

**- INTERNATIONAL -**

Vol. 8 No. 81

**PRESS**

21<sup>st</sup> November 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, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.**

**SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

**Concluding Speech of Comrade Kuusinen on the Colonial Question.**

**Report of Commissions — Conclusion of Congress.**

**Fortieth Session.**

Moscow, 21st August, 1928.

Comrade REMMELE Chairman: The next point on the agenda:

**Concluding Remarks of Comrade Kuusinen.**

Comrades! By the co-reports of Comrade Ercoli, the Chinese Comrade Strakhov and the Indian Comrade Sikander, as well as by the discussion speeches, the draft theses and my very deficient report were many-sidedly supplemented. In general we can establish, that we had a fruitful discussion. Errors and

deficiencies of a "fundamental" nature in the draft theses were found by only a few comrades, as far as I noticed, only by Comrades Bennett, Rothstein, Heller and the other English comrades, partly also by Comrades Lominadze and Losovsky.

I.

**The Leading Thought of the Theses: The Hegemony of the Proletariat in the Revolutionary Movement of the Colonies.**

In the discussion, emphasis was laid on the critical remark, which I myself pointed out already in the report, that is, the lack of a theoretical proof of the theses of Lenin on the possibility of the non-capitalistic development of the backward colonial countries. This thesis is of course embodied in the draft theses, it was also, to some extent, further developed by it, there are elements of its theoretical proof on hand in the draft, but the proof itself has not yet been given. I request that this point (3) receive special attention, because I regard it as one of the basic ideas in our theses in general.

The remark of Comrade Neumann, that the most important is missing, because Lenin spoke not only about going round the capitalist stage, but besides this about the development of these countries to Socialism and Communism — is not right either. I quote the respective part:

"This signifies the greatest possible shortening of the path of development of these People, the greatest possible acceleration of their development from the present backward and, with some of these People, altogether primitive stage, through the most necessary intermediary stage to

the richest unfolding of their Powers in the Socialist and further in the Communist Social order..."

I must again emphasise, that in preparing the Draft Thesis; the underlying leading thought for me, was the independent role of the Proletariat in the revolutionary movement of the colonial countries, the attaining of the hegemony of the proletariat, including, as well, the leading role of the Communist Parties. This is for instance, the main criterion in the division of the countries into groups. The Chinese Revolution is being stressed specially because, it was the first great colonial revolution in which the Proletariat played an independent role. As the strategic central purpose of the whole bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Draft Thesis lays emphasis on the winning of the hegemony of the proletariat and the leading role of the Communist Party. At another part of the Draft Thesis it is said:

'Of decisive significance for the success of the direct mutation of the revolution from the first phase to the end of the first period (that is to the point where the proletariat and peasantry conquer Power) is 1) the degree of maturity of the proletarian-revolutionary leadership of the movement, that is that of the Communist Party of the respective country (its strength, independence, consciousness of purpose, fighting ability as well as its authority; connection with and influence in the trade union and peasant movements); 2) the degree of organisation (even, if this is not possible to the same degree) that of the peasantry.'

I regard it as necessary to remind the comrades of these main ideas, because Comrade Losovsky in his criticism repeatedly asserted, that in the Draft Theses the proletariat, the hegemon of the revolution, totally "disappears", and established this as a big gap. Indeed, if it were true this would be an immense gap. The Draft, furthermore, describes, even if briefly, the peculiarity of the colonial proletariat, its fluctuating composition, the exceptionally great percentage of the women and children, the difficulties of organising the colonial worker, the difficulties of developing its class consciousness, etc.; in many places the workers are seasonal workers, and even the workers of the older industrial branches stand with one foot still in the village; this helps the alliance between the workers and the peasants, but makes the creation of a proletarian ideology difficult.

Another big remark of Comrade Losovsky is, that one should have described in the Draft Thesis the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Well, comrades, the whole of the end of the 4th chapter describes only this matter. Whether bad or good, is another question, but it is described, I attempted it and this is not a "gap". It is true, nobody can give a fully concrete description what the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is going to look like, but we can write about the general tasks, about the role of the Communist Parties, about the role of the proletariat during this period.

#### The Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution and the Process of its Mutation into the Socialistic Revolution.

Comrade Fokin said, that the Central problem has not been raised in the thesis, i. e., the problem of the mutation of the Revolution from one period into the other. Now then, Comrades, the following is written about this in the draft:

"The second period is, the very period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution's mutation into the first period of the Socialist Revolution. This process of mutation can, to a certain extent, already begin during the first period,

(embryonic genesis of the hegemony of the proletariat); it can, however, also be interrupted at various times. Only in the second period can the development of the country be steered under the dominating influence of the proletariat, whereby this development will receive a new, non-capitalistic direction."

We, then copiously describe how this happens. Already, at the beginning of the description of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, this problem is being put and described; true, not in the shape of a scholastic question, but as a historical process and as a political task. What is more, the question on double-rule and the questions on the Soviets etc., were put at the same time, all questions which comrade Fokin did not find in the draft. What can I do when critics come, who assert that that which I inserted in the draft as a matter of major importance, is not there at all?

The bourgeois-democratic revolution is denoted in the Draft Theses as Soviet-revolution, as class-revolution of the workers and peasants etc. Why so many denotations? It has the purpose of popularisation, in order to avoid that anybody, and before all the comrades of the colonies should misunderstand it, — when we speak about bourgeois-democratic revolution, that anybody, perchance, should be of the opinion that we mean by it the simple bourgeois revolution, since our scientifically correct terminology is a bit hard to understand.

A comrade, despite this, misunderstood it. Naturally, one can say, that only the first period of the Socialist revolution can fully complete some of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. But simply to say, the bourgeois-democratic revolution is identical with the common bourgeois revolution, this I can regard only as a simple mistake.

Comrade Neumann in the question of the mutation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, represented the point of view, that the struggle decides everything. These words are from Lenin, but the thought has not been correctly reflected, according to my opinion. As the VII. Plenum of the Executive said, the Chinese Revolution cannot destroy the capitalist yoke without growing beyond the limits of bourgeois-democracy, in this sense it is right. But growing beyond the limits of bourgeois democracy is one thing, and growing over the limits of bourgeois democratic revolution is another. The bourgeois-democratic revolution is a period in which the prerequisites of the socialist revolution are being prepared, but in itself this period does not go beyond its own frame. Of course, it is right what comrade Neumann says, that the mutation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution does not occur automatically nor without the active force of the working class; but neither can it take place without a minimum of the objective prerequisites, in the maturing of which, the proletariat and the Communist Party can naturally effect a great deal, and before all, after they have succeeded in conquering the power. But just to say, that by this mutation the struggle decides everything, is not right. One has to add, struggle decides it all, when a minimum of the objective prerequisites exist. In the frame of these objective prerequisites the struggle decides. It is very important for a revolutionary to bear in mind the maxim of Napoleon, of which Lenin was so fond, that one should just throw oneself into the struggle and then one will see what is going to come out of it. However, Lenin never meant it in the sense that we need no theory and no analysis of the objective prerequisites, because only the struggle decides everything.

## II.

### Against the Theory of De-Colonisation.

#### The Attitude of the Draft Theses on the Question of the Industrial Development of the Colonies.

I will now touch on our main question, namely, the theory of de-colonisation. The theme of our thesis is not the colonial problem in its entirety, but only the revolutionary movements in the colonies and semi-colonies. For the characterisation of the revolutionary movements, one must necessarily also charac-

terise the forces against which the movement is directed. This is in the first place the imperialist colonial regime, and secondly it is the class of native exploiters. The second chapter of our draft analyses the substance, the main tendencies of the imperialist colonisation policy. These are pointed out in a manner that, out of the contradiction between the imperialist colonial regime and the counter-forces in the colonies, one should have a logical introduction to the general perspectives of the revolutionary crises in the colonies. These counter-forces were not elaborately

described in the draft. Still less, does the draft claim to describe the totality of the economic development in the colonies. These are three different matters. You perhaps may tell me, it is a deficiency that the totality of the process has not been described. However, here we are dealing only with general thesis. Should we want to raise concretely the question of the revolutionary perspectives in each country for itself, then one could not do this without describing in its fully concrete entirety the actual totality of the process of economic development. If you so desire, we can add some things about the most important colonies, so that we put the revolutionary perspective concretely for them.

