

Special Number

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 50

25th July 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12: Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
— Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliessfach 29, Vienna VIII.
Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

The V. World Congress of the Communist International

Fifteenth Session.

The Chairman, Comrade **Wynkoop**, opening the session, informed the Congress that no news had been received from the Belgian Party that the Belgian Government had seized Comrade Lenin's brochure on Co-operation. The Congress would of course protest against this action.

Comrade Dengel

Comrade Dengel demanded the floor for a personal explanation. He said that his speech was made at the request of the German Delegation only in the sense that they were of the opinion that the theses of Comrade Varga did not describe the revolutionary situation with sufficient vividness. Comrade Varga was then called upon for a concluding speech.

Comrade Varga:

The debate was almost exclusively confined to political questions, and only a very few speakers dealt with economic questions. The comrades concerned themselves less with the economic situation than with the process of development, which in my opinion was a mistake, since the future can be deduced only from an investigation of the facts. In order to support the proposition that the prospect I described is not sufficiently revolutionary, it must first be proved that either the material I adduced or the inferences I drew from it, were incorrect. One cannot base a criticism solely upon the tendency of the reporter.

Comrade Radek has discovered a discrepancy between the brochure which I wrote in April and the speech I delivered at the Congress. I must state that in the interval, new facts occurred which made it necessary to give my conclusions greater definiteness. The crises in America, Germany, Polish Upper Silesia, and Rumania, are daily becoming more acute. Even in England, unemployment, which had been receding, again began to increase the last week.

Comrade Dunne accuses me of having over-estimated the crisis in America. Even bourgeois reports show that production, in the steel industry, had declined 30% within two months. I think that such a crisis has never been observed before. Nevertheless, the American crisis has special peculiarities. Usually the beginning of a crisis is accompanied by a money crisis. This is not true of America in the present instance. We find the paradox

that, while there is this crisis in production, the world-market is over-stocked. Capitalism is overcoming the crisis at the expense of the proletariat, by restricting production and not by a reduction of prices and bankruptcy.

Comrade Wynkoop says that Central Europe and the Balkans are becoming colonies of Western Europe. This opinion is wrong. Imperialist England and Imperialist France are fighting for the hegemony of Europe. The reparations question was essentially a question as to whether Germany should become the colony of France or the colony of "Western Europe"; it is rather a fight between the great imperialist powers for hegemony in Europe. The whole Ruhr struggle is in fact a struggle between England and France ending with a French military victory. The economic weakness of France as expressed in the franc crisis, nevertheless, compelled the French bourgeoisie to forego the military victory and subordinate itself to the Anglo-American policy.

Comrade Dengel dealt with the theses in great detail. His statement that only the Right was in agreement with the theses is perhaps not altogether true, since the Russian delegation has also associated itself in principle with the theses. He declared that the tendency displayed in the theses was incorrect. The central question is, in my opinion, whether the present disorganization can be ended and whether a so-called "normal" capitalism can be revived. Well, the last five years have shown that the bourgeoisie, immediately after the war, was in full retreat before the proletariat. After two years the capitalist offensive began, which resulted in victory all along the line. Economically, the class contradictions within the capitalist system have become more acute. The distribution of wealth has moved in favour of the small groups of wealthy capitalists. There is an agrarian crisis which is spreading over the whole world, and there is a special crisis in Western Europe resulting from the industrialisation of the former agrarian countries and of the overseas countries. Politically, however, capitalism has strengthened its power. To deny the possibility of this period of social crises coming to end would be Utopian.

Comrade Dengel asserts that, like Kautsky, I foretold a super-imperialistic capitalist epoch, "in which the contradictions of capitalism would be so great that they would have to end". Is it possible that the contradictions between the various imperialist super-powers can end? The possibility exists. Of the seven great imperialist powers, the World War annihilated three. Russia, which retired owing to the revolution; Austria-Hungary,

which was smashed; and Germany, which was crushed and reduced to a colony. One can imagine that in the next world war, one or two other imperialist powers will be excluded and be degraded into objects of imperialist world policy.

Comrade Dengel says that the "Comintern would be running a very great danger if it accepted such a development of capitalism". I think that this expression is absolutely out of place. On the contrary, if there exists such a tendency towards strengthening capitalism, it would be a betrayal of the interests of the proletariat to conceal the truth. I do not mean to say that such a prospect of capitalism recovering exists; but what we must fight is the attitude that if such a prospect does exist, it is dangerous to speak of it. He says I place much too much emphasis on the will to fight of the proletariat. It is an absolute contradiction to say that we are condemning the Rights because they would not fight in the revolutionary situation, and on the other hand to rebuke me because I assert that the proletariat will-to-fight is an essential factor for the victory of the proletariat.

Comrade Dengel further states that I am guilty of a contradiction when I say that there is a tendency on the part of the individual capitalist countries to isolate themselves and at the same time speak of the international inter-locking of capitalist interests. That is by no means a contradiction. The bourgeoisie of each country endeavours to reserve the internal market as a monopoly for itself. To that end it erects high custom barriers around its own country.

Allow me in conclusion to deal with one question which was not mentioned here at all. Not a single word was said in the debate of the Hungarian proletariat. Five years ago, in addition to Russia, there existed another comparatively strong proletarian country, Hungary. The Hungarian proletariat was the only proletariat besides the Russian which set up its dictatorship and maintained it for four and a half months. This proletariat has no delegation at this Congress. This is due to the fact that there is no Hungarian Communist Party. That is no fault of the Hungarian emigrants, nor can it be ascribed to the formation of false fractions. On the contrary, sharp fractional differences exist only because we have not succeeded in creating a live communist movement in Hungary. It is worth thinking about, for there once existed a powerful working-class movement in Hungary. The Hungarian trade-unions are the only trade-unions

in the world which have gained in membership during the three years. If the foundations are laid, then the profound influences which the dictatorship has left working in the mass of the Hungarian proletariat, will quickly result in the Hungarian Communist Party becoming the great and powerful party which its past deserves. (Applause.)

Sixteenth Session.

June 27, (Morning)

On the session being opened, several personal explanations were made.

Comrade Bordiga:

Comrade Zinoviev claims that I was trying to use diplomatic methods in connection with the questions of the fraction in the International. I emphasise that I have not changed my opinion in this matter. As regards the article introduced by Comrade Zinoviev, his interpretation is absolutely correct: it is most likely due to the German translation, which was probably sent to Comrade Zinoviev by the Italian expression. In that article I wrote that fractions exist in every section of the International, which are fighting for the leadership of the Party. We agree that there ought to be no fractions and that the International ought to become a true communist world-party. In order to achieve this aim, we must first create a unified organisation of the Communist International.

Comrade Varga:

My remarks about the non-existence of an organic Communist Party in Hungary before the dictatorship has given rise to a misunderstanding. I did not intend in any way to deny the significance of the Hungarian Communist Party in the fight for the dictatorship. The Hungarian Communist Party was created in the autumn of 1918 and amalgamated with the Social Democratic Party after the establishment of the dictatorship. The establishment of the Hungarian dictatorship is undoubtedly the work of the Communist Party, first of all. But its existence was not of sufficient duration to enable it to develop a basis for an illegal Party after the overthrow of the dictatorship and during the period of the White Terror.

Report of Comrades Bukharin and Thalheimer on the Programme Question

Chairman Gebhardt (Germany) calls upon Comrade Bukharin to deliver his report on the Programme of the Communist International.

Comrade Bukharin:

Comrades, at our last Congress the programme question was discussed with considerable thoroughness. The most important programme questions were dealt with in the reports made at that time. I will therefore not again go over the paragraphs contained in my report and in Thalheimer's supplementary report.

Differences arose in connection with two quite different questions: firstly, in connection with capitalist accumulation—a purely theoretical question brought forward by Comrade Rosa Luxemburg. We have decided to deal with these questions at separate meetings.

As to the second question, which gave rise to differences—the question of partial demands and transition slogans,—there are no differences in connection with it, unless some delegation or group of delegations object to his.

Thus, in to-day's report I will deal only with new questions, namely with questions not discussed in former reports. Comrade Thalheimer and myself propose (and I believe we voice the opinion of the Commission on this) that at this Congress, we adopt not a final programme, but rather a draft which the Parties affiliated to the Communist International may discuss.

In the first place, we need the programme for the ideological training of all Parties. We also need the programme for its

political significance and to demonstrate and to further our work. I must say that I do not share comrade Maslov's scepticism as to the relation to the programme, who proposes that only a programme of action be adopted in lieu of a programme. I think that in various documents already adopted by the Communist International, we have sufficient material and also sufficient elucidation of the most important questions which concern the programme.

The first question we have to consider is—our philosophy. Not a word has been said in the draft laid before the Fourth World Congress about the philosophy of the Communist International and of communism in general. But since then we have gone through experiences which make it imperative for us to deal with this question. During the meeting of the Enlarged Executive we had a very heated discussion on the religious question. The discussions showed us that the question of our philosophy needs elucidation. There are more subtle facts which, in a less obvious form perhaps than the religious discussion indicate that there are still some dangers ahead. We notice among Communist Parties, and to a still greater extent, among social-democratic parties—especially in the German Social Democratic Party—a relapse into the old Hegelism, which we must designate as pre-Marxist and an idealistic viewpoint. This is particularly noticeable in the social democrat Cuno, especially in his work on the State, the role and functions of this State. Unfortunately Communist Parties are not immune from such relapses into old Hegelism, certainly in a less prominent form than in social democratic ranks, but which nevertheless reveal the same politically harmful tendencies.

The second phenomenon is particularly noticeable in the Italian Party, although probably it is not conscious of it. This ideological deviation from revolutionary Marxism could be designated as idealistic voluntarism. We find the same deviations in the Russian Party, but in a different form, namely in the form of agnostic positivism. The point is that in all this, Marxist materialism is treated, avowedly or tacitly as an obsolete viewpoint. This is a great danger, especially because bourgeois science and bourgeois philosophy and ideology are at present in process of dissolution. This bourgeois ideology is tainted with mysticism, and therefore in a period of general disintegration and chaos can to a certain extent permeate proletarian circles. That is why our philosophy must be given a place in the programme. It must be precisely and concisely formulated. We must say that we are materialists; our viewpoint is the viewpoint of revolutionary materialist Marxism.

If the influence of bourgeois ideology is noticeable on the philosophical field, it is also present in our economic doctrines. I should like to propose to the congress here to discuss Comrade Bordiga's article in "Die Internationale". Not because I attach much importance to Comrade Bordiga's arguments, but because his article shows us in a crude form the dangers which are ahead. It is a question of symptomatic phenomena, when a scientific man prints such foolish things and such social democratic rot. The article is very outspoken. Comrade Boris would like to send the entire bourgeoisie and also the petty bourgeoisie to the devil. He has no wish to make common cause with any revolutionary parties in the Colonies whatever, on the plea that they are bourgeois parties. He also taboos partial socialisation. He says: the devil with any kind of socialisation which is not complete socialisation! He wants to socialise everything, including the state-paper basket of "Die Internationale". He justifies his article by saying that political economy is the be-all and the end-all. Thus, we must socialise everything, or nothing. He is much more radical than the most radical elements represented here. But under this radical cloak, we have literally a purely social democratic theory, and I fail to see how it was possible for the editors of "Die Internationale" not to notice it.

One of the most important differences between the Second and Third Internationals is the conception of imperialism, the conception that a few great powers exploit the colonies, receive super-profits from these colonies and by means of them corrupt the working class sections, which provide the basis for social democratic policy. Hitherto we thought that this conception is the most important point which separates us from the Second International. This conception is a strong weapon in our hands against social democracy, and against the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie, a strong weapon which enables us to establish connection between the revolution of the industrial proletariat and colonial rebellions which in the trend of history are nothing but component parts of the world revolution. Against this, are directed all the attacks of the social democrats, on the theoretical as well as on the practical field.

