

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6. No. 18

10<sup>th</sup> March 1926

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

## Session of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

*(Detailed Report.)***Second, Third and Fourth Sessions.**

### Report of Comrade Zinoviev on the Activities of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

**(Second Session, February 20, 1926.)**

#### I. Introductory.

Comrades, you have already been presented with a written report of the Executive Committee containing considerable material in relation to my report. In addition you have received the theses which have been discussed and approved on the whole by the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. As you are already somewhat acquainted with the extensive material connected with the theme of my report, I may assume that my task is somewhat lightened. I therefore take the liberty of confining myself to the bringing forward of only a few of the most essential figures and facts.

You all remember that at the Fifth Congress we recorded the temporary advent of the "era of democratic pacifism" in capitalist countries. We may state boldly that the year 1924 was indeed thus featured. The year 1925, at the commencement of which the last Enlarged Executive of the C. I. took place, was a period of capitalist "stabilisation". The year 1926 is already a period of wavering and less firm stabilisation. I presume that the reflection of this feature of the period through which we have just passed will be the point which will characterise the present Plenum. However, although the stabilisation of capitalism is not firm, is very conditional, our first duty as revolutionaries is not to exaggerate this circumstance and not to draw incorrect conclusions therefrom.

I would like to make the following words of Comrade Lenin the basis of my report.

"For a real revolutionary the greatest danger — perhaps even the only danger — is an exaggeration of the revolutionism and the forgetting of limits and conditions for the timely and successful application of revolutionary methods. . . Real revolutionaries will only fail (not in a sense of outward defeat, but the inward breakdown of their cause) in the case — and in this case they will surely fail — of their losing sobriety. . .")\*

\*) N. Lenin "On the Significance of Gold at the Present Time, after the Victory of Socialism", Complete Works, No. XVIII Part 1, p. 410.

We should not forget these words particularly at the present time when we have good grounds for speaking of the extreme instability of capitalist stabilisation. If I appraise in advance the context of the work of this Plenum, I may say that its leit motif is the idea of working class unity, the idea of trade union unity. I will again remind you here of the well known words of Lenin which point out that "it is necessary to be able to find at any moment the special link in the chain which must be grasped with all strength in order to retain grasp on the whole chain and prepare a firm transition to the next link"\*\*) I think that at the present moment this "link" is the slogan of the unity of the working class, particularly in the sphere of the trade Unions.

#### Two Perspectives of Revolutionary Development.

As you know, comrades, commencing from the V Congress we have been working constantly confronted with two possible perspectives. To some degree already at the III Congress, the decisions of which are extremely import and particularly opportune and vital at the present time — I will refer to this again in the second part of my report — since the III Congress and in particular since the V Congress all our work has been based upon the consideration of two possible perspectives. How is this to be understood? This is a matter of two perspectives in the question of the tempo of development (and to some extent also the path of the proletarian revolution), but not in any sense a question as to the inevitability of the proletarian revolution. We were and we remain proletarian revolutionaries. We are certain that the dictatorship of the proletariat is on the agenda of history. Every stage of historical development confirms the soundness, the flawlessness of our course for the proletarian revolution. We consider that even our own generation is destined to experience the victory of the proletariat on a world scale. In this respect we have one perspective, which is absolutely immutable. But in respect to the tempo, period, — and this is a factor of extreme importance for each Party — and partially

\*\*) Ibid p. 412.

also. in respect to the path of the proletarian revolution, as I have already said, we should reckon on the possibility of two perspectives in our work, as was quite clearly stated at the V World Congress.

### On the Tempo of Revolutionary Development.

In the resolution of the V Congress we indicated that in the given historical stage the Comintern must take into consideration two possible perspectives: 1) the rapid maturing of revolutionary conflicts, under which the victory of the proletarian revolution can be achieved in 3—4—5 years, and 2) the slow maturing, the protracted development of the world revolution.

It stands to reason, comrades, that the existence of two possible perspectives in our struggle and work has its drawback: at times it is estimated as eclecticism, is interpreted as the absence of a firm Comintern policy on the most important questions. At other times — and this is quite understandable from the point of view of the subjective moods of each of us, we would have preferred to start from a less rosy perspective in actuality does not arise from our eclecticism, nor from the lack of far-sightedness on the part of the Comintern, but it is dictated by the trend of world historic development in the period which the Comintern has passed through. I might remind you, comrades, that in the history of Bolshevism and of the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, there was also, before the Comintern was founded, a situation when we had to reckon with dual perspectives. After 1905, the Bolsheviks did not doubt the inevitability of a second revolution: after the defeat of 1905 they were firmly convinced that the second revolution would infallibly take place since the first had not solved the revolutionary tasks and since the revolutionary forces had remained. But with respect to the tempo and time of the second revolution — would it take place in 2 years time or in 10 years time — on this question after 1905 we had to consider two possible perspectives for a very long period.

At that time, there were also attempts to characterise the Bolshevik position as a kind of eclecticism. Yet it was not eclecticism, but historic dialectics, Marxist-Leninist treatment of the question. In summing up the whole position, the Bolsheviks arrived at the conclusion that in respect to the tempo of development of the second revolution they would temporarily have to reckon with perspectives of a dual nature. And this factor by no means made the tactics of the Bolshevik Party opportunistic or insufficiently firm.

We are experiencing an analogous situation at the present time with the sole difference that on a world scale the situation is much more complicated than in a simple country: after the world imperialist war, after the victory of the Russian revolution and in particular after defeats in various countries, the situation is very complicated and to predict in advance the tempo and route on a world scale is now much more complicated.

The time has come when we can analyse much more objectively and calmly the causes and lessons of our defeat in Germany in 1923, of the two defeats in Bulgaria, and finally the last defeat in Reval, the period during which these defeats were incurred was a very difficult one in the Communist movement. We should approach these events not as historians, but as revolutionaries. The defeat of 1905 served as a subject of study for Leninism in 1906—7—8 and the subsequent years. Immediately after the defeat, we did not have a sufficiently experienced and objective outlook for a sober and calm analysis of these events.

Comrades, while estimating at this time the lessons of the German defeat, and one might say those throughout the whole of Central Europe, we should first of all note that these lessons emphatically bring to the fore the question of the necessity of winning the masses. In this report I cannot deal specifically with these lessons, they should be a theme of independent study. For the time being I will confine myself merely to calling upon the Communist International to devote as much time as possible to these events and to ponder over them in connection with the task now facing us, the task of winning the majority of the working class on the one hand, and of establishing correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry on the other.

I return to the question of dual perspectives dealt with at the beginning. If I were asked at this time as to whether we should not reject these perspectives in view of the infirmity of capitalist stabilisation, and to confine ourselves to only one. I would reply: no. on the question as to the tempo of the revolution we still have to take into account two possible perspectives (and on the question of the route — still more so) and I

will endeavour to show the necessity for this in my subsequent analysis of the present situation.

### On the Path of the Revolution.

First of all on the question of the path. At first we were rather inclined to over-concentrate our vision on Central Europe. That was at a time of what we might call a German "distraction". It seemed to us that after Russia, it would inevitably be Germany's turn for revolution. At the last Enlarged Plenum in 1925 we had to devote more attention to Great Britain, putting off the German revolutionary perspective. By the end of 1923, the position of German capitalism was extremely difficult and therefore the change which occurred in 1924—25 as a result of the temporary stabilisation also seemed particularly striking. Therefore, at our Enlarged Executive at the beginning of 1925, we took a rather sceptical attitude towards the question of the maturity of the revolutionary situation in Germany. Now again economic and political difficulties have swept over Germany and Central Europe. There is no doubt that capitalism has been relatively stabilised in the Balkans, but at the same time even now the Balkans may be for capitalism a source of greatest surprises.

At the present time a new and exceptionally important factor has sprung up — the movement in China, which also holds many surprises.

You will see, comrades, how difficult it is even to make a general estimation of the situation or a determination of the geographical route of the proletarian revolution. While endeavouring to appraise the situation on a world scale we should say that obviously the revolution is pre-eminently upon the agenda in Europe and only slightly less so in the East. But we see that the European revolution is closely connected with the rise of the national-revolutionary movement in the East; both processes are closely interwoven and develop parallelly. Then comes America. 1) Europe, 2) the East, 3) America. At the same time, comrades, both in Europe itself, and in the East and in America, one must also distinguish the special, mostly clearly significant points, particularly, in America, the important role which I think the South American States are destined to play. This is our presentation of the question of the possible future route of the revolution. I think, comrades, that here also we must take into account various possibilities, various perspectives. The growth and maturity of the Comintern should infallibly be shown in its ability to foresee and reckon with all possible routes of the proletarian revolution, and to draw the necessary practical conclusions therefrom.

### Europe and the East.

Mr. C. T. Cramp, Chairman of the British Labour Party and General Secretary of the National Union of the Railwaymen, recently wrote an article containing a scheme which shows real "genius". Cramp declared: what is the use of a split in the International, what is the use of a struggle between Moscow and Amsterdam? Can we not come to terms peacefully and share the Continents among the various Internationals; Europe could be given to the Amsterdam International which has the majority in Europe. This will be the "First" International. Let Moscow be the "Second" International. Moscow is fairly near to the Asiatic people, its ideology and theory are to a considerable extent permeated with the Asiatic spirit. Why should not Moscow become the home of the Moscow-Asiatic International? Such an amicable distribution, in the opinion of Cramp, will settle the dispute between Moscow and Amsterdam. The "III" International can be America, can be the American Federation of Labour. According to Cramp the American Federation of Labour has achieved "brilliant results", it has helped to put the Mexican trade union movement on its feet.

Having thus divided up the "spheres of influence" amongst ourselves, we will put an end to the split in the present-day labour movement, says Cramp in developing his plan of veritable "genius". The "wisdom" of the British reformist leaders is shown in this rather naive proposal. It is superfluous to refute this "ingenious" plan at our Plenum. It is clear that we are endeavouring to form in Moscow not a Moscow-Asiatic International, but a World International and that the whole trend of historical development will lighten our task.

Some of the gentlemen who speak directly on behalf of the bourgeoisie understand the matter better than Cramp and put things much more clearly.

For instance, a prominent personage in the American political world recently estimated the significance of our Soviet Constitution in the following way:

"The new constitution of the U. S. S. R.", says this gentleman, "is glorified by its creators not as a single historic fact, but as a step towards realising a definite policy. In order to symbolise this, the Soviet coat of arms changed and, according to Article 70, is composed of a hammer and sickle with the world globe as the background and certain countries pointed in red by which it is understood that in time this red will spread everywhere." What a tremendous discovery!

And the conclusion of this dignified person is the following:

"It is not a question of the propaganda by separate zealots of Soviet Russia directed against American institutions, but of the open declarations of the Soviet government as to its firm decision to form a Socialist League of Nations to which all countries must sooner or later adhere, not only theoretically but in actual practice."

As you see this bourgeois takes stock of the situation better than Cramp.

I will take the liberty of quoting an article of Mons. Chasseigne in the February number of the journal "Revue de deux Mondes" under the title of "The Mobilisation of Asia".

"Bolshevism has not the force to take the European stronghold by storm and is therefore attempting to surround it, to capture it by treachery. It is shamelessly entering into deals with all enemies of the West. In the East, there is no more nationalistic organisation than the III International. Under the pretext (!) that class interests temporarily coincide with national interests, it supports the national heroes and the Eastern bourgeoisie, and in Russia makes concessions to its new bourgeoisie — the peasantry.

'The indestructible bridge' between Europe and Asia, the only offspring of which the Comintern can be proud, the path for the attack of the Vandals on European civilisation. The famous 'moujik's Vatican' has become a Mecca where all the demands and pretences of the colonial peoples find a response."

As you see Mons. Chasseigne "consoles" himself in the fact that we Bolsheviks direct all our attention to the East. This problem thus acquires a burning character. All our enemies, including also the reformist leaders in England, are studying this theme thoroughly.

From year to year we have to introduce various corrections, concentrating attention at one time on Central Europe, at another time on the West, then on England, then on the East and vice versa. One thing is clear, the Comintern is growing more and more into a world organisation and despite the dual perspectives as to the tempo of the movement, it stands unshakably on unchanged grounds on the question of the inevitability of the proletarian revolution.

## II. On the "Stabilisation" of Capitalism.

### The Menshevik Bourgeois Estimation of "Stabilisation".

How did this question stand a year ago? Almost as soon as we had pronounced the word "stabilisation" the leaders of the II. International, in particular the German Social Democrats, began distributing leaflets in Berlin exultantly announcing to the world that "in Moscow it has been decided to renounce the revolution and the proletarian dictatorship". As a matter of fact this never even entered our heads. It stands to reason that we have not for one moment renounced the revolution. We merely stated what corresponded to the true state of affairs and which to some extent also remains in force at the present moment — a certain stabilisation in the situation of capitalism, a stabilisation that was relative and weak, but nevertheless a stabilisation.

Wherein lay the difference between us and the Social Democracy on this question, between us and say, the school of Kautsky, Hilferding, and Otto Bauer? The difference by no means lies in the fact that we denied the existence of signs of a temporary, relative stabilisation of capitalism in one country or another. No, we see these signs, we speak about them openly and will continue doing so. We are sufficiently strong so as not to build up illusions for ourselves, we are sufficiently strong

to look dangers straight in the face, we are sufficiently strong to estimate the enemy and its forces in the proper manner. Wherein lies the difference? The real difference, comrades, is in that the Social Democrats view stabilisation not as something relative and transitional — they see in it a whole new historic epoch of capitalism and consider that capitalism will continue to exist during a long period. "Yes, capitalism waged war, but now it is recuperating and possibly after the war it will only become stronger; it will still exist for whole decades, if not for centuries." That is the attitude of the Social Democrats.

I will perhaps be reproached for exaggerating. Nothing of the kind! It stands to reason that such a sly fox as Otto Bauer or Hilferding would not speak so frankly. But we are not so much interested in the "scientific" analysis of these sly foxes as in the everyday agitation of the Social Democrats, the methods of practical work of the II. International. In what form do they present their ideas to the proletariat? How do they themselves approach this question? In this respect an article in the "Pravo Lidu" for December 16, 1925, is very characteristic. Czechoslovakia — I hope our Czech comrades will forgive me — is still rather a provincial country. It does not play the foremost role in the II. International. It is therefore all the more curious to note how the theses of Bauer and Kautsky are interpreted by the Social Democrats there. How do they understand stabilisation? Here is a short extract from one of the Social Democratic articles:

"Thus for some inexplicable reasons there are even now in Russia entirely erroneous views concerning Europe. Even now the opinion prevails there that the economic order of Europe is approaching a catastrophe, that intrigues are going on in Europe against Russia, and that there are plans for an alliance directed against her, that European states are already disorganised to such an extent that their collapse is merely a question of time. But if it has been possible to successfully carry out a series of measures, as for instance the adoption of the Dawes Plan, the financial support of Germany, Poland and Austria — does not this represent the defeat of the Communists of Germany, France and Great Britain? And since it has come to Locarno and to the agreement concerning European debts to America — all of this is symptomatic that Europe is ready for a whole century of a new life."

Thus Europe, capitalist Europe, is settling its affairs for another whole century! What is really in the mind of Otto Bauer and Hilferding is in the mouth of the provincial Czech Social Democrat! The agitation conducted by the Social Democracy to all intents and purposes bears much closer relation to this simple formula of a century of flourishing capitalism than with the ingenious 'scientific' formula of Otto Bauer or Hilferding.

It is interesting to contrast with this what is said by the far-seeing bourgeois. Let us take for instance the article of the well-known British liberal economist Keynes. He is by no means a Bolshevik, — not so long ago I had the pleasure of a personal conversation with him and I had come to the conclusion that he has a most... wild idea of Bolshevism. But he is something of an expert on British and world economics. Well, quite recently Keynes stated in an article published in the columns of "Nation and Athenaeum" in its issue of February 6th, 1926:

"The 'sane' financial policy is throttling Germany as well as Great Britain. I think that the only way of getting rid of it is by the aid of a political storm. The big business men of Germany are ready to collaborate in all loyalty with the Dawes Commissioners, partly out of love of a peaceful life and partly out of the desire to maintain good relations with the foreign financial world. But a time might come when the German Government, in its submission to the orders of the Committee on Reparations, will fail to find support among the electorate. If this were to happen what threat can the Allies use to intimidate the German people? The campaign of the Western powers in the direction of lowering the standard of living in Central Europe might prove far from satisfactory to the cause of capitalism and might give the forces of ferment in the West an opportunity for which they are only waiting. At present Germany is an economic danger spot in Europe."

This is how Keynes appreciates the situation! He thinks that the knife is not only at the throat of Germany, but of almost the whole of Europe. He is of the opinion that the question can only be solved by cutting the political knot.

The difference between us and the Social Democrats does not at all consist in our denial of the temporary, transitional, short-lived and weak stabilisation of capitalism in this or that country. We see this stabilisation, we point it out and we will continue pointing it out in accordance with the actual condition of affairs. The difference consists in our predicting, as before, the death of capitalism. Our diagnosis is the same as before: the death of capitalism, dictatorship of the proletariat within a comparatively short time! The diagnosis of Social Democracy is different. It predicts the revival of capitalism for decades and even for a whole century, its existence during a new and prolonged epoch.

#### A Correct Criterion for the Appreciation of Stabilisation.

Some comrades said quite correctly that at the 1925 Session we did not define clearly enough the character of "stabilisation". We are not going to assert that in the theses now before you the meaning of this term has been fully elaborated. We will be only too glad to define it more precisely with the help of all comrades. But it is necessary to say at the outset what it is all about, what serves us as a criterion when we speak of stabilisation.

When we speak of the process of the reconstruction of world capitalism, we must say with what epoch we are comparing the present epoch, if with the pre-war epoch 1913—14, or if we take as the point of issue 1919—20 — the years after the end of the war, when the bourgeoisie was confronted with greatest difficulties. We must differentiate between these two epochs, and in order to define exactly the term "stabilisation" we must have both epochs in view. If we take as the point of issue the pre-war epoch 1913 or the beginning of 1914, we can say that, with the exception of America, hardly in any of the capitalist countries has the pre-war level been fully reached. Capitalism to-day is quite close to this level, but it has not reached it yet. Moreover, comrades, we must bear in mind that since 1913 the population has increased. In so-called "normal times" the growth of the population is supposed to be accompanied by a growth of the productive forces. But if we take as the point of issue 1920, namely, the epoch of the end of the war, we can say that a relative stabilisation has taken place in many capitalist countries.

However, world economics are a phenomenon too complicated for their different historical periods to be judged by simple comparative figures. If we take for instance the world production of coal in 1923 and in 1924 we will see at the first glance an extraordinarily satisfactory state of affairs: in 1924 the production of coal exceeded by 24 million tons the pre-war production. However, all of us probably know of the terrible crisis through which the British coal industry is going and with it the entire national economy of Great Britain. Coal troubles are also experienced by other countries. What is really the matter? The matter is that evidently a certain re-distribution of productive forces has taken place throughout the world (this is also shown by the reduction in the world export of coal from 191.5 million tons to 146.7 million tons). Evidently a considerable number of countries which were consumers of coal have begun to use their own coal or forms of power other than coal. The war, which severed international economic relations, compelled many countries to adopt more economical machinery, with respect to fuel — white coal, peat, oil, etc. Before the war the percentage of vessels using coal was 87%, at present it is not more than 65%.

The partition of Europe itself with its numerous customs walls, with its protectionism, its as yet unstabilised valutas and unsettled debts, precludes the idea that the process of capitalist restabilisation can be carried out on simple straightforward lines. Moreover, if we consider that there has been a general turn towards America on the part of world economy, that we witness the decentralisation of the British Empire, that finally, the war has stimulated a powerful anti-imperialist movement in the East, we will understand that the "process of stabilisation" is not such a simple matter for capitalism. It demands great expenditure, many sacrifices on the part of someone. Let us consider at whose expense this process of "stabilisation" is taking place,

how there can be achieved this new consolidation, this "equilibrium" which capitalism has as yet been unable to realise? Chiefly at the expense of the toiling masses, at the expense of the workers as a whole.

#### Stabilisation at the Expense of the Workers.

In our theses we pointed out two main sources of stabilisation:

1. Interest exploitation of the workers.
2. The so-called American "aid".

Bourgeois stabilisation is being achieved in the various countries. Among these methods in various ways we must differentiate between the German method which consists in the so-called "rationalisation of production", namely, its trustification and in the accompanying parallel process of bankruptcies. Here stabilisation is mainly achieved at the expense of the toiling masses and has in its wake reduced production, unemployment, high prices, heavy taxes, etc. The other, the British method is the method by which "stabilisation" is introduced in the interests of finance capital, but against the interests of industry, in the form of deflation which is based on the desire to make the pound sterling "keep pace" with the dollar. To all intents and purposes this method is also applied at the expense of the workers, for it results in a stoppage of export and unemployment with their consequence — reduced wages. On this subject it is again Keynes who has much to say. I have already quoted him and will go on quoting him. This is what he says in his book "The Economic Consequences of Mr. Churchill":

"Our problem is to reduce money-wages and, through them, the cost of living, with the idea that, when the circle is complete, real wages will be as high, or nearly as high, as before. By what modus operandi does credit restriction attain this result? In no other way than by the deliberate intensification of unemployment. The object of credit restriction, in such a case, is to withdraw from employers the financial means to employ labour at the existing level of prices and wages. The policy can only attain its end by intensifying unemployment without limit, until the workers are ready to accept the necessary reduction of money-wages under the pressure of hard facts.