A number of comrades who criticised this chapter from the point of view of industrialisation or the de-colonisation theory, raised the question, where does the proletariat come from, where does the bourgeoisie come from? It has, substantially, no different origin in the colonial countries from that in the other countries. The development of native capitalism is not being denied in the thesis. Already in § I this is being distinctly stated as one of the important facts, which came to light after the II. Congress, the strengthening of the elements of capitalism, and in particular of industrial development in the colonies, the growth of the proletariat, the beginnings of its organisation etc. About India in particular it has been said that:

“... even through these petty concessions (on the part of British imperialism) the tendencies towards the independent economic development of India, where the native industry experienced its first thriving boom during the war and in the first period after the war, have received significant encouragement.”

Whence originates this native capitalism, the native industry in the colonies — was asked — when the imperialist colonial policy tends to block the industrialisation of the countries? The answer is at least hinted briefly in the draft:

“On the other hand, the tendency of the imperialists to bring the colonies into a one-sided dependence on their countries, rises in ever sharper form against the economic and social counter-forces created by the imperialists themselves.”

Besides, it is stated in the draft, that the imperialist policy conditions a certain furtherance of production-development in the colonies. It is, therefore, altogether superfluous, comrades, to bring quotations from Lenin and Marx against us, in which it is said, that capitalism in the colonies serves as an unconscious tool of historical development, as well as of historical relations, or that it occasions the first steps in the development of the industry etc. Obviously, imperialist exploitation in the colonies is not solely plunder, but capitalist exploitation as well, which cannot go on without a certain development of industry or at least a certain development of the productive forces. The material basis for the capitalistic development of production has to be created in the form of constructing means of transport, railways, ports etc. Only to get the raw materials out of the ground, mines, plantations have to be organised, cotton-growing introduced — all these spheres of production, which the theses designate as the main spheres of colonial production. At the same time the native capitalistic development is partly an undesired by-product of the imperialist exploitation and it is partly a development of native capitalism, evoked by this exploitation, and which takes place in spite of the hampering tendencies on the part of imperialism.

#### The De-Colonisation Point of View.

What is the point of view of the Draft Theses? This has been opposed by many comrades, first of all, Comrades Bennett Rothstein and Heller. All these comrades say, quite naturally and I believe, that after we put the question so sharply at this Congress, all the adherents of this false point of view will say as well — that they are not at all supporting the de-colonisation theory. This word, so to say, has been killed. It is, indeed, not true what comrade Bennett says, that our comrades spoke about de-colonisation only in quotation marks. Regrettable as it is, there have been written seriously not only articles but whole books, in this sense; even our periodical for Indian matters, which appears abroad, represented for a long time this theory. Therefore, the question is not at all a question in quotation marks. I would prefer that those comrades who represented the de-colonisation theory would say: it was a

mistake, we represent it no more. Comrade Palme Dutt, it is true, has already partly revised his former point of view in his last article. This I admit. And, of course, I never was of the opinion, that our comrades speak in the sense about de-colonisation as do the imperialists or their lackeys. Of course, they do want to fight against imperialism, and do not want to embellish it. All this, however, does not excuse the objective incorrectness of this theory.

Let us take this theory in the form as it has been defined here at this Congress, for instance, by comrade Bennett. He said:

“We are not dealing with colonisation or de-colonisation. We are dealing with the industrialisation of India under the control of England.”

He also spoke about “a new stage of imperialist colonial policy” and about the “participation of the imperialist powers in the industrialisation of the colonies” etc. Comrade Rothstein has spoken among other things about the tendencies of imperialism to:

“transform the colonial countries into territories for producing the means of production, and in this manner carry out that process of industrialisation, which will not adapt these colonies to the requirements of the imperialist mother-countries, but on the contrary — as we see this in a highly classical and clear manner in the example of England (!) —, it will before all transform them into serious competitors...”

Basically taken this is the very same theory, as has been formerly represented by Comrade Palme Dutt, also by Comrade Roy and Comrade Rathbone in their latest books.

#### Whether Marx' Point of View Agrees with the Theory of De-Colonisation?

Can it be mere chance that neither Marx nor Lenin ever asserted that the imperialist colonial policy promotes the industrialisation of the colonies? No. What they asserted is something quite different.

The basic question is: is it correct, that the main tendency of the imperialist colonial policy, in its substance, consists of in that it checks the independent economic development, first of all, the industrialisation of the colonies? Or is it right what these comrades say, that the imperialist colonial policy furthers the industrialisation of the colonies? This is the question which decides the line of the theses. Either the answer given in the draft theses is right, then the main line is also correct, or it is false and then you must reject the theses. You have to decide this question, comrades. Of late, in our literature, attention has sometimes been turned somewhat one sidedly only to the one function of the imperialist colonial-monopoly, namely to the function of exploiting the colonies. Little regard has been paid to the other functions, connected therewith, of the imperialist colonial-monopoly, namely, its function of preserving and further developing the conditions of its own existence. This is the function of subjugation, as it has been designated in the draft. We can see now — and this is useful — that it was high time that attention be turned to this aspect.

Marx, in “Capital” lays down the following general law of development:

“By constantly making a part of the hands ‘super-numerary’, modern industry, in all countries where it has taken root, gives a spur to emigration and to the colonisation of foreign lands, which are thereby converted into settlements for growing the raw material of the mother country; just as Australia, for example, was converted into a colony for growing wool. A new international division of labour, a division suited to the requirements of the chief centres of modern industry, springs up and converts one part of the globe into a mainly agricultural field of production, for supplying the other part which remains a mainly industrial field.”

Now, says Comrade Bennett: This was the colonial policy of the 19th century, but in the theses the colonial policy of the 20th century must be described. In itself, the putting of the question in this manner, has of course, its justifications.

The epoch of finance-capital, of imperialism, does not as a rule abrogate the general laws of capitalism, but it may in one sense or another, modify the laws. We must investigate, if and how this law established by Marx has now been modified, above all by capital-export, upon which, in particular, has been based the criticism of the respective comrades against the draft theses (it was even asserted, that I totally forgot this important side of imperialism). No, this has not been forgotten.

### The Role of Capital-Export.

I have re-examined Hilferding, as to what he had established on the question of a possible modification of the Marxian Law; As you know, Lenin took no exceptions to this part of Hilferdings "Finance capital". We have every reason to presume that if Lenin had not been in agreement with Hilferding on this point, he would have called our attention to it. What one finds in Hilferding in no way indicates a change of this Marxian law in the sense that capital export furthers the industrialisation of the colonies. On the contrary, he points to other spheres in the colonies, to where the exported capital is streaming:

"In particular, the creation of the modern transport system, that of railways and steamship lines absorbs enormous quantities of capital."

and further:

"Is the soil fertile, then it becomes possible for the native industry to deliver its raw materials such as, for instance, cotton, far cheaper than the old sources." — "Yet more important is the supplying of raw material to the metallurgical industry. The rapid development of the metallurgical industry has, despite all the technical advance, the tendency to raise the prices of metals, which is still further enhanced by capitalistic monopolisation. This makes it even more important to have sources of these raw materials in one's own economic sphere."

The centre of gravity, then, lies in the production of raw materials and the acquisition and monopolisation of the raw material resources. Further on writes Hilferding:

"As long as capital-export substantially served the purpose of creating, firstly, transport systems in the backward country, secondly of developing the industries producing the means of consumption, so long it furthered the capitalistic development of this country. True, even this method had its disadvantages for the country in question. The greater portion of the profits flowed to foreign countries, to be spent here, partly as revenue, not at all employed to start the wheels of industry in the debtor country, or to be accumulated." (Here it does not deal with colonies only. — K.) "This accumulation need not, of course, by any means take place in the country from which the profit has been derived; by this capitalistic 'absenteeism', the accumulation, that is the further-development of capitalism in this country was extremely retarded".

