

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 5 No. 37

PRESS

23rd April 1925

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213. Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

Meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the C. I.

Eleventh Session. Moscow, April 3rd, 1925.

Discussion on the Question of Trotzkyism.

Comrade Scocimarro (Italy):

In general, Trotzkyism has found its defenders in the ranks of the Right wing of the International. In Italy, on the other hand, it takes on the aspects of Left extremeism. In one of his writings, Bordiga has expressed his solidarity even on this question with the point of view of Comrade Trotzky. What are the reasons for the Trotzkyist orientation of Bordiga? We must look for them in the field of ideology and principle. There it is that we find an affinity between Trotzkyism and Comrade Bordiga's conception. Thus, for instance, we see these affinities in the excessively mechanical articulations of Marxist dialectics, which leads people sometimes to consider the course of history as a succession of contradictory positions. We see that in Trotzky in the examination he has made of the events in Russia from April to October, 1917.

We also see that in Bordiga, in his tactical conception providing for a too-mechanical succession of types of situations already formally established in political predictions; as well as in his attitude of negation toward the slogan of the Workers' Government

We find other aspects of ideological unity between Bordiga and Trotzkyism. We find them in the formal character of tactical and political method; in the neglecting and ignoring of the particular and essential elements of each situation of a factor determining the tactics of the Party, in the general conception of the relationship between the function of the Party and the spontaneous movement of the masses, in which conception the role of the Party is too much minimised.

For instance, it has been said that the Leninist tactics and methods were good as long as Lenin was alive. In his articles on the question of Trotzky, Bordiga states that a revision of the tactics of the International has come about as a result of the fact that Lenin is no more, and that without him we lost our Berlin October. No commentary is necessary.

Up to what point is there an affinity between Bordiga's attitude and that of Trotzky? There is no need to prove it.

The fact is that in Trotzkyism as well as in Bordiga one perceives easily enough a certain dislike of the adoption of Bolshevism, that is to say of the revolutionary method which has developed on the terrain of the Russian Revolution, to the revolutionary movement of the Western countries.

In reality, Bolshevism has given us tactics which have a universal value. The attitude of Bordiga towards Bolshevism has analogies with Trotzky's attitude in the past in opposing to Bolshevism his tactics which were defined by the words: European Marxism.

Bordiga states that in none of his writings after 1917, does Trotzky reaffirm his past opinions. It is necessary for me to point here to the documents which demonstrate precisely the contrary. In sketching the events of October in writing the history of the Russian Revolution, Trotzky is preoccupied with proving that first of all this did not disprove his theory of the permanent revolution. That means that Trotzky still has accounts to settle with Leninism.

How could Bordiga have committed such apparent errors?

In what way does Bordiga put the question of Trotzkyism? He denies that there is a Trotzkyism in opposition to Leninism. He divided the policy of Trotzky into two entirely distinct and independent periods; the first lasting until 1917; the second after 1917. He condemns the first which was characterised by Trotzky's Centrist attitude, and he unconditionally approves of the second during which Trotzky, he claims, maintained a perfectly Bolshevik attitude. Under any circumstance, says Bordiga, if a new Trotzkyism exists no one can pretend to link it up with the old Trotzkyism and this new Trotzkyism is at the left and not at the Right of the Party. The fact that Comrade Trotzky's position seems to him to be Left is sufficient for him.

For Bordiga, Trotzky's differences with the Russian Party after 1917 on the most important questions of the revolution are of no importance, because other Bolsheviks have made similar errors. That is a justification which justifies nothing.

Bordiga does not see that Trotzkyism, even in its new form of expression signifies an entire revolutionary method in opposition to the revolutionary method of Leninism. What he is interested in is exploiting Trotzky's absurd and incomprehensible attack against the leaders of the Party and of the International to use them on his own behalf in his own differences with the International, differences upon which the Fifth Congress has already pronounced judgement. According to Bordiga the cause of the defeat in Germany is to be looked for in the tactics of the Comintern. That is why he demands their revision. The Fifth World Congress revised the tactical decisions of the Fourth Congress and eliminated any possibility of an interpretation giving rise to opportunist deviation, but it rightly rejected the revision demanded by Bordiga. In again putting this question and in basing it on Trotzky's attitude, Bordiga goes beyond Trotzky's thoughts, as Trotzky does not fight the tactics of the United Front nor the slogan of the Workers Government. On the contrary, he states that the tactics of the United Front have given excellent results.

In his article, Bordiga, through following the footsteps of Comrade Trotzky, arbitrarily links up the errors of the German Party with the errors of certain comrades in the Central Committee of the Russian Party in the months of October, 1917. The purpose is evident. The endeavour is made to make one believe that these errors still continue in the International. It is not our intention here to make an apology or to take up the defence of anybody, but we must clearly state that this affirmation is absolutely false and without any foundation. To spread this legend in the ranks of the International and in the labour movement signifies propagating defeatism. An error which has been recognised no longer presents any danger; it is the errors which one does not recognise which are dangerous, and in this case Bordiga would do well to examine a little more attentively his political position. The fact Trotzkyism appears in Italy under a form which reminds us very much of Bordiga's former abstentionism, and in France, under the aspects of the rebirth of the syndicalism of Rosmer and Monatte, signifies that in Trotzkyism in the West there are crystallised all the ideological deviations from Bolshevism and from Leninism.

To fight Trotzkyism in our Parties means fighting its deviations and defending Leninism.

Comrade Treint (France):

Through the discussion on Trotzkyism and in the fight against Trotzkyism, the French Party has taken a great step forward. Some comrades belonging to our infinitesimal Right Opposition have tried to explain the crisis through which our Party went last year, by saying that it was a crisis imported by the Russians, and that it was utilised by comrades between whom there were personal differences.

In reality, from the time that we fought in the Committee of the Third International, there have always been two groups of comrades: one which through all hesitation and errors in detail endeavoured to work in a Leninist way; and another group full of sympathy for Trotzkyism, and which at the same time included all sorts of elements with revolutionary temperaments more or less foreign to Marxism. I mean by this our individualist elements and our pure syndicalists. We must notice here that it is precisely one of the characteristics of Trotzkyism that it tends to coalesce into one Opposition Bloc all sorts of heterogeneous elements in the fight against Marxism and Leninism.

When we wanted to create the trade union apparatus of our Party, we met with the resistance of certain elements such as Monatte, who said that the Party ought not to create trade union commissions, but to reply upon the consciousness of its members to have the Communist point of view prevail in the trade unions.

Later, in the course of the past year, after we had established our trade union apparatus, we were opposed by Monatte and Rosmer, who, when faced by the counter-offensive of the Anarcho-Syndicalists in the CGTU., wanted to beat a retreat. Rosmer said, "Let us abandon the trade union commissions". Monatte proposed that trade union fractions be established but to state that these fractions would not be under the control of the Party.

We had to fight these tendencies which would have ended simply by forming a veritable Party within the Party.

Later, the question came up of the reorganisation of our Party on the basis of factory nuclei, and here again we had to combat deviations advocated by Monatte, who wanted to limit our nuclei to the sole work of trade union recruiting.

In many other points, we met with resistance, and here we no longer merely touch upon questions of a primarily organisational nature, but upon those which clearly possess a political aspect.

We also met with resistance on the part of our Opposition Bloc said, "We make no distinction between Brandler, Klein, and Ruth Fischer. We are with the entire German Party". We have to fight this thesis, to point out that these were the reasons for the German defeat, that this defeat in Germany may perhaps be explained by many reasons, but that in any case it was at least in part the consequence of an entirely false political line which was called Radekism and Brandlerism by the Fifth Congress.

We also differed on the English question. We had to combat the illusions with respect to the Labour Government, which was represented as going to retain power in Britain and to accomplish reforms.

We must point out that all these deviations were permitted by our Opposition Bloc, by a group which endeavoured to base itself on the fundamental ideas defended by Comrade Trotzky.

We do not want to say that these deviations are Trotzkyist deviations, but it is evident that all the deviations of pure syndicalism, of the return to Opportunism have found a point of support in Trotzkyism in our Party. When the discussion developed in Russia, when it entered our Party, it all at once illuminated to the bottom all our more or less confused former differences, and our Party has also carried on its discussion in the ideological sphere for months and months, carrying on a bitter struggle against the Trotzkyist deviations. During this discussion the Party has grown stronger, its ideas have been clarified, and I want to say that on the principal points the Party has gained by the discussion.

To begin with, there is the conception of the role of the Party. We had to discuss this thoroughly, especially after the reopening of the discussion, in consequence of the appearance of the "Lessons of October". With respect to the role of the Party, we had to fight resolutely against the idea propagated by Comrade Trotzky of the moment of the revolution; and to-day the French Party has understood the significance of this discussion. It knows that men and groups are not tested only at the moment of decisive action, that such a test would only have a secondary value, for it is a test made at the moment when the most backward masses have been drawn into the revolutionary current. We have also seen all the dangers contained in this conception of Comrade Trotzky. In France and I believe in all countries, it is the argument of the Opportunists, the argument of certain revolutionary syndicalists: "We demand our place within the Party because it is only in the test of the decisive battle that we can be truly judged."

We would then be obliged to conceive the Party as an aggregate, as a sort of federation of different fractions existing alongside of Bolshevism. There we see the resurrection in a new form of the old Trotzkyist theory, the old theory of the "groupists", when Trotzky defined the Party as a conglomerate of various tendencies all of which had a right to exist.

Comrades, to-day in the French Party the conception of the role of the Party is entirely clear. Our Party has eliminated all the errors of Trotzkyism: all the individualist quasi-anarchist errors, the errors of the belief in legitimacy, of the co-existence of diverse factions in the Party. It has also learned to know the Luxemburgist errors and how to arm against them.

In the course of this discussion we have also learned how to define exactly the relationship of forces of the different classes in the revolution, and how to group these forces to obtain a victorious revolution.

As for our relationship with the peasantry in particular, the French Party has learnt very much. It has learnt all the difference between the conception of the permanent revolution,

which only appeals to the workers, and the Leninist conception which seeks allies of the proletariat and which bases the anti-capitalist revolutions, the proletarian revolution on the alliance of the workers and peasantry. For us in France this is a problem of very great importance because our peasant population is very great.