This is the so-called 'sound' policy, which is demanded as a result of the recent act of pegging sterling at a gold value."

Under the pressure of harsh measures the workers are to accept reduced wages. Such is the British method.

The French method is somewhat different: it is the method of inflation which for a time, affects the proletariat much less than the petty-bourgeois elements. But here too, stabilisation is in the end obtained at the expense of the workers.

Finally, the American method of stabilisation consists in levying interest on loans when they are floated, e. g. by Morgan, and in reducing this interest almost to nought to preserve the paying capacity of the debtor, if the interest on these loans is to be paid to the American Government. Such was the case last year with respect to the Italian loans: the Italian Government will pay the American Government on its war debt a lower interest than it will have to pay to Morgan for the recently floated "stabilisation" loan amounting to 100,000,000 dollars. In other words, the "magnanimity" of America towards "stabilising" Europe is practised entirely at the expense of the American petty-bourgeoisie, working class and farmers.

The question of who pays for the present "stabilisation" can be explained by the taxation policy of the various countries. In Great Britain, last year's taxes compared with pre-war taxes amounted to 258%, in the U. S. A. to 195%, in France to 293%, in Japan to 192%, etc.

To give a more or less clear definition of the modern "stabilisation of capitalism" several other items must be considered.

Firstly, unemployment. Five million of unemployed in Europe is a fact of enormous importance. Unemployment has largely become a chronic status. Every child knows that there is chronic unemployment in Great Britain. It is as clear as day that we shall soon have the same situation in Germany. It is even possible that the figures which I have quoted are an under-estimation. Chronic unemployment in Germany to the extent of one to one and a half millions is almost certain.

Here are figures on unemployment in the most important countries:

	persons
Germany . . . . .	2,500,000
Great Britain . . . . .	1,500,000
Poland . . . . .	400,000
Austria . . . . .	200,000
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	100,000

Another important feature is the question of wages.

Official statistics in the various countries give exaggerated figures, and trade unions, when they deal with this question, include in their statistics only separate categories of workers, frequently in separate districts of the country, with the result that no exact dates are available for any country. Therefore, the figures given below are only approximate.

To sum up: five million unemployed, a low level of wages,

### Fluctuation of Real Wages in the Main Countries of the World.

Taking 1913 as 100, we get:

Years	U. S. A.	Great Britain	France (miners pay per shift)	Germany	Italy	The Balkans (Roumania, Bulgaria)
1923 avr. month	116,8	97,1	97,3	62,2		In these countries wages in 1925 do not exceed 50% of pre-war level
1924 " "	126,8	97,3	96,3	71,2	97,3	
1925 " "	128,1	99,1	91,7	75,1	89,7	

a heavier burden of taxation and growth of European indebtedness to America, etc. etc. — such is the "price of stabilisation". We are perfectly justified in saying that stabilisation in its present form, even if it partially (and only for a time) consolidates the bourgeois order, is achieved by methods which in essence are tantamount to the revolutionisation of the situation. If we take the most important countries and briefly analyse what has happened during this period since the moment when we first uttered the word "stabilisation" we will see that even in the foremost country of Europe, in Great Britain, there has been a change for the worse. It is true, that during the last few months an improvement has taken place in the general economic situation. However, on the whole, the position of Great Britain in 1925—26 continues to grow worse.

A new feature in the existing situation is the extension of the crisis to another country, and to a victorious country at that — to France which is going through a prolonged social, political and financial crisis gradually becoming more and more complicated.

Finally, an abrupt change has taken place in Germany where, only a year ago, the state of affairs seemed brilliant. To many the change seemed abrupt, but in reality it was only what was to be expected. There you have also to do with an acute crisis, with an avalanche of bankruptcies, with severe unemployment, — and this at the very beginning of the period when the results of the Dawes Plan became evident. Hitherto the effects of the Dawes Plan were hardly noticeable in Germany. This is only the beginning, and worse will follow. It is only this year that Germany will begin to feel the results of the Dawes Plan.

Fourthly, we have Poland, where the economic catastrophe has almost reached the breaking point. And Poland is very important, for it is the centre of the colliding influences of Great Britain, France and America, for it is an important centre on which to a certain extent depends the trend of development on the one hand in Germany and on the other hand in Russia.

### III. In the Various Capitalist Countries.

#### America.

Before the war the antagonism between Great Britain and Germany was the determining factor, and at present it is the antagonism between America and Great Britain which is becoming more and more that determinant. But it would be wrong to represent matters, as this is sometimes done, as if Europe in comparison with America is a mere pigmy. This is not so, if for nothing else, than by the fact alone that Europe has a population three times that of America. Europe has a population of 350 million including over 100 million workers,

whilst America has only a population of 115 million. This alone already means something. This antagonism must not be exaggerated, neither must it be underestimated.

One should not exaggerate the fact that America is at present exporting an enormous amount of capital to Europe. It is, of course, doing this, but the amount of the exported capital in itself is certainly no criterion. I am reminded of Comrade Lenin's book "Imperialism" which gives the figures of the export of capital from Europe (before the war) — figures in many ways much more impressive than the present figures of the export of capital from America. At present the situation has been reversed. A decade sufficed to effect such a radical change. But one should beware of underestimating this fact. One should above all bear in mind that we have to do here with differences between Great Britain and America which become and more decisive.

I will quote a few figures. The national yearly income of the U. S. A. is 60 billion dollars. Of the 9,720,000 dollars worth of gold in the world, 4,545,000, viz. almost half, belonged to America in 1924; at present if I am not mistaken, it is almost 60%. All Europe is in debt to America. The latter can now permit itself the luxury of openly dictating political terms when granting loans. The most vivid example of this is perhaps the recent loan to Belgium. In this case America quite openly dictated the political conditions to Vandervelde and his Government, namely, a reduction of the army, a slashing of the budget, and the "most favoured nation" clause conditions for the said loan.

The U. S. A. has a colossal share in the world production of the most important raw materials: 43,3% of the coal, 47,6% cast-iron, 49,3% steel, 70,9% to oil, 50% cotton, etc. Of course one must not run away with the idea that this state of affairs is already a permanent achievement of the American economy. It is not so, for the post-war years with their alternating industrial crises and booms present an extremely variegated picture. During the last three years the U. S. A. share in the world production of the aforesaid raw materials has suffered a decline (coal 8%, cast-iron 16%, steel 12%, etc.). A further reduction of this share is not at all impossible. But nevertheless the share remains colossal. America needs a stabilised Europe, a stabilised world economy, otherwise there cannot be stability in its own affairs in spite of all its wealth. In other words: the limited success of world capitalism with respect to stabilisation acts as a boomerang against America; perhaps not quite so strong, but it does hit. This is reflected in the instability of production, of international trade, with regard to international agreements and debts, and also in connection with the export of capital.

The U. S. A. is but one of the links of world capitalism as a whole, (although the strongest link). Therefore the complaints of world capitalism, which after all have their root in the absence of real stabilisation, will seriously affect the hegemony of America.

In conclusion, I must remind you that there are in America symptoms of another agrarian crisis and in connection with this there is a revival of the movement for a Labour Party. The position of the upper stratum of the workers is not all bad, but considerable sections of unskilled workers have a hard life of it. Read for instance the article of such a man as Purcell in which he describes his trip to America. He has seen many things there and has come to the conclusion that the majority of the working class lives under fairly difficult conditions. Large sections of unskilled workers have a hard time of it. One must reckon with the fact that at present hegemony is in the hands of America, that the differences between America and Great Britain are becoming a determining factor, one that must be reckoned with and which pre-determines our further decisions.

#### Great Britain.

I will deal now with Great Britain. Here we have an utterly different situation. Its loss of a privileged position in the world market is a fact. I refer to such a prominent person as George Harvey, former American Ambassador in Great Britain and now editor of the "North American Review", one of the most influential economic periodicals in America. In an article headed "Dangerous Situation in Great Britain", which appeared in that periodical at the end of 1925, he gives the following estimate of the economic position of Great Britain:

"The times when Great Britain was the manufacturing country are past. At present its functions are those of 'mediator' or industrial negotiator between the producers of raw material and the consumers of manufactured goods. Moreover Great Britain finds it more and more difficult to compete with others, as it has to reckon with enormous transport cost."

In this article Harvey also refers to the statement in the British press by the chairman of the Administrative Board of the Federation of British Industries, Mr. Allan Smith:

"Thus we have reached a state when it will be necessary to consider the liquidation of our national income and to begin to live on our capital. If something is not done in time to revive foreign trade we will soon reach a state of national bankruptcy."

When British capitalists themselves begin to talk about the liquidation of their national income and about national bankruptcy, it is a serious argument that goes to show that capitalist development in Great Britain is on a downward grade.

Harvey winds up his article by appealing to America to help the ancestress of the Anglo-Saxon peoples.

This is what he says:

"Since it is said that we must help the whole world, our attention should be turned first and foremost to Great Britain. In the name of racial affinity the U. S. A. must give the question of Great Britain second place immediately after the question of its own country."

What "manner of help" the Americans are giving to their Anglo-Saxon sister, however, is exemplified in one of the British Dominions — Canada, which has of late almost ceased being a British Dominion. I dealt with this already at the last Session of the Executive Committee. Today I will merely quote a few figures concerning U. S. A. and British investments in Canada.

Before the war. In a period of 14 years (1900—1913) the investments of foreign capital in Canada can be expressed in the followings figures:

Great Britain	U. S. A.
(In Dollars.)	
1,743,118,000	627,794,000
Proportion	
3 : 1	

"other" countries invested a comparatively small sum — 162,715,000 dollars.

At present British and U. S. A. investments in Canada are almost equal — the share of each of the two countries is 2.5 billion dollars, viz. the proportion is now

1 : 1.

The very character of the investments of capital of these two countries differs. The British investors in Canada are rentiers (holders of bonds, receiving only interest) and the American investors are owners receiving not only interest but profit from their enterprises.

American "Anglo-Saxons" take the most active part in the process of the dismemberment of the British Empire, which we are now witnessing. The community of Anglo-Saxon interest is becoming more and more questionable and the fine phrases about help to the "ancestress" of the Anglo-Saxon peoples do not alter the fact that the "ancestress" is on the way to the most serious economic convulsion.

However, it would be wrong to assume that this will happen very soon, that within a few months there will be a revolution in Great Britain. The main thing at present is that the trend of development, which a year ago was hardly discernible, is now assuming a quite distinct form. Moreover I must point out that the British bourgeoisie, the conservative bourgeoisie, is still pursuing its plan to make war on the Soviet Union. You know the article published in the February issue of the British journal, "Fortnightly Review" under the pseudonym of "Augur". The rumour is that Mr. Augur is very intimate with Mr. Chamberlain, the British Foreign Secretary. This is what he writes:

"If the Soviets will not take advantage of the opportunity which is theirs at present, if they fail to join the concert

of European nations, if they will ignore the necessity to show their desire to arrive at a peaceful agreement, they will inevitably be expelled from the family of European peoples, and in the event of bad behaviour they will make themselves the object of the application of protective measures which in the interest of peace will be far from peaceful."

This sounds almost like an ultimatum. What measures can be called "far from peaceful"? I think military measures! Let all the British workers hear this! They must, all of them, understand that just now, when the British bourgeoisie is rather uneasy on the eve of a conflict with the miners, it is again turning its attention to the plan of something like an armed attack on the U. S. S. R. I presume that we must now fully realise — if we want to be the World International — the fundamental difference in the position of the proletariat of these two countries.

#### The Attempt to "Americanise" the Labour Movement.

In Great Britain we witness a development of the working class which is favourable to the trend of revolution, whilst in America it is of a reactionary character. The best proof for this is found in the following two documents, one of which attests the revolutionisation of the British Labour Movement, — i. e. the resolution adopted at the Scarborough Congress, a resolution on imperialism which brings forward the slogan: "The right of all peoples of the British Empire to self-determination, including the right to complete severance from the Empire"\*)). One must at least have a certain knowledge of the British Labour Movement to appreciate the significance of this fact. We all of us know that far a long time so-called "Labour imperialism" reigned supreme in Great Britain, that the colonial excess profits of the British capitalists have been the soil which nurtured and brought forth the labour aristocracy. But if we have before us a resolution adopted by the Trade Union Congress and framed in an almost Leninist spirit, this goes to show that the development of the British Labour Movement is proceeding along the revolutionary path.

The second document refers to America. It exposes very clearly the basis of the modern labour movement in the U. S. A. This document is the proclamation of the American Federation of Labour to all American workers, adopted in October 1925 at its Convention in Atlantic City. This resolution contains the following statement:

"The American Federation of Labour stands firmly and irrevocably for democracy, for the people's right to govern and to dispose of their own destiny by means of their own political apparatus.

The American Federation of Labour inspired by pure idealism protests against despotism, bureaucracy and dictatorship, be their character violent or benevolent.

The American Federation of Labour protests most emphatically against revolution and against the application of violent measures where democracy exists, and where the people have an opportunity to change their government by means of the constitutional rights granted them.

The American Federation of Labour condemns the philosophy of Communism which is an attribute of the Soviet Government and which forms the foundation of its structure and policy.

\*) The Trade Union Congress considers the British Government's domination over non-British peoples as a form of capitalist exploitation for the purpose of guaranteeing to the British capitalists 1. cheap sources of raw material; 2. the right to exploit cheap and unorganised labour power and the utilisation of the competition of this labour power to lower the existence level of the workers in Great Britain.

The Congress declares its determined opposition to imperialism and resolves: 1. to support the workers in all parts of the British Empire in the organisation of trade unions and political parties for the protection of their interests, and 2. to support the right of all the peoples of the British Empire to self-determination including the right of complete severance from the Empire.

The resolution was adopted by 3,820,000 against 79,000 ("Daily Herald". 14. IX. 1925.)

The American Federation of Labour protests against the philosophy and dogma of Communism and against the dictatorship existing in that unhappy and oppressed country.

The American Federation of Labour declares war on it, not a defensive war, but war of the most energetic and offensive character.

The American Federation of Labour demands that the Government of the U.S.A. maintain its position of non-recognition of the Soviet regime. We praise our government for its courage, for its determination to adhere to the fundamental principles of democracy and not to allow itself to be influenced either by diplomatic intrigues or by business interests.

The American Federation of Labour will consistently take action against the spreading of Communist propaganda in any shape or form in the U.S.A. and on the Western hemisphere. It is proud of the pledge of the organised workers of Mexico to work in this direction jointly with us.

The American Federation of Labour declares that its structure as well as its principles are founded on democracy. Despotism and Democracy cannot be made to agree. To capitulate before the enemy is tantamount to playing into his hands.

The American Federation of Labour proposes also in future to take adequate measures for the protection of its integrity against the destructive, disintegrating and demoralising doctrines of Communism and to do its utmost to protect from their pernicious influence the democratic institutions of our republic. We are for America, for a democratic America and we want the whole world to know it."

This proclamation was adopted by the Convention of the American Federation of Labour, and this, comrades I consider the best illustration of the hypocritical and renegade mood of the "labour" leaders which they endeavour to piously conceal behind the "high" philosophy of democracy, "pure idealism", the right of peoples to govern and to dispose of their own destiny, etc.

The U. S. A. is at present the promised land of reformism. "American" methods are beginning to be transplanted to European soil. I have a feeling that West European comrades are not yet fully aware of the important role which this "Americanisation" is bound to play. In Germany we already notice that the German Social Democracy is pitting America against the Soviet Union. In Germany a beginning has already been made with the establishment of labour banks, etc. The slogan of Fordism is already being brought forward there, and this slogan is becoming the ideal of the German Social Democracy in lieu of Marxism. Up till now this phenomenon is limited to Germany, but, comrades, we must realise that this "Americanisation" is bound to progress in the near future. An effort will be made to introduce so-called American methods in all countries with a developed Labour movement. The propaganda in favour of the Soviet Union will be challenged by the propaganda in favour of imperialist America. Moreover, comrades, it is said — and we must not underestimate this — that these gentry will be able to hawk their goods throughout Europe.

It is true, that in America there are big labour banks (as many as 40 banks with a capital of 200 million dollars) which are of course completely dependent on the banks of the big bourgeoisie and which are connected with them organisationally. An attempt is being made to represent this as a new epoch of the Labour movement when capitalists and workers, having associated themselves for the realisation of commercial profits from joint stock companies, will lead mankind along a new path without any social convulsions whatever. Thus we find in almost every number of the organ of the American Federation of Labour a whole page of advertisements of the Rockefeller Oil Trust under the sensational heading: "Who are the capitalists in the Standard Oil Company?"

The answer is: "The 49,000 shareholders including 14,000 employees. Among the small shareholders are manual and office workers, widows, orphans who are in this way utilising their savings, — may be that among them you will find your milkman or your laundress."

The advertisement winds up thus: "And this is called capitalism! Is it really capitalism?"

Thus this must be called "Socialism". We find, for instance, in the organ of the American Federation of Labour a big ad-

vertisement of a labour bank: "The hand that writes this bank cheque is the hand that rules the world. Workers themselves can rule the world if they will take their savings to these bank". At present these labour banks are the subject of a distinct school of thought.

In the "New York World" of January 3, 1926, there is a very interesting article by Frank Bohn under the heading: "Workers begin to take more interest in banks than in the ballot box".

He goes on to say:

"We notice, for instance, the development of labour banks. The Locomotive Engineers Union alone has 16 banks. The deposits in its chief bank, which is in Cleveland, Ohio, amounted to 23 million dollars at the end of last year. This bank advanced money to the Bergholz Local of the United Mine Workers Union' for the establishment of a co-operative mine. As a result 110 miners paid for their mine 270,000 dollars, the shares being divided equally among these miners. Here is a short notice from the 'American Labour Year Book' on the success of this co-operative mine: 'In two months 14,000 tons of coal were obtained and 25,000 dollars worth of coal was sold. In view of the high quality of the coal and its careful preparation for the market it found a ready sale on the Cleveland market at prices higher than usual. As the demands for the coal and the efforts for its production grow, the number of workers increases. Every newly appointed worker becomes a member of the co-operative and receives his portion of shares, the value of which is at present 2,500 dollars per person. Wages according to trade union rates reach from 30 to 50 dollars a week after deductions to cover interest and capital."

On the strength of this fact Bohn arrives at the following conclusion:

"Marxist socialism is inapplicable to American conditions. Marxism declares as a 'scientific fact' that there can be nothing in common between capital and labour', that there must be class war between them until either one or the other is destroyed. Moreover, as workers have no property they also have no fatherland. The slogan of the marxists was: 'Workers of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!'

To sum up, one can say that our workers have come to the conclusion that the conquest of political power does not yet guarantee them improvement of their economic position, as the American political order is not adapted to the administration of economic enterprises. Workers and farmers have realised that the only correct path is that of the miners of Bergholz."

In Europe, too, the workers are beginning to be fascinated by the labour banks, first and foremost in Germany. The German Social Democrats are now endeavouring to popularise Bernstein's theory concerning small capitalists. In America the amalgamation between trade unions and capitalism is becoming more and more evident, the leaders of the American Federation of Labour speak quite openly of the "Monroe Doctrine" as applied to the Labour Movement. There are already big mixed trade unions of employers and workers. This movement is assuming a systematic character.

Destruction of capitalism through the participation of workers and small shareholders! The old, old story! Remember what Kautsky wrote against Bernstein in the days when Kautsky was a Marxist, what Hilferding and Rosa Luxemburg wrote about this "theory". Perhaps it would be as well to compile an anthology on this question to freshen up our memory.

Whilst in Great Britain we witness the revolutionisation of the working class because of the objective situation, whilst the premises for the development of a labour aristocracy are disappearing there, in America we see just the opposite.

What is the American Federation of Labour? In reality it is the organisation of the labour aristocracy. In America there are over 4 million skilled workers and in the ranks of the American Federation of Labour there are only 2,800,000 workers, including of course a certain number of unskilled workers. Thus of 30 million workers there are only 2.5 million organised. Of course, these are the cream of the labour aristocracy as Comrade Pepper correctly said, — the labour aristocracy of the labour aristocracy.

Such is the social basis of reformism in America.

In the epoch when, in Great Britain the objective premises for the development of a labour aristocracy are disappearing, conditions favourable for the development of a labour aristocracy are springing up and are becoming consolidated in America. These new American methods are transplanted to other countries, and we must take this into account.