Now our super-clever Boris criticises my draft programme saying, that the whole doctrine of super-profits is fundamentally anti-Marxist; it is absurd, it is class-conciliatory, etc. I see myself on an author who was in no way a petty-bourgeois wild, i. e., the venerable Karl Marx. In his "Theories of Plus Value", Vol. 2, Part 2, Marx says: "Even a blind sow finds an acorn, and even a bourgeois economist can sometimes speak the truth." And with reference to his famous blind sow, Marx says:

"J. B. Say, in his comments on Constanzio's translation of Ricardo, made just one correct observation on foreign trade. Profit can also be made by cheating. One wins what the other loses. Gains and losses within a country cancel each other. But this is not the case between various countries. And according to Ricardo's own theory—which Say does not notice—three working days of one country can be exchanged for one working day of another. Here the law of values must be essentially modified. Or, as highly-skilled, complex labour within a country bears a certain proportionate unskilled, simple-labour, so the working days of one country can bear a certain proportion to the working days of another country. In such a case, the richer country exploits the poorer, although the latter may gain by the exchange. J. S. Mill developed this theory in his "Some Unsettled Questions, etc."

From this we can infer that Comrade Boris conceptions are somewhat less profound than those of a blind sow. But of course, that is not the decisive factor for us. The decisive factor

is that we clearly see that this doctrine of superprofits of richer countries is an entirely Marxist doctrine. Marx put that down in black and white. But Marx proceeds from the hypothesis that there is a peaceful exchange between the countries. What must be said when we also take the powerful means of state into consideration? The question is perfectly clear and comprehensible to any child. Only Comrade Boris believes that this doctrine is absurd.

Now for the arguments of Comrade Boris on wages. Naturally, the bourgeois can corrupt the working class only by means of higher wages. That is entirely correct. Why are the wages of these workers higher than the average wage? One answer is: The wages are higher because the labour power is of a different nature, because the labour power is more highly skilled. That would be correct, but a further question is necessary: where is the basis? How did the possibility arise for these sections of the working class to transform their labour power into more highly skilled labour power? The wages of every section of the labour aristocracy conforms with its more highly-skilled labour power. But why was just this labour more highly skilled? Why does this labour power belong to the highly-skilled workers and not to the unskilled worker? Practically the whole working class of the capitalist states is an aristocracy as compared with the pariahs of the working class. That is the basic question. This question is answered by our doctrine, which was created by Marx and developed by Engels and Lenin and which is clearly discussed even in the programme of the Russian Party. Comrade Boris absolutely overlooks this question. And that is a complete return to the Second International. For if we do not have this premise, we cannot fight against the labour aristocracy, imperialist politics, and will not be in a condition theoretically to explain all these fundamentally important phenomena. Engels even speaks of the bourgeois proletariat in England. This is also an absurdity from Comrade Boris standpoint. We must ask: how is it possible that the editor of the "Die Internationale" cannot exercise a censorship? (Korsch: It was merely brought up for discussion!) Comrades, we cannot bring up every bit of piffle for discussion. That is a bit strong.

I come to the second question—one of the most important.

At the beginning of the war there were bourgeois economists who actually went mad in the effort to justify the imperialist war and invented the theory that the war was a very useful thing from the standpoint of the development of productive power. These imbecile illusions of the bourgeois economists vanished some time after the beginning of the war. Now, the courageous Boris, writes:

"Neither can one talk of the destruction of productive forces by the war."

We all know that ten million people were killed during the war, the destroyed railways mean an increase in means of communication, while the destroyed factories and villages in Germany and Belgium signify an increase of the productive forces according to the deductions of Boris.

The third theory is that of the crisis.

We are all aware of the great controversy between us and the social democrats on the question of the crisis. We all know that the revisionists, led by Bernstein, were the first to attempt to prove that the trustification of industry, the creation of monopolist industry, tends to enable capitalism to overcome the crisis. There are different versions of this theory. In its crudest form it is represented by the pure and simple revisionists. What is our view upon these things? We have dealt with this question more than once and I think we have shown that in some branches of industry the state of anarchy has been partly removed as a result of the creation of monopolies. But the creation of trusts does not prevent crises; it rather produces them in a more extended and graduated manner.

Boris goes on to say that the growth of productive forces signifies the growth of the organic composition of capitalism; the ever increasing systematisation in the management of production, instead of crisis, a growth of the productive forces. What does it all mean? Does all this represent a communist theory? It is pure revisionism, and a pure social democratic theory.

There is yet another social democratic doctrine which says that the circumstances during the war and the period of revolutionary ferment are such that the revolutionary proletariat, if it wants to carry out the revolution victoriously, must constantly bear in mind the necessity for the continuity of the process of production. This is what we are told by Kautsky, Hilferding, etc.

As I bluntly put it at the last Congress, the use of telegraph poles for barricades will not encourage the increase of production. Revolution, like war, entails loss of productivity through the temporary destruction of the productive forces. Now, comrade Boris comes along again and reconstructs the whole doctrine of the continuity of production. And he transforms the transitory decline of the productive forces into an absolute process. He goes on to say that this indicates that Bukharin "is seriously of the opinion that the Communist system of production will have to start literally with nothing in the way of means of production and distribution". What a wonderfully clever fellow he is! He himself evolves the mathematical formula, and then he accuses me of it. If for instance we were to transform comrade Boris' relative foolishness into absolute foolishness, we would also obtain the corresponding result. But we are content with having to deal with relative foolishness. What is the meaning of the thing in itself? It means nothing else than the restoration of the social democratic doctrine. For it is the best argument in the hands of the social-democracy against revolutionary methods. If we say that the revolution can be based only on the growth of the productive forces, then we get the doctrine established by Kautsky. You see how tactically we have established our theory. We have shown that the process of relative and temporary transition renders the destruction of the productive forces absolutely necessary. We have shown by various Marxian quotations that this transformation, these critical circumstances, serve as the basis for the revolutionary change. The social democratic doctrine, on the contrary, asserts the impossibility of the revolution. They argue in this way: before the war the productive forces were not developed enough for the realisation of socialism; during the war the social revolution is impossible because the productive forces are partly destroyed, and after the war one must wait until they develop again, so by that time a new war will come. And thus the circle of stupidity runs merrily round. Boris' theory represents the expanded reproduction of this theory. See what a rich bouquet of theory we get! Negation of super profits, negation of the wage-relations of the labour aristocracy, a theory of war-time prosperity, and consequently a justification of the social-patriotic attitude during the war; the social-democratic doctrine about the continuity of the process of production. It has quite a number of passages which sound very radical, but behind these radical words we have the foulest social democratic trash. And it is this thing that the super-wise Boris uses for his attack against us on the national question, on the colonial question, on the question of the united front, on the question of socialisation and so on and so forth.

If such things are written by the "Left" comrades, they are even more dangerous, because when the "Left" comrades, whose tactical and political orientation is quite proper, indulge in such foolish talk, they compromise the entire political orientation of the "Left" wing. We must protest in the most emphatic manner against such irrelevance, and expose the comrades in question.

I would now like to touch upon another theoretical question which was omitted in our previous discussions, viz. the question of crises; not of crises as a specific phenomenon of the transition period, but of crises in general. As you know, a theoretical discussion on the theory of crises is going on in Marxian circles. There are two formulas which are fundamentally different (disproportionality, and under-consumption). We must have a formula which will express the contradiction between production and consumption as a component part of the anarchy of production. I believe that in our draft programme we must be somewhat more cautious in formulating the process of the decay of capitalism. We already see the empirical fact that on the whole we are facing the process of capitalist decay, but within this great process we see also partial processes of regeneration. For this reason we must give a somewhat more exhaustive definition and a clearer description of the transition period. I shall point out a few things. We must elaborate more clearly our ideas upon the period of the two processes, the fundamental process of the proletarian revolution in itself does not yet constitute the world revolution, but there are also other yet disruptive processes which have a revolutionary sense, e. g. the national crises. Taken by themselves, these secondary processes are not integral parts of the proletarian revolution. In the process of world history, these phenomena have direct bearing on the world revolution. We should mention that during the transition period, antagonistic forms of organization may continue to exist side by side for a long time. We should point out that after the

conquest of political power, a new law of social development will operate. In the first place, development would proceed amidst the flame of revolution, and secondly, the law of social development would work concretely upon a new basis. Capitalist development is nothing but the extension of the capitalist contradictions; these contradictions will go on and lead to the collapse of the capitalist system of production, but after the capture of power by the proletariat, the law of social development will not tend in the direction of extending the contradictions, but rather in the direction of their gradual elimination. We should mention further the idea that during the transition period there should be a bloc between the proletariat and some sections of the peasantry. Here I would like to make a few remarks. Even in the ranks of the Communist International there is a dangerous tendency to ignore the importance of this problem. It is absolutely clear, and strategically as well as tactically necessary, that we must consider the peasantry as our allies, but this should not be misconstrued in the sense that we should transform ourselves into Workers' and Peasants' Parties. On the contrary, the more we retain our proletarian character, the more successful will be our policy in regard to the peasantry.

I now come to the question of the new economic policy which I consider to be the most important part of my report.

First of all, a few introductory remarks. After the introduction of the new economic policy, we, the Russian Communists, and also our friends, the foreign parties, almost without any exception, had a feeling that we had acted somewhat improperly, and that we ought to apologise for the new economic policy. We did not think the new economic policy to be expedient and rational in itself. Now however we may quite conscientiously say the very opposite. The question of the new economic policy on the whole should be formulated by us in the following manner:

The only correct economic policy for the proletariat, the policy which insures the growth of productive forces, is the policy which we described as the "new economic policy". War-time communism was nothing else but a corrective of this new economic policy, the necessary corrective for the political expression of the direct class war against the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois elements.

Comrades, the fundamental phenomenon which will confront the victorious proletariat after the conquest of political power, will be the variety of the forms of economy with which it will have to deal. In no country, not even in the most capitalistically developed, are the productive forces so highly developed as to have caused the disappearance of all the immediate strata. No Marxist will assert that the social revolution cannot come unless every petty bourgeois, every handicraftsman, every small capitalist shall have disappeared. It would be a foolish exaggeration, of the kind contrived by our opponents to make a caricature of Marxism.

The second fact is as follows: There are as many different economic forms as there are classes or rather social strata. As long as we have small enterprises we shall have small producers, as long as there are small farms in the countryside we shall have peasants and as long as we have small capitalist enterprises, we shall have small capitalists and also handicraftsmen. The third factor consists in the heterogeneity of economic motives, of economic impulses. Thus, if we have different economic forms, we also have different economic motives. The motives of the peasantry differ from those of big capitalists.

The economic motives of socialised enterprises differ from those of the big peasantry. Even the economic motives of the big peasantry differ from those of the small peasantry.

This main problem could be formulated as follows: it is the problem of coordinating and subordinating firstly, the economic forms, secondly the classes and thirdly the economic stimuli.

In the face of such heterogeneity, we must of course consolidate the hegemony of the proletariat also on the economic field. It means that our socialised enterprises must have the hegemony in our economic life, and that the other economic forms, consequently all intermediate motives, must be subordinate to this economic hegemony. The transition period is the period during which the most advanced economic forms squeeze out other forms by means of competition. Therefore it is impossible to carry out this complete socialisation à la Boris. It is impossible because of the heterogeneity of the economic forms within the Soviet Union. We are unable to carry this through for technical reasons. We have not enough organizational forces to socialise everything, even the peasant allotments. This is one of the

sons. Secondly, it is politically impossible, because, by attempting it, we would rouse the petty bourgeoisie and all the traders against the victorious proletariat. Thirdly, because to attempt to socialise everything all at once, such heterogeneous enterprises would require a gigantic administrative apparatus the cost of which would be higher than that of anarchic production. This played an important part during the period of military communism.

