

What will the co-operative democrats have to object against these elementary democratic demands? Do they not correspond to the actual fact that a considerable portion of the co-operative members, on the trade union field, are tending not towards Amsterdam but Moscow, and on the political field not towards the International of social traitors but to the International of revolution?

Thus the organ of the English co-operative societies, the "Co-operative News" of May 17, contains a direct provocation of the communist members, when it points out that probably at the next Congress in Ghent the demand will be put forward that connections be set up with the Moscow International and that the acceptance of this proposal would have serious complications in all continental countries and also in England, which would jeopardise the whole future of the Alliance. We agree with this journal when it goes on to say that all affiliated bodies should cast their vote at the election of the Executive Committee of the Alliance in order to ensure that the Alliance shall possess the real authority of its constituent bodies.

We trust therefore that the co-operatives in all countries will lose no time in providing their members with full information regarding the approaching Congress and will alter the old methods of election. Up to the present, however, we notice that the election of delegates is carried out behind the scenes in committees. The election of delegates, however, concerns the democratic right of self-determination of the members.

Therefore, members:

1. Demand an immediate general meeting of your co-operative society!
2. Demand information regarding the agenda of the Congress!
3. Elect from your own ranks reliable class conscious comrades, who at Ghent will see to it that the International co-operative movement does not become a reformist play-thing, but a powerful factor in the working class fight for emancipation.

## Special Number

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 49

24<sup>th</sup> 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, Schlessfach 29, Vienna VIII.  
Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr. Vienna.

## The V. World Congress of the Communist International

### Continuation of Discussion on Report of the Executive.

#### Thirteenth Session.

(Evening)

June 25th.

Comrade Stewart opened the Session and called upon Comrade **Piccini** (Italy).

Events are occurring in Italy at the present time, the extent of which cannot be estimated. It is not impossible, that a complete reversal of the situation may occur. If our Party can place itself at the head of the movement, it is possible that a decisive struggle with fascism may develop. The proletariat is aware that an enormous amount of revolutionary energy exists among the Italian masses, and it knows that, if the wave of revolution will not merely sweep away the fascist dictatorship, but the whole bourgeois regime, a large section of the bourgeoisie will attempt to turn the fascist dictatorship into the path of democracy. It is possible that fascism may choose a third way, that of a new dictatorship upon Rome, in order to consolidate its position. The proletariat has again become conscious of the fact that the decisive factor in the political life of Italy. The class struggle is again beginning to flare up. It is certain that, at the next opportunity, the proletariat will again take up the struggle and carry it on to a decisive fight, which will lead it to victory. Comrade Piccini here read a **Manifesto to the Workers of Italy** (entitled "The Crimes of the Fascists").

**Ercoli** (Italy).

Spoke on behalf of the Centre group, explained why this group had detached itself from the left wing with which it was united in the early years of the Party. He said:

This was published in No 39 of the Inprecorr.

At the moment when the Communist Party was formed, an agreement was reached between us and Bordiga, because we shared in his conviction that our Party must be based on the struggle against the "right" and against the centre. We are still convinced to-day that it is the only basis upon which a Communist Party can be developed in our country. Bordiga was reproached by the International with having given to the Italian Party a theoretical basis which limited its manoeuvring ability, and which detached it from the movement of the masses and from the objective developments.

Our Party was constituted at a time when the defeat of the labour movement in Italy was inevitable. Under such circumstances the new party was faced with a problem of life and death, and the policy pursued by the leaders in the first years was a good one, even if it was not in full accord with the policy of the International.

To-day the conditions of the proletarian movement in Italy are profoundly different from those of two years ago. Our Party has won for itself an unshakable position among the best sections of the working class, but it must now shoulder the task of becoming a mass party. This problem cannot be solved unless we give up the theses of Rome, and unless we modify the spirit in which the Bordiga group has been leading the Party in recent years.

Zinoviev spoke of a choice between Bordiga and the Communist International. We hope that we may be spared the necessity of making this choice.

We shall now state our opinion on Zinoviev's report. On the whole we are in agreement with his report, which furnished a basis for complete definition of the points on which the Fourth Congress and the Enlarged Executive of June left the doors open to "right" deviations. But we also ask that we should not content ourselves with a formula, but that we should endeavour to define its political and historical value.

Rossi declared himself ready to accept the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government, if it is merely a question of words. The truth of the matter is, that in order to get important strata to fight for the conquest of power, we must carry out a manoeuvre. There are comrades who say that the manoeuvring should be limited now that we no longer have a leader like Lenin. Our answer is that Lenin did not map out a line of tactics to suit himself alone but for the places and times, in which there are solid communist parties that are closely connected with the working class. The Fifth Congress must lay down the basis on which such Parties could be formed throughout Europe.

For these reasons we are in agreement with the conduct of the Central Committee of the Russian Party in regard to the opposition.

Finally, we are against any proposal to accept the Italian socialist party into the International as a sympathising party, in the form and on the conditions adopted at the Enlarged Executive of June.

#### Katayama (Japan):

The Japanese delegation is in agreement with the report of comrade Zinoviev, but regrets that he made scarcely any mention of the Eastern question. Comrade Varga's report and thesis is also incomplete, it takes account of no other countries except Europe and America and never makes even mention of the serious depreciation in the Japanese currency. He should write another report or else change his title to "Report on the European and American economic situation". His report is not a report on the "world situation".

We consider that the slogans of the united front and of the workers' and peasants' government as defined by Zinoviev are quite correct so long as they are interpreted in a revolutionary manner. They are also suitable for the East though they cannot be applied there as they are in the West. For in the Eastern countries the agrarian problem is by far the most important of all, the capitalist system has not yet developed there, they are countries exploited by the imperialists. It might be said that in the East the mass of the workers are all peasants, but in India, China and other Colonial countries capitalism has, since the war, begun to develop. Therefore the slogans of the workers' and peasants' government can be adopted and its application to the past should be carefully studied.