We are on the way to becoming the **World International**. The labour movement is developing more and more. **West European workers are sending delegations to the U. S. S. R.** Social Democrats send their leaders to America. A Social Democratic Trade Union Delegation has already visited America and has found a common language with the American trade unions. An important member of the German trade union movement, Tarnow, made the following statement at the Congress of the American Federation of Labour: "Bolshevism is a good religion for starving and desperate people." The American delegates, the "fat boys" (as they are called there) of the Federation agreed with him. You can read in the "New York Times" that the American working class has entered upon a new era. "The trade unions in America have officially put an end to irresponsible methods of struggle and have cleared the way for collaborating with the employers for the solution of the industrial problem to the advantage of both sides." Thus at the time when in Germany these new tunes are only beginning to be acclimated, in America they have a quite firm foundation. In North America we are no doubt confronted with a prolonged period of the bloom of the labour aristocracy and its ideology.

I think that all our Parties are now interested in the study of this new ideology. What is said today in America will probably be said tomorrow in Czechoslovakia, Germany, etc. If we want to understand today the substance of reformism, if we want to examine the recesses of its heart, its very substance, if we want to read its innermost thoughts, we must certainly study the ideology of the American movement.

#### France.

I will now deal with France. I have already said that the new feature in the political situation of the current year is — that France, one of the victorious countries, is on the **threshold of a crisis**. It is not merely a financial crisis as some comrades assume, it is an economic, political and consequently also a **social crisis**.

The French crisis has its roots in the entire post-war economics of France. Its cause is the adventurous policy indulged in by France during the period of the occupation of the Ruhr. France, which played the role of universal creditor, is becoming herself a debtor. She had to cede the role of political leader of Europe to other more powerful bourgeois countries. These causes find their reflex first of all in the present internal position of France, and they show that the crisis is not only a financial crisis.

On the other hand, we cannot agree with the assertion that the present position in France can be compared with that of Germany in October, 1923. This would be an extremely optimistic appreciation, not at all in keeping with reality. We must not lose sight of the tempo of the movement, we must see the situation in its proper light. I think that we have at present in France a situation extremely favourable for the proletariat to assume a leading role.

We witness at present in France the development of the **struggle between the big and the petty-bourgeoisie**, including, last but not least, the peasantry. The peasants and small renters are almost five-sixths expropriated owing to inflation and heavy taxes. Their position at present is such that, if we act cleverly, the labour movement will be given a great impetus towards further development. That is why I said in my introductory remarks that the French Party is going through a period when it will be able to make a mighty step forward, provided it adopts a correct policy. It will not only be able to become the leader of the entire working class, but it will also exercise influence on large sections of the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the peasantry. There is no way out for the bourgeoisie.

I have with me also the letter of Mr. Keynes. He imagines he has a monopoly of inventions by which to save the bourgeois governments throughout the world. Keynes has written a letter to the French Minister of Finance concerning the French franc. It is an interesting letter. He says: How am I to help

you overcome the crisis? The best means is the confiscation of capital. But this is unjust, where is the justice of it, etc. It would be a good thing to reduce wages, but this too can lead to a crisis. The least objectionable way out is — raising prices for the necessities of life. This it would be comparatively easy to carry out. My advice to the Minister of Finance is to follow this path.

The French bourgeoisie has already entred or will enter upon this path. Our Party must foresee this and must take it into account, and if it does this and makes it known in good time, the masses will listen. The French bourgeoisie has no means wherewith to outlive the crisis, except measures which are bound to make it more acute. If it wants to come to agreement with America — and it will have to want it because its indebtedness is very great — this means too will prove inadequate for the bourgeoisie. I think that France is the country where the present retarded tempo of the crisis will soon give way to a more rapid tempo. It is self-evident that perhaps in six months time we will be able to speak of the growing acuteness of the situation in France and of the successes of our Party provided it will have the ability to organise and to lead the masses. The country which up to quite recently appeared to some people in the light of a bourgeois paradise, and which continues even now to bear this appearance, is already on the threshold of an increasingly sharp crisis, and will repeat the gradual revolutionisation of Great Britain.

The crisis in France will be most acute when the **big bourgeoisie renounces inflation**. It is not yet willing to do so, for inflation is profitable to the bourgeoisie. It is saving the French capitalists from a trade crisis and gives an opportunity for the growth of big capital at the cost of the ruination of the petty bourgeoisie. It will endeavour to cling as long as possible to this juicy morsel at least for another two months, and when at last it will be forced to surrender, the real crisis will begin.

France is in a peculiar position. Notwithstanding the financial and political crisis, there is hardly any unemployment there. Even the two million foreign workers who came to France during the first post-war years, can earn money. As the crisis develops and when inflation is given up, the bourgeoisie will be compelled to restrict industry and to throw overboard first of all the 2,000,000 foreign workers, in order to save the situation.

Out of this another important task arises for our Party. It is absolutely necessary to bring these **2,000,000 workers under the influence of our Party**. Unfortunately it has done very little in this direction. In six months time, they will probably be absorbed by Spain, Italy, Poland, the various countries where the misery is greatest and where the situation is objectively revolutionary. If we are a real International we must be able to take in hand these 2,000,000 workers. They can become for us 2,000,000 agitators and organisers of the proletarian revolution in all countries.

The present situation in France creates very favourable objective conditions for the development of the Communist labour movement. The petty-bourgeois government as represented by the Left Bloc exposes to the whole population its robbery of the petty-bourgeois elements and presents a classical example of parliamentary befogging of its electors. Whilst the place to study reformism is America, the process of decay and the treacherous character of petty-bourgeois parties led by the Briands and Herriots — this "classical" bourgeois republicanism we must study in France. It is there in the example of the "Left bloc" that we must show to the workers of the world what the "Left bloc" really is, whereby leadership is actually in the hands of the big bourgeoisie. We must expose the "democracy" of a Briand to the proletariat of the whole world.

The French working class has no firm **organisation** traditions. There were no big parties in that country, no strong trade unions, but to make up for it is has a glorious tradition of revolutionary struggle. Comrade Lenin said more than once when he still lived in France, that the French workers will sometime make a revolution, "without noticing it themselves". Organisational traditions are very weak in France. Only 10% of the workers are organised in trade unions there. This is a shame and the time has now come when we positively must organise at least 25%. Although there are no organisational traditions in the French working class, it has revolutionary traditions, and with the acuteness of the inevitable crisis, much can be expected of France.

### Germany.

I will deal now with Germany. Efforts are made to compare the present situation in Germany with that in 1923. This is, of course, also an exaggerated estimate of the acuteness of the present situation. But, comrades, we must admit that if anyone had asked us in March 1925, at the Fifth Enlarged E. C. C. I., whether it were possible for the situation in Germany to reach its present stage of acuteness, the answer would have been in the negative. For did not we all assume that two to three years of relative stability were guaranteed, and some representatives of the ultra-Left predicted even a decade. (Interruption by Scholem: "Who for instance?") This was said by Maslov. He said that one would have to wait at least 10 years. We reckoned on two to three years relative stabilisation.

But the contradictions of capitalism are so great that in spite of all its elasticity — and one cannot deny that as to the German capitalism, it is very elastic; it has learned much from the Versailles Peace, from the German Revolution in 1918, and also partly from our revolution — and yet we see that in Germany the situation is much worse than we anticipated. But I think that the greatest peril for us would be to exaggerate the tempo of revolutionary development in Germany. Comrades, I think that there is not as yet in Germany an immediately revolutionary situation. This certainly does not exist there! We must not harbour illusions. Therefore, no concessions whatever to the ultra-Left. Energetic struggle against them! It is just in situations such as this, when people are inclined to exaggerate, that it is easy to lose one's head and ruin the Party without wanting to. This is the real "ultra-Left" peril. I think that everyone can see it. There will be henceforth in Germany chronic unemployment to the extent of one to one and a half million unemployed. Even if Germany, perhaps this year in the spring of 1926, will emerge temporarily from this terrible crisis, even if the parliamentary crisis were to be solved there — although I fail to see now it can be solved, how they can get out of this blind alley — the situation is much more favourable for the work of our Party than we were led to assume not so long ago.

We must enter to the credit ledger of the revolution everything which is in our favour, but at the same time we must remain calm and must take the sober view that an improvement of the capitalist situation is not out of the question in Germany. It is self-evident that America will not abandon Germany. If October 1923 were to be repeated in Germany tomorrow, do you really imagine that America would remain indifferent to the fate of Germany — where it has invested so much capital? On the other hand, it is self-evident that in spite of America's desires, Europe is becoming revolutionised. On the one hand, America is "stabilising" Europe, on the other hand, it is revolutionising it — without inverted commas. Taking into consideration the pace of both processes, we can say definitely that at first America will not leave Germany to her fate. It will endeavour once more or even twice more to save her. This must not be under-estimated, but one must also consider that compared with 1925 the situation in Germany now is much more revolutionary.

### The East.

I will not deal at this time with the other countries. A few more words about the East. We are convinced that we have achieved much there, and this is correct. I have already said that one half of our attention must be turned to Eastern questions because we are a world Party — the World International. But there are "Left" exaggerations on this field. I am not surprised when a Chinese revolutionary who appears in our midst at the height of the struggles in his country, imagines that he speaks for the Chinese people as a whole. In reality this is not as yet the case. One of our main bases will be and should be the South American countries also. I will deal with this subject quite briefly. It is self-evident that the North American States which nurture the labour aristocracy, which have the whole of Europe in their grip, do not live only on the colonial, semi-colonial and European exceed profits but also on the South American countries. We are not yet accustomed to look upon the South American States as oppressed countries, but objectively this is their position.

We need not, of course, cherish illusions and lose our heads. Our success is considerable. The First International, the Inter-

national of Marx, dared not even dream of such connections in the East. That the Kuomintang Party, which has 400,000 members, which the historical "tomorrow" will place at the head of the whole of China, is identifying itself ideologically with us, already constitutes a very great success. In former times, proletarian revolutionaries dared not even dream of such things. This is enough to make one lose one's head. But the Communist International must not cherish any illusions. The success of the U. S. S. R. which is building up Socialism, its role in the modern labour movement, its prestige in the ranks of the whole working class, — all these are enormous successes which are apt to make one lose one's head. We may well consider the growing movement of the peoples of the East as one of these successes.

Big work is in store for us in this part of the world: for we are making only our first steps in the East. The best confirmation of the correctness of Leninism, to mention the latest factors of world historical significance, may be considered, in our epoch the unification of the national-revolutionary movement with the proletariat. This mingling of two revolutionary streams guarantees us victory.

We are also achieving our first successes in the sphere of the labour movement in the East where an extensive process of industrialisation is taking place. This process is of enormous historical importance. If we succeed in capturing the colonies for socialism, and in rallying them behind us before the bourgeoisie of those countries has time to consolidate itself, we will be able to avoid the capitalist stage there. But, historically, another perspective is not out of the question. On the strength of this we must attach particular importance to the existence of an organised nucleus of the working class in the countries of the East.

At present, the labour movement is weakest in Japan. We must take measures towards the development of a mass movement in that country. There are opportunities for this, and at all costs we must take advantage of them.

If we take the present world situation as a whole, we must without exaggeration and without over-estimation admit the correctness of our analysis made last year.

We took then as our starting point the possibility of two perspectives, and we shaped our tactics in a manner adaptable to the slower as well as to the more rapid pace of revolutionary development. In each case we had, of course, to take as our starting point the perspective of the slower development, utilising the flexibility of our tactics to introduce the necessary corrections whenever a more rapid pace set in. On the main, the entire trend of events has borne out the correctness of our analysis. Developments in Great Britain, France, Germany and Poland, as well as in the Balkans and in Central Europe, in the East and in the U. S. S. R., have negated all the assertions of our opponents and have shown the correctness of our analysis and the total absence of any ground for pessimism.

In America, the Labour Movement will probably find itself in very difficult straits for quite a number of years. The new American reformist methods are being transplanted to Europe, and this we must take into account.

A general survey of the picture shows us that we are preparing gradually to change from the defensive position in which for a time we historically found ourselves in a number of countries into a new offensive.

## IV. Struggle for Unity and New Factors in the Labour Movement.

### One of the Injunctions of Lenin to the Comintern.

I am coming now to the tactical part of my report. With your permission I will again be guided in what I say by the words of Comrade Lenin. This will be the best prologue to the subject before us. At the III World Congress Comrade Lenin said:

"Whoever in Europe — where nearly all the proletarians are organised — does not understand that we must capture the majority of the working class, is lost for the Communist movement. He will never learn anything if in the course of three years of the Great Revolution he has not yet realised this." (See Lenin's Works, Vol. XVIII, Part 1, p. 304).

I think it very appropriate to remind you just now of this statement by Comrade Lenin. I have already said that the slogan "Of the Unity of the working Class", viz. of the capture of its

majority, is at present the most important "link" of the chain. I am reminded of Max Adler's article dedicated to Lenin's death and published in the columns of the "Kampf". After giving Lenin his due, Max Adler declares openly that a real Socialist spirit is to be found only in Bolshevism, that reformism and bureaucracy reign supreme in the II International, etc. But he considers that Lenin's greatest mistake was the over-estimation of the revolutionary forces of the world proletariat. In his article, Adler writes as follows about this "mistake":

"This was primarily the mistake of over-estimating the revolutionary forces of the world proletariat which, because of inadequate information on world events at that time, seemed to him really well prepared. However, at that time he did not stand alone in this supposition, because of the Russian proletarian revolution and because the indignation of the proletariat in all the other countries was feverishly quickened by the war."

If this accusation were correct, it would mean that the foundation of the III International is rotten to the core. But this accusation is not correct. Adler also makes another statement in this article which interests me most of all at the present juncture. It is as follows:

"These were serious errors on the part of Lenin, the effects of which are felt in the Socialist movement even now. But Lenin was just the man who could have overcome this if his prolonged illness and premature death had not prevented him."

Thus Lenin is just the man who could have re-established the unity of the working class throughout the world and could have led the proletariat along the right path. Comrades, I think that the same task is at present before the Communist International as a whole. This task devolves on the Comintern by the right of inheritance, and we take it upon us.

For a considerable period we, the Communist International, have had to struggle for the very existence of the Communist Parties. It was impossible for us not to leave the Social Democratic Parties.

Now we have entered upon another stage and we take upon ourselves the task of re-establishing the unity of the world proletariat as a whole. The task is of greater magnitude than our former task. During the first stage of Comintern activity, our task consisted in gathering together the best revolutionary elements, who everywhere constitute a minority in the working class and in the workers' parties, and in creating independent parties even if we had to resort to splitting parties already existing. Now we have before us a task of a higher order — the task of re-establishing world proletarian unity. But on what basis? This is the crux of the matter. I think that we are approaching a period when we will be able, generally speaking, to re-establish the unity of the world proletariat on our basis, on the basis of Communism. The United Front is nothing more nor less than tactics of the re-establishment of real unity in the working class, of the unification of the entire working class with the exception of those sections of it which are alien to us, sections which will march together with the bourgeoisie right up to the social revolution. United Front tactics are tactics of the re-establishment of working class unity on the basis of revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

#### Workers Delegations in the U. S. S. R.

There has been much talk in our circles lately about so-called "new phenomena" in the labour movement. It should be said that what we frequently erroneously call "new phenomena" are really old recurring "phenomena". One thing is certain: we must carefully study everything that is new in the labour movement, in every corner of Europe, in every corner of the world. The first effort in this direction was made recently by Comrade Pepper in his article and also in his report. I consider his effort a very successful one.

We must compare seriously and thoroughly all the new facts and we must analyse them. However, there must be no exaggeration in this respect. It is erroneous to imagine that the new 2<sup>1/2</sup> International is on the point of being born, that the Left Wing of Social Democracy is stronger now than it has ever been before.

The delegations to the U. S. S. R. can be called a new phenomenon. It is to a certain extent new. It is true that we had already one delegation with us in 1919 — a British dele-

gation, but after that there was a long interval. Now delegations are again coming to us. This is new and significant. It is significant because on the whole this movement is developing over the heads of the Social Democratic leaders. Already in August 1925, Jouhaux said at the Congress of the General Confederation of Labour in France when the question of sending a delegation to the U. S. S. R. was raised: "I fully understand the Russian Revolution, and I forgive it, but I do not think it is worth while to send delegations to Russia, for they will inevitably come back from this tour with the impression of the complete impotence of the Soviet Order." Thus in August 1925, Jouhaux had still the cheek "to forgive the Russian Revolution", and to point out the futility of delegations which could only get an impression of impotence of the Soviet Union.

The situation has changed since then. This movement is new and very important. It is as yet in an embryonic state and it is bound to develop. It is bound to assume new forms. Later on, peasant delegations will also find their way to the U. S. S. R. We have news from Germany that even the police want to send their delegation to Soviet Russia. Our answer to them was, why not? But perhaps a little later. The time is not quite opportune at present. There will also be another possibility — the despatch of delegations from the U. S. S. R. to Europe. The article in "Pravo Lidu" from which I have already quoted contains the followings statement:

"It would be desirable to supplement somewhat the system which has come into vogue lately of sending delegations of workers and of representatives of the intelligentsia from Europe to Russia. It would be as well for the Socialists of European countries to invite to Europe delegations from Russia. Russian comrades, representatives of manual as well as brain workers should see with their own eyes what Europe is like at present, how many institutions it has of the type of which Russia is proud and which are claimed to be achievements of the revolution, what the position of the workers is and how they fare with respect to their political rights. But above all, the representatives of the Russian workers should see with their own eyes what the economic and political situation is like in Europe and throughout the whole world."

There will be no objection on our part, they have only to send a proper invitation and we will come. If you please! Why not? In this article I was also invited personally. The Czech Social Democrats write as follows:

"It would be very acceptable indeed to us if, for instance, Mr. Zinoviev made a tour in Czechoslovakia. Then we could show him the revolutionary character of his Section. We could also show him how insignificant counter-revolution is under our conditions, and likewise what is being done and what could be done."

Thus, you see, comrades, that we have already reached the stage of personal invitations. But every beginning is difficult, and I am waiting for new invitations from the Social Democratic leaders. I think that our proletariat is not at all adverse to sending its delegations to Europe, in order to explain there the meaning and importance of the Russian Revolution. In the same article, the Czech Social Democrats stand up for the Czech bourgeois state as their own State. They say: what is the meaning of delegations to Russia? What will these delegations derive from their visit? There are in Czechoslovakia identical institutions as in the U. S. S. R., and may be even better ones. They speak of the bourgeois State as of their own State.

I think that the movement for the sending of delegations is as yet in an embryonic state. It will assume entirely different forms. However, these delegations are already something new, they are an interesting symptom of the epoch.

The other new phenomenon is the establishment of the Anglo-Russian Committee for Trade Union Unity. This important fact is closely connected with the position of world capitalism. If we did not witness in Great Britain the decline of imperialism and the decay of the labour aristocracy and consequently the revolutionisation of the labour movement, the formation of such a committee would have been inconceivable. We were right when we said at the XIV Congress of the A. U. C. P. that the Communist International is now proceeding in its activity along two paths: the old path (formation of Communist nuclei and Communist Parties) and the new path (despatch of delegations to the U. S. S. R. and formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee).

### The Left Opposition in the II. International.

The third phenomenon which is not quite new, but is looked upon as such, is a sort of crystallisation of the Left Opposition in the II. International. Something of this kind also happened before. The new characteristic of the present position is its predominantly trade union character. I am not going to assert that the present Left groups are stronger than the late 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International. Politically speaking, the 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International was still-born, because there can be no intermediate organisation between the Socialist and the Communist Internationals. But just at first the 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International represented a mass movement. Suffice to remind you of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany with its 500,000 membership and several million votes at elections. A similar big movement represented by the 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International was also to be found in France. The present Left groups of the Parties of the II International are considerably weaker than the late 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International. One can hardly compare these groups with the 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> International, and its revival is hardly possible. Such geniuses as Balabanova and Steinberg will not succeed in concocting it a second time. Such comedies are not repeated in history. Therefore, Left oppositions will assume new forms, they will follow new paths, — I think, above all, the trade union path. This is an interesting and characteristic peculiarity of the present situation. It is a sign that the present opposition is very close to the proletariat, for the reformist trade unions, in spite of their negative sides, are after all mass organisations and mouth pieces of some sections of the proletariat. Taking all this into consideration, we come to the conclusion that we must watch very carefully the oppositions which are assuming definite form in the respective Social Democratic Parties.