The New Economic Policy is the only correct and true proletarian economic policy. When I speak of the only correct economic policy of the proletariat, I mean a policy based on the growth of productive forces, and a policy which encourages this growth. What was military communism? It was rational consumption of existing food stores. At that time his was the only possible policy, the first strategical position which gave us a firm footing in the economic life of the country. We seized power in economic organization, we also partly destroyed them (this too was a good thing, it is in fact a justification of the policy of military communism). On the other hand we established rational consumption of the existing food stores. That we could not give encouragement to productive forces, is self understood. How could we encourage agriculture, if we took away all the surplus produce? What motive could the peasantry have for production?

There was a great conflict between our State policy and the economic motives and impulses of these strata of the population, which made the partial existence of these economic forms impossible. In making a careful survey of this matter, we recognise the economic mistakes we made and we realise what real proletarian economic policy must be like.

Comrades, I should like to deal here with an argument used by Boris. His justification of the demand for complete socialisation is—that every national economy is a unity, and being a unity, requires just such a policy. This sounds very radical, but in reality it is theoretical opportunism. Why? Not only is there a unity, but there is also a unity of contradictions. To a certain extent, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is also a social unity. But there are contradictions within it, and the same may be said of all economic forms. This, in fact, is the whole problem. The bourgeoisie has co-ordinated these contradicting elements. We must have another kind of co-ordination. To deny this problem, one must assume that society represents a united whole, and not a unity in contradictions.

Further, if we regard the varieties of economic forms as the main phenomenon, it becomes quite clear that the most important manifestations arising out of the diversity of production are the forms of market relations. And here I think we must deal with the following prospects. Formerly our idea was somewhat as follows: we have a portion of the economic life of the country; other, socially hostile, or partially socially hostile elements have the other portion, and these we shall be able to swallow up by the direct methods of state power and without market relations. In all probability, judging by empirical facts—not merely by the Russian experience, what will actually happen will be that necessary and therefore the competitive struggle between the state forms of proletarian economy, between the socialised industries and the other forms of industry. Formally, the method is the same as under the capitalist economic system. The great difference lies in the fact that under the capitalist economic system, large and medium-sized industries have almost the same economic content. If the industries are in the hands of private capital, a competitive struggle against them by the large proletarian industries will take place—a revolutionary struggle, a class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This is perhaps the most important point we must grasp; since all doubts and misunderstandings, all attacks upon *Nep* and the present situation in Russia proceed from the fact that the comrades concerned fail to understand the entirely new forms of class struggle based upon economic competition. Formally, matters are almost the same as they were under capitalism, the producer received wages, the whole process goes on as in capitalist society. But the important thing is, that in spite of this formal identity, there exists a difference in principle.

Here comrades I think belongs the idea of the development of economic planning. We can only carry out economic planning to the extent that the material basis therefor exists. This material basis for economic planning is nothing but the result of the squeezing out of backward economic forms by the superior large industries with a proletarian social content.

Here we have an entirely new conception. But I think we can safely say that only this perspective is a correct one; it is the only one which can be theoretically proved. And it is just this perspective which is the strongest weapon against every form of pessimism on this subject. What grounds are there for pessimism? We shall certainly have crises, but these crises will disappear when we have complete economic planning. We shall in all probability have crises for many years to come, but the general line of the squeezing out of other economic forms, which do not possess a social character, is the only right one and represent the victorious prospect of our social development.

The new economic policy, which is already fairly old, has also many inherent contradictions, especially during the initial stage of proletarian economic policy. Our socialised enterprises and institutions are growing, but the same must also be said of petty bourgeois enterprises. Thus, we have already not only a contradiction between form and substance, but contradiction between various social forms and social forces. Naturally the class struggle on the economic field will definitely solve this question.

Just a few more words to make myself fully understood on this question. I said that we will arrive at our final socialist economic order by means of various economic struggles, in which big enterprises will be in the hands of the proletariat. But the matter is not so simple, because proletarian dictatorship is able to co-operate with the small producer under his hegemony. This is very important, especially as far as the peasantry is concerned. A situation is possible in which the proletariat and the proletarian big enterprises form a bloc with the small producers, and co-operate with them.

After a few explanatory remarks on war communism, we shall be able to see that the new economic policy is not a corrective of war communism, but that the new economic policy is the only expedient policy of the proletariat. War communism on the contrary appears to be a corrective of the new economic policy. But why is it a corrective? Because it is necessitated not by a rational economic policy, but by direct political struggle. In many cases there are conflicts between the viewpoint of economic rationality, namely between the formula of the necessity of economic policy and the necessity and expediency of direct political struggle. I told you that we took away everything from the peasants. Was this necessary? Certainly, but in what sense was it necessary and expedient? It was the necessity and expediency of war. Had we acted differently, we should have lost the war. And without victory in war further development was impossible. On the whole, war communism will probably have to be applied in many countries to a lesser or greater extent. This will be necessary, because the bourgeoisie will be able to offer energetic resistance to the proletariat. But the important point is that all our parties should be able to distinguish between political and economic expediency and that they adapt it to the situation in their respective countries.

Comrades, but I should like to say a few words on the agrarian question. This question was very fully discussed at our Congress. We have before us Comrade Lenin's theses and the results of the work of our various commissions. Nevertheless, I should like to say a few more words. There is a certain tendency within our ranks, which, I think, constitute a considerable danger. But there is already a tendency among some of our comrades to deduce from our attitude towards the peasantry, that in agriculture, there is no difference between small and big enterprises. In the face of this tendency, we must state here most emphatically that we adhere to the principle of big enterprises in agriculture. We believe that the development of big agricultural enterprises is the only means to increase agricultural production. But the solution of this problem is different now than in the pre-war period. Before the war, during the period of so-called healthy capitalism, our main task consisted in getting rid of all relics of feudalism, of sweeping away all obstacles which stood in our way. We asked: does victory belong to big or small production? Contrary to the revisionists, we said: big production is more progressive than small production.

Well, we are now in a different epoch. Our task does not consist in prognosticating the development of agriculture. Our task is to find an ally to be able to break down the power of capitalism. For this purpose we are even entitled to parcel out farms at the expense of big landed property, in order to secure an ally. For this is the main point. To win over the peasantry, we must be able to give it something, in accordance with the nature of the various countries and the social importance of the peas-

Eighteenth Session.

June 28th.

The Session was opened by Comrade Gebhardt who called upon Comrade Thalheimer to make his supplementary Report on the Program Question.

Comrade Thalheimer:

Comrades: My task will not be to present another entirely separate report, but to supplement the report of comrade Bukharin mainly by dealing with the discussions which have already taken place. It has become evident that agreement will be possible on all essential points. I will briefly recall the controversial points which played a part at our last Congress, and the position they have now reached. The first question which was discussed was the question of accumulation, that is to say, Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation. We have agreed not to formulate this for the programme, but to formulate a programme which will reach above and beyond these theoretical differences. We have not done this from any personal motives, but because a theoretical discussion must be fully worked out before one can make the whole question clear.

The second question, and perhaps the most important controversial question discussed by the last Congress during its debate on the programs, was the question of whether transitional and partial demands should be included in the general programme of the Communist International or not. This question was decided by the Fourth Congress, which resolved that the definition of the nature of and necessity for transitional and partial demands should be placed in the general programme, while the particular application of these demands in relation to concrete questions, should be left to the national programs. It is well known that comrade Lenin was in complete agreement with these decisions, and as their theoretical correctness has already been established, we do not see any reason to alter them.

The principle laid down was that transitional and partial demands cannot be excluded so long as the bourgeoisie has not been conquered, and the dictatorship of the proletariat has not been entered upon and firmly established.

I shall chiefly deal here with the debates which have so far taken place in the programme commission.

The first question which was discussed, and which Bukharin dealt with very fully, was the question of the different forms of the transition to socialism, especially the concrete questions of the NEP and of war communism. With regard to the question whether NEP could have any application to other countries beside Russia as a transition to socialism, there was no differences of opinion in the commission, everyone was in full agreement with the views developed by Bukharin. On the other hand, there was considerable discussion of the question of war communism and the part which it might have to play in other countries. The question we discussed was: Is war communism a necessary preliminary stage to NEP or not?

The second question which was dealt with, was that regarding the formula with which the fact that NEP is of general application should be expressed in the programme. The conclusion reached was that one cannot of course insert "NEP" into the programme in a concrete form; the form "NEP" itself cannot be mentioned, but the important point is to get its essential meaning into the programme.

What are the essential characteristics of NEP? They are calculation according to capitalistic methods: retention of the functions of money; retention of the form of trusts; continuance of banks and exchanges. In short, the combination of the organizational forms of capitalism with the fundamental transformation of their social significance. It may be of some interest to note here that these general forms of the transition to socialism, as we regard NEP, are already sketched out by Marx. I refer here to the third volume of "Capital," and to Marx's notes on the Gotha program, where he says that in the transition to socialism we would at first have to adapt ourselves to the economic forms left behind by capitalism, and that we shall only be able to proceed to full communism at a further stage of development, when we have eliminated those forms also.

Now as to the question of war communism, which must defend a little against comrade Bukharin. What is the nature of war communism? It can be defined as a rational

entry in these countries. For the high price we have to pay now for the progress of revolution, we will be compensated later, when we shall have the pre-requisites of dictatorship—the entire industry in our own hands. Then we shall be able to introduce more progressive forms of agriculture. Why? With your permission, I will make a very important but purely theoretical remark. One of the greatest contradictions in the capitalist of production, consisted in the gulf which existed between industry and agriculture. During that period we witnessed an ever-growing disproportion between the growth of productive forces in industry and the growth of productive forces in agriculture. Why? I am unable to give a detailed answer to this question. The most important phenomenon in this connection is the appearance of a new factor, the so-called absolute-rent. Comrades will find this subject fully explained in the third volume of "Capital". Agriculture was, so to speak, under the yoke of industry. We can and shall free agriculture from this yoke to the extent in which we get rid of this disproportionality of capitalist methods of production. If from the viewpoint of economic rationality, we stand to lose something by parcelling the estates of big landowners, we shall be compensated, and compensated generously, through the abolition of absolute rent, and the systematic intervention of socialised industries in agriculture. I think that in this connection, we must bear in mind what Lenin said in his last article. We had a special form of so-called agrarian socialism in the country-side even in the time of capitalist prosperity. This was a very peculiar ideology. It had its material basis in the growth of peasant organisations which were under the hegemony of big landowners, priests, etc. It is on this basis that the so-called agrarian and co-operative socialism developed. All this, of course, was utopian. To believe that tendencies coming from this side would develop into Anti-Capitalist organisations, was a semi-capitalist illusion. But comrades, the establishment of proletarian dictatorship changes the situation in this respect. But, under proletarian dictatorship, when industries are socialised, the growth of these institutions means that these institutions become part and parcel of the proletarian economic body.

That is why this question has a very different aspect in the epoch of proletarian dictatorship. And this is very important.

Comrades, we believe that in accordance with the decision of the Fourth Congress, we must also have a tactical-strategic section in the plan of our programme. I think that we shall have to discuss this section of our programme a little later. We will elaborate this programme, provided that comrades show a little interest in it. Surely it cannot be that the critical capacity of the International should be centered in Boris alone. This lack of interest in theoretical questions which was always a characteristic of reformist tendencies, is a dangerous symptom. Nearly in all parties, including the Russian Party, lack of interest in theoretical questions was always a sign of opportunism. We must do our utmost to combat theoretical opportunism and scepticism. There are enough forces in the International to solve also theoretical problems. (Applause.)

