

SPECIAL NUMBER.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8. No. 59

PRESS

4th September 1928

CORRESPONDENCE

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

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Twenty Eighth Session.

Moscow, August 14th, 1928 (morning).

Comrade Bukharin's Speech in Reply to the Debate on the Programme Question.

1. Imperialist Echoes on the Programme of the Comintern.

THE CHAMPIONS OF UNITY AND THE SPLITTERS OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

Comrades, permit me first of all to deal with the comments the imperialist and the Social Democratic opponents of Communism have made on the publication of the Draft Programme of the Comintern. The "Sotsialistichiski Vestnik" (The Socialist Messenger), issued in Berlin, published two long articles by the Menshevik Abramovitch entitled "A Programme of War and the Splitting of the Working Class". These articles are full of sinister insinuations against Communism. Abramovitch must have scoured the Criminal Police Dictionary for the words with which he expresses his ideas. He says, for example, that Communism would not even stick at employing "poison and the dagger", etc. I will deal with these articles a little later. Otto Bauer has also expressed his opinion about our programme in an article published in the Brussels "Le Peuple" entitled "Brussels-Moscow". In this article Otto Bauer writes:

"While the Moscow Congress more than ever directs its efforts towards splitting the international working class, the Brussels Congress must undertake the duty of calling upon the exploited of all countries to unite in the struggle against imperialism, against war, and against foreign domination."

Thus, Otto Bauer asserts that the Congress of the Social Imperialists is fighting for unity between the working class and the colonial peoples whereas our Communist Congress has "split the ranks of the workers". It is not difficult, in my opinion, to refute this cynical assertion. Recent events in the labour movement prove conclusively enough who at the present time really champions the idea of unity among the world proletariat and who indeed is splitting the ranks of the working class for the benefit of the capitalists. Who is expelling the Communists from the trade unions in Great Britain, in Germany, and other countries? Who has joined hands with the employers in a campaign against the Communist workers? The reformists. Was not the tactical change initiated by the Executive Committee of the Comintern, and now approved by the Congress, called forth primarily by the fact that the upper strata of the reformist organisations, parties, and trade unions have become more and more merged with the capitalist organisations and are splitting the labour movement to its base? The tendency to split the ranks of the workers and particularly of the trade unions is particularly characteristic of the policy of the reformists in nearly all countries. The reformist leaders, the Social Democratic and trade union leaders of the Amsterdam and II. International are fighting against the very idea of international trade union

unity; in whose interest the reformist leaders are conducting this policy of splitting the trade unions is perfectly obvious. In one of the recent numbers of "Der Arbeitgeber" — "The Employer", the organ of the German Employers' Federation, a long article was devoted to our Programme. This article is entitled "The Programme of the Communist International" and it gives a very characteristic appreciation of the Draft. It says:

"For the non-Communist world, the Programme represents an interesting contemporary document and is at the same time a valuable key to the understanding of the political, economic and social force against which we shall have to contend in the near future. The Communist International is a body which stands above all the Communist national sections and consequently it stands above the Communist Party of Germany. Therefore, the Programme of the Communist International will serve as the basis upon which the Programme of the Communist Party of Germany must be drafted. The Communist International gives instructions concerning trade union policy and then the Red International of Labour Unions works out these instructions in concrete form. The Communist workers who belong to the organisations affiliated not to the R. I. L. U., but to the II. (Amsterdam) International of Trade Unions must also carry out the principles laid down in the Programme of the Communist International. Thus, this Programme becomes an obligatory instruction to the leaders of the oppositional groups in the free trade unions and its practical significance for the internal economic peace of bourgeois private capitalist countries can hardly be exaggerated. It is, therefore, not only a matter of interest but of necessity for every employer and factory manager to study the important postulates of the Programme of the Communist International."

You see, therefore, that our Programme is attracting very considerable attention in employers' circles. But I did not quote this passage merely to point this out. What is characteristic is the thing the German employers regard as most dangerous for themselves. In their eyes, the principal danger are the Communists in the trade unions, and the passage I have quoted implies in essence an instruction to the reformist leaders to expel our Party comrades and the opposition generally from the trade unions. This is the significance of the employers' estimation of our Programme. And the practice of the reformist and Social Democratic leaders during the past few years shows that they are working hand in hand with the employers to eradicate Communist "sedition" from the factories and from the trade unions. Under these circumstances, for them to reproach the Communists with splitting the ranks of the working class is cynicism to the last degree.

If we take the second point, namely, unity between the industrial proletariat in the monopolist countries and the oppressed classes in the colonial world, we will be able without difficulty to show that there too, the Social Democrats are the splitters.

Take the resolution on the Colonial Question passed by the Brussels Congress. Any imperialist government could sign it. There is hardly any difference whatever in principle between the colonial policy of the reformists and that of the imperialists. Are not the protests expressed by the colonial visitors at the Congress of the II. International proof of this? Has not the imperialist line adopted by the reformists on the colonial question called forth numerous protests from the Anti-Imperialist League against the position of the II. International on the colonial question? It is a remarkable fact that precisely at this time, when the Chinese bourgeoisie is acting as the bloody executioner of the working class of China, precisely at this time and not in the period of the "Northern Expedition" that the II. International has invited the Kuomintang, this party of garrouteurs and hangmen, to its congress. This fact demonstrates more strikingly than anything else that the II. International is the force which is trying to drive a wedge between the industrial proletariat of the home countries and the oppressed classes in the colonial countries in the interests of the imperialists. Yes, indeed, the II. International is the personification of the idea of "unity", but of a special kind of unity, the unity between certain strata of the working class and of the labour aristocracy with imperialism against

the revolutionary workers and particularly against the workers and peasants in the colonies. Against such unity the Communist International will fight tooth and nail.

ABRAMOVITCH'S SILLY CHATTER AND THE EVIDENCE OF SIR GEORGE BUCHANAN.

In order to analyse the third big problem, the problem of war; in order to reply to the provocative accusation hurled against us that the proletarian State is the "incendiary" of world war, that the Comintern is the force which is "kindling" war and that the Programme of the Communist International "provokes" war, — these people are insolent enough to hurl accusations like these against us — the best thing to do would be to compare what the Social Democrats write about us with certain documents of the past. Mr. Abramowitch in No. 15 of "Sotsialisticheski Vestnik" writes as follows:

"Even at the risk of calling down the wrath of the Communists upon our heads we must declare: yes, the bourgeoisie of Europe fear the real necessity of transferring part of their political power to the Social Democrats who enter into coalitions with them, a hundred times more than the stage thunder of the "Communist revolution." For the former is a reality, an immediate reality, immediately manifesting itself in a number of political and economic concessions, which must be made today or tomorrow to the working class, whereas the Comintern, with its propaganda and its revolutionary perspectives is something which may or may not come some time 'after Christmas', while in the meantime, political power remains completely in the hands of the bourgeoisie."

So the coalition between the Social Democrats and the bourgeoisie means "transferring a part of political power to the working class" (!), and this "stands to the credit" of the Social Democratic Parties, whereas the Comintern is so "opportunistic" that it "leaves political power in the hands of the bourgeoisie." It is a wonder Mr. Abramowitch is not ashamed to put forward a silly argument like this and deliberately raise it in connection with the problem of war.

Comrades, in turning over the leaves of the memoirs of the later Sir George Buchanan, formerly British Ambassador in Petrograd, I discovered a very interesting illustration to Abramowitch's "witty" article. Sir George Buchanan, an experienced British statesman and British Ambassador in Russia in 1917, describes the role of the Social Democratic leaders and the leaders of the Labour Party during the last imperialist war and the mechanism of "transferring a part of political power to the hands of the working class." I would recommend the Publishing Department of the Comintern to publish books, documents and memoirs of this kind. Permit me to read a few extracts from these memoirs. Buchanan first of all speaks about Russian Menshevism and says:

"Tseretelli's (the leader of the Mensheviks in 1917 and now an ally of Kautsky. N. B.) name was linked up with mine — which is rather surprising considering his biography — and we were regarded as the principal leaders of this movement. This accusation no doubt arose as a consequence of the fact that we conducted active allied propaganda in favour of the war and for the exposure of German falsehoods."

(Translator's Note: The above and following excerpts from the memoirs of Sir George Buchanan are re-translated into English from the Russian translation from which Comrade Bukharin quoted in his speech. In view of the pressure of work at the Congress it was not found possible to refer to the original.)

As you see, the alignment of forces in 1917 was perfectly clear: The Menshevik leader with Sir George Buchanan, the representative of British imperialism, jointly conduct active allied propaganda in favour of the war and jointly expose "German falsehoods."

Not less interesting is the story of how Arthur Henderson's mission to Petrograd originated. Sir George Buchanan in his memoirs writes the following:

"On May 24th I received a cable from Lord Robert Cecil, then Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, informing

me that the War Cabinet considered it necessary to create a more favourable attitude among the Russian Socialists and workers towards the war and to remove the false impression prevailing in Russia concerning our aims. Being of the opinion that this could be more successfully achieved by the leaders of the Labour Party than by anyone else, the Cabinet decided to send Mr. Henderson on a special mission to Russia." (Laughter.)

You see now what "transferring political power" means. The imperialist butchers invest the Hendersons with a part of their power in order that the latter may recruit the Russian Socialists and workers for the purpose of continuing the imperialist butchery.