Here, we can see in what direction, according to Hilferding, capital export in the epoch of finance capital modifies the Marxian Law. You will excuse me, for reading such long quotation from Hilferding; the man is a scoundrel, but on this point he formerly depicted matters correctly, as Lenin already acknowledged. Hilferding then goes on to speak about the assimilation of imported capital, which is more easily accomplished in the larger countries but meets difficulties in the smaller ones; he writes as follows:

"This emancipation became totally impossible as soon as the character of capital export has changed, when the capitalist classes of the large economic spheres strove less for the creation of industries producing the means of consumption in foreign countries, but set themselves much more the task of securing domination over the raw materials for their ever more rapidly developing industries producing the means of production. Thus, the mines of the countries of the Pyrenean peninsula came under the power of foreign capital, which was now exported, not as loan capital but was invested direct in these mines, in this manner also — against great resistance — the mineral wealth of Scandinavia, in particular Sweden came into the hands of foreign capital. At a time when perhaps, under different circum-

stances, these countries could have gone over to the creation of the most essential modern industries, their own iron industry, the raw material was withdrawn for the benefit of the English, German and French industries. Thus, their capitalistic development, and with it, also, the political and financial advance was hamstrung right at the beginning. Economic tributaries to foreign capital, they became also politically, States of the second order, left to the protection of the bigger."

Therefore, this can be said regarding even such countries as Sweden, Spain etc. Take, this analogy, then, for the colonies; to what a greater extent does the export of capital effect there the slowing up, the hampering of the inner capitalistic development. In India this is particularly clear. Just imagine the immense reserves that Indian Capitalism would possess if only it could develop its forces in full freedom. It is too simple to say: export of capital means industrialisation. No, the matter is not so simple. For instance, loan capital is being exported by England to Australia or Canada, or by America to Germany. This can promote industrialisation, and in fact it does. It may also to some extent advance the industrialisation, when, for the purpose of strengthening the British agency, England exports money, in the form of loan capital to be put at the disposal of the bourgeoisie of South Africa. Loan capital can, however, be also a means, a weapon of expansion, for example when American capital is being placed as a state-loan in the different South American countries. Here we see, as a rule, that when the government is in financial straits, and proves unable to meet the regular amortisation, the representatives of American capital come and take over the control of State finances, place their own finance-commissar in power as comptroller, etc. This is one of the ways by which imperialism nowadays establishes its colonial monopoly in an independent country.

But capital is being exported not only as loan-capital but as production-capital as well, mainly for the acquisition of the raw material resources and the high points of economic-command in the different new spheres of imperialist expansion. When in this form it goes, for instance, to the Latin American countries, where English and American imperialism are sharply competing, and where they are only now capturing the high-economic-commanding points, naturally, this capital-import has to induce there a certain development of production, e. g. mines have to be opened and put into operation; but the substance of the matter, the actual question, is the acquisition by imperialism of the raw material resources, not the industrialisation of the countries.

The State-loan of London to the Indian government means again something different. It means the squeezing out of tribute from the Indian people. As is clearly to be seen from the statistical material, British export capital serves for the greater part unproductive purposes, but even in cases where it is being used for plantations, for mines, etc., it does not mean the industrialisation of India.

### A Close Analogy.

You may remember yet another analogy in this connection. You will recall the discussion in the C. P. S. U. between Comrades Stalin and Sokolnikov on the question of "Dawesising" the Soviet Union. Here, too, capitalist export from the imperialist countries was spoken of. Now, as a matter of fact there is hardly any capital export to the Soviet Union, but there is no doubt that the Soviet Union could easily obtain capital from the foreign countries, if only the Russian proletariat would permit the foreign capitalists to colonise, not industrialise, a bit of the country. At that time Comrade Stalin among other things wrote the following against Comrade Sokolnikov:

"Our country has to be transformed from an agricultural country into an industrial one capable of producing the means of production by itself. This is the substance, the basis of our general line. We have to arrange matters so that the ideas and efforts of our economists are co-ordinated in this direction of transforming our country from a country importing the means of production, into a country which produces the means of production. Because this embodies the main guarantee for the economic independence of our country. Because this is the guarantee that our country will not be transformed into an appendage of the capitalist coun-



### A. Measures Favouring the Industrial Development of India.

1. The 3 per cent. assessment on the cotton consumption of the Indian textile mills was abolished (as a result of a textile workers' strike).

2. The tariffs on the lower qualities of textile products were raised from 11% to 16% (England does not import textile goods of low quality to India, so this measure was directed against the fast growing Japanese import).

### B. Measures to Hinder the Industrial Development of the Country.

1. In the year of 1920: A law on the Imperial Bank by which the bank is forbidden to give credit to industrial undertakings.

2. In the year of 1922: Railway construction plans with a capital expenditure of 1,500 million rupees. The Indian bourgeoisie demands the orders for the Indian metallurgical industries. The orders were given to an English concern, since the English offer was pretty near 50% cheaper.

3. In the year of 1923: Orders for 3,132 railway cars given to England.

4. In the years of 1926—27: a) the export duty fixed at 12% in the year of 1919, on leather and skins (for the purpose of creating a leather industry) has been reduced to 3% (thus raw material will be exported).

b) The rupee exchange has been set at 1.6, even though all the industries were against it and demanded an exchange at 1.4.

c) Instead of increasing the tariff duty on iron and steel, as demanded by the Indian bourgeoisie, preferential tariffs were fixed for British iron and steel goods.

d) The increase in the coal tariff demanded by the Indian bourgeoisie was rejected in order that the South African coal industry should be protected and promoted (South Africa imports to India).

e) Capital is being exported from India to Brazil and the Minister of Finance approves of it.

f) More orders given away to England.

g) Duties on automobiles tyres were lowered.

h) The Royal Commission on Agriculture carries on its work in a sense that Indian capital (and the wealth after mobilisation) be directed to agriculture.

Here we see two rather insignificant measures regarding of which one could say that by them the industrialisation of India has been promoted; all of the remaining measures aim directly at retarding the process of industrialisation. I have stated already in my report, what the temporary circumstances were that forced the English Government, during the war and in the first years following the war, to grant the respective concessions.

Comrade Losovsky took exception to the expression used in the draft theses which describes the colonies as the "agrarian hinterland" of imperialism, and instead proposed the expression

of "raw material hinterland". I cannot see, in this, an important difference. We, of course, do not mean by the expression "agrarian", agriculture alone, but use it in its wider sense, as Marx also used it, by the inclusion of primary production.

### Why must the theory of decolonisation be emphatically rejected?

Perhaps we have spoken too much about the decolonisation theory at our Congress. But a mistake in this question is no trifle. I emphatically repeat, that the theses do not contain a word regarding the mistaken theory put forward by our comrades. The theses speak only of the decolonisation lie of the imperialists and their reformist lackeys which is being spread by them as an apology for the imperialist colonial regime. This, of course, is quite another matter and we have every reason to call them by their real names and to unmask them. You should read the last article of the Austrian social imperialist, Renner. He is a dangerous enemy, one of the worst lackeys of world imperialism. I am not going to quote his article. You may read it yourselves, as a horrible example. It is not all untrue what the scoundrel writes. But he puts the perspective of capitalisation of the whole world; the whole world will be industrialised and the socialist world revolution will be postponed till the proletariat will become the great majority even in the colonies etc. He opens the imperialist perspectives for the whole colonial world. This is, of course, absolutely wrong. This is the socialist conception, against which we must carry on a sharp struggle, and the falsity of which we must prove to every worker. But not all the facts put forth by these people are false. Only they substitute the unimportant for the important, and in this manner twist the reality, embellish the "progressive" role of imperialism.

By this juggling they create the appearance, as if the colonial world were to be decolonised and industrialised in a peaceful manner by imperialism itself. Comrades, it is one of our main tasks to expose this imperialist pretention, this imperialist lie. The main mistake of Comrades Bennett, Rothstein and Heller lies in their not sufficiently recognising this task. This is a great mistake, a Right mistake. It must be corrected. One should not act the way Comrade Bennett did in his last statement, in which he says: I only said what Marx said... No, the theory that imperialism industrialises the colonies, and in this way decolonises them, is a wrong theory, and this must be distinctly stated. A number of English comrades (perhaps with the aid of Comrade Bennett) went off on the wrong track on this question. I am, however, certain that after these English comrades convince themselves of the falsity of the view put forward by them here, they will frankly admit this.

I will once more reneat my opinion, that such amendments to the second chapter of the theses as will clarify the matter, are useful. Even, some parts of the proposals of the English comrades are acceptable, but one will have to be careful to see that the line that is now expressed in the second chapter of the draft thesis, is not changed.