And then we have learnt through this discussion to enlarge our horizon. We have learnt to note with more attention than in the past that beyond the peasants living amongst us, there are all the millions of colonial peasants who really constitute a necessary ally for the proletarian revolution.

The French Party has learnt much from a third point in the discussion. This was Trotsky's opinion, very ingeniously expressed, of the possibility of an American super-imperialism.

I have already given a summary, but I want to demonstrate more completely all the dangers which Trotskyist ideology, if it develops, could call forth for the French movement. The French revolutionary movement lived in the main before the war upon the basis of anarcho-syndicalism. This was an instinctive reaction of the proletariat against the electing degeneration of socialism.

What is anarcho-syndicalism? It is a theory which holds that the revolution can be prepared and conducted by the trade union organisations alone. Now, only proletarians are admitted to these trade union organisations; small artisans, small proprietors, farmers and tenants are excluded, then they misunderstand the problem of the peasantry, or if they admit the artisans or the peasant masses, they take them into trade union organisation which is not directed and animated by the Communist Party, which permits the movement to be drawn into all sorts of opportunist and petty-bourgeois deviations.

A theory such as Trotskyism, which on the one hand misunderstands and minimises the role of the Party, and on the other hand fails to appreciate the role of the peasantry, can only serve to grant new life to the anarcho-syndicalist theories coming up under new forms. This is precisely the phenomenon observed by us in the first half of the discussion in France. We have also seen comrades coming to defend democracy within the Party under the cover of Trotskyism, in a form entirely pernicious and harmful to the development of our movement.

Our Trotskyites have defended democracy from the viewpoint of the formal and individual right of every member. This is not the proletarian democracy which we want to establish and which subordinate everything to the general interests of the working class.

The individualistic and anarchistic conception of democracy advocated by the Trotskyists is particularly dangerous in a country like France where the poison of a prolonged practice of bourgeois democracy has penetrated very deep.

Comrades, we want to show you now what our Party has achieved. It has completely eliminated the errors of Trotskyism which our cadres have already fully grasped. But nevertheless, there exists a small group of men in our Party, cut off from the organisations, who constitute a real fighting fraction connected with other men who pursue the same work in other sections of the International. We protest here against the constitution in the International of a real fraction which is not only connected with members of our Parties, but has also its connections outside the Communist International, among anarchistic elements or among elements which the Communist International was obliged to expel from its ranks. At present this small group of men is carrying on its campaign, it is picking up strength in connection with the temporary stabilisation of capitalism. And we can see that the campaign is directed just against those Parties, who together with the Russian Party, expressed themselves for the Bolshevik, the Leninist lines. We are aware of the campaign conducted against our comrades of the Communist Party of Germany. It is a campaign conducted quite openly on the strength of certain difficulties experienced by our brother Party. Of course there is not a Party in the International which is immune from all criticism and blame, and one must criticise and blame where it is needed. But there is one thing which must be borne in mind and that is — that this criticism must be made from the Leninist point of view and not from the point of view of the Right.

Against the French Party whose objective position makes progress easier, the campaign is conducted less openly, but it is conducted nevertheless. It is naturally not very easy

to attack openly a Party which develops under favourable objective conditions, but minor campaigns of petty belittlement are nevertheless pursued.

The right which shelters under the ideology of Trotskyism continues its work and we have already even manifestations which are rather disquieting. We have had for instance, Souvarine's letter. This is not any longer a right tendency, it is a Menshevik and counter-revolutionary tendency.

Comrades, we say: this is a "right" development which is beginning to attack the fundamental principles of the International. As the Communist International has vigorously reacted on these tendencies, the right sees its only salvation by predicting a catastrophe of the Russian revolution and by representing Trotsky as its saviour. We contend that Russia has no need to be saved, that it is a prosperous position. It has of course difficulties to cope with, but the language adopted here by our opposition elements is the language of the Mensheviks, the counter-revolutionaries. We have also witnessed a series of attempts right in the very heart of the International. We have seen Comrade Nin who holds a very responsible post in our apparatus of the RILU, a member of the Russian Party, on the occasion of the expulsion of Rosmer, proposed in a letter addressed to the latter, to supply him with information on the Russian Party for the purpose of adding fuel to the campaign against the Communist International and the Communist Party of France; a campaign carried on in the "Revolution proletarienne", a weekly review under the direction of Monatte and Rosmer. We have seen Comrade van Overstraten who occupies a responsible post in the Belgian Party get into contact with Rosmer after the latter's expulsion from the Party and invite him to a conference in Belgium to undermine the policy of the Communist International in Belgium, and you know that our Belgian Central Committee has already been conducting a provisionally victorious campaign against the Leninist policy.

We protest against all these manoeuvres. We know that Comrade Trotsky cannot be in agreement with all these doings. We fully understand the difference between the very subtle errors of Comrade Trotsky and the coarse errors which we emphasise here, but we are obliged to say one thing. At the Fifth Congress our French Delegation was received by Comrade Trotsky. At that time our right elements had committed various breaches of discipline. We asked Comrade Trotsky the following very simple question: are you in agreement with the undisciplined attitude of our right, and we are compelled to say that Comrade Trotsky did not give a clear answer to this question.

Since then our right has acted as I just told you, since then the elements excluded from our Party, such as Monatte, Rosmer and Souvarine issue in the International this review which goes by the name "La Revolution Proletarienne" against the French Party. These facts are public, and we are sorry to say that hitherto Comrade Trotsky has maintained silence with respect to them. We think that this is a situation which cannot last. Subjectively, Comrade Trotsky is a loyal comrade who loves the Russian Party, and who is attached to the Communist International. But by his theory which encourages right tendencies much coarser and more extreme, he throws confusion into the ranks of the International and of the Parties. The development of right tendencies encourages anarchist and bourgeois criticism. It is with right arguments based on Trotsky that our Parties are attacked by the elements of the left bloc in France, by the labourites in Great Britain, and the Social-Democrats in Germany. And everywhere these tendencies give an impetus to fascism, white terror and governmental reaction. Thus objectively in spite of Trotsky and against the wish of Comrade Trotsky this is a chain which goes from Comrade Trotsky to the bourgeoisie via the right.

Therefore, on behalf of the French Party, and I think, on behalf of the Executive we address ourselves to Comrade Trotsky and say: we do not doubt your intentions, but we implore you to break this chain which objectively connects you with all the deviations of the right and through it with the bourgeoisie. Break this chain and turn your attack together with us against the right.

Comrade Bell (England):

The Communist Party of Great Britain has followed the whole discussion around what is called Trotskyism and has

no hesitation in allying itself with the Central Committee of the R. C. P. and the E. C. of the C. I. When the New Economic Policy was introduced every Communist realised that we were entering a transition period towards Communism, and that in this period the Party and the International would be faced with many dangers and difficulties. We understood that the NEP meant the strengthening of the power of the petty bourgeoisie and the richer peasantry and that this would strengthen the demand for political power on the part of these elements who would endeavour to weaken the proletarian dictatorship in Soviet Russia.

Everyone knew that we would have to pay the price for the backwardness in the industrial development of the Soviet Republic. Moreover, we had to reckon with the treachery of the Social Democrats in all countries outside Soviet Russia. At the Third Congress we recognised these things and that we were faced with a period of stabilisation more or less temporary. And when our opponents, the bourgeoisie, the Social Democracy or our Labour Party, taunt the C. P. or the Comintern for not introducing universal communism, we can afford to ignore this.

For us the class struggle is not a mere metaphysical question, the class struggle is a living thing — the struggle of one class, the working class against all the forces of bourgeois society. During this period of temporary stabilisation, the problem of a real Bolshevik Party is not simply to accept the situation or to slacken its activity. During the period of the slackening of the tempo of revolutionary development a real Bolshevik Party must not only continue its work but rather intensify it and prepare for new struggles lying ahead. The basis for all the "Right" tendencies acknowledged to exist in the Comintern is a complete misunderstanding of the character of the Bolshevik Party and its role. It is no accident that there is an ideological similarity between the Right Wing in the Comintern and the renegades in the Second International. When we hear sections of the Comintern objecting to receiving orders from the E. C. of the C. I. we can clearly understand that they have not yet been completely Bolshevised.

The bourgeois press never loses an opportunity to slander the leaders of the Soviet Republic or of the Comintern, and when a Newbold, a Phillips Price, a Tranmael, a Höglund, and Balabanova desert the Communist International, we can understand why they are eulogised in this press. But comrades, it is a more serious thing when the bourgeois press begins to eulogise such a prominent member of the Comintern as Comrade Trotzky and those opposition element standing by him. Of course, there is only a very attenuated comparison between Trotzky and Newbold, but we must recognise that the capitalist press are continually waging war against the Comintern and against the Soviet Republic. In England, when Comrade Lenin died, the whole capitalist press shed crocodile tears over him. They also said that Trotzky was a reasonable man, etc. They said that Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin were the real enemies of Russia and when they were discussing the questions of credits they used the opposition of Comrade Trotzky to try and sow dissension in the workers' ranks.

They said to the Russian peasant: We are ready to give you credits for machinery, but we must have guarantees that these will not be used to carry on international propaganda against Britain and her colonies in the East. They concluded that if the Russian workers and peasants would dismiss Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin and the other leaders of the Comintern they could come to terms.

Trotzkyism is an old question, it did not begin in 1923, but when we see Trotzky's opposition and the opposition within the Comintern, used by the bourgeois press of England and the other capitalist countries, we can understand the danger of allowing Comrade Trotzky or anybody else in the Comintern to be used as a cats paw for strengthening imperialism.

Comrade Trotzky is a very fine fellow. In England and in Western Europe he is regarded as a romantic figure and particularly among the intellectual sections of our movement in England as well as in other countries, there is a feeling that he should have special privileges, a certain amount of scope and criticism. They all agree that he is a wonderful leader, a wonderful fighter for the world revolution. But why, therefore, should the Party be so severe on Comrade Trotzky?

I will tell you the substance, I overheard between a worker and an intellectual on this question. The intellectual put the question as I have described it, and the reply of the worker was "Why the hell should Comrade Trotzky have any more privileges than an ordinary member of the Communist International?" The same discipline should be applied to Trotzky as to any other member of the Communist International. That is how the working class always understands the vital problems facing it, and our Party is quite clear that the revolution needs not only romanticism and valiant service but real discipline and above all centralised direction.