You know very well that Henderson achieved great success among the Russian Mensheviks and fulfilled his mission, the mission of a man invested with authority of an imperialist agitator of his Britannic Majesty's Empire. His experiences with the Russian workers, however, were very unfortunate. (Laughter.) On the next page we find not only Tseretelli and Henderson, mentioned but a whole bouquet of representatives of the II. International, — the flower of the II. International. This chapter might have been entitled: "The Leaders of the II. International at Work", at work "winning political power for the proletariat" and "organising the struggle against imperialist wars". We read the following:

"Henderson dined with us next day together with Prince Lvov and Tereshchensko. Among the other guests were the Belgian Socialist Minister, Vandervelde, and the French Minister for Supplies, Albert Thomas, who undertook the duties of Ambassador after Paleologue's departure. During the two months that he spent in Russia, Thomas not only tried to convince the Minister (Keresky, N. B.) of the necessity for firmness in regard to the internal situation, but he also tried by his passionate eloquence to raise the spirits of the people in regard to the war." (Laughter.)

The "Socialist" Thomas tried to persuade the "Socialist" Keresky to be "firm" in the internal affairs of the country. Thomas urged Keresky ruthlessly to suppress the resistance of the masses of workers to the continuation of the imperialist butchery. Thomas was the intellectual rampart of the counter-revolutionary attempt to suppress the Petrograd workers.

It is interesting to get a glimpse of the personal lives of these gentlemen. Further on we read:

"In St. Petersburg, in Moscow and at the front, he (Thomas, N. B.) addressed numerous meetings of soldiers and workers, and it was not his fault that the seeds he scattered fell on barren ground. We were always glad to see him if only because his whole being seemed to radiate the joy of life and kept up our spirits." (Loud laughter.)

"In conversation with me after dinner he asked:

'What would you have said several years ago had you been told that I and two other socialists would be guests at your table?'

The very thought of such a thing would have scared me to death, I replied. 'But the war has changed all this and now we are all "comrades"'. (Loud and prolonged laughter.)

Comrades, what is the real meaning of these literary "curiosities"? They show how these gentlemen "fight" against war. We good-for-nothings, of course, are "in favour of war" but the II. International, led by the Vanderveldes, the Hendersons and the Thomases lead the struggle against war. The leaders of the International "radiate the joy of life" They never fall into "low spirits"! These Cabinet Ministers were and are now the real vehicles of the political power in the "hands of the proletariat"! Only an unmitigated fool can fail to see the function these gentlemen played. Buchanan excellently describes the "fight" they carried on against the war when he writes that not a single person, not a single government, and not a single group was able to fulfil the rôle of propagandists in favour of the imperialist war so well as the leaders of the II. International. The same thing can be proved in regard to the German Social Democrats. A number of memoirs have been published relating how Ebert and other leaders, Mueller,

Parvus, and the whole Central Committee of the German Social Democratic Party "fought" against the war. This was the situation at the time of the first imperialist war.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATS IN THE SERVICE OF IMPERIALIST WAR.

And what is the situation now? Has the position of the Social Democrats changed for the better? Have they changed their theories? Have they annulled the thesis about "defending the fatherland"? No, they have not. On the contrary, this theory is being still further developed and in connection with the question of war is assuming an even more despicable form. Would Kautsky, who is now preaching a counter-revolutionary uprising against the U. S. S. R., have dared to do anything like this before? Would Hilferding have dared before to speak of foreign affairs and to advance theoretical arguments to prove the necessity for crushing the U. S. S. R. by the combined forces of the imperialists as he does now? Henderson and the other intimate allies of Buchanan have become more despicable in their conduct than ever they were before. Never before have we witnessed such despicable conduct on the part of the Social Democrats as we witness now. And these people have the insolence to say that they are fighting against war! It is an absolute lie! These people say that we are "provoking war", because we are warning the world proletariat about the growing war danger, because we tell the working class the truth, we prove to them that war is inevitable and that the bourgeoisie is preparing another imperialist war. Abramowitch, for example, in his first article takes up a very definite position on the danger of war against the U. S. S. R. Listen to what he says:

"We must deal in another connection with the peculiar "Megalomania" of the Bolsheviks who are striving (seriously?) to persuade themselves and others that 'the whole capitalist world is trembling with fear of the terrible spectre of the proletariat glowering at them from the historical experience of the U. S. S. R.': that all the capitalist governments see in their sleep visions of crusades against the land of the proletarian dictatorship. "Alas, these heroic times have passed long ago. The capitalist world "sleeps peacefully", notwithstanding the astonishing successes of the U. S. S. R. and all the "Communist propaganda."

These words clearly show the difference between ourselves and the Social Democrats on the question of the war danger. We say that the bourgeoisie is intensively and feverishly preparing for war. The Social Democratic theoreticians, however, say that the capitalist world "is fast asleep". We say: the capitalist world is not asleep, it is not only wide awake, but it is exerting every effort, technically, militarily, diplomatically, and even economically to prepare for war. These gentlemen, however, say that we are "provoking" war! What can we have in common with people like that, with people who argue that war is not the outcome of the social and economic struggle between Imperialist States, with people who are doing all they can to screen this struggle, to distract the attention of the workers from the feverish arming of the bourgeoisie, from its diplomatic preparations and from the historical inevitability of another imperialist war under these conditions.

I think that in regard to these two questions, — the question of splitting the working class, and particularly of splitting the trade unions, and the question of combating war, we can with a clear conscience say: **Our Programme is a Programme of struggle against imperialist war, our programme is a Programme of proletarian class unity.** And for that reason we are opposed to unity with the bourgeoisie, we are opposed to Social Democracy, we stand for proletarian dictatorship. I think that after the conclusion of our work here we must exert all our efforts in every country to the maximum in order to expose the astounding lies circulated by the Social Democrats and that we must do this very important work concretely, spiritedly, and in such a manner that it shall reach the most backward strata of the working class. We must thoroughly expose the lies circulated by the Social Democracy and conduct systematic fight against it. These comrades, are the remarks I felt obliged to make concerning the bourgeois and Social Democratic comments upon our programme.

2. The Introduction to the Programme. The Marxian Theory and the Programme of the Comintern.

The Programme Commission has already accomplished half its work, i. e. we have concluded the general discussion. I must say that never before have we had such lively discussions at the Congresses of the Comintern as we have had at this Congress on the question of the Programme. Never have we had such a large number of amendments and suggestions for improvement and never have so many critical thoughts found expression in our discussions as during this discussion. We discussed a number of problems. Without counting the large number of minor problems, more than one hundred problems were discussed on the Commission. It is utterly impossible for me to report on all these questions to the Congress, and notwithstanding the exceptional importance of the work of the Programme Commission as a whole, I must confine myself only to the most important problems discussed.

First of all, I will deal with the **introduction**. Several comrades appeared inclined towards the idea of leaving the introduction out altogether. In the debate on the Programme at the Plenum of the Congress other comrades expressed themselves in favour of letting the introduction stand. I, too, think that it would be better to have an introduction to the Programme. In the introduction we show the historical continuity of our revolutionary traditions, we show the historical origins of the Comintern. Our opponents have quite cleverly noted this. The "**Arbeitgeber**" from which I have already quoted commenting further on our programme says:

"In the Programme of the Communist International a very clever attempt is made to utilise all the emotional factors that might serve as propaganda among the masses. This is particularly in evidence in the reference to the recognition of Social Democratic authorities. The II. International is not described as a bad and heretical organisation in itself, but merely as having degenerated and become bankrupt in the war of 1914—1918 through the fault of the opportunist leaders."

Of course, I will not insist that every word of this is true, but in my opinion this is a very shrewd appreciation of the introduction to our Programme. We certainly do not desire to break with the good old revolutionary traditions; the legacy of **Marx and Engels** is our legacy and not that of the Social Democratic Parties.

I want here to rectify what, I think, was an involuntary slip of the tongue on the part of Comrade **Dengel**. Comrade **Dengel** in speaking of the introduction among other things said:

"Leninism, which represents a development of and **supplement to Marxism**, provides us with a concrete guide for our activities."

I am sure that it was not Comrade **Dengel's** intention to put up Leninism as against Marxism, but the word "**supplement**" may give rise to a wrong interpretation of what Comrade **Dengel** had in mind. To **supplement** something means to

introduce in it something new in principle. We fought against the various attempts that have been made to "**supplement**" Marxism because we were of the opinion that these supplements were something non-Marxian, that it was desired to add to the Marxian system of views. **Lenin**, of course, never made supplements of this kind, and it would be better to express it in the words that Comrade **Dengel** himself used, namely "**the further development**" of Marxism.

This is a rather important point from both the theoretical and practical point of view. We Communists are charged with making anti-Marxian "**innovations**". We emphatically deny this charge. There is not a single atom in our theories and in the teachings of **Lenin** that contradicts **Marxism**. I will try to prove this. What do we understand by Marxism? Quite a number of things may be understood by that term. We could take it to mean the sum of ideas, the concrete ideas expressed by **Marx**, i. e. all that which **Marx** wrote and is organically connected with his doctrines. From this point of view it might be argued that every new postulate, for example, a Marxian analysis of recent phenomena like trust capital, is not Marxism. However, such an interpretation of Marxism would be wrong. Marxism is not confined to a definite number of postulates. It is a **revolutionary philosophy** and at the same time it is a **method of investigation**. With the aid of this method we are able to analyse various phenomena. When we make a Marxian analysis of problems like the problem of imperialism, when we apply the Marxian method, we by that, work out new ideas, including also new theoretical ideas. But this intellectual product is by no means a **supplement** to Marxism. It is a new **Marxian** postulate which immediately becomes an inseparable part of Marxism. For that reason I boldly assert that we have not added a single non-Marxian atom to the Marxian system: we have studied new facts and new phenomena from the Marxian point of view and by that have added to the Marxian treasure store, we have **developed** his theory, etc., etc. On this question of our attitude towards Marxism we must not make the slightest concession to the Social Democratic theoreticians who assert that Bolshevik Marxism contains "**alien**", "**non-Marxian**" elements, elements that are either of "**Bakuninist**" or "**Asiatic-Marxian**" origin, but not of genuine Marxian origin. The very opposite is the case. It is precisely because Leninism has enriched Marxism that **Leninism** is the most orthodox Marxism in the world. That is what we must say. I have no doubt whatever that Comrade **Dengel**, in advancing his postulate, thought exactly the same.

