy. The women's committees of the Communist Party have been created for that very purpose. The first task of the International Women's Secretary since the time when its centre was removed to Berlin has been to increase the effectiveness of these organisations on an International scale. We may say that the preliminary conditions have been created to win over the large masses of the women workers. At least one thing has been accomplished; we have convinced our Comrades of the necessity of special women's organs. There is still a long way to the practical activity of these committees and here I must speak on certain points which Comrade Zetkin has already somewhat dwelt upon.

I wish to point out that in England, a country especially important for the International struggle of the proletariat, no central women's committee has been created by the Executive to conduct the work systematically for the whole country.

I wish to point out that in France to-day there are only 15 women's committees as against many hundred local organisations of the Party, and that the central women's secretariat in France has been jeopardised and actually dissolved by the crisis in the Party.

I wish further to point to Czecho-Slovakia, where the Party is strongly organised, and where, in spite of this, only one-seventh of the local groups have deemed it necessary to answer a questionnaire sent by the women's secretariat, that only one-tenth of the local organisations have women members, and that 47 in all, i.e., only 2 per cent., can boast of a women's committee.

It is no wonder then that when the work of organisation among the women is so much neglected in a strong Party like that of Czecho-Slovakia, that in the smaller Parties, like Austria, Holland and Denmark, their activity is confined to the capital of the country, to the seat of the Central Executive.

The coming period of intensified proletarian struggle over all Europe demands that the number of women's committees be increased to extend into the smallest local organisations.

What are the tasks of these committees? The most immediate, the most elementary task is that the few active Comrades should do all the necessary work; they must become maids of all work. They must carry on organisation and propaganda work throughout the whole country; they must speak, they must write, they must issue instructions for definite activity within all branches of the political life. We cannot hope to accomplish the tremendous work before us with the few active comrades which we have. It must be another task of these comrades to educate the inexperienced women in the Party and prepare them for definite tasks. For this purpose discussion evenings, courses, and circles for women must be organised, in order to prepare them for their work among the masses outside of the Party. It is a sign of strength in the English movement, or at least a positive beginning of the work, when our comrades

with true instinct begin their activity by creating the small Party schools for women comrades of which Comrade Zetkin spoke.

The third task, however, is the most important. The women's committee must see to it that agitation among the large masses of the women proletariat be included in the general work of the Party; that it does not remain a special task of a small handful of communist women. They must make all efforts that the agitation among the women becomes a branch of the whole movement, that it be carried on by all organisational and political means at the disposal of the Party, and be supported by the full authority of the Party and its various organs.

The most important task which we have to fulfil in order to get the women into general party work, is the work within the factories and unions. It was no accident, but the result of a definite plan of the International Women's Secretariat that we proceeded as soon as the resolutions on the women's movement had been adopted in the International, to organise, immediately, common action of the Women's International with the Trade Union Section, which were entrusted by the Party with the work of agitation and education in the factories and Trade Unions.

It is no accident that Bulgaria, which possesses the model party of the International—of course, relatively, as Comrade Zinoviev has said—is that country where the organisation of the working women in the labour unions and the factories has been farthest extended. In Bulgaria there are special organs in the Party and in the Trade Unions which are completely controlled by the Party; the co-ordination between the Party and Trade Union Committees is definitely defined by rules and statutes; and the greatest care is taken of the special conditions and needs of the working women and the task the Communist Party is to accomplish for the mobilisation of women in the unions and factories.

In the illegal parties the work within the Trade Unions is of special importance. In Finland, Rumania, and Spain, where the Party is not able to function openly and obtain contact with the working women, the Trade Unions are practically the only field through which they may influence the women workers from the Communist standpoint.

The Czech women comrades on the Executive have quite rightly requested the International Women's Secretariat and the Red International of Labour Unions that the R.I.L.U. sees to it that the demands of the working women be more seriously taken up by the unions affiliated with it, among which, for example, the agricultural workers alone have 30,000 women members.

Comrades, the necessity of mobilising the working women for the struggle forces us to organise the work among the unions systematically. This means that the Communists must absolutely take active part in the most important portion of the general

party work. So long as the construction of Communist fractions is not accomplished as the foundation of our work within the labour unions and factories, the Communist women, with all their special plans and proposals for the revolutionary education of the working women in the factories and unions, are merely beating the air. Just a word on the question of the consumers' co-operatives. The co-operatives differ from the trade unions inasmuch as their members consist not only of working women but of great masses of proletarian housewives. Here we have a field for work which contains large numbers of women whom we could not reach through our work in the factories and unions.

A second factor causes us to undertake work within the co-operatives at the present time. This is the daily increase in the cost of living and the general suffering which may be found in nearly all countries. The co-operatives are one of the means by which, working together with the proletarian political parties and the unions, the struggle will be made against the deterioration of the standard of living of the working masses.

The work of education, among the women members of the co-operatives, will build up a revolutionary consciousness which will strengthen the United Front of the proletariat among the women of the working class who are not yet engaged in the productive processes.

Comrades, a few words on the question of the press. The press is one of the most important means to win over the unorganised masses and influence them in the Communist sense.

We must increase the importance of the women's movement so that we secure in the general section of the Party press and in every other organ of the Party, in the Trade Union magazines, in the scientific publications, in the agrarian publications, etc. The women's movement will not attain its due importance until it receives the full support of the Party, until all the problems of the women are thoroughly discussed in the Party organs and the importance of agitation among women has been recognised.

In conclusion, I would say that the prospects for the women's movement are very favourable.

At the preceding congress, everything still remained to be done in the Communist women's movement. To-day, the foundations have been laid for agitation among women, and at the next World Congress we must be able to declare that the work among women has become an integral part of the general Party work, that we have been able to mobilise the women and lead them into the revolutionary movement to fight in a United Front for the final victory of the proletariat.

Smidovitch (Russia): In Russia the propaganda and agitation among the women workers are conducted by special departments under the auspices of the Communist Party, which use special methods in their work owing to the backwardness of the female masses. These departments work on equal terms with all the other departments of the party committees.

The methods of the working women's sections consist in directing the activity of the working women in the accomplishment of the practical tasks embodying the aspirations and demands of the working class. This method of attracting the working women in practical activity has greatly contributed towards increasing the influence of the Communist Party among the masses of the working and peasant women. In each Communist nucleus there is a Comrade whose duty it is to carry on political agitation among the working women, who is, in fact, the organiser of these women. The women workers of every workshop have elections of delegates at their general meetings two or three times a year. These delegates are subsequently convened to delegates' meetings by the women's section of the Party Executive. There are 70,000 such delegates throughout Russia. These delegates' meetings are in the nature of practical and political schools. At these meetings reports are presented on all political economic questions, and it is here that the women are encouraged in their first attempts at social activity. The delegates are sent on practical work in various commissions and organs of soviet construction.

At the Soviet elections it became evident that the women delegates were very active, that they were taking part in the elections, that they vote for Communist candidates and that a considerable number of them were becoming members of the R.C.P.

The Russian Communist Party has 29,773 working women in its ranks. The number is not very considerable, but one must take into consideration the fact that the Russian Communist Party demands regular party activity from all its members.

The number of working women in the trade unions is growing from year to year, and we have at present about a million and a half women trade union members.

A considerable number of working women are members of workshop committees and of Administrative Councils of Trade Unions. The Central Trade Unions. The Central Trade Union Committees have also some women members. The new economic policy imposes upon us the task of preventing the women workers becoming scattered owing to unemployment caused by the reduction of industrial activity. The working women's sections displayed much energy on this field. It is owing to their initiative that artels, i.e., women's co-operatives were formed for the benefit of the unemployed women. By this means thousands of working women have remained under the influence of the party.

In the present conditions of the new economic policy, when the Soviet State is temporarily being deprived of the means to come to the assistance of the mothers, it is precisely in the field of co-operation that the activity of the working women can find its expression. In Petrograd, 24,000 working mothers are organised within the co-operative society, "The Mother and Child," which is part of the network of the Petrograd Consumers' co-operatives. This co-operative society provides the

necessaries of life at reasonable prices, and proposes to establish homes for infants.

Such co-operatives exist also in some of the towns and countries of the Pskov Province, and also in one of the communes. Since the International "Women's Day," in 1922, the working women's sections were given the right to send working women as apprentices to the co-operative sections. A certain number of these working women are already in the co-operative societies. In many instances the working and peasant women are members of the administrative councils in the workshop and village co-operatives.

Moreover, a considerable number of working women are attending courses on co-operation. We consider our work on the co-operative field as a means of bringing together the urban and the rural workers, and to bring them under the Party's sphere of influence. Therefore, we convene our peasant women conferences by village or by county, and do house to house canvassing, getting the more advanced among these women to attend lecture courses and agricultural colleges.

The working women's sections do their utmost to attract the working and peasant women into the schools for adults. Preparatory courses are organised for them. There are 3,633 working women at the working women's faculty (Rabfak), and a considerable number are sent to the Communist Universities, where they receive their education. The Central Committee of the Communist Party publishes two periodicals for women: one for the peasant women and the other for the working women. There are also several provincial magazines and about 60 working women's papers. These publications have several hundreds of working and peasant women correspondents.

At present there is not a single field of Soviet construction on which the Russian working women do not display their remarkable capacities and activity. Neither is there a front at which the working and peasant women did not prove themselves excellent comrades. Thousands of working women fell in our struggle, whose names have remained unknown to history.

The thoroughly awakened working women are animated by an entirely Communist spirit, and the energy which they have displayed in Communist and Soviet construction knows no bounds.

Being convinced of the importance of this work, I call upon all Communist Parties to pay the greatest attention to the agitation and propaganda among the working women. Their participation in the united proletarian front is indispensable for its success in the final victorious struggle.

Kasparova (Russia): Comrades, in the great struggle for the proletarian revolution, the Communist International has always devoted particular attention to the national-revolutionary movement against imperialism, which in recent years has drawn into it the masses of working men and women, and

men and women of the peasant class in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East. Inasmuch as the Third International supported this movement, inasmuch as it protected the interests of the large masses of workers in the East, it could not fail to take part in the women's revolutionary movement in those countries for, as Karl Marx has already pointed out, no social revolution is possible without the aid of the women.

But since the Second World Congress of the Communist International laid down the guiding principles of the colonial-national question for the period of the struggle between imperialism and the proletarian dictatorship, the following events have taken place in the East:

(1) The development of the struggle against imperialism in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries, such as Korea, British India, Dutch East Indies, Egypt, and Syria, China and Persia, with the extension of the independence of Turkey.

(2) The beginning of a proletarian class movement in nearly all the countries of the East, starting in the capitalist country of Japan, and the simultaneous formation of Communist Parties in nearly all these countries.

At the same time we observe an ever-increasing participation of the women in the movement, who have been languishing under the oppression of slavery, particularly in those Eastern countries where the industries are beginning to develop. As far as Japan is concerned, the following figures may be taken as an illustration: 3,047,902 male workers and 3,225,363 female workers, out of a population of 28,042,395 men and 27,918,145 women.

The working population of British India in 1911 was approximately 101,825,424 men and 47,359,582 women, out of a total population of 320,000,000. Out of that number there were 11,500,000 men and 6,000,000 women engaged in industry. The weaving trade alone employed 1,764,193 women, the spinning trade 1,215,714, the food preparing industries 2,200,000, the women working on the land were 12,000,000, as against 13,000,000 men employed in the same industry.

In Egypt, as well as in Syria, the number of women employed in the cotton factories and in silk spinning, as well as in tobacco industries, has been continuously on the increase. Even in China, where there has been a weaker development of industries, there are already over 200,000 women in the factories. The ever growing participation of women in industrial pursuits has resulted in a correspondingly increasing participation of women in the general labour movement. This is shown by the strikes in Japan in 1918 and 1920, in the great weavers' strike in China in 1921.

In India, after the weavers' strike at Bombay and at Achmedabad in 1916, we had the strike of the Madura Factory at Madras in 1920 (700 working women), then the strike at the pottery works at Bombay in 1922. An All-Indian Union of

working women was organised at Bombay in 1922. Many more similar instances could be quoted.

At the same time, even in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East, which have as yet no big industries, as, for instance, in Persia and in Turkey, owing to the economic conditions of the post-war period, the women are becoming an ever more indispensable factor in industrial production. In all the Eastern countries where a strong national-revolutionary movement exists, as in Korea, India, Egypt and even in Turkey, the woman takes an active part.

In almost all these countries there are illegal or legal revolutionary women's organizations, which are under the influence of the national bourgeoisie, although they embrace large masses of working women and peasant women. The economic condition of working women and peasant women is very bad in all the countries of the East. They form a cheap labour force for European and Japanese capitalists and a defenceless object of exploitation.

Thus the development of the women's movement in the Eastern countries has furnished us with fruitful soil for Communist propaganda and agitation. Then experiences of Communist propaganda activities in the regions of Soviet Trans-Caucasia and Turkestan may be made use of in the other Eastern countries in a majority of cases, in so far as Mahomedan women are concerned. We draw the attention of the Communist Parties and groups of the Eastern countries, as well as of the Communist Parties of England, France and other colonising countries, to the extraordinary importance of the work among women during this revolutionary period. In this work the diverse objective conditions in every country are to be taken into consideration. Where there are already organised Communist Parties and a labour movement, as, for instance, in Japan and partly also in China and India, the Communist Parties may create special organs for work among the women. Where there is chiefly a national-revolutionary movement embracing large masses of working women, the Party should take advantage of this movement to get into closer contact with the masses, to emancipate them from the influence of the bourgeoisie and to lead them into the fight against alien imperialism and for the proletarian revolution under revolutionary and democratic slogans.

In the East, where it is the task of the Communist Parties to deepen and broaden the popular national-revolutionary fight by establishing close contact with the national liberation movement, the Communist women's groups, by taking part in this struggle and attracting the other women's organisations (cultural and educational associations as well as the suffragist) should make this the basis of their activity and train cadres of intellectual revolutionary women.