In connection with this, Otto Bauer's attitude is particularly interesting. I assume that all of you know his speech on the U.S.S.R. It is very characteristic and interesting. On the whole, the Austrian Social Democracy deserves careful study: firstly, it is a strong, and secondly, a clever counter-revolutionary party. In contradistinction to the British reformist leaders, one cannot possibly call the leaders of the Austrian Party simpletons. They know what they are about. This serious mass party constitutes the cleverest and the most elastic section of the II. International. Otto Bauer is the most prominent figure in the so-called Left Wing of the Second International and therefore his attitude is extremely symptomatic. It is self-evident that Otto Bauer's speeches on the U.S.S.R. are made under the pressure of the Austrian Social Democratic workers. This is felt in every word he says. Bauer's speech is sugared, it flows like milk and honey. But we have not yet forgotten that this leader of the Left carried a resolution at the Marseilles Congress of the II. International which contains the following statement:

"The Communist International is spreading the illusion that it will be able to bring freedom to the workers on the points of the bayonets of the Red Army. The Comintern is of the opinion that a new world war must be stirred up if world revolution is to be victorious. The Communist International supports the revolutionary movement in Asia and Africa hoping that with the support of these countries it will be able to deal a deadly blow to capitalism by the means of war."

What does this mean, comrades? This is actual poison. What does the bourgeoisie want? War, of course! What is the meaning of Locarno? Preparations for a new war! What is the meaning of the League of Nations? Also preparations for war! What are the toiling masses mostly afraid of? War! What are the peasant masses mostly afraid of? War! What is the working class mostly longing for? Peace! With what does the worst part of Social Democracy accuse the Communist International? "Red Imperialism". In what consists the greatest attraction of the Soviet Government? In its peace policy! This is our strongest point — our struggle against war. We are the only organisation capable of seriously fighting for the prevention of war!

Otto Bauer knows all this perfectly well, but he is endeavouring to confuse the workers by subtly poisoning their minds. This assertion of Bauer is dastardly poisonous and treacherous. He offers you milk and honey adding to it at the same time a big enough dose of a very strong poison. Thus, the best, the most prominent leader of the contemporary Left Social Democrats, a man with a past in the Socialist move-

ment, is bringing such accusations against us. Scheidemann, Vandervelde and Co. have nothing more to lose, the only thing which can happen to them is to be for a time without the salaries paid them by the bourgeoisie, but they are done for in the Socialist movement. It is different with Otto Bauer, he has still some remnants of socialist prestige. Therefore he parades as a person who has thoroughly understood the Russian Revolution and who, under certain conditions is prepared to join the workers and "even" to come to Russia. Just imagine how happy Russia will be! There is a rumour that Mr. Lloyd George is also ready to come to Russia soon. In reality Otto Bauer is doing the work of the Right Social Democracy. He is doing the work of the bourgeoisie, he is adding grist to the mill of "Augur". At the Marseilles Congress Otto Bauer did a great service to the militarists and imperialists of the worst type, of the type of "Augur".

The "Left" Wing of the German Social Democracy is now much weaker than before. Perhaps just at present the Left Wing of the French Social Democracy is the strongest. The French have their Otto Bauer — Compère-Morel. But neither must French Left tendencies be exaggerated. The French are magnificent orators, from their lips everything sounds much more impressive than from the Germans. Listening to Compère-Morel's speech one can really imagine that he is within five minutes of being a Communist. It was not for nothing that at the Congress of the French Socialist Party he was told: "Well, go to the Communists". But what is the objective role of Compère-Morel? Is he really a champion of radical policy? Nothing of the kind. The whole dispute at the Congress was — in what proportion Socialist participation in a bourgeois government is admissible. By their "Left" phrases, Left Wingers are only preventing workers from leaving the Social Democratic Party. They say: our Party is the opponent of the National Bloc, it favours a Socialist policy, etc. This is their objective role.

I do not, of course, mean to say that the very fact of the formation of a Left Wing of the French Socialist Party is of no importance whatsoever. But what really matters is not the astuteness of Monsieur Compère-Morel or of Otto Bauer, but the fact that the masses are veering Leftward. The reasons for this turn to the Left are indicated in the theses, and I think it superfluous to repeat them here.

### Relapses of Reformist Illusions.

I think that reformist illusions in the labour movement go in cycles — to a certain extent like the economic crises in capitalist development. I am not going to assert that the sections of the proletariat who have emancipated themselves to a certain extent from the influences of reformism are rid of it for good. Relapses are possible and inevitable. When we review the historic past of the Labour movement we can see that the 1907—1917 period was a decade when reformism reached its highest development. I mention the year 1907 because it was then that the Stuttgart Congress of the II International took place. At this congress on all main questions the Right Wing was victorious. At that time we failed to understand this, but now it is perfectly clear. The Stuttgart Congress which adopted several Left resolutions on the colonial question (but only by a slight majority and thanks to the support of the Japanese) represented in reality the complete victory of the Right Wing in the II International. The period between 1907 and 1917, viz, the period preceding the Russian Revolution, was a decade of greatest bloom of open and hidden Right and Centrist reformism.

This was followed by a period when reformist illusions waned in the labour movement — about 1917—1920. These 3—4 years were times of terrible hardships for the masses, and of their rebellion against the war. This was a time when the Russian Revolution had a maximum attraction for the workers, when everyone was inclined to believe that world victory over capitalism was on the point of being won.

This was followed by a second cycle of reformist illusions in 1921—1925. As you see the duration of the cycle is no longer 10 but only 4 years. The infection was now not so great. The epidemic did not spread to the entire working class because we already had a Communist International, because we already had the victory of the Russian Revolution. I reiterate, this epidemic was less destructive this time than in 1917, but nevertheless, the new cycle of reformist illusions was a fact.

I am inclined to think that just at present we are on the brink of a new decline of reformist illusions. The years 1925 and 1926 signalise the beginning of a new cycle in the modern labour movement. It would be wrong to imagine that the present development of the Left groups is greater than the 2<sup>1/2</sup> International, but it would be equally wrong to underestimate this phenomenon. It does not at all mean that even those sections of society which have been already captured by us, which vote for us, are definitely secured for us. This is not so and I foresee a new cycle of reformist illusions. It will be perhaps shorter, for historical experience is accumulating, for the masses learn from it on a national as well as international scale. There is no doubt whatever, that when Germany for the third time will be on the threshold of a revolutionary situation, the masses who have learned by experience will not be swayed by reformist illusions as strongly as before. But a new temporary revival of reformist illusions is more than probable. It will certainly happen in America and possibly also in Europe.

### The Bankruptcy of the Opponents of the United Front.

It is with this perspective in view that we must approach the old and the new factors of the labour movement. We are justified in saying that the past year has not been in vain, that our tactics in spite of many mistakes were fundamentally right and contributed to the development of these new factors. They contributed to the differentiation in the ranks of the opponents and they also contributed to our consolidation, although not as rapidly as it should.

This perspective must also be considered when we approach the question of united front tactics. I have already said that the tactics of the united front is not an episode in the process of our struggle, it is the tactics of a whole epoch right up to our capture of the majority of the proletariat in the most important countries. I have endeavoured to reconstitute for myself the history of the united front on the basis of Comintern documents. In my opinion it is high time for some comrade to write a book on the history of united front tactics, pointing out our mistakes and achievements and enumerating the evidence in favour of this campaign. Is there any one among us who remembers that the question of the united front was first raised in 1922, and that in the beginning our tactics met with opposition from the ultra-left as well as from the Right? This is rather interesting! Who opposed these tactics in 1922? At first it was Souvarine, but he soon gave way. Then Frossard became a determined opponent of these tactics. The then C. C. of the French Party criticised the united front tactics from the Left viewpoint and branded it as treason. Do you remember how Comrade Roberto opposed these tactics on behalf of the Italian Party? I do not know where he is now, it would be as well to learn from the Italian comrades to what tendency he now adheres and if he is still in the Party.

(A voice in the audience: "He is still in the Party, but does not adhere to any particular wing!").

At that time, Comrade Roberto opposed united front tactics on behalf of the then Bordiga C. C. of the Italian Party, criticising these tactics from a "Left viewpoint". Such was the state of affairs at that time. Was this a chance occurrence? I do not think it was. Tranmael, who at that time was still a member of the Communist International, was also against united front tactics and the slogan of the workers and peasants government, and he too opposed these tactics from a "Left viewpoint". We all of us know where Tranmael is now.

What I have been telling you are facts. It would be well for Bordiga to remember where Tranmael is now.

For a long time "Humanité" fought against united front tactics, and headed by Frossard endeavoured to represent them as an attempted fraternisation with Social Democracy.

### Against the Revision of the V Congress.

In spite of all difficulties and impediments, united front tactics have prevailed. But we are not justified in saying that they have become finally consolidated: even now we have to overcome serious difficulties of the same nature. History to a certain extent is repeating itself.

The III Congress was of exceptional importance. This Congress signalised the turning point, it intervenes between two epochs in the history of the Communist International. At that time up to the III Congress, we were all convinced of the proximity

of the victory of the proletariat. We thought that it will be with us in a year or two. Lenin also believed that victory was near. In this respect the III Congress represented the turning point. By that time we could already see that matters are not moving so fast. Lenin probably saw this sooner than the others.

But it does not follow from this that we must "revise" the decisions of the IV and V Congresses. Both these Congresses, just as the III Congress, represent important stages in the history of the Communist International. A "revision" of their decisions would be a mistake. If anything in them require amendment, such amendments would be of a trifling nature. A revision of the decisions of the IV and C Congresses we designate in our theses by the name of liquidatorship. And we must insist on this. Many matters which the IV and V Congresses omitted to settle will be settled by the VI Congress. But in substance the resolutions of the V Congress are perfectly correct.

At times the question arises: Was our appreciation of the Social Democracy correct? I think it was. Some people are pleased to make it appear as if the V Congress placed fascism and Social Democracy on the same level. If it had done so, it would have embarked on a vulgarisation of Bolshevism, but it did not say so. This is what it said in its resolutions:

"In America a hue and cry is raised in connection with the formation of a 'Third Party' of the bourgeoisie (the petty bourgeoisie). In Europe Social Democracy has in a certain sense become the 'Third' Party of the bourgeoisie. This applies particularly to Great Britain where in addition to the two classical parties of the bourgeoisie which formerly ruled the country alternately without any friction, the so-called Labour Party has become a governing factor. In reality its policy is very close to that of one of the wings of the bourgeoisie. There is no doubt whatever, that the opportunist leaders of the British Labour Party will, for a number of years, in this or that combination of forces, do their share in the consolidation of the power of the British bourgeoisie.

There is also no doubt whatever that in France, in Great Britain and in a number of other countries the leaders of the II International are playing the role of bourgeois ministerialists whilst in reality they are the leaders of one of the fractions of the 'Democratic' bourgeoisie.

Social Democracy has long been going through the process of conversion from the Right Wing of the Labour Movement to the Left Wing of the bourgeoisie, and in some places into a wing of fascism. That is why it is historically wrong to speak of the 'victory of fascism over Social Democracy'. Fascism and Social Democracy (in as far as it is a question of the leading strata of both) are the right and the left hand of modern capitalism, which has received its coup de grace from the first imperialist war and the workers' first struggles against capitalism".

This is quite a different matter. Of course if we were to ignore the dialectic method, if the V Congress applied to the Social Democracy a term which would be applied only to its upper stratum, if without any further ado fascism and Social Democracy were placed on the same level — this would constitute a very serious mistake. But the V Congress did not commit such a mistake. Those who attribute to the V Congress this mistake are vulgarising its resolutions. Both the Right and Left have sinned in this respect. But in reality everything said by the Congress was and is absolutely correct: In some places leaders of Social Democracy support the fascists. Is that not so? For instance in Bulgaria where the Social Democrats openly participate in a coalition together with Tsankov? And are not the Social Democrats in Hungary connected with the fascists? I ask you: how is one to interpret at present in France the Right Wing of the Socialist Party? What is its actual role? I reiterate, this is perfectly correct, the whole of 1925 is a confirmation of the viewpoint of the V Congress.

The greatest change has taken place in Germany. But is it not true that a section of the leading upper stratum of the German Social Democratic Party is even now endeavouring to help the bourgeoisie, even in such an elementary question as compensation to ex-royalty? This is a question of making a gift of two milliard marks to the former ruling princes. Don't you think, comrades, that any honest bourgeois republican

would be against such compensation? In the given case, even a republican could well support the working class, and yet when one deals with the so-called Social Democracy, one must fight hard to persuade it to oppose openly any payment to ex-royalty. With such an example, can you really say that the upper stratum of the German Social Democracy is not a wing of its bourgeoisie?

I would perhaps understand the attitude of the Social Democrats if the throne had not been overthrown, if the puppet were still sitting on it. But as the puppet has been driven away, as the throne no longer exists, why, even from their point of view should any compensation be paid to its heirs? Is it really necessary at a time of terrible unemployment, to give them a whole milliard marks only because of "juridical" arguments for such compensation. What can we call this? Are we not confronted with the worst bourgeois elements in Germany?

Where are, then, the mistakes and exaggerations of the V Congress? I already dealt with America. These quasi-socialist leaders declare that they welcome the refusal of the American government to recognise the U. S. S. R. They are openly opposing the present labour movement. Are not they the Third Party of the bourgeoisie? The appraisal by the V Congress of Social Democracy was and is correct, and we have no reason whatever to alter it. At previous congresses Lenin's characterisation of Social Democracy was even more harsh.

Today Comrade Pepper gave me a copy of the "Vorwärts" in which there is a description of Stampfer's speech in the German Reichstag on the question of fascism. This is what he said:

"It is the hard luck of fascism in all countries that it is always looking for a leader without being able to find one. If fascism stands in need of a leader it must wait until some Socialist has gone crazy."

Precisely. Very witty indeed. However I do not know which of them is more crazy — Mussolini or the Social Democrats who just now are intent on giving Wilhelm and Co. a milliard marks. Mussolini has not yet deprived himself of "princely domain", and is looking after his affairs fairly well. In this quotation there is much more than Stampfer wanted to say, namely, that two subjects — fascism and the leaders of the Social Democracy — are not so very far apart. In some places they are phenomena of the same nature.

If anyone were to say that the fundamental appreciation of Social Democracy by the Comintern was not correct, he would be on the wrong path, and he should be dealt with as a liquidator. The appreciation was and remains correct and we have no reason whatever to alter it.

## V. Errors and Successes in the Application of United Front Tactics.

### Fundamental Errors of the Ultra-Left.

I have already spoken here of the errors involved in the application of united front tactics. These errors are really considerable. Which were the most important among them? We have tried to enumerate them as follows:

The most serious error is a formalist interpretation of the tactics as a whole. Some comrades are of the opinion that united front tactics consist in writing two or three open letters — whether they are good or bad is a secondary consideration. The letter has been written and there is an end to it. No answer is expected.

The second error is over-exposure. They want to expose the Social Democratic leaders, but by the way they do it, they expose far more their own incapability. We had examples of this particularly in the German Party under the leadership of Comrade Ruth. I want only to remind you of the story of the Hindenburg elections.

(Scholem: "Hear, hear!")

If Comrade Scholem says "Hear, hear!" it must be so. We were holding an Enlarged Plenum during the Hindenburg elections. To be fair one must admit that the comrades who were here, including Comrade Ruth, very soon recognised the correctness of our warnings against this error. Thereupon the Comrades returned to Germany. Hindenburg was elected. The day

after the elections, the C. C. of the German Communist Party wrote an open letter to the Social Democrats, in which it said: "We propose this and that, but we know that you will not do it, and the working class will then see how reactionary the Social Democratic leaders are. In other words we are making these proposals with the full conviction that you are scoundrels." This is the most classical example of how one should not expose. If you are actually convinced of this — and I am also convinced of it — keep out this subject in your official correspondence. Remember that if you abuse them you are giving them a loophole out of the situation.

The third error is the proposal of unacceptable conditions, unacceptable not for the leaders — this would not matter so much — but for the progressive section of Social Democratic workers whom we want to draw to our side. In connection with this we have a number of examples from France and America.

In France a very interesting illustration is the question of Morocco and Syria. Some of our French comrades came forward with the statement: "We are against war, we are for evacuation and therefore the condition for a united front with the Socialist workers is the demand that they should immediately recognise our slogans of fraternisation with the Riff troops, etc. We are in favour of the conversion of the Moroccan war into civil war." The excuse for this was that in the book "Against the Stream" for which I am partly responsible, Lenin brings forward in concrete form in a number of articles the slogan: "Conversion of the Imperialist War into Civil War." Hence this must also be applied to the Moroccan war. They forgot all about the "little" differences between the present Moroccan war in France and the World War of 1914—1918. The fraternisation slogan in itself is correct. One must, of course, call upon armies fighting for somebody else's cause to fraternise. But it is a mistake to bring forward this slogan as a condition for the united front with reformist workers whose mood is as yet Social-patriotic.

We have also an interesting example in America — the story of the Trade Union Educational League. I will not say that the entire blame for it must be put at the door of the American comrades. In the heat of factional struggle it was said: Foster alone is to blame. I think first of all that all of us bear a share of the blame and secondly, that the situation was such that pressure of the majority of the American Party sometimes compelled Foster and other active workers in the American trade union movement to go as rapidly as possible to the Left. This was a mistake. I am not going to investigate who was actually at fault. But it is a fact that our trade union organisation (the League) which has to carry out the united front in America now has also officially the same programme as our Communist Party, namely, the dictatorship of the proletariat and support of the Workers (Communist) Party. This means that one of the conditions of united front tactics is to a certain extent also recognition of the proletarian dictatorship. The only thing lacking are the 21 points.

The fifth variety of errors is an incorrect interpretation of the question of the Labour Party. This complaint is deeply rooted. Already at the Second Congress Comrade Lenin had to fight against some of the British comrades who advocated severance from the Labour Party. This was in reality a struggle over the interpretation of united front tactics. The British were against them. I remember that several comrades supported this view — Serrati, I believe and Bordiga. Do you think we should have achieved the successes which we at present witness in Great Britain, if the British comrades were not inside the Labour Party? Just now we are so firmly established there, that the Right elements want to expel us from the Labour Party. We are dangerous to them and there is a struggle over this question. In Norway this question takes another form. Those who do not know how to apply united front tactics in a proper manner will be against the Labour Party.

On the other hand we meet with deviations when comrades imagine that advocacy for the Labour Party is tantamount to liquidation of the Communist Party. I do not know which of these two deviations is worse, — probably they are equally bad. If the Communist Party were to act according to this second viewpoint, Communists would become only the Left tail of the Labour Party. Both errors are inadmissible and we must fight against them.

There are also some psychological survivals of former errors. Here is an example: During the campaign for the expropriation of royalty, a social democratic worker offered to make common

cause, but the Communists said: "You are a Social Democrat, and I do not want to have anything to do with you." We will never achieve the united front if we are going to use such methods as free fights with Social Democrats, such as took place in Berlin. Such things are certainly inadmissible.

Frequently it is discussed abstractly in our circles in what manner united front tactics should be applied — "from above" or "from below". Some comrades say: "From below — yes, but certainly not from above". All these are the machinations of the ultra Left, intended to water down and bring to naught the tactics of the united front. The V World Congress gave a very clear answer to his question. It said: The united front from below is always essential except only in the event of armed actions when sections of workers, befuddled by the Social Democrats, fight on the other side of the barricades. In all other cases, always, united front from below. Under certain concrete circumstances, it is perfectly admissible to have the united front from below and at the same time from above. But one should always bear in mind that the V Congress rejected the "united front" carried only from above, namely parliamentary combinations.

#### Ultra-Left Phraseology and Opportunist Actions.

Such are the ultra Left errors in connection with united front tactics. There are also Right errors. A classical example of them is the Saxon policy in 1923. This is an example of the interpretation of the united front as a direct political alliance with the Social Democrats. The hard lesson taught by the Saxon experiment to the German Communist Party and to the entire German working class will guard us from such errors in the future. We will not tolerate a repetition of such an experiment.

Here is another example from the recent life of the German Party, — I am speaking of Zeitz — this error must be laid at the door of a small local organisation. That it was a small and local organisation is particularly characteristic of the Ultra-Left. It is dangerous to underestimate small, local organisations — it is they which sometimes expose very vividly sore spots. When it is a question of the upper stratum, that is quite another matter. There you have trained parliamentarians. They know how to speak in a manner not to be understood by anyone, and this is the main thing. But when a little local group makes itself heard, it will probably show better than anything else what is wrong with some of the Ultra-Left tendencies. I think that Zeitz's example is very convincing. More convincing than some of the long Ultra-Left declarations of recent weeks and days. I do not attach much value to these declarations. I sincerely wish that the Ultra-Left complaint should at last be cured — then there will be no need for declarations. The Comintern does not really need a Right and an Ultra-Left tendency. This symmetry serves no purpose. It would be all the better if it were really to disappear. But for the time being, the Ultra-Left peril is very great in Germany. We will struggle against it sharply and to the end.

Thus, the Zeitz example is more interesting than many declarations. The Zeitz organisation, headed by the Ultra-Left, resolved to have a united front with the Social Democrats and signed an agreement that Communists and Social Democrats must put a stop to mutual struggle by words or deeds or in any form whatever. What does this mean? It is reminiscent of the "Saxon" method in 1923. I think that this disease must be diagnosed and thoroughly liquidated. It is high time to investigate and overcome Ultra-Left as well as Right errors in connection with the application of the united front tactics.