We analyse all phenomena from the Marxian point of view. There are many new phenomena which **Marx** could not have analysed for the simple reason that they did not exist in his time. The problem of imperialism, the problem of the transition period — in the concrete form in which it presents itself to us at the present time, — the problem of the new type of state — the **Soviet State** — there are many problems which we have to analyse today which did not confront **Marx** so concretely.

3. The Question of Finance Capital.

AN INVOLUNTARY DEFENCE OF PRE-WAR HILFERDING.

The first dispute on the Programme Commission arose over the question of industrial capitalism and capitalism generally. The controversy centred around the problem of crises. I dealt with this problem in my first speech and, therefore, I will not deal with it at length here. The second question which gave rise to discussion was the question of **finance capital**. I would not have touched on this question but for the speech Comrade **Sultan Zade** made at the Plenum of the Congress which compels me to come to the defence of "**poor**" **Hilferding**, and even our friendly relations with Comrade **Sultan Zade** cannot prevent me from doing this (Laughter). First of all with regard to the conception of the term "**finance capital**". Comrade **Sultan Zade** quoted a passage from one of the latest Social Democratic reso-

lutions in which reference is made to the unification of industrial, merchant and bank capital and said that this was not what **Hilferding** said before. Formerly, said Comrade **Sultan Zade**, **Hilferding** spoke about the **domination** of bank capital over industrial capital, but now he speaks about the unification of the **three** (and not two) forms of capital. Is that right? Let us see what **Hilferding** wrote in his book. In Part 5, at the beginning we read the following:

"Finance capital means the **unification of capital**. The former, separate spheres of industrial, merchant and bank capital are now placed under the guidance of the financial aristocracy, which combines the industrialists and the bankers in a close personal union." (Rudolph **Hilferding**: "**Finance Capital**".)

This is Hilferding's formula of the trinity: merchant, bank and industrial capital.

In the book I wrote at the beginning of the war: "**World Economy and Imperialism**". I refer to these processes and I also speak of the merging of industrial and bank capital. As a matter of fact, Comrade Sultan Zade is not arguing against Hilferding, but against me. What was Lenin's point of view on this question? In Lenin's book "**Imperialism**" there is a special chapter entitled, "**Banks and Their New Role**". In this chapter Lenin says the very same thing that we have said:

"We get on the one hand a merging or as N. I. Bukharin very aptly expresses it, a grafting together, of bank and industrial capital, while on the other hand the banks grow into institutions of a truly "universal type". (Lenin: "**Imperialism, the Latest Stage of Capitalism**", Volume XIII).

Comrade Sultan Zade, in arguing against the merging theory, does not refer to Lenin, but Lenin expressed his view on this very clearly. Lenin also expressed his opinion of Hilferding's book. In Part 3, headed "**Finance Capital and the Financial Oligarchy**" Comrade Lenin first of all quotes the following passage from Hilferding:

"An increasing share of industrial capital ceases to belong to the industrialists who employ it. They are able to handle the use of capital only through the medium of the banks who are the real owners of the capital. On the other hand, the banks are obliged to sink an increasing share of their capital in industry. As a result, the bankers, to an increasing degree become industrial capitalists. This form of bank capital — i. e. the money form of capital — which thus becomes transformed into industrial capital I call finance capital. Finance capital is possessed by the banks and employed by the industrialists."

And then Lenin goes on to say:

"This definition is incomplete insofar as it fails to take into account one of the most important factors, namely: the growth of the concentration of production and of capital to such a great extent that concentration leads, and has led to monopoly. Throughout his whole work, however, and particularly the two chapters preceding the one from which I have taken the above definition, Hilferding emphasises the role of capitalist monopoly. The concentration of production, monopoly, the merging of banks with industry which grows out of monopoly — such is the history of the rise of finance capital and the meaning of this term."

As you see, Lenin gives the very definition which Sultan Zade attacks. And this definition is materially correct. In objecting to this definition and in arguing that such relationships between industrial and bank capital is impossible, Comrade Sultan Zade is arguing against Lenin. Of course, we may not regard this as convincing. Even Lenin may have written things that are wrong from the theoretical standpoint, but this has to be proved, and Comrade Sultan Zade has failed to do so.

The fact that on this question I take the "pre-war" Hilferding under my protection does not mean that everything Hilferding has written in his book is right, Hilferding has formulated a number of postulates and theories which are absolutely wrong and these are to be found also in his "**Finance Capital**". For example, in my opinion, his theory of **Money** is wrong. Then also there are a number of erroneous passages on the theory of value. This has given rise to a number of wrong conclusions. Absolutely wrong conclusions are drawn in connection with the theory of the circulation of money, of paper currency, etc. But where Hilferding does not make mistakes, he is right and it is no use denying it. Comrade Sultan Zade completely lost sight of the merging of various forms of capital which finds expression in a personal union. Hilferding brought this point out. I did the same. Lenin also emphasised the point of the personal union. You, Comrade Sultan Zade, fail entirely to analyse this problem.

Comrade Sultan Zade tried to strengthen his argument by referring to **Stinnes**. But this was a bad example, because the **Stinnes** enterprises were a peculiar economic form in a specific period of inflation.

(Sultan Zade: What about Ford.)

Yes, but there is also **Morgan** and **Rockefeller**. Tell me, do they represent bank capital or industrial capital?

(Sultan Zade: Industrial capital.)

But surely you know that these two are also the two biggest banking groups in the world. The two biggest and most well-known groups of banks in the world is the one headed by **Rockefeller** and the other headed by **Morgan**. These two are simultaneously representatives of bank and industrial capital. To prove your theory, you refer to **Stinnes**, but you lose sight of two far more striking and far more typical examples, — **Rockefeller** and **Morgan**.

COMRADE SULTAN ZADE'S ARGUMENTS.

Comrade Sultan Zade puts forward yet another argument which in my report I forgot to reply to. Comrade Sultan Zade says that Hilferding was Minister for Finance, but he never attempted to capture the banks and that if he had attempted to do so, the results would have been very curious. The fact that Hilferding made no attempts to bring about socialisation has nothing at all to do with these theoretical questions. Even if he had accepted your theory and abandoned his own theory of finance capital he would have done nothing towards socialising either the banks or the industries. Why? Because he is a Social Democrat. But no one is supporting the postulate that it is possible immediately to subjugate the whole of industry by "capturing the banks", because this theory is wrong. At the risk of appearing immodest I say that I was the first to analyse this problem. You will find that this is so by studying the literature on this subject. On the basis of a number of theoretical premises I proved that to seize the banks does not yet mean to seize the industries, even if there were only 6 or 12 banks in the country, because the economic threads which combine industry with the banks is credit, the specific relations established by financing, etc. At the very moment you capture the banks — remember this is the period of proletarian revolution — these threads snap. In seizing the banks you seize bank premises, account books and other documents and shares, but as the threads of credit are broken — you disorganise credit by the very revolutionary act you commit — "capturing" the banks does not enable you to capture industry. But this is an altogether different problem.

Comrade Sultan Zade brought forward the following argument: bank capital could not play the leading role because its sphere of activity was the sphere of circulation, — it was a derivative factor, whereas the primary factor was industry. On the Programme Commission I conditionally made a theoretical concession to Comrade Sultan Zade. In manoeuvring against him, I said: Let us concede theoretically that your definition of "finance capital" is correct, — that finance capital is not the product of a merger, that it is not the synthesis of industrial and bank capital, that finance capital is bank capital and nothing more. But even in that case, I said, your argument is wrong because it is too simplified. You say: production is the primary and circulation is the derivative, therefore the derivative cannot dominate over the primary. My answer was: take the system of State capitalism. The State is derivative but, under State capitalism it regulates the whole process of production. To this Comrade Sultan Zade, in his speech yesterday replied: "These are two different things; the State is something altogether different, it is the **super-Structure**, whereas bank capital is, say what you like, a part of capital, and one part cannot dominate over the other".

Very well. But this is an altogether different argument. In advancing this argument, Comrade Sultan Zade, you contradict yourself. Is not industrial capital a part of capital as a whole? It is. So you put forward two arguments. First you brought forward one argument and I disproved it by my argument about State capitalism. Then you brought forward another argument to the effect that one part cannot dominate over the other. But according to your own theory one part — industrial capital — can dominate over the other — over bank capital. Hence, the argument about "parts" is unsound.

You could have brought forward a third argument. You could have said that the combination of the two arguments about the parts and the super-structure, that the synthesis of these two arguments produce a positive result. But it is not my business to invent argument for you (Laughter). You must do that yourself.

I quoted the example of the economic relationships between America and Germany. Comrade Sultan Zade replied that these were credit relations. All right. But does American bank capital enter into the sphere of production in German economy? Yes, it does. This is the quintessence of the whole problem. Can you deny that a certain part of American capital invested in Germany becomes transformed into basic capital? No, you cannot deny it. It is an indisputable fact. A part of American capital becomes transformed into the basic capital of German industry. That is all that has to be proved, and I think it is enough.