### III.

## On the Role of the National Bourgeoisie of the Colonies.

### The Differences of Opinion in the Decolonisation Theory Lead to Political Consequences as well.

When one starts out from the point of view of the decolonisation (industrialisation) theory, it is quite logical that the relation to the national bourgeoisie takes a totally different aspect from the description given in the draft theses. The picture drawn by Comrade Bennett is fairly consistent: imperialism plays a progressive role in the colonies, because it furthers industrialisation; the national bourgeoisie of the colonial countries, say for instance that of India, as far it benefits by industrialisation, belongs to the same camp as the imperialists; when certain conflicts between it and English imperialism arise, they centre around the question of dividing the loot (as was the case so many times formerly between trade capital and British imperialism); but in as much as the national

bourgeoisie takes an oppositional position against imperialism, it thereby struggles against the progressive role of imperialism, and consequently, plays a reactionary role. This opposition, however, in the opinion of Comrade Bennett, will be easily liquidated by a lasting compromise. "There are", he says, "plenty of possibilities of a — perhaps at present not yet existing — understanding between this oppositional bourgeoisie and British imperialism." But when the matter is put in a way, that "Great Britain does everything, and will continue to do everything, in order to restrict the industrialisation of India" (which, according to the opinion of Comrade Bennett, is absolutely false), then — says he, "under such circumstances there is no future for any development of sharp class struggles, there is no basis for the proletarianisation; the place of the proletarian masses will be taken by the pauperised masses."

A totally different picture will be had when we start out from the reality, which is that imperialism does in fact restrict the industrialisation of the colonies, prevent the full development of the productive forces. Under these circumstances the class interests of the colonial bourgeoisie demand the industrialisation of the country — I underline the word class interest as different from certain private and group interests — and in so far as the bourgeoisie represents its class interest in this respect, in as much as it stands for the economic independence of the country, for its liberation from the imperialist yoke, then it plays a certain progressive role, while imperialism plays a substantially reactionary role. The economic independence of India, or a similar colony is an aim which lies in the national interest, not only in the interest of the bourgeoisie, but also in the interest of the proletariat and the peasantry. Therefore, because the bourgeoisie displays this interest against imperialism one cannot condemn it. It should be condemned because it does not stand for this interest radically, nor decidedly, nor consistently, because it capitulates before imperialism and betrays the national struggle. The idea, which has been stated repeatedly in the theses, that the bourgeoisie of the colonial countries capitulates before the imperialist bourgeoisie, is unintelligible for those comrades who are of the opinion that the entire national bourgeoisie of the colonial countries, like India, Egypt, etc., simply take an anti-national, compradore position. It is self-evident that the fact that there exists an objective and, even profound contradiction between the class interests of the national bourgeoisie and imperialism, and that this bourgeoisie has its own political main line which is not without special significance, does not at all mean — and this has not been emphasised in the theses — that it is capable of representing its objective class interest in a more consistent, more independent manner. The national bourgeoisie of the colonies is not able to do this. It is too national-reformistic to do this. This does not in any way, exclude certain understandings on its part with imperialism. On the contrary, the national bourgeoisie seeks such understandings. Before all, it seeks such understandings in the questions of the struggle against the revolutionary proletarian movement and against the agrarian revolution. It also seeks economic understandings. Comrade Lenin, in his speech at the II. Congress, referred distinctly to the understandings of the first kind, and this has also been underlined in our draft theses.

As against this, in the conception of Comrade Bennett, the entire basis of the contradiction between the interests of national independence of the colonies and imperialism really disappears, and with it also every contradiction of any political significance between the class interests of the national bourgeoisie and the imperialist colonial regime. With him everything is so simple: there are only two camps, a camp of counter-revolutionaries and a revolutionary camp; and within the one, as well as the other, everything is quite clear and homogeneous, without differences of political importance. In reality, however, the matter is not so simple. Not even in China is this the case, even though the Chinese revolution compared, for example, with India is an entire long stage ahead of it. National reformism, represented by various petty bourgeois groups, may attain quite a large political influence among the toiling masses as has been recognised by Comrade Strakhov, if I have correctly understood him. That is still more the case in India.

Not even in the national-revolutionary camp is everything homogeneous. This camp will by no means be the same revolutionary camp in India as it will be, for instance, in Germany, or as it was there in the years of 1918—1919 or 1923. A camp of the national revolution in a colonial country will, in the first stages of the revolutionary movement, contain many very heterogeneous elements. It may, among others, contain such petty bourgeois elements which will play even a Fascist role at a later stage. It is not right to embellish this camp, to depict the entire camp as one of complete unity till the end of the revolution. This is not the case. Some elements that may be our enemies tomorrow are, today, national-revolutionary. We have to look at the matter from its dynamics.

#### THE INDIAN NATIONAL REFORMISTS.

It is just as important to see clearly the national-reformist character of the camp of the national bourgeoisie. To comrade

Bennett the entire national bourgeoisie is simply counter-revolutionary and nothing else. For instance, the Swaraj Party of India is simply a "bourgeois counter-revolutionary Party", says he, literally. He does not bother to characterise it closer. But then, he presents things in a way as if, according to my opinion, this party were a "wonderful revolutionary party", as he expressed himself. No, comrades, this is not a revolutionary party. Comrade Lozovsky even asserted that my thesis contain a call for the "support" of the Swarajists, and then he made a long speech against support. No, comrades, in the thesis, on the contrary, the task is put that the Swarajists, as well as the national reformists in general, shall be "ruthlessly unmasked" and in no way supported. But the Swaraj Party is not a common counter-revolutionary party — there are such parties in India. Does this party carry on an anti-British propaganda? Yes, this has to be admitted. Did it organise nationalist campaigns? It did. What is its programme? "Liberation of India without force" the last condition, too, belongs to its programme. Briefly, lot of noise and little result, this is what this party makes. Much has been quoted from the statements of the deceased leader of this party, among which there are some quite ugly pieces. In my report I mentioned a quite counter-revolutionary article from the "Forward", the organ of the Swaraj Party and related how the leadership of the Indian National Congress betrayed the nationalist mass movement of Bardoli in 1922. This is all true, but despite this, the Swarajists are not the common kind of counter-revolutionaries. They have, for instance, organised and led the present boycott-action in Bardoli (refusal to pay taxes to the Government). The organ of the English imperialist bourgeoisie, the "Times", writes on the 8th of July the following about this action:

"In the territory of 100 villages of Bardoli, with a total population of over 80,000, the respect for the law and the authorities has seriously diminished and the district officials of the Government in the whole neighbourhood depend for their supply of food on Mr. Patel (he is a Swarajist, K.) and his 'generals'. Even if peace would be concluded tomorrow it would take years before the due respect for the lawful authorities could be re-established.

"According to the reports the discipline of the 200 Satyagraho volunteers is exemplary ... When the Commissioner visited Bardoli last month there was a complete 'Hartal'. Every house in the village that he visited was bolted and barred and the streets were perfectly deserted. When the tax collector, who personally is highly esteemed, shortly visited the place he was compelled to obtain a permit from the Satyagraho officer in order to be able to hire an automobile. But the actual struggle will take place at harvest time, because the people whose lands are under foreclosure will sow this land and strive to gather in the harvest. The Governor would need an immense force of police to prevent this." (Retranslated from the German. Tr.)

If we had a genuine Communist Party in India, then this Bardoli action would have afforded us the opportunity to utilise the mass movement: as it is, however, we could not at all take advantage of it. Naturally, this action in Bardoli was organised by the Swarajist bourgeoisie as in a laboratory, on a limited territory, where there were many more "kulak" elements than in other places and there is less danger of movement spreading directly among the wide masses of Indian peasants. This is just one of the "laboratory demonstrations" so typical for the oppositional national-reformist bourgeoisie. But it is not a counterrevolutionary act. These "counter-revolutionary Swarajists" belong to the Anti-imperialist League which is sympathetic towards us. Comrade Bennett knows quite well that the whole Indian National Congress, in which the Swarajists comprise not the Right Wing, but the centre, is part of the Anti-Imperialist League. Has Comrade Bennett ever raised a protest against this? The present General Secretary of the Indian National Congress is Nehru junior: a national-revolutionary, the leader of the "Republican Party". As against this, his father, Nehru senior, is a typical Swarajist leader; he participated here among other guests in the Tenth Year Anniversary Congress of the October Revolution. I mention this incident only because he was invited to come here with the participation of Comrade Bennett, who to the delegates of

our Congress represents the Swarajists as being merely counter-revolutionaries.