The United Front against imperialism, like the United Front of the workers, can be realised only by the attraction of the largest masses of women. (Prolonged cheers.)

THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SESSION 22, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speaker: Comrade Schueller.

Schueller (Austria): Comrades, the Communist international has regarded the question of communist work among the masses of the working Youth and the situation of the Youth International as important enough to be placed on the agenda of this Congress.

I should like to deal with the following three points: (1) The development of the Young Communist International from the Second World Congress until to-day; (2) The present situation of the Youth and their struggle against the capital offensive and reaction; (3) The practical relations between the Communist Parties and the Communist Youth.

The Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International achieved a certain amount of renown among friends and enemies, which it has well merited. This Congress brought with it a radical transformation in the activity of the Communist Youth. You know, that during the war when the Social Democrats went over openly into the ranks of the reformists, the Communist Youth were the first to pick up the banner of the class struggle, the first to declare war against war and to struggle for the social revolution. You also know that the Youth were the first to renew International organisation and have become the enthusiastic supporters and defenders of the Russian revolution and the Third International. In that period a definite type of Socialist—we may just as well say Communist—Youth movement was created as the political vanguard of the proletariat. It was the time when Communist Parties either did not exist or were very weak, and when the Communist Youth assumed a leading political role in the working class movement.

The Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International opened a new era in the activity of the Youth. Communist Parties had been created, and the Communist International had become a strong International organisation. The leading political role of the Communist Youth was no longer necessary, and they had to surrender the political leadership to the Communist Parties. This first important point was decided at the Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International.

Politics were to remain the fundamental, practical basis of the activity of the Youth organisations, which were to remain the heart of the Communist Youth movement, but they could now devote themselves to their proper tasks, concerned

directly with the Youth. The most important of these tasks are: (1) To defend the economic needs of the Youth; (2) To educate the Youth systematically in the Marxian doctrine; (3) To carry on anti-militarist propaganda among the young workers in and outside the bourgeois armies.

The third important result of the Second World Congress must be especially emphasised: The Communist Youth decided to enlarge its organisation. During the war and in the first years of the revolution, the Communist Youth was forced, just as the rest of the Communist movement, to organise into small narrow groups of a comparatively sectarian character. This was the motto of the Communist Youth: "First clarity, then majority." This means that the Communist Youth should consist only of a small number of chosen and tried elements. During the war and the year following, when Communist parties did not exist, this slogan was historically justified. But it had no more justification when the parties began to organise the masses. Their new slogan became: "To the masses!" To win them, to organise them, to become a mass organisation both in size and in leadership. This slogan of the Third Communist Congress, "To the masses!" was adopted by the Communist Youth, but not as a matter of temporary tactics, but as a basis for the Youth movement in general. We must keep in mind that the organisations of the Youth must be wider than those of the organisations of the Party. The Communist Party embraces within its ranks only members with a clearly defined Communist creed and a certain degree of Communist class consciousness. The Youth organisation must go to the large masses of the young workers, win the still indifferent elements, draw them into the class war, give them the first elements of Communist education in the class war, gradually train them to become class conscious workers.

Well, Comrades, let us see whether the development of the Communist Youth International since the Second World Congress justified the resolutions of that Congress. We must answer this question in the affirmative. In spite of all the difficulties we have met, we must acknowledge that the decisions of the Second World Congress were the correct ones and have brought us nearer to our true goal.

We must, however, admit that the political activity in the Y.C. Leagues of Central Europe has grown weaker, and that a decline of political interest is to be observed, not only among the masses, but also among the members of our organisation and even within our central committee. It is this fact which is troubling our comrades in the Communist Parties most. For instance, whenever one meets comrades who have come from Central Europe and had something to do with the Youth movement, they will invariably say: The young people do not trouble much about politics, they are only concerned with their education. Naturally, these comrades are very concerned about this state of things. To some extent, such statements

are exaggerated. This is due to the fact that the tasks of the Y.C. Leagues in the present phase are not quite correctly understood by many of our Party Comrades. How are we to account for this? First of all, we must establish the general facts. Our Y.C. Leagues are, of course, part of the working class youth, and are, therefore, influenced by the moods and conditions prevailing among the working class youth as a whole. As has been already said, these moods and conditions and the entire position of the working class youth have undergone a change since 1921 which served to detract their interest from political matters, and caused them to concentrate their attention on the questions more immediately affecting the working class youth, such as the economic, the educational and the social questions. This is the foremost reason.

The Y.C. Leagues have made great strides on the economic field. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the question of the economic struggle, viz., of the struggle for the immediate needs of the working class youth, was a very contentious question at the Second, as well as the Third Congress of the C.I., and was the subject of lively discussion even after these congresses. This task was something new for the masses of the Y.C. Leagues, excepting, of course, Russia, Austria, and Germany. However, we are justified in saying to-day that the necessity for the economic struggle through the Y.C. Leagues, has not only been recognised by all our organisations, but that a beginning has already been made to put this recognition to a practical use. To-day the economic question and the economic struggle of the working class youth are everywhere the centre of the interest and the activity of our Y.C. Leagues.

Comrades, I must deal now with our anti-militarist work. This work has remained the same in the various Y.C. Leagues. As before, this work was conducted with great enthusiasm, and our young Comrades have their press and continue their anti-militarist campaign. This work has exacted many sacrifices and victims. It is only in Central Europe that we must admit a lessening in the interest for the anti-militarist question, and a decreased activity on this field. This is as grave a feature as the slackening of the interest in politics in general, which we must combat by the same methods.

A beginning has also been made on the field of education. However, we soon saw that we could not do as much on this field as on the economic and trade union field, because the educational work demands forces which we ought to get from the parties, but which were not forthcoming. Many improvements were also made in the work of organisation. Let us take, for instance, the Y.C. Leagues in France and Great Britain, which, like the parties, had a federalist basis. In those countries we were successful in establishing centralised collaboration within the organisation. A division of labour was introduced, and we were successful in achieving increased individual activity of

the members, as well as centralisation. We have also made progress on the international field. The collaboration between the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International and the Leagues is to-day as close as that between the Central Committee of a League and its districts and groups. The Young Communist International is justified in saying that in many questions it works better than many a Central Committee of a national section, especially in the matter of giving advice.

Nevertheless, we have not yet become mass organisations. By mass organisations we understand an organisation that has a mass membership and exercises constant influence over the masses of young workers, and leads them in their struggles.

I now come to the position of the young workers, and to the campaign led by the Young Communist International in this connection. You all know that the condition of the young workers, along with the condition of the adult workers, have not improved during the 15 months that have passed since the Third World Congress, but have rather become worse in the economic sense, under the pressure of reaction and the menace of war and militarism.

During the same period the campaign of the reaction against our Young Communist Movement has become more acute. We witness a systematic reactionary attack in all countries directed against the Young Communist Movement. For instance, we have to register persecutions of the Young Communist Movement in France, Poland, Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia. In France and in Czecho-Slovakia the Young Communist organisations were dissolved by the authorities on account of their anti-militarist propaganda, while the Party carries on its activities quite legally.

We thus see that the position of the young workers has grown worse everywhere, but we must emphasise another fact of importance, namely, that the young workers are used as a lever to bring down the standard of living of the adult workers. The wages of the young workers are the first to be reduced, thus paving the way for a reduction of the wages of the adult workers. Reports of this kind will be found in abundance in the young workers' journals.

There have also been cases where the young workers were left at work while the older workers were discharged. It means that the young workers were used as a means of increasing the unemployment among the adult workers. There has also been cases where young workers were pressed in the service as strike breakers against the adults and were made to serve as a weapon of capitalism against the adult workers. The reactionary trade unionist bureaucracy, the Amsterdam International, did not give a lead in this question, but rather sacrificed the interests of the young workers in all these matters. Whenever it is a question of fixing wages, conditions of labour, the right to strike, etc., we see the reactionary trade unionist bureaucracy everywhere taking passive attitude in regard to the young workers.

Instead of calling the working youth to the United Front with the adult workers, they carried out their manoeuvre of amalgamation. Now we stand before the amalgamation of the Second-and-a-Half Youth International and the Workers' Youth International, i.e., before the final capitulation of the centralist Eunuchs of the Second International.

We have examples where the young workers have taken militant action in spite of the dictates of the social-democratic trade unions and the social-democratic youth organisations, and unfortunately also without our direct impulse. We have such an example in the English Engineers' Strike. The trade unions forbade the apprentices to strike. The apprentices, mind you, in a place where there was and there is no youth movement, spontaneously met and declared: "No, we won't stay at work, we will strike!"

What conclusions are we to draw? The first conclusion is the one that I have pointed out, namely, that the young workers today are anxious to take part in the struggle against the impoverishment of the young workers.

Secondly, we should draw the conclusion that the adult working class organisations do not protect the interests of the young workers, and the young workers are no longer willing to wait until their demands will finally be taken care of.

I must also say a few words about the anti-militarist campaign. This is still a sore point with most of our parties. On this field we must have more mutual understanding than before, because the present situation is such that this struggle must not be left entirely to the Young Communist Leagues. It is absolutely necessary that the parties intensify the struggle. Closer co-operation is an absolute necessity.

I must say also a few words about the Party press. I am able to report a considerable improvement in the party press in connection with the treatment of young peoples questions, as most of the papers are paying much more attention to these questions than heretofore. Germany is no doubt the focus of the economic struggle of the young workers. And yet it happened in Germany that a newspaper editors' conference arrived at the decision to stop all young people's supplements in the entire German Communist press. We have been told that the Berliner "Rote Fahne" is very loth to accept articles on young peoples' questions, and that it is almost impossible to get anything in that line accepted by the "Rote Fahne." The young peoples' supplement cannot get any permanent foothold in that paper. Long ago was the struggle on this score, the political bureau said "yes," and the editors said "no." Neither has the central organ in Czecho-Slovakia a young peoples' supplement, nor was it possible to get a single article about the organisation of the youth workers into the British press. Even an article on the formation of the Y.C. League was rejected. It is even more difficult to get something about the Y.C. movement in "Humanité" than the "Rote Fahne." Thus, there is room for improvement in that direction.

Therefore, the Communist International must make a clear statement on this question, and it is ready to do so. It declares that the united front of the young and the adult workers for a common struggle against capitalism and reaction is an absolute necessity, and calls upon all its parties and the entire working class to stand up for the interest and demands of the working class youth as well as for their own and to make them the subject of their daily struggle.

There is now the practical side to the entire question of the struggle in the interests of the young workers. It is the practical collaboration between the young Communists and the Communist Party. Generally speaking, the practical collaboration between the Communist Party and the Young Communists have greatly improved during this year. Nevertheless, we must not relax in our mutual efforts to attain the ends which to us is both a necessary ideal and a practical demand. I will adduce one illustration in connection with this question. We had a very protracted discussion in Czecho-Slovakia with the Party officials as to whether the existence of the Young Communist League was a necessity or not. Many leading Party members adopted an attitude which practically meant that the Young Communist Leagues were not needed, that it was sufficient to have a Party, trade unions and sport organisations which could be entrusted with the training and organisation of their young members. Such an attitude is a complete misunderstanding of the tasks of the Young Communist Leagues as an organisation which is to attract the wide masses of the working class youth and to give them a Communist political training.

We had to work hard in Great Britain before we were able to persuade the Communist Party of the necessity of bringing into being a proletarian young people's movement, and it was only after a struggle lasting for several months that the Party Congress endorsed this idea.

All this goes to illustrate the fact that in some countries there is no proper appreciation of the Young Communist movement.

In conclusion, I must touch upon the question of the organisation of the children's groups. This movement has been firmly established in the course of this year in many countries and the Parties are beginning to take an interest in this work. This interest is very welcome, and we should insist that the Parties should not encourage the tendency of a vague general education for working class children, that they should throw overboard the bourgeois nonsense of a general rational education and that they should insist on a purely Communist education for the children. We trust that the resolution will meet with your approval and will be put to practical application.

In this way, the Communist youth will fulfil its duty towards the Party more eagerly than this year, and the co-operation with the Party will be more pronounced.

Three years have passed since the Communist Youth International was formed in Berlin. We met in a small smoky back-

room of a suburban inn, forced to underground methods by the Noske reaction. Since that time the Communist Youth International has grown tremendously. Its membership has been nearly quadrupled, it has grown in strength, definiteness of purpose, and determination. We hope that the Communist International and the Communist Youth will be able to penetrate the ranks of the working youth, to arouse them to action, and replenish the Communist Movement with powerful fighting troops. And we hope that we will be able to prove to you at the next Congress that the Communist Youth International, assisted by the Comintern, has fought for the interests of the masses of the young workers, has drawn them into the struggles of the adult workers and won them over to Communism. (Applause.)

THE NEGRO QUESTION

SESSION 22, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speakers: Comrades Billing and Mackay.

Billings (America): In the Negro question we have before us another phase of the race and colonial question to which no attention has been paid heretofore.

Although the Negro problem as such is fundamentally an economic problem, it is aggravated and intensified by the friction which exists between the white and black races. It is a matter of common knowledge that prejudice does play an important part. Whilst it is true that, for instance, in the United States of America the main basis of racial antagonism lies in the fact that there is competition of labour in America between black and white, nevertheless, the negro bears a badge of slavery on him which has its origin way back in the time of his slavery.

There are about 150,000,000 negroes throughout the world. Approximately 25,000,000 of them reside in the New World, and the rest reside in Africa. The negroes in America and the West Indies are a source of cheap labour supply for the American capitalist, and we find the capitalist class has always used and will always continue to use them as an instrument in order to suppress the white working class in its every-day struggle. They will be the source from which the "white guard" elements will be recruited in the event of a revolutionary uprising anywhere and everywhere.

The capitalist class as a class has recognised the valuable aid that the negro masses will be to them. Therefore, for years they have made it their business to cultivate a bourgeois ideology in the mind of the negro populace. This, of course, was

done in their own interests and not in those of the negroes. They have carefully planned out and planted organisations amongst the negroes to carry agitation in favour of the bourgeoisie as against the white workers. They have what is known as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Urban League. The first organisation supplies grants of money to negro schools; the second is a notorious strike-breaking institution.