The platform of the Communist International is always open to the discussion of vital questions affecting the working class and the revolutionary movement. The very basis of Bolshevism is self-criticism, as we have been told repeatedly from this platform, and by no one more so than by Comrade Trotsky. The ruthless acknowledgement of our mistakes, a sifting out of our experience; that is the fundamental basis of Bolshevism, and we can only prepare new methods and policies by an understanding of our experiences and errors. But there are occasions, comrades, when questions are in order to be discussed and when they are not. When Trotsky raised the discussion in December 1923, we in Great Britain were willing to listen and to discuss with Trotsky his proposals for overcoming the difficulties facing Soviet Russia. But when Comrade Lenin died and the bourgeoisie thought their chance had come, the Central Committee of the Russian Party and the Comintern were correct in declaring that the situation was such that the discussion must close. And when Trotsky used his privileged position as a member of the Political Bureau, who was entitled to publish opinions in the press on vital problems of our movement, to reopen the discussion despite the decision of the Party to which he had agreed, it was clear that the time had come to exercise the severest discipline and to put Comrade Trotsky in his place. **The Communist Party of Great Britain is in complete agreement with the political line taken by the PolitBureau of the Russian Central Committee of the Comintern.**

We believe that the preparation of paper plans is very essential, but we do not believe that it is sufficient for the workers to overcome the difficulties facing them by the mere preparation of paper plans. When the peasant wants manufactured goods and machinery, credit and a readjustment of prices, he will not be satisfied by a mere diagram of how he is going to get them. When the town worker wants better hours and better wages, we must be able to offer him more than a mere paper plan. We must be able to deliver the goods. It is our opinion, the consolidated opinion of the Communist Party of Great Britain, that the political line taken by the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and by the Comintern is the correct line that will solve our problems and that is why on this question we are against Trotzky and for the Comintern.

Comrade Neumann:

We fully agree with Comrade Bukharin that Trotzkyism is not merely a phenomenon appearing once in one or two Party discussions, but is a prolonged tendency within the labour movement. We agree that Trotzkyism is not only a Russian but also an International phenomenon. The Trotzky discussion in Germany went pretty deep. We faced the question: what are the international and the specifically German peculiarities of Trotzkyism. What are the essential characteristics of Trotzkyism in Germany and in the International? How must Trotzkyism be fought in Germany, what are the ideological roots of Trotzkyism, and what are the ideological weapons which we must use against it? What, finally, is the sense of the whole Trotzky debate in the RCP, in the Communist International and in our Party.

If we raise the question of Trotzkyism and the Trotzkyists in the International, the Trotzkyists in the International will reply: "There is no Trotzkyism; there are mistakes of Comrade Trotzky, but there are various points on which he is right. But where is there a group in Germany which advocates the theory of permanent revolution?"

It is clear that this question cannot be answered by pointing to a definite programme. The earmark of Trotzkyism is, in fact, its lack of principle in the international sphere,

its lack of principle in the individual countries, and its lack of principle toward itself.

Trotskyism today is a particular danger in Western Europe. The principal basis is that we are living in a revolutionary Epoch, but not in an acute revolutionary Period in most countries. During these times in many countries in Western Europe, in these times of the partial stabilisation of capitalism, the breathing space, this current in all Parties is of greater significance.

But it would be absolutely wrong to draw primitive analogies and parallels with the Russian Party history. The concrete forms of the phenomenon of Trotskyism vary in every phase and in every country. Take, for instance, the question of the "cadres" of the personnel of Trotskyism. Its "cadres" in the RCP are not the old elements, not the Old Guard; on the contrary they are attacked by the Trotskyists and must be overthrown by them. The Trotskyist "cadres" are the young elements in the Party, those who entered the Party, like Comrade Trotsky, during the revolution of 1917, and those who, like many others, entered since 1917.

One of the principal characteristics of Trotskyism is the question of the peasants, the question of the alliance with the non-proletarian sections, the standpoints which Lenin criticised as a combination of revolutionary phrases with a Right and opportunist tactic, which tends in the direction of an alliance with the bourgeoisie.

But that is not the whole content of Trotskyism. In Germany the peasant question is undoubtedly of decisive importance, but here it is not the earmark of Trotskyism. In Germany it manifests itself in the false connection of the role of the Party in the revolution, of the relation between the Party and the class, the organisation to the mass, of consciousness to spontaneity. The conception of the Luxemburgists on the role of the proletarian party in the revolution has many things in common with the Trotsky theory of permanent revolution. This point immediately furnishes the transition to Trotskyism in Russia, the link of the chain of permanent revolution. The theory of permanent revolution is revealed in the RCP, principally in the rejection of the alliance with the peasantry, the denial of the leading role of the Communist Party. Trotsky always termed the Bolshevists in the Russian Social Democratic Party sectarians, Blanquists, adventurers, Jacobins, etc., since he believed that the Bolshevists were a sectarian "ultra left" tendency, and that he represented the "left" tendency, whereas in reality he stood in the Centre. This Bolshevik fraction of the Social Democrats and the later party of the Bolshevists were called a "lot of adventurers", a sect by Trotsky up to 1917. He said what Paul Levi writes today. Trotsky did not wish the Bolshevik Party to continue as the leading party of the proletariat. He wanted "reconciliation". This unity fetishism also existed in the left radical group of Rosa Luxemburg in Germany. Its principal mistake was that it did not develop as a fraction, but fought against the opportunists, against the Centre only on separate points. This fundamental error penetrated the whole German Revolution. First there was the split from the (SPG.), then from the (ISP.), but in the course of the whole German Revolution we did not have the recognition of the leading role of our Party. The thought of drawing to us the left wing of the social democrats or of the Social Democratic Party as a whole to the side of the revolution, hung like a millstone round our necks. That was the Trotskyist theory of the bloc revolution, which Brandler stated most clearly at the Leipzig Party Congress: "We must draw the Social Democrats over from the left wing of the bourgeoisie to the right wing of the working class".

This Trotskyist bloc policy resulted in Russia in the August bloc, in Germany in the Zeigner Government of 1923.

A second characteristic of Trotskyism is the lack of understanding of the internal structure of the Bolshevik party. Trotsky never understood the Leninist idea of active members. He never saw the leadership, he saw only single leaders. He does not see the organisational basis, the discipline, the disciplined unity; he does not see the structure; above all, he does not see the active work in the Party which for him is a question of secondary importance.

In Germany we link up the demand for making the members more active with the discussion against Trotskyism.

The question of Party Democracy is also of impor-

tance, which Trotsky formulated incorrectly, and not only in 1923, but as early as an 1903 together with Rosa Luxemburg. We all favour party democracy within the framework of party discipline. In Germany we conducted extended discussions since the Frankfurt Congress, but we state that party democracy cannot be unlimited. We regard it as a characteristic of Trotskyism that it opposes the slogan of the Bolshevisation of the party by the independent slogan of "party democracy".

We believe the same is true of the uninterrupted demand for "freedom, discussion and fractions". We find this formation of fractions not only in Germany, but, as Comrade Treint has explained, also on an international scale. And as a logical consequence we see that our right fractions already are in contact with the social democrats; we see that municipal representatives have deserted us for the Social Democrats; we see reports in social democratic papers about our meetings of our Party organisations, which were given them by the Right.

I wish to touch upon one more point about Trotskyism in the International. Lenin often pointed out that Trotsky has a "European Deviation", that he rejected the methods of the Russian Bolshevists on the ground that one must seek the last word in revolutionary tactics among the West European, the Social Democratic Parties. This underestimation of the Bolshevik forms of struggles, of these "barbaric Russian forms" is returning; are returning again in the arguments we heard here from Kreibich and Smeral. The fight against "exaggerated" centralisation is nothing more than the European deviation of Trotsky reproduced in Western Europe.

I must remark that we also oppose an exaggerated mechanical transplanting of these forms, but that we issue no special slogan in connection with this necessity. We regard this warning as a correction, whereas the Right regard the Bolshevisation as an unpleasant correction of their social democratic traditions.

Behind the spasmodically exaggerated warning against the "mechanical" transplanting of the Russian experiences lies concealed the rejection in principle of the foundations of Leninism itself.

We see that in Germany and Western Europe Trotskyism is assuming a peculiar aspect. This aspect can briefly be characterised as follows:

1. The denial of the leading role of the Communist Party in the Revolution, the false conception of the relations of the Party and class.
2. The idea of the bloc with the Menshevists in one form or another.
3. The false conception of the internal structure of the centralised organisation of cadres and of the discipline of the Communist Party.
4. The denial of the alliance with the peasantry, and the rejection of the strategic alliance in general with the non-proletarian sections, the reserves of the proletarian revolution.

Out of all these characteristics springs the dangerous element which is most important for us, i. e. the tactic of Trotskyism, which is counter to our tactic. I want to go into one question, on the attitude of Trotskyism to partial demands. Trotskyism gives an example of its tactics in the question of freedom of coalition. It is known that Comrade Trotsky in 1910, when the first strikes began again in Russia and the Bolshevists issued the slogan: Overthrow Czarism! Trotsky rejected this slogan and opposed it by the slogan of freedom of coalition. The Bolshevists replied that they never opposed this slogan and that they also advocate it now, Trotsky replied that the Bolshevists ought then to abandon the slogan "Overthrow Czarism", and issue only the slogan: freedom of coalition. But the Bolshevists did not reject the slogan of freedom of coalition and neither did Trotsky. But the difference lies in whether the conception of the achievement of our final aim stands behind the partial demands or not. Trotsky wanted the class slogans to take a back seat behind the partial demands. We have a similar example in the taxation question in Germany. The Brandlerists demanded the formulation of a tax programme after the acceptance of the Dawes Plan. Our Party did put for-

ward a taxation programme, but the opposition wanted to surrender the fight against the Dawes Plan in favour of this taxation programme. It not only wanted to launch a taxation programme, but "a taxation rescue programme", and wanted to present this to the masses of workers as a deliverance from the consequences of the Dawes Plan. The opposition tried to transform the partial demands into final demands, although it did not openly admit it. The Trotzkyists do not understand the relation between tactic and strategy. They made a strategy out of every tactic, in every tactical retreat they change the whole strategy. Trotzkyism sometimes follows the correct tactics during a rise of the revolutionary wave, and seems to reveal a Bolshevist aspect, but during the ebb it inevitably turns to Menshevism.