What are the Swarajists? They are the representatives of the Indian national-bourgeoisie, they are typical national-reformists, they are typical bourgeois oppositional opportunists, nationalist chameleons. According to my opinion, it is the duty of the Communists within the Anti-Imperialist League to carry on a sharp struggle for the unmasking of these people. But very little will be done in India or in the League for their genuine unmasking by means of us merely yelling, they are counter-revolutionaries and nothing else.

### Lenin on the Question of the Position of the Oppositional Bourgeoisie.

We can compare the Indian Swarajists with the Cadets of Tsarist Russia. Comrade Lenin did not at that time (during Tsarism) simply relegate the cadets to the ranks of the counter-revolutionaries. Lenin has characterised them so well that I can best throw light on the question with his own words. Comrade Lenin wrote:

"Our liberal bourgeoisie took the road of counter-revolution... Should we, however, conclude from this that the bourgeois liberals are counter-revolutionary, that their conflicts with the reactionary Junkers or, in general, the rivalry and the struggle between the various factions of the bourgeois liberals are counter-revolutionary, that their tance for a new revolutionary upsurge, this would be, in fact, Menshevism turned upside down. The experiences of the Russian Revolution as well as the experiences of other countries are an undeniable proof that, when the objective conditions for a deep political crisis have developed, the smallest conflicts, which, seemingly, are the least related to the actual seat of revolution, may have the most serious significance as a starting point, as a drop which fills the cup, as a beginning of a change in the sentiments, etc. We should not forget that the Zemstvo campaign and the petition of the liberals in the year 1904, were the fore-runners... of 9th of January."

After some reference to the student movement of that time, Lenin then continues:

"The radicalisation of the top strata is just a symptom which shows that the 'objective tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia remained unsolved.' But we say: If the bourgeoisie radicalises itself, this means that: in the powder-magazine of the Russian Revolution new powder is gathering."

Especially about the Cadets Lenin wrote:

"This party wavers between the democratic petty-bourgeoisie and the counter-revolutionary elements of the big bourgeoisie. The social basis of this party is on the one hand the mass of the city population... on the other hand, the liberal landowners, who, with the aid of the liberalised officials, strive for a pact with absolutism... An extremely wide and innerly contradictory social basis of the party... Its programme is totally bourgeois... The political conscience and the political understanding of the 'opportunists' consists of the fact that they grovel before those who are at present stronger in order to place obstacles in the way of the militants and to disturb them now here, now there.

All this is a quite fitting characterisation of the Indian Swarajists too. One can likewise apply to them the following assertions of Lenin:

"The historical role of the Russian Cadets is a transitory, a one-day role. The Cadets will fall and prepare the ground either for the burial of the revolution for a long time to come, or for the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry."

"That the big bourgeoisie will commit betrayal is unquestionable, it already has two-thirds betrayed."

That is how Lenin put the question; he even figured the degree of the betrayal of national-bourgeoisie in thirds. This is something different from the 100% counter-revolutionary character that Comrade Bennett attributed to the oppositional Indian bourgeoisie. As Comrade Stalin stated, the Bolshevik

Party of Russia, even at the time when the big bourgeoisie according to Lenin's words had already in two-thirds betrayed put the strategic question of the revolution in the manner that for the coming period of the revolution one has to attempt to neutralise this bourgeoisie. If such a putting of the strategical tasks was correct at that time in Russia, is it less possible at present in India? I don't think so. Trotsky, naturally, asserts that according to our conception the national bourgeoisie of the colonies is much better, more revolutionary, etc., than the Russian bourgeoisie was during the Revolution of 1905. But this is altogether wrong, and here Comrade Bennett, who repeated this assertion, also errs. The bourgeoisie of the colonial countries is not better, but there exists a difference and this is, firstly, the vacillations of the colonial bourgeoisie, both to the Left and to the Right, are much greater, they may even swing to the Blackest reaction; secondly, the objective contradiction between their class interests and the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie are deeper than were the contradictions between the Cadets and Tsarism.

When Lenin wrote about the conflicts between the national bourgeoisie and Tsarism he gave the following important advice:

"The proletarian party is, before all, unconditionally bound to utilise all and every conflict, to unfold these conflicts, to widen their significance, to connect with them the agitation for the revolutionary slogans, to carry the knowledge of these conflicts to the wide masses, to rally them to an independent open action with their own demands, etc."

These suggestions of Lenin are embodied in our theses, but what Comrade Bennett proposes means that we make the thing just upside down, just contrary to what Lenin advised, and indeed not utilise, not unfold the conflicts of the national bourgeoisie with imperialism, not to broaden the significance of these conflicts, but to minimise them, not to connect our agitation for the revolutionary slogans with these conflicts, not to carry the message of these conflicts to the wide masses. This is not the tactic which was taught to us by Lenin, the greatest revolutionary strategist.

### The Dangers of National Reformism.

Will the national bourgeoisie of one or another colony, for instance, a part of the Indian bourgeoisie, join up, even if only temporary, with the national revolutionary camp? In the draft theses this answer has been given: in all probability not. I wish to emphasise this, since some comrades interpreted it quite differently; not only Comrades Bennett and Lozovsky, but Comrade Schuller too enlarged the sense of the theses in this respect to a great extent. It is said in the theses:

"If the national bourgeoisie (in an acute revolutionary situation) has to choose between the two camps, it will in all probability prefer the camp of the imperialists to that of the revolutionaries and join it (or approach to it)."

Could we, however, assert with certainty, in general theses of the C. I., that in all colonial countries the possibility is excluded that a part of the national bourgeoisie, even if for a very short period only, would join up with the national-revolutionary camp? No, we cannot do this. This was possible in China, in Syria, etc., and we cannot absolutely exclude this alternative. We can, however, say that it is very improbable. There is, for instance, the possibility to be regarded, that some other imperialist states will interfere, and particularly in such a case the role of the bourgeoisie of a colony may, temporarily, become objectively half-revolutionary. The draft theses refer to four conditions in this connection:

1. If the revolution does not rapidly expire; 2. if the immediate danger of an independent victorious class revolution is not yet clearly, not yet dangerously before the eyes of the bourgeoisie; 3. if the utilisation of the masses of the people in order to force concessions from the government does not seem to be hopeless and, finally, 4. if the national bourgeoisie feels a substantial support of another capitalist state backing it up, therefore, if and when these four conditions are on hand, then even an important part of the national bourgeoisie can — I emphasise — can go together with the national-revolutionary camp for a part of the road. If, however, these conditions do



not exist we may expect that the whole of the national-bourgeoisie will keep aloof from the national-revolutionary camp. If it comes along it comes mainly to sabotage the revolutionary movement and to betray it at the first best opportunity. This is the point of view of the theses. Of course, we do not speak here about the national bourgeoisie or any part of it being revolutionary or better than the counter-revolutionary comprador-bourgeoisie. We speak about something more important, we point out to our comrades the real danger which arises at the moment when part of the national-bourgeoisie temporarily draws near to the national-revolutionary camp, so that we are not taken by surprise, so that our comrades may keep their eyes on the most dangerous probabilities, so that they may never forget that this bourgeoisie will in any event play a treacherous role, the role of the executioner, the same as the Chinese bourgeoisie has already played, but that the greatest danger is when this bourgeoisie tries, by revolutionary phrases, to bring the masses over to its side. It is this that our comrades in the colonies must always bear in mind.

The opposition to this point of view as expressed in the theses took a three-fold character in the discussion. Firstly, on the part of Comrades **Bennett** and **Rothstein**, secondly on the part of Comrades **Lozovsky**, **Schuller**, **Fokin**, as well as **Lominadze** and **Heinz Neumann** and thirdly, on the part of the Chinese and Indian comrades. Since this is an important question I must give some consideration to the objections raised by the Comrades so as to put them clearly.

#### On the Intervention of England in Afghanistan and in Turkey.

About the point of view of Comrades **Bennett** and **Rothstein** I have already spoken a lot. I want briefly to point out here how characteristic it is that when one starts out from the point of view of the decolonisation or industrialisation theory, then one sees not only the role of the national bourgeoisie and its national reformist role in a wrong light, but also to some extent even the role of imperialism. This was particularly expressed in a somewhat peculiar manner in the speech of Comrade **Rothstein**. What did he say about Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey? I quote literally:

"For example, we find here the statement that British imperialism first waged a war for the subjection of Afghanistan, but the Afghans, a small and undeveloped people, courageously defended their independence, and afterwards forced the British Government to recognise it." But what are the actual facts? — asks Comrade **Rothstein**. "The actual fact is that it was the Afghan king **Amanulla** who rose in revolt against the puppet of British imperialism in Afghanistan, as part of the general revolt of the colonial peoples against British imperialism after the war. It was not the British who declared war on him. He carried the war into India, he managed to rouse a certain ferment and a certain amount of trouble behind the British lines, with the result that the British were forced to give way."