Facing this condition, it was inevitable that the negro population would have some sort of reaction against the oppression and the suppression to which they were subjected throughout the world. Their first reaction was, of course, in the forming of religious institutions, the only forms permitted at certain times for their own enjoyment, but later we find that there has been a continuous development of organisations on the part of the negroes, which, although purely negro, are to a certain extent directly or indirectly opposed to capitalism. The three most important negro organisations operating to-day are, firstly, what is known as the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, an organisation which is composed of a large proletarian element led by bourgeois intellectuals. It bases its action upon the principle of seeking redress from the capitalist class by means of petitions and what practically amounts to begging that something may be done for them. Then we come to the other more interesting form of organisation which is known as the Garvey Association, an organisation that is ultra-nationalist, yet composed of a rebel rank and file element. It is an organisation which, in spite of the fact that it has drafted on its programme various cheap stock schemes, is influencing the minds of the negroes against imperialism. This organisation came into existence after the world war. Of course it did not take any definite radical form, it was saved in time by its own leader; but, notwithstanding this, the race consciousness has been planted and used to a very large extent far into the interior of Africa, where hardly anyone could expect that an organisation could be planted which had its origin in America. The third organisation is the African Blood Brotherhood, a radical negro organisation which bases its programme upon the abolition of capitalism. It was the one organisation which, during the time of a race riot in Tulsa Oklahoma, put up a splendid and courageous fight, and the one to which the capitalist class in America is going to turn its attention next.

We have also in Africa certain small organisations which get their direct inspiration from America, the headquarters and centre of political thought among negroes; these organisations are stretching out and developing as far as the Sudan. These can be utilised by Communists if the means of propaganda are carefully, deliberately and intensively used to link up these movements. We see in them a sort of organisation which will react against imperialism throughout the world.

There are in the United States about 450 negro newspapers and magazines, and, while they are mostly strictly racial, they have a great influence upon the negro masses everywhere. There

is, for instance, the "Chicago Defender," which issues 250,000 copies weekly which are spread out all over the world, wherever there are large groups of negroes. Then there is the "Crisis," a monthly magazine which has a circulation of over 600,000. These papers, and especially the "Chicago Defender," and others with a smaller circulation, have constantly used radical propaganda material that we sent out.

The negroes feel the impending crisis which will break out in the south between black and white. It was in the south that the seed was sown and the results are bound to come in some way. It will probably take the form of race rioting on a very large scale.

In the United States, of the approximate number of negroes (12 millions), two millions live in the northern industrialised part of the country, and the other nine or ten millions in the south, and I suppose that all of you have a picture in your mind of what the south is like. When you enter there it is like Dante's Inferno. Eighty per cent. of the negroes live on the land. They are discriminated against and disfranchised, and it is there that the class struggle is waged in its most brutal form. The relation between blacks and whites is one of constant conflict and of fighting to the death. The lynching of a negro is something to be enjoyed in the south as a picture show is enjoyed elsewhere. The white population in the south is so saturated with this idea of white domination over the negro that this question must engage our attention. At the present time when there are big strikes in the north United States, the capitalist class and its hirelings hurry to the south in order to draw the southern negroes into the northern districts as strike-breakers. They promise them higher wages and better conditions, and so induce them to enter those areas in which strikes are in progress. That is a constant danger to the white workers when on strike. Of course, the entire blame for this must not be placed upon the negroes. The labour unions in America, and I am speaking of the bona fide trade unions, have for the last few years insisted that, although a negro is a skilled worker, he cannot by virtue of the fact that he is a negro enter the trade union. It is only recently that the American Federation of Labour has made a weak attempt to try to get negroes into the regular trade unions. But, even to-day, such an organisation as the Machinists' Union still has, if I am not mistaken, the assertion in its programme that the qualification of membership is that every white brother shall introduce for membership other white men, or something to that effect. This means that the negroes are permanently excluded from the unions simply on account of the fact that they are black, and the capitalist class and the reactionary negro press use this to the fullest extent in order to prejudice the minds of these black workers against the labour unions. When you speak to a negro about his joining a trade union, or about the necessity of his becoming radical, the first thing he throws at you is the assertion: "Don't preach to me. Preach to the whites. They need it and I do not. I am always ready to fight alongside of them so long as they agree to take me

into the trade unions, but as long as they do not I will scab, and, by God, I have a right to scab. I want to protect my own life." That is one of their arguments, and it cannot be ignored. While theoretically we may use all the beautiful phrases that we know, nevertheless these are hard concrete facts in the everyday struggle.

The Negro Commission therefore prepared certain definite proposals to which I hope you will agree.

McKay: Comrades, the negro race in the economic life of the world to-day occupies a very peculiar position. In every country where the whites and blacks must work together the capitalists have set the one against the other. It would seem at the present day that the international bourgeoisie would use the negro race as their trump card in their fight against the world revolution. Great Britain has her negro regiments in the colonies and she has demonstrated what she can do with her negro soldiers by the use that she made of them during the late war. The revolution in England is very far away because of the highly organised exploitation of the subject peoples of the British Empire. In Europe we find that France has a negro army of over 300,000, and that to carry out their policy of imperial domination in Europe, the French are going to use their negro minions.

In America we have the same situation. The northern bourgeoisie knows how well the negro soldiers fought for their own emancipation, although illiterate and untrained, during the Civil War. They also remember how well the negro soldiers fought in the Spanish American war under Theodore Roosevelt. They know that in the last war over 400,000 negroes who were mobilised gave a very good account of themselves, and that, besides fighting for the capitalists, they also put up a very good fight for themselves on returning to America when they fought the white mobs in Chicago, St. Louis and Washington.

But more than the fact that the American capitalists are using negro soldiers in their fight against the interests of labour is the fact that the American capitalists are setting out to mobilise the entire black race of America for the purpose of fighting organised labour. The situation in America to-day is terrible and fraught with grave dangers. It is much uglier and more terrible than was the condition of the peasants and Jews of Russia under the Czar. It is so ugly and terrible that very few people in America are willing to face it. The reformist bourgeoisie have been carrying on the battle against discrimination and racial prejudice in America. The Socialists and Communists have fought very shy of it because there is a great element of prejudice among the Socialists and Communists of America. They are not willing to face the negro question. In associating with the comrades of America, I have found demonstrations of prejudice on the various occasions when the white and black Comrades had to get together; and this is the greatest difficulty that the Communists of America have got to overcome

—the fact that they first have got to emancipate themselves from the ideas they entertained towards the negroes before they can be able to reach the negroes with any kind of radical propaganda.

However, regarding the negroes themselves, I feel that as the subject races of other nations have come to Moscow to learn how to fight against their exploiters, the negroes will also come to Moscow. In 1918, when the Third International published its Manifesto and included that part referring to the exploited colonies there were several groups of negro radicals, in America that sent this propaganda out among their people. When in 1920 the American government started to investigate and to suppress radical propaganda among the negroes, the small radical negro groups in America retaliated by publishing the fact that the Socialists stood for the emancipation of the negroes, and that reformist America could do nothing for them. Then, I think, for the first time in American history, the American negroes found that Karl Marx had been interested in their emancipation, and had fought valiantly for it. I shall just read this extract that was taken from Karl Marx's writing at the time of the Civil War :

"When an oligarchy of 300,000 slave holders for the first time in the annals of the world, dared to inscribe 'Slavery' on the banner of armed revolt, who on the very spot hardly a century ago the idea of one great democratic republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century, when on that spot the counter-revolution cynically proclaimed property in man to be 'the corner-stone of the new edifice'—then the working class of Europe understood at once that the slave-holders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy war of property against labour, with their hopes of the future, even their past conquests, were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic."

As Marx fought against chattel slavery in 1861, so are present-day Socialists, his intellectual descendants, fighting against wage slavery:

The work among the negroes of the south will have to be carried on by some legal propaganda organised in the north, because we find at the present time in America that the situation in the Southern States (where nine million out of ten million of the negro population live), is that even the liberal bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie among the negroes cannot get their own papers of a reformist propaganda type into the south on account of the laws that there discriminate against them.

The fact is that it is really only in the Southern States that there is any real suppression of opinion. No suppression of opinion exists in the Northern States in the way it exists in the south. In the Northern States special laws are made for special occasions—as those against Communists and Socialists during the war—but in the south we find laws that have existed for 55 years, under which the negroes cannot meet to talk about their

grievances. The white people who are interested in their cause cannot go and speak to them. If we sent white comrades into the south they are generally ordered out by the southern oligarchy, and if they do not leave they are generally whipped, tarred and feathered; and if we send Comrades into the south they won't be able to get out again—they will be lynched and burned at the stake.

I hope that as a symbol that the negroes of the world will not be used by the international bourgeoisie in the final conflicts against the world revolution, we shall soon see a few negro soldiers in the finest, bravest and cleanest fighting forces in the world—the Red Army and Navy of Russia—fighting not only for their own emancipation, but also for the emancipation of the working class of the whole world.

Kolaroff (Chairman): I call your attention to the fact that this is the first time that the negro problem has been brought before the World Congress of the Comintern; I do not believe it necessary to prove the importance of this question. We have to win over to our side a race which has lived till now in a state of oppression. The Negro Commission has adopted the resolution which is somewhat too theoretical in form and may not be wholly understood by the working class and the lower section of the black race. The Presidium therefore decided to refer this resolution back to the Commission to be altered and simplified.

There being no objections, the motion is adopted. (Final resolution on Negro Question printed in volume of Resolutions and Theses of IV. Congress of the Communist International.)

CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

SESSION 23, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Markhlevsky.

Speakers: Meshteriskoff, Lauridan, Henriet, Khintchuk.

Markhlevsky (Chairman): I declare the session open. I call on Comrade Meshteriskoff to report on co-operation:

Meshteriskoff: Measured not by the power and discipline of its organisation, but by the number of its members, the co-operative movement represents one of the strongest forms of the labour movement.

It is no exaggeration to state that the co-operative organisation has tens of millions of members throughout the world.

The co-operative is not merely a movement whose members combine from time to time for making necessary purchases in common, it is an organisation which endeavours to create its own ideology, to permeate all its work by that ideology, and to

inculcate it into the minds of its members. The view persistently advocated by the old leaders of the co-operative movement, i.e., that the co-operation should be "the third form of the labour movement," entirely independent from the two other forms, the Party and Trade Union organisations, tended to create in the mind of every active co-operator a special co-operative domain wherein the old co-operative leaders ruled supreme. Of course, no human head can be divided by impenetrable walls into entirely separate compartments. Then new ideas of the revolutionary struggle forced their way even into this secluded "co-operative sector," but this process developed with extreme slowness.

The experience of the Russian revolution has shown clearly what colossal difficulties arise in the organisation of public feeding and exchange of commodities, in case the proletariat captures power without having preliminarily gained control over the co-operatives.

Under such conditions the proletariat is compelled to carry on the struggle for this position at a time when all its forces should be concentrated on the retention of political power and the organisation of the new society, when it is imperative that co-operatives should immediately begin to perform their useful functions at the command of the new proletarian government. The conquest of the co-operatives cannot be achieved at one blow. It is impossible during a brief period of time to thoroughly clean up the swamp of the old co-operatives. Many of the important co-operatives remain for a long time in the hands of the old co-operatives—the enemies of the proletariat who sabotage the work, and the organisation of public feeding and of the exchange of commodities is carried on inefficiently. This arouses the resentment of the masses, but weakens the power of the new revolutionary government.

The Communist International is fully aware of the importance of the co-operatives. At the Third Congress of the Comintern, held during the summer of 1921, the question of the co-operatives was placed on the agenda and the Congress adopted the theses presented by the speaker on this question.

These theses chiefly dealt with the work which Communists should carry on in the co-operatives. The questions of tactics and of organisation was dealt with only very generally. The theses mainly conveyed the idea that the co-operatives should cease to be "the third form of the labour movement"—entirely independent and isolated from the other forms, that the work of the revolutionary co-operatives should be most closely united with the work of the revolutionary political and trade union organisations of the proletariat. The theses emphasised that the old slogan of the opportunist co-operatives as to the political neutrality of the co-operatives should be decisively repudiated, for under the screen of this slogan the social-traitors boldly carried out without any hindrance the policy of transforming the co-operatives into the hand-maid of the bourgeoisie. In respect to the form of organisation, the theses urged that the Communist co-operatives should organise Communist nuclei which

should unite into district organisations and also nationally, and that the entire movement must be headed by the co-operative section of the Comintern.

This section was instructed to convene the First International Conference of Communist Co-operatives.

In compliance with this instruction, the first international conference of international co-operators convened in Moscow on November 1st, 1922. At this conference 36 delegates representing 20 countries were present. Delegates with voting power represented Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbeidjan, Armenia, the Far Eastern Republic, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Bulgaria, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Esthonia, Lithuania and a representative of the Anglo-Saxon countries and the members of the co-operative section of the Comintern. Of the countries with a large co-operative movement, Czecho-Slovakia and Belgium were not represented. There was also no special representative from England.

The conference continued for six days, November 1st—6th, holding two sessions every day.

The agenda of the conference was as follows :—

1. Seating of delegates.
2. Reports by the delegates on the status of the co-operative movement in their respective countries and on the work of the Communists in the co-operatives.
3. Communism and Co-operation.
4. Tactical questions.
5. Organisational questions.
6. Elections.

The reports of the delegates brought home the fact that the co-operative movement is undergoing a big crisis due to the following causes: The economic crisis, the sharp fluctuation of the currency and the violent capitalist offensive. The assistance given to the membership by the co-operatives limited to their former narrow functions has under these conditions become illusory. So long as the co-operatives continue to employ the old methods of work, they are unable to render any substantial aid. The bankruptcy of the old co-operatives has been felt even by the old leaders, who are totally unable to discover any new methods of work. All this facilitates the growth and development of new revolutionary ideas in the co-operatives.