#### United Front Successes.

And now I will deal with the successes achieved in connection with united front tactics. Did we have such successes? We did, and very considerable ones.

I think that the greatest successes were achieved, first of all, in Great Britain. What is done by the British Party is really united front tactics.

Also successes in Germany. You all know of the magnificent demonstrations, of the movement initiated in Germany, for our permeation of the masses.

There were also successes in Belgium, which together with Austria, deserves special attention. In Belgium we have one of the strongest and most important parties of the II. International, not because His Excellency, Mr. Vandervelde, is reigning there, but because nearly all the workers are organised. But our Party, although small, is strongly welded together and has to its credit

considerable achievements on the field of trade union and political unity.

There are also successes in the Scandinavian countries, especially in Sweden. We know of the Conference in Göteborg. This is a prelude to a real gathering together of massive component sections of the proletariat under the banner of Communism. The Höglund abscess, which was the cause of the disease of our Party in Sweden, has been lanced. The Party has been purged of unhealthy elements and is now on the road to the capture of the masses. And where is Höglund now? Comrade Kilboom told that Höglund is editing a collection of works — what do you think, by whom? — by Branting. Höglund is the right man for this work. And "Uncle" Ström, (Höglund's friend), as Kilboom says, heads a Bureau for the combating of Soviet Russia. Such is the fate of these leaders.

I should like to mention that the policy of the Chinese Party is another very characteristic and energetic application of United Front tactics in other than labour circles, in spheres of different social composition.

And other successes, which must be emphasised again and again, are the delegations to the U. S. S. R. and the Anglo-Russian Committee, of which I have already spoken.

I think that our position is such that we need not trouble ourselves with an endless criticism of errors. We have also considerable successes to our account. This shows that United Front tactics are correct tactics, all that is needed is to see the difficulties and obstacles and to overcome them. The path we are following is the right path. We have with us all the objective conditions for the further application of united front tactics.

#### The Struggle for the Masses.

As mentioned in the theses we must, precisely in this period of relative stabilisation, be able to make ourselves the chief (if not the only) party of the working class. Is this possible? I think it is.

In this respect the example of the Czech Party is very instructive. A year ago there was a crisis in our Czech Party. Under the influence of this crisis, some of our Czech comrades thought the present period unpropitious for the application of united front tactics, that it was utterly impossible, as unpromising Bolsheviks, to continue to be a mass Party. Some comrades said: Either Bolshevisation, and then we will become a small Party; or we become a big mass Party and then Bolshevisation goes by the board. Many thought that Bolshevisation was fine in principle but that this was not the season for such fruit. We brought forward the slogan: Through Bolshevisation towards the Mass Party, as Bolshevism is alien to all Sectarianism. We said: It is just through intelligently conducted Bolshevisation that we will become the Party of the toiling masses. Our viewpoint has been fully confirmed by the Czechoslovakian example. The Czechoslovakian Party is becoming the main party of the working class of Czechoslovakia. Why was this possible? Because the Social Democratic Party is ceasing more and more to be the Party of the working class. Comrade Paul Froelich, in his work on the German Social Democracy, gives very interesting data. \*)

Of the 844,000 members in March 1925, 1,200 were leading Party officials, 7,000 trade union officials, 600 members of the national and local parliaments, 6,600 members of municipal councils, 30,000 members of municipal administrations, 1,500 town mayors, 2,890 members of juridical bodies, etc. His investigation has shown that there are over 50,000 Social Democrats in the Government apparatus and in that of labour organisations. In addition to these there are in the Social Democratic Party 100,000 small tradesmen and housewives (not wives of working men), 10,000 inn-keepers, 70,000 intermediate and minor civil servants and 100,000 technical and commercial employees. According to this computation, there are in the present Social Democratic Party 350,000 proletarians. But although the proletarian element predominates in the German Social Democratic Party, the petty bourgeoisie plays a decisive role in the Party and trade union apparatus.

A few days ago I received interesting material from Comrade Varga about Bremen — a full investigation of the Social Democratic Party in Bremen, which, although only a local organisation, is one of the best. In it we see the same picture.

\*) Paul Froelich, "The Present Role of the Social Democratic Party of Germany", "Die Internationale", Hefte 10—12, 1925.

The statistics refer only to 7,465 members out of 8,643 namely, 1,178 are entered in a file headed "Occupation unknown". The chief groupings are as follows:

1. Independent artisans;	274
(such as bakers, hairdressers, bootmakers, tailors, etc.);	
Inn-keepers	101
2. Small traders and merchants	65
3. Office workers, free professions	950
Civil Servants	307
Employees in private enterprises	162
Foremen	92
Shop assistants	84
Railway employees	83
Officials in trade union and party organisations	71
Engineers and technicians	46
4. House-wives	1,356
5. "Other professions"	31
6. Skilled workers	3,336
7. Unskilled workers	1,447
Total	7,465

If we are to count the first five groups as belonging to the petty bourgeoisie, we obtain the following picture:

Petty bourgeois elements	2,862 (35,8%)
Skilled workers	3,336 (44,6%)
Unskilled workers	1,447 (19,3%)

We witness the same process also in the other countries: Social Democracy is becoming the party of the labour aristocracy, merging more and more with the petty bourgeoisie. In America this process is taking a very vivid form, but in Europe too we witness the same phenomenon.

With such a state of affairs, when Social Democrats go the length of proposing a gift of a billion marks to their former rulers we have an opportunity, by using united front tactics cleverly to capture the majority of the working class. We would be simpletons were we unable to do this. In a situation when Social Democracy has already lost 50% of the workers, and morally even more than this number, we have excellent chances for success. They will, of course, still poll a heavy vote at election time, but we, who have behind us the U. S. S. R. which is growing and developing, and the Communist International, we are the only party which is sincere in its endeavour to organise not the labour aristocracy, but the working class, we should be able to become a real proletarian mass party.

But this will require proper application of united front tactics. There has lately been in the most important parties, e. g. in Germany, a dispute about joint lists of candidates at the Berlin municipal elections. The tactics of the C. C. were absolutely correct. The growth of unemployment, wage reductions, the fact that the economic position of the toiling masses is gradually becoming worse, the degeneration and treachery of Social Democracy, create a situation favourable to the application of united front tactics. If under such circumstances we are not able to capture the majority of the working class, we must be simpletons and without initiative, or else we are making such mistakes which are utterly impermissible.

The same applies to the question of the expropriation of ex-royalty. The ultra-Left maintained that this is a purely parliamentary question. Who is there now who believes this? Everyone can see that this is the road which leads to the masses, and we have not many such roads as yet, for many of them are barricaded by the Social Democrats. The roads accessible to us and enabling us to approach the Social Democratic workers are very important and we must make a maximum use of them.

## VI. Opposition to Ultra-Left and to Right Tendencies!

### The Ultra-Left in Germany.

Of recent years there has been in some of the Parties a certain relapse into Ultra-Leftist tendencies: in Germany, Poland, partly in Italy and in France, to some extent in Norway. We had a very vivid example in Germany and Poland where this disease

became very pronounced. I think that it is not by any means a chance occurrence that ultra-Left errors are making their appearance just in this present transition period. It is quite clear now that 1925 was, to a certain extent, a transition year, for instance with respect to the question of stabilisation, the question of the development of the Left Wing of the labour movement, the question of the degree of the downward curve of reformist illusions. In some countries our influence had begun to spread, there were signs that stabilisation was after all instable. This was the very moment for the Ultra-Left relapse and it made its appearance in an extremely virulent form. It cannot be said that the Ultra-Left camp was unprepared and unorganised. In any case, there was very evidently agreement between the Ultra-Leftists of Poland and of Germany. Some Polish comrades always made a "timely" appearance in Berlin in order to defend the "Polish" Ultra-Left point of view. I do not think that the Ultra-Left campaign against the Comintern policy was spontaneous. It was to a certain degree organised. This was particularly evident in Poland where the Ultra-Left C. C. of the Party came out in opposition to the French Party, the German Party and the Bulgarian Party and to all intents and purposes against the Comintern as a whole. We had to fight against this and we did.

What is going to happen now? There are present in this hall, representatives of all sorts of Ultra-Left tendencies, and we are very glad of this. We have here Bordiga, Ruth Fischer, Rosenberg, Scholem and Domski. They will have their say and we will answer them. I will not forestall events. It is possible that we shall hear new theories. I followed with extreme interest the latest news from Germany about the Ultra-Left. I can gather from this that the Ultra-Left are beginning to split up. We are not saying this in a spirit of malevolence, for they are our comrades of the International. Our policy is not such as if we had to deal with a class enemy. Comrades who have sincerely recognised their errors will, I think, be able to work under the guidance of the Central Committee if they are willing to follow the path and the political line of the Comintern. But this must be shown by deeds and not merely by declarations. As to the others, — fight to the bitter end. We want to have clearness on this point. Thus this relapse into the Ultra-Left disease was one of the most important events in the life of the Comintern during the last year. We had to fight against it and we did.

Comrades, as you know, in our theses we state that the Right deviation showed itself in its most virulent form in France, the Ultra-Left deviation in Germany. The path of International is at present determined by the struggle against the Ultra-Left tendency in Germany and against the Right tendency in France. We must not forget that the success of the united front tactics can at times foster Right perils. The present leaders of the German C. P., whom we support, are fully aware of the fact that in the near future, when we will fully apply the united front tactics, the Right peril is bound to appear. It has made its appearance in a number of countries. In France it is the chief peril. In Italy some comrades show signs of it. At the Party Congress some of them even defended the theory according to which the State is above the class. There are Right perils in Norway and in Holland, where such leaders as Wynkoop and Ravenstein have taken an inadmissible position. Ravenstein has migrated to the bourgeois newspapers and is attacking from there the Communist Party of Holland. We see also Right errors in Roumania where Christescu, one of the prominent leaders of the Party, is guilty of them.

We must also take these perils into account. We know that in a country like Germany such tendencies are quite possible.

Thus, comrades, our tactics concerning this question are the same as before: no concessions, either to the Right or to the Ultra-Left. We must take every section separately and we must ask ourselves: which peril is the greatest in Germany, in France, in Italy, and in accordance with the degree of the peril we must attack and fully expose it.

I think that we followed the correct line in the theses of the Communist International. We could not, of course, enumerate everything. But we enumerated what was most important: the Ultra-Left peril in Germany, the Right peril in France. Some people will say: You have forgotten the Balkan, you haven't said a word about the Y. C. I., about women, too little attention has been paid to Norway, etc. But we cannot stop at all these details, we can only point out what is most important and we can lay down the general line. I think that everything goes

to show that there is a Right peril in France and an Ultra-Left peril in Germany.

The last days have brought us something new. It is said that Rosenberg and Scholem are beginning to solidarise with us. We have Weber's statement and that of other comrades that Scholem is no longer Ultra-Left. We have not yet become convinced of this. We must wait and see how work will develop after the Plenum; but hitherto the fact has been that the Ultra-Left peril was strongest in Germany, and that is true even today. It seemed to me of late — and I said so at the session of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. — that there is in Germany even the danger of the formation of a parallel Ultra-Left Party. Perhaps I was exaggerating this peril. If so, all the better. An Ultra-Left Party under present conditions would be historically doomed to destruction, but it certainly could do harm to our cause.

There were also other unhealthy symptoms in the German Party. All of you will probably remember Schönlink's article and his expulsion. It is sometimes said that one person doesn't matter. But just as with the story of Zeitz, this is not a personal question. Some comrades say that Schönlink is an honest fellow, that he cannot be bought. No one here ever said so, but he is a person who understands what it is all about and who expressed what other people thought. The C. C. expelled him and one comrade, Comrade Scholem, abstained from voting on that occasion. (Scholem: "Because I had no confidence in the C. C.") I do not know from what viewpoint there can be lack of confidence in the C. C. which expels a person who has openly declared himself a follower of Social Democracy. It is strange that just at that time Scholem thought it necessary to express lack of confidence in the C. C. (Scholem: "This was at the time of the letter of the E. C. C. I."). The letter of the E. C. C. I. is one of the best documents of the Comintern. (Scholem: "I do not think so.") If you do not yet acknowledge this and if you will not become convinced of it in the near future, then you are hopeless. Do you think that the further favourable development of the German Party would be possible without this letter? I do not say that letters make history, but in this case and under the existing circumstances, we have achieved a great deal, and the letter has fully justified itself.

#### The Right Peril in France.

In spite of the laments of the Right Wing about the disintegration and downfall of the French Party, objectively its position is favourable. The Right in France is raising a hue and cry that the C. P. F. is "dying". They literally repeat what was already said in 1910 by the Russian liquidators. Our enemies have shown that they can better estimate the situation.

A very competent and authoritative personality in the political world who is now in Paris, has given the following appreciation of the Communist Party of France and of its work:

"Communism has of late achieved visible and indisputable successes in France.

Side by side with street disturbances there have been visible signs of disintegration in the ranks of the army and police forces. All the misfortunes which befall the country, the Communists endeavour to use for their agitation to the detriment of France and its prestige.

How has it been possible for the Communists to achieve such successes?

Because they found in the country a fertile field to foster discontent.

The differences between the various groups of the ruling party, the seriousness of the financial crisis, the growing dissatisfaction of the middle and lower sections of the population caused by the imposition of new taxes, but mainly the prolonged and sanguinary Moroccan adventure which France has been carrying on many months for the defence of its interests in Africa and in the Mediterranean, provide prolific material and favourable atmosphere for Communist anti-governmental agitation. The war in Morocco has been used by French Communists and Italian Communists living in France, for anti-militarist agitation in the country and in the army. This agitation has met with considerable success. There were manifestations of enthusiasm in the streets in honour of the independence and the leaders of Morocco. Desertion is becoming the order of the day in the army and refusals to take an active part in the war or to go to the front have been frequent.

A general protest strike against the war was declared for August 2nd. Mass desertion has assumed such proportions as have hitherto never been witnessed in any war. There have even been cases of whole detachments going over to the enemy. Side by side with this there have been strikes and mutinies in Brest among crews of several vessels. Bolshevism is beginning to permeate the ranks of the political and civil administration, especially the ranks of postal servants and bank clerks."

This is said by our class enemy who seems to possess a considerable amount of discernment. It is quite impossible to suspect him of sympathy for us. The Right Opposition, however, which is not homogenous, estimates the situation quite differently. We have already said in the theses that there are three tendencies in the ranks of the Right Opposition.

The first are the former syndicalists who are going through a retrogressive "development" from Communism to reformism. Nothing can be done here. I remember that at the time when Rosmer declared that he would join the Party, I had a bet with a comrade, a friend of Rosmer, that he wouldn't. I was convinced that Rosmer was not going to join the Party. I lost the bet. Rosmer did join the Party, but 18 months later he left it. He is too much a syndicalist to become a Communist. We are going forward and the Right wants us to go backward.

The second tendency is that of Souvarine. By its nature this tendency is so permeated with anti-Communist and reactionary moods that it reminds one in many ways of Bubnikin. I do not mean to say by this that Souvarine in his outward appearance resembles Bubnik. Bubnik has sold himself to the bourgeoisie. I do not say this of Souvarine. But the objective intent of this group is the same: to disintegrate the Communist Party.

The third group (Loriot) represents the retrogressive development towards Social Democracy. A comrade explained to me the viewpoint of Loriot concerning the Comintern. This viewpoint deserves attention. Loriot says: When the Russian Revolution was in peril we foreign revolutionaries had to protect it at any cost. At that time we Socialists of other countries adopted the 21 points, the Leninist principles, we recognised everything, because the Russian Revolution was sacred to us, and it was in danger. However, now that it has become consolidated the time has come to revise everything, to take full advantage of freedom of criticism.

I have no documentary evidence to bear out these words. Perhaps they are not correct. If so, Comrade Loriot can refute them if he so wishes. But as far as I know Loriot such a conception is quite possible with him. According to Loriot it would seem that Leninism was right at the time when the Russian Revolution was in danger, and it is wrong when the peril is no more. Generally speaking, this represents a retrogression towards Social Democracy. It goes without saying that everything must be done to bring the Loriot group back into the fold of the C. I. and to overcome these unhealthy moods within this group. But if we do not succeed in this, our attitude must be that it could not be helped.

Within the French Right there are good workers, dissatisfied with the regime of the Party and to some extent hostile to the C. C. There was too much mechanical centralisation — and I say it openly — that there was too little democracy within the Party. Some of the workers supported the Opposition only as a protest against such conditions. I am glad to be able to say that the C. C. of the French Party acknowledged on its own accord all these errors at the Conference in December 1925. The situation in Germany required an open letter from Moscow. In France, the comrades in the C. C. came of their own accord to the same conclusion and wrote a letter themselves. Of course, this is much better. The C. C. realised its errors and I think that this is of utmost importance and that by this means the best elements of the Opposition will again be won by the Party.

#### The Right Principle.

I will deal now with the principle on which this opposition is based. First of all, the Right Opposition is fighting against the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei. You are of course, acquainted with the letter of the Right to the E. C. C. I., a letter bearing 250 signatures. I will begin by dealing with the views of the Opposition concerning organisational questions.

They say: "At present nuclei cannot be the basis of the Party in France. To say the contrary means not taking into account the economics of the country and the structure of the modern capitalist states, means to deceive one's self concerning the true correlation of social forces which drive the Party toward a rapid and complete liquidation. But not only these causes show the inconsistency of the new regime of the Party. Favouritism finds its way easier into a nucleus. Moreover, nuclei meet with internal difficulties which can ruin them, we have learned by experience that the existence of a nucleus depends on the capability and steadfastness of the secretary."

However, it is difficult to find in a given locality a sufficient number of secretaries able to put new political life into inactive nuclei. That is why the comrades limit themselves entirely to current business, distribution of leaflets and handbills, dealing with questions of interest to the factory to which they belong. From time to time, they receive reports from the district delegate and ask him to be short for everyone is in a hurry to get home, as it frequently happens that workers live a long distance from their place of employment. The most important questions receive only superficial attention. Frequently, the meeting adjourns without making any decisions. Nothing is done towards the education of Party members as the conditions are not propitious for it. It is futile to increase the number of propagandists as the results will be exactly the same. Nuclei will continue to disintegrate as there is no one to put life into their activity. To save the Party it is essential to abandon the methods used in the last year. The C. C. proposes to develop the apparatus and also to form both street nuclei and 'sub-districts'."

To hell with all these inventions! They only augment the evil instead of remedying it.

"In this letter we do not pretend to deal fully with the question of the organisation of the Party. We will limit ourselves to the declaration that an immediate return to the organisational basis of the Party is essential. This can be done without abolishing factory nuclei. On the contrary, efforts should be made to extend the network of such nuclei."

You can judge for yourselves the experience in the construction of factory and workshop nuclei in our foreign sections if you study, for instance, the work done by the recent **Org Conference of the E. C. C. I.** Since the Fifth Congress, when we took up this question in a business like manner, for the first time we have done much on this field and experience has shown that we are on the right track. We will adhere to this system with a few necessary corrections, for we find that it is the correct and proper system. It is interesting that the Ultra-Left in Italy as well as the Right in France, are up in arms against this system. Why? Everyone understands that factories and workshops and the nuclei within them constitute the basis for our activity, but the Right and the Ultra-Left contend that it is not so.

However, what is much more interesting in this Right declaration is their view of political questions and particularly of the Moroccan War.

This is what they say: "The C. C. wanted to enforce at all costs its ideas of evacuation of Morocco and of fraternisation which under existing conditions are nothing but words which lead nowhere.

Why not indeed bring up the question of the evacuation of Nizza, Savoy and Corsica? Hitherto, the slogan of evacuation has only mitigated against the slogan of the united front against the war in Morocco, a slogan which approached realisation."

May I be forgiven by the comrades who are signatory to this "historical" document, but I cannot help describing such a viewpoint otherwise than as social patriotism. (Voices in the hall: "Hear! Hear!")

If they can speak with such abandon of the annexation of Nizza, etc., and about the necessity to adapt one's self to the policy of the bourgeoisie, they are Social-patriots pure and simple. For this means: that bourgeois doings are law to us. In this respect, this group shows its opportunist hoofs, and this is what makes me so indignant.

In spite of all its errors, our Party is fighting courageously against the war, and just at such a time the Opposition comes forward in the service of the bourgeoisie by writing a letter against the Comintern in which it says mockingly and contemptuously: "Why shouldn't we indeed demand the evacuation of Nizza, etc.?" This is the language of Social-patriots.

The C. C. of the French Party may have been guilty of all sorts of errors, but it never made concessions to Social-Democratic principles.

### The Anti-Party Policy of the "250".

I see that the letter concludes: "The Party is suffocating, the Party is dying and meanwhile there is a revival of the Socialist Party thanks to its 100,000 members, it is recapturing the influence it lost after the split in Tours. Capitalism is consolidating and stabilising itself and looks with confidence into the future."