Comrades, if **Amanulla** really created a "certain amount of trouble" behind the British lines, then the man acted cleverly; that is what we must do when we get into a similar situation. But that we should not say that the British at that time conducted a war against the Afghans, but that we must say that the Afghans revolted against England, this I cannot understand. Similarly strange is the request of Comrade **Rothstein** that we should not lay emphasis on the occupation of Constantinople by the British, but that we must say that it was a revolt of "Angora" against finance capital; and "the situation is similar as regards Persia", said Comrade **Rothstein**. Comrades, if for instance, the British were to come to our Soviet fatherland, if they were to occupy Leningrad, well, we would have to say, according to the conception of Comrade **Rothstein**: Moscow is revolting against England. One is not permitted to say the British are conducting a war against the people of the Soviet Union. Was there a war in Afghanistan? Certainly there were battle lines, there war firing, etc. Now, when the British come to a foreign country and form their battle-lines, and when the "puppets" of the English Government are shooting — then, this is war. Certainly Comrade **Rothstein** is right when he says that the British did not declare war. But without declaration of war they also for a long time conducted war against the Soviet Union. It seems to me that Comrade **Rothstein** has read a bit too much of the English bour-

geois papers and has not, with sufficient carefulness, borne in mind that these papers reflect the events of the world in a one-sided and crooked manner, particularly as far as events in the colonies and semi-colonies are concerned.

#### It is Necessary to Distinguish between the two Stages of the Revolutionary Movement in Order to Overcome the Tendency to Jump over the Immediate Difficulties.

As already said, the section of the draft theses dealing with tactical questions was opposed by Comrades **Lozovsky**, **Schuller** and **Fokin**, and also by Comrades **Lominadze** and **Heinz Neumann**. All these comrades excepting, Comrade **Lominadze**, reject the theory of decolonisation or industrialisation. Comrades **Lozovsky** and **Neumann**, in their speeches, distinctly dissociated themselves from this, even though Comrade **Lozovsky** at the same time polemised against the "theory of the hinterland" contained in the theses. Comrade **Schuller** put such an analogy: we do not even say that the Social Democrats will ever lean to the side of the revolution; therefore, how can we put such a thing in the perspective for the national bourgeoisie of any colony? It seems to me that the national contradiction to imperialism disappears by this analogy. If we put such an analogy then the relations of the social forces in the colonies appear to be the very same as in the imperialist countries. But in reality this is not the case.

These comrades demand that we should not distinguish between the two stages of the revolutionary movement before the taking over of power by the proletariat and the peasantry in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. According to my opinion, we can see these two phases quite concretely in the present historical situation in India and China: the movement in India is at present in its first stage; the movement in China is in a more mature stage. The transition from the first to the end of the second stage can, as we already emphasised in the theses, take place in the course of a single revolutionary wave. But it is also possible that the transition process will be interrupted. These various possibilities must be borne in mind by our comrades in the colonies so that they shall not be taken by surprise. In characterising these possibilities the theses have particularly underlined the tasks confronting the Communists in this period of transition, in the development of the revolutionary wave:

"The task of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat is, as far as possible to take the lead of this process. Should the revolution be now successful, then we have passed through a whole stage: the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is established. If however, the counter-revolution is victorious, then the revolution suffers a defeat; with the climax of this revolutionary wave only the first stage of the revolution ends."

Therefore, it is not at all depicted as if in every case the transition from the first stage to the second will happen in the same manner as in China. But the differentiation between the two stages is necessary, in my opinion, because they exist in reality. A defeat in the course of the transition from one stage to the other is, however, not at all necessary. We cannot however, deny every possibility of a defeat. We must emphasise the task of the Communists in this connection. And I agree that it was a correct idea which Comrade **Lominadze** expressed in his speech on the first point of the agenda, that it was the task of the Chinese Communists to attempt to lead the revolutionary process as far as possible in this situation of transition. We must by no means, condemn the Chinese Communists on this account, but only for the real mistakes that they committed at that time. As against this the tendency to jump over the difficulties of the first stage, without genuine effort to overcome these difficulties, this tendency, according to my opinion, is false and it was against this tendency, that I wished to guard our Parties in the colonial countries when I emphasised the difference between the two stages. The special significance of the danger of bourgeois national-reformism consists in the fact that it has mass influence, and our weakness consists in that we have not yet succeeded in India, Egypt, etc., in undermining its mass influence. We should neither have nor spread any illusions about any kind of revolutionary role of

the national bourgeoisie; rather we must spread the knowledge in our ranks and among the proletariat that the reformism of the national-bourgeoisie is the greatest obstacle in the way of acquiring mass influence. It would not be a good thing for our Party or the revolutionary movement in a colony if in certain circumstances the reformist bourgeoisie were to join the national-revolutionary front for a time. This would be a most dangerous situation and our comrades must be prepared for such a dangerous situation. The special task — said Lenin — of the Communists in these colonial and semi-colonial countries is the struggle against the bourgeois-democratic tendency (or, as we now call it, against national reformism) of the bourgeoisie of one's own nation. How they should and can fulfil their special tasks in the different stages of the revolutionary development, that is the question. How shall we struggle to win over the masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie? This question is not so simple that it suffices to tell our comrades, as Comrade Fokin has said: "Furious attack against the bourgeoisie" and that's all. Or as Comrade Neumann formulated this task for India:

"One has to yell it that the Communist Party must regard as the most important lesson, the national bourgeoisie will in any event betray the revolutionary movement right at the outset."

In the draft theses, it is also said that the bourgeoisie, so far as it goes with the nationalist movement at all, will betray this movement.

But one has not said that our comrades should only yell. Comrades, one yells mostly in panic or in pain. As a means of revolutionary struggle it is weak. One must know how, by right means and methods, to unmask before the toiling masses the real character of the national-reformist bourgeoisie. We have attempted in the theses to give a few directions to our Parties on the question, how to act so that this unmasking should be rally successful, should bring real results, and I hope, that these directions will prove useful in practice. The next basic task for us, is that of winning the masses away from the influence of the national bourgeoisie. I had expected that Comrade Neumann would relate some of the experiences from the time of the Canton uprising, that he would have told us how better to prepare an important revolutionary action, how better to organise it, how to win the masses previously and how to mobilise the wide masses for such an action. Our Parties, and mainly those in the other colonial and semi-colonial countries, could have learned something from this. We have by all possible ways and means, to communicate these Chinese lessons to our Parties, as well as through such directives that should be contained in the theses. But Comrade Neumann did not make even an attempt in this direction. It should have been his task, firstly, to exercise self-criticism and secondly, to clarify the various important lessons of the Chinese revolution. And when he now presents the matter as if the Chinese bourgeoisie have won nothing at all, in the first stage of the revolution, and that the proletariat have won very much, then I have to say: one must estimate somewhat more soberly the positive as well as the negative results of the Chinese revolution.

As far as the opposition of the Chinese comrades to this part of the theses is concerned, I will say that it seems to me to a certain extent natural and innerly even a very sympathetic opposition, Comrades, when the Party, in a case where it has suffered a defeat in the revolutionary struggle, shows a little tendency "towards the Left", this is not a bad sign. It seems to me that the Party is really revolutionary. One cannot blame the Chinese comrades if they now estimate the objective rôle of the bourgeoisie in other colonial countries just as we have to judge it in the general theses of the Communist International. I remember when we established our Finnish Communist Party after the defeat of the revolution in Finland — this was just ten years ago — this our Party stood so much to the ultra-Left that I believe no Party in the world was ever so much ultra-Left. I myself, at the time of the foundation congress, formulated such a theses as: "In the revolution one does not need reason, one needs only weapons". This was understandable in the then prevailing situation, even if it was not very reasonable.

### The Various Tasks of the Communists in the Colonial Countries.

I cannot say that I am in absolute agreement with all the other comrades who have spoken here. But it is not possible for me to go into a discussion of the varying opinions. For instance, I cannot agree with the assertion of Comrade Sultan-Zade and another comrade, who spoke about Persia and Turkey. We must examine these arguments in the Commission. Such suggestions and partly critical remarks as for instance, Comrade Omura from Japan put forth were very fruitful; I believe that in the final formulation of the theses much of this can be put to use.