As to the united front this should be a united front of all the Sections of the Comintern against Imperial oppression in the East and in the Far East, and should be led by the Comintern. Hitherto there has been no connection between those Sections of the Comintern which belong to the exploiting countries of the West and those belonging to the exploited countries of the East. There is a danger of approaching these questions from the petty-bourgeois nationalistic point of view.

With regard to comrade Bordiga's doubts as to the Russian leadership of the Comintern, comrade Katayama pointed out that in the last five years Soviet Russia had grown into a strong country even speaking only in the economic point of view. Indeed it must have become one of the strongest countries in Europe, because, though the United States Government would not recognise it, American capitalists—Wall Street—were quite ready to recognise Russian credit. In January the chervonetz stood higher than the English pound.

The government of Soviet Russia is a Party Government, a government of the Bolshevik Party, and the strength of Soviet Russia is the strength of the Comintern. When we look to see if the **Nep** will succeed or not, do not let us forget that **Nep** is controlled by the dictatorship of the proletariat, that capitalism in Russia is harnessed and exploited by the workers, it is a tenant of Soviet Russia and is guided and controlled by the strongest Party in the Comintern. I am against the leadership of the world revolution by any other Party of the Comintern than the Russian Party.

#### Montefiori (Australia)

said that the tasks before the Australian Party were in many respects similar to those before the British Party. Both had the task of affiliating the Communist Party to the Labour Party, both had the task of forming a united front of the workers and both were attempting to become real live Parties.

But the Communist Party of Australia had greater difficulties to face than the English Communist Party. These were due partly to the size of Australia, which was larger than the U. S. A. and 25 times larger than England, Ireland and Scot-

land. Yet the population was only 5½ millions, and was scattered chiefly among the large towns on the coast.

The Australian trade-unions also were extremely conservative and had always strongly held to the "White Australia" theory. They believed that coloured labour would lower the standard of the Australian worker. The Communist Party had to prove to them, especially in view of capitalist development of the vast importance of the Pacific problem at the present time that when Marx said "workers of the world unite", he did not mean to say, "white workers of the world unite." Australian workers must learn that the communist was not trying to introduce cheap labour but to unite the workers of the world against the capitalist offensive.

As an instance of the constructive work done by the Australian Communist Party, comrade Montefiori quoted a telegram to the "Times" (London) stating that the two capitalist parties, the National party and the Country party, were joining forces in order to fight labour. What had aroused the alarm of the capitalists was the likelihood of the Communist Party getting into the Labour Party and forming a left wing in the immediate future. Comrade Montefiori also quoted from the "Australasian" a capitalist paper which had stated just when the Australian Labour Conference was about to deal with the question of communist affiliation, that two courses were open to the sections of the labour party which opposed communism: 1) to reject communists by personal violence (Here was a proof that fear was already known in Australia), 2) to adopt a resolution excluding them. Either course, this capitalist newspaper pointed out, would split the labour party into two almost equal sections for so far the anti communists had only prevailed by a narrow majority.

Another instance of the progress of the Communist Party in its attempt to form a united front was provided by a resolution recently adopted by the miners of New South Wales to the effect that the Australian Labour Party was broad enough to embrace all phases of working class thought and that in view of the forthcoming State and federal elections, of the chaotic economic position, the amount of unemployment, and the frequent attacks made on the trade unions, all parties should fight as one. This was considerable hope that labour would win both in New South Wales and in the Federal elections. Labour governments also existed in Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia and it was likely that the Labour party would win the proposal to admit communists in the hope of winning the elections. The question of affiliation was to come before an all-Party Conference this month.

Australia had already experienced several labour governments, and communists knew how very little these governments had been able to do. In 1911 and 1912 the New South Wales labour government, led by Mr. Holman, a lawyer, and the Federal labour government, led by Mr. Hughes, a lawyer, came to power. Both these lawyers became imperialists when they broke out.

Experience of this sort had produced a far more revolutionary spirit in the Australian Labour Party than in the British Labour Party, and to an Australian it would seem ridiculous to call the present Labour government in Australia a Labour government at all. Although Ramsay MacDonald had declared that they were not only in office but in power, he had just advised the king to appoint as governor of Western Australia, where a labour government is in power, a Tory soldier. Why had not the British Communist Party criticised and protested against the imposition of a Tory soldier upon the Labour Government of Western Australia? Such a protest would have been received with the greatest enthusiasm in Australia and would have helped to strengthen the Communist Party.

The Communist Party of Australia sent a special message to their comrades in all the countries bordering on the Pacific, assuring them that no communist supported the colour bar. And if the Communist Party of Great Britain would take an interest in the Pacific and in Australia, the way would be opened towards the formation of a true mass party and the workers would understand what revolution meant and rally to its cause.

#### Semann (Java):

Comrade Zinoviev was right when he said that the European Communist Parties must work in close co-operation with the Colonial Communist Parties. Comrade Wynkoop said that the Dutch Communist Party has been very active in the colonies, but this is not really so. If the movement in the colonies is strong, this is not due so much to the influence of

of the Party, as to the influence of the Russian revolution. In the work in the Dutch colonies was greatly impeded by the divisions within the Dutch Communist Party. When the women's strike broke out in Java last year, the party was split in settling its dispute with the National Trade-Union Federation (N.A.S.). The strike ended in failure and scores of comrades were imprisoned. Therefore, our advice to the Dutch Party is—that they work more energetically in future, and to the Executive that they pay more attention to the colonies.

#### Kreibich (Czecho-Slovakia):

None of us would dispute the obligation of the Communist International to criticise right and left digression and to indicate political directions to the sections. But the manner in which this is done is by no means a secondary consideration. It has become the habit to attach very great importance to resolutions, resolutions and occasionally also to old theses, while neglecting to examine and analyse the actual work of the Parties in the economic and political perspective in the respective countries. Our election victory shows that our Party has not made a mistake. Our comrades at home expect to receive from the Executive fresh advice and directions for their future political activities.

I also think that workers, whose time is taken up with their work and fighting, will hardly understand that a Party's programme to the Russian and German question is a fit criterion for judging the Party.