From the report on "Communism in the Co-operative Movement," and from the discussions which took place on this report, it is evidence that the Third Congress of the Comintern laid down correct fundamental lines on this question. The First International Conference of Communist Co-operators did not introduce any amendments to this statement. There was not even a single motion in that direction.

On the question of tactics, the conference laid down very emphatically that the co-operative movement must intervene

very energetically in all questions connected with the co-operatives or with the consumers. They must conduct this struggle side by side and in close contact with the Communist parties and the red trade unions. Of special importance is the struggle against everything which contributes to the rise in the cost of living and which hinders the struggle against it. This applies to the struggle against all forms of increased taxation, to import duties, export duties and indirect taxation, to the struggle against the attempts to impose excessive or special taxes on the co-operatives and to the demand that the distribution of the necessities of life among the population should be entirely in the hands of the consumers' co-operatives, and finally to the participation of the co-operatives and their members in all the forms of this struggle.

On the field of organisation, the Conference has drawn up the outlines for Communist work within the co-operatives, from the nucleus to the co-operative section of the Comintern. The latter must consist of 20 representatives of the various countries who are to be elected at the International Conferences. For current work, the section has appointed a Presidium consisting of seven members.

Thus, basing itself on the experiences of the first year of Communist work within the co-operatives, the conference has taken two important steps in connection with the elaboration of the tactics of the form of organisation of the movement.

On the strength of this work, the section invites the Plenum of the Fourth Congress of the Comintern to adopt its resolution on the question of co-operation.

Lauridan (France) declared that the co-operatives cannot be more than auxiliaries to the Party. The Communists oppose the political neutrality of the co-operatives. He regretted that the previous speaker had not spoken of the Peasant Producers' Co-operative. The Congress, he said, must express its opinion on the question of Guild Socialism.

Henriet (France) declared that he opposed the Producers' Co-operative because they neutralised a section of the working class in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. He also opposed Guild Socialism, which menaced the existence of the trade unions in times of a crisis. The French Socialists make use of the co-operatives for the support of the Social Democratic Parties. In an era of capitalism, the Co-operatives foster dangerous illusions in the minds of the workers. They can acquire importance, but only during the proletarian dictatorship. A developed co-operative system in Russia might have enabled us to avoid NEP.

The Chairman: Since no other speaker has sent in his name, I call upon Comrade Khintchuk, in view of the agreement, to conclude the debate.

Khintchuk: This argument between Lauridan and Henriet has nothing to do with the question. So far they have not spoken to the question.

Comrade Lauridan was wrong in reproaching us with having forgotten the producers' co-operatives. We have not mentioned this question in the resolution because it has not yet been studied. We spoke of it at the Conference of Communist Co-operators, and we adopted a resolution which states in paragraph 11: "The producers' co-operatives and credit associations, which are nearly always organisations of the petty bourgeoisie, are not capable of leading a struggle against capitalism, and for this reason are doomed to extinction, or to become capitalist joint stock companies." I will read you only part of the resolution, and you will see from it that we are acquainted with the subject.

If we have not mentioned the subject in the resolution presented here, it is because we did not wish to speak at this Congress on a question which has been insufficiently studied.

We shall postpone this question to the Fifth International Congress, to which we shall present a special resolution. Comrade Henriet was not right in saying that we now have the "NEP" because we did not have co-operation before. The object of the "NEP" is to construct State capitalism, and the co-operatives cannot aid in this.

Comrade Henriet is right when he says that, with Communist co-operatives well developed beforehand, the task of the revolution will be easier; but "NEP" does not enter into this question.

Comrade Lauridan observed that we must preserve the unity of the co-operative movement. He is quite right on this point. We are in favour of that unity and have mentioned it in the resolutions of the Third Congress. We did not repeat these matters at the Fourth Congress because one does not wish to say the same thing over and over again.

We are with you in the idea that Communists should stay in the co-operatives, that we must capture the co-operative societies just as we captured the labour unions. We have no right to abandon the power of the co-operative to our enemies.

The importance of the co-operative movement is not yet thoroughly realised by Communists. It is nevertheless an extremely powerful and useful instrument, which we must develop and use for the revolution.

EDUCATION QUESTION

SESSION 25, November 28, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Hornis (Germany): Comrades, the Education Commission arrived at the unanimous conclusion that the question before the Congress should not be the entire scheme of the Communist education policy, but only the question of Communist educational work done by the Party itself, namely, the

question of the political education of the members and functionaries of the Party, and of the political education which is carried on by the members and functionaries of the Party among the masses outside the Party.

The Communist policy differs from the bourgeois and reformist policy not only by its aim but also by the fact that it has a strictly scientific basis; that it rests on a careful analysis of the historic situation and on a thorough knowledge of the social forces which are at work within the capitalist system. Its methods are the methods of Marxist research and of historic materialism. Thus, the Communist International can only fulfil its task as leader of the revolutionary proletariat and as the defender of the masses of the oppressed and exploited if it puts its policies on a strictly Marxist basis. For this reason, it is essential that the Communist parties should give their members and functionaries a careful theoretical training.

The Communist educational work is very different from that carried on within the reformist parties. The reformists make the workers believe that in spite of the exploitation and the poverty of the proletariat, it has the opportunity within the capitalist system to emulate the bourgeoisie at least on the field of knowledge and art, and that perfect equality and freedom exist at least in this respect under the capitalist system. The aim of Communist educational work is the training of revolutionary fighters, the education of every individual for class solidarity, the development and intensification of the fighting, agitational and organisational power of the Party. Thus, while the result of reformist educational work is a greater dependence of the working class on bourgeois ideology, the aim of the Communist educational work is to free the workers from the thralldom of bourgeois ideology.

The Communist educational activity, being strictly dedicated to the struggle, must confine itself to certain limits. It is quite impossible for a financially weak party, engaged in a hard political struggle, to indulge in teaching any branch of science that might be quite useful in itself, but serves no direct purpose in promoting the task of the Party. It must confine itself to such subjects as will be of direct interest to the fight. For instance, it should give the membership instruction in the history of the revolutionary labour movement, in the principles of Marxian science, in the principles and tactics of the Communist International, and where the large masses are still strongly under the influence of the theological doctrine it must take a further step to acquaint them with natural science and the role of religion. In those countries where the large masses of the proletariat are still illiterate, attention should also be given to elementary education, at least among its own members, in order that they be enabled to become propagandists and agitators, as well as reporters for the Party, for, otherwise, they will not be in a position to carry out their political and revolutionary tasks.

Communist educational work should always be revised in the light of experience gained in the daily struggle and propa-

ganda of the Party. It should therefore be closely related to daily practice and to daily conflicts. Under no circumstances should the educational activity of the Party run on parallel lines with the political work, but the former should always be subordinated to the latter. This should be achieved by purely organisational means, by seeing to it that the responsible officials of the educational work of the Party should not be composed of unknown literatures, aestheticists, etc., who form, so to speak, the unattached intellectual fringe of the revolution; but of the best political officials and fighters of the Party, so that the entire educational work should be strictly subordinated to the political fighting interests of the Party. This would at once bring to light the necessity of adapting the educational policy continuously to the political experience under given circumstances. When the Party is engaged in action which demands the straining of all the forces, which calls every member to the front, where the centre of gravity is in the street, in the factories, etc., all must temporarily be put in the background, and renewed theoretical work during the ensuing quiet period in order to analyse the past experiences and to draw the proper lessons from the victory or defeat, so as to turn it all into a source of new knowledge and new force for action.

To sum up, the minimum educational demands upon Communist Parties to-day should be stated as follows: Centrally guided and organised educational work among the members; special training for the officials, scientific Marxian intensification of the agitation; associated with a really popular form of propaganda and supported by all the technical means of the magic lantern, music, the stage, etc.

It would be wrong to allow free play to the initiative of individual groups of persons in the publishing of textbooks, etc. This work should also be centralised and carried on by the united forces of the Party.

The educational work of Communist Parties should also include the educational work among the young workers and the children. The independent educational work of the Young Communist organisations should be strongly supported by the Party financially as well as by supplying teachers, books, etc. Every member of the Communist Youth must be attracted and admitted to all the educational institutions of the Party. The Communist Parties should also take care of the revolutionary education of the proletarian children organised by our local Communist children's groups.

The Commission submits the proposal to the Congress—a resolution in that sense will be handed to the Presidium—that in order to organise, to guide and control Communist educational work of the different parties, the Executive of the Comintern shall create a section which shall take charge of the educational work of the different parties, making it an international organisation. The Commission deems it exceedingly desirable that a Socialist academy should be established here in Moscow, the seat of the Executive, the place which brings together all the

threads of the International and where the international outlook of the comrades is most wide awake. The exact details will be discussed later on. But we deem it necessary that the individual countries should have the possibility of sending some comrades with the necessary practical and theoretical preparation to obtain their thorough Marxian training here, at the seat of the Executive. For all the Western parties, all the parties outside of Soviet Russia, know that they suffer because they have quite large numbers of revolutionary comrades who lack proper Marxian science, and this need should be satisfied by establishing the academy.

Comrades, this systematic and centrally organised educational work, guided by the Executive, will be a great source of strength to the theoretical training of the militant forces of the Communist Parties and of the Communist International. (Prolonged cheers.)

Krupskaya (Russia): Comrades, I should like to add a few words to what has been said by Comrade Hornle. Our Communist Party has had a great deal of experience in the line of agitation and propaganda. The distinctive feature of our Party has been that every member of the Party is obliged to carry on active work. Twenty years ago Comrade Lenin, in his book "What Must Be Done," emphatically stated that every member of the Party must be active in Party work. At the Second Congress of the Party in 1903 it was the question of Party membership that became the cause of the split between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The proposition introduced by Comrade Lenin stated that every member of the Party must not only subscribe to its programme, but must be active in one of its organisations. On the other hand, the position of Martov was that a member of the Party should recognise the programme of the Party and work under its directions. From the first glance it appeared that the difference of opinion was very insignificant. Indeed, many comrades were then of the opinion that the whole argument involved minor details and had no serious background. But, the subsequent history of the Party proved that the issue involved was of a very vital character. Every member of the Party must work either in the field of agitation and propaganda or carry on organisation work. I shall dwell on the question of agitation first. Owing to the proper organisation of its agitation apparatus, the Communist Party succeeded in gaining an immense influence in the masses. Agitation is calculated to act upon the sentiments and the emotions. By means of agitation, the broad masses are drawn into the Party. The question of agitation has first arisen when a large economic movement began to manifest itself. The first agitation on a large scale was conducted in the struggle for the improvement of the material conditions of the working class. This was in the nineties of the last century. Then many of our Comrades paid too much attention to this particular phase of the struggle, and as a result we had a special faction, the so-called "Mysl" group. The latter over-estimated the significance of the direct

elemental movement of the masses. They were too much carried away by the colossal successes of their agitation and began to believe that theory was altogether unnecessary, that the entire thing is in the elemental movement of the workers. This "Mysl" group went so far as to express the famous idea that we have no need for Marx and Engels and that the working class will achieve Socialism without them. Then the Party directed an energetic campaign against this tendency. Another question which arose then was how to deepen our agitation. This controversy also occurred during the same period, i.e., 30 years ago. Then a part of our Comrades maintained that we should not force the agitation and confine ourselves to those questions which find an immediate response among the masses. At the time the masses were mostly interested in economic questions, and, therefore, some of our members insisted that we should limit ourselves to this phase of the struggle and not go any further in our agitation, i.e., to stand on the level reached by the working class at this given time.

These were the so-called economists (the group of the "Workers' cause") who maintained that it was unnecessary to deepen our agitation and that all we had to do was to follow behind the working class. During this time the "iskra" group conducted an extremely determined and passionate campaign against this tendency, considering it productive of the greatest detriment. Indeed, if the Party would have taken this standpoint of the economists, it would have meant that the Party would not be leading the masses.

Marxism helped the Party to correctly estimate the value of agitation. How did we conduct that work? We always defined the central issues of our agitation, which required much time. At the end of the 'nineties, the economic demands were the central issue of our agitation. In 1905 the central issue was the political demands of the working class, and, finally, during the world war it was the war that became the central issue. But the central issue was only one of a number of questions into which it was divided. We gathered a select element of agitators into a group where we discussed all the questions of our agitation. Our Party was capable during the war to accomplish colossal work, because during the preceding period we devoted the utmost attention to all the questions of agitation. Discussing the forms of agitation, we shall consider first verbal agitation. The success of agitation depends not so much upon the eloquence and the artistic ability of the orator, but it depends much more to what extent the question is of vital interest to the masses.

We have in our Party still another tradition. Not only agitation, but also propaganda played in our Party a great role. Prior to the time when our agitation began to attract large masses, we were conducting propaganda in our illegal circles. Usually a Marxian student would come to the circle and read Marx and Engels and lead discussions on the questions of the day. He would speak on the history of civilisation and on political economy. This tradition took deep root in the working class, not only among the adult workers, but also among

the youngsters. I had a chance to observe how in a far-off village the boys and girls demanded of their teacher that she teach them the subjects which they were taught formerly in the circles, i.e., political economy and the history of civilisation. They thought that without such study there is no salvation. The studies in the circles were very frequently interrupted due to arrests, and the workers had to complete their education in exile or in the prisons. The tradition of our Party is such that the jails and the places of exile were converted into a sort of universities and schools in which the workers who were later to become prominent leaders acquired a solid Marxian training. The "Workers' Cause" group was unappreciative of the importance of propaganda. Comrade Lenin, arguing with them, pointed out that Engels in his introduction to the "Peasants' war," states that parallel with the economic movement of the working class and the political struggle, equally important is theoretical grounding. The Communist Party has never separated the questions of agitation and propaganda from its fundamental work. Agitation and propaganda constituted the essential work of the Party.