Seventeenth Session.

The 17th Session of the World Congress took place in the evening of June 27, in the Grand Theatre and was attended by the representatives of all the big factory nuclei of Moscow. The Presidium of the Session consisted of comrades Zinoviev, Kolarov, Gebhardt and Katayama. When comrade Zinoviev appeared on the platform he was greeted with stormy applause. Voices were heard from all parts of the hall: "Long live the leader of the Communist International, comrade Zinoviev!" There was another storm of applause when comrade Rykov appeared on the platform and began to deliver his report on the economic policy of the Soviet Union and on the results of the discussion in the Russian Communist Party.

Then the representatives of the Party nuclei of the most important factories of Moscow made speeches of welcome to the Congress and explained to it the attitude of the Moscow Party membership to the Party discussion. All the speakers assured the Congress that the Moscow workers were in full accord with the decisions of the Thirteenth Party Congress and strongly condemned the petty bourgeois digressions of the opposition.

Comrade Kolarov replied to the addresses of welcome on behalf of the Congress. He thanked the Moscow working men and women for the welcome extended to the Congress and pledged the latter to do its utmost to lead the world proletariat to victory.

centralised method of distribution, adapted to the necessities of war. The policy of military communism could never have been carried out in Russia without the resources which czarism had left behind it.

What is the distinguishing mark of war communism from the economic point of view? Abolition of money, highly centralised control, no private trading, the crippling of the small trader, and the requisitioning of agricultural produce. In order to decide whether war communism should form a feature of our programme, it is necessary to remember that war communism was not evolved from any theoretical programme drawn up beforehand by the Russian Communist Party, but simply developed out of the necessities of revolutionary strategy.

What were these necessities? They were mainly two: the first, to drive out the bourgeoisie from all those positions the economic strength of which could be utilised in the political struggle. All the strongholds of economic power which were destroyed, were not destroyed simply from the economic point of view, but from the point of view of revolutionary strategy, the end being the complete defeat of the bourgeoisie. And the necessity for this action endures so long as the power of the bourgeoisie is not really broken. It remains until the bourgeoisie has been subjugated, and placed under the control of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is the first aspect.

The second essential function of war communism, is to supply the army and the urban industrial population with food. This function must of course be closely related to the fact that requisitions of agricultural produce are not made until the peasants have had the land handed over to them by the industrial workers, so that the requisitions taken from the peasants could be regarded as a receipt given by them to the working class in exchange for the land they have received.

If we are attempting to reach a general formula for the relation of NEP to war communism, we must realise quite clearly that NEP would never have been possible in Russia unless it was preceded by a preliminary stage of war communism. It could not have been possible because the will of the bourgeoisie, and their resistance, had first to be broken, and very thoroughly broken, before they were ready to submit to the leadership of the working class. Therefore we may assert that a longer or shorter period of war communism must precede the NEP in future revolutions. If it be further asked how war communism and NEP will be modified to suit different conditions, I think we may consider the following aspects of this question:

The decision as to how far war communism can or must proceed, will depend upon the particular conditions in a given country, and also on the international conditions in which the proletariat of a particular country seizes power, that is to say, on how much fighting is necessary before the bourgeoisie is subjugated to the leadership of the working class.

It will depend upon the strength of the working class as against the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. It will also largely depend upon the international situation.

It is equally clear that the forms of the New Economic Policy will also vary in different countries, and that the general scheme, the outline of the NEP in different countries will undergo changes according to circumstances. It is both possible and probable that in countries where the capitalist system is highly developed and is much greater in proportion to the pre-capitalistic, peasant stage of production than was in Russia, the NEP may be developed much further than has been here in Russia. It depends upon the degree to which industry has been centralised, its strength in proportion to that of peasant production, its technical organization, its relation to finance capital to petty bourgeois capital, etc.

Naturally we cannot lay down all the concrete adaptations of this kind in our programme. We must be content to lay down the essential principles of the New Economic Policy, as the general form of the transition to socialism, and the essential principles of war communism, as the adaptation of economic necessity to the requirements of revolutionary strategy; that is to say, war communism must be regarded from the aspect of the defeat of the bourgeoisie, the conduct of a civil war, and of possible wars of intervention.

The commission unanimously agreed that the transition to socialism must be laid down in the programme from these points of view.

A second question which was discussed was that of the various divisions of the working class. A full report was given to the programme commission of all the various groupings of the working class in relation to its political tendencies, groupings, and parties. The main point on which stress was laid here, was naturally that of the part played by the aristocracy of labour in a period of imperialism, its relation to the superior imperialistic power of certain countries, and the relation of the aristocracy of labour to the opportunistic tendencies in the working class. But, in considering these points, it was also realized that it was not only important to distinguish these various divisions, but equally important to make it clear that these divisions are of a transitory and merely temporary nature, since the main line of development is at present proceeding in a direction which will obliterate these differences, and level down the various subdivisions of the working class into a common economic position and a common ideological attitude, thus drawing them nearer together. It must not be forgotten, in considering all these groupings, that above and beyond them there exists the fundamental identity of interest of the working class as an economic class. It is this fundamental unity of the working class, founded upon its place in the machinery of production, which must be our starting point when we set out to pass over all the divisions and differentiations of the working class, and to unite them under the leadership of the Communist Party.

We also reported upon the various types of countries. It had been decided similarly by the Fourth Congress that this description of the different countries should be made as an introduction to the national programmes, and that it should be made from the point of view of revolutionary strategy, of the conquest of political power. Comrade Varga spoke on this subject, and has also submitted a draft of the descriptions. The aspects considered here were as follows:

First, the aspect of economic development, including the following questions: 1. Whether a country may be expected to develop further under the capitalistic system or not; 2. Whether a given country has already reached its highest stage of development, or passed it; 3. The problem of the Soviet States where the proletariat has already seized power, and broken down the capitalistic framework.

Secondly, the classification of countries according as to whether they are the exploiters or the exploited in imperialistic politics; whether they are partially or wholly independent of the great imperialistic powers.

Thirdly, the class structure of the various countries, and the relative strength of the various classes in each country, of course, with special reference to the working class.

During the discussion special stress was laid upon one point which is important for us in defining our own standpoint in distinction to that of the Second International, namely the fact that one must very carefully differentiate the development of a country from the point of view of revolutionary strategy, from its development from the point of view of Socialism. The aspects which determine the transition to socialism are not the same as those which determine the transition to revolution. The important features are the technical and economic stage of industrial development, the degree of centralization, and the proportionate strength of industrial in relation to that of other non-capitalistic forms of production in the same country.

A typical instance of the way in which these two points of view can be confused, is provided by Kautsky, and showed itself in a particularly blatant way in his treatment of the question of the Russian revolution. For in Russia we can see, with the greatest clearness, the difference between the two aspects.

Where revolutionary development was concerned, our experiences have shown that Russia was far in advance of all other countries. But as soon as political power had been conquered, it soon became evident that Russia was backward, where the evolution of socialism was concerned. These two circumstances are closely related to one another.

To turn now to the agrarian question. Lenin's theses on the agrarian question at the Second Congress, and the theses of the Fourth Congress, were taken as a foundation. The points discussed were the following:

The attitude which should be adopted towards the various bourgeois projects for agrarian reform, such as that of dividing

up large estates for the benefit of poor peasants. The question was asked, what should be the attitude of the Communist programme to bourgeois plans of this kind?

The Communist Parties cannot afford to take up an attitude of neutrality or of opposition to plans of this kind, least of all when they have already gained a hold on the masses; but neither must they be dragged along at the heel of a movement of this kind, they must take up the only possible attitude, which is to drive such movements further forward, and to put forward demands which will force them on towards revolution. For instance, in relation to the bourgeois schemes for agrarian reform, the demand should be made for the distribution of land to the poor peasants without any compensation being paid for it to the owners of the large estates.

It was further discussed whether this attitude was equally suitable to a slow and a fast revolutionary tempo, whether it was required because a slowing down in the tempo of revolution had been accepted. The commission decided here that this was not the case. The fact that we are obliged to join in these movements is dictated by the revolutionary situation itself. Then the question of small and large scale farms was discussed. Superficially it might appear that by supporting the division of land at the present moment, we were approaching, in some respects, the points of view of the revisionists. But that is not the case. We look at things from the point of view of revolutionary strategy. David looks at them from the point of view of reformist politics. We define our own attitude by declaring that we take our whole stand on the necessity for largescale farming. In agriculture as in other forms of production, we aim at the development of large-scale production. This means of course that we do everything that is possible, politically and economically for this end, but we must lay stress upon it as our fundamental standpoint, because it is the standpoint necessary for the development of socialism.

Then another point which is of a certain amount of importance among Social Democrats. You are aware that among the Social Democrats the antagonism which exists between the urban worker as purchaser, and the peasant as seller of food, has been made much of in the last years. And the stress laid upon this antagonism was a means towards uniting the urban worker with the bourgeoisie against the smaller peasantry. What have we to say about this? Of course we have to admit that antagonism between the worker and the peasant does exist, where the price of food is concerned. But the difference between the worker as purchaser and the peasant as seller of food is nothing in comparison to that antagonism between the workers and the peasants together on one side and the great capitalists and big landlords together on the other. Thus far we can submit false views of the Social Democrats, to a thorough revision.

The question of land nationalization, and the part it should play in our programme was also discussed. With regard to the nationalization of large estates there is nothing to be discussed. The only question that arises is as to how far the principle of nationalization should be extended. Should it be extended to small and medium sized properties? On this question the commission decided to leave the matter open, and not to mention the nationalization of small and medium-sized properties, but to indicate in the programme that profiteering and speculation in land should be prohibited by law.

Then, comrades, there is still the national question. Firstly, how far shall the Communist Parties of oppressed nationalities make use of the right which our programme gives them for national self-determination even to the point of secession; that is, how far or under what circumstances shall they apply this programme slogan practically and politically? Well, comrades, the point of view which must serve as our criterion can only be a general point of view—that the national points of view must be entirely subjected, under all circumstances, to the point of view of the international class struggle. All these various questions must be concretely solved from this point of view.

The second question was whether the slogan of the right of self-determination was sufficient for the solution of all national questions. It was pointed out that a number of national questions existed in countries, like the United States, where there is an extraordinarily mixed population; which shows that the slogan of the right of self-determination cannot solve all national questions. Then there is the race question. The Programme Commission was of the opinion that the slogan of the right of

self-determination must be supplemented by another slogan: "Equal rights for all nationalities and races." The Programme Commission also discussed whether or not the programme should contain a definition of the conception of a nation. The Commission came to the conclusion that it was practically impossible to find a definition for the conception "nation" which would satisfy all requirements, and that for the requirements of our fight it is only necessary to have a political definition, so that we may know where we can intervene and where we can not. Of course, everything depends upon whether or not the working class of the country raises the national question. If the national question is a vital one for the working class, if it is vital for the workers and peasant-proletariat, then it is naturally vital for the Communist Party and must not be neglected.

A further question which was discussed in the Programme Commission was the question of the new form of the bourgeois governments. Fascism was discussed as a form of government on the one hand, and the Labour Government on the other. The various types of fascist government were discussed, and we came to the conclusion that fascism had already developed various national types.

The next matter that was discussed was what the next stage after Fascism would be. Various speculations were made. Must Fascism be eliminated directly by the proletarian dictatorship, or could intermediate stages arise? Comrades, the Commission was of the opinion that we cannot prophesy about this question but must leave it open, because various possibilities exist.

Then the question of the intellectuals was discussed. I will not report on this question, since it is a special point of the agenda.

Then on the role of the party, on which subject Comrade Kuusinen spoke. I will mention the following points which arose from this discussion: We all agreed that the conception of the role of the Party as represented in the Communist Manifesto is obsolete and the matter must be changed accordingly.