In connection with the German question, many of us had the impression that it was more a question of sending scapegoats into the wilderness, than investigating thoroughly the work of the German Party and of the Communist International, in order to find out what mistakes we all of us made in connection with the German question. At the present juncture, the Executive and all the other Sections of the Comintern must give their hearty support to the German Party and its leading organ. There must also be in future closer collaboration between the German Party and the Parties of other countries.

I cannot help saying that the forecast of the future given by comrade Varga's report is much too vague. I mean that his report holds out no prospect of any consolidation of the situation or of a temporary peaceful period for the development of the world.

In the question of the united front from above or from below, the main point is whether the social democratic workers are determined to fight, and also the methods which we must use to give them an opportunity to fight.

The assumption that the workers' government might be a form of government for the period of the consolidation of capitalism, is in my opinion erroneous and groundless, for such a period it would be quite impossible. A workers' government can only be contemplated for the revolutionary period. It is a last resort, a final move on the chess-board and a last manoeuvre during an acutely revolutionary period to induce the leadership of the working masses to accept the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

#### Comrade Wolfe (Mexico)

that the United States had now become the centre of gravity of world capitalism and of world reaction. It was J. P. Morgan who stopped the fall of the franc; it was General Dawes, his younger brother, who was arranging a mortgage of Germany. It would be increasingly clear to the European Proletariat that it was a dangerous enemy in the United States. The attention of the European proletariat should be drawn to the fact that in the United States American peoples it and the Communist International have a potentially powerful ally. It appeared that the Communist International did not sufficiently realize this. Comrade Zinoviev's report on the American Party mentioned its struggle against the imperialism of the United States in the Philippines, but made no mention of the economically and politically more important imperialism of that country in Latin America.

The population of Latin-America was equal to that of the United States. One of the reasons why the crisis that Comrade Zinoviev had expected in the United States three years ago did not materialize, was that when European markets had failed, Latin-America had provided the United States with markets as well as a sphere for the exportation of excess capital. The United States now had four billion dollars invested in Latin-

America. Further, its countries were a rich source of raw materials including the petroleum so important to imperialist hegemony.

Comrade Wolfe told how the United States had invaded with its troops a half dozen American countries, how in those and other lands of Latin-America it had set up financial overseers with a mission similar to that of Dawes in Germany, how in other American countries it had financed revolutions and set up autocracies. This had engendered an ever-growing discontent and antagonism against the United States. Santo Domingo, for example, had gone six years without a president because the United States had been unable to find a single Dominican willing to accept the post of the president it had deposed.

Revolts against autocracies set up by the United States were brewing in Venezuela and Peru, and might be expected this year. Owing to the lack of a central agency for the Communist Parties of the two continents, the American Party did not even know that revolts were imminent in those countries. No Communist Party had issued a call to revolt to the proletariat of those two lands, but a liberal intellectual, the Minister of Education in Mexico, had. To the Latin-American mind, bourgeois liberals such as LaFollette and Borah had up to now represented the struggle against American Imperialism and the championing of their rights, in place of the Communists' representing that championship.

Samuel Gompers, of President of the Pan-American Federation of Labour, recently defended the occupation of Haiti by American troops and regularly defended American imperialism. This could be used as a means of arousing the Latin-American labour movements against him and thus unseating him as president of the Pan-American Federation. Such a move could only be made if we had some continental centre to take charge of continental problems in the two Americas.

The Profintern would find it easy to affiliate the Latin-American labour movements. Amsterdam had no real strength in those countries. It was a question of domination by Gompers, by the Anarchists, or by the Red International. Affiliation had been secured almost without a fight in Chile, and in Argentina, in two years the Profintern had won forty per cent of the membership. The work of the Communist International and the Red International had been defective during the past year, through lack of a Spanish-language press, lack of a central agency and other causes. The growing importance of America in the domination of Europe made it imperative that more attention should be given by the International to Latin-America, and the organizing of continental resistance to American imperialism. The European and American Proletariats and the International would find valuable allies there.

#### Bordiga (Italy):

We are discussing a report on the activities and tactics of the Executive Committee during the time which has passed between the Fourth and Fifth Congresses. I find that in this congress a general discussion on tactics was necessary. At the Fourth Congress a draft theses on the question of tactics was adopted, but there was not a real discussion on tactics as at the Third Congress. At present this discussion will be necessary, but we are now faced with a debate of a quite different order, because it is one thing to discuss the line of tactics of the International in general and it is another to discuss only the tactics which the International has applied during the period between the last congress and the present one.

One other remark. We must discuss the whole activity and tactics of the International, on the report of the Executive. In reality one does not state the case of the Executive Committee, but it is always the Executive Committee which states the case of each Party (applause and laughter). And each orator who comes to the International Congress replies only to that which Comrade Zinoviev has been able to say about the affairs of his party. He remains within the restricted boundaries of his national affairs.

Comrade Zinoviev has given us a review of the world situation with which in general one is in complete agreement. I agree that the situation seems momentarily to point towards a left bourgeois policy, but I do not think that this indicates that the capitalist offensive has ceased or relented. We think that the capitalist offensive may be carried on by very varied methods. There the method of the right, which is open reaction, martial law and terror against the communist movement. There the method

of the left, which is the fable of democracy, the illusion of class collaboration. But these two methods aim at the same end.

The conclusions with regard to the capitalist crisis, which we were led to declare at the previous congress, namely, that the bourgeoisie was compelled, in order to safeguard its power, to hurl itself in a violent offensive against the working class, remain true today.

The social democratic policy has become the policy of a third bourgeois party. Fascism is not the simple traditional reaction of martial law and of terrors, it is a movement much more modern more cunning, more expert, and it tends to appeal to certain strata of the masses. We draw attention to the fact that the two methods of the bourgeois offensive are uniting, and that the social democrats and the fascists are together conducting a violent offensive against the revolutionary movement. It is against this offensive that world communism must fight.