In my opinion Comrade Sultan Zade's theoretical arguments suffer from the following defects: he lost sight of the specific form, of the hierarchical structure of the trusts, subsidiary companies, syndicates, cartels, banks, daughter banks, etc., which can be subjected to control. The term "control" is of purely American origin. As it is interpreted in America it means **domination**. It is possible to exercise control over an enterprise even when far less than one half of the total capital is owned,

4. The Forces of Imperialist Capitalism.

THE CONTRADICTIONS OF IMPERIALISM. WHY "ULTRA-IMPERIALISM" IS IMPOSSIBLE.

I now come to another question which is closely connected with the former. I have already spoken of the antagonisms prevailing among the bourgeoisie as a whole; now I want to speak of the contradictions within imperialism. Several comrades gave the expression to very valuable utterances, in my opinion, concerning the mutual relations between monopolist organisations and noncartelised branches of industry and between the corresponding strata of the bourgeoisie. Several comrades quoted passages from the works of Lenin on Imperialism in which emphasis was laid on the fact that an essential feature of imperialism was not only that it gave rise to monopolist organisations but also the difference that exists between the monopolist, cartel and trustified branches of production, etc., and the non-combined branches of production. In the course of the discussion several comrades also stressed the fact that — according to Lenin — Kautsky fails to see this and for that reason he belittles the inherent contradictions in the finance capitalist system. Other comrades urged us to emphasise more strongly the law of the uneven development of capitalism and to express more sharply the postulate on the uneven development in the epoch of imperialism and the contradictions of the imperialist system. I think this can be done, especially if we link up this question with the analysis of "ultra-imperialism". The problem of "ultra-imperialism" is not so difficult. The relative difficulty of the problem, speaking roughly, in general outline, lies in the following, in my opinion: can a world capitalist system exist in which the whole of world capitalist economy will be combined in a single, gigantic trust? If, theoretically, we emphatically reject this supposition, then another question immediately arises: does that mean that we reject the fundamental law of capitalist development, viz., the law of concentration and centralisation of capital? If you accept the law of the concentration and centralisation of capital then you must say: some capitalists absorb others; the larger capitalists swallow the smaller; the biggest capitalists swallow the larger; large trusts arise which enter into conflict with each other and some trusts absorb the others. Where is the historical limit to this? The logical and historical limit is the establishment of a gigantic world trust which concentrates in its hands the whole of capitalist world economy. We raised this problem in Russian literature at the beginning of the war.

Speaking quite abstractly, this supposition cannot be denied. The whole point, however, is that the path of development towards such a "world trust" is so bestrewn with losses, with "overhead charges" and the process of development is so monstrous that it gives rise to a **class struggle of cataclysmic character** and capitalism must perish in its flames. This process is combined with colossal wars and colossal revolutions and therefore **empirically** such a trust is impossible. Hilferding understood this perfectly well at one time. In his "Finance Capital" he adopted the view that "ultra-imperialism" was impossible. He wrote:

and sometimes when only 30 per cent of the shares of the company are owned. Comrade Sultan Zade's theory does not give a correct orientation even on the question of class relations. If you advance your theory of finance capital as against ours you by that emphasise that a wide gulf separates the bank magnates from the industrial magnates. I do not deny that there is friction, sometimes very severe friction between the industrialists and the bankers; at times this friction assumes very acute forms. But the main line is the line of unification, including even merchant capital and even big landed property. Once again I emphasise that this does not exclude the possibility of serious friction among the bourgeoisie. But the general tendency of the great capitalist organism in the process of growth of the productive forces is along the line of merging, along the line of the bourgeoisie of all categories becoming transformed into receivers of dividends, notwithstanding various antagonisms, frictions, etc.

"From the economic point of view a universal cartel which would direct the whole of production and in this way eliminate crises is conceivable. It is conceivable economically, although socially and politically such a thing is impossible, because the antagonisms of interests which it would develop to the utmost limits would inevitably cause its collapse".

This is what Hilferding used to think; Comrade Sultan Zade is mistaken when he says that the Social Democrats still say the same thing. The passage I have just quoted is the very opposite to what Hilferding says now; At the present time the Social Democrats speak of "organised world capitalism". At the present time their ideology is "Mondism", and the ideology of "Mondism" is certainly not based on the premise of sharply accentuated contradictions of capitalism. Social Democracy now says: the more capitalism becomes organised and the more we cooperate with capitalism, the better will be conditions the proletariat enjoy and the more concessions the bourgeoisie will make. In his "Finance Capital", however, Hilferding says that class relations will become so acute that capitalism is bound to perish. This postulate, which Hilferding advanced in the past, is correct. Hilferding has not only betrayed Marxism, he has also betrayed himself. Now the Social Democrats talk about "ultra-imperialism". The Social Democrats believe that the bourgeois system is developing on an ascending curve and they look forward to the opening of an idyllic epoch of "ultra-imperialism". In view of this we must formulate the problem in our Draft Programme very precisely.

THE PARASITICAL DECAY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES OF MODERN CAPITALISM.

A few words about the forces of capitalism in the imperialist phase of development. In the Draft Programme it is stated that imperialism is the final phase of capitalism and that the characteristic feature of imperialism is parasitic decay. At the very beginning of our Draft we emphasised the moribund, parasitical aspect of capitalism. This is the historical appreciation of the modern phase of world capitalism.

In this connection, without entering into any polemics whatever, I want to say a few words in regard to the possibility of an erroneous interpretation of this thesis. There is a tendency in our ranks to over-estimate the so-called parasitic aspect of capitalism resulting from the destruction of productive forces. In my opinion, however, it is wrong to assert that the tendency of the parasitic degeneration of capitalism is universally supreme and that it determines everything. If this were so, it would mean that the productive forces of capitalism have already ceased to develop. As a matter of fact they are developing and rather rapidly. It is by no means out of the question that in certain countries, I emphasise the word "certain", the productive forces of capitalism will grow with extraordinary rapidity. We are passing through a peculiar phase of capitalism in which science

is linked up with technique more closely than ever before, when technical invention assumes grandiose proportions, when science is passing through a remarkable period of development. Many problems which, as we say, define a whole epoch, are now already solved theoretically and only await practical solution. All this of course, does not mean that we are entering into a period of capitalist prosperity, as the Social Democrats think; on the contrary, an epoch is approaching of enormous intensification of world contradictions, an epoch of wars and of monstrous inflation of all the contradictions of the capitalist system to a degree hitherto unseen. Capitalism is doomed to perish, not because it is rapidly degenerating into a parasitic organism, not because it is sinking into decrepitude and impotence, — that is not what is meant by the decay of capitalism, but because moribund capitalism has entered into its last stage, in which the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system become extraordinarily intensified and give rise to conflicts which will bring

about its destruction. The parasitic aspect of capitalism continues to increase, but this is not degeneration proper; it is degeneration that comes as a result of the intensification of the contradictions of capitalism. It is precisely this specific feature of capitalism that is digging its grave. I agree that we must emphasise more concretely this aspect of capitalist development in our programme, — various contradictions arising from the law of the unevenness of capitalist development, contradictions between the cartelised and non-cartelised spheres of production, antagonism arising out of the fixing of quotas, the struggle between various imperialistic States — in order to rouse that section of the workers who have been put into an hypnotic trance by the Social Democrats, in order to destroy the legend about the developing, "organised" capitalism. It would be very useful to elaborate all these factors in greater detail and to emphasise them more strongly in our programme.

5. The Social Roots of Reformism.

THE ROOTS OF REFORMISM LIE IN THE PRE-IMPERIALIST PHASE OF CAPITALISM.

A very lively discussion took place on the Programme Commission on the question of the social basis of reformism, the analysis of Fascism and on the mutual relations between Social Democracy and Fascism. I think the social basis of reformism must be examined at this plenum of the Congress at least briefly. I will not expound this subject as widely as I did on the Programme Commission but will deal merely with certain points that I did not touch upon on the Programme Commission.

The process of development and the relative strength of the Social Democratic Parties and of reformism in the trade union movement call for an analysis of this problem in all its aspects. During and after the imperialist war we attributed reformism primarily to super-profits. This is the most essential factor in the analysis of the social roots of reformism. I will try to deal with this question a little more in detail. We must divide the social roots of reformism into two groups. Some of the roots of reformism can be traced to the previous period of capitalist society, while the other category of the causes and social roots of reformism can be traced to the specific features of the imperialistic development of the big capitalist countries. Formerly, prior to the war, in tracing the roots of German revisionism we observed in it various petty bourgeois features in the proper sense of the term. In analysing the position of the revisionists on the agrarian question for example, we orthodox Marxists declared that the revisionists, the Bavarian Wing of the Social Democratic Party for example, was closely linked up with the petty bourgeois strata of that party. We said quite rightly, that the working class does not enter the arena of history as a completely crystallised class, but that it crystallises itself out of the reservoir of the proletarianised peasantry and of the proletarianised middle strata, of the urban petty bourgeoisie. These strata of the working class, which arise in the process of capitalist development, in the process of the economic ruination of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, carry with them remnants of petty bourgeois ideology.

In analysing the processes which took place in previous epochs, for example the development of capitalist relations out of the Guild system, we see that the so-called patriarchal relations between the employers and the workers gave way to other relationships only in the course of a long process of historical development. There was a time when patriarchal relationships between the employers and the proletariat, — then still in an embryonic stage — were very strong indeed. At that time, the class antagonisms between the wage slaves and capitalist employers was not so marked and sufficiently developed historically as to create a sharp ideological differentiation between them. Only in the process of development of the class struggle did the general patriarchal ideology — which prevailed even among the proletariat — disappear. The absorption of the petty bourgeois and even the middle urban strata by the proletariat meant that this ideology was being reproduced. These petty bourgeois ideological features were the characteristic features of the reformists. These reformists have a petty bourgeois ideology, and the social roots of their reformism can be traced to the

patriarchal relations that existed between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; reformism was the ideological expression of the, as yet, inadequate social differentiation. The influx of peasants and proletarianised strata of the petty bourgeoisie into the ranks of the working class again and again reproduced the ideology of reformism among the proletariat. Such was the social basis of reformism. The social basis of reformism, I emphasise this, in the previous stage of capitalist development was a very specific one. The basis of the reformism of our epoch is altogether different. In our epoch, reformism is linked up primarily with imperialist development.