At the present time, when the Party has become legal and the working class is in power, all our education work, our work in the trade unions, is permeated by the same traditions.

We are to-day witnessing generally a fundamental transition. In the first years of the revolution all our attention was concentrated on the agitation on the fronts and among the entire population; at the present time when we entered upon the work of economic construction, questions of a more involved character have come to the fore. Now the interest in theory and in the study of Marxism is extremely intense. I am working in the Chief Political Education Department and there we receive every day abundant confirmation of the fact that the masses are to-day striving for fundamental education. This is perfectly natural.

In 1905 the revolution stirred the masses to the very depths and brought the entire country into an upheaval. This was followed by years of reaction. During these years the intelligentsia lost heart. It imagined that all the conquests of the revolution were lost and that there was no hope for victory. But the masses cannot be made to forget the revolution. We saw that in 1912 the Lena events stirred the masses anew and proved that the masses had grown stronger. Throughout this period of time colossal internal work was going on unobserved.

The impressions of the revolution were thought out and digested by the masses, and in 1912 the masses represented an entirely different phenomenon from what we observed in 1905. At the present time an identical process is manifesting itself. We see that the masses withdrew into themselves. At the present time the entire attention is concentrated on building up of this material basis under the conquest of the revolution. But the building up of this material basis is closely bound up with the transformation of the human element, with the

elevation of it upon a higher cultural level, with a modification of the habits of work and the change of the entire psychology.

To-day we are passing through a definite stage when a deeply intensified, internal and invincible work is going on among the masses. The working class and the working youth of Russia is at the present time engaged in self-education. This fills us with the hope that at the time when the world revolution arrives we shall be ready for the occasion.

REPORT ON FRENCH PARTY

SESSIONS HELD, December 1-2, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Trotsky (Russia): Although the crisis in the French bourgeois government should have favoured the development of the Communist Party, the French Party is going through a severe crisis. The number of its members and the subscribers to its papers has diminished. The Party is in a state of lethargy, and its critical state is marked by violent factional conflicts. The bourgeois newspapers can make use of the arguments against the Party. This factional fight, however, is only a reaction against the passivity and the conservatism of the Party, and indeed the Executive predicted this crisis. The situation is the same as that of a year and a half ago. The conservatism and passivity became apparent after the Congress at Tours. Some say that the chief causes are the traditions and individualism of the French workers. But if the French bourgeoisie was able to conquer this individualism for its purpose during the war, the Communist Party should be able to conquer it in the interest of socialism and the revolution. Our incapacity for organisation is the chief cause of our failure. The good revolutionary traditions of the French movement made possible the organisation of the Communist Party.

The French Party has made terrible mistakes in its trade union policy. At the Party Congress Jacob declared that trade union problems have nothing to do with the Party, and Lafont added that in the economic field the Party played only a secondary role. These views explain the attitude of the French Party during the strike in Havre. We acknowledge the importance of the trade unions, but we also know that the organised workers need the leadership of a party, and that the Communist Parties are the ones to permeate the unions with the Communist spirit. It is only the reactionaries who declare that the trade unions and the workers' parties terrorise the working class. He who maintains that the Party is oppressing the trade unions furnishes an argument for the reaction. Agitation in the trade unions is not only a right, but a duty of the Communist parties. The Communist Party cannot win the confidence of the working

class so long as it denies that it is best fitted to defend the interest of the proletariat. After the murder of strikers in Havre, under the pressure of the Union of Building Workers, the C.G.T.U. called a general strike for the Tuesday, and the Communist Party signified its agreement with that decision although no preparation had been made for it. The attitude of the Party can only be explained by bureaucratic distrust of the working class by the Party. The Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. themselves rendered real action impossible, and the treacherous dissidents and the C.G.T. of Jouhaux felt themselves justified. This action was a repetition of the badly prepared May demonstration in 1920. The Party has learned nothing from its past mistakes. At the Paris Congress, Frossard declared that he had hesitated for the past two years between his duty to the Party and his duty to the International. These two years, he said, have been so much time gained, for the Party would have run its head against a wall if it had obeyed the instructions of the International. This speech was to pave the way for a breach with the Comintern. The same Frossard signed a resolution jointly with Souvarine to the effect that the French Party had suffered such losses because it had not fulfilled the instructions of the Comintern. Frossard will have to declare which declaration he will stand by.

Comrade Trotsky quoted the number of letters and telegrams which had been sent to the French Party during the last year and a half. No less than eight were sent in connection with the Havre affair. Frossard and Cachin had been invited to Moscow many times. The letters of the Executive enlightened the problem of the united front, criticised the passivity, the press policy, and the trade union tactics of the Party, the attitude of Sellier, Lafont, and of the mayors of the Parisian suburbs, as well as the attitude towards the syndicalists and the anarchists.

The French Party did not answer the letters. Frossard should tell us what there is in these letters that can be described as an offence against the French Party. The French Party always maintains that the Executive exaggerates. Yet all these exaggerations were weighty facts, as shown by the examples of Sellier and Fabre. With regard to the protest against the interference of the Executive, it was not considered as a slur upon the dignity of the Russian Communist Party when Cachin sat as a member of a special commission to consider the question of the Workers' Opposition in the Russian Party. The decisions of the enlarged Executive were of the utmost value for the Russian Communist Party. The interests of the Party and the Comintern stand higher than the falsely rated dignity of the Party. The French Party now finds itself in the following position: There is much passivity and conservatism among the leading elements of the Centre, but there are also good revolutionary working class elements in the same faction. The Left, even if it has made many mistakes, stands for pro-

gress towards a genuine Communist policy. The Renault group opposes the findings of the Comintern, but there are also genuine revolutionary working class elements among them. The proposed resolution means that the Congress condemns the errors of the Centre, emphasises the fault of the Renault faction, and maintains that the Left, even if they have made minor mistakes, have on the whole represented the policies of the Comintern on important questions correctly. The Centre in the Paris Congress rejected the proposal of the Executive with regard to the distribution of posts.

In placing responsibility upon the Centre, Comrade Trotsky stated that Kerr tried to throw the responsibility for the events of the French Congress upon the Left and upon the Comintern. With regard to the Jaures' incident at the Congress, Comrade Trotsky stated that the memory of Jaures belonged to the oppressed classes of all countries, and not to the dissidents. Jaures was the greatest figure in the Second International but we should only accept his revolutionary spirit, and not inherit his failures. In the name of the Commission, the speaker proposed that the Party posts should be proportionately divided, although the Comintern was against proportional representation in principle. The leading elements of the French Party must blow up all bridges leading to bourgeois conceptions; also the break with Freemasonry must be thoroughly carried out. The Communist Party must realise the gulf between the working class and the bourgeoisie, but some of the leaders of the French Party have thrown bridges across this gulf by means of the Masonic Lodges. Freemasonry is the most perfidious and infamous fraud on the working class which the bourgeoisie has perpetrated. A decisive struggle against Freemasonry is necessary. This would bring about a crisis in the French Party which would have good results. The Communists must leave the plane of bourgeois and human rights. This measure is most important as it will rid the Party of amateurs, dilettantes and careerists. Workers, who really work in industry, must represent the Party in parliament and in the municipal councils, to the extent of nine-tenths of the Party candidates and nine-tenths of the posts in the Party must also be occupied by real working men. Party journalists must not write for bourgeois papers. The Party must carry out a clear agrarian and colonial policy. The C.G.T. and the dissidents can only be won over by a strong Communist Party, and not just by the C.G.T.U. alone. The formulated programme of action for the French Party is not tactical and revolutionary. Factory Councils are absolutely necessary. The Party must thoroughly practice the tactic of the United Front. The slogan of workers' government must not be construed in the sense of a party coalition, but in the sense of mass action against the bourgeois government and a struggle against the Left bloc. The Centre is mainly responsible for the adoption of resolutions. Independence and Party dignity have so far been merely disguises for anti-Communist and anti-Comintern policies. The Com-

minist Parties must guard their independence and Party dignity against the bourgeoisie and against petty bourgeois criticism.

In France, the Centre will be responsible during the next few weeks for this energetic action in the ranks of our French Communist Party. I am sure that the painful explanations which we had with our French Comrades in the commission, and which I submit to you in the shape of a report, cannot be repeated again. The danger was clearly indicated in the speech of Comrade Frossard, which I have already quoted and interpreted. It is the business of the Centre to definitely obviate and remove this danger. I see no reason for a break. On the contrary, I believe the situation is extremely favourable for our French Communist Party. The national bloc is breaking down. There is absolutely an impossibility of exacting the reparations. The Left bloc finds itself in a difficult situation, and I believe that our Party holds in its hands the future of France, which means the future of humanity at large. We feel confident that, inspired by such grand and glorious prospects, the Centre will do its duty to the last, and by the time the next Congress will meet, we will have a unified, homogeneous revolutionary party, faithful to its duty until the complete triumph of the revolution of the French proletariat. (Prolonged cheers.)

Cachin (France) declared, on behalf of the Central Committee, that it would carry out unreservedly and according to strict discipline all the decisions concerning the United Front tactics, the trade union question as well as the Freemasonry question, and decisions of the Red Trade Union International. The Central Committee was not alone to blame for the mistakes which were committed. He was in favour of the liquidation of the factions. Renould declared, on behalf of his faction, that the latter was convinced that the United Front tactics were right also in France. His faction will submit to all the decisions of the Congress. He said that his faction endeavoured to prevent all factional struggles.

Souvarine declared that the Left was proud that its tactics were recognised as the right tactics. It promised to observe discipline in future as heretofore.

Jean Renaud considered the decisions which were taken rather doubtful. However, he submitted to the decisions of the World Congress.

Trotsky, in his concluding remarks, reiterated that the proportional distribution of posts did not create a precedent. The resignations of the Left group were a mistake. He emphasised the fact that the factions themselves had agreed on the list of candidates for the vacant party posts, and he expressed the hope that the factional struggles would cease.

Resolution and Programme of Action concerning French Communist Party are included in the volume of "Theses and Resolutions of the IVth Congress of the Communist International."

Humbert-Droz announced that all the factions of the French Party have agreed to propose the following list of candidates for the National Council of the Party:—In the Central Committee, for the Centre: Frossard (as secretary and delegate to the Executive), Louis Sellier (as provisional secretary and substitute for Frossard during the latter's stay in Moscow), Cachin, Jacob Garchery, Leisiave, Maranne, Gourdeaux, Laguesse, Parqueraux. As candidates of the Centre: Pierpont, Dupillet, Plais. As representatives of the left in the Central Committee: Rosmer, Treint, Vaillant-Couturier, Souvarine, Tomasi, Christen, Deporter, Cordier, Bouchez. As candidates of the Left: Amedée Dunois, Salles. To the Central Committee of the Renault Group: Barbaret, Fromont, Dubois, Werth, and as candidate, Lespagnol. Cachin will be the director of "Humanité," and Amedée Dunois the General Secretary. Frossard will be the General Secretary of the Party, with L. Sellier as his substitute. Trent was appointed as the representative of the Left.

All the commissions were appointed on the basis of proportional representation. The resolution on organisation was carried.

Kolorov (Chairman) announced that Victor Meric had been condemned to 13 months' imprisonment. On behalf of the Congress he expressed sympathy with the convicted Comrade.

Humbert-Droz moved the resolution on the Spanish question. It declares that the Spanish Communist Party must not make any concessions in principle on the question of parliamentarism and anarcho-syndicalism. It further declares that the Communists must work on the trade unions. The resolution was carried unanimously.

Kuusinen (Finland) moved a resolution on the Danish question which declares that the Congress recognises the United Communist Party as the only section in Denmark, and invites the non-affiliated groups to join the Party within three months. The resolution was carried, as were also the resolutions on the reorganisation of the Executive and the resolutions on the Young Communist Leagues.

ITALIAN QUESTION

SESSION HELD, December 4, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speaker: Comrade Zinoviev.

Zinoviev declared that the history of the last year in Italy, written in the blood of the working class, has shown clearly all the weaknesses and the whole tragedy

of the working class movement. Numerically, the working class is strong enough to overthrow the bourgeoisie, but they are still weak intellectually and politically because they have not yet overcome the influence of bourgeois thought. This appeared especially clearly in Italy. In 1914 the Second International drove the workers into the war. In 1919 the social democrats stood protectingly in front of the bourgeoisie and declared to the workers that they could attack the bourgeoisie only over their bodies. In this way, the social democrats saved capitalism. In 1919 the revolutionary spirit ruled the Italian masses. The Socialists recognised this fact. Serrati wrote then to the Executive that the Italian workers were no longer willing to work for their exploiters. The Socialist Party grew from 68,000 members in 1914 to 216,000 at the end of 1919. During the same period the membership of the Trade Unions increased from 320,000 to 2,250,000. The masses placed their hopes in the Party to lead them to victory. The resolution of the Party Congress at Bologna demanded the revolutionary struggle and adhesion to the Third International. But the reformists remained in the Party, even after Bologna, in order to destroy it from within. The reformists knew quite well how to disguise themselves as Communists. D'Aragona cheered Communism in Petrograd and was one of the R.I.L.U. The Communist International was the style of the day. This is what made the 21 conditions so necessary. They rendered us great service because it made more difficult the entrance of reformists and centrists into our organisations. When the occupation of the factories and the creation of the Red Army began in Italy, the comedy of the reformists stopped. Five days and five nights the Trade Union leaders negotiated with the leaders of the Socialist Party. D'Aragona and the Trade Union leaders managed to withdraw from the struggle, whereupon the Socialist Party capitulated. D'Aragona began a series of treasons; he negotiated first with the Ministry, then with the leaders of the Trade Unions, then with the Socialist Party. This betrayal of the leadership was a signal for the beginning of the capitalist offensive, which has now terminated in the victory of Mussolini. What has been the activity of the Communist International during this period?