The question of the freedom of coalition, of the taxation rescue programme, the attitude to the Dawes Plan in Germany, etc., these historical examples are not without importance, because they will form the principal point of conflict in the coming period between us and the Trotzkyists, because for Trotzkyism a whole system develops out of every partial demand, because a strategy is formed out of every tactical turn and every tactical retreat. If now from definite measures, partial demands, taxation demands and, under circumstances, a standpoint on the Washington Agreement is adopted, when in the question of the eight hour day we adopt a different policy, the Trotzkyists declare we have accepted their basis. They "agree" with the Bolshevisation theses, with all the decisions of this Executive session; they also said that after the meeting of our Central Committee, after the Fifth World Congress, and because we know that, we will continue the fight ideologically and reveal the fact that this declaration is nothing more than a platform for the further development of groupings which must be killed off and destroyed.

On account of all these reasons it is necessary to represent the question of international Trotzkyism still more clearly and to define it sharply in the various countries. I believe that the debate on Trotzkyism will play a great role in the development of the Comintern. It was perhaps the principal fault of our international agitprop activity that the results of the Russian Trotzky debate were not sufficiently internationalised, that merely the documents of the Russian Party discussion were translated and published. We must make good this neglect. For we will have the same gain which the RCP. already has, i. e. that the fight against Trotzkyism elucidates the principles and methods of Leninism still more sharply. We cannot assimilate Leninism without making Trotzkyism specific nationally in all concrete questions, and demolishing it ideologically, politically, and practically. Only if we do this on an international scale will we be able to assimilate Leninism during this non-revolutionary period, and create Bolshevist parties.

Comrade Sanborn (America):

Our American Party, too, has its manifestations of Trotzkyism. In America we call it Loreism, as the man, who is the exponent of Trotzkyism in our Party is Lore, the editor of our German organ, the "Volks-Zeitung". While theoretically he may not understand what Trotzkyism is, he was quick to vote for Trotzkyism on the Central Committee of our Party. Comrade Bukharin said that all the critics and enemies of the Communist International were quick to state their approval of the position of Comrade Trotzky, and the case of our American supporter of Trotzky is ample proof of this; for Comrade Lore, who today supports Trotzky in every way he can, has for years been a critic and at many times an opponent of the Communist International. He was with Serati in 1921 and against the Communist International. He was for Levi and said the Comintern was wrong, and in 1923 he wrote that it was a correct attitude of the German Communist Party to prevent a revolution in Germany. In 1924, he celebrated the Fifth Anniversary of the Communist International in the "Volks-Zeitung" by writing an editorial, stating that the Comintern now was all right." At the beginning it was a Blanquist organisation but it has changed its policy. It was against working in the trade unions and is now for it, and a long list of similar twisting of the true history of the Comintern. In our Party as well as in the Russian Party, Trotzky-

ism manifested itself through an erroneous position on the farmers. Comrade Lore is one of the critics of our work among the farmers in the United States, of our effort to develop the Party's support and influence among the farmers at the present time.

Comrade Lore also is an opponent of centralism and sharp discipline within our Party; After the last convention of our Party in December 1924, Comrade Lore sent a telegram to his paper stating that the newly elected Central Committee was a victory for the Trotzkyites in our Party. But fortunately this did not prove to be true. While the Central Executive Committee majority wavered to some extent on the issue of Trotzkyism, at the beginning of last year it too took a position against Trotzkyism and for the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. In the recent debate, our C. E. C. endorsed the decision of the Central Committee of the Russian Party, and this time we did not have any wavering except on the part of Comrade Lore. However, Loreism as the expression of Trotzkyism has a foothold in our Party. It is one of the tasks before our Party to eradicate this American expression of Trotzkyism and this can only be done if the C. E. C. of our Party is ready to carry on a united struggle, ideologically and organisationally against this expression of Trotzkyism. Any effort to minimize, or escape this struggle, the effort to compromise with Trotzkyism, which had expressed itself can only be an expression of sympathy with Trotzky. And we in the American Party will demand that we carry on this fight until this expression does no longer exist in our Party and the Party as a whole stands united against Trotzkyism and for the Russian Communist Party.

Comrade Safar (Czechoslovakia):

Before the Fifth World Congress the old Party leadership of the CP. of Czechoslovakia carried on no explanatory work either in connection with the German October or on the so-called Russian question, and took no clear standpoint either on one or the other of these questions.

That which was not clear in the resolution formulated by Comrade Smeral at the Conference last year permitted sympathetic treatment of the so-called "Trotzky Question". Already at that time the argument of the "method" and form played a great role and not only in the Czechoslovakian Party. Solidarity was affirmed, of course, with the attitude of the C. I. on the Russian Question, only the personal side of the problem should have been treated less harshly.

At the time of the first discussion it was already clear that Trotzkyism represented dangerous deviations from the principles of Leninism in its theoretical basis.

In the second discussion it was a matter of practically the same questions which were the centre of the first discussion. Although the Congress of the RCP. announced the discussion closed, Comrade Trotzky took up this discussion in his "October" a second time and in fact with increased sharpness, and this time it is not merely a question of the Old Guard and its "degeneration", but also of the inadequate leadership of the Comintern, which according to Trotzky's theory must bear the responsibility of the October defeat in Germany and for the analogous defeats in Bulgaria. The attack this time was conducted on a broader basis, was directed openly against the policy of the CC. of the RCP. in the most decisive periods of the development of the Russian Revolution, as well as against the former leaders of the Comintern. At this moment the Sections of the Communist International ought not to have waited for any decision of the Russian Party; they should themselves have taken a clear unambiguous standpoint to Trotzky's attack. That is what the CC. of the CPC., for instance, did immediately, as soon as the first information about the fresh attack on the part of Comrade Trotzky became known. In a resolution which was, as a matter of fact, passed by the entire CC. of the CPC. with two or three abstentions, the CC. adopted a clear standpoint on Trotzky's views.

But Comrade Smeral and a few other comrades believed that we had acted somewhat precipitately, that the information on Comrade Trotzky's fresh attack was not widely enough known. While the majority of the Brünn District Committee believed that the decisions of the CC. against

Trotsky were absolutely unfounded, a special role was reserved for Comrade Muna to play in the Trotsky Question. The attitude of the CC. against Trotsky seemed too weak to him. Before the Fifth Congress he had agreed with Smeral's resolution on the Trotsky Question, but now he believes that the attitude against Trotsky ought to be sharper than that adopted by the CPC. Unfortunately Comrade Muna neglected, in spite of repeated requests, to determine his sharp attitude. Not only that all honest enemies of Bolshevism and the dictatorship of the proletariat viewed the attack of Trotsky sympathetically — it must also be remembered that the opportunists of all the Sections of Comintern and naturally also the opportunists in Czechoslovakia, flirted with Trotskyism and, like Trotsky, or like the opposition in the RCP., counted on the so-called "new autumn crisis", and as a consequence, with the victory of the Trotsky theory. The autumn crisis did not appear; but the policy of the CC. of the RCP. proved to be absolutely correct, and the views of the opposition of the RCP., of Trotskyism, especially in the estimation of the relations of the RCP. of the Russian peasantry, proved entirely wrong. Fundamentally the defeat of Trotskyism means also a mortal blow to the opportunist wing in all the Sections of the Comintern.

In the name of the majority of the official Czechoslovakian Delegation I declare that we completely support the statement made by Comrade Bukharin. The solidarity of the Russian Party, as well as its growth form one of the premises for the development of the international revolutionary proletariat, and in overcoming Trotskyism, the RCP. has become stronger and more influential. In rejecting and fighting against the principles of Trotskyism it was in a position to cope successfully during the last few months and during the past year with the tremendous difficulties which stood in the path of the development of the power of the Soviet Republic, and on an international scale the Comintern will overcome great handicaps also by rejecting, fighting and overcoming the principles of Trotskyism.

Comrade Dorsy (America):

The Central Committee of the Workers Party stands clearly behind the Russian Communist Party in its fight against Trotskyism. In our Central Executive Committee, the vote against Trotsky was 12 to 1. The single vote was cast by Comrade Lore, who is the spokesman or the Right Wing element in the Workers Party. The Lore group, in addition to making the mistakes as regards the international policy of the Comintern, on the questions of Levi, Serrati, Brandler and so on, naturally follow an opportunistic policy in our Party. The conception of this group is not that of a fighting Communist Party.

This group in our party — and it represents a considerable number of our membership — has never yet organisationally, definitely expressed itself. This group represents a danger in our Party and the issue confronting us is how best we can fight this right wing tendency and win the entire Party over to Leninist policy.

Now, Comrade Bukharin in his speech, has shown the way to do this; by carrying on an ideological struggle against the leaders and those who give expression to these tendencies.

We, the CEC. of the Workers Party, have followed out this general line of tactics.

But in this struggle we find that we have certain dangers to confront, and of them is the tendency on the part of groups within our Party to make a purely factional issue out of the question of Trotskyism. Comrade Sanborne in his speech demanded that the Central Executive Committee of the Workers Party carry on a struggle against Lore and Loreism, which he identified entirely with Trotskyism. Comrade Sanborne in his statement told you of a number of articles that Lore wrote in favour of Levi, in support of Serrati, etc., but he failed to tell you that these articles, or several of them, were written during the period when the group that is now the minority of the Central Executive Committee, was controlling the Party and at that time, this minority group, then controlling the Party, made no fight whatsoever against Lore. On the contrary, Lore's opportunistic deviations and aims were overlooked and Lore was entrusted with the most responsible positions in the Party. Comrade Sanborne said that we wavered on this Trotsky issue. I am sure that the Comintern does not believe that. The Comintern is convinced that the present majority of the Workers Party is 100 percent opposed to Trotskyism and all its manifestations. Our Party has gone on record repeatedly to that effect. There has been no wavering on the part of our Party in this vital issue, and there will be no wavering.