What deductions must one draw from this? It is necessary to declare that the work of the Communist Parties consists not only in carrying on the propaganda of our maximum program and our Marxist ideology, but in studying and following all the particular episodes of working class life, in participating in all the struggles called forth by the immediate interests of the working class, in considering this struggle as the ground upon which the Communist Party calls to the proletariat to fight, and the conducting of this fight towards revolutionary development.

The formula applied to this situation is the formula of the united front from below and not from above. The united front of the workers, of the entire working class, and not a coalition of the leaders of the Communist Party with those of other parties, self-styled workers, is a sufficiently good formula.

And now we find ourselves confronted with a formula, presented by Comrade Zinoviev, which does not completely exclude the united front from above. We are confronted by Comrade Ruth Fischer who says: This formula deserves to be explained, but at the same time, in certain cases, we accept a united front tactic which would lead us into agreement with the leaders of the other parties.

In what sense may one accept this? From my point of view the position which one must take up this problem of tactics is this: the basis of the united front must never be that of a bloc of political parties. This may be done by other working class organizations, but not in such organizations as, by reason of their constitution, are capable of being captured by a communist lead, and are susceptible of being made revolutionary.

The world revolutionary situation at the present day, is such as to dissuade us from the tactics of coalition with the social democrats. But there is nothing to guarantee that tomorrow this may not be resumed. Our opinion on this point differs from that of Zinoviev in that we believe that these tactics of alliance with opportunist parties will never be a policy useful to the communist revolution, neither when a revolutionary situation is favourable, when it is clear that the Communist Party may play an independent part, nor when the situation is unfavourable and the moment of final action far removed.

That is why I think that this question will perhaps never be suitably answered except in the form of a thesis of the tactics of the International, and not in a simple resolution on an executive report, which concerns only the period of the preceding year.

The phrase which says that the workers' government is the pseudonym or synonym of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not convey the idea which it should. We are told, if we say dictatorship of the proletariat, the masses will not understand, if we say workers' government the masses will understand, and we shall gain adherence among those strata which hitherto we had not been able to get to listen to our theoretical propaganda. The very modest role of this formula of the workers' government is reduced to this. Now it is just this which I contest, I have never seen the practical use of it. Around the words dictatorship of the proletariat, there are displayed such events, that have so interested the deepest masses of the proletariat of the world, that even the workers of the countries outside Soviet Russia know quite well what the dictatorship of the proletariat, is, and demand it by instinct, even when they are influenced by social democratic leaders. But how can a simple peasant, understand the workers' government when we, leaders of the labour movement, after three years, have not been able to understand it and to give it a satisfactory definition (applause). I simply demand the burial of the Third Party, and at the same

time of the tactics and the watchwords of workers' government. But we shall be told: You are bad boys. The International going to the left and you are still not content, you still want for more.

Well, let us admit that the International is going to the left, but if I may recall the speech which I made at the Fourth Congress, I think that what we then criticised in the work of political control of the International was that tendency to go to the right or to the left according to the indications of the situation according as one interpreted the opportunities offered by the development of events. And since we have not discussed the problem of the elasticity with which the International conducts its actions, to the extent to which that elasticity remains, oscillations will still occur; a strong oscillation to the left will provoke oscillation to the right. Now it is not a deviation to the left which we demand in the present situation; it is rectification of the tactics of the International in a clear and precise manner, and in conformity with the opinion of the majority of the International.

We wish to achieve a true centralization and a true discipline. To arrive at this result it is necessary to have clarity of tactical control, and continuity in the position of our organizations within the limits which separate us from other parties. Your words indicate that you are not certain that the International will remain always revolutionary. We shall be told that the existence at the head of the International of the Russian Bolshevik Party is a sufficient guarantee that the International will not go too far to the right, that it will always keep a revolutionary course. I think that the importance of the contribution which bolshevism has made to the movement for the revolutionary liberation of the proletariat of the world exists exactly in a special position in which the Russian Party is. It does not exist in the presence of the most developed capitalism and the most extensive and the most advanced proletariat. It does not exist in the presence of already accomplished bourgeois revolutions which has already passed the democratic stage.

Well, this party has all the same been able to deduce true revolutionary theory from great capitalism and a developed proletariat, and has applied it on a grand scale where there is the probability of its failing. It has confirmed its truth. It is the truly enormous contribution which bolshevism has made to the cause of the world's proletariat in the period since the Russian revolution and in the first years of the International.

But all the same we must not forget that if the bolshevik party has been able to achieve the synthesis of this party's development in Russia with the revolutionary experience of the world, it is because its leaders were compelled to emigrate and to live in the midst of Western capitalism, where there was a proletariat which had been able to form its theory and policy. The imperialist war of 1914 allowed the magnificent and brilliant application of this world doctrine which is Leninism because Lenin is of the world and not only Russian. He belongs to us in everything.

The masses of the West are more revolutionary than we believed. Naturally, in order to realise the conditions which will allow the triumphant development of the revolution in all countries, it is necessary to produce certain circumstances, it is necessary for us to be on top of the situation.

A psychologically and politically favourable situation already arise among the proletariat of the West. We have seen parliamentary elections in three great European countries, we have had the good fortune to have tried everywhere to carry out elections as a coalition bloc of parties, but in all countries we have had the good fortune to have tried everywhere to carry out elections entirely against the bourgeois groups of the right and left. We have appealed to the proletariat to respond. It has responded almost simultaneously, in three great countries, a considerable number of workers have shown themselves prepared to follow the Communist Party. This has an importance ten times greater than if, in one country, we had allowed the tactics of co-operation, in another coalition, and in another dependent tactics.

We have confidence in the International because the International is the proletariat of the whole world, which is led to fight for its freedom from capitalist exploitation, because the International is the Russian victory, the marvelous tradition of the movement for the liberation of the world's proletariat, and is at the same time the tradition of other countries.

## Fourteenth Session.

June 26th.

The discussion on the report of the Executive was continued, with comrade Wynkoop (Holland) in the Chair.