We had quite a thorough discussion on the question of democratic centralism, especially on the question whether or not we should retain this expression. After a long discussion on the subject, the Commission decided that we must unconditionally retain this expression because it had been clearly and precisely defined, particularly by Comrade Lenin.

The commission also made an analysis of the organizational conceptions which had been put forth by Comrade Luxemburg. The historical background of these conceptions were discussed, and the Commission came to the conclusion that the conceptions are now obsolete and are no longer advocated by anyone.

In connection with the question of the communist party another question was discussed—People's Party and Class Party. Comrades, this question played a certain role also among the social democrats, who represent themselves as the People's Party, that is, as the party which unites within itself the working class and all the other toilers. We claimed to be a People's Party but in an entirely different way. We claim to be the People's Party in that we, as the revolutionary class party of the proletariat, assumed the leadership of the toiling classes.

Comrades, another point that was discussed was that of the communist philosophy. Comrade Bukharin has already spoken in detail on this subject. The only question which was discussed in the Programme Commission was how far must we go in detail in this question. Shall we give a more or less detailed declaration or shall we restrict ourselves to giving a brief and precise statement of the standpoint of the Communist Party on this question. We decided to do the latter and to say at the place: "The Communist Party bases itself on the standpoint of dialectic materialism."

The last point, the strategy and tactical principles, has not yet been discussed in the Commission. One part of the debate has been anticipated here, and the other part will be discussed in the Commission.

In conclusion I will state: I believe that it is of significance for us that in the Programme Commission it was shown that no fundamental differences were expressed in the programme Commission. Hence Comrade Bukharin and I are of opinion that this Congress should accept the draft of the programme as outlined here in essentials, and as it will emerge

from the Commission, so that it can be sent out as the official draft of the Communist International to all its sections for further consideration, amendment and discussion. When this is done, then either an Enlarged Plenum or the next Congress should definitely adopt the programme in its final form.

Comrade Gebhardt proposed to the Congress on behalf of the Presidium to adjourn the discussion on this point of the agenda until the delegates receive the plan from the Program Commission.

The following motion was also received by the Presidium: The undersigned delegations speak on behalf of parties which from the beginning followed the Russian Party discussion with the greatest attention and with considerable concern, and which give whole-hearted support to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. They are actuated by the conviction that the proposals of the opposition will imperil the dictatorship of the proletariat and the unity of the Russian Communist Party. Therefore they maintain that the action of the Russian Communist Party opposition was directed not only against the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, but objectively (irrespective of its subjective intentions) against the interests of the entire Communist International. For, by imperilling the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Union of Soviet Republics, and by weakening the Russian Communist Party, which alone is capable of maintaining this dictatorship, it attacked the legacy of Lenin which is dear to every communist throughout the world. Therefore, the Communist International must insist on the unequivocal rejection by all members of the International and by all its Sections, of such un-Leninist conceptions, which are contrary to the interests of the world revolution, and which bring into contempt the authority of the old Bolshevik guard, which is not only the leader of the Soviet State, but also of the Comintern.

The Fifth Congress of the Communist International must endorse the decision of the Thirteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, and must state very emphatically that the views of the Russian Party opposition are petty-bourgeois, opportunistic digressions. We want to emphasise the fact that the Russian question is of great international importance.

If there are delegates who are still of a different view after comrade Rykov's report, we move that a discussion on comrade Rykov's report be opened, to enable members of the Congress who hold different views, to make their standpoint clear. We therefore, propose that a prominent representative of the opposition of the Russian Communist Party, be given two hours to open the discussion.

Signed by the German, French, British and American delegations.

This proposal was adopted by the Congress with general approval.

Comrade Dunne made the following statement on behalf of the Polish Delegation:

The majority of the Polish Delegation declares:

1. That the action of the minority of the Polish Delegation (comrade Pruchniak, Varsky, Valetzky and Kostzeva) was fractional, and did not have the consent of the Delegation.
2. In its declaration the minority omitted to explain its attitude to the Russian and German questions, which are the basis of the present crisis within the Polish leading Party organ.
3. Comrade Krayevsky, and N. Grzegorzewsky have repudiated in their speeches the attacks on the Communist deputies, and do very active revolutionary work in the Polish Sejm. Therefore the declaration of the delegation in connection with this question, was uncalled for.

Nineteenth Session.

June 28 (Evening).

Comrade Kolarov declared the session opened and announced that a deputation from the workers of Leningrad had arrived in order to convey the greetings of the proletariat of Leningrad to the Fifth World Congress. Comrade Bulygina, who was greeted with enthusiastic applause by the congress, spoke on behalf of the working women of Leningrad. Comrade Smolin spoke for the men. The Leningrad workers presented a group in costume as a present to the congress.

Comrade Anisimowa presented to the German women leather workers on behalf of the leather-workers of Leningrad a red flag which was received on behalf of the German leather workers by Comrade Wilde. Comrade Homitsch presented a red flag to the German Delegation on behalf of the rubber-workers in the Treugolnik Factory in Leningrad; this flag is destined for the workers in the aniline and soda factory in Ludwigshafen. Comrade Smolin representing the workers at the Putilov works presented a red flag to the workers at Krupps. After the presentation of the flags the delegates all rose and sang the "Internationale". Comrade Thalmann thanked the Leningrad workers on behalf of the German workers for the flags.

After this Comrade Gebhardt read a declaration made by the minority of the Swedish delegation which we will publish later.

The following protest against the persecution of revolutionaries in India by the British Labour Government was read by Comrade MacManus:

Indian Persecutions.

"A few days after four Communists had been sentenced to four years' rigorous imprisonment, 111 more arrests were made in India. Most of the men arrested are poor peasants who are charged with carrying on Bolshevik propaganda. They were put on trial on May 15th. The imperialist newspapers did not allow a word about this wholesale persecution to appear in the British press.

The fact of the matter is that unbearable exploitations have driven the Indian poor peasantry to put forth the slogan: Confiscation of Large Estates and Division of Land Among the Cultivators.

The MacDonald Government is, therefore, not only permitting the persecution of Indian Communists but is rushing to the aid of reactionary landlordism as against the militant demands of the rebellious peasantry.

The Fifth World Congress of the Communist International draws the attention of the World Proletariat and particularly of the working class of Britain to this imperialist policy of the so-called Labour Government and calls for a most energetic protest.

The Fifth World Congress expresses its solidarity with the workers and peasants of India in their struggle against Imperialism—a struggle which has become sharper when a so-called Labour Government has become the willing instrument of imperialism. It calls upon the working class of Britain to realise their duty towards these Indian workers and peasants who are persecuted and enslaved in their name and urges them to make such a protest as will compel the Labour Government to release these prisoners and to put a stop to this campaign of persecution against the Indian working class.

Moved by British Delegation,

by A. MacManus.

In the name of the Political Commission,

Ruth Fischer, Germany,

spoke on the report of Comrade Zinoviev. She said:

The resolution here presented was subjected to a thorough examination in the Political Commission and after a number of amendments, was adopted. At the request of the Political Commission, Comrade Bordiga handed in a counter-resolution, which, however, against the vote of Comrade Bordiga, was rejected, since it represented an entirely different point of view from the resolution presented by the German, Russian, French, and British delegations. Bordiga attacked not the Right tendencies and digressions, but the Communist International and the E.C.C.I. In his resolution he refers to the delayed intervention of the Executive in the German question. This is in complete contradiction to the fact. The Commission placed on record that the intervention of the Executive helped essentially to prevent a split and supported the fight against the Right tendencies. On the subject of the united front, Comrade Bordiga offers a very diplomatic formula. He divides the question of the united front

into a political question and an economic question, and rejects the economic question entirely. Comrade Bordiga, moreover, demands that the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government should be entirely abandoned even as an agitational slogan, although the Italian left had only recently adopted this slogan for agitational purposes. The Commission decided to adopt the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government as formulated by Comrade Zinoviev. Comrade Bordiga wants to apply the formation of nuclei and fusion only to the early stages. If he rejects any kind of fusion, it is a bad policy which must be disavowed. The draft of Comrade Bordiga was rejected, against his own vote, since his resolution would have offered decided support to the Right wing in the Communist International.

Comrade Ruth Fischer then referred to a number of additions which were made to the original draft and went on to say that the commission recommended the Congress to adopt this resolution with the greatest possible majority. The resolution described concretely the errors which were committed by the individual parties. The Commission asked that the attacks made by Comrade Bordiga in the Commission against the Executive by his resolution, should be rejected and that the resolution lying before the Congress should be adopted and acted upon accordingly.

Comrade Bordiga:

Ruth Fischer, in the name of the Commission, has just spoken with admirable vigour against the Italian extreme left. Her vigour is indeed astonishing in view of her reputation for being an ardent leftist, particularly in the struggles which have just taken place in our fraternal German Party. She exaggerated the extent of our attitude by lending it the character of a fight against the whole International and against the Executive Committee.

She maintains that our resolution is playing the game of the Right and the opportunists. This is not the way to regard the question. If we have felt that it is necessary to submit a resolution different to that voted by the commission, it is because we do not think that the latter gives sufficient guarantees against the Right and against the danger of opportunism from the Right.

Since the Fourth Congress many resolutions have been adopted unanimously which also failed to give these guarantees.

The Communist International must take stronger measures against the danger of revisionism.

We have adopted this revolutionary criticism in all sincerity. That is why we regret that the comrades of the German left, state that we are helping the Right. Nevertheless we shall stick to our resolution until the vote of the Congress.

Comrade Bukharin:

In the counter-proposal, comrade Bordiga puts forward his abstentionist tactics. And although we postponed the voting for a whole day to give him time to formulate his reasons for advocating these tactics, he has not done so.

Thus, we cannot argue against Bordiga, but must be satisfied with combatting Bordigaism, as expressed in our Italian Party organs. Bordiga says that he will defend the marxist viewpoint against the opportunism of the Executive. But I must say that Bordiga himself has revisionist tendencies of a peculiar form. Whatever Marx may have said, he never let the masses out of sight. This cannot be said of Bordiga and his followers. In a recent number of the "Lo Stato Operio" there is an article containing the following definition of the role of the Party: "We oppose to the terrorist minority of the bourgeoisie, the terrorist minority of the proletariat in the interests of the consolidation of proletarian dictatorship." This definition shows that the writer of the article understands the masses even less than Mussolini. We Marxists have learned, that the victory of the working class rests on its capacity to set large masses into motion against the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie. In Russia we had people who shared the viewpoint of this Bordigan comrade. But they were not the Bolsheviks, but the Socialist Revolutionists, the worst enemies of Marxism.

Comrade Bordiga referred to our pessimism, although his and his followers' conception is not exactly optimistic. Their

theses contained the following statement: "It is a childish delusion to believe that we can bring the masses over to our side while fascism is in power." Clearly comrade Bordiga's conception and that of his followers is a revisionist and not a Marxist conception. They try to transform our Party into a sect and this fundamental mistake leads to others. The International is not going to tolerate this.

What we say is: we must win over the majority of the proletariat, the more the better. The logical deduction of comrade Bordiga's and his followers' viewpoint is: the less the better.

From this follows the attitude towards the united front. Bordiga's interpretation is—that united front tactics can be proposed by us only to nonpolitical organisations of the proletariat: trade unions, factory councils, etc., but by no means to political organisations. We, think that with the growth of social contradictions, and with the growing acuteness of the class struggle, opportunist parties are bound to split, one section of them entering, into our ranks. If this be so, we must accelerate this process. A theory, which adopts the viewpoint of the minority, threatens to ruin not only the Party but even the entire labour movement of the respective country for many years to come. If we do not require the majority, what is the use of fusion, formation of nuclei and all the difficult work connected with the masses.