THE ROOTS OF REFORMISM UNDER IMPERIALISM.

On the Programme Commission we discussed the following problems: very frequently reference is made to the super-profits which the bourgeoisie of certain countries obtain in the process of exploiting their colonies. But Otto Bauer mockingly asks us: Where are Switzerland's colonies and Australia's colonies; where are the colonies of the Scandinavian countries, the proletariat of which receives far higher wages than that in other capitalist countries? Where are the Swedish colonies, the Norwegian colonies, etc? We studied this problem very carefully on the Programme Commission and taken on the whole, I think we solved it. The point here is that there are other kinds of super-profits besides those that flow from the colonies into the pockets of the bourgeoisie of certain countries. On the Programme Commission I quoted the following example: "When we analyse capitalist society on the basis of the economic doctrines of Karl Marx we find that the capitalists owning enterprises with superior technical equipment and consequently, with a productive capacity that is above the average, obtain so-called differential profits. The value of commodities and its market price are determined by the average productivity of social labour, but to the extent that certain enterprises are able by their superior equipment, to raise the productivity of labour above the average, to that extent the manufacturer, the capitalist obtains superprofits, i. e. differential profits. This takes place not only within the limits of a single nation but within the sphere of world economy. If a country is more developed than all the rest then that country will obtain super profits in the process of exchanging its commodities with those of the other countries. In his "Theories of Surplus Value" Marx says that the country that is wealthier and more developed than the rest obtains super-profits, so to say differential profits, within the sphere of world economy. The wealthier country exploits the poorer country not necessarily by sheer colonial plunder but by trading with her, by exchanging commodities in accordance with all the "rules" of the law of value. On this economic basis, specific relationships are established between various countries. The bourgeoisie of the developed country may obtain super-profits first of all from its colonies. It may obtain super-profits also from capital exported, not necessarily to its own colonies, but to foreign countries, which may not be colonies but capitalist countries where the rate of profit is higher. A country may obtain superprofits also on the basis of simple commodity exchange providing the

industries of that country are technically better equipped and its production is carried on on a higher stage so as to enable it to obtain differential profits within the sphere of world economy. For example, when Austria sold scythes to Czarist Russia, although Russia was not a colony of the Austrian bourgeoisie the latter obtained super profits as a result of the exchange of commodities. The Austrian bourgeoisie was able to extract higher profits through the channel of exchange. Hence it is clear why a chocolate factory in Switzerland, say, notwithstanding the fact that Switzerland has no colonies, can obtain super-profits. Analysing the situation as a whole we see that in accordance with the law of uneven development, various countries occupy various positions in world economy and stand in varying relationships with other countries. The more favourable the position of a country is, irrespective of whether it has colonies or not, the wider are its possibilities of obtaining super profits, and accordingly, the development of various industrial countries proceeds along varying lines. The more favourable the position of a country the wider are the possibilities of rapid accumulation for the bourgeoisie of that country, the wider are its possibilities for utilising technical improvements, for bribing their wage slaves and improving the quality of labour power. On the Programme Commission I stated that socially, the so-called corruption of the aristocratic stratum of the working class really takes place.

THE VARIOUS SOURCES OF SUPER PROFITS AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAT.

But this is not an external force that contradicts all the other laws of capitalist development. Not in the least; all are the expression of the fundamental laws of capitalist development. If the bourgeoisie of any country can give the proletariat of that country higher wages, the bourgeoisie by that can obtain a certain development of labour power as an economic category. The workers who earn more wages can become more skilled. I must add however, that by higher skill I do not mean skill in the old sense of the word, to acquire which it is necessary to undergo a long period of training: at the present time we have a new kind of skill, or to speak more correctly, a new form of skill which enables the workers to develop greater energy in a given unit of time, in other words, labour power acquires an internal social-physiological of energy in a given unit of time. This is characteristic of a structure as the result of which it can develop a larger quantity definite level of development of the capitalist system. On the other hand, this gives rise to a stratum of skilled proletarians who approximate closer to the engineers, etc. The qualitative improvement in labour power proceeds in these two directions. Thus, on the basis of super profits it is possible socially to corrupt certain strata of the proletariat which represents the more highly skilled stratum of the world proletariat. Frequently, in speaking of the proletariat we have in mind the European and American cadres of the proletariat — the German, the British or the American proletariat. But in analysing the great process of internal evolution, the internal regrouping that takes place among the world proletariat we must keep within our field of vision not only the European and the North American proletariat, but also the Chinese coolies (because these too are workers) and the workers in the various colonies, the workers employed on plantations and the enormous proletarian armies who, as yet, only potentially bear strictly proletarian qualities. In the colonies and semi-colonial countries we have huge strata of such workers numbering tens of millions. When analysing, not capitalism in the abstract, but the world capitalist system in its concrete form, we must — for it is our theoretical duty — take into consideration the proletariat as a whole, we must have before our mind's eye the whole of the proletariat, with all its component parts, — from the members of the American Federation of Labour to the Chinese coolies and Indonesian labourers. The fundamental tendencies of capitalist development must be examined, not from the point of view of the best paid strata of the proletariat, but from the world aspect, from the point of view of world economy as a whole. If you examine the theoretical postulates I have just laid down from this point of view you will easily see that they are absolutely correct. Take the British workers for example. Why have they

been the most conservative proletariat in the world? The bourgeoisie in no other country has obtained such enormous super profits as the British bourgeoisie obtained. These super profits bore a specific structure, they were obtained mainly from the exploitation of British colonies. Now, however, the economic and social structure of Great Britain has changed; her position in world economy has undergone a colossal change. Britain is already being squeezed out by other States and this explains the changes in the basis of reformism; this also explains the radical tendencies we observe among the British proletariat and the disappearance of the conservative elements in the ideology of the organised British proletariat. Hence, the growth of Communism in Great Britain, the general strike, the miners' struggle, etc. The historical development is slowly but surely proceeding in this direction.

Now take the United States of America. The position of the United States is now an exceptional one, it occupies something like a monopolist position in world economy. But the monopolist position of the United States today and the monopolist position formerly occupied by the British Empire. This must be taken into account. The difference between the monopolist position of the United States today and the monopolist position formerly occupied by Great Britain lies in that the American bourgeoisie, unlike the bourgeoisie when the British Empire was at the height of its prosperity, has no enormous colonial territories. As a result of the export of capital, of its higher technique, of very specific conditions of production, of exchange of commodities, etc., the American bourgeoisie is able to extract the maximum of super profits, notwithstanding the fact that America has no large colonial possessions; and although these super profits bear a somewhat different social-economic character, and although they are not immediately obtained by colonial plunder, by the exploitation of the United States' "own" colonies they are super profits nevertheless. In view of the fact that an enormous share of the world's super profits goes to the bourgeoisie of the United States it is perfectly understandable why, at the present time, the American proletariat is the most conservative proletariat in the world.

From this point of view it will be clear also why Social Democracy in Germany is still strong. Germany has no colonies, but in so far as technique is concerned Germany has beaten world records in certain branches of industry. Needless to say, the recent development of Germany would have been impossible without American credits. We have said this on more than one occasion. But even Germany obtains super profits. The further victorious development of German industry on the world market quite naturally holds out very tempting prospects for a section of the German proletariat. This is precisely what the German Social Democrats are playing on; this is the social basis of their strength and this to a certain extent explains the stability of their position. In examining and analysing the situation as a whole we see, as it were, a number of "aristocratic" countries in which there is, speaking conventionally, a labour aristocracy, i. e. a proletariat whose standard of living is higher than the average standard of living of the world proletariat. But within each separate country there is a differentiation of strata among the proletariat. For example, although the American proletariat as a whole represents a labour aristocracy in relation to the Chinese coolie, nevertheless, that labour aristocracy has its own labour aristocracy, within it, representing the real, conservative upper stratum of the world proletariat.

Patriarchal relations, a certain community of interests between capital and labour of the old type have long ago been destroyed by the competition between various capitalists and by the class struggle, which became more intensified as a result of that competition. The petty bourgeois roots of reformism, to which I referred above, die out in the process of the intensification of the class struggle, but it is possible for the imperialist, i. e. the social-chauvinist, or social-imperialist roots of reformism to remain strong in the proletariat. I think that the intensification of the contradiction of capitalism will turn up these roots; the complete eradication of the conservatism of the American proletariat is hardly conceivable without severe social historical cataclysms. But the very essence of imperialism is that on the one hand it creates the conditions for the growth of various social imperialist ideologies

among the working class, and on the other hand, — in intensifying the antagonisms between various imperialist States and involving the proletariat in gigantic wars accompanied by monstrous destruction of human labour power, the destruction of productive forces, etc., — it smashes social imperialist ideology to fragments. This is the great process of the proletariat becoming transformed into a completely independent class. We never imagined that this process of historical development would be so prolonged and we never realised the "pains" the proletariat as a class would have to suffer before it become crystallised into a force, absolutely differentiated from the bourgeoisie in its ideology. This historical development was not determined by capitalism in the abstract, but by the fact that capitalism contains within itself the possibilities of corrupting certain strata of the proletariat, and at times even considerable masses of the proletariat, in a given country, as was the case formerly in Great Britain and is now the case in the United States. It is precisely because we live, not in an abstract but in a concrete world capitalist system

that the process of revolutionising the proletariat has been so painful, prolonged and at times even tragic. The antagonisms between the various imperialist powers, the intensification of the struggle among them, and due to that, the intensification of the class struggle — all this, in the final analysis, will eradicate social imperialist ideology from the minds of the working class and will sweep the organisational and political expression of this ideology, viz. social democracy, from the face of the earth.