**Fried** (Czecho-Slovakia):

The Congress is occupying itself with the German and the Russian questions. In both these questions the Czech Party plays an important part. The Czech State has been given the function of a policeman standing behind Germany and the Entente. The German revolution can never stand on a sure footing until it has a rear-guard in Czecho-Slovakia. And a Party suffering from confusion can never fulfil this task. Czecho-Slovakia also plays a leading part in the schemes hatched by the anti-bolsheviks, and the Communist Party must take up a definite and unambiguous attitude towards this fact.

The whole activity of the Czecho-Slovakian Party consists in agitation and propaganda. At the most fateful moment the only weapons it seizes are agitation in the press and in parliament. At the time when the Emergency Law, which threatened to drive the Czech Party underground was being discussed, the Party did nothing but make speeches in Parliament, instead of organising a powerful mass agitation. Nothing gives a better indication of its attitude than the fact that the parliamentary fraction had an idea of appealing to the League of Nations on behalf of Carpathian Russia. The hundreds of thousands of unemployed were left unorganised. The very name of proletarian dictatorship has vanished from the agitation and propaganda of the Party, leaving scarcely a trace behind. With regard to the peasant question it is only quite recently that anything has been done; with regard to the national question practically nothing has been done. The Party has scarcely developed any anti-militaristic agitation; it is not preparing the masses either ideologically or from the organisational point of view for civil war. The mass of the Party is increasing rapidly, but the old mass and the new mass are not united together by a common struggle. And if Czecho-Slovakia were faced by a really serious situation there is a danger that we should see a repetition of the Bulgarian failure in an even worse form.

The discussions which will take place after the world congress will show that the mass of the workers stand firmly behind the International.

The Party suffers very much, especially in Slovakia and the Carpathians, from the lack of a Hungarian Communist Party. It is the task of the International, partly for the sake of the revolutionary movement in Czecho-Slovakia, to further the reawakening of the Communist movement in Hungary with all the means in its power.

The Congress must lead the Czecho-Slovakian Party into a healthy condition. It must make it possible for the mass of the Party to give a clear answer to the question whether they wish to be a fighting Communist Party or a colourless propaganda position party.

**Buck** (Canada)

and that hitherto the Congress had dealt very little with the problems of the English speaking sections of the International. In Canada, the Party was influenced largely by England, and the numerical strength of the movement in the United States. The Canadian Labour Party, general political tendencies were largely influenced by Britain. Unless a definite application of the principles of the United Front to Canada were thought out at the Congress, the Canadian Party would remain in a state of continual confusion with regard to its policy towards the Labour Party.

The main problems before the Congress were said to be those of the United Front and of the Workers' and Peasants' Government. Comrade MacManus had said that these were secondary to the problem of building up a mass party. But, said comrade Buck, the tactics of the United Front were really a part of the building up of a mass party. It had been said that the Party was to be tactically inside the Labour Party, but ideologically outside it. But this was no solution of the problem. The Canadian Party had never been, ideologically, inside the Labour Party, but this had had no effect on the United Front. It was also the weakness of the British Party, and one which belonged to the effort to build the United Front.

The Canadian Party had been working in the trade unions, influencing and controlling their actions tactically, but this

had produced no ideological effect, i. e. it was not revolutionising the masses. Something more than ideological influence was required by the Party. If we were to build up the United Front, we must base our activities on the workshops. Many instances could be given of this kind of activity in the Canadian Party. In the mining districts, many of their locals were purely camp locals. And in other industries a similar industrial basis of organization was adopted. At the same time in some of the cities, the old geographic form of local was maintained. It was everywhere noticed that, where the industrial locals were, the Party was forging ahead, ideologically, etc. Also, in those districts, the Labour Party was stronger and more active than elsewhere. Indeed, in many places, the Labour Party had been almost entirely built up by the Communist Party of Canada.

The solution of the United Front problem in Canada, the United States and Great Britain, meant basing the organizational activity of the parties on the factories and workshops. Thus, not only would the desired clash of ideologies be achieved, but it would be brought home to the rank and file.

For Canada and the United States a solution of the problem of the workers' and peasants' government was urgent. The statement that this slogan was a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat was not true for Canada and the United States.

A Farmer-Labour Government in Canada and the United States would be a Liberal-Labour Government. In Canada the farmers had over 100,000 politically organized members, and they were not in any degree revolutionary. Even the most radical of them had only as their slogan the demand for a Government-built railroad, to lower their freights to the Atlantic coast. The question was as to the limitations of the United Front. Should the Party strive to build a Labour Government, or should it have an alliance with the farmer elements? An alliance was certainly as far as the Party could go.

In conclusion, Comrade Buk emphasised the importance of co-ordination and solidification of the Canadian and British Parties on the basis of the many problems which they had to tackle in common. The great thing they needed at the Congress was more definite discussion, and more concrete application of solutions of their problems.

Comrade **Baer** (Germany):

The German Party hopes that the Italian question will be cleared up at this Congress, as recent events in Italy show that fascism has reached its climax there and the Italian Party will be faced with a difficult situation.

When Radek says that the German Party did not react to the findings of the Committee of Experts, I am compelled to tell him that the German Party's election propaganda was entirely based on the Experts' Report and that it dealt with the consequences of this report at thousands of meetings. As to the factory-councils elections, I can only say that wherever the Party had an opportunity to make itself heard, great successes were achieved. It stands to reason that our success could not be the same in districts where, after a prolonged struggle, 90% of communists were thrown out into the street. The appointment of a new Central Committee, which received the unanimous support of all our members, shows that there is no longer room in the German Party for reformist tendencies. It is not true that the members of the German Party ever suffered from illusions. It was cognisant of its tasks under all circumstances. This is shown by the attitude of the Party to the Levi affair and to the Friesland affair. Besides, we all knew in October that it was all up with the Brandler group. I should like to meet Brandler's accusation that all the actions of 1924 were not under our leadership but under that of the social democrats, by drawing your attention to the actions in Rheinisch Westphalia where 600,000 to 700,000 workers fought for 6 or 8 weeks, and to the actions in the Rheinisch brown-coal district where 40,000 workers kept on the fight for 10 weeks. In both these actions the leadership was in our hands.