The Italian left wing comrades are splendid and brave fellows. They are courageous enough to deny facts, if they do not harmonise with the conception of terrorist minorities. They have not yet denied that we here had a proletarian revolution. They say that the workers' government slogan is opportunistic and harmful, and cannot lead to a victorious revolution. We want the revolution with our tactics, they lost theirs with the tactics, and now they come to us and say, that we are opportunists and they want to save us from opportunism. No, comrade Bordiga, unconsciously you want to save us from a possible victory.

As to international discipline, we read in the already mentioned organ: "There is no need for the fusionist tactics of the International, and it is essential for our Party to take up an active and decisive attitude against it. There has been quite enough talk about discipline when the International veers to the right, it is time for us to form a left fraction." We cannot help feeling that this is smacking of Trammalism.

We must oppose this very vigorously. Bordiga accused us of having artificial resolutions passed here without any discussion. And this, although we have done our utmost to give him an opportunity to explain his viewpoint.

This attitude of Bordiga is by no means new. But as long as Lenin fought against it, he submitted. To-day he says—Lenin is no more, and nothing stands in the way of forming a fraction.

We are compelled to tell comrade Bordiga and the Bordigians that what they are doing here is bound to have dangerous consequences. They already begin to use very dangerous terms, especially in connection with international discipline. We must fight very energetically against Bordiga's viewpoint, as we want to have in Italy a victory, not a defeat, a mass party, not a small heroic sect. In Italy too, victory can only be achieved with the masses on our side. Therefore, we advocate as opposed to his little groups' position, a revolutionary organisation of the proletariat, capable, under good leadership to bring the Italian proletariat to the final victory. (Applause)

Thaelmann (Germany):

Today's debate reminds me of the situation at the Fifth Congress when the majority of the delegates were united with the Russian Party in fighting against the tendencies of the Communist Labour Party in Germany. It will be remembered that Ruehle and Pfemfert have gone over since then to the side of the counter-revolutionaries, as Comrade Lenin and others prophesied that they would. Today, at the Fifth Congress a new situation has arisen. It has become evident that since the Fourth Congress opportunist deviations have manifested themselves in the application of the united front tactics and of the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government, by certain sections. We know that in the Russian question, not in the application of the tactics of the united front in the workers' and peasants' government, but in the questions of the programme of

economic policy, of proletarian democracy within the Party, and of the young guard and the old guard, strong differences of opinion exist. The tendencies of the opposition were unanimously condemned by the 13th Congress of the Russian Party, and therefore the Fifth Congress must understand how to take up a straight fight against the right. The debate on the report of the Executive showed that we have already had a certain success in presenting another opinion, have now been pursued by the Congress and have attached themselves to the left groups in various sections. The attitude taken by Bordiga in declaring that the Communist International must be pushed towards the left and that at the same time war must be waged against right tendencies, is therefore incomprehensible to the majority of the Congress.

In the theses which Bordiga submits on the tactics of the Comintern, a clear tactic is not substituted for that of the Comintern.

1) The condemnation of the tactics of the Executive, as is expressed in Bordiga's theses, is therefore in some degree contradiction with the theses of the Comintern, and objectively interpreted denotes support of the conceptions of the right wing of the International.

2) When Bordiga declares that he does not entirely reject application of united front tactics, but is of the opinion that distinction must be made between the economic and the political united front; this reminds me of the attitude of certain trade-union leaders who take the line that economics and politics do not go together. We cannot adopt this counter-revolutionary trade-union theory as a communist theory, for if we support the united front tactics in the trade-unions, we must support it also in the political sphere in view of the process of disintegration going on among the political labour parties.

The question of the united front tactics in Italy is a complicated but an important question. If the maximalists in the Italian Party are neglected and no attempt is made to win over a mass of workers for the proletarian revolution by separating them from the Socialist Party, it will be a mistake.

It is also a mistake to reject the formation of nuclei as Bordiga does. We have had great experience of this in Germany. The Communist Party of to-day became a strong mass-party in the Independent Socialist Party split.

In relation to the application of the united front tactics, I recall an incident which had great importance in Italy. At the time of the popular movement led by the "Arditi del Popolo" in 1921, the Italian Communist Party refused to make use of this movement, although Lenin expressly demanded that they should. Many parts of Italy, the comrades were even obliged, despite prohibition of the Party, to fight against this group which was not, it is true, a purely trade union or social democratic group, but was a mixed semi-bourgeois collection of workers, peasants, and small traders and which was not, nevertheless, successfully combatting fascism.

3) With regard to the slogan of the workers' government, Bordiga rejects this even as a method of agitation in the sense which it has been defined at this Congress. He is of the opinion that the dictatorship of the proletariat is weakened by the use of this synonym. There are many capitalistic countries where this could play a great part in agitation.

4) With regard to the contradictions in Bordiga's theses to the theses of the Fourth World Congress, it must not be forgotten that the Fifth Congress has strongly expressed the view that the tactics of the Executive were the right tactics, but that different conditions on different occasions have failed to apply them in practice as they were meant to be applied.

The theses of Comrade Bordiga show quite clearly that the Italian Party has not yet clearly defined its position in relation to the central and the various sections on the questions of organisation, statutes and discipline. Comrade Bordiga says that he will submit to discipline up to a certain point, that is to say up to the point, but how he will then carry out the resolutions for which he prepared to vote he has not told us.

At the Conference of Federation Secretaries held at the end of May, Comrade Bordiga, however, declared that if the Fifth Congress of the Communist International did not adopt his line, he would organise a left fraction against the wishes of the International.

Here we must speak seriously with Comrade Bordiga. If one section of the Communist International considers it necessary to go against the whole tactics of the International, and if it is said that a left fraction is to be formed against the Executive, then Comrade Bordiga must at least tell us clearly and definitely here what he meant by this conception, and how he proposes to carry it out in practice.

5) An exceptionally important question for us is, that of Bordiga's own activities in the Communist International. We must consider whether it is right that a party leader in his attempts to further the revolution should refuse to work together with the Central Committee and to carry out the decision of the Centre by accepting a parliamentary mandate. We can see in Germany how vigorously communist action in the Reichstag is proceeding, how the communist program seizes the masses by this means and how the demands of the revolutionary proletariat are made upon the parliamentary tribune. It is incomprehensible why Bordiga should pursue such a policy of abstention with regard to his party without carrying on the activities demanded by the Party, which are necessary to forward the revolution.

It is interesting that Comrade Bordiga has occupied two pages of his theses with remarks addressed to the German workers in which he declares that he does not think the German workers will understand or thoroughly digest the attitude of Comrade Ruth Fischer.

I think I may speak in the name of the German delegation when I say that the German workers understand the position of Comrade Ruth Fischer and of the German delegation perfectly well. We must not only fight against the right which we have already overcome, but we have also to overcome the so-called centre. When Comrade Bordiga tries to discredit the left, his political attitude cannot be a very truthful one. I have been asked to declare in the name of the German delegation that we are unanimously in agreement with the draft of the commission's resolutions and that we do not accept Comrade Bordiga's theses.

If a comrade takes up the position that he cannot carry out this policy, then it is naturally necessary that the World Congress should ask him what his attitude is towards discipline. The German delegation takes the view that a very definite attitude must be adopted towards the conceptions of Comrade Bordiga, and it makes the following declaration with regard to the draft resolutions of the Italian left:

"The German delegation is opposed to the resolution submitted by the Italian left.

"The Italian left is not in a position to lay down a new and clear tactical line, for the tactics of the Comintern. The criticism it has passed on the activities of the Executive stand in contradiction to the facts, and when objectively considered implies a support of the conceptions of the right wing of the International. If the Italian left, especially in the question of the united front tactics, has approached the conception of the Comintern in its resolution, it has also given proof of deviations from the conceptions and decisions of the Comintern, and these deviations must be rejected.

With regard to the question of the workers' and peasants' government, the Italian left wishes to reject this slogan even for purposes of agitation, because it is said to weaken the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This danger does not exist, as the Congress has expressly explained that the workers' and peasants' government is only to be interpreted as a method of agitation for the Soviet dictatorship.

The German delegation considers it a political mistake on the part of the Italian left not to have agreed with the resolution of the Political Commission, and to have inserted a resolution of its own. This rival statement differs from the resolution of the Political Commission in the essential point that it tries to lay the chief blame for the opportunist errors which have been committed in various sections under the leadership of the right, upon the decisions of the Fourth Congress, and the Executive.

The German delegation has already announced to the Congress the firm determination of the whole German Party to fight against all opportunist digressions, both in the German Party and in the Comintern with all its might.

The German delegation calls upon the Italian left to support this fight which is being carried on in common by the Russian, the German, the French, and other parties, with all its energy. It expects the Italian left, and comrade Bordiga in particular, to

carry out the decisions of the Congress, not merely formally, but with full conviction, in accordance with their declaration at the Plenum. It expects them not to sabotage the fusion with the maximalists and no longer to refuse to take part in party work in the leading workers' organisations."

Bordiga:

Comrade Bukharin based his remarks on an article published in an official organ of our party, an organ no longer controlled by the tendency which I represent. The article was written on the author's own responsibility. To understand the opinion of the left fraction one should read the articles signed by those of our comrades who also signed the theses expressing the left point of view. I do not think it a very serious matter that a mere workman, a comrade of our party, finding himself in an extreme left position, should have said things which were not quite correct. Nor am I trying to evade responsibility for what I have said.

It has been pointed out from several sides that our point of view regarding the general direction of the Comintern, has not been sufficiently clear. A complete scheme of theses on tactics will be presented to the commission dealing with this question by the Italian Left. What we ask is, that one of our comrades, myself for example, should be nominated as a co-reporter on this question; this would give me the opportunity of developing our thesis and clearing up points which are still confused.

The Italian Left has been accused of playing the game of the Right. It has been said that Radek has voted with me. Now that is not true. We had two resolutions and Radek voted for neither of them. What was the only resolution that Radek could have voted for? A resolution still further to the Right. Your position is an intermediate one between us and Radek, and to arrive at Radek, we should have had to pass your way.

In conclusion Bordiga said: It is a contradiction to announce on the one hand that we are anti-Marxist, terrorist, pettybourgeois, and pseudo-anarchist, and on the other hand, to summon us at a decisive historical moment to direct the proletarian movement in Italy. I am sorry to have to say that everything we have heard here, has only confirmed us in our absolute conviction that we did right in acting as we did.

Comrade Bukharin:

I would like to make the following declaration: Even if the article quoted was not written by Comrade Bordiga, it is nevertheless a symptom of the mental atmosphere produced by Comrade Bordiga in the Italian Party. For this reason the passages which I have quoted are a good argument against the politics of Comrade Bordiga. Besides, Comrade Bordiga did not say one word to disavow the opinions expressed in that article. This can be proven by various statements made by Bordiga himself.

Bordiga:

Comrade Bukharin has surrounded himself with a heap of Italian newspapers, pencil underlined, black, red, blue, etc.—but the texts which he has quoted are simply the resumé of a report of our conference. This first report was not drawn up by me and the resumé which has been made of it has entirely misrepresented my views.

The meaning of my declaration on the subject of discipline was simply this: if the International moves yet further to the right, we shall find it necessary to form within the International a left fraction. I never said anything except this.

Comrade Macchi

declared that he, as a member of the delegation of the French Party, in which he serves as organiser of the immigrant Italian Communists who are now in the French Party, on personal conviction supports the draft submitted by the Italian left wing, and that he thereby expresses the opinion of the aforesaid Italian comrades.

The congress then took a vote on the resolution. The resolution submitted by the Commission was carried by a majority of all against 8, no one abstaining.