We must pay more sympathetic attention on the part of the Communist International to the Korean movement and secure for it a united leadership. We must necessarily arrive there at the liquidation of factional struggle. If we consider the Japanese capital-exports to Korea we find here another example that these by no means signify an industrialisation, but rather the subjugation of the country. An immense pauperisation is taking place there as a result of the colonial regime. The particular difficulty of our Party there consists in just the fact that the proletariat is so weak, that it develops so slowly and that it is so little class-conscious.

The comrades who spoke here on the Negro Question also mentioned many new and important things. I quite agree that on this point there is a gap in the theses which we must fill. The question of South Africa must be examined by us, especially in the Commission. I believe that we must tell the majority of the leadership of the South African Party that they must unconditionally correct their attitude, their opposition in the question of the slogan of the Native Republic must be given up. On Ireland, Comrade Carney as well as Comrade Schuller have correctly spoken. I am agreed that the theses be supplemented in this direction.

What new and important things have we found in dealing with the colonial question at this Congress? Firstly, the Chinese experiences. Secondly, we have become more closely acquainted with the Indian revolutionary movement and it has come more into the foreground. Thirdly, the Latin American movement. It is the first time that we have had such a big delegation from these countries, and we have heard from the comrades much that is of importance on the revolutionary movement in their countries.

We have attempted now for the first time to grasp the colonial question in all its entirety. Naturally, we did this only in a deficient manner. I am sure that, owing to the lack of time we will not be successful even by our collective work in preparing quite good theses. But we can develop these questions further in the coming period through articles and directives of the Comintern, and first of all by our practical work in the various colonial countries. The Chinese revolution not only gave new and great revolutionary experiences to us and the Chinese proletariat; it also opened up a new period of great colonial revolutions in which the proletariat of the colonial countries will play an independent role, and which will have the greatest significance also for the revolutionary movement of Europe and America. This fact, comrades, places a very great responsibility on the Communist International. Comrades, we are responsible that the proletariat, the Communist leadership in these colonial revolutions shall prove capable of fulfilling its historic mission.

We emphasised in the draft theses two practical, and seemingly modest, but very important tasks, Party and Trade Unions: the building up of the Party, the organising of independent trade unions. This I want to emphasise again. The third basic task is the winning of the masses away from the influence of the national-reformist bourgeoisie, the unmasking of this national-reformist bourgeoisie. And then, to the furious attack on imperialism and all its allies, beginning with the national bourgeoisie allied with it and ending with the scoundrels of the Second International.

It is a point of theoretical dispute, comrades, whether the colonial revolutions are only an auxiliary force of the socialist world revolution, or whether they are part of it. The only important thing is comrades, that they will be our allies, allies in the struggle against imperialism and against capitalism. The European and American proletariat, hand in hand with the proletariat and the peasant masses of the colonial countries, with the colonial slaves of Africa, must rally to the struggle and to victory!

Chairman: Comrade **Remmele**.

Two comrades have requested permission to make statements. On behalf of the Chinese Delegation, Comrade Petrashevsky.

#### STATEMENT BY COMRADE PETRASHEVSKY\*) (China):

I have been instructed to read a statement of the Chinese Delegation.

1. The last statement of Comrade **Pepper** accused the Chinese comrades of not giving consideration to the mistakes of leadership during the Canton uprising. This does not correspond with the truth. The fact is that in the last political resolution of the highest body of the Chinese Communist Party, as well as in the report of Comrade **Strakhov** and in the speech of another Chinese Comrade, — the only comrade who was not killed among those who led the uprising, — not only the past mistakes of the comrades leading the Canton uprising were thoroughly analysed and openly recognised, but these mistakes have on the whole been corrected in practice.

2. In his speech Comrade **Pepper** repeats his statement that the Chinese resolution at the IX. Plenum accepted his viewpoint. This is entirely untrue. At that time he proposed in place of the slogan of Soviet power, the slogan of self-government for the villages, and instead of winning over the masses for preparation of armed uprising he proposed the legalisation of the Communist Party. These proposals, which are suited only to spread the illusion of constitutionalism, were definitely condemned by the Plenum. There are now in China a few leading comrades who propose: revival of the mass movement and the calling of a real constituent assembly. That is the ghost of **Pepperism** that has appeared there. Legalist tendencies are arising here because, even if unconsciously, **Trotsky's** opinion was shared that the revolution was declining. These "legalists" who, it is true, speak of the heroism of the Canton Communards, do not mean it seriously.

3. Comrade **Pepper** says, one should not only pay tribute to the heroism of the Chinese proletariat, but that the mistakes of the Party in the past should be thoroughly investigated. And therewith he divides the history of the Chinese Communist Party into two periods, the first the period of Sun-Yat-Senism and the second, the period of Trotskyism. Does not everyone know that millions of workers and peasants were organised during the so-called first period? Was not the Communist Party the organising force? Not a single document of the Chinese Party has maintained that the Chinese Revolution has already entered the stage of a Socialist Revolution. And it is precisely Comrade **Pepper** who is using all **Trotsky's** arguments to represent the Canton uprising as a putsch, even though the term putsch is not openly used.

#### Declaration of Comrade **LUHANI**:

Comrades, in making a reference to me in his concluding speech, Comrade **Kuusinen** may have given you a wrong impression as to my opinions. Hence, you will permit me to quote a part of the declaration which I made to the Congress yesterday. I said yesterday in my declaration: "I consider it necessary to declare that I have nothing whatever to do with the so-called decolonisation of India theory which Comrade **Kuusinen** described in his speech introducing the draft theses on the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies. What he and some other comrades taking part in the discussion said in this connection is a complete travesty and misrepresentation of what some of us wanted to convey by the provisional use of the term "decolonisation". I emphasise that our use of the term was provisional and I entirely repudiate the interpretation which Comrade **Kuusinen** has given to our use of the term.

Apart from the question of the exact stage of the capitalist development in India, the principal political ideas in our point of view are and have been: that the class struggle is developing in India; that the Indian bourgeoisie is a potential, if

not already, an actual, counter-revolutionary force; and that in the national-revolutionary struggle against imperialism, the decisive and leading role is in the process of being transferred to the proletariat standing at the head of the radical petty-bourgeoisie and the peasant masses.

I maintain that the thesis of Comrade **Kuusinen** has not succeeded in formulating a contradiction to this point of view. The thesis has only succeeded in under-stating it. I hope that with necessary amendments, some of which are being put forward by the delegation of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the thesis on the colonial problem, so enlarged, will emerge from the VI. Congress as a fit instrument in the hands of the young Communist Parties of the East, — an instrument which will enable them to fulfil their difficult revolutionary task in a Marxist-Leninist way.

#### Comrade **REMMELE**:

Comrades, we will take now the vote on the theses. Those who agree that the theses be adopted by the Plenum as the basis, please show your cards. (The vote is taken.) The theses are adopted against 14 votes, with one abstention. (Applause.)

I call on Comrade **Rothstein** to make a statement in regard to the voting.

#### Declaration of Comrade **ROTHSTEIN**:

The British Delegation has decided to vote against the acceptance of the theses moved by comrade **Kuusinen** as a basis. The British Delegation (**Priestley**: The majority of the British Delegation) yes, the majority, I will give you the figures if you like (**Priestley**: It's not necessary). The British Delegation has furthermore tabled an amendment to the theses of Comrade **Kuusinen** which it has requested the Presidium to circulate to the delegations, and which it requests shall be voted upon at this Congress also.

In view of a number of accusations and charges which have been made at the Congress in the debate, the British Delegation has instructed me to make the following statement of our position:

In the first place, as can be seen from the speeches of all the members of the British Delegation who have opposed the theses of Comrade **Kuusinen**, we have not for a moment entertained or supported the absurd and un-Marxian theory of decolonisation. We are not responsible for things which have been written by Comrade **Roy** or Comrade **Luhani** or other comrades in the past. We are responsible for what we have said ourselves, and it is on what we say that we take our stand. We have never suggested that imperialism in any way has weakened the oppression of the colonies or their dependence, their rule by finance capital. On the contrary. We have never suggested that imperialism was a progressive force in the colonies. On the contrary. We have never stated that imperialism softened the contradictions within the colonies or as between the colonies and the imperialist metropolis. On the contrary, we stated, and we stand by it, that these contradictions are enormously accentuated. What was stated, and what we stand by, is, in the first place, that decolonisation in the real sense of the word involves a revolution, that there is no decolonisation without revolution, and secondly, that imperialism hastens the development of the objective conditions which make for successful revolution under the hegemony of the proletariat. In the view of the British Delegation the revolution alone can carry out the decolonisation.