Of course there must be no fatalism in our approach to this subject. That would be a system of extreme narrow-mindedness. The period of the first world war has closed, but we must emphasise its consequences, concentrate the attention of the masses upon the approaching war, reveal the contradictions of capitalist society and consciously intervene in the ripening process of the proletariat, to accelerate this process and eradicate social democratic influence. In my opinion, all this is closely linked up with the problem of the social roots of reformism.

6. The Character of Fascism.

On the Programme Commission we had a long and serious discussion on the question of the character of Fascism. In the course of this discussion two extreme tendencies — if one may so express it — were revealed. Some comrades hold that Fascism exists in all highly developed capitalist countries. All reactionary tendencies, the tendency of transition from the parliamentary system to the open violent dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, all the tendencies towards applying terror in the struggle against the proletariat, all the tendencies towards the formation of bourgeois volunteer class armies, etc., — all this is interpreted as Fascism. Other comrades go to the other extreme and argue that Fascism is something specific and that it cannot exist in highly developed capitalist countries. Various formulae were proposed. For example, several comrades took colonial possessions as their criterion and argued that Fascism is possible only in those countries which have no colonies and for that reason were unable to corrupt any sections of the proletariat. In such cases Fascism takes the place of coalition with Social Democracy. Other comrades advanced approximately the following formula: Fascism is a specific phenomenon peculiar to backward countries and therefore there are no grounds for speaking of Fascism in highly developed capitalist countries.

In the course of further analysis and discussion we established the following: Firstly, the so-called reaction arises from the fact that the parliamentary system has already played its historical role; this tendency to establish a new form of government is determined by the development of modern capitalism, i. e. by monopolistic capitalism, by the intensification of the class struggle, by the prospects of war and the general instability of the capitalist system as compared with previous epochs. Hence the tendency to establish powerful central governments, to concentrate all the forces of the bourgeoisie and to abolish the useless petty bourgeois Party system. I mentioned these points on the Programme Commission. All these represent a tendency towards changing the method of government. To these must be added other factors like the establishment of class armies and bourgeois police forces, etc. I personally believe that the Fascist form of reaction, i. e. the bourgeois attack upon the working class is indeed a specific form. The specific character of Fascism lies in its mechanism; and this is an important point. The peculiar feature of the mechanism of Fascism lies in that Fascism, as a specific form of reaction, strives to secure the support of the broad masses — the petty bourgeoisie in the towns, the small peasants and at times also certain strata of the proletariat. In Italy and Poland, Fascism in its original stage, was a mass movement. In Italy, it was a petty bourgeois mass movement; in Poland it was a petty bourgeois mass movement with the addition of broad strata of the proletariat. All followed Pilsudski

and helped him to achieve his coup d'état. The internal mechanism of this Fascist coup d'état was extremely peculiar. The masses, driven to desperation, played an important part in it. Of course such things are possible only under certain very specific historical conditions, when the whole situation of the country is unstable, when the whole of society is in a state of ferment and when large sections of the petty bourgeoisie, of the peasantry and partly also of the proletariat are driven to a state of desperation. Some comrades ascribe these specific symptoms merely to the backwardness of the respective countries, but this is incorrect. It is not the degree of backwardness of the respective country or the possession or non-possession of colonies that is decisive in this matter, but the instability of the capitalist system in the respective countries. This is the decisive symptom having decisive significance. Therefore, when the basis of American capitalism will have been shaken Fascism will also arise there. It is due to these circumstances that we have the embryo of Fascism in Great Britain, which under no circumstances can be described as a backward country. I emphasise the fact that the embryo of Fascism in Great Britain was germinated by the fact that the foundations of British capitalism have been shaken. In regard to the tendencies of development we may say that, as the social crisis which is shattering the capitalist organism grows, so we will observe the growth of Fascism in other countries. If we examine the situation statically we may say that at the present time we have various forms of Fascism: the classical form, various transitional forms and tendencies of development towards Fascism. Of course these transitional forms and tendencies cannot be called Fascism in the proper sense of the term, they are the "embryo" of Fascism. It is not yet genuine Fascism, but given certain definite historical conditions they may become crystallised into genuine Fascism. The general situation is by no means homogeneous. The existence of various forms of reaction is due to the varying social economic conditions prevailing in the various capitalist countries; but the general line of development is absolutely clear. I think that is how the debate on Fascism may be summarised.

In regard to the relations between Social Democracy and Fascism our analysis led us approximately to the following conclusion. First of all there is not the slightest doubt that Social Democracy reveals a social-Fascist tendency. Secondly, this is merely a tendency and not a completed process, for it would be a mistake to lump Social Democracy and Fascism together. Nor must this be done in analysing the situation or in laying down Communist tactics. Our tactics do not exclude the possibility of appealing to the Social Democratic workers and even to some of the minor Social Democratic organisations; but we cannot appeal to the Fascist organisations.

7. Our Ultimate Aims.

I come now to the question of our ultimate aims, with which I will deal only briefly. In my opinion three main problems confront us: one of them bears rather an academic character. Still I think I ought to deal with these problems here.

Someone accused us of having a non-Marxian approach because we spoke of **Labour** in Communist society. These comrades claimed that the term "labour" is an historical conception, that in Communist society labour, as such, will disappear and they sought to prove their argument by quoting various passages from Marx, in which Marx speaks, not of labour, but of work. I opposed this argument. It is true that passages like this can be found in the early works of Marx, written in his youth. In Marx' earlier works we find other undifferentiated terms. For example, in his "Poverty of Philosophy" no distinction is made between labour and labour power, whereas there is a very important difference between the two from the standpoint of Marxian political economy. In "Capital", however, Marx in many places speaks of labour in Communist society. In the celebrated chapter on labour in Vol. I of "Capital" Marx speaks of labour as a process of "interchange of matter" between nature and society as being the general basis for any form of society. "Wage labour" is an historical conception like value, profit, wages, etc., but "labour" is a different category.

Secondly, several comrades proposed that the reference to the abolition of private ownership of articles of consumption be eliminated from this chapter. They proposed to state that in Communist society the right to the private ownership of articles of consumption will remain in force. I consider that this postulate is wrong. We must draw a distinction between the

fact as such and the juridical shell of the fact. Marx says that things will be distributed according to needs. This does not mean that if I take an apple Comrade Manuilsky will have the right to claim this apple. It means that he will be able to take another apple, not mine, but an apple similar to it, and eat it.

Generally speaking, when we talk about all remnants of the State dying out we mean also the dying out of State-judicial conceptions. Juridical conceptions have a very specific form and this form disappears with the disappearance of the last remnants of the State form.

The position in regard to the conception of **coercion** is analogous. Reference was made to lunatics, etc. Although the Communist International is hardly the place to talk about mental defectives, permit me nevertheless to say a word or two about the question of coercion. The problem of coercion in regard to mentally defectives is not a juridical problem. The source of coercion in this case is a medical certificate to which others, for example the relatives of the patient, submit. But this "submission" is not by any means submission in the juridical sense.

There are no juridical relations between me and the doctor who prescribes medicine for me. When a doctor is healing a child and utilises all sorts of medicines for a purpose, he is frequently obliged to resort to coercion, but this is not juridical coercion. These forms of medical coercion are quite different from juridical coercion, and the two concepts must not be confused. Hence, I think that the formulae in our draft on this point should be left intact.

8. The Nationalisation of the Land.

KARL MARX ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TOWARDS THE PEASANTRY.

I come now to the urgent and practical question of the nationalisation of the land. You are aware, of course, that the question of the nationalisation of land gave rise to a very heated discussion. Many arguments were brought forward against the formulae in the draft programme on this point. The tone of the discussion was set by Comrade **Renaud Jean** from France, with whom many members of the Programme Commission expressed their agreement. This is indeed one of the most urgent and acute political problems. Comrade Renaud Jean directed his arguments mainly against the passage in the draft which says on the one hand that it is impossible immediately to nationalise the land and on the other hand speaks of the immediate prohibition of buying and selling of land. I objected to Comrade Jean's argument on the Programme Commission and I want to repeat my objection here. The contradiction which the comrades claim to see between the two points mentioned is only a formal contradiction. What is important for us is not mere talk about nationalisation. The prohibition of the purchase and sale of land is of decisive importance because it is equal to 95% of the nationalisation of the land. This is of decisive significance for us. But it is asked: why should we adopt the compromising form of nationalisation? Why speak about prohibiting the buying and selling of land and not about the immediate nationalisation of land? We do this out of caution, although we are not cowards. We are afraid that the slogan of the immediate nationalisation of the land, which means also the peasants' land, will repel a considerable section of the peasantry from us. Is this opportunism? I think not. In support of my contention I will quote from an orthodox Marxist like **Karl Marx**. In an article published for the first time in one of our scientific magazines, Marx gave expression to a number of ideas on the peasant question which wholly coincide with Lenin's point of view. This is all the more remarkable for the reason that Lenin was not even aware of the existence of this article when he

was engaged on working out our relations with the peasantry. We have all taken great note of Enderle's pamphlet on the peasant question, but the manner in which Marx treats this question will be new to us. Almost every word coincides with what Lenin said. Marx drew up a very detailed synopsis of Bakunin's "State and Anarchy". In this synopsis he adds a number of his own remarks and replies to a number of questions which Bakunin puts to him. Among other questions Bakunin asked Marx: What will be the position of the "common peasant" after the proletariat has captured power? In reply Marx writes:

"Where the mass of the peasantry are private owners of land, or where they even represent a more or less considerable majority, as is the case in all continental States of Western Europe, where it has not disappeared and its place in agriculture taken by labourers, as is the case in England, the situation will be as follows: either it will become a hindrance to and will cause the collapse of every workers' revolution, as has been the case up till now in France, or the proletariat (for the peasant owner does not belong to the proletariat; even when according to his position he does belong to the proletariat he does not think that he does) must as a government take measures which will immediately result in the conditions of the peasantry being improved and in inducing the peasantry to come over to the side of the revolution. These measures must bear the germs of the transition from private ownership of land to the collective ownership and facilitate this transition so that the peasants will come to this by economic means." (Italics ours. N. B.)