Then we have another danger to confront, and it is this — proposals to make simply mechanical organisational attacks against the Lore wing, without a previous ideological preparation. In such a manner, for example, as the arbitrary removal of officials because they are of a Trotsky tendency. The way the members react in such a campaign is to consider the disciplined members as martyrs; such a policy strengthens the Lore group.

I am not very greatly alarmed over the situation, although we have carried on our fight against the right wing under considerable difficulties. As you know our Executive Committee has been split. The two Central groups should be united.

I believe that before we leave Moscow this time, we will be able to eliminate this factional fight between these two centre groups, which is injuring the Workers Party so much. It is the hope of the majority of the Party that this should be done. We have directed our efforts towards it for the past year, and if we can succeed in uniting the two groups here in Moscow, and thereby bring unity into our Party, I think we shall be able to successfully fighting against the Lore right wing. The Trotsky deviations in our Party, will resolve itself into a comparatively simple problem.

Comrade Bukharin:

(Greeted with applause)

The discussion has provided no basis for a reply, since all comrades who defend Trotsky's position have remained silent here. I therefore make the following proposal: I request the Plenum to ask the Political Commission to prepare a resolution on this question and to submit it to-morrow to a vote.

As far as the internal Party questions of the various sections are concerned, these vary in the different sections. Thus it appears to me that the adoption of my suggestion is sufficient. I wish to put it to the vote here.

(The proposal was unanimously accepted).

Twelfth Session, Moscow, April 4th, 1925.

Chairman: Semard.

Comrade Gussev has the floor to announce the decisions of the CCC. of the RCP. on the Brandler - Thalheimer Affair.

Comrade Gussev :

Comrades, the Central Committee of the CPG. asked the Central Committee of the RCP. to hold Comrades Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek, Edda Baum, Felix Wolf, Walcher and Möller to render account to the Party. These comrades are accused by the Central Committee of the CPG. of having conducted fractional activity within the CPG. The Politbureau of the CC. of the RCP. decided to hand this affair over to the Central Control Commission of the RCP., since the comrades in question are members of the RCP. Besides the Commission which was formed by the CCC. of the RCP., members of the International Commission, as well as of the International Control Commission were coopted for the investigation of this matter. The Commission consisted of Comrades Peters, Solz, Slutschka, Stirner, Gussev and Piatnitzky.

The Commission examined the material submitted by the German Central Committee, questioned all the accused and gave them every possibility of explaining what they had to say.

On the basis of the examination of the material, and also on the basis of the examination of the witnesses produced by the accused, the Commission came to the Conclusions contained in a resolution which I will read here.

I wish to emphasise that this resolution is based exclusively on uncontested facts, or at least on facts which were not contested by the accused, but which were merely interpreted differently. The resolution reads:

Resolution of the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party in the Case of Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek and Others.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany requested the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party to take action against comrades Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek, Edda Baum, Felix Wolf, Walcher and Möller. The Central Committee of the German Communist Party charges these comrades with taking part in and guiding systematic faction work in the German Communist Party directed against the Central Committee of the German Communist Party and against their carrying out the policy of the Party which was based on the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern. On the 11th of the February 1925, the Central Committee of the German Communist Party resolved to ask the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party forthwith to expel Comrades Brandler and Thalheimer from the RCP. On March 2, the Politbureau handed the statement of the Central Committee of the German Communist Party for investigation to the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party to which representatives of the International Control Commission of the Comintern were to be co-opted.

After examining the documents submitted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany and hearing the evidence of the comrades against whom the charges have been made, the Central Control Commission arrived at the following conclusion:

Within the German Communist Party there are Right factional groups (composed of the former Right wing of the Party) which are working against the Central Committee and its policy. The line of policy of these groups and their views, in the main, coincide with the views expressed in an article written by Comrade Thalheimer for the "international", but which he later withdrew. Comrade Thalheimer's article contains factional, anti-bolshevik, semi-Trotskyist, criticism of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern and defends the position of Brandler-Radek, which was rejected by the Congress (especially on the question of the estimation of

the German October). Comrade Thalheimer describes the resolution of the Congress on combating opportunist tendencies inside the Communist International, as an exhibition of "fear of spooks", and declares that the Congress "ignored the question" of future prospects and failed "to give a definite reply to this definite question". Furthermore, Comrade Thalheimer's article contains a number of severe attacks against the German Central Committee, the ECCI. as well as against the Russian Old Bolshevik Guard (the attacks upon the latter being entirely in the spirit of Trotzky's "Lessons of October").

This factionalist article by Comrade Thalheimer, which was not published in a single communist publication, was distributed in the ranks of the German Communist Party over the head of the German Central Committee and without the permission of the Central Committee of the ECCI. and was utilised for factional purposes.

The factional activity of the groups referred to above, became particularly marked after the Fifth Congress of the Communist International and took the form of convening factional meetings, in factional speeches at Party and trade union meetings aimed at securing the passage of their own previously drawn up factional resolution (against the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany) and the widespread circulation of anonymous circulars, containing sharp criticism of the line of policy of the Central Committee and also a detailed plan of factional work.

The purpose of the factional work of the groups mentioned is firstly, to change the line of policy of the Central Committee, and to change the composition of the Central Committee in order to secure the reinstatement to leading positions, of Comrades Brandler and Thalheimer. The group of Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer, with whose views are associated Comrades Felix Wolf, Walcher, Edda Baum and Möller — after the Fifth Congress of the Communist International, convened conferences to discuss questions affecting the German Communist Party, closely questioned comrades arriving from Germany concerning the state of affairs within the Party, collected material against the German Central Committee, discredited the Central Committee by factional criticism of the policy conducted, made absolutely intolerable personal attacks on its members, and maintained communication and gave support to the factional groups above-mentioned. Communication was also maintained with the expelled Right Wing, headed by Jannack, to which assistance was also rendered.

Members of the group of the Brandler, Radek, Thalheimer group confirmed the fact that two conferences or "talks" were arranged in the rooms of Brandler and Radek on the question of German Party work (although they denied that these conferences bore a factional character). Comrade Brandler stated that he "queezed", information out of comrades arriving in Moscow concerning the internal state of the German Party. Comrade Möller made a report at one of these conferences on German affairs. The said comrade Möller — working in one of the Soviet delegations in Germany, sent reports through his institution, which, on the admission of the Chief of this institution, bore a "pessimistic" character, i. e. they contained a pessimistic estimation of the internal state of the Party from the point of view of the Right Wing, Brandler orientation. These reports served as material for the Brandler group. Comrade Radek handed Möller £ 100 for the purpose of the giving financial assistance to the Right Wing group expelled from the German Communist Party (although he denied that this money was intended for factional work). Through the agency of Anna Kolditz, an employee of Brandler's, living in his rooms in Berlin, letters were sent from Germany addressed to Brandler in Moscow containing cleverly disguised plans for future factional work. In a letter addressed to Comrade Eisenberg, Comrade Brandler wrote: "In Germany an opposition has been formed which is not content with phrases about Bolshevizing the Party, but desires to fight for concrete aims. In Gotha and Remscheid, the local trade unions, which are in our hands, have put forward concrete demands including the demand for the transference of the burden of taxation as a concrete method

for fighting against the Dawes Plan. The Central Committee rejected this. The Gotha Central Committee submitted and abandoned the demand for transferring the burden of taxation. In Remscheid, however, the Central Committee did not submit. For this, Jannak, Plutes and others were expelled. In Hamburg, Westermann and Faber have been expelled. The expulsion of Faber has been endorsed by the Central Committee. On the Central Committee, Remmele no doubt, declared that prior to October 1923, the Party was merely a radical Socialist Party, but now it is a Bolshevik Party. At the meeting of the Central Control Commission, Brandler tried to prove that his letter was not factional and the phrase: "Gotha and Remscheid are in our hands", meant to imply that Gotha and Remscheid were in the hands of the Party. This explanation, however, contradicts the rest of the text of the letter, which is obviously factional, as well as the fact that the Gotha and Remscheid factionalists put up their own resolution against the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

At the meeting of the Central Control Commission, Comrades Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer made speeches containing exceptionally sharp and absolutely intolerable statements against the German Central Committee. Comrade Brandler particularly declared that "he will still be in the camp of the revolution when several of the comrades of the present Central Committee will be in the camp of the counter-revolution". Not less sharp and factionally hostile, although not so politically bitter, were the speeches made against the Central Committee by Comrades Radek, Thalheimer, Felix Wolf and Edda Baum. Behind all these factional declarations was the totally unconcealed striving to discredit the Central Committee, and to secure a change in its composition.

In addition to detailed attacks, these comrades (particularly Thalheimer, Radek, Brandler and Wolf) at the meeting of the Central Control Committee, declared that the German Central Committee was not carrying out the resolutions of the Fifth Congress, with which they, the supporters of the Brandler-Radek group, were now prepared to associate themselves. In this connection, Comrades Thalheimer and Walcher attempted also to prove that Zinoviev and Stalin had now adopted the views of Thalheimer-Brandler; the whole of Walcher's speech was directed to proving that the German Central Committee was not carrying out the resolution of the Fifth Congress, particularly on the question of the trade unions. Thalheimer said the same thing, and he declared that he was not in agreement with the German Central Committee on a single question, but that he was in agreement with Stalin and Zinoviev; that now Stalin and Zinoviev had come over to his, Thalheimer's side, and were supporting the views expressed by him in the above mentioned article. These efforts, directed towards substituting Brandlerism for Bolshevism and by distorting the line of policy of the Fifth Congress while pretending to associate themselves with those decisions, introduce the policy of liquidation and by this means place the German Central Committee in opposition to the Comintern, bring about the dismissal of the Central Committee and the substitution of its policy by Brandlerism. This method of substitution is recommended in individual cases and in the factional circulars mentioned above.

On the basis of what has been stated above, the Central Control Commission considers it as proved that within the Communist Party of Germany there are organised fractions, containing several internal Party groups and a group of members of the Russian Communist Party (Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek and others) which are conducting factional work on the basis of a political platform which finds its expression in a number of articles and documents (Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek and the anonymous authors of the circulars). The Central Control Commission is of the opinion that on the grounds of the facts quoted above, in the complex difficult conditions in which the German Communist Party has

now to work and in the face of a widespread, sharply hostile tendency against Brandler-Thalheimer within the Party, the German Central Committee was right in demanding the expulsion of Brandler and Thalheimer from the Russian Communist Party, which they fully deserved, also demanding that Comrades Radek, Edda Baum, Felix Wolf, Heinz Möller and Walcher be made to answer before the Party, in order to deprive these comrades of the possibility of conducting further factional work in the Communist Party of Germany.