Already, before the occupation of the factories, the Executive had pointed out that Serrati's basic error laid in his fetishism for the unity with the reformists. He demanded unity at any price, complained of the lack of personalities to take over the State apparatus, made an idol of unity, and used it as a cover for a frivolous attack against the Comintern. In Livorno, Serrati spoke against the split and defended Turati, although the latter's magazine, "Critica Sociale," was an organ of bourgeois counter-revolution. The split in Livorno was an absolute necessity, and the Comintern would insist upon it again in any similar situation. Lenin sent a letter which insisted that the Party, though it should not make an immediate revolution, should nevertheless prepare it, and must therefore

expel the reformists. Serrati answered with this question, "Who are the reformists?" To-day, every sparrow on the roof knows what reformism is, and so does Serrati. We do not regret the split in Livorno because the young, weak Communist Party of Italy has, nevertheless, saved the honour of the revolutionary working class.

But what has reformism led to? The Socialist Party has lost three-quarters of its membership; a million and a half members have left the Trade Unions. We see then that reformism has not only betrayed the revolution but also destroyed the Party. Serrati set his hope upon the agreement between the Trade Unions and the Socialist Party. But the speeches of Mussolini, Turati and D'Aragnona in Parliament prove that this agreement has been broken, and that the reformists wish to sell the Trade Unions to Mussolini. The reformists declare that they wish to spare the workers the unnecessary sufferings of the revolution. Well, the revolution has not taken place, but many of the workers have fallen as victims. The most important lesson of the Italian tragedy is the recognition that our chief enemies are reformism and centrism.

It is the wish of the Comintern to see a rapid reunion of both parties in the near future. The majority of the Communist Party oppose this reunion. This is easily understandable. The atmosphere is much too loaded with enmity; too much has been lost; too much anger has remained. But we must not allow ourselves to be guided by emotions. It takes much courage, honesty and decision to be a Communist to-day.

The commission proposes that the Vella group be expelled because they refused to accept the 21 conditions.

The speaker expressed his hope that, as a result of the reunion, a new gathering of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat would begin; but he declared that the Comintern was not yet through with the Italian problem. We may have difficulties with the most prominent leaders of the Italian Socialists, for although the sickness of centrism has been overcome, this does not exclude the possibility of relapses. The Comintern would always support the real Socialists.

Our main tasks in Italy to-day are:—(1) To defeat the reformists; (2) to realise the political and economic United Front; (3) to issue the slogan of the workers' government; (4) to change the Fascist Trade Unions into enemies of the bourgeoisie by the formation of nuclei and the policy of the United Front; (5) to unite the "Arditi del Popolo" and every anti-Fascist element against the reaction; to restore to the working class its courage and its class consciousness by the union of the Socialist and Communist Parties.

The speaker finished his speech by expressing the hope that the power of the Fascisti might soon be overthrown.

In the name of the majority of the Italian Delegation, Comrade Bordiga declared that although they were against the fusion, they would accept the decision of the Congress without

any further discussion and would carry it out as loyal and disciplined members. As a proof of this, they voted for the resolution.

In the name of the Socialist Party, **Comrade Serrati** declared that the Party Conference in Rome had expelled the reformists, accepted the 21 conditions, and demanded the fusion of the Communist Party of Italy and the Communist International. The delegation has already informed the leadership of the Party of the decisions of the Congress, and hoped for the approval of the Congress. The speaker believed that as a result of necessary guarantees, the Party would evolve towards the Left; the polemics of the past will remain only as a useful lesson.

In the name of the minority of the Italian Delegation, **Comrade Graziadei** declared that the fusion was bound with difficulties and dangers, but that the guarantees should give us hope for the best. For that reason he also welcomed the fusion.

Under great applause the resolution was unanimously adopted.

QUESTION OF THE OPPOSITION IN THE CZECHO-SLOVAKIAN PARTY

SESSION HELD, December 4, 1922.

Chairman: **Comrade Kolaroff.**

Speakers: **Comrades Radek, Sturz, Smeral.**

Comrade Radek declared that the Czecho-Slovakian Party was built of the Left Wing of the Social Democrats, and that there still remained a certain distrust for the leaders who were fighting honestly for Communism. The political centralisation at the present time is too slight; the activity of the Party shows many defects; the Trade Union cells are not sufficiently organised; the fight against Amsterdam is conducted without any unified policy; the Parliamentary group neglects its agitation and demonstration activity.

Although the soldiers possess the suffrage right in Czecho-Slovakia, the agitation of the Communist Party in the army is still very weak. The opposition is partly responsible for all these mistakes. The unemployment crisis led to the sharpening of the situation. Nevertheless, the opposition undertook the responsible steps and spread lies against the majority of the Party. After a thorough investigation, the commission finds the accusation of the opposition thoroughly unfounded, and establishes the breach of confidence of the opposition. However, since there are good proletarian elements in the opposition, the commission demands that the expulsion of the opposition be revoked, but that its members be suspended from every Party office for their breach of discipline.

The speaker ended the speech with the exhortation to root out the distrust in the Party, to stop their dispersed action, to fight the anarchist syndicalist tendencies, and to proceed unitedly against the reaction.

In the name of the opposition, Comrade Sturz declared that, although the resolution did not remove the dangers which menace the Party, and would therefore remain understandable for the large masses of the workers, the opposition would nevertheless submit to the decision of the Congress.

Comrade Smeral stated that the majority accepted the resolution, for they did not want to expel the Left Wing at any price but only wished to preserve discipline and the authority of the Party leadership which are absolutely necessary to remove the defects which have existed until now. The majority, therefore, will vote for the resolution.

The resolution was adopted against one vote.

SPANISH QUESTION

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speaker: Comrade Humbert-Droz.

Comrade Humbert-Droz: The Spanish Commission was appointed at the request of the Spanish delegation, not for the purpose of investigating into an interior conflict, but for the purpose of discussing and settling, together with the International, certain tactical points and certain important political questions connected with the activity of our Party in Spain.

One of the most important questions now before the Party is the attitude to the anarcho-syndicalist movement.

We are witnessing a breaking away of the working masses from the anarcho-syndicalist organisations, and the leaders of this movement are turning towards a kind of neo-reformism.

Thus, the moment is propitious for propaganda and Party activity in this sphere. A tendency has come to the surface in the Spanish Communist Party which demands that the latter should relinquish its Communist intransigence on certain points, in order to meet the anarcho-syndicalists half-way, especially by concessions on the parliamentary field, thus winning them over to our side.

The Commission was of the opinion that, while one of the essential tasks of our Party consists in attracting the elements which come from the anarcho-syndicalist movement and from the masses who had been deceived by the tactics of the Spanish anarchist leaders, our Party must not try to achieve this end by a deviation from our principles. On the contrary, it would be better if our Party won over these elements less rapidly, but really converted them to Communism.

The Commission was unanimous in recommending to our Party not to make concessions to the bankrupt anarcho-syndicalist ideology, but to work in the anarcho-syndicalist organisations on the lines of pure Communism. The Commission advised our Party to set forth in its propaganda that the parliamentarism of the Communist Party is not that of the old social-democratic parties, supporting this contention by the theses of the Second World Congress.

The second problem before the commission was the attitude of our Party to the Spanish trade union movement.

You are aware that the Spanish trade union movement has two great central organisations—the reformist General Confederation and anarcho-syndicalist National Confederation.

In addition to these two central organisations, there are a few autonomous trade unions.

There is a tendency in the Party to abandon the reformist trade-unions owing to the attitude of the Amsterdam leaders who are not any better in Spain than they are in the other countries. The Commission was unanimous in recommending to our Party to combat this tendency within the Party, and recommend to our comrades not to leave the ranks of the General Confederation, but to remain in it in order to form nuclei and to make it amenable to the Communist ideal.

If trade unions are expelled from the General Confederation, as has happened recently in the case of the trade unions that had participated with the Communist Party in the United Front action, we advise our Party not to make its members resign from the General Confederation for the sake of solidarity, but to instruct all its members to remain in the General Confederation and to fight within this organisation for the re-admission of the expelled comrades. Should this struggle for the re-admission of the expelled not have any result, we advise our Comrades to direct these expelled trade unions to join the National Confederation, and by no means to establish a third central organisation in addition to the two already existing.

The Commission also deemed it necessary to deal with the attitude of our Party towards the United Front tactics.

On February last our Spanish Party voted, together with the French and the Italian Party, against the tactics of the United Front. But already towards May or in the beginning of June, on the occasion of the great strikes of the Asieris, our Communist Party applied United Front tactics with great discrimination, and not simply because it was ordered to do so by the International. We want to emphasise this fact.

Attention was also drawn to the fact that the interior crisis which for a time had undermined the existence of our Party, was settled satisfactorily by a stricter application of Party discipline.

The Commission therefore puts before you its resolution, which it has adopted unanimously.

REPORT ON JUGO-SLAVIA

Known: The Jugo-Slavian Party arose in the period of 1919-20, when the Communist slogan attracted the masses, when the wave of the workers' movement—exemplified in the Italian movement—created in every country the possibility of the widest development for the Party. We saw how the Jugo-Slavian Party, hitherto very insignificant and only recently purged of the reformist elements, became suddenly one of the mightiest parties, capturing many municipal councils and sending to parliament 69 deputies. On the whole it appeared to be a big force.

During the whole of this time, in spite of the quite clear indications that the easy victory may end in a similarly easy defeat, the Party took no measures to form an illegal organisation in preparation for fighting not by means of resolutions, but by action. When the notorious Defence of the Realm decree was promulgated—a decree is in force only for six months, and has yet to be approved by parliament to become law—instead of at once starting the fight, the Party hoped that parliament would refuse to approve it and prevent it becoming law. Meanwhile the Communist and municipal councils were dissolved, and the Communist deputies were thrown out of parliament. All this took place under circumstances which were unheard of in other countries. No appeal was made to the masses, no sign of life and protest, no attempt was made in Jugo-Slavia to fight in the usual Communist way. The victory scored by the anti-proletarian class without a fight and without resistance seemed to surprise even the victors themselves by the ease with which it had been achieved. Repressive measures were undertaken against the working class. The reactionaries began to suspend newspapers, to dissolve trade unions and to hand over their property to the reformist organisations. People were thrown into jail, while the Party did not manifest even the least hint of a fight against the raging counter-revolution. The major part of the active comrades had to flee abroad to escape imprisonment.

Emigration set in, with all its characteristic features. This was a new experience to the Jugo-Slavian organisation, but to the parties that had passed decades underground it was nothing new. The leaders, detached from direct activity and direct contact with the proletarian masses, were musing in exile over the causes of their defeat, and, as usual, shifted the blame from one to the other. There was no Marxian analysis of the events that had occurred in Jugo-Slavia. Instead of this, the emigrants indulged in fruitless squabbles. Regardless of the absence of any differences of principle, there were quarrels that resulted from mutual mistrust, as one group differed from the other in the interpretation of the common experience. There were no tactical differences, but the mistrust of one group of leaders towards the political tact and ability of the other group. This was lamentably manifested during the Vienna Conference.

Happily, the Conference was called. In this connection we have to state that at that Conference they worked out certain political and organisational resolutions which obtained the sanction of the Executive of the Comintern, and it should also be stated that these resolutions did not cause any difference of opinion on either side.

Since there are no political differences, there is nothing to prevent the comrades from working out those organisational methods which will enable them to work together, and by working together forget all the sentiments of mutual distrust. For this purpose, the Commission worked out a series of proposals of an organisational character, which have been submitted to the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

With regard to the political position of the Party, I will read to you the resolution elaborated by the Commission, expressing at the same time not only the hope, but the profound conviction that from the moment that the highest authority of the Party—the Fourth Congress—will have said its final word, all the mistrust will vanish and the Jugo-Slavian Party will tackle the great tasks before it.

DANISH QUESTION

Kolarov (Chairman): The next item of the agenda is the Danish question, and I call on Comrade Kuusinen to address you.

Kuusinen: We have at present two Communist Parties in Denmark, and both have appealed to this Congress. On the ground of these appeals the Presidium has drawn up a resolution on which I would like to make a short report.

The Danish Communist movement originates from two sources—the opposition wing of the Social-Democratic Youth Movement and the Revolutionary Wing of the Syndicalists. It was most fortunate for the Communist movement in Denmark that it was able to enlist the greater number of the Syndicalists on its side. It must, however, be said that the leading Danish Comrades, who came from the Youth Movement, were not capable of fulfilling the tasks which confronted them. These comrades formed the small original Communist Party, and under this leadership the revolutionary wing of the Syndicalists was attached to the Party in the form of a Federation.

These organisations on our instruction united into a single Party, but later, during a crisis last February, split asunder. The E.C. again ordered unity, and we are now faced with the task of finishing the work which the E.C. began, and propose the following resolution. This is one of the main tasks for the Danish Party in the near future. The resolution is quite short and contains two points. I shall now read it to you:—

“(1) This Congress declares that the present Communist Party of Denmark, which was formed under the directions of the Executive of the Communist International, by a union of

the Communist 'Enhatsparti' and a part of the so-called old Party, one which has loyally carried out all decisions of the Communist International, is recognised as the only section of the Communist International in Denmark. The Party's chief publication, 'Arbeiderbladet,' and other recognised organs of the Party, shall be issued as Communist Party publications.

"(2) The Congress demands that all Communist organisations at present outside of the United Party shall join the United Party.

"Such organisations and members of the so-called old Party, who within the next three months decide in favour of this United Communist Party and declare themselves as prepared, loyally to execute all directions of this Party and its central organs, and of the Communist International, shall be received into the United Party without further conditions."

Kolaroff: I will now put to a vote the Kuusinen proposal offered on the Communist Party of Denmark.

The proposal is unanimously adopted.

NORWEGIAN QUESTION

Neurath (Chairman): Comrade Bukharin has the floor.