Comrade Brandler endeavoured beforehand to create distrust in the present leaders of the Party. He said that the Landtag elections in Prussia next spring would show that the Communist Party is in a very difficult position. We are fully aware that in the event of the present stagnation continuing, the Communist Party will perhaps lose large masses who are still under its control to-day. Our task must be to consolidate the Party in such a way that we are able, up to-day to take the fight for a ten pennings' wage increase, and that to-morrow we are ready for a barricade fight with the workers.

## Comrade Amter (America)

said that America was being completely neglected by the Congress, which was a serious matter, in view of the fact that the Dawes Report had been finally decided, not by British finance, but by American imperialism. For this reason alone the question of American imperialism should have been more in the foreground, but he would point out a few more facts with regard to this imperialism. It was spreading not only to South America and Canada but to the West Indies and Central America. It played its part in the stopping of recognition of Soviet Russia by China. It was invading Europe and the East and had reached its climax in Germany. All these things meant that we were facing a war, instigated by American imperialism.

The American question had been neglected not only externally, but internally. In the American Party, as in other parties there were opportunists. Comrade Amter read extracts from articles by Comrade Lore to show that he represented opportunistic tendencies which had not been suppressed by the Central Executive Committee.

Turning to the agrarian crisis, Comrade Amter recalled Comrade Dunne's statement that this was growing less important, and that it was therefore not necessary to form a united front with the farmers. This he declared to be a complete misconception. The two countries most affected by the world agrarian crisis were Soviet Russia and America, and realisation of this fact put them in a position to see what was the task of the Communist Party. It was a Leninist method to make concessions to those farmers who were fighting against capitalism in order that they might be drawn closely into co-operation with the workers, and thus with the communists. The official pamphlet of the American Party dealing with the growth of the Labour Party, stated that it would be a mistake of the greatest magnitude to exclude the working farmers from the Labour Party. The co-operation of the farmers and workers had become traditional in America. Comrade Amter quoted figures to show that in many States the Farmer Labour Party contained large groups of industrial workers which held the Party completely under their control. There were other States in which the membership was composed predominately of farmers, notably the state of Montana, which, he pointed out, was organised by Comrade Dunne, who now repudiated the farmers. They recognised clearly that the workers must predominate over the farmers, and keep the leadership in their hands.

With regard to the economic crisis, Comrade Amter declared that Comrade Dunne ignored one of the most important features for the future activity of the American Party. At the Party convention last January, Comrade Pepper had stated that the Party must face the issue of unemployment. Again in February Comrade Pepper introduced a thesis on unemployment which was rejected by the majority of the Party. The next month the majority issued a thesis, and Comrade Amter agreed with Comrade Varga that in this the Central Executive not only shared the illusions of the bourgeoisie, but went further and did not even believe their admissions. The majority thesis declared that it was certain that unemployment on a large scale would face the working class in the near future. But it might not occur until the summer of 1925. In view of the fact that even Gompers had recognised that unemployment was becoming serious, the failure of the Central Executive to see the issue was the failure to recognise the duties of a Communist Party. Comrade Amter quoted statistics to show the widespread nature of the present crisis, and added that the latest issue he had received of the "Daily Worker" contained no word of a campaign by the Party against unemployment or for organising the unemployed. He said that the American Communist Party had failed to see the two most important issues facing it.

## Sommer (Germany)

The German Delegation welcomes the fact that the discussion was brought back to the height of principle by the speech of Comrade Bordiga. It is not only tactical questions, but fundamental principles of the International that we have to discuss here. Some comrades here have criticised not only tactical measures, but the very fundamentals of Leninism. The congress must therefore clear up the subject fully.

Leninism implies also fighting within the capitalist system for partial demands, but for the set purpose of organising the revolution. Radek finds in this principle an element of "putschism", and for this reason he gave us the task to organise

a million members, at the moment when we were on the threshold of revolution. Yes, if we had raised the slogan: "All power to the proletariat", we would have gained a million members, but we would not have done so by putting organisational questions to the forefront in the course of an acute revolutionary situation.

The secret, illegal preparations for the revolution, which comrade Brandler boasts represent only the "putschist" seamy side of reformism. If one is engaged in reformist politics one cannot play the military game behind the back of the proletariat. But if we put the question of power in the foreground everyone will see the necessity of technical preparations.

In Comrade Zetkin's speech there was a good deal of talk about the "spontaneity of the masses". Here again we have a case of ignoring the Leninist conception of the role of the Party in the revolution. Comrade Zetkin said that if the situation were revolutionary, the masses would have brought about the revolution even in spite of the party. It is true this is the sharpest criticism that any one could level against the party. The party in October 1923 sank to the role which was played by the social democracy in 1918. The workers are waiting for the signal from the Communist Party, and if the workers do not budge, it is because this signal is withheld.

Comrade Thalheimer spoke about the "continuity of leadership". By this he meant to say that in Germany the old guard had been dismissed. Comrades, we support the Russian C.C. not because it is the old guard, but because it is the old bolshevik guard. Given a proper bolshevik leadership, we shall be able to take care of continuity; but it cannot be done if the leadership is of the wrong kind.

Contrary to the assertions of some comrades we have no reason to expect a wave of democratic pacifism in Germany; we can rather expect a wave of fascist pacifism; the carrying out of the Experts' Report by dictatorial means.

A mass movement against the Experts' Report is already afoot in Germany. Soon we may find ourselves again in the midst of decisive fights. It is therefore to our interest that the neighbouring countries should also have good bolshevik parties which are engaged in organising the revolution.