This is brilliantly said, — "by economic means". Immediately before our eyes looms up co-operation, etc.

".... However, the peasantry must not be repelled by proclaiming for example the abolition of the right of inheritance or the abolition of his right of ownership. The latter may be done only when the capitalist tenant squeezes out the peasant and when the real owner becomes a proletarian working for wages like the

urban worker..." (Italics ours. N. B.)
In another passages, Marx writes:

"For that reason it (the radical social revolution, N. B.) is possible only when under capitalist production the industrial proletariat occupies at least a certain place among the masses of the people; and in order that he may have at least some chances of victory it must be in a position to do for the peasantry, immediately, at least as much as the French bourgeoisie did for the French peasantry at the time they made their revolution." (Italics ours. N. B.)

These passages are enough. The point made in them is that the proletarian revolution must immediately bring some benefit to the peasantry. This problem is dealt with by Marx as exhaustively as was subsequently done by Lenin. The decisive point is the emphasis laid upon the immediate assistance to be rendered to the peasantry and the fact that unless this is done the revolution will collapse.

CAN THE PROLETARIAT AID THE PEASANTRY IMMEDIATELY AFTER IT HAS CAPTURED POWER?

I quoted these passages in order to show that Marx had come to this conclusion, and then starting out from this point of view, to examine the problem further. Comrade Dengel advanced the slogan: "No dissemblance on the question of nationalisation, but agronomic aid, etc." But Comrade Dengel, this is exactly what cannot be done immediately, because in the first stages of the development of the revolution you will have a decline in the forces of production, you will have civil war, you will have a situation in which we, the poor U. S. S. R., will have to render you economic aid. I am convinced of that. For a certain period you will have to fight strenuously, you will be unable to set your industrial culture into motion, you will not be able to introduce measures for land reclamation, etc. This is almost inevitable in the first stage of development of the revolution. You will be thankful if you will not have sabotage and things like that to deal with. We must emphasise that we do give something to the peasantry immediately. We give them land: We do not repel them by taking the land away from them. We will say to the peasantry: you have received something from the revolution which you can utilise, we give you guarantees that you will retain possession of your own

land and the additional land you have got. This land will not pass into other hands. We guarantee this to you by passing a law prohibiting speculators from speculating in land. This will be the guarantee that you have received something palpable from the revolution.

Some comrades talked about "alienating" the whole of the land, i. e. they proposed a formula which lumped the big landlords' land with the peasants' land and at the same time obscured the point about confiscation, — by the term "alienation". This is politically unwise. It is doubly ridiculous (Chinese comrades) to speak about confiscating all the land. Actually, the revolution gives land to the peasantry, but this slogan threatens to take it away from them. To formulate our demands in this way means to put everything upside down.

Thus, in the programme we carry out a definite line: we give the peasantry more land, we give them guarantees for these gains, we draw a distinction between big landed estates, which are to be expropriated and small allotments which we shall not touch. The fact that we acted in this way in the U. S. S. R. is not an accident. It may be argued that we were tied up in bloc with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries. But if we compare the situation in the U. S. S. R. with what it is likely to be in the Western European countries we will find that the difficulties in the latter countries will be even greater than they were in the U. S. S. R. On the problem of nationalisation we will encounter greater difficulties in the Western European countries than we encountered in the U. S. S. R.

At first several comrades argued heatedly that this question was never before presented in the manner in which we are presenting it now. This is not true. We presented this question in this way at the IV. and V. Congresses. And that is how it was presented by Marx and by Lenin.

(A Voice: At the II. Congress of the Communist International.)

Yes, and at the II. Congress Lenin raised this question. We are not presenting anything new. There might be some argument in favour of the point of view of our opponents, but not much of an argument, if the premise laid down by Comrade Dengel were feasible, i. e. if in the first phase of the revolution we were in a position to render immediate economic aid to the peasantry. But we must not harbour such illusions.

9. The Nature of Bourgeois Democratic Revolutions and the three Types of Countries.

On the Programme Commission we also discussed the question of bourgeois democratic revolutions and the three types of countries. On these questions also there was a very lively discussion. I will briefly state the arguments in as condensed a form as possible.

On the question of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Great care must be taken not to confuse two things, two criteria: 1. The criteria of the driving class forces of the revolution and 2. the criteria of the objective content of the revolution. On the Programme Commission I quoted the example of the Great French Revolution, which represents a classical example of bourgeois revolution but which at the same time was directed against the liberal bourgeoisie, i. e. the most outspoken representative of the bourgeois system. The dictatorship of the mountain was primarily the dictatorship of the petty-bourgeoisie. The plebeian method of abolishing feudal domination and feudal survivals, in order to pave the way for the development of capitalism, was radically carried out by the petty-bourgeoisie against the liberal bourgeoisie. I repeat that we must not confuse the question of the driving forces of the revolution with the question of the objective content of the revolution. In China, for example, at the present stage of development, the bloc between the workers and the peasants implies a fight against the bourgeoisie and not only against feudal domination. Nevertheless, in China, we have not yet got a proletarian revolution, but merely a bourgeois-democratic revolution, and we are approaching a system of

government personified by the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. But even such a form of government can be brought about only in the fight against the bourgeoisie (can we imagine the dictatorship of the peasantry under the hegemony of the proletariat being brought about without fighting the bourgeoisie? The premises for such a revolution are the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the destruction of the bourgeoisie and its political power). At the same time the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is not yet the dictatorship of the proletariat — as the sole vehicle of power. Another question arises and that is: how long can the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry last? I think that right from the very beginning we have the processes of the one merging into the other. But this does not in the least imply that we do not draw a distinction between the workers' and peasants' dictatorship and the proletarian dictatorship, i. e. between the objective content of a revolution leading to the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry and that of a revolution which directly leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. From the world historical viewpoint and from the viewpoint of a given country, the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is a preliminary stage to the proletarian dictatorship. But only a preliminary stage. It is a stage in the development of the revolutionary process. To lump these together is not in the Leninist traditions; it is Trotskyism of the purest water.

Correspondingly, we may draw a distinction between three types of countries, which we have done. Perhaps this must be emphasised still more strongly in the programme. I do not object to that. Such a division, — like every more or less abstract division — bears a more or less schematic character. But that is no argument against marking the division, against drawing a distinction between countries of a proletarian dictatorship and the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry; between an immediate proletarian revolution and a bourgeois democratic revolution of the proletariat and the peasantry. As a result of our discussion we came to approximately the following conclusion on this question:

In describing the countries with a medium level of capitalist development it would be better to refer to the **Balkan countries**: Yugoslavia, Roumania, perhaps also Bulgaria and certain of the **South American** countries. At the same time, a more elastic formula should be adopted, because there are countries where the proletarian revolution, while being Socialist in "content" will have to carry out enormous tasks of a bourgeois-democratic character. The proportions between these elements may vary very considerably. Perhaps the Polish comrades are right when they say that Poland is one of the countries in which the proletarian revolution will bear a specific

10. The Problem of War Communism.

The next problem is the problem of War Communism. On the Programme Commission Comrade Varga took up a strong position against us. There I explained why Comrade Varga was such a strong advocate of War Communism. I said that Comrade Varga has still failed to understand what a profound mistake his party made during the Hungarian dictatorship. What mistakes were made with regard to the peasantry? First of all the "mistake" was made that the peasant got absolutely no land. Secondly, very considerable expropriations (requisitions, etc) were made. Thirdly, the big landlords remained in occupation of the Soviet farms in the capacity of experts. These, to put it mildly, were the mistakes committed in regard to the peasantry. As far as the petty-bourgeoisie in the towns are concerned, in the first period of the proletarian dictatorship a decree was passed which prohibited private traders from opening their shops under penalty of death. I said that under such circumstances it was a miracle that the proletarian dictatorship lasted as long as it did. I argued that no distinction was made between our attitude towards the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie on the one hand and towards the landlords and the big bourgeoisie on the other. On the Programme Commission, and partly also at the plenum of the Congress, Comrade Varga stated in jest that he was opposed to nationalising barbers and that he had had a very "close shave" with them (Laughter). I will not develop this theme. But am I right in asserting that Comrade Varga has not understood the mistakes committed by the Hungarian dictatorship? I claim that I am right. Here, before me, I have the original unrevised manuscript of an article on Hungary, written by Comrade Varga for the "Great Encyclopedia". How did Comrade Varga in that article — prior to his debate with me — estimate the principal lessons of the Hungarian revolution? In this article he describes the various factors in the Hungarian Movement under the dictatorship of the proletariat and writes:

"Both these circumstances (the isolation of the revolution and the weakness of the Communist Party, N. B.), together with the fatal historical fact that in the summer of 1919 the Soviet Government in Russia was being pressed more and more to the North by the White Guards, as a result of which it proved impossible to unite the Hungarian and Russian Red Armies — all these circumstances must inevitably have brought about the fall of the Hungarian dictatorship even if the leadership had not made a single mistake."