Basing itself, however, on the desire to achieve as painless a liquidation of the factional groups inside the Communist Party of Germany as possible and to give Comrades Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek and the others an opportunity of proving the truth of the declaration they made at the meeting of the Central Control Committee that they will refrain from carrying on factional work, the Central Control Commission considers it possible to limit itself to the following measures:

1. To censure severely and utter a warning to Comrades Heinz Möller for their systematic factional work and their serious violation of Party discipline.

2. To prohibit Comrades Brandler, Thalheimer, Radek, Edda Baum, Felix Wolf and Heinz Möller from interfering in any form in the work of the Communist Party of Germany.

3. The Central Control Commission warns the comrades, that in the event of their continuing factional work or interfering in the affairs of the Communist Party of Germany, they will certainly be placed outside of the Russian Communist Party.

4. To regard it as impossible to allow Comrades Brandler, Thalheimer and Radek to take part in Comintern work.

5. The Central Control Committee considers it necessary that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany shall conduct extensive, internal Party work for the purpose of explaining to the members of the Party the political significance of this resolution.

This resolution was approved by the Presidium of the CC of the RCP and of the Politbureau of the CC of the RCP;

In conclusion I wish to say a few words on the political significance of this resolution. It stresses a matter with exceptional sharpness which all Right deviations have in common and which could be studied by you here in the present session of the Executive. We encounter the same method everywhere, which consists in the attempt to substitute liquidationist views for the views of the Communist International, by formally adhering to the decisions of the Fifth Congress and especially the theses on Bolshevism, and then interpreting them in accordance with one's own liquidationist views.

The situation which arose on a European scale recalls the situation in which the Russian Party was placed in 1907. At that time both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were convinced that it was all up with the Russian Revolution, but they drew opposite conclusions: The Bolsheviks drew revolutionary conclusions and planned on a new revolution; the Mensheviks, on the other hand, drew liquidationist conclusions. Something similar to this is now observable in the conclusions arrived at during the session of the Executive of the CI, when Right groups explain the situation in their way, draw their peculiar conclusions, and apply their own methods, in order to substitute their own views for those of the CI. This was also evident in the matter in hand, when Thalheimer declares that he agrees with Zinoviev and Stalin and that Zinoviev and Stalin had come round to his viewpoint.

This method is not new, but in the course of the last year it became quite the fashion. (Applause.)

The resolution was submitted to the vote and unanimously accepted. (Applause.)

The following Declaration of Comrades Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer is read out:

To the Polit Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

Dear Comrades.

We consider it necessary to submit to you the following declaration and request your permission to communicate it also to the Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, and to publish it.

1. We consider the differences which have existed between the signatories to this declaration and the Executive Committee of the Comintern concerning the slogan of **Workers' Government**, to be historically closed. The idea that the Workers' Government could be something more than an agitation slogan, had for its premise: a period of sharp collapse of the capitalist system fringing the masses of the social-democratic Workers up against the social-democratic leaders and permitting the hope that, by a coalition with the left social-democratic elements, it would be possible for a time to gain temporary advantages for the fight for the **dictatorship of the proletariat**. The stabilisation of capitalism in Western Europe, which is becoming more obvious every day since November 1923, is strengthening social-democracy, makes it necessary for the Comintern to make a sharp change of front against social-democracy and gives to the slogan of Workers' Government a purely agitational significance. Under what conditions a fresh revolutionary wave will rise and what calls it will make upon the Parties of the Comintern, it is impossible to foresee now. Consequently, the differences existing at the Fifth Congress concerning this question, are now of historical significance only for us.

2. The most vital thing for us in the past year was the care for the preservation and the mass character of the Communist Parties, which were threatened by the hostile attitude of the German Central Committee towards the question of partial demands and by its organisation policy, which placed outside of the Party valuable proletarian elements, — founders of the Party, merely for the reason that they demanded a policy enabling the Party to avoid the fate of becoming a revolutionary sect. The theses read by Comrade Zinoviev, the chairman of the ECCI, on the 22nd of March, indicate that the leaders of the Comintern see the danger ahead. In spite of the fact that these theses contain unfair assertions concerning our policy, we declare that they correspond with our point of view and that we associate ourselves with them. We welcome the fact that the leaders of the Comintern explain to the Communist Parties that their Bolshevisation demands the most careful adaptation to the peculiarities of the development of each country, that Bolshevisation may be achieved only through free discussion in the organisations, but a regime of Party democracy rendering possible the selection of the

Party leadership from among the most experienced comrades. We welcome the fact that the leaders of the Comintern impose the obligation upon all parties to take all measures to secure a healthy, normal, internal party development and the removal of all traces of previous factional conflicts.

3. We declare that we will do all in our power to secure the achievement of this aim. We consider it our duty to call the attention of the Executive Committee to the fact that, in order to achieve this aim, it is necessary to reinstate in the Party more than 50 proletarians, — the founders of the Communist Party of Germany. A Section of these comrades was expelled for defending the policy of partial demands and a section for breaches of discipline, which, if they did occur at all, were due to the fact that the German Central Committee did not properly carry out the line of policy now proposed in the theses of Comrade Zinoviev. While not defending breaches of Party discipline, we call the attention of the Executive Committee to the fact that it is a matter concerning excellent proletarian elements who, already during the war, worked underground as revolutionaries, and who, even after expulsion, have shown by their conduct and all their speeches, that they are convinced Communists. The reinstatement of Comrades like Jannack Westerman, Deizen, and Volker, will not only remove the injustice committed against these comrades in Germany, bound to us by ties of 15 years of joint work, tional work in the ranks of the German Communist Party and the establishment of real unity in the Party.

4. Our declaration has the aim to assist in this and to help in the fulfilment of the great tasks which now confront the Comintern. Never has the Comintern been so much in need of unity as at the present time. We are convinced that comrades in Germany, bound to us by ties of 15 years of joint work, will associate themselves with the fundamental ideas contained in this declaration. The development of the Western European communist movement calls for a synthesis of the leading elements — which became crystallised in the battle of ideas against social democracy while they were still in the latter and which later, breaking with the social democracy, established the Communist Party — and the young elements which came to communism in the battles of 1919 and later, and which express the temper of the working class youth which grew up after the war. To bury old factional antagonisms, to hammer out a Bolshevik line of policy in the fire of self-criticism, on the basis of Party democracy — this is the task which will be fulfilled if Comrade Zinoviev's theses will be not only passed by the Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee, but also carried out.

With Communist greetings,

(Signed): H. Brandler, K. Radek, A. Thalheimer.

Reply to the Declaration of Comrades Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer.

Introduced by the Delegation of the RCP., in the Name of the Central Committee of the RCP.

Comrade Manuilsky

now read the following Declaration of the CC the RCP.

Having read the declaration of Comrades Radek, Brandler, and Thalheimer of March 25, 1925, the Enlarged Plenum of the ECCI. considers it necessary to note the following.

Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer bear the greatest responsibility for the Social Democratic distortions of the tactics of the Communist Party of Germany which caused such great damage to the German revolutionary movement in 1923. The tendency headed by Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer tried to convert the revolutionary tactics of the united

front into tactics of coalition with the Social Democracy. By means of the "Saxony" Policy (the conditions upon which Brandler joined the Government of Saxony, his "work", in it, etc.) this "tendency" converted the tactics of the Communists into a banal parliamentary comedy, which revealed the utter political bankruptcy of these three comrades,

The Thirteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party unanimously declared that the policy of Comrade Radek, who at that time tried to speak in the name of the Russian Communist Party, had nothing in common with the real policy of the Russian Communist Party. The Frankfurt Congress of the Communist Party of Germany, with equal determination, condemned the line of policy of Brandler and Thalheimer. Finally the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, in the name of the Communist Parties of all countries, severely condemned the Menshevik deviations of these three comrades.

Instead of conscientiously admitting their political error, by their declaration of the 25th of March, 1925, they still further aggravate it. They declare that they "associate themselves" with the theses on the present session of the Enlarged Plenum of the ECCI. But they regard their differences with the Comintern over the question of workers' Government as "historically closed", merely because "the period of the acute collapse of the capitalist system has come to an end". They continue to believe that when the revolutionary struggle will again become acute, it will be necessary to return to the old tactics of Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer, which they themselves, in their declaration of the 25th of March 1925, defined as a striving "by means of a coalition with the Left Social Democratic elements... temporarily to win a position for the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat". The authors of the declaration, by this show that they continue to stand as before with both feet on the ground of the tactics of coalition with Social Democracy; in other words, they continue in their departure from Bolshevism to Menshevism.

At the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, Comrades Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer continued persistently to advocate their anti-communist position. In the articles of Comrades Thalheimer and Kreibich, written immediately after the Fifth Congress, their anti-communistic position was still more sharply defined. The whole of the activity of these comrades in the period between the Fifth Congress and the present Enlarged Plenum of the ECCI has been directed against the policy of the Fifth Congress. Therefore, the statement contained in the declaration of Comrades Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer, of March 25th, 1925, to the effect that for them the most important thing last year was "to endeavour to preserve the mass character of the Communist Party", cannot be taken seriously. The Communist International, established under the direct guidance of Comrade Lenin and always remaining true to Leninism, from the first day of its existence to the present day has worked entirely in the direction of creating and preserving mass proletarian parties. The difference between the Comintern and the "tendency" represented by Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer, consists in that the Comintern strives to form and preserve mass Communist, Bolshevik parties, whereas Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer are conducting a policy of Semi-Menshevik "mass" parties. On the lips of these three comrades the phrase "revolutionary sects" sounds like the declarations of Paul Levi.

Equally insincere politically, was the conduct of this group in connection with the question of the Trotzky species of Menshevism: While the whole of the Comintern sharply condemned Trotzkyism, Radek in Russia directly supported it; and Brandler and Thalheimer wrote ambiguous declarations, striving by half-hearted repudiation of Trotzkyism, to secure the opportunity of attacking the brother Communist Party of Germany.