Thus it would seem that our party is dying, that the Socialist Party is growing, that capitalism is looking with confidence into the future. I must say that the authoritative person to whom I referred a little while ago understands the situation in France better than does Loriot.

Of course, it is essential to do everything possible to win over for the Party good comrades and proletarians from the opposition ranks, but against this Right tendency one must fight to the bitter end. If we were to make such concessions, what would remain of the Communist International except the label? The Party must learn to carry on practical work, to initiate a comprehensive discussion and must at the same time be able to fight the Right Wing and to raise the question of discipline. We must realise that a regular mutiny took place in our French Party. Proclamations with 250 signatures were issued against the Party, leaflets were published, etc. The decisions of the central organs were flouted. A number of Party members from the Opposition collaborated in journals published by Rosmer, Souvarine and Co., who were expelled from the Party, journals with a decidedly anti-Party trend. We have with us here a worker from the Opposition. I ask him how can he defend such things, allow the publication of such letters, how can he tolerate collaboration with Souvarine? Some people say they signed without having read the statement. Quite possible, such things do happen.

But read the statement now. What does it mean? You are being dragged back to Social Democracy. The Party is criticised, it is said that from the Left attempts are made to exploit every error and to put the entire life of the Party on the wrong basis. Just at the time when the Party is really getting back into touch with the masses, when it is succeeding in this and is becoming the only mouthpiece of sentiment of the French proletariat, it is told here that the Party is dying. But this is an old, old story, also to us Russian Bolsheviks. The Mensheviks were always saying the same thing and ended by themselves dying politically. The people who are now raising a hue and cry on this subject in France are political corpses and our Party will make big strides forward in spite of all the errors it has permitted just as did our German Party.

I do not imply by this that everything is for the best in our French Party. We will have a commission which will deal fully with this question. Therefore, I need not do so here. There are in France also certain signs of an Ultra-Left peril. This was particularly evident at the last session of the Enlarged C. C., and these symptoms must be carefully studied. Our most serious consideration is claimed by tendencies which without aigning themselves with the Ultra-Left, are in reality committing mistakes of the Ultra-Left type. By this I allude especially to work on the trade union field. We said in the theses that our French Party has not done everything possible for the application of the united front on the trade union field. What does this mean objectively? It is a tendency tantamount to failure to understand united front tactics. It is essential to get rid of the negative sides of the organisational regime, it is essential to fight against everything which was bad in the Party, it is essential to take away the ground from under the feet of the Ultra-Left on the field of trade union work.

But first of all we must fight against the Right Opposition in France, for if our Party had made any principal concessions to it, it would not be a Communist Party.

## VII. Conclusion.

### The Trade Union Question.

As to our tasks, they are explained in a special section of the theses. I am not going to repeat them, since they have been already formulated.

I think that there should be more clarity with respect to the questions of partial demands.

All our sections should be asked to elaborate programmes of action for a definite period, on the basis of partial demands. They must be elaborated together with the Executive Committee. First of all, we must concentrate our attention on trade union work. It is stated in the German resolution that seventy-five per cent of our attention should be devoted to the trade union question. This must also be repeated on an international scale, this must become the lever of our united front tactics.

In connection with this, I should like to say a few words on the question of whether a separate affiliation of the Russian Trade Unions to the Amsterdam International is permissible. I found a note of warning against raising the question of the possibility of the Russian trade unions' affiliation only on a national scale. This is clearly an international question and cannot be solved merely from the French, German, British, American or Russian viewpoint. If there is an international problem which is international through and through, it is this problem. It is quite possible that it would be more convenient for this or that country and probably for a very important country if the Russian trade unions were to join Amsterdam. But if the question is treated on an international scale, for the whole Communist International, it cannot be contemplated even for a minute that Russian trade unions should affiliate separately to Amsterdam. We must confirm what was said on this question by the C. C. of the A. U. C. P. (and what is included in our theses).

### The Youth.

A few more words on the question of the Youth. The organisations of the Youth are committing the same errors as are the Parties, and to a certain extent achieve the same successes. We can record that a successful application of united front tactics resulted in strengthening the position of the Youth, especially owing to the four Youth delegations which visited the U. S. S. R., and also to the desertion from the Social Democratic Party by the Independent Socialist Youth in Vienna, etc. As to the British Y. C. L. its best recommendation is what the "Daily Mail" has said about it.

"Members of the Young Communist League, who are supposed to be specially trained for propaganda among children, are sent into the parks, into the streets and children's playgrounds. They are advised to say to the children when they are a little tired of play: 'Shall we learn a new little song?' At first, the kiddies will be rather suspicious, they will feel shy, but in the end they will join in the singing of the 'Red Flag', the International, or some such revolutionary song."

If our British Young Communist Leaguers are really showing such activity, we must welcome it as a great success of the Y. C. L. and we must congratulate our young British comrades.

The Italian Youth was at first following the Ultra-Left but at present it has adopted the policy of the Comintern.

The task of the Y. C. L. now consists in a correct application of united front tactics, first of all in trade unions, in order to draw into our ranks large sections of working class youth.

Let our wish for the Y. C. L. be: Fewer theses, closer to the everyday life and the everyday interests of the Youth!

### Party Democracy and Comintern Leadership.

I should like to deal quite briefly with internal tasks. To a certain extent I dealt with this question in my first speech on the future leadership and the internal regime.

We have a special thesis on the questions of the internal regime of the Party, about the democratisation of the Party. I think that this question has been sufficiently elucidated. Communist workers must insist on the realisation of democracy within the Party.

As to Comintern leadership, I should like to deal with it in a little more concrete form. You know that at the XIV. Party Conference of the A. U. C. P., the question was raised: that the time has come to draw representatives of the Sections into the practical leadership of the Comintern much more than heretofore. I think that there was every reason to raise this question and that it is essential to arrive at a definite decision on it. We have previously had decisions calling for the sending of the best available forces into the leading organs of the International. But this remained on paper and far from sending the best available forces, no one was sent at all. Sometimes, it happened that people like Katz were sent. I think that the time has now come no longer to leave our decision on paper. Leadership of the C. I. must assume a more collective character. Our tasks are growing, they are enormous and complicated. They can only be solved on the basis of collective leadership, only if the best available forces can remain here for half a year and not only a few days or weeks.

### More Independence!

One more thing: at the last Plenum we told the Czech Party that we would help them to find the proper political line for their activity, but that all the rest they must do for themselves. The Czech Left had to find the way to the masses without any assistance from us. Moscow has broad shoulders, but one cannot be always sheltered behind these shoulders. In this way the Czech Left, by its own efforts, took deep root in these masses and did its best to capture them. Now is the time to tell all our Parties: "More independence!" Nearly every Party has had its own experience, its achievements and errors. Now is the time for more independence, and not merely for waiting to hear what Moscow has to say. When I say this, my words have nothing in common with the anti-Moscow position which was taken by some Ultra-Left and Right elements for such an attitude is tantamount to a denial of proletarian dictatorship. Such moods among the Ultra-Left and Right are enthusiastically welcomed by the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy. I realise that sometimes these moods have their origin in a strong nationalist feeling, and Comrade Lenin has always warned us of this danger.

We also encounter a trend of thought which is about as follows: Russia is a peasant country, a backward country, etc. how can it lead the Comintern? We have already stated that as soon as a second victorious proletarian revolution has taken place in a big country we will consider the desirability of changing our organisation. But until this happens, the maximum amount of influence in the Comintern must remain with the Party of the country of the First Proletarian Dictatorship. It is essential to fight against such moods, to check them at the outset. On this question we must be perfectly clear.

But a feeling of self-reliance and independence must grow in our Parties. They must themselves choose their leaders. The Comintern has been frequently obliged, the next day after the Party Congress, to dissolve some C. C. and to appoint another in its place. Of course there can be situations when this cannot be helped. But under more or less normal conditions this should not be. We must organise our affairs in a manner that the leading cadres should really be drawn from the Party itself, that the Party itself should select its best forces for its own leadership. It is essential to create a new generation of leaders. In this respect every Party must develop a maximum of energy.

If we had made these proposals three or four years ago it would have been empty phraseology. Why so? Because at that time the Parties were too weak, they were still suffering from infantile disorders. Now the situation is utterly different, the Parties are stronger and have developed, they have overcome and are overcoming a whole series of crises. Therefore: more democracy within the Party, more collective work in the leadership of the Comintern and more independence of the various Parties in choosing their leaders and in deciding their political policy: But at the same time the Comintern remains a centralised World Leninist Party without which we cannot fulfil the tasks before us. This is as clear as day.

Thus no one should by any means jump at the conclusion that we contemplate a revision of the IV or V Congress, even though we lay the greatest stress on the importance of the III. World Congress. Our slogan, the slogan issued by Lenin, is — To the Masses! This slogan is not always rightly understood, it is frequently interpreted in too mechanical a manner.

Many comrades imagine that going to the masses means only telling the workers: "Join the Communist Party." No, comrades, the question is not as simple as that. This slogan means that we must look for the masses on all the highways and bye-ways — through the trade unions and cooperatives, through the youth organisations and non-Party organisations, such as sport Leagues, educational societies, etc. We must learn to look for the masses and we must also learn to find them. Comrade Kilbom said in one of our commissions that some comrades in Sweden have the peculiar notion — I think a proverb has already been coined in connection with it — that those who have not developed into Communists in a couple of days "should be spit upon". If it is really necessary to use such strong expressions in this case, I think they should be applied the other way about. A person who becomes a Communist in a few days time is very cheap goods.

#### To the Masses! For Workers' Unity!

What we need now is patience and ability to capture the masses. We have plenty of time.

Some comrades think that capturing the masses on the highways and bye-ways is tantamount to going to Amsterdam and withdrawing our appraisal of Social Democracy. They say that if this is not done, we will be "at the mercy of Ultra-Leftist tendencies", etc. The theses deal with fundamental stages of the international proletarian labour movement as they appear to us. A number of methods for the improvement of our work have been found, and we have also found formula capable of linking up with the masses. We have been able to put into more concrete form the fundamental paths pointed out by preceding congresses, especially those which were under Lenin's direct leadership.

The only real champions of working class unity are we, our Communist Parties, our Communist International which has behind it the first workers' government. It is we alone who take upon ourselves the task of uniting the international working class on our basis, on the basis of the Communist International, on the basis of the interests and great tasks of the working class.

Just now in some countries Left reformists are beginning to talk about the amalgamation of the III. International with the II. International. We have received a letter from the British Independent Labour Party proposing to us such an amalgamation. We will of course not ignore this letter, but will send a very full reply to it. We will write a letter which should have an educational influence on the British working class. To the question itself, as to whether there is a possibility of amalgamating the II. with the III. Internationals we can say unhesitatingly: "There is not!" The Communist Party is the most important weapon of the working class in its struggle for emancipation. The establishment of independent — even though they be small — Communist Parties is of paramount importance to the working class. Even if a Communist Party is very small and is guilty sometimes of great errors (we will correct these errors) it is the only historical lever of the liberation struggle of the working class. Thus our reply concerning the amalgamation of the two Internationals must be an emphatic "No!", and not only on an international scale but also for every separate country.

In the present situation, we have a fundamental task before us — to establish the unity of the working class on the basis of Leninism, of the Communist International, which as yet has not the majority of the workers behind it, but which will capture this majority and will free the working class from the yoke of capitalism. (Long and prolonged applause. Delegates rise to their feet and cheer.)

(Third Session, February 22, 1926.)

## Discussion on the Report of Comrade Zinoviev.

The third session of the Enlarged Executive was opened by the Chairman, Comrade Smeral, at 11 a. m. There stood on the agenda the discussion of the Report of Comrade Zinoviev. The first speaker in the discussion was

### Comrade Neurath (Czechoslovakia):

The Czech delegation declares itself completely in agreement with the Theses on the political situation. It expressly welcomes the agreement of the Theses with the tactical and principle decisions of the V. World Congress. It was the decisions of the V. World Congress, their precise formulation, that first rendered possible the successful fight against the Right elements in the C. I. This is shown before all by the experiences of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. Without the decisions of the V. World Congress we should still have the Bubniks in our Party.

We agree with the estimation of the situation in France and Germany. We are nevertheless of the opinion that, along with these special formulations, these Theses on Tactics should not fail to call attention to the Right dangers within most of the Sections of the C. I. The reason for directing the attention of the C. I. to the Right is — apart of course, from the momentary conditions in the C. P. G. — in the European situation and because, precisely as a result of the correct and successful employment of united front tactics, there again arises the possibility of Right dangers: With the masses, over whom our future influence will reach, we are taking over those sections of the working class who are still dominated by democratic and parliamentary prejudices. It is mainly in the struggle against the Right that we shall overcome the heritage of Social Democratic illusions.

The objective European situation and the situation in Czechoslovakia is favourable for the revolutionary development. The crisis of parliamentarism everywhere signalises the sharpening of the fight of the bourgeoisie against the Communist Parties. This is also shown by the experiences in Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovakian economic crisis is permanent. The elections to the National Assembly brought a defeat for the coalition government. The difficult situation of the government is being taken advantage of by the big agrarians, the banks, the clergy and the higher state officials. On the other hand the decisive economic organisations are exercising a strong pressure on the government in regard to the question of the recognition of Soviet Russia; this pressure is being reinforced by the mass demonstrations of the working class in favour of Soviet Russia.

This severe economic and political crisis is causing the coalition government to bring about an understanding with the bourgeoisie of the national minorities to grant equal rights to all nationalities. The results of the economic crisis are being expressed in the revolutionising of the petty bourgeois and peasant sections and a great part of the indifferent and social democratic workers. These masses will, after the fraudulent national equalisation which the Czech bourgeoisie wishes to carry through with the bourgeoisie of the national minorities, recognise that the C. P. of Czechoslovakia is the only party which continues determinedly to carry on the fight for the right of self-determination of the nations. The understanding of the ruling bourgeoisie with the bourgeoisie of the national minorities will have as a result an extraordinary intensification of the fight of the whole bourgeoisie against the Communist movement, against the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. In this situation there is necessary a C. P. with a firm leadership. We have this leadership. But we must not forget that we were only able to bring this about in a decisive fight against the Right, and after overcoming the influence of the Right elements in the

Party leadership. We must emphasise this because there are Right elements in Czechoslovakia who conceive the recent great and serious events in the Russian Party as being some sort of Right deviation.

We are of the opinion that the estimation of the international situation as laid down in the tactical theses is perfectly correct, that it is right and necessary to conduct everywhere a determined fight against the ultra-Lefts. The C. P. of Czechoslovakia cannot and will not overlook the necessity of this struggle, but we believe we should also say that in this moment, with the present international situation, the necessity of the fight against the Right must not only not be overlooked but must be waged energetically because the greatest dangers threatening the Comintern come precisely from the Right. The enemy of the Communist International is on the right.

### Comrade Scholem (Germany):

The speech of Comrade Zinoviev has, in our opinion quite correctly characterised the development of the C. I. The perspectives which Comrade Zinoviev has put forth are also the perspectives which have been put forth by us in various debates within the C. P. G. I admit that many of us did not believe that the new rise of the revolutionary movement in Germany would begin very soon, but that it would be two or three years before there would commence the dissolution of the Dawes' illusions. But Comrade Zinoviev declared in his speech that the leadership of the C. I. had the same opinion. For this reason there existed the two perspectives: 1. Foreseeing a somewhat longer development, according to which one must adapt ones tactics, and 2. the possibility that things would come to a head much more quickly, which happily has come about, especially in Germany. Our agreement with the analysis of the international situation and our agreement with the perspectives of development is therefore to be especially emphasised, because the Right elements, who are still to be found in all Sections of the C. I., undoubtedly have another perspective. When, for example, Comrade Varga declared only a few days ago in a description of the future of Europe that the civil war of the proletariat in Europe must end in a speedy victory, as otherwise there would begin upon the shattered fragments of European civilisation the building up of a primitive capitalism, we must say that that is a false perspective. The civil war in Europe will, according to my firm conviction, by no means end in the speedy victory of the proletariat, but will be a long process, a process which cannot end as a putsch which can be commenced to-day and be ended to-morrow with the victory of the entire European proletariat.

The international task of the Comintern, the formation of a Left wing of the working class under the leadership of the Communist International, will not be rejected by the Left groups within the Comintern. At a discussion of the German question in the Presidium of the Comintern, Comrade Stalin, in reply to the question why he sees a special danger in the group in Germany personified in Comrade Rosenberg and myself, is said to have stated because these comrades did not see and do not see the new processes in the German labour movement.

Comrades, I should like to take the opportunity here of declaring that we saw this new process quite clearly and that in no phase of the debate in the German Party did we leave any doubt regarding this matter.

Comrade Zinoviev said there now exist the same difficulties as at the time of the III. World Congress when right and left elements endangered the line of the Comintern. I believe this comparison is false, for such dangers do not exist, at least not from that tendency in Germany which we embody.

Comrade Zinoviev has enumerated various failures and deviations in the question of united front tactics. He mentioned

various deviations, firstly that which flatly rejects the united front tactics. I do not believe that this deviation plays any role within the Communist International.

Then Comrade Zinoviev mentioned, quite rightly, the deviation which is embodied in the method of "over-exposure" carried on by the German C. C., by Ruth Fischer in the past year. We rejoice to receive from the mouth of the chairman of the C. I. a belated justification of the struggle which we conducted against this frivolous, against this dilettantist method of Ruth Fischer (laughter).

The Executive of the Comintern forcibly represents us as being an ultra-left anti-Comintern fraction, and with us thousands of Left wingers, of honest revolutionary workers without seeing that the kernel of our criticism was correct, as was afterwards admitted in the letter of the Executive. This criticism of the Executive we now have to bring forward in a serious manner.

I do not need to say anything further regarding the third error of the Brandler bloc theory regarding the deviations of the united front tactic. Comrade Zinoviev has now declared that out of the left errors of that time an ultra-left international fraction developed, consisting of Domski, Bordiga, Rosenberg and Scholem. As a matter of fact no such ultra-left international fraction existed. I do not say that because I need be ashamed that Domski and the C. C. of the Polish Party made the same criticism of the people's bloc theory of Ruth Fischer as we did. That was a very reasonable criticism and the Executive six months later adopted this criticism. But on the other hand I do not know where there existed any connection. As regards the attitude of Bordiga, we declared at the last Party Conference of the C. P. of Germany that there are various questions in which we can in no way have solidarity with Bordiga. Our fight against a common incitement against the left elements in the Comintern is a fight which we — and I hope along with the Executive — will conduct at all times. We declare that for the moment such a danger in Italy is passed, and that at present there therefore only remains of all these things the fact, that last year we opposed such a policy of splitting. When in October of the previous year there came the Open Letter of the Executive to the C. P. G., we declared at the time that the political line of this letter is correct, but we opposed this letter because of its inner Party line, because it was the culmination of that line which sought to represent us as an ultra-left, anti-Comintern fraction and I declare here openly that I do not regret my attitude for a moment and have not come here in order to do penance. But I declare as before: I will sign no letter in which I am characterised as anti-Communist, anti-Bolshevik, as a corrupt element bought by the bourgeoisie. We are not corrupt elements bought by the bourgeoisie, but representatives of left workers, and do not submit to the Executive of the Comintern describing us as corrupt elements bought by the bourgeoisie.

At the sitting of the national conference of the C. P. G., when the Open Letter was discussed, we clearly and plainly showed, by indicating the two perspectives, the Bolshevik perspective and the perspective of the Right, that we are ready to identify ourselves with the Bolshevik perspective. Comrade Zinoviev has clearly and plainly shown in his speech that the Executive of the Comintern leaves no doubt that it has this perspective and that it will continue this line. There is thereby given the possibility that we, in spite of the rejection of the Open Letter, because it had a false inner Party course against us, are prepared to begin to work in the Party in a serious manner.

I must say a few words over the position in the C. P. G. I have the task here of clearly and openly describing before the Enlarged Executive Session our attitude as the left opposition in the C. P. G. We will support the present central committee of the C. P. G., if it continues the policy which it has begun in the question of the referendum against the princes. This is a case in which, for the first time for a long time, in fact I believe for the first time since the existence of the C. P. G., a great mass movement is being developed and led by the Communist Party, and that the Communist Party has also succeeded in retaining the leadership of this mass movement in which, as a result of the pressure of the masses from below, the leadership of the Social Democracy has been forced. We are not such fools as to belittle and not to recognise such successes.

There undoubtedly exist a number of other differences, and there is no use in concealing these differences and saying, everything is lovely. That would be wrong. There still exist various differences, but they cannot be abolished by mutual declarations of love, falling on the knees and such like things, but only by common work in the future.

We believe that the Central Committee has made mistakes and making mistakes in neglecting the economic struggles in Germany. We believe that it would have been necessary to issue our economic programme as soon as possible. We also believe that there exists a serious neglect in the handling of the unemployed movement, of the factory council movement, in connecting the economic struggles with the everyday policy of the C. P. G. These are things which can have very serious results if one does not give them the greatest attention, and we have to express this criticism also here at the Enlarged Executive.