## De Visser (Holland)

Since 1909 the Dutch Party has conducted an energetic campaign against reformism, and since the world war it has fought for the revolutionary united front. Mistakes were made as a matter of course, but no fighting party is immune against mistakes. The Party has taken to heart what Lenin said and wrote about infantile sickness. The recent tactical differences within the Party have also been satisfactorily settled with the help of the Comintern. The delegation, which was sent in April from Russia to Holland recognised the merits of the Dutch Party as a revolutionary Leninist Party. Foul means were frequently used in the fight against us. After our Congress, which unity was achieved, some members of the opposition left the Party although they had expressed themselves in favour of unity, and are now approaching the Comintern as an independent group. I think that the Comintern will refuse to have anything to do with this group. In connection with Comrade Semaun's statement that Wynkoop exaggerated the influence of the Dutch Party on the Indian movement and that it was in reality the Russian revolution which had influenced the movement, I will merely remark that already in 1911-12 a number of Dutch comrades were very active in the Indian movement. Semaun himself acknowledged at various meetings that the Dutch Party had carried on a thorough and energetic agitation against the new yoke which had been laid upon the workers and peasants. At the last Dutch Congress we decided to take immediate steps for the formation of factory nuclei and for the bolshevisation of the Party. We do not look upon parliamentary action as the most important plank of our platform but concentrate all our energies on the fight against militarism. We also do our utmost to permeate the masses and to convert the big and powerful trade unions into revolutionary workers' organs.

## Lozovsky

The end which we have to reach is the organization of the revolution, and all the tactical processes which increase the fighting capacity of the working class, which lead to the integration of reformism and bring us nearer to the victory of the revolution, are good. It is from this point of view that the slogans of the united front and of the workers' and peasants' government, etc., must be judged.

Bordiga in his speech reproached the Executive for being pliable. The International is not an immovable statue cast in bronze, it is not an automatic machine, which always performs the same movement, it ought not to be as still as a telegraph pole; it is a fighting organization, which adjusts its methods of combat in order to attain its essential object—to win over the masses for the social revolution. What should we say of a general who was guided by the "immutable laws" of war, and never adopted his strategy and tactics to changing conditions, who could not rapidly alter the disposition of his troops and their grouping, pass from the offensive to the defensive from fighting in the open country to fighting round a fixed base, and so on? The most that could be said of a general like this would be that he was only a student and not a strategist. The creator whose genius produced the strategy of bolshevism, Lenin, gave the Communist International enough examples of the adaptability of the Bolsheviki Party.

A careful consideration of the whole activities of the Russian Communist Party will show that its apparent and formal oscillations (war communism, the new economic policy, the creation of poor peasants' committees, and later their suppression) had nothing in common with the hesitation and vacillation peculiar to reformism. This is the true communist policy in the best sense of the world.

The Communist International can no more accept the slogan of the united front only from below, than it can the slogan of the extension of these tactics to all countries, irrespective of the concrete conditions of the class struggle.

Should the united front in industrial organizations, for instance, in factory committees, or trade-union branches be from above or from below? What really matters is how the masses can be mobilised by these slogans of ours, what really matters are the tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of workers whom we can influence, the success or failure of the united front as a means of rallying to us the masses who are influenced by the reformists. It is from this point of view that our tactics in the trade-unions play a decisive part. Factory committees and trade-unions are the natural sphere for the application of those tactics of united front by which it is possible to capture the majority of the working class.

In reply to comrade Ruth Fischer, Lozovsky refuted the allegation that there had been a divergence of opinion between the Red International of Labour Unions and the Comintern on the question of the trade-unions in Germany.

One final remark. The transformation of the Communist International into a strong and united international bolshevik party, was a long and painful process. This process could be hastened only if the nucleus directing the International knew how to take a turn to the right or to the left, in only a formal sense of course, whenever circumstances demanded it. The international Bolsheviki Party could be created only by international action. The activity of the Comintern and of its sections must perform this task in the immediate future.

## Vasiliev (Carpathian Russia)

The Communist Party which is the leader of the workers and peasants in Carpathian Russia, has sent me to bring to the World Congress not only the greetings of our Party, but also the greetings of those masses of workers and peasants who have so recently won a brilliant victory at the elections, thereby moving to the Parties of all countries that the peasantry, when it has enough attention devoted to it, is capable of active struggle for the revolution.

Comrade Zinoviev has pointed out the faults of our party with admirable exactitude. After the suppression of the proletarian revolution in Hungary a new government was established in Czecho-Slovakia, which promised a new life to the workers and peasants. But now already it is obvious to everybody that instead of a new yoke has been laid upon the workers and peasants of Carpathian Russia. Our most recent victory at the elections shows that the suffering people of Carpathian Russia are looking for their salvation to the Communist Party.

Carpathian Russia is a colony of the Czecho-Slovakian Republic. The mass of its workers and peasants live under conditions of the most extreme exploitation. And they have come to their masses to the Communist Party in order to fight for their freedom and for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade, we love our Party all the better because it came to birth in our little corner of the world where the great conditions of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary are still alive, and where the roar of the cannons of the Russian Red

Army has so often been heard; but it is just this love which drives us to express our discontent with the policy of our Party. The Party is not occupying itself with the agrarian question at all, although it is of decisive importance. The same is true of the national question. What we want is that Carpathian Russia join the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics, and we ask the Party to express itself clearly on this subject. But what does the Party Executive do? It does nothing but makes speeches in Parliament, instead of organizing all the workers and peasants to a revolutionary struggle against their oppressors.

We demand that the Party definitely change its present unreliable policy and proceed to communist action. In our district the revolutionary situation it always present. It must be made use of, and for that it is necessary that the Party should enter upon the road of a definitely Bolsheviki struggle.

## Gschegeschewski (Poland)

The fight against opportunistic deviations must be carried on in a way that does not disguise the true foundations of opportunism. I say this because some comrades in criticising the Polish Party, have not pointed out the real faults of the Party but have limited themselves to petty details.