A particularly glaring light is thrown on the declaration of Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer, of the 25th of March, 1925, by the fact that the declaration was made at the moment when the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party, in conjunction with representatives of the International Control Commission, after investigating, the question of the factional, — but not — schismatic "work" of these three comrades in the German Communist Party, came to the conclusion that Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer deserved to be expelled from the ranks of the Russian Communist Party, and consequently, from the Comintern.

If, generally, in view of the above, serious importance cannot be attached to the Radek, Brandler, and Thalheimer declaration of "solidarity" with the tactics of the Comintern, still less does this declaration deserve the confidence of the Communist International when it is made after the Central Control Commission has passed the above-mentioned decision.

The Plenum of the ECCI sees in this politically insincere declaration of Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer, nothing else than a tactical manoeuvre, borrowed from the tactics of the Social Democratic leaders, directed against the line of policy of the Fifth Congress and therefore refuses to take cognisance of it.

Geschke (Chairman):

We will now vote on this declaration of the CC. of

the RCP. The Presidium proposes that the ECCI adopt this declaration of the CC.

The declaration was unanimously adopted.

Comrade Bertz of Chemnitz has the floor for a second declaration on the same subject:

Comrade Bertz:

In the name of the German Delegation I have to make the following declaration:

"The Delegation of the Communist Party of Germany has the following answer to make to the "declaration" of Comrades Brandler - Radek - Thalheimer to the Politbureau of the RCP.:

1. At the request of the RCP, and of the Central Committee of the CP. of Germany, the Central Control Commission has instituted expulsion proceedings against Brandler and Thalheimer and disciplinary proceedings against Radek because of the fractional work and crass breach of discipline. The "statement" of Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer is a thinly veiled manoeuvre to weaken the impression which must be made upon the Communist workers by the decision of the highest party court of the RCP. Brandler, Thalheimer and Radek are utilising the Session of the Enlarged Executive to establish for themselves again a legal platform for factional work through the declaration of their alleged agreement with the decision of the Comintern.

2. This manoeuvre of Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer, will neither deceive nor astonish any member of the Communist Party of Germany. For more than a year the right factional group in the CPG., under the leadership of Radek and a group of fractional emigrants in Moscow, has been endeavouring to employ these same opportunist tactics of the united front against the leadership of their own party and of the CI., which they employed in 1923 towards the Menshevik class enemies of the proletariat to the advantage of Social Democracy and the disadvantage of the Communist cause. They have only learned from the events of October 1923 to transfer their particular methods of struggle against Menshevism to the ranks of their own Party and to utilise them for purposes of dividing the Party. They thus again proved that the irreconcilable and decisive differences between the policy of Radek and Brandler and the policy of Bolshevism are not "historically exhausted", but are historically and practically more alive than ever. Only the objective situation in which the Communist Party of Germany has to fight has changed. There has been no change in the Brandlerites. Since the whole-hearted condemnation of their principles by the German Party they have only moved still further away from Communism and have approached even more closely to Social Democracy, whose ideology they represent in our ranks. The CPG. therefore sees no reason to discuss the fundamental problems of our tactics or any other political question with persons like Brandler, Radek, and Thalheimer. The discussion with Brandlerism was closed by the Frankfurt Party Congress and the Fifth World Congress. What the Party and the International now require is the continuation and intensification of the ideological struggle against Brandlerism until its last vestiges are extirpated in the heads of the members of the Party.

3. It is also characteristic of the spirit of Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer, that even today — contrary to the point of view of the Third International — they declare that in a period of a rising revolutionary wave, it is possible "to bring about a temporary conquest of transition positions for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat through a coalition with the social democratic elements".

The purely demagogic relationship of the above-named to the Comintern and its decisions are characterised by the fact that in this same declaration they endeavour to pretend their "complete agreement with the Bolshevisation theses of Comrade Zinoviev."

4. The political significance of this equivocation is its clearly visible intention to drive a wedge between the CPG. and the RCP., between the CPG. and the Comintern. Here Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer confuse the CI. with the

German Social Democracy. They mistake the relationship of the International with its Sections and the relationship of the Communist Parties with one another, for the relationship of the various local organisations, groupings and tendencies within SPG. After having proved their inability to manoeuvre amongst the various tendencies of the social democracy in a Bolshevist manner, they desire today to prove their ability to carry out manoeuvres in a Menshevik manner against the parties of the Comintern. At the same time they are transferring the methods of demoralisation of their factional work in Germany to the entire International.

5. In order to obtain legality for this method of struggle, Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer are misusing the Communist principles of "party democracy" and "freedom of discussion" and are using them as battle-cries against the German Central Committee. They believe that they will in this way be able to win the Comintern for their Brandlerist aims. In this as well they are the victims of an illusion similar to that of October 1923. Just as they at that time hoped to obtain the German Soviet Republic without effort under the banner of the Weimar Constitution, they now count upon overflowing the leadership and the political fundamentals of the CPG under the banner of "party democracy and freedom of discussion". This time, however, their aim is a diametrically opposite one: no longer the overthrow of the bourgeoisie but an insurrection in our own ranks. . . Nevertheless this struggle is not only much more hopeless but also much more unbolshevist than 18 months ago. The CPG will pay careful attention to this aspect of the Brandler - Radek - Declaration, hostile to the Party. As before and even more than hitherto, it will ruthlessly suppress and render impossible any endeavour to carry on factional work, any attack upon party discipline, and any thwarting and hindering of their policy.

6. It is no accident that Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer appeared before the Comintern with a new offensive against the German Party just at the moment of revolutionary ebb. They know very well that in certain periods it is inevitable that feelings of fatigue and depression arise in the Party. They want to exploit the mood to place obstacles in the path of the Party. They hope to be able to gain the most unclear and wavering elements of the Party for themselves and for their fraction through the aid of such moods. **They have endeavoured and will endeavour to distort the revolutionary tactics of manoeuvre to which the party is compelled to resort in this situation into their opportunist alliance with social democracy.** They have attempted and will attempt to exploit the revolutionary tactics of partial demands and partial struggles, the Bolshevist tactics of retreat and tacking, to raise the partial demands to a Menshevik system, to proclaim the retreat as the normal communist policy and to veer the Party over to the social democracy. That is why they continually raise in their declaration the knowingly untrue charge against the Central Committee of the CPG. that "it rejects partial struggles".

7. The CPG. fully realises that it is lost if it yields to such desires and sentiments. That is why it has carried on the ideological struggle against Brandlerism even after October to the present day with such determination and down into the lowest organisations of the Party, down to the smallest local organisations and factory nuclei. That is why it destroyed the Brandlerite fraction, which following the example of their deposed leaders endeavoured to undermine the Party and in many cases collaborated directly with Social Democracy, not only with all political means, but also with all organisational weapons. In this connection it could not hesitate even to expel a small group of factional fighters who at the moment of defeat, disorganised, injured and in part even betrayed the Party.

8. At the close of their declaration Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer demand the "burial of factional antagonism".

A year before this statement and also today the CPG. was and is always ready to liquidate the last vestiges of factional struggle.

The sole but uncertain road to the "burial of factional struggle" is the complete and final burial of Brandlerism, of the Menshevik policies of Brandler, Thalheimer and Radek, who provoked and prolonged the factional struggle and brought it to a head."

This is the statement of the German Delegation. I should only like to add that for the German Delegation, the

measures taken against Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer and company do not go far enough. But in the expectation that in the event of a renewed endeavour to form a fraction or to arrive at fractional decisions, more decisive measures will be taken than now, **we have declared our readiness to accept the steps taken by the RCP. against Brandler, Radek and Thalheimer.**

Comrade Ruth Fischer :

From the standpoint of the German Party, Comrade Clara Zetkin's arguments must be answered, as we are now in a rather difficult political situation after the presidential elections.

As to the presidential elections, I think that one cannot quite agree with Comrade Zetkin. We admit that we are surprised at the relatively large number of votes polled by the Social Democrats and the small number of votes polled by us. We know, of course, that one cannot automatically compare presidential elections with parliamentary and municipal elections. The example of Finland and America shows us that these elections are a much more difficult proposition and are not a criterion of the true relation of forces.

Nevertheless the presidential election campaign in Germany aroused this time much more enthusiasm than the Reichstag Elections, which explains any wrong appreciation of the results. For a correct appreciation of the Presidential Elections, it is characteristic that in this for the workers purely abstract and demonstrative nomination of a Communist who has no chance whatever to be elected, the most reliable industrial districts voted very much in our favour whilst Bavaria, and rural districts generally lost a considerable number of votes. As compared with the December elections we lost 30 % in Berlin, and in Bavaria up to 80 %. This means that the attitude in the agricultural districts and especially in the South German districts, which have still a separatist tendency, was utterly different from that of industrial districts.

We must admit that mistakes were made in organisational work. Moreover, the difficulty of the tactics which we have to adopt to expose the Social Democrats has become evident. Our Party has had such a bad experience with Brandler's opportunist exposure policy, that it is slow in learning to combine an irreconcilable policy towards the Social Democrats with a policy enabling us to expose these **Social Democrats to the workers in connection with every day questions.**

This is one of the chief lessons which we must draw from the election campaign. There is another lesson namely, that during the setback of the revolutionary movement in Germany and the temporary restoration of the bourgeoisie we must not leave out of account that in spite of the liquidation of fascism there is a **permanent monarchist peril in Germany**, and that in these elections the workers are voting on the question — republic or monarchy. In spite of all the criticisms of the Social Democrats this election result is a sign that the workers feel that they must resist the new "legal" monarchism. That is why this question is particularly difficult for us, since the Social Democratic Party has always posed and fought in the name of the German Republic. In the name of the German Republic our best fighters were slain, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were assassinated in the name of the German Republic. That is why this question is a very complicated matter for the German Party. We must raise the question: Monarchy or Republic in such a way as to disassociate it entirely from the opportunist policy of the Social Democrats. And if this question is new for the German Party, we must say that the Comintern too has not paid enough attention to it. I have read a criticism of the Agitprop Department on the "Rote Fahne" saying that the policy of the "Rote Fahne" has much that is perfectly correct and commendable. But we also read in this criticism: "It seems to us that on the whole the "Rote Fahne" exaggerates the monarchist peril, and diverts thereby the attention of working class readers from the real peril of the social significance of the Luther Government."