We saw at the commencement of the activity in Saxony in November 1925, that the Party was falling into the old errors. We expect and desire and hope that the C. C. of the C. P. G. has not forgotten the errors of the year 1923.

Further, we see certain differences in individual questions, which perhaps appear to be small questions, but which still exist. Comrade Zinoviev said that one is a real ultra-left when one opposes an election agreement with the Socialist Party of Germany. Comrades, we have raised no objection on principle to having joint lists of candidates or concluding any election agreement with the Socialist Party in Germany. But we have objected to making a principle of concluding election agreements.

At the elections to the Westphalian Diet for example, the Communist fraction concluded an election alliance not only with the Social Democrats, but also with the bourgeois left parties. On this occasion the Communist Party gave its votes for a Social Democrat of the name of Mehlich, who, in the Ruhr district, played a role similar to that of Noske.

(Interjected by Thälmann: The central made a protest against this.)

All the better. I did not know that before. But it would have been more useful if the C. C. had made its protest openly.

This policy reminds me of a somewhat similar case. The Socialist Democrat Hirsch, who was Prussian Prime Minister at the time when Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered, and through whose hands the Prussian Government placed money in the hands of the white-guardists in order to murder the Communist and to spy on them, has been elected in Dortmund as Lord Mayor for ten years with the votes of the Communist fraction. That is the policy against which we raise our criticism.

(Interjection: Why do you not say anything about Halle, as giving another side of the picture?)

We demand that the inner Party course of repelling and driving out all the Left elements and of attracting all right elements, of whom it is known that they have not abandoned their intentions, shall cease.

Comrade Zinoviev spoke of the danger existing that in Germany there could be formed a Left parallel party. I say here in full seriousness: this danger did actually exist and was stronger than the Central Committee believed and still believes to-day.

We have seen this danger. It was signalled by the case of Katz, a group which will have nothing more to do with the Comintern, which recognises the role of the Party from the standpoint of the Communist Labour Party, of the Syndicalists. (Interjection Braun: "Your declaration of solidarity in the Reichstag!") Yes, as indicating the difference between us! (Interjection: Geschke as a provocation!") I have very clearly said that the C. C. with its inner Party course, has supplied grist to the mill of these elements. I have already said this on other occasions and will not take it back.

We declare here openly that we have nothing to do with these elements.

In conclusion, I should like to say: we hope that as a result of this session of the Enlarged Executive there will be an end to the fight against us as an ultra-left anti-Bolshevik, anti-Communist fraction. We are not so childish as to believe that the differences in the C. P. G. will be liquidated from to-day.

There will always be a current which emphasises more the role of the Party and there will always be a right current. These currents will reveal themselves on various occasions, and will always struggle with one another.

### Comrade Semaoen (Indonesia):

In our Party we have neither right nor left difficulties, but other difficulties exist. These difficulties are caused by factors existing outside of our Party.

During the year 1925 our Party was very active in the struggle against exploitation and oppression by Dutch imperialism and against its reactionary policy in general. That struggle claimed many victims. According to the latest information, about 3000 workers and peasants have been sentenced to imprisonment for terms from 3 days to 15 years. 500 Communists have been sentenced for terms from one month to five years. 50 comrades have been killed, 150 wounded. 50 houses of Communists have been destroyed or burned by government officials with the aid of hired bandits. One family has been poisoned and two comrades have been assassinated.

The number of comrades dismissed from the military and police service, from the factories and plantations is also very great. During the year 1925 five of our leaders have been deported to malaria infested places. According to the government's statement these leaders were deported because they are the principal leaders of our Party, which is under the discipline of the III. International and uses every means for destroying the government in order to establish a Soviet regime and an International Soviet Republic.

The Government pointed to the existence of factory nuclei in the mining and oil industry, to the strikes demonstrations, collisions with the police, the connection between our Party and Moscow, etc. I think we can conclude from the above facts that our Party is a serious and real Communist Party.

Difficulties exist for us owing to the fact that nationalist tendencies can exist and develop inside our Party on account of the action of some Dutch comrades, both from the right and the left. Although nationalism in an oppressed nation is a revolutionary factor, nationalism in our Indonesian Party would not be good because it would promote the nationalism of some of our leading Dutch comrades in the revolutionary movement in Holland.

If you talk with some Dutch comrades about the policy of our Party in Indonesia they will tell you what some of the Dutch comrades have done in Indonesia years ago when they were left wing social democrats, and speak depreciatively of the "native" leaders of the movement. By so doing these Dutch comrades "nationalise" the result of the work of our native comrades. It is true, that many Indonesian Communists are in prison as the result of the work of Dutch imperialism, but I make bold to say that the obtaining of wage increases for the workers in Indonesia lately and development of Communist policy among the Indonesian masses is really the work of our Indonesian leaders themselves.

To the comrades in Holland I would like to say: "Do not try to interfere in our tactics of leading the national movements as the Sarekat Islam etc., onto our line, as very great changes have taken place in the last few years in Sarekat Islam of which our Dutch comrades know nothing."

Another danger we have to face in Indonesia is that of our Party being isolated from the masses. Until now the government has succeeded in isolating our movement from all other revolutionary movements in the world, and recently even from Moscow. But having connection with the working and peasant masses our Party has been able to progress and to lead the national energies of the country in the fight for emancipation.

According to the latest news a new law is being introduced which will render it impossible to publish our organs. There already exists a prohibition against strikes and the holding of meetings. These reactionary measures will promote the propaganda of the Indonesian anarchists who advocate incendiarism against the sugar industry, the oil wells and tobacco works. For the illiterate masses plunged in misery such propaganda is attractive and it will be difficult for our Party, driven into illegality, to oppose it with our own methods of fight. We promise, however, to do our best and at the same time express our best wishes for the growth and prosperity of our brother Party in Holland.

### Comrade Semard (France):

The French delegation is in agreement with the main lines of Comrade Zinoviev's analysis of the international situation. It merely wants to introduce in the discussion certain supplementary facts on the situation in France.

The report indicated for example, that the position of the French workers is better than that of the workers in the neighbouring countries.

It must be emphasised that if the position of the French workers appears favourable as compared with the situation of the neighbouring countries, it should be borne in mind that the pre-war wages were notably lower for a large section of the workers; their wages were below the cost of living standard.

It is evident that in the present situation the French worker is favoured.

I want to stress why it is that the wages are actually insufficient, although much higher as compared with the level of neighbouring countries.

This is first of all confirmed by the great number of strikes which have taken place during the last 2 months, by the movement among the middle classes, particularly the bank strikes, the movement among the officials, and the strikes developing, particularly in the metal industry (Citroën factory) and the threatened railway strike in Alsace Lorraine.

These facts show that the workers are already entering into action not only to raise their salaries, but in order to protect them against the fluctuations in the cost of living, and particularly against inflation.

I also want to emphasise that for some months the cost of living has made tremendous leaps upwards. Thus in the month of January the cost of living increased by 12%.

It should also be pointed out that if a certain stabilisation of the franc may be foreseen at the time when the settlement of foreign debts will be made, perhaps in a few months time, the financial crisis on the contrary will continue to become more acute.

I have just emphasised that the workers are now commencing to move with respect to wages and the sliding scale. I also want to emphasise the proposals for the united front which we have made, for if we have committed errors, we have also done some good things, in particular our last proposals which were made after our conference on December 2.

We made proposals to the reformist leaders and to the reformist workers for immediate demands. We had to record a refusal. But does that mean that the united front is not being realised? No. In certain parts of the provinces we have realised the united front from below.

In the Citroën works, for instance, we have proletarian unity committees which embrace practically all the workers, mobilising practically the whole factory against the bosses for immediate demands.

We can see perspectives of great struggles. An economic crisis is threatening and is already breaking out. Albert Thomas, leader of the International Labour Office, has said that this crisis is at our doors, it is a crisis due to decreasing production, restriction of credits and unemployment.

On the other hand, this situation is still more aggravated by French imperialism continuing the wars in Morocco and Syria which everyday make the financial deficit more acute.

Consequently there are perspectives of struggles for the proletariat in defence of wages. Can we say that these partial struggles will spread into a more general movement? That is possible. Fascism is developing of late and has found its political and economic basis. It is therefore possible that in the development of the partial struggles of the workers, we will for the first time come into collision with the fascists, or at least their civilian organisations.

Confronted with this situation it is quite evident that we are in agreement with Comrade Zinoviev. We must develop the united front and make more agitation for trade union unity.

And now I want to underline the faults we committed in the application of the united front so that they may serve as an example to the brother Parties.

There were certainly Leftist faults at first consisting in a bad estimation of the fascist movement and in slogans which were too advanced for the masses, particularly that of the "revolutionary tribunal".

There were also faults in the united front tactics for the Morocco war.

The defeatist slogans were evidently correct, and we intend maintaining them in our programme against the Right, which demands their suppression. We will continue defending them before the wide masses of the workers, but we will not introduce them any more as a condition for the participation of the workers in the united front. At first the wide masses did not understand these slogans and our fault was that we did not explain them before issuing them.

I should say comrades, that these Left Wing errors have been corrected and that since our conference of December 2, we have made some progress. At the present time our basis for the united front brings us still nearer to the Social Democratic workers and establishes a link between us and the large non-Party masses.

While we have to formulate observations against the attitude of certain leaders of the Right, we should emphasise here that we have to combat certain Leftist faults which have tendencies to continue in our Party, and we may say that we will politically beat all those who resist our conference of December 2nd. On this point the International should also with us condemn the faults of the Left and the comrades who tend to continue them. But comrades, comrade Zinoviev is right here also. Whereas there is a Left tendency natural enough amongst the whole proletariat, there is nevertheless an even greater danger from the right.

First of all there is the systematic fractional work with the "Bulletin Communiste", with the Souvarine group which is now being formed, for Souvarine, who is supposed to be disciplined, is forming a small group to embrace all the opponents of Communism.

Side by side with the "Bulletin Communiste" there is the "La Revolution proletarienne". This small organisation has certainly much wider ramifications than the "Bulletin Communiste" among the old Syndicalist cadres which are affected by the demagoguery of Monatte and Rosmer. Consequently, in our Party the dangers from the Right are much greater than the dangers from the extreme Left.

The ideology of the Right is revisionist. It criticises in its thesis the united front as defined by the V Congress. It is against reorganisation on the basis of factory nuclei.

The position of Loriot should be emphasised strongly here, as we intend beating the Right in France on the question of nuclei in a big discussion so that the echoes may be heard throughout the International.

Comrades, what does Loriot say? He, says: "The formula of the V Congress is seductive, but it is idiotic in its application." Commencing from this point of view he writes: "To think that one can separate the leaders from the masses is pure utopianism, one cannot form the united front over the heads of the leaders." He affirms further the necessity for a coalition: "The united front is neither an end nor a trap; if the Party proposes it, this is done honestly and loyally. Its object is to unite all the forces of the proletariat into temporary coalitions for limited objectives."

Loriot evidently refuses to desire a coalition with the leaders, but objectively tends towards this aim, when he says that one cannot separate the masses from the leaders.

On the other hand, what is still more serious is that at the time when we were faced with important colonial wars, the Right systematically condemned our defeatist slogans not because they could be rejected by the workers, but because they were rejected by the leaders.

Loriot's position on defeatist slogans is a flagrant proof and also a demonstration of the Social Democratic spirit which animates the members of the Right, with the exception of proletarian elements which will separate from these few Right Wing intellectuals.

What did the opposition say on the question of Morocco? First of all they said the war was a reactionary war: "Abd-el-Krim is a feudal chief who must only be supported to the extent to which he is really revolutionary and if he will allow us to educate and organise in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the large masses exploited in the Rif". Only on this condition will we be able to support Abd-el-Krim.

The letter of the 250 candidates stated that "we wanted to impose at all costs the idea of evacuation of Morocco and of fraternisation, which in the circumstances were only superfluous demands without any real object".

Could one really sign a thing when all the opponents of Communism are saying the same thing? Loriot adds: "The military evacuation of Morocco is synonymous with revolution, its meaning is that of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

I would like to observe that the military evacuation through defeat followed by wide movements of fraternisation and of revolt of the tribes in French Morocco, is not necessarily a revolution in France, it would simply mean that imperialism is in a difficulty and is obliged to retire.

Comrades, this should be emphasised as this is not being done, that fraternisation has occurred, and comrades know that whole battalions have fraternised, have gone over to the side of the Rifis and Syrians.

What is the nature of the war in Morocco? It is precisely that similar races are lined up against one another who have quite naturally a tendency to fraternise amongst themselves, and if our French Party had had the possibility of conducting sufficient agitation on the front, we are certain that the fraternisation would have been much greater.

I therefore only emphasise that it is not only the introduction of this slogan into the united front which the Right is combatting, but the slogan itself.

Our comrades are discontented with a certain mechanical procedure in the reorganisation of the Party. This discontent is not concerned with political questions, but questions of organisation.

Leftist faults have also been made in the trade union movement. Our agitation for unity has for some time ceased to remain in the forefront. The Unity Left Wing which was constituted within the reformist unions, was not adequately organised after the Federal congresses. But I must point out the difficulties met with. Reference is made to the British Trade Union and the agitation made in favour of unity, but the situation is not the same; the British movement is not split; in France we have two trade union confederations and the creation of a unified movement does not take the same form as it does in the British Trade Unions.

On the other hand, it must also be stated that a certain spirit of revenge in the rank and file organisations animates the unity comrades, who see the reformist leaders pursuing their disintegrating work and systematic scissionist policy in the trade unions and thus hindering our comrades recruiting for the C. G. T. U.

On the other hand, for some time past, it is certain that amongst the Communist Party elements there is a certain underestimation of trade union work and movement, owing to the extraordinary political activity which we have been displaying during these last eight months. Finally, there has been a rather serious repression on the part of the bosses. The nuclei which were formed after the repression of the employers, in order to keep police spies from entering have also prevented the entrance of good working class comrades.

All these questions, comrades, have produced great difficulties in our trade union work and we consider that Comrade Zinoviev was right in saying the agitation should above all be conducted on this particular point.

These faults have been corrected since our last conference and the National Confederal Council of the C. G. T. U. placed the question of unity in the foreground.

I now wish to bring forward the faults we have committed in the Party reorganisation.

We have not formed street nuclei at the same time as the factory nuclei, we have not formed sub-districts for territorial work; the old branches ought to have disappeared only after the complete reorganisation. In this manner, we have estranged from us no small number of artisans, small tradesmen and even isolated workers who have become merely sympathisers.

There errors, comrades, have now been overcome and our reorganisation is being continued. We are forming street nuclei in some districts. In passing, I should point out that the Right was also against these nuclei.

In the letter of the 250, it is stated: "At the present time the nuclei cannot constitute the basis of the Party in France. Without suppressing the nuclei we must return to the branches." And some of them indicate that we should return to the branches in order to apply "democratic centralism". Thus we find in a thesis: "Democratic centralism is only applicable in view

of the present circumstances, if the territorial branches once become the basis of our organisation."

Our Comrade Engler who is here, can say whether he is in agreement with this thesis.

In the letter of the 250, it is stated: "Failure has been practically general." They state that the Party is going from the nuclei "towards rapid and complete liquidation."

We have 60,000 members in 1,500 factory nuclei and 2,500 territorial units, i. e. street and village nuclei and old branches. Our Party has gained great influence amongst the masses of workers and peasants, and particularly amongst the middle classes. We have only just learned that in the last recruiting campaign 70% of the new members were peasants, in the Limousine region, for instance. Consequently this shows that there has nevertheless been some thorough work put in by our Party.

Another point is the question of the new tendency, or rather new current which is being formed in our Party, a **centrist, confusionist current** which helps the right to carry out their petty manoeuvres. In a motion put forward by **Morin**, it is stated that there should be: "Entirely free and permanent tribune of discussion, no action to be taken against collaborators of the **Bulletin Communiste** and the **Revolution Proletarienne**, who could write in this free tribune unless they had relapsed from the Party. Proportional representation to different delegations and on all organs."

This is no longer democratic centralism that is being demanded respecting and applying the decisions of the majority, but a club of philosophers which is being proposed.

Further, **Humberdot** wants a marriage of convenience between the two cadres, between the old cadres and the young in order to save the Right wingers. He has written something of this sort:

"We must 'fit in the young generation' of the Left into the old generation with Social Democratic traits so that the one learns 'politics' and that the other gain support.

Thus in a few years we will be able to obtain a Party that is quite harmonious and serious. Such is the alliance which I propose."

Comrades, that is an alliance with Social Democratic idea the fitting in of the young Left generation into the old organisation so that the latter can teach them politics; that means a return to the wide united Party where **Guesde** was to be found side by side with **Jaures**. Why not, then, also have political unity after the fashion of **Renaudel**?

We know, comrades, that the Right, the collaborators of the **Bulletin Communiste** and the **Revolution Proletarienne** are behind these confusionists.

In conclusion, we will combat this growing confusionist tendency by applying true democratic centralism, by realising all the tasks set by our Conference of December 1 and 2, and by abolishing all our Leftist faults which we acknowledged before the International and which we already corrected. This is in complete accord with the Comintern of which we intend remaining the most active and the most disciplined section.

### Comrade Braun (Germany):

We have not come to the Enlarged Executive in order to allow certain decisive questions to be smothered up, not even by good or diplomatic speeches of **Scholem**. **Scholem** declares that precisely at the moment when his group was about to develop into a Bolshevik group, there came the letter of the Executive, which has to a certain extent disturbed this process of development by representing this group as being ultra-left and anti-Comintern. What are the actual facts? Whoever does not recognise that the Open Letter was a necessity, not only for the German Party, but for the entire International, in order to make a decisive turn in this epoch of preparation of the second revolution, has altogether failed to understand the matter.

In Germany, the position was as follows: after the serious opportunist errors of the year 1923, things were going to the other extreme, and there were tendencies for this line to spread through the International. If a change has been brought about, this is to be attributed to the great effect which the letter to the German Party has had and still has on the whole International.

**Scholem** says that nobody thinks of disturbing this approach to the masses which has been introduced by the Open

Letter. The only disturbers whom he sees are those who wish to make use of this approach to the masses in order to fraternise with the German Social Democracy. He has omitted to say who these people in the Comintern are, in order that he can go back to Germany and, on the occasion of every approach to the masses which the C. C. makes, again be able demagogically to declare to the workers: look these scoundrels are preparing the way to the Social Democracy. When one declares that preparations are being made to enter the Social Democracy, it is obvious that many workers become mistrustful and begin to doubt. This spreading of the poison of doubt and mistrust is the characteristic feature of this deviation, and is at the same time the point of contact with the right deviations of which we shall never lose sight. **Scholem** says further that he is completely in agreement with the policy of the C. C. in the question of the expropriation of the princes. But Comrade **Ruth Fischer** recently said at one of the sessions of the Executive that this is parliamentary cretinism.

(Interjection **Ruth Fischer**: This is not true!)

**Scholem** says he is in agreement with this policy, but what **Scholem** does not or will not understand, because he is still today seeking a platform for future opposition, is that this policy would not have been at all possible without the letter of the Executive. And here we see another inconsistency with **Scholem**. He says he agreed with the policy in the question of the expropriation of the princes, but that errors have been committed in regard to the question of unemployment, in the economic struggles in Saxony. That is how Comrade **Scholem** has proceeded in Germany. When any error makes its appearance that, according to **Scholem**, is the line of the C. C. **Scholem** says that we have not led any economic struggles.

The leadership of economic struggles in the present period in Germany depends in the first place upon the influence which the Communist Party has in the trade unions. This perhaps can change in a short time, but in the present period we cannot conduct such great mass movements of a revolutionary character against the will of the trade unions. The weakness of the influence of the Party is mainly to be attributed to the fact that **Scholem**, **Ruth Fischer**, etc., have carried on a false policy. **Scholem** says the inner Party course involves the danger of a new Heidelberg, the danger of a new split of the C. P. G. This danger, he says, was far greater than the members of the C. C. realised. It is a very serious question if the ultra-lefts have a certain basis in the Party and this basis has been solidified especially as the result of the false policy of the last 18 months. But we must now bear in mind that it is precisely through the change of policy which the Party is carrying out that this state of affairs will be deprived of its social basis.

We have learnt from the development of the Party and we will understand how to prevent a second Heidelberg even on a smaller scale, but we will also not permit our patience to be taken advantage of by certain elements who mistake this patience for weakness and believe that they can, by exerting pressure against the Party, carry through everything they wish including every deviation from Bolshevism. And therefore we say, comrades, **Katz** was excluded from the Party because he personified to a certain extent all the anti-Bolshevik tendencies which existed in this ultra-left group, and because, on the basis of this anti-Bolshevik attitude, he proceeded to act against the Party, which of course, no Party, unless it wishes to be destroyed, can tolerate. We regret that along with **Katz**, 12 workers had to be excluded.