Bukharin (Russia) (greeted with applause): First of all, I would like to characterise briefly the two Norwegian factions. The existence of these factions has deep historical roots and can be understood only by knowing the history of the Norwegian Party. The first tendency, forming the majority in the Norwegian Party, is partly syndicalist and partly reformist. The existence of these tendencies in the Norwegian Workers' Party finds expression in certain minor phenomena. First is Federalism, which is a result of syndicalist traditions. This explains the specific and original structure of the Party. Until very recently, and even now our Norwegian brother-party has been having its basis in the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions had entered the Party en bloc, and this produces the peculiar situation that there are no Communists in the Communist Party. This finds its explanation in the whole history of the Norwegian movement.

The third political tendency which is characteristic of this group is a separation of politics from economics, and of politics in general from parliamentary politics. This can also be easily understood from the standpoint of the historical development of the Party. This standpoint is absolutely incorrect. We all know that politics is only a concentrated expression of economics. But such a tendency does exist within this group.

The second group in the Party, the second faction, finds its basis, historically considered, in the development of the Youth Movement, While the first group originated from the

old Trade Unions and more especially from the Trade Union opposition, this group grew up from the Youth Movement. While the first tendency shows a sort of anti-political policy, the second advances the importance of politics and the conquest of political power. From a Marxian standpoint, we can say that the second faction is more orthodox, more imbued with the Marxian principles.

This, then, is the general situation of the Party. In the first faction we have various elements, some with syndicalist, some with reformist tendencies. The third tendency within that group combines peculiarly the reformistic element with a syndicalist cover. The first faction controls now the majority of the Party and of the Executive, and many tactical and theoretical mistakes of the Party have their cause in this leadership.

I would like to say a few words upon the concrete mistakes of the Party. First the question of federalism. This federalism appears most crassly in the attitude of the Party towards the Comintern. We are developing towards ever-increasing centralisation. Our Congress has adopted a resolution on the question of organisation, which shows clearly our tendency to stricter centralisation. This is also the opinion of most delegations, of most parties. But it is not the view of the Norwegian Party.

The Congress may express its view on these resolutions, etc., but the Comintern must not interfere with the internal business of a Party. This is the application of the purest federalism to our International organisation, and this federalism will suffer no criticism. We all must protest sharply against this.

We next come to the question of the organisation of the Party. In this regard it is quite evident, as I have already remarked, that we must reorganise the Party. Under the present circumstances we must have a completely unified Party; and a Party is not unified when it has non-Communists among its members, who were automatically drawn into the Party with the rest of the comrades. When Comrade Zinoviev was for the first time in Halle, as a representative of the Executive of the Communist International, an agreement was entered into with Comrade Tranmael personally that the Party must be reorganised. A long time has elapsed since then, and the reorganisation of the Norwegian Party proceeds but very slowly. So far this task has not been accomplished.

Then comes the question of the name of the Party. Already at the Second Congress of the Communist International it was resolved that in all cases the word Social-Democratic should be struck out. Since then we have written several letters to the Norwegian Party, but about two years have already passed and the old names are retained. The Commission proposes, therefore, that the name be altered in the shortest possible time, as this is for us no trifle but an important matter.

I shall now proceed to the question of general tactics. As I have already remarked, there is a difference of opinion between two factions. The antagonism between those two factions may be described somewhat in the following manner:— The first faction, the majority faction, says, "We are a real proletarian Party, and must carry on the class struggle against the entire bourgeoisie. We are against all manœuvring, etc." The other faction, the minority, represented by Comrade Scheflo, says, "We must fight, of course, against the whole capitalist system, but we must distinguish between the various sections of the bourgeoisie; and especially must we distinguish between the large capitalists and the large landowners on the one hand and the peasantry and its various groupings on the other." The Executive has supported this second tendency.

On the other hand, we must once again tell our Comrades of the Scheflo tendency, that in their parliamentary activity, based on the whole upon a proper political orientation, they nevertheless committed several grave mistakes. Their biggest mistake consisted in supporting the compulsory arbitration law. We must therefore repeat that it was a mistake that cannot be denied. But at the same time we must say that it is absolutely Marxian and Communist to take advantage of the antagonism between the contending bourgeois forces.

I now come to the question of the "Mot Tag" magazine. With regard to this magazine, we resolved that it should not continue to exist as an organ independent of the Party. In the Commission we quoted various articles from this review—e.g., an article by the editor of the review in which he designated our entire German Party as an intellectual clique. Naturally this ought not to be tolerated, and the spreading of such "false reports" about our two Communist parties should not be tolerated.

In the first draft we outlined two possible solutions—either to discontinue this review or to convert it into a party organ. Our Norwegian Comrades declared themselves in favour of the second solution, and we have acceded to their desire in the matter.

Now I come to the Communist press and to the central organ. On this subject we will merely say the following:— The Norwegian Comrades must carry out the decisions of the previous Congresses of the Communist International with regard to their Party press and their central organ.

With regard to the "personal" matters there are two Comrades, Karl Johansen and Halvord Olsen. The first was formerly a bourgeois journalist. He writes articles now directed against the Comintern. We recommend the Congress to expel him. With regard to Olsen, he is a worker who has made mistakes. He must be told of these but we recommend that he be not expelled.

EGYPTIAN QUESTION

Reporter: Comrade Katayama.

Katayama (Japan): Egypt holds the key to the East and the Far East. Therefore the Egyptian Communist movement is important.

For forty years the Egyptian people have been exploited by English and French imperialists. The late war brought about a change of attitude on the part of the Egyptian people. They revolted against English imperialism. The Egyptian petty bourgeoisie and the Egyptian capitalists are satisfied with the nominal independence of Egypt, but the Communists and the revolutionary workers are not satisfied with nominal independence. They want a real independence and on this point the Comintern should support them. We, the Egyptian Commission, agreed that the Communist movements in Egypt should be helped and encouraged. A strong Communist movement should be built up in Egypt in order to hold the key to the East and the Far East. In the case of revolt in India, Egypt, by reason of the geographical position it occupies, would hold the key to the Indian revolution and could assist it by blockading the Suez Canal. Therefore, we want to help the Egyptian Communist movement, and we want you to recognise the Egyptian Socialist Party. The Egyptian Socialist Party is young, it is inexperienced in many ways, although the Egyptian Comrades are working for the Comintern on Comintern lines. But we want to make certain conditions as to their admission to the Comintern and so after several sessions the Commission has reached the following conclusion:—

1.—The report of the S.P.E. delegate, made available to the Commission, is satisfactory evidence that the S.P.E. represents a substantial revolutionary movement in conformity with the Communist International.

2.—The Commission considers, however, that the affiliation of the S.P.E. must be postponed until—

- (a) the Party has expelled certain undesirable elements;
- (b) the Party has convoked a Congress at which an attempt shall be made to unite with the S.P.E. any Communist element in Egypt that may at present exist outside the S.P.E. and will accept the 21 demands of the C.I.;
- (c) the Party has changed its name to "The Communist Party of Egypt."

3.—The S.P.E. is therefore instructed to summon a congress for the above purposes at an early date, and not later than January 15th, 1923.

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

SESSION HELD, November 17, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Reporter Comrade Eberlein: Comrades, after the World Congress had been decided upon, the Presidium sent to the various sections of the Communist-International a distribution plan according to which the delegates to the World Congress were to be elected. According to this plan, 350 delegates from 61 countries were invited to the Congress of the Communist International. According to a decision of the Presidium a sub-committee, which was appointed on November 16th, 1922, consisting of Comrades Trilliser, Piatnitsky and Eberlein, was entrusted with the preliminary examination of the credentials. Subsequently the Enlarged Executive appointed a final Commission for the examination of the credentials, and Comrades Thalheimer (Germany), Kabatchiev (Bulgaria), Schefflo (Norway) and Gramsci (Italy) were added to the three other comrades.

This Commission examined the credentials of the comrades who had arrived, and found them to be on the whole correct. The Presidium had previously issued instructions that every delegate was to provide himself with a special credential signed and stamped by the Central Committee of his respective Party. These instructions were in most cases strictly adhered to.

I shall now report to you on the number of delegates who have already arrived, and the number of credentials which have been found correct, and will ask you at the conclusion to endorse the work of the credentials commission. At the same time I will try to give you, as far as this is possible, the number of members of the respective parties. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that not all the parties were able to state the exact number of their members, as a considerable number of parties have been forced to carry on illegal existence, and are therefore unable to produce definite statistics.

Moreover, I should like also to draw your attention to the fact that the number of the invitations was based not merely on the actual membership of the parties. The distribution of credentials also took into account the political importance of the respective parties in the present stage of the revolutionary struggle, the special political and economic situation of the given country, and, finally, the degree of illegality of the Party and the extent of its oppression by the enemy.

Twenty comrades were invited from the German Party, which has at present a membership of 220,000, out of which 102,400 paid their membership dues regularly during the last quarter (according to the lists of contributions). Twenty-three comrades have arrived. The Credentials Commission seated

the 23 comrades with a decisive vote. Their credentials were found to be in proper condition.

The French Party declared their membership to be 78,828. Twenty comrades were invited, and 24 have arrived. Twenty-three delegates were recognised as entitled to a decisive vote, and one was granted deliberative vote.

The Italian Party stated its membership to be 24,638. Twenty comrades were invited, and 21 comrades have arrived, all of whom were recognised as entitled to a decisive vote.

The Russian Party stated its membership to be 324,522 in Russia proper. There is a separate membership list for the Ukraina, White Russia, and the Near and Far East. Seventy-five comrades were invited, all of whom have arrived and were given a decisive vote.

The Czecho-Slovak Party stated its membership to be 170,000; 125,000 members having paid their fees during the last quarter. Twenty comrades were invited, and 17 have arrived and were given a decisive vote.

In addition to these big parties, the Young Communist League, with a membership of 760,000, and the Profintern were allotted 20 decisive votes each. Each of these organisations has sent 20 delegates. Their credentials were found correct.

The British Party stated its membership to be 5,116, only 2,300 having paid their membership fees, according to information received by us. Ten delegates were invited, and seven have arrived. Their credentials were recognised as correct.

The American Communist Party stated its membership to be 8,000. Ten delegates were invited, nine have arrived. The Workers' Party of America has also sent representatives. It has a membership of 20,000. Three delegates have arrived and were given deliberative vote. Two representatives of the Negro Organisation, with a membership of about 500, have also arrived from America, and were admitted to the Congress with a deliberative vote.

The Polish Party stated its membership to be 10,000, 7,000 having paid their membership fees. It should be stated that the Polish Party is carrying on an illegal existence. Ten comrades were invited, 10 have arrived and were admitted to the Congress with a decisive vote.

The Ukrainian Communist Party stated its membership to be 80,000, 10 comrades were invited, 15 comrades have arrived, out of whom 10 were given a decisive and five a deliberative vote.

The Norwegian Party stated its membership to be 60,000, six comrades were invited, of whom five have arrived and were admitted with a decisive vote.

The Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia claims a membership of 80,000. Six comrades were invited. Considerable difference of opinion has arisen in connection with the distribution of the credentials among these delegates. The Central Committee had allotted six credentials, but only four of the appointed comrades have arrived. In their stead, two other members have

arrived on invitation by the Presidium owing to the fact that the Party differences were to be settled here at the Congress. A Commission for the Yugo-Slavian question was also appointed here. The two comrades, who in their capacity of visitors were admitted to the Congress with a deliberate vote, protest against this, demanding to be admitted with a decisive vote. The credentials Commission refused to comply with their demand. But the comrades claim that at the election by the Central Committee, one of the comrades who has arrived was rejected by 4:4 votes, and the other by 3:5 votes. The credentials Commission, after careful examination of the credentials, has come to the conclusion that the comrades were not elected. However, as this question is of great importance to the Yugo-Slavian Party, and as the Party differences are very acute, the credentials Commissions left the decision of the question to the Presidium. The Presidium decided to give a decisive vote to both of these comrades, with the clear understanding that this decision has no bearing on the Party differences within the Yugo-Slavian Party, which are to be settled by the Political Commission. The comrades were informed of this matter in a special resolution. For the foregoing reasons we ask, therefore, that this comrade's mandate should likewise be recognised.

The Bulgarian Party has 40,000 members. It was invited to send six delegates, and that number has come. These credentials are in order.

The Finnish Party has 25,000 members on the books; of these 20,000 are full paying members, six delegates were asked for, seven have come. Their credentials have been ratified.

The C.P. of Spain has about 5,000 members. Three delegates were invited, four have come. Three have been given mandates with the right to vote, one has been given a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Roumania has about 2,000 members. Four delegates were invited, three have come. These three have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Sweden has 12,143 members on the books. During the last quarter 7,843 members paid full dues. Six delegates were invited and six have come. All have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Latvia has 1,500 members. Six delegates were invited, eight have come. Six have been admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Switzerland has 5,200 members. Three delegates were invited, three have come, and have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The Austrian Party has about 16,000 members. Three delegates were invited, six came. Four delegates were admitted with the right to vote and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Holland has 2,500 members. One delegate was invited, four have come. One received the right to vote, three admitted with consultative voice.

The C.P. of Belgium has 517 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of China has 300 members, of whom 180 are full paying members. Three delegates were invited, one came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of India cannot represent a definite membership, since its work is entirely illegal. Four delegates were invited, one has come, and has been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Ireland. Three delegates were invited, four have come. Three admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Azerbaijan. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two admitted with the right to vote, one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Georgia has 18,811 members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two delegates have been admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Lithuania has 1,000 members on the books, 500 being full paying members. One delegate was invited, two have come. Both have been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Esthonia has 2,800 members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two were admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Denmark has 1,200 members on the books, of whom 780 are full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. One admitted with the right to vote, two with consultative voice.

The C.P. of Persia has 1,000 members, 500 of these being full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two have been admitted with the right to vote, one with a consultative voice.