I think that this criticism is beside the mark. The result of the presidential elections gives great joy to the SPG. which

declares that the Communist Party is in its death throes. We know that these polemics have already been going on for years, and we will be "in our death throes" as long as we have not beaten the Social Democrats. The main thing for us is to beat the SPG. on its own ground. It is not enough to fight against the SPG. only from the historical standpoint. This has been once more confirmed by the experience of the presidential elections.

The questions raised by Comrade Clara Zetkin are more or less connected with political questions, with policy. Her report has reminded us who have come from Germany of many similar speeches which we have heard at home, which consist in seemingly agreeing with the principles, whilst practically frustrating the work by proposing another platform. Far be it from us to associate Comrade Clara Zetkin with the elements who were given their due here today. But I must say that it is dangerous to make use of such formulae.

First of all Comrade Zetkin gave us in her report a picture of the complete collapse in the trade unions. I do not know where the material came from. A considerable amount of material comes now from various parts of the international. Our delegates from the districts know that in their own district there are already more trade union fractions than the number stated by Comrade Zetkin for the whole Party. Such material is not conducive to facilitate objective criticism. Comrade Zetkin accuses the German Party of having expelled the best elements from the Party and of having discouraged others, for instance, Ernst Meyer, etc. I do not think it is necessary to dwell on the isolated cases mentioned by Comrade Clara. But one thing seems to me important: the reproaches of those who failed to get a parliamentary mandate. It is rather characteristic that such a thing could play a role — all the more characteristic as the forthcoming parliamentary elections in Czechoslovakia cast in advance their shadow on the crisis. To use Comrade Smeral's words, parliamentary elections and mandates should be treated with great discrimination also in the Comintern.

After the Frankfurt Party Congress we made peace with all the districts. Only those who witnessed the demoralisation of the Party which Brandler caused by inciting one district against another, can realise how important this was. What did we do? In the first instance, we enforced trade union tactics. More efforts will be required to make the Party adopt a correct policy. When the question of attracting forces is raised, I can only point out the formation of fractions. I maintain that the German Party would have made greater progress with its Bolshevisation if the Right were not to interfere with it. It is the Right which fills the workers with distrust. For instance, if we were to receive today the news that a kind of press correspondence of the Right is being disseminated in the districts with articles and reports, we would like to ask the Communist International to tell us on the strength of its former experiences if a fraction can dare doing such things without going over very soon to the enemy, without becoming openly Menshevik. Therefore, Comrade Zetkin's advocacy of those who disturb the Party, who hinder its development, was very bad and brings, unfortunately Comrade Zetkin's report very near these things.

I think that on the basis of the decisions of the Comintern and of our Party Congress, the German Party will be able to carry out its Bolshevisation in good earnest. Our progress towards Bolshevisation is difficult, not only because of the objective situation in Germany, but also because of our party's past which makes it particularly difficult to deal with the Party questions now before us.

I am convinced that with the help of the decisions of the Executive and with the help of our comrades in the districts in the struggle against the right elements we will yet come to truly Bolshevick tactics in Germany.

Geschke (Chairman):

Comrade Neumann has the floor as reporter of the Political Commission.

Comrade Neumann :

The Commission unanimously adopted the draft theses of Comrade Zinoviev on Bolshevisation, which were introduced by the Russian, German, and French Delegations.

Many changes were made. No counter-suggestions in the matter of principle were made in connection with the draft by any delegation. The chapter on Luxemburgism was somewhat toned down. For instance, in the trade union questions "the mistake of Rosa Luxemburg", was changed to the "mistake of the Luxemburgists", and "the mistakes which the Polish Party and Rosa Luxemburg made" was changed to "the mistakes which the Polish Party made under the leadership of Rosa Luxemburg". No one objected in principle to this chapter on Luxemburgism.

In the paragraph on the "concrete tasks of the German Party", the passage "under no circumstances must this be done by mechanical purging of the Party and similar measures", was unanimously eliminated at the suggestion of the German Delegation.

The formulation on the workers' and peasants' government, in connection with the decisions of the Fifth Congress was made concrete by the addition, "that is in the revolutionary sense, which excludes all opportunist interpretation".

A suggestion of the French Delegation, which makes a paragraph on joint work with the CGTU. concrete, was also adopted unanimously. The same is true of a suggestion by the Italian Delegation with reference to the fight against the ideological deviations of Graziadei and the Bordigists.

A suggestion of Comrade Zetkin with reference to work among women was adopted.

The suggestion of the British Delegation is also of some importance, and was adopted; in the paragraph, "A Bolshevik is not one who joins the Party when the revolutionary wave is at its height. A Bolshevik proves himself during the period of defeat", was added: "This does not mean that these comrades who join the Party when the revolutionary tide is rising are inferior to those whose membership is of long standing, but the real test of their qualities can only come during the period of depression and difficulty".

The suggestion of Comrade Kolarov on the concrete tasks of the Balkan Parties was also unanimously adopted.

Many other suggestions were turned over to an Editorial Commission appointed by the Presidium for final formulation. This included a proposal on the trade union question.

Comrades, the Political Commission adopted the Bolshevisation theses unanimously, without taking a vote, and recommends that the Executive adopt them unanimously.

(The theses were thereupon unanimously adopted by the Plenum).

(At this point Comrade Zinoviev delivered his closing speech, which will be published in the next Special Number, Ed.).

Comrade Varis, a student of the University of the Toiling Peoples of the East greeted the Executive in the Hindustan language. (Applause).

Comrade Nikolayeva, (Indochina) greeted the Executive in the name of the women of the Far East.

Comrade Gallacher (Great Britain) :

Comrades, a modern, stupid, patriotic, imperialistic British poet penned these words — "East is east, and west is west and never the twain shall meet." But that imperialistic poet did not visualise the coming into existence of the Communist International. Under the banners of the Communist International East and West has met, — east and west marching shoulder to shoulder under the guidance and teachings of Marx and Lenin and east and west to end the reign of the imperialistic exploiters, and here tonight, as a representative from Britain the land of the worst type of imperialist countries, the land of the imperialists who have robbed and pilfered the east for centuries, I say in the name of all the delegates of the West to our eastern comrades that we pledge ourselves to march with our eastern comrades until the great goal of the world emancipation has been achieved.

Comrade Larkin (Ireland):

Communism is going to bring the different races of the world together in one homogenous movement, for the great purpose. This movement is close to life itself, and expresses the needs of countless millions of the earth's peoples. We have got to direct the real work.

It is an inspiration to come to this great city to gather strength and courage to go forward with our work for the obliteration of capitalism. This movement gives us something to live and work for, and something to die for. We must not mind these insignificant people who cross the stage of life, these Brandlers, Thalheimers, Radeks, to-day social democrats, and to-morrow Bolsheviks, and then again social-democrats. We must be willing to serve, be willing to learn. The workers of the world are reaching out for knowledge; they are reading Marx, they are reading Lenin, and they are going to be guided by Marx and Lenin, and not by Radeks or by opportunist politicians.

I give you all greetings and I can promise you on behalf of the Irish proletariat we will not fail you in the big struggle ahead.

Comrade Roy (India):

Comrades, I certainly express the sentiment of all of you and of the mass of the revolutionary proletariat that you represent in welcoming the students of the Eastern University before this Session of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International. In this Session the significance of the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples in the relation to the struggle against capitalism has been very clearly drawn out. The ability to form organic relations with this very powerful ally in the colonial and semi-colonial countries will to a great extent determine the development of the world revolution in the future. Judging from the spirit and understanding with which the Communist Parties of the world are approaching this great problem of international significance, we can well hope that the revolutionary forces of the colonial and semi-colonial countries will be brought within the active ranks of revolutionary forces being organised under the banner of the Communist International. **Together they will go to the final battle against world imperialism and complete the task which has been started by our Russian comrades under the leadership of Lenin and Marx.**

Comrade Domski:

In the name of the Polish, German and French Delegations I submit the following resolution for your acceptance:

Draft Resolution on the Report of the Executive of the C. I.

The Plenum of the Enlarged Executive of the Comintern declares that the decisions of the Fifth World Congress of the Communist International on the **political and economic situation**, and on the **tactic of the Communist Parties** have been proved correct and were substantiated by the development of the international situations since the Fifth World Congress.

The Enlarged Plenum declares that the **Executive of the C. I. acted in the spirit of the decisions of the Fifth World Congress** in all its activity, and that in its activity successfully further the Bolshevisation of the Communist movement and the task of overcoming opportunist tendencies.

The Enlarged Executive lays special emphasis on the significance of the **international campaign for unity of the trade union movement**, which increases the Left tendencies in the Amsterdam International Trade Union League, undermines the influence of the Right trade union leaders, and accelerates the revolutionisation of the masses organised into the trade unions.

The **Plenum determinedly meets the attacks of the Right elements on the activity of the ECCI**. It declares that the Executive, in intervening in a number of Parties, assisted in overcoming the opportunist tendencies. The manner of dealing with the Czech questions especially was absolutely correct.

In the extremely difficult international situation, between two revolutionary waves, in the period of temporary depression in the labour movement of some countries, the Executive helped the Communist Parties to preserve their mass character, to deepen their influence over the masses of workers and peasants, and to increase their ability to carry on active work.

The **Enlarged Plenum expresses its confidence in the Executive** and calls upon all Sections of the Communist International to continue resolutely and energetically to support the struggle of the ECCI for the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties.

Polish Delegation: Domski.

French Delegation: Albert Treint.

German Delegation: Ruth Fischer.

The theses were unanimously adopted.

Correction.

In the speech of Comrade Kreibich at the Enlarged Executive, reported in our special Number 32, page 421, the last line of the third paragraph should read: "pure commissary treatment of the illness of the Party", and not, "pure Communist treatment"

Pages 497 + 498
of Inprecor 1925

Vol. 5 No. 37 April 23

are

BLANK

Mtg Sept 2021

Pages 497 + 498
of Inprecor 1925

Vol. 5 No. 37 April 23

are

BLANK

Mtg Sept 2021