Comrade Gebhardt reads the following telegram:

"The inter-parliamentary commission of the French and German Communist members of parliament, held at Cologne on the 22nd of June for the purpose of arranging for a common systematic fight against the Experts' Plan, sends its best greetings and wishes of successful work to the Fifth World Congress. The conference has reached unanimous decisions on all questions, which guarantee the mobilization of the French and German proletariat against the new and serious counter-revolutionary offensive inaugurated by the capitalist experts."

Twentieth Session.

June 30.

Comrade Sméral opened the session with the announcement that the Presidium is of the opinion that the work should be finished by July 8th. In order to be able to do this, the Presidium proposes that some questions be handed over to the Enlarged Executive which is to meet for two or three days immediately after the Congress. These questions are as follows: Propaganda, co-operation, work among women, International Red Aid, and questions of various sections, except the Russian section.

The programme for the remaining days of the session according to the proposal of the Presidium was adopted with two dissents.

Twenty-First Session.

July 1st, 1924.

The national question was the subject of today's agenda. Comrade Gebhardt opened the Session and called on Comrade Roy to open the debate.

Comrade Roy:

It is no longer necessary to emphasise the importance of the question of the colonial and semi-colonial lands today. Their importance has become almost axiomatic for the Communist International and its sections. Insufficient application has not been given to the question; this is not from any lack of sentimental appreciation of its importance, but because it has not been theoretically understood. The theses of the Second Congress gave us the essentials of the whole affair. We all accepted them, and professed to determine our activities by them.

I must first point out that in the resolution on the report of the Executive, there is a clause which does not correspond with the theses passed by the Second Congress. My amendment was rejected on the ground that it was not in accord with these theses, but I want to prove that it is the resolution which does not correspond with the theses, and which is totally mistaken when considered in the light of the events that have taken place since the Second Congress. The resolution says, that in order to win over the people of colonial and semi-colonial countries there must be a "further direct development of the direct contact of the Executive with the national movements for emancipation." It is true that we must always have a connection with these national movements, but it seems to have been overlooked that these connections have not always been successful. To quote again from the theses of the Second Congress: "Communist Parties must give active support to the revolutionary movements of liberation, their form of support to be determined by a study of existing conditions." For instance a movement which might have had a revolutionary significance in 1920, is not in the same position in 1924. Classes which might have been allies of the revolutionary proletariat in 1920, will not be allies in 1924. Here is the danger of a rigid formula, and the danger of our inefficiency, futility and lamentable lack of any action in this sphere. If we are to improve we must rectify this fundamental error. Again the theses of the Second Congress set us our way by pointing to the importance of a class movement. "We must try as far as possible to give the peasant movement a revolutionary character, to organise the peasants and all exploited into soviets and thus bring about the closest possible union between the communist proletariat of Western Europe and the revolutionary peasant movement of the East, and the colonial and subject countries."

As Marxists, we know that in the colonial countries, capitalism is not well developed. But there are masses of peasants and the importance of the revolutionary movement is there. The united front must be extended beyond capitalist countries to the peasants in exploited countries. And this is most important in imperialistic countries like England, where there are no peasants except in the colonies, so that without an extension of the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government to the colonies, this slogan can have no reality. The theses of the Second Congress also stated that it was the duty of the International to support the revolutionary movement in the colonies and in backward countries for the exclusive purpose of uniting various units of the future proletarian parties and educating them to the consciousness of their specific tasks, that is, to the tasks of the struggle against the bourgeois democratic tendencies within their respective nationalities.

If this is our task, then we must have direct connection with the masses, but the resolution says, that we must have direct connection with the national liberation movements. These include all sorts of classes and aims. We shall never progress if we stand by this vague formula, our failure hitherto has been due to theoretical confusion.

What practical results has our connection with the national liberation movement had hitherto? None, except in one or two cases where a nationalist State Government has had friendly relations with the Soviet State. But we are not talking of such relations, but of the revolutionary movement and the connection between the East and the West. To understand this, we must analyse the social composition of all the different classes in all these different countries, and then lay down a general law. For instance, the colonial countries themselves may be divided into at least three groups: 1) countries where feudalism is still the dominant form. 2) Semi-colonial countries having the semblance of a national State, but dominated financially and politically by imperialist countries. 3) Pure colonies completely dominated by imperialism.

The first group plays no great revolutionary role at present, because although there are frequent revolts of the masses, they are disorganised and spasmodic and frequently by reactionaries, priests, etc. It is difficult to give a revolutionary direction to them, but they should be recognised as allies supported by something more than resolutions.

In the second group, e. g. Persia, China, etc., it is also difficult to give a revolutionary direction to them, but they should be recognised as allies and supported by something more than resolutions.

In the second group, e. g. Persia, China, etc., it is also difficult to find a uniform political character among the social classes.

It is necessary to clear up a misunderstanding on one point we are going further. It is not true to say that I am in favour of determination of the toiling masses and not of self-determination of nationalities. The self-determination of oppressed nationalities must be advocated, but we must find out how they can achieve self-determination. By admitting the self-determination of oppressed nationalities, we must not admit the self-determination of the bourgeoisie without admitting that of the masses. But the proletariat alone has a right to self-determination. We must analyse social conditions in order to understand what class is going to play the important part in obtaining it. The Communist International must support national liberation movements, but for practical purposes it must find out what class is leading them, and must establish direct contacts with that class.

Manuilski said that in the last year there had been a great upsurge of the national movement in British India. As a matter of fact, last year, was a period of the worst depression in the nationalist movement there. In 1920 and 1921, this movement, led by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders struck terror into the hearts of British imperialists, but that period is now past. It is misleading to suggest otherwise, or to quote the Bombay strike as a proof of the power of the nationalist movement.

What was the Bombay strike? In any other country, it would have been considered as of the first revolutionary importance, but because it happened in a colonial country no one knows

anything about it. 150,000 men and 30,000 women struck for three months against Indian and British capitalist imperialism—it was a true revolutionary movement, and had nothing whatever to do with the national movement. Its origin lies in the conflict between Indian and British capitalistic interests in the textile trade. During the war and afterwards, under pressure from the government which desired peace, some small wage increases were given to the workers. When the owners tried to take these away, the workers refused to accept their conditions. In came the nationalist leaders—petty-bourgeois humanitarians, radicals and Fabians who still lead the trade unions—and told the workers to accept the starvation wage offered for the sake of national interests; if they did not, Lancashire cotton would come in and under-sell Indian cotton. But for the first time in history, the Indian workers repudiated their leaders, and went on with the fight. The workers were left to struggle without their leaders, people were killed by machine-guns whenever there was the slightest disturbance, the lock-out was imposed upon 83 mills, there were many deaths from starvation, and when at last a relief committee was organised, the National Congress refused to contribute to it. Such is the recrudescence of nationalism.

Manuilsky also quoted the struggles of the peasants. But these are signs of decomposition in the national movement, the form of which—the united front against foreign domination, is dead. The struggle of the peasantry is a class struggle of the exploited peasantry against Indian landlords, it is parallel to the struggle of the Indian town workers against Indian capitalists. Thus, the national movement is split. In 1920 to 21 the revolting peasantry and the proletariat were led by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, who, however, failed to understand the significance of the revolutionary forces they have called into action. Now this nationalist movement is split by a class struggle. With which class are we to have our "direct contacts"?

The petty-bourgeois are still linked in thought with feudalism and landlordism and are separated from the masses, but if we organise the peasantry and the workers they will force the pace for the petty-bourgeois, who are now ready to compromise with imperialism for the sake of peace and money. If they find that by fighting for more, they gain support from the masses in their fight, they will grow bolder and less inclined to compromise. No foreign country can dominate another unless it first wins over a section of the people. This imperialism has always done, choosing sometimes one class and sometimes another. In India where national capitalism is growing rapidly, the national bourgeoisie has been won over to support the Empire and has even demanded in a recent manifesto that military power and foreign relations should remain in the hands of the British Government. Because the Indian bourgeois knows better than anyone else that the discontent of the masses is economic and not nationalistic, the exploiting class in India demands protection from the exploited. Indian capitalism is running straight into the arms of British imperialism and the same tendency will soon be seen in other countries.

He then turned to the question of Egypt, and pointed out that Zaghlul, who is now in power there, had used more revolutionary phrases than anyone, and had been accepted by the Egyptian people as their leader. But Zaghlul came into power by exploiting the nationalist movement of the masses, and he was still merely exploiting them. They had supported him without asking for anything for themselves, and they were getting nothing—neither economic nor political change. The whole Central Committee of the Egyptian Communist Party were in jail, where they were being brutally ill-treated. Thus, we see that a nationalist government can be in power without any nationalist liberation. Nationalist liberation can only take place when imperialism is overthrown and the Egyptian proletariat though young and inexperienced must lead the peasantry in this task. The communist attitude towards the Egyptian bourgeois and petty-bourgeois should be to encourage them to fight against imperialism, and to put forward always stronger demands, supporting them in refusing compromises.

In conclusion Roy said that the direct contact of the Comintern must be with the social class which is most revolutionary, and the separate conditions of each country must be analysed from this point of view. Every section of the International must be given its special task, in order that national sections may not be reproached again with the negligence which has not been their fault.

Comrade Katayama:

Comrade Lenin gave a new meaning to the national question, which became one of the fundamental policies of the Communist International. That the Second International is nothing but a tool of imperialism was shown by its policy towards the national question. The Communist International knows that without the overthrow of imperialism, world revolution is impossible, and the struggle of the colonies and semi-colonies is inseparable from the struggle of the proletariat of the imperialist countries.

There are several types of nationalist movements, depending on internal conditions in the country, and the task of the Communist International is to formulate the correct tactics with reference to each type of nationalist movement. "Workers' and Peasants' Government" is the most important slogan for the proletarian national movement.

The position of Japan in the Orient is of great significance for the revolution in the East because Japan is the only capitalist-imperialist country in the Orient. The war and the earthquake seriously affected Japan's international prestige, as manifested by the American immigration law passed recently, and Japan is beginning to turn to Soviet Russia and China to combat Western imperialism. Thus the C. P. of Japan has an important task, for upon it depends the revolutionary fate of the whole Orient. The C. P. is growing in influence and has forced connections with the movements in Korea and China.

It is the duty of the Workers' Party of America to make use of the growing nationalist movement in the Philippines.

The recent immigration laws passed in America indicate the growing struggle between American and Japanese imperialism. The pretext that the law was passed to protect the American worker against Oriental competition must be pointed out to the Japanese and American workers. The law is also an expression of the monopolistic-spirit of the American bourgeoisie.

We must fight such immigration laws in accordance with the spirit of the theses of the Fourth Congress. We must explain the significance of these laws to the proletarians of both countries, Japan will tend to utilise the discrimination against all Orientals in its Imperialist designs, and the workers of the whole Orient must be warned against this plan.

Boschkowitsch (Yugoslavia):

The State of the Serbians, Croats and Slovenians, was formed as a result of the military collapse of Germany and Austria. The strongest national element are the Serbians who constitute 39% the next strongest are the Croats and Slovenians, next come 6% of Moslems, 5% Macedonians, 4% Germans, 4% Hungarians, and so on. The democratic ideas of the Yugo-Slavian bourgeoisie are of quite recent origin. In 1917/18 it claimed that the Serbians and the Croats were one nation, while after the war and the revolution the Serbian and Slovenian bourgeoisie claimed to be a homogeneous nation, and together they suppressed the revolts of workers and peasants. After the failure of the Russian offensive on Warsaw, and after the collapse of the revolutionary movement in Italy, the struggle began between the Serbian bourgeoisie on the one hand and the Croatian and Slovenian on the other hand. Now the idea of three different nations emerged. At the same time a reign of white terror was inaugurated under the most pronounced hegemony of the Serbian bourgeoisie. In August 1921 the Defence of the Realm Act was promulgated, and communist propaganda was made punishable by 20 years imprisonment or by the penalty of death. The internal politics of Yugo-Slavia were much influenced by Soviet Hungary and by the German and Russian revolutions. When our Party was made illegal, it transpired that it had not taken sufficient stock of the role of the national press. Unfortunately, there was far from complete unity in this respect among a considerable number of our comrades.