I absolutely disagreed with this statement. I said that the statement contains an under-estimation of the mistakes com-

mitted. Comrade Varga says the dictatorship would have fallen even if the policy carried out would have been excellent and irrefragable. I stated on the Programme Commission, and I repeat here, that the Hungarian proletarian dictatorship was overthrown by armies from without, by peasant uprisings from within and partly by the petty-bourgeoisie in the towns. In view of the policy they conducted towards the peasantry, the leaders of the Hungarian Revolution were unable to disintegrate the enemy armies consisting of Roumanian, Czech and Hungarian peasants. During the civil war the Hungarian dictatorship had the majority of the population against it. It was unable to carry on disintegrating propaganda among the enemy armies. How could it maintain itself in power under such circumstances? It was absolutely impossible. If you terrorise the petty-bourgeoisie in the towns is it surprising that the overwhelming majority of them turn against you? How could you maintain yourself in power with half the party and the government consisting of Social Democrats in a situation when the petty-bourgeoisie was entirely opposed to the dictatorship and when the enemy armies fought against the dictatorship. How could you expect to maintain power under such a situation? I ask, and ask again. If the peasantry were on your side you would have had excellent opportunities for disintegrating the army of the enemy. Assuming the Hungarian peasants had received some immediate benefit from the revolution, is it not conceivable that when the Roumanian peasantry came into Hungary and encountered their fellow peasants in Hungary they would have refused to fight? We demoralised the British troops in Archangel and the British fled. In Odessa the interventionist armies were also demoralised. Ask Comrade Piatnitsky what happened when the Cosacks were marching on Moscow. We demoralised them. Our victories to an enormous extent were the result of our demoralisation of the enemy forces. This was one of the surest weapons in our struggle and will be our best weapon in future wars. But in Hungary this weapon was never utilised and the situation that developed there was the very opposite to what we had in Russia. Considering the manner in which the lessons of the Hungarian dictatorship are explained in this article I have every political right to assert that we have here an under-estimation of the mistakes committed and primarily of the mistakes committed in relation to the peasantry and to the petty-bourgeoisie generally. Did Comrade Varga's passionate speech in favour of War Communism have anything to do with the under-estimation of mistakes? I claim that it did, for to fail to understand the gravity of the mistakes, to fail to see the difference between landlords and peasants and between the big bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie means that the application of "War Communism" on such a basis must inevitably lead to the doom of the dictatorship. If I

character, in which it will, *en passant* fulfil a number of bourgeois-democratic tasks and in which the percentage — if it is possible to reduce these things to arithmetical terms — of bourgeois-democratic elements in the general process of the proletarian revolution will be very large. Perhaps it would be advisable to formulate the question more elastically.

In connection with this I would like to say a few words about the speech delivered by Comrade Alphonso yesterday.

Comrade Alphonso argued against two passages in the programme. But these two passages are taken from Lenin; those who are opposed to these passages must confess that they are opposed to Lenin. To say that these passages, written by Lenin, are the embodiment of Menshevism is going a little too far. Now in regard to the question itself. I have already referred to this question before and it may be necessary also to deal with it in the discussion on the colonial question. Under certain conditions it is possible for us to march together with the national, revolutionary bourgeoisie providing it is really revolutionary and providing it gives us the opportunity to organise the masses. There was a time when this was possible, but that time has passed. In India the situation is different.

speak with some restraint about "War Communism", it is precisely for these reasons. As far as conclusions are concerned, our controversy with Comrade Varga was reduced to a minimum. Comrade Varga proposed that we should not say in the programme that War Communism was inevitable, but that it was probable. I agree with that; in a number of countries under certain definite conditions War Communism is probable. On this point I agree with Comrade Varga, but I am opposed to his line of argument. Of course, starting out from the probability of War Communism under definite conditions we must say:

Firstly, we will not have a simple reproduction of the "War Communism" that existed in the U. S. S. R., in other countries. Nor will N. E. P. in other countries be exactly

similar in form to N. E. P. in Russia. We will have numerous variations of the system. Comrade Lenin not only said that at a definite stage "War Communism" is justified and inevitable, but he also said that under "War Communism" we committed a number of stupid blunders and that we ought not to recommend others to commit the same blunders.

Secondly, we must not tie our hands by any statement to the effect that "War Communism" will be necessary at the beginning or at any other definite period of development of the dictatorship. If it will be necessary then we will introduce it. If the premises for War Communism exist in any country then that system will be applied here. I think that is all that need be said about it.

II. The Universal Significance of N. E. P.

There was a lively discussion also on the question of the New Economic Policy. Some comrades thought, and they brought a number of quotations from Comrade Lenin to prove their case, that in a number of countries, under certain conditions N. E. P. will not be applied and that in those countries it will be possible immediately to proceed to the socialistic exchange of products without complicated market relationships. Yes, Lenin did say something like that. Nevertheless I must say that at the III. Congress Lenin said that the experience of the New Economic Policy in Russia must be subjected to analysis and utilised on an international scale. He also said that perhaps England represents an exception in regard to N. E. P. At the IV. Congress Comrade Zinoviev dwelt at length on the question of the New Economic Policy and, more definitely even than Lenin did at the III. Congress, said that N. E. P. will be necessary in other countries. He said this in the name of the Russian Delegation, after discussing the matter with Comrade Lenin. The international significance of the New Economic Policy as a method of combining Socialist industry with the small producers had become much clearer than it was at the III. Congress. There is another circumstance to which I referred on the Programme Commission and that is that at the IV. Congress Comrade Lenin in the main approved the draft programme we drew up at that time in which N. E. P. is treated in the same way as it is treated in the present draft. It may be argued that no document or memorandum exists to prove this. But it is inconceivable that Lenin should express his opinion in regard to what was relatively a second rate question in the draft programme, namely, the question of partial demands and "forget" to do that on a fundamental question, namely, the question of the New Economic Policy. As a matter of fact he did discuss this question, although from the formal logical point of view what he said contradicted the words he had previously uttered. Why? Because the situation had become much clearer.

We must take care not to mix up two different things. On the one hand we will have variations of Socialism. Under capitalism we have variations of capitalism. I said this at the IV. Congress and I think also at the V. Congress. We have variations of capitalism in France, in the United States and in Germany. Naturally this must lead to variations of Socialism. In backward countries we will have still other forms. After the proletarian revolution, socialism in Germany will be of a much higher form than the Socialism in the U. S. S. R., notwithstanding that the latter originated first.

The premises for building up Socialism in Germany will be much wider than they are in our backward country. Lenin said and wrote on numerous occasions that after the proletarian revolution in Western Europe, we will again fall back to our position of a backward country, notwithstanding the fact that to-day we are the most progressive country. The co-

operative plan drawn up by Lenin will have a different specific gravity in a country like Germany. Agricultural co-operation will not play so great a role in Germany as it does in Soviet Russia. The structure of society will be different. As far as structure is concerned, there will develop, so to speak, different "national" types of Socialism and these variations will exist for a fairly considerable period. The process of merging of the various parts comprising the world proletarian dictatorship into Unions of Soviet Republics and then into one Socialist world system will be a fairly prolonged one. The various qualities and the variations of socialist construction are not matters of secondary importance. But that does not mean that the methods of Socialist construction in other countries will differ extremely from those in Soviet Russia. The comrades who opposed me did not deny that it will be necessary to retain market relationships to a certain extent in all countries. But market relationships are the most essential factor in the policy of N. E. P. If market relationships exist it means that you have the "New Economic Policy". The question as to how long this will exist, as to how long it will take to overcome market relationships, is an altogether different question. The stages of this development and the length of time it will take, will differ in the various countries. From the point of view of the controversy about whether N. E. P. is necessary and whether it is universal, there is no difference in principle. That, in my opinion is how the position stands in regard to N. E. P.

On the Programme Commission we all agreed with the remarks made by a number of comrades concerning the peasant question and concerning the national question, as a separate and special problem which must not be confused with the general colonial question. I will not discuss this any more. Well these are the main questions that were discussed on the Programme Commission.

Of course I have not exhausted the whole of the discussion that took place on the Programme Commission by a long way. I have merely touched upon the most theoretically complex and important questions. There are a number of tactical and strategical questions which are extremely important from the general practical point of view, but which are not particularly complicated theoretically and I have not touched upon them. I think that all this can be carefully gone over again in a special commission. The Plenum of our Programme Commission decided not to set up any sub-commissions but to establish a small commission for the purpose of drafting the concrete amendments to the programme. On the conclusion of its work this small drafting commission will submit to the Congress the final text of the programme. I now propose that the Congress adopt the draft programme as a basis.

12. Conclusion.

We have not yet concluded our work on the programme, we have merely concluded the **general discussion**. We still have a very difficult task before us and that is to incorporate in the draft the concrete amendments and improvements that have been suggested. This will be a very great and difficult piece of work. But the general discussion has shown that in the main the draft programme has not encountered any serious objection and for that reason I ask you to adopt the draft as a basis.

At the present time, when the Social Democrats assert that our programme is a "programme of war and of splitting the proletariat", when they are persistently trying to deceive the

masses of the workers by pretending to be a force fighting against war, we must carry our programme to the masses of the proletariat so that they may see once again that our programme is the programme for the **unification of all the proletarian forces**, the programme for the **unification of the industrial proletariat of the home countries with the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies**. The world proletariat will see that our Programme is the most faithful guide in the Communists' devoted struggle against imperialist wars, that our programme is indeed the **programme of the world revolution. The Programme of the World Dictatorship of the Proletariat.** (Loud and prolonged applause.)

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	2 schillings
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the **sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A.** are the **Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y.,** to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.