In Turkey there are now two Parties, that of Constantinople and that of Angora. The Angora Party has about 300 members; two delegates were invited, six have come. Two have been admitted with the right to vote, two were given visitors' cards, and two were refused admission. The membership of the Constantinople Party cannot be stated. Two delegates were invited, three came; two were admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Australia has 900 members, of whom 750 are full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, four have come. Two were admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Argentina has about 3,500 members. Two delegates were invited, two have come and have been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Africa has 200 members on the books, 100 of these being full-paying members. One delegate was invited,

two have come. One has been admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Java. The exact membership cannot be given, but the Party has probably about 1,300 members. One delegate was invited, one came and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Canada has 4,810 members. One delegate was invited, three have come. One delegate was admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Portugal has 2,900 members on the books, 1,702 being full-paying members. One delegate was invited, two have come. One was admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Chili has about 2,000 members. One delegate was invited. This comrade did not arrive until yesterday evening, and his credentials have not yet been examined.

The C.P. of Uruguay has about 1,000 members. One delegate was invited, one came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Brazil has about 500 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Mexico has about 1,500 members. One delegate has been invited, one has come, and was admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Armenia. One delegate was invited, two have come. One has been admitted with the right to vote, and the other has been given a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Chita. One delegate was invited, but has not yet arrived.

The C.P. of Bukhara. One delegate was invited. One came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Mongolia has about 1,500 members. One delegate was invited, one has come. He was admitted with a consultative voice only, for the Mongolian Party has not yet affiliated to the C.I.

The Communist Party of Korea. One delegate was invited, four have come. Since, however, there are fierce party struggles among the Communists in Korea, it is difficult to determine which of these delegates represent a genuine Communist Party. In these circumstances two of the delegates were admitted as visitors, and two were refused admission.

The Communist Party of Iceland has about 4,000 members, but the Party as a whole is still Menshevist in outlook. There is, however, a fraction comprising 450 communists, and this fraction has been admitted to the C.I. One delegate was invited, one came, and his credentials were recognised, with the right to vote.

The Communist Party of Fiume has about 150 members on the books. One delegate is on the way to Moscow, and on arrival will be admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The Communist Party of Palestine. One delegate was invited, and is now on the way to Moscow.

The C.P. of Greece. One delegate was invited, but has not yet come.

The C.P. of Hungary. Three delegates were invited, seven delegates were appointed by the Presidium of the C.I. and were admitted by the mandate commission with the right to vote, seeing that the C.P. is illegal in Hungary and has not yet been able to become established in that country.

One delegate was invited from Turkestan. He has come, and has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Uigurian Section of the C.P. of Turkestan sent three delegates. One was admitted with a consultative voice; the other two have been given visitors' cards.

The C.P. of Crimea has sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Mountain Republic has sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Egyptian Party has also sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

There have also been admitted with a consultative voice one representative of the Women's International, one representative of the Famine Relief.

This completes the list of the C.P. that were invited to send delegates to the Congress and that have done so.

In all, 350 delegates were invited to the Congress, and 394 have come. Of these 340 have been given the right to vote, and 48 have been given a consultative voice, while five delegates have been given visitors' cards.

In addition, a special invitation was sent by the Presidium of the Congress to the Italian Socialist Party, asking for five delegates. Five were sent, and have been admitted with a consultative voice.

The opposition in Czecho-Slovakia was invited to send three comrades. They have come, and have been admitted with a consultative voice.

Two comrades were invited to the sessions of the Program Commission and were admitted with a consultative voice.

Two comrades, Frossard and Cachin, were invited from France. They have not yet arrived, but according to the latest telegrams they are on the way.

A comrade has also been invited from Norway, but has not yet arrived.

Of these specially invited comrades, 10 have arrived up to now, and have all been admitted with a consultative voice.

There has also come a representative from the U.S.A. to the Agrarian Commission, and he has been admitted with a consultative voice.

Now let me say a few words regarding certain cases in which the Mandate Commission found it necessary to refuse credentials.

Two delegates were sent by the Foreign Bureau of the C.P. of Persia. This F.B. was dissolved by the Comintern more than six months ago. Apparently, however, it continues to exist, since it has sent two delegates to Moscow. The Mandate Commission thought it necessary to refuse credentials.

The recognition of the mandates of the C.P. of Austria entailed difficulties. Three comrades came from Austria with credentials given in Vienna on October 17th and 19th. One of them left Vienna as early as October 19th. On October 22nd we received a telegram from the Executive Committee of the Austrian Party cancelling three credentials, and consolidating all the credentials upon the Austrian representative on the Executive, Comrade Grün. The telegram stated that the Austrian Party could not afford to defray the travelling expenses of the three delegates to Moscow. Notwithstanding this telegram, the three delegates arrived. Thus we had, on the one hand, Comrade Grün with three credentials; and on the other hand the three delegates with what they regarded as valid credentials from the Austrian Executive Committee. The Mandate Commission decided, on the proposal of the four Austrian comrades, to recognise the credentials of the three who had specially come from Vienna, and also to give the right to vote to the fourth comrade. Thus the Austrian Party has four duly accredited representatives.

The Women's Section of the Eastern Division, represented by their leader, Kasparova, asked for a mandate with the right to vote. The application was refused.

Speaking generally, the distribution of mandates conveying the right to vote and of mandates giving a consultative voice merely (when there were numerous delegates with valid credentials) has been effected on the following principles. As a rule those comrades who have come from their respective countries direct to the Congress have been given the right to vote, whereas these comrades who had been for some time resident in Moscow and were no longer in direct touch with their respective countries, have been given a consultative voice only.

Furthermore, upon the instructions of the Presidium there were admitted to the Congress of the Comintern with a consultative voice all the delegates to the Profintern Congress, and those delegates to the Young Communists Congress who had already arrived in Moscow were given visitors' cards for the Comintern Congress. Admission with a consultative voice was also granted to two of the delegates to the Co-operative Congress, seeing that the question of co-operation is under discussion at the Comintern Congress and these two comrades had, therefore, to work upon the commission.

This ends the report of the Mandate Commission. I ask you in the name of the Commission to recognise the mandates and to ratify the decisions of the Commission.

ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Neurath (Chairman): We now come to the election of the Executive. A Commission was appointed, on behalf of which Comrade Kolaroff will now report.

Kolaroff: In accordance with the resolution on the organization of the Executive of the Communist International, the future Executive must be composed of one chairman, 24 members, and 10 substitutes.

Therefore, the Presidium has asked the different delegations to nominate their delegates and to prepare complete lists. Some delegations have handed in complete lists, while others have only designated their own candidates.

The small Commission has had a most difficult problem to solve. As you know, our International is composed of 62 Communist Parties. Each of these Parties would like to be represented on the Executive, which is naturally quite impossible.

Therefore, the Small Commission was forced to make a choice, giving a preference to certain Parties—notably to those parties which, because of their numerical strength and political importance, are of greater importance within the International.

On the other hand, the Small Commission has tried to have the whole world represented on the new Executive. We believe that the Commission has succeeded in solving this problem in a more or less satisfactory manner. In the list which it now presents to you are contained representatives of all continents, all the large Parties, and all those groups of inter-connected parties which are in a more or less identical situation.

The list prepared by the Small Commission has been confirmed by the Presidium with certain modifications, and I am instructed to present it to you. It is as follows:—

Chairman—Zinoviev.

France—Two delegates, Frossard, Souvarine; one substitute, Duret.

Germany—Two delegates, Clara Zetkin, Eberlein; one substitute, Boettcher.

Russia—Two delegates, Bukharin, Radek; two substitutes, Lenin, Trotsky.

Czecho-Slovakia—Two delegates, Smeral, Neurath; one substitute, Nuna.

Italy—Two delegates, Generali, Grasci; one substitute, Bordiga.

Young Communist International—Two delegates, Schueller, Schatzkin.

England—One delegate, MacManus; one substitute, Newbold.

America—One delegate, Carr; one substitute, Damon.

Scandinavia—Two delegates, Hueglund, Schefflo.

Poland—One delegate, Pruchnjak.

Finland—One delegate, Kuusinen.
 Balkan States—One delegate, Kolaroff.
 Australia—One delegate, Garden.
 South America—One delegate, Stuermer.
 South Africa—One delegate, Andrews.
 The Orient—Two delegates, Katayama, Safarov; one substitute, Roy.

With regard to the delegates recommended by the Italian Party, the Presidium has decided to move that they be accepted with the reserve that the Italian Party, after its Unity Congress, has the right to propose new representatives, who must, however, be ratified by the Executive.

In the name of the Presidium, I ask you to adopt this list, if possible, unanimously.

Executive elected unanimously.

CONCLUDING SPEECH OF COMRADE ZINOVIEV

In winding up the Congress, Comrade Zinoviev said that the task of the Fourth Congress was the study, differentiation and concentration of the questions of the international labour movement. The Congress solved these problems. For the first time the Comintern acted as a really international party with a collective experience, having solved the questions of the internal party life of the French Czecho-Slovak, Italian, Norwegian, Spanish and other Communist Parties.

He expressed the hope that the French Party will overcome the old social-democratic traditions, that the Italian Party will fulfil the will of the Italian proletariat, that the Norwegian Party will rid itself of its federalistic, syndicalistic and reformist tendencies, and, finally, that the opposition minority of the Czecho-Slovakian Party will find the right path. He expressed his satisfaction with the fact that the majority of the Czecho-Slovak Party supported the resolution on the Czecho-Slovak question, notwithstanding the breach of discipline by the Czech opposition.

The minorities of the Parties should take into consideration that the resolutions adopted by the Congress are based on the collective experience of all the Communist Parties.

The Comintern grows. The Comintern is no longer only a symbol, but a united world organisation of the revolutionary proletariat. It is necessary that we systematically carry out the tactic of the United Front, which is the key to the solution of the most important tasks of the proletariat. International discipline consists not only in that different sections carry out decisions with which they are in agreement, but precisely in that they comply with such decisions with which they are not in full accord.

The general situation remains revolutionary. The victory of the Comintern is assured by the entire course of events.



To the WORKING MASSES of TURKEY

THE Fourth Congress of the Third International, held contemporaneously with the fifth anniversary of the great Proletarian Revolution, sends its warmest greetings to the workers and peasants of Turkey, wishing them success in their heroic struggle for independence against Western imperialism.

Comrades of Turkey! you have given a live example of a revolutionary movement of independence to the entire East and to all the Colonial countries subjugated by imperialism.

But the latest events show that the bourgeois nationalist government intends to usurp the fruits of this victory won at the price of your tremendous sacrifices.

The nationalist government of Angora is ready to come to terms with the imperialists at the price of some concessions obtained for the benefit of the big bourgeoisie of Turkey. It inaugurated this new policy by dissolving the Communist Party and suppressing all its organisations, by making wholesale arrests and maltreating our imprisoned comrades in barbarous fashion, and finally by suppressing the Turkish Labourers' Union at Constantinople.

The Turkish Communist Party has always supported the bourgeois nationalist government in the struggle of the toiling masses against imperialism. The Turkish Communist Party consented even, in face of the common enemy, to make temporary concessions in its programme and its ideal.

In view of these facts, the attitude of the government towards the Communist Party demonstrates the desire of the government to banish all the conscious representatives of the working class and the peasantry who will insist on realisation of the democratic reforms which were solemnly pledged in order to obtain your aid, and also in order to make the appearance of a real bourgeois government at the Lausanne Conference.

The bourgeois government of Turkey has the audacity to commit against you and your representatives such crimes that arouse the indignation of the entire world proletariat, led by the Russian proletariat, which grudged no material or moral sacrifice during the most trying period, when all the imperialist and capitalist Powers made common cause for the purpose of strangling the toiling people of Turkey.

The nationalist government, in preparation for an understanding with the imperialists, endeavours to destroy your true representatives and to separate them from their friends abroad.

The Fourth Congress of the Communist International protests vigorously against this barbarous act, and considers it as its duty to solemnly proclaim its readiness to support any

government or political party that will refuse to play the part of the gendarme of imperialism, which will continually fight against imperialism and reaction, and which will realise the democratic reforms for the benefit of the toiling masses of Turkey: To you, the imprisoned comrades, the Third International—the general staff of the world proletariat—affectionately salutes you as the most conscious and most devoted representatives of the toiling masses of Turkey.

Remember, comrades, that the gloom of dungeons has never yet obscured the sun of the revolution.

Remember, comrades, that on the eve of the victory of the revolution, the impotence of the ruling class manifests itself by increased ferocity. This is what we are witnessing now, when capitalism breaks down under the weight of its inherent contradictions, when the shock of imperialist conflicts has reached its highest point, the international bourgeoisie redoubles its persecutions against the heralds and the builders of the new Communist society.

But no white terror ever succeeded in intimidating those who are firm in their faith of the inevitable and final victory of the social revolution. The place of every comrade that is imprisoned or shot is taken by hundreds of comrades arising from the exploited proletarian ranks, who will continue to fight for freedom with increased vigour.

Comrades, the Third International considers as its essential duty to do everything in its power to rescue you from the hands of your hangmen.

Long live the World Revolution!

Long live the faithful Communists of Turkey!

Long live the Third International!

Long live Soviet Russia!



If you cannot afford to miss reading

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Official Organ of the Communist International

Latest numbers in stock 1/-

Communist Bookshop, 16, King Street, W.C.2

—and you must read the

RESOLUTIONS AND THESES of the FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL held in Moscow, Nov. 7 to Dec. 3, 1922

Obtainable at all Communist Party offices in England, Ireland,
South Africa, Australia, Price 1/-, and from the offices of the
Workers' Party of America and Canada, 10 cents.

—then, if you would keep abreast of the
changing phases of the workers' struggle
in all lands, send your subscription for the

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

to the following address:—

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP,
16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

Make your cheque or money order payable to THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Price . . . 4d. per copy.



IMPORTANT

to every Trade Union worker and every student of working-class politics

Towards Trade Union Unity

by G. Zinoviev

¶ This pamphlet is a verbatim report of Comrade Zinoviev's speech on the Trade Union question at the Fifth Congress

PRICE
TWO
PENCE

WOMEN WORKERS !

Read how the Russian working women work for the Revolution in

Work Among WOMEN

PRICE
1/-

Obtainable from The Communist Bookshop at No. 16 King-street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2