Now a few words about the policy of the Comintern: if comrade Bordiga had wished to be logical in his criticism of the tactics of the united front, he ought to have said that communist workers ought only to belong to organizations which consist solely of communists. That would mean, as his whole attitude to the problem of the united front does mean, that he was an opponent of revolutionary manoeuvres. Comrade Brandler's opportunistic mistake lay in this, that he had already entered the Saxon Government and did not manoeuvre in a revolutionary manner. The right wing of the German Party founded itself upon a false interpretation of the decisions of the Fourth Congress. With regard to the internal questions of the Polish Party, one must admit that the Party has not understood rightly, despite its revolutionary past, how to carry out the policy of revolutionary manoeuvres to capture the masses. We are blamed for opportunism as was shown in the fact that we did not use the situation enough as a means to action, and did not apply the tactics of the united front in a revolutionary sense.

To turn now to the Russian question. The majority of the delegation stands for uncompromising support of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. This attitude was not adopted first at this Congress but much earlier during a long struggle between two tendencies. I am very much surprised that the minority of the Polish Delegation had not expressed itself clearly upon this subject.

From the outset we have not taken the point of view of the opposition and what we say must not be interpreted as support of them. We were not speaking of the tasks of the Bolsheviki Party, all we were saying was: comrades do not shoot at the opposition with dum-dum bullets. And that was our attitude also to the German question.

The slogan of the workers' and peasants' government is specially important for us, and all the more so because the Polish Peasants' Party has also adopted this slogan. We must declare quite definitely that what the workers' and peasants' government means to us is the power of the workers and peasants, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Our Party must stand firmly behind the Comintern on these questions and tread the road of revolution on which the Comintern and the Russian Communist Party are marching forward.

## Samuelson (Sweden)

Comrades: A speech was delivered by Comrade Hoeglund yesterday, in which he attacked the minority of the Swedish Party. Comrade Hoeglund is an excellent representative of formal and diplomatic discipline. So far he always succeeded in keeping himself, or balancing himself, through the official line of the Communist International. Our members consider the Comintern not as an organization which asks for formal adherence, but as an organization of action and fighting. The reservations of Comrade Hoeglund are unfortunately enough no exception, but they have rather become a system, a sequence of ultra-right deviations which are not rendered harmless by the revolutionary traditions of Comrade Hoeglund. There was a time when Comrade Hoeglund objected to changing the name of the Party from "Left Socialist" to "Communist". He was opposed to a clear formulation of the point of the program which deals with the arming of the proletariat, of course, from the standpoint of "tactics", but it is always so: On the question of centralism,

Comrade Hoeglund was dissatisfied with the decisions of the Fourth Congress and he threatened even to give up his mandate to the Executive. He has not yet given up his standpoint.

Thus, for instance, on the Norwegian questions. In an article which he wrote on November 5th of the last year he expresses his solidarity with Tranmael. Yesterday I learned for the first time of Comrade Hoeglund's admission that the article in question was inadmissible and erroneous. He began with an attack upon the left wing of the Party, and with a cleaning. He wants to oust from their positions the men and women in the movement who are in opposition to Hoeglund.

Comrade Hoeglund spoke yesterday about our gross violation of discipline. It is that we cannot sit by silently and passively while the majority in our party are undermining the authority of the Communist International. Comrade Hoeglund is now advocate of discipline and centralism in the International. But at the same time he is in favour of the strictest obedience in the Swedish Communist Party.

Unfortunately, our Party is far from being a bolshevik party. Nevertheless, I believe that the ranks of our membership are imbued with a good desire to become a fighting and earnest Communist Party. But, Comrades this good desire should not be spoiled by the persistent retrograde deviations of Comrade Hoeglund.

On the basis of all these faults we find ourselves compelled to stand in opposition. Our present differences are the reflection of different conceptions on fundamental questions. It is only a tactical manoeuvre on the part of Hoeglund when he endeavors to shift the controversial questions from the sphere of organization to the domain of personal questions.

The Swedish minority is of the same opinion as Comrade Zinoviev that it is now more essential than ever to have a fighting Communist Party, a discipline of action, as the fundamental principle of the Communist International. If this is recognized, the present dispute in the Swedish Communist Party will soon disappear. (Applause).

**Gorsky** (Y. C. L. Poland):

I wish to say on behalf of the Polish Young Communist League that we agree as a whole with Comrade Zinoviev's criticism of the Polish Communist Party. The economic position

of Poland is very critical and becomes worse almost every day. All the attempts at stabilisation made by the bourgeoisie lead only to an intensification of the class struggle.

We noticed here at the Congress a certain veering to the left on the part of our leading Polish comrades. But this left tendency is not very noticeable in practice. The formula adopted by the Party leaders on the question of the united front and of the workers' and Peasants' Government is neither a right nor a left formula, but a confused formula, and that is worse than anything else. We welcome the assertions of the representatives of the leading organ of the Party at this Congress that the workers' and peasants government in Poland will henceforth be synonymous with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At its meetings, the Young Communist League has criticised the Party leadership very severely. We should like attacks on the left comrades to cease, and also that those who are at the helm of our party should steer in to the left.

**Comrade Fiala** (Austria):

The Austrian Party was not in a position to take a definite stand in discussions of the International, because there has been constant factional strife in our Party for the last two years. Nevertheless the C. C. of the Austrian Party and the majority of the Delegation have expressed themselves unreservedly in favour of the line of policy of the Executive. On the question of the application of the tactics of the united front the standpoint of the overwhelming majority of our delegation coincides with the views represented by Comrades Zinoviev. Here and there we had some slight deviations in the municipal elections, but the party promptly and vigorously stamped out such tendencies, so that they had no chance to spread. We are of the opinion that the comrades of the C. C. in Germany failed to make proper application of the tactics of the united front. The leadership lacked political insight. We think that the Executive was obliged to intervene and save the German Party from collapse. That the Executive had acted properly, was demonstrated at the Frankfurt Conference of the Party. On the question of the workers' and peasants government we must ask for a clear definition. The majority of our delegation considers the definition given by Comrade Zinoviev as the proper one, and they adhere to it unreservedly.

## 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 Wynkoop's brochure on Co-operation. The Congress would of course protest against this action.

### 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 added 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 Romania, 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 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,