England and France are the principal imperialist powers in the Balkans which are now facing the menace of a new war. It is therefore our particular task to inaugurate a campaign against the war, particularly in connection with the national question. We must form a united front with the petty bourgeois parties and the peasant organizations, particularly with Raditsch's party, for common action against the hegemony of the Serbian bourgeoisie.

Kreibich (Czecho-Slovakia):

In connection with the National Question too we should not omit to point out that the solution of the question will be made possible only through the proletarian revolution, for it is our duty to dispel the illusions of the national emancipation fight. The new national states are living proof of the bad economic, political and national solution of the national question by the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the solution of the national question by the idea of a union of socialist Republics is clear proof that the proletarian revolution will bring about national emancipation.

Neither is it to us a debatable question that the oppressed nations and national minorities must be accorded the right of self-determination, even to the extent of secession from the State. But the proclamation of this right does not mean that we must, as a party, in every acute situation declare ourselves invariably in favour of separations. We shall have to decide in every individual case as to the proper slogan which we as communists should advance. Of deciding moment to us in this respect will be the proletarian class interest, the interest of the proletarian revolution.

Let me cite the practical instance of the Czecho-Slovak State. Here we had to consider first of all, that a national State like Czecho-Slovakia, even if it oppresses national minorities, ought not to be classed with the old and mighty imperial States. In regard to Carpathian Russia, the Czecho-Slovak bourgeoisie plays only the part of the oppressor. Here the political demand in our daily struggle will be based on the standpoint that Carpathian Russia, like Eastern Galicia, belongs only to the Soviet Republics, and that this is the only revolutionary slogan for the national liberation struggle in Carpathian Russia. Here the aim of the national movement is obviously in keeping with the interests of the proletarian revolution.

Of course, only existing national movements and liberation struggles can be made use of for our communist politics, we can neither invent nor engineer such movements and struggles. Slovakia, for instance, there exists a strong movement in favour of autonomy; in this movement we can acquire the leadership and expose the reactionary and illusory nature of the bourgeois autonomy movement. But there is no separation movement. Slovakia, for an independent Slovak State under a capitalist regime would merely be the playball between Poland and Hungary and would only aggravate the economic and political plight of the working masses in Slovakia. In a proletarian State, Slovakia would almost naturally be merged into the economic sphere of Hungary, while in the event of a proletarian revolution in Hungary, a Slovakian *irredenta* could play a revolutionary part in our fight against the capitalist republic of Czecho-Slovakia.

Quite different again is the situation in the German populated districts of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. Here we have an irredentist movement. This is due to the fact that these districts ever since the beginning of the capitalist era, were in no way particularly allied with Germany, and that for centuries the districts were economically identified with Czechia. First of all, it ought to be observed that German Bohemia is a highly developed industrial district, so that there there can be no question whatever of the oppression of an economically backward country by alien capitalism. The peculiar geographical, economic and strategical position of German Bohemia renders quite complicated the question of its separation and incorporation with Germany. To a proletarian Germany a Bohemia torn from its bourgeois Czecho-Slovak Republic would merely be a dangerous handicap, because its incorporation with Germany could be attained only through a war with Czecho-Slovakia. But a German revolution would have its hands full to defend its territory and to liberate the territories that were taken away from Germany. On the other hand, the revolution in Czecho-Slovakia would lose valuable militant forces.

But if a victorious proletarian revolution should take place in Czecho-Slovakia before it does in Germany, we would have to do our utmost to suppress an irredentist movement in the German districts, which would only be of a counter-revolutionary nature, because the separation of these districts and their annexation to a capitalist Germany would compel the proletarian Czecho-Slovak State to capitulate to the Czech capitalists.

As communists, we shall fight for the self-government of the German districts, for national equality, and for the removal of national domination by the so-called State nation, which means

reality the Czech bourgeoisie, but our fight for the national liberation of the oppressed peoples and national minorities cannot be conducted in such a way as to result in the restoration of the national oppression of peoples. It was just such a fight for liberation that was waged by the Czechs and the Slovaks in the past, which was certainly not less justified and not less revolutionary than the national liberation fights with which we now want to identify ourselves.

Sommer (Germany):

Comrades Manuisky and Roy were right in emphasizing the necessity of a concrete treatment of the national question, if the question of self-determination is to be dealt with in a truly revolutionary spirit. If we had never left out of sight comrade Lenin's formula on this question, it could not have happened that, under the cloak of self-determination, a practice had crept into the Third International which is reminiscent of the worst social traitor traditions of the Second International.

Comrade Manuisky said that comrade Neurath and myself made the best fight against Thalheimer and Radek in the Ruhr question, but he did not make the contentious question of Neurath's and my contention was—that this was not a question of a national fight of the oppressed German people, but a question of the continuation of the imperialist war. Thus, it is a question of Lenin's formula: transformation of the imperialist war into civil war. But Thalheimer and Radek were of the opinion that the Ruhr war could not be an imperialist war, because there is no longer such a thing as German imperialism. Therefore, we ought to consider the question if it is possible for us to go part of the way with bourgeois nationalism. We were attached on the strength of Lenin's criticism of the Ruhr pamphlet which says that a national war in Europe is out of the question, if one of the belligerent groups suffers crushing defeat and the labour movement meets with a serious setback. It requires courage to refer to this quotation at a time when the rising wave of powerful mass actions brings the question of social revolution to the fore. In May, 1923, when the great Ruhr strike broke out, and when the Ruhr proletariat discharged its task, a statement appeared in the "Rote Fahne" declaring that it was not in the interest of the German Communist Party that the Cuno government should fall as long as social-democratic workers were not ready to fight for the overthrow of the government. This is a social-democratic theory, which interprets the struggle against the imperialist government at the Ruhr as support of foreign imperialism. The Congress must put an end once and for all to such misinterpretations of the self-determination formula.

I should like to point out that in Upper Silesia we were forced to solve the national question on proletarian lines, and to conduct the defensive of the German and Polish bourgeoisie in the Ruhr district.

Comrade Kreibich asserted at the Congress, and comrade Thalheimer did so even more emphatically in the press, that in Czecho-Slovakia it behoves the Communist Party to treat the national question in a way not detrimental to the independence of the Republic. It is a queer thing, this republican independence, which is nothing but the integrity of the Czecho-Slovakian States. We do not at all consider as an embodiment of the right of self-determination of the Czech and Slovak nation, but as a bulwark of French imperialism. It is self evident that we must make common cause with the Czecho-Slovakian State, but our interpretation of the national right of self-determination must dissociate itself completely from the bourgeois interpretation, otherwise we will get into the morass of social-patriotism. We must see to it that Communist Parties steer clear of any compromise with bourgeois nationalism on the question of self-determination.

Comrade Jackson (America):

The most significant recent development in connection with the Negro question in America is the migration of Negroes from the south of the United States to the north. During the war they were attracted by high wages, but there is more than a temporary economic basis for this migration. It is the expression of a growing revolt of the Negroes against the persecutions and discriminations practiced against them in the south. The effect of this migration to the north is that the Negroes, because of

the higher standard of living they find in the north, and because they are unorganised, become the tools of the exploiters against the white workers, whose standard of living decreases as a result of Negro competition. The recent race riots are due directly to this economic development and not to anti-race feeling.

The Negro problem is a peculiar psychological problem to the communists. The Negroes are not discriminated against as a class but as a race. Even the wealthy bourgeoisie among the Negroes suffer from persecution, and a peculiar Negro culture and peculiar psychology have developed. The ideas of Marx have spread only slowly among the Negroes, because the socialists and even the communists have not realised that the problem must be dealt with in a specialised way. The same newspapers do not satisfy the needs of the Negro worker which suit the needs of the white. The same speeches, propaganda, literature, will not suffice. The Negro feels no antagonism to communism, but wants to know how it will satisfy his peculiar needs.

In February of this year a Congress took place where all Negroes of all classes were represented. It was dominated by petty-bourgeois Negroes, but the communists were able to insert a few class ideas into the programme.

The Negroes are destined to be the most revolutionary class in America, but communist propaganda among the Negroes is hampered by the lack of publicity carrying a special appeal.

The Negroes in the south are engaged primarily in agriculture, and an agricultural movement is developing there, which the communists must exploit to the full.

Comrade Guilbeaux:

I think that the problem of the nationalities and the oppressed peoples is one of first-class importance.

Lenin attached special importance to the study of this question, in fact, the national question played a very important part in the Russian Revolution. The situation of the Ukraine and of Turkestan, among others, permitted Lenin to compose the theses which he submitted to the Second Congress of the International. After having emphasised the fundamental differences in the attitude of the Second and the Third Internationals to this question, Lenin pointed out that 70% of the populations of the globe are dominated by 30%. The emancipation of the oppressed peoples is just as important as the adhesion of the poorer peasants to the social revolution and to communism.

Lenin distinguished two movements: the bourgeois democratic movement, which must be combated, and the revolutionary national movement which the Communist International must encourage.

In his report Manuisky puts forward an excellent application of the theses of Lenin, namely, to constitute revolutionary peasant parties in intimate contact with the communist parties.

When Comrade Manuisky put his case, he might have observed a certain agitation among the French Delegation. Nevertheless, Manuisky's reproaches were more than justified. It is true that Jaures, whose conceptions however belong to the Second International, had done more to combat French Imperialism, than the Communist Party.

The imperialism of Britain and France are the most specific and the most powerful. The two parties, the British and the French, must carry on a determined fight against the capitalism of their countries, which dominates a great portion of the universe. The British Party has done very little by way of a campaign in favour of a revolutionary movement in the colonies. But the British Party is small numerically. I think we should be much more severe with the French Party, which counts 60,000 adherents.

Just as on the question of parliamentarism and the Party press, the French Communist Party displays passivity and reformism on the imperialist and colonial question. A colonial Commission was once appointed by the Party. What has this Commission done? The Party must elect an investigation commission, consisting of two or three comrades, who will undertake to travel about in the various French colonies and study on the spot how to create centres of education and propaganda.

The Party should have adopted a far greater number of native candidates at the recent legislative elections. There should have been in the parliamentary group some representatives of

the backward countries who are suffering under the yoke of French imperialism and who would have denounced the misdeeds of so-called civilisation. It required a month for "Humanité" to make up its mind to publish the first open letter of Roy to MacDonald. The information and articles published by the Party press on the imperial and colonial question, are far from adequate.

"Humanité" has scarcely said a word about the Balkan Question, the importance of which has been emphasised by several speakers at the present Congress. Even on the Albanian problem, where we find expressed the conflicts between Turkey, Greece, Italy, and America, "Humanité" confined itself to certain communications from the bourgeois press agencies, and that is all. The French bourgeois press displays the interest of imperialist France in Syria. France, who obtained a mandate

from the League of Nations, has established in Syria, as in Morocco, a powerful centralised organisation, and regularly spends enormous sums.

Russia is a marvellous laboratory in every respect. In the vast territories of the U.S.S.R. one can study what our Russian comrades have done in the interests of the proletariat and the poor peasants, as well as in the interest of the populations which have long been backward and oppressed. It is now certain that the revolutionary struggle will extend throughout the East and the colonial countries. I express the hope that the comrades in the western countries and especially the French comrades will study the full meaning of the problems which have been raised and already solved by the Russian Revolution. The final emancipation of the proletariat cannot be accomplished without the assistance of the backward and oppressed peoples.