(Interjection of the representative of the district VI of Berlin: Hear, hear!)

We regret that we were compelled to exclude 12 workers, but we will endeavour to win back some of these comrades. When **Scholem** delivers such a conciliatory speech here, I must call to mind **Kilbom** can bear witness to this) that **Scholem** only a little while ago declared at meetings in Berlin that the Open Letter means the introduction of the liquidation of the Communist International.

(Interjection **Scholem**: I never said that!)

Of course you said that. We have only ascertained that your whole line was: the liquidation of the Comintern is being introduced. These sentiments are no chance phenomena, but are deeply rooted sentiments and conceptions, and even conscious conceptions of some people who only recently stood at the head of the German Party.

Comrades have attempted to carry on fractional work and are still continuing to do so today. But these attempts will fail, because we are strong enough to convince the working class members of the Party. It must be stated that we have two tendencies in this ultra-left group. There are some comrades who perhaps are following the path of Katz; we hope that there are not many of them. But on the other hand, there are of course comrades — and these form the greater part — who are honestly open to conviction. In this respect one should here create a platform, not on the basis of diplomacy, but of clearing up the matter. The Enlarged Executive is a forum which can and must set up this platform for the next few months.

When Comrade Ruth Fischer had signed the E. C. C. I. letter, she went to Germany and attempted to organise underground a revolt against the C. C. Now, with the continuation of these attempts, she will be pulverised, that is evident. Should Scholem and his group now begin to follow this path, their fate will be no different. We wish to declare this quite openly, because unless this is made clear, we shall not be able to secure the Party line.

A word regarding the Right dangers. Are there Right dangers in the German Party? When one places this question in the perspective, one must say: of course there exists the possibility of right dangers. We have not yet any strong developed Bolshevik cadres, like those which the Russian Party has. We have had a number of serious deviations in the past which attempt partly even today to consolidate themselves in various directions. Do there exist today in the German Party Right dangers representing a serious danger against which we must concentrate our fire? They do not exist to this extent. The danger today is the ultra-left ideology, of the vacillations as they are personified in Ruth Fischer, in a profound pessimism and lack of belief of both groups, which at bottom, spring from

the same roots. Scholem, who makes such a great outcry over the Right dangers, abstained from voting when Schönkank, a liquidator, was to be expelled, but spoke in the discussion against the expulsion. In this connection we again have solidarity with liquidatory tendencies from the Right.

In conclusion a few words as to the future development which can arise in regard to Right dangers, perhaps upon the basis of greater successes than we have today. A great lesson has been hammered home into the consciousness of the German Party, not only of the great masses of the membership, but also of the majority of those comrades who experienced the opportunist failures of the year 1923: whatever steps we take in the application of the united front tactics, we will never abandon the principle that at all negotiations, at every tactical turn, the independence of the line of the Party, the independence of its tactical methods and measures, must be maintained.

So far as the question of the fight against Right dangers is concerned, the Party will not disregard this struggle, but now the question of the day in Germany is before all, the fight against ultra-left dangers, and the fight for overcoming the vacillations. After our victory, which we have won, it is our task to consolidate it by the first successes, to secure our line, to consolidate the Party and thereby create the basis for a successful policy of the C. P. G., and for a strengthening of the C. I. and with it the preparation of the German revolution.

The German delegation expects from this Enlarged Executive and from the decisions which will be adopted here, the securing of this course, the speeding up of the tempo of development also for the Party. We have not such a long time that we can afford to lose years by a false policy; we must learn to march more rapidly and to act more rapidly and in order to march more rapidly we must carry on the fight against these moods and tendencies right up to the end.

(Fourth Session, February 22, 1926.)

## Continuation of the Discussion on the Report of Comrade Zinoviev.

### Comrade Brown (Great Britain):

I do not propose to deal at very great length with many of the problems which beset the British Party and the British working class at the present time, but the British delegation consider it necessary to make one or two observations on the Political Theses submitted by the Presidium.

With the general political line of the Theses the British Delegation is in complete agreement. But whilst being in agreement with the general political line, nevertheless there are one or two points that we desire to make in the discussion. Our first point relates to the part of the theses dealing with the economic situation in Britain at the present time. We are afraid that a too gloomy view is taken with regard to the position of British capitalism. On this question it would appear that the period of rapid decline was accentuated almost into a landslide in Great Britain. We would warn the Plenum against this view of the report.

Whilst it is true that during and after the war period British capitalism has continued on the down grade, it still has tremendous resources to draw on and these resources and sources of resistance should be carefully considered. We would particularly draw your attention to the renewed activity of British imperialism in India and also to the attempts of British imperialism in the Near East, in Egypt, and the Sudan. But perhaps the most important fact that will show you that British capitalism has great powers of resistance is shown by the reports of over 1700 commercial and industrial companies. We find that in 1925, these companies made a profit which was 8.7% above the profit made in the previous year 1924, which in its turn was above that made the previous year. These are points which must receive great attention before we pass that part of the report.

Nevertheless we agree that British capitalism is on the decline. This is proved by the fact that British capitalism no longer pursues a policy of granting concessions at the

expense of the exploited peoples of the colonies. Hitherto it has kept peace in the home country and used the working class of Britain as allies against the colonial peoples. That period has passed. The result is that the British working class is driving to the Left. The whole movement is taking up a Left position. The British working class can now give pride of place as being the most reactionary to the American Federation of Labour.

This point is described in the Theses as of world historical importance. But the Theses fail to mention another point. British capitalism is dropping its democratic mask. This is to be seen in the preparation being made by the boss class in the shape of the organisation officially of the O. M. S. (Organisation for the Maintenance of Supplies)... Arrangements are being made for men to take their place in the key industries in the event of a big struggle in May. Then there is the kidnapping of Harry Pollitt, when those guilty were let off with a few words from the judge, the sabotaging of the delivery of labour papers, the organisation of special police, and before all the preparations of the government for placing the administration of the whole country under the control of the Privy Council in cases of emergency.

Further, there is the arrest of the 12 leaders of the Party. These twelve leaders were arrested because the C. P. has been able not only to show a lead, but has been able to get the trade union movement to rally round and follow their lead in the last crisis. The Government were frightened of a repetition of this process next May. In view of this we consider it necessary in the Theses to draw attention to the fact that the British government is dropping its mask of democracy and coming out into the open struggle.

Next there is the question of the British Independent Labour Party and its suggestion that the II. and III. Internationals should be united into one International. It is very essential that we should understand why this has been put forward by the I. L. P. There is a revolutionising process going on throughout

the whole British labour movement. The I.L.P. has felt this and within the rank and file of the I.L.P. there is healthy reaction to it. The C.P. has been striving for a **united front with the I.L.P. and all working class organisations**. Proposals for joint action have been put to the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P. by the C.P. The rank and file agree with these proposals and district councils have expressed themselves in favour. This process is reflected in the leadership of the I.L.P. It is faced with the alternative of forming a united front or placating the membership. The leaders declare that the C.P. is not its own master and therefore they approach Moscow and send proposals to Moscow, in order, under the guise of conducting negotiations with the Communist International, to take away the minds of the workers from the united front proposals.

We must draw the attention of the I. L. P. to the fact that they cannot expect a united International when they refuse all agreements to form a united front. The I.L.P. must show its willingness to unite its forces for a united front campaign with the Communist Party. The I.L.P.'s **main plank of a living wage** should be turned into a first plank in the united front. The **unemployed situation** should also be included, as this is a question which directly affects the I.L.P. both in regard to the members themselves and in view of the fact that the I.L.P. has control of many local governing bodies and that it is the policy of the government to prevent relief and assistance being given to the workers through these bodies. This would drive a wedge between the reactionary leaders and the working class members in the districts. **Dawes and Locarno** should also be forwarded as items for the united front.

### Comrade Engel (Berlin):

Comrades, before I proceed with my speech, I must declare on behalf of the III. District of Berlin that, for the members of the **Wedding District, Comrades Rosenberg and Scholem** do not come in question as their representatives before the Executive.

I come now to the question of the **Open Letter**. Comrades, we, as revolutionaries, who up to now have steadily followed our line, who have followed the line of the C.P.G. and the line of the Comintern, cannot help being surprised when an open letter suddenly makes its appearance, in which workers are abused who represent a certain Bolshevik line. I of course, do not stand here as an anti-Bolshevik, but claim to be a Bolshevik, although I am a so-called ultra-left. Therefore, I protest that the so-called ultra-lefts are abused as being anti-Communist, anti-Bolshevist and goodness knows what.

Comrades, the tactic of the **German Party** has not always been correctly and systematically carried out, because certain dictatorial measures are employed there towards those functionaries who were not always of one mind with the Central. In this connection I must mention comrades **Ruth Fischer and Maslow**. I accuse Comrade Ruth Fischer of having destroyed the Left in Germany.

As regards the present policy I must declare that the C.C. has not always understood how to rally the masses together. I will speak of certain cases which have occurred in Germany. I take the case of **Katz**. Katz did a stupid thing which was not in our interests. We must, however, at least take care that those workers who have been excluded from the Party are admitted again. When we see how the matter came about, we must say that the C.C. was partly to blame, that the situation in **Hannover** developed as it did. I repeat that the comrades in question who are honest revolutionaries, must be again admitted into the Party, that it must be made clear to them that they have acted wrongly and that what they did was not in the interests of the Party. We are absolutely unafraid of the future, for if we do not deviate from the line of the Comintern and if we stand true to the line, nobody will be able to have anything against us, and we declare that we stand on the basis of the Comintern.

### Comrade Varga:

Comrades, the picture of the world situation was perhaps never so complicated, both from the economic and the foreign political standpoint, as at the present time. We have before us four great portions of the world. The first portion is the

**Soviet Union**, which is already building itself up outside of the capitalist society and is on an ascending line. We see as a parallel to this the **American Continent** which, upon a capitalist basis, is likewise on the upgrade. The whole world situation shows more or less a polarisation of forces round these two centres. **All revolutionary forces**, in the widest sense of the word, are concentrating more and more round the **Soviet Union**. **All the capitalist forces**, all the counter-revolutionary forces are concentrating round the **strongest bourgeoisie**, round the bourgeoisie of the **United States**. As a third portion we see **Asia and the North African Colonial area**, which is at present in a great revolutionary ferment, bearing an outspokenly anti-imperialist character. As the fourth portion we have **Europe**, which is surrounded by these three forces, which is in an exceedingly difficult position and where the shaking of capitalism has made the greatest headway.

A year ago we stated here that a **stabilisation of capitalism** is to be recorded in Europe. The period is not long enough in order to be able to form a judgment as to whether the stabilisation is progressing or whether it is only an interlude. My opinion is that the year 1925 was for Europe an economically unfavourable year, a year of comparative boom but with a very limited revival of economy, and, as the events of the last few months show, we are now again in the trough of a crisis.

But even this temporary improvement of the position of capitalism in the year 1925 has been bought by a **worsening of the position of the workers**.

We must now raise the question, why is European capitalism not in the position to grant an improvement in the living conditions of the working class? I believe, comrades, we can give the following reasons.

1. Europe has lost her leading position as the industrial workshop of the world.

2. The Colonial surplus profits out of which the European bourgeoisie had created a labour aristocracy have been greatly reduced by the revolutionary activity of all the Colonial peoples.

3. Europe has lost the possibility of securing, by capital import, the non-European markets in competition with America.

The development is proceeding along an ever-increasing isolation of the European bourgeoisie from those sections which are interested in the maintenance of capitalism. In the last few years, as a result of the inflation, not only has the bourgeoisie-minded working class lost its economic basis, but enormous sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, the great section of small investors, who were fanatically in favour of the existence of capitalism, and, a great portion of the working class have been pressed down into the proletariat.

With what means is the European bourgeoisie, in spite of its objectively advancing isolation, defending itself against the **proletarian revolution**? It is surrounding itself with a number of chains of defence which it is setting up between itself and the revolutionary proletariat. These chains of defence are: the innermost chain, the **State apparatus of force**. The second chain is the **petty-bourgeoisie and the peasantry**, which is gathered round the bourgeoisie. The third chain is the **Social Democracy**, which is pushed forward within the working class in order to form a defensive wall for the bourgeoisie. And when we really consider our task as a strategic task for which we fight, then we find we are immediately confronted with the **Social Democracy, against whom at present our attack must in the first place be directed**.

It is not correct to say that the Social Democracy is the party of the petty-bourgeoisie. Of course, the Social Democracy is not a workers' party, the Communist Party alone is the workers' Party, but the Social Democratic parties are parties which have great masses of workers in their power. They are parties of the working class.

The second lesson which one can draw from a thorough observation of Social Democracy is that the tactics of these parties in defending the bourgeois society are exceedingly clever and elastic. In every State, in every country we see that the particular possibility of leading the working class from the revolution to the bourgeoisie is skilfully carried out. Only if one penetrates very deeply into the matter will it be possible in every individual country to take up a successful fight with it. Should we succeed on our part by a clever tactic in destroying

this protective wall pushed forward by the bourgeoisie, we shall soon be in the position to direct our attack immediately against the State organisation of force which will therefore compel the bourgeoisie to throw away the democratic ideology in order at once to hold down the working class by force. This imposes upon us the task of carefully studying the system of white terror, the terror of the bourgeoisie as it has existed for some years in a great number of countries in Eastern and Central Europe. Millions of people have for some years been living under a system that prevents a legal Communist mass movement. We must seek means to remedy this.

Comrades, I should like in conclusion to make a remark against Comrade Scholem. He said that I have an incorrect perspective. The fact is that I am polemising against the opinion of the Social Democrats, let us say against the theory of Hilferding. He says that for European capitalism there is still a period, a long lasting period of peaceful progress. That is what I have always denied. In connection with this I have written that there exist four possibilities, only not this one. And I believe that in this respect nobody can find any kind of deviation from the correct standpoint if he judges the matter objectively.

What I wish to emphasise, and what I have already often here emphasised is the following: There is no automatic transference of power to the proletariat. The capturing of power must proceed by means of long struggles, and of course the victory of the proletariat is by no means automatically assured if we do not know how to carry out the revolution. If, I do not know for what reason, that is not clear to Comrade Scholem, I really cannot help it. I believe it is necessary that we point out that it requires very severe, big and long drawn out struggles in order to vanquish the bourgeoisie, and on the other hand, to emphasise repeatedly that the perspective of the Social Democrats which says that now a new period of peaceful rise of capitalism will appear is incorrect. Therefore, one must fight against both perspectives, against the perspective of peaceful progress, but also against the perspective of an automatic transference of power to the proletariat after the collapse of capitalism. I do not believe that Comrade Scholem is right when he sees in this any Right deviation. (Applause.)

### Comrade Semard:

The Presidium proposes the following resolution:

## Resolution on the Eighth Anniversary of the Red Army.

"The Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. of the Comintern sends its warmest Communist greetings to the Red Army of the Workers and Peasants, which can now look back upon eight years of existence.

These eight years of life of the Red Army of the Soviet Union were years of titanic struggles, of magnificent victories, of persistent and systematic learning.

The Red Army, which has defeated the counter-revolutionary armies, which has driven back the intervention of the imperialist powers, has become a centre of culture and education of millions and millions of youths from the ranks of the workers and peasants, it has become a school of Communism.

The five years which have passed since the conclusion of the civil war have clearly shown that Red Army has not lost anything in the way of strength owing to the fact of its being a school, but that its power which is directed towards the defence of the Soviet Republic, has increased still more.

In the ninth year of its existence, the Red Army must not forget the constant armaments which are being carried out by the bourgeoisie for the purpose of fresh wars, it must constantly remember that English imperialism is preparing for war against the U. S. S. R.

The Communist International, which reflects the sentiment of millions of class conscious proletarians of the whole world, expresses the firm conviction that the present temporary period of peace will not weaken the international spirit of the Red Army of the Soviet Union, that it will not reduce its watchfulness and its readiness at the necessary moment to come forward in the interest of the world revolution.

**Long live the Red Army of the Soviet Union!**

**Long live the proletarian world revolution!"**

### Comrade Seegers (Holland):

The Dutch Party is in agreement with the analysis given by Comrade Zinoviev and also with the conclusions drawn from it. If I wish to make any criticism of the attitude of the Executive it is that the Right is not combatted sharply enough. In Holland the Right not only shows serious Right deviations, but also sabotages the work of the Party. It is evident that the Dutch Party cannot become a mass Party so long as this struggle continues and so long as the Right fraction does not abandon its sabotage.

The Central is in agreement with the present tactic and with the resolution which the Presidium submitted in December. It is thoroughly convinced of the fact that the Party must direct its entire force to work in the reformist trade unions. The main task is the formation of a Left Wing in the reformist mass trade unions. But the Party must also remain in connection with the revolutionary trade union Central and criticise its mistakes. There are deviations and the present Central has undertaken to combat them.

I agree with Semaoen that the former leadership revealed a Dutch Imperialist tendency and had a bad effect on the Indonesian movement. But the present Party leadership has altered this tactic and is convinced that collaboration on an equal footing with the Indonesian Party is necessary, and that every imperialist tendency must be combatted. Comrade Semaoen was only in Holland for a short time and this at a time when the new Central was only just beginning to work. If comrade Semaoen had remained longer, he would have seen that the present Central in the last few months has carried on a great campaign for the struggle of the Indonesian workers.

In conclusion, I must protest against the fact that Comrade Wynkoop, member of the Executive of the Communist International, is not present here. The Central invited him, but he refused to appear. This must not be passed over without protest for Comrade Wynkoop ought to have appeared here in order to give an account regarding the sabotage he has conducted.

The Central is also aware that Left dangers exist, especially in the trade union tactic, with the revolutionary trade unions, and it will sharply combat these in the future.

### Comrade Engler (France):

Semard alluded in his speech to the slogan of fraternisation. He recognised that this was a tactical error. Since, in spite of myself, I belong to the Right, I take the liberty of stating that I am not sufficiently convinced by this argument and I persist in saying that even from the specifically Communist point of view the slogan of fraternisation is not good. I consider that when one displays the intention of reaching the masses, even based strictly on the Communist viewpoint, it seems that it is, above all, indispensable to take account of the degree of the comprehension of the masses which are being appealed to.

The French opposition (let us change the terms and drop the Rights) has declared that the best slogan for drawing the working class towards us is that of immediate peace with the Riffs.

Slogans are very nice, but one must also, when issuing them, know if the moment is appropriate for their application and it is thus that I am led, in spite of myself, to speak in this hall about our 24-hour general strike.

We were alone at Rouen with only a metal factory upon which we could reckon. The bosses had for a long time been wanting to get their own back on us for the gain we had obtained from them, and I advised the Party that in making this strike we would be exposing our flank to the employers, who would use every methods for disorganising my union which is the most powerful on the lower Seine. Unfortunately my predictions came true.

I think that the leadership of the French Communist Party, has committed a good few errors, and I also consider that my comrades Lorient and Paz have also committed errors in their theses.

Comrade Zinoviev also says in his speech that both in Italy and in France the Right is against nuclei. We are, and always have been, in favour of factory nuclei, we think they

have a preponderant role to play, but we are against nuclei when you consider that they should be the decisive organisation of the Party.

The nucleus cannot be the decisive organisation of the Party and I want to try to make you understand in my working class language.

We have six in our nucleus and you know that in all the other nuclei it is the same thing.

Comrades, in our nuclei of the lower Seine which are generally composed of an average of ten members, there are generally five of us who meet. If the live member of the nucleus is not there, the nucleus meets and does not discuss anything. The nuclei are not alive and if you want them to become the decisive organs of the Party, propose something concrete to us. Form groups of nuclei, call them what you wish, but at least let there be an important number of comrades who discuss things and form an opinion.

Zinoviev has stated that in France the Right has fought very obstinately.

Comrades, we claim that we have been extremely moderate in the discussion as compared with the attitude taken by Comrade Zinoviev on August 12th, 1925 in his report on the German Commission here.

You have made exclusions. We immediately requested you to reinstate the comrades who were just expelled and who were expelled for not thinking as you do.

(Interruption of Thorez: But Souvarine was excluded by the International.)

That is all the same to me. You call counter-revolutionaries comrades whom we refuse to consider as such. We demand their immediate re-instatement.

You have compared Souvarine with Frossard. I am not the advocate of Souvarine, but I say that the Communist Party should take care, for so long as it systematically leaves outside the ranks of the Party a man who has demanded to be reinstated, I assert that this can serve as a point of attraction for the opposition comrades and for other comrades who have not the same capacity for resistance as we have, who get disheartened more quickly and who are excellent fighters but who resigned from the Party as they find the Opposition is really too badly treated.

As Souvarine has made a demand for reinstatement, I say the following: "Let us know the conditions, however severe they may be, for the reinstatement of Souvarine in the French Party, we will not combat these conditions, we will transmit them to those interested in a way that they may know when they can be reinstated in the Party."