#### Comrade **REMMELE** (Chairman):

The British Delegation is at liberty to hand in its declaration or its amendments to the commission. If it does not agree with the proposals of the commission, it can speak again on this question at the session of the Plenum when the vote is taken.

We must now appoint the commission which is to elaborate the theses. The Presidium proposes the following comrades:

**Strakhov**, **Li Kuang** (China), **Omura** (Japan), **Dutt** (India), **Jones** (Negro representative from the U. S. A.), **Bunting** (South

\*) Pseudonym.

Africa), Neumann (Germany), Bennett (Great Britain), Pepper (U. S. A.), Reer (France), Bukharin, Mif (U. S. S. R.), Popov, Skripnik (Candidates), Losovsky (Comunist fraction of the R. I. L. U.), Ercoli, Humbert-Droz, Kuusinen, Samin (Indonesia), a

representative of South America, Fokin (Y. C. I.) and a Turkish comrade.

As no one has objected, I take it that you agree to this composition of the commission.

(Close of Session.)

## **Declarations of Comrades Sikander Sur and Murphy in the Forty-first Session.**

### **Declaration of Comrade SIKANDER SUR (India):**

Owing to a misunderstanding in the translation, the Indian delegation voted against the Colonial Theses. All our speeches prove that we are against the decolonisation theory and therefore cannot vote with those who are its advocates. Under such circumstances we, the two Indian delegates with decisive votes, request you to unregister our votes for the acceptance of the thesis in principle, and reduce the 14 votes against to only 12.

### **Declaration of Comrade MURPHY (Great Britain):**

As there appears to be some misunderstanding in the minds of some of the Congress delegates concerning the position of the British delegation, I want it to be clearly understood that Comrade Rothstein, in making his declaration yesterday, spoke in the name of the majority of the Delegation, with four members of the Delegation being in favour of the line of the thesis on the colonial question.

---

The Reports of the 41st to to 43rd Sessions (On the Situation in the Soviet Union and in the C. P. S. U.) have been published in No. 63 of the Inprecorr. Editor.

---

# Report of the Commissions.

## Forty-fourth Session.

Moscow, August 29, 1928.

Chairman: Comrade Remmele.

Comrades, I declare the 44th plenary session open.

In the interval since the last Plenary Session our Czech brother Party has sustained a great loss. Comrade Horaz, who was one of the founders of the Czech Party, has died of heart failure.

(All the comrades rise to their feet).

Comrade Horaz was one of the most energetic Party Comrades who at one time was in the foremost ranks of the revolutionary struggle. He fought in the Russian civil war, in the ranks of the Red Army. Subsequently, he returned to Czechoslovakia to do his bit in the revolutionary struggle. Comrade

Horaz, who was forty years old, was Delegate to the Congress, which shows that he could do his duty not only in the revolutionary days but also later, in the sharp struggle for Communist Propaganda and agitation. He was struck down in the midst of this work, on the battle-field of the revolutionary struggle.

The funeral will take place to-day in the Crematorium at 4 p. m.

I thank the comrades for paying homage to the memory of our late comrade.

Comrades, we have still to deal today with a series of questions.

I call upon Comrade Piatnitsky to speak on the first item of the agenda, the report of the Credentials Commission.

## Report of the Credentials Commission.

### Report of Comrade Piatnitsky.

The Credentials Commission has examined and confirmed 372 credentials with a decisive and 143 with an advisory vote. Consequently, there are at the Congress 515 delegates with a decisive and advisory vote. The number of delegates at the V. Congress was 475: 342 with decisive and 133 with advisory vote.

Altogether, 66 Parties and organisations were invited, embracing 4,024,159 members. Of these members, 1,798,859 belong to Communist Parties and sympathising organisations; 2,225,300 are members of organisations of the Young Communist League. Of the invited sections, 58 with a decisive and advisory vote are represented at the Congress. At the V. Congress 42 sections with a decisive and 7 sections with advisory vote, altogether 49 sections, were represented. Thus we have nine more sections at the VI. Congress.

Fifty seven sections with a decisive vote have been invited. Out of this number 52 are represented. Thus 5 sections are missing, namely: Australia, Portugal, Korea, Egypt and Cuba. Of the nine sections with advisory vote which were invited, 6 are present; the 3 absentees are the Republic of Tanutuva, Peru and the Philippines. At the VI. Congress 9 Parties which were not present at the V. Congress are represented, namely, Palestine, Colombia, Syria, Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador, Venezuela, New Zealand and Chile. On the other hand several Parties were represented at the V. Congress which are absent now: Portugal, Egypt and Korea.

**Composition of the Delegations:** Filled in questionnaires were received from 470 delegates. Forty five delegates did not fill in the questionnaires. Of these 470, 325 are men with a decisive and 126 men with an advisory vote, altogether 451 male delegates. The number of women delegates is as follows: 12 with a decisive and 7 with advisory vote, altogether 19 women. Thus, there are at the Congress 95.8% men and 4.2% women. At the V. Congress the percentage of women was 5.37, that is to say, bigger than this time. I think that this is a defect which must be certainly remedied by the time of the next Congress.

We gather from the 428 questionnaires in which the delegates indicate their social position, that 214 of them are manual workers. Thus 50% of the Congress delegates are manual workers. Considerably fewer questionnaires were elaborated at the V. Congress. According to them, 57.5% of the delegates to the V. Congress were manual workers.

Seventy five delegates of the VI. Congress are employees (17.4%). Free professions are represented by 108 people (25.6%), peasants by 13 people (3%), agricultural labourers by 3 people (0.6%) and housewives by 2 people (0.4%). There are no indications concerning 11 people.

According to their present profession or occupation, the delegates can be divided as follows: Manual workers — 78 with a decisive and 12 with advisory vote — altogether 90 people or 21%. Twenty of the 37 French delegates are former industrial workers and 9 still work in factories. The Italian delegation has 17 members: 10 former and 5 present industrial workers. The Belgian delegation consists of 4 people including 3 industrial workers. The Yugoslav delegation consists of 4 people, including 3 former industrial workers. The delegation of the C. P. G., which is 25 strong, has in its ranks 21 industrial workers, 8 of whom still work in factories. Of the 3 Swiss delegates one was and another still is an industrial worker, etc.

Among the delegates there are 193 leading Party functionaries with a decisive and 99 with advisory vote, altogether 292 or 62.2%, including 155 members of Central Committees with a decisive and 30 with advisory vote; 25 editors of Central organs with a decisive and 4 with advisory vote; members of Central Control Commissions: 10 with decisive and 2 with advisory vote; members of the E. C. C. I.: 12 with a decisive and 6 with advisory vote; members of the E. C. Y. C. I.: 16 with a decisive and 5 with advisory vote; members of district committees: 52 with a decisive and 6 with advisory vote; district secretaries: 40 with a decisive and 5 with an advisory vote, etc. editors of provincial newspapers: 2 with a decisive vote, etc.

#### Delegates According to Age:

	With Decisive vote	With advisory vote	Total
Under 20 . . .	3	1	4
From 21—30 . . .	130	34	164
„ 31—40 . . .	135	60	195
„ 41—50 . . .	54	28	82
„ 51—60 . . .	9	7	16
Over 61 . . .	5	2	7

Thus, the overwhelming majority of the delegates are people between the ages of 21 and 40: 359. Delegates between the age

of 41 and 50 constitute 18%; between 51 and 60 — 3.4% and over 61 — 1.5%.

**Party Status:** Delegates who joined the Party prior to the revolution of 1905; 19 with a decisive and 13 with advisory vote, altogether 32 or 7.8%. Delegates who joined the Party between 1905 and 1917; 20 with a decisive and 11 with advisory vote, altogether 31 (7.9%). Delegates who joined us after the revolution of 1917: 244 with a decisive and 86 with advisory vote, altogether 330 delegates, namely, an overwhelming majority.

Delegates who belonged to Socialist or Social Democratic parties till 1916; 57 with a decisive and 33 with advisory vote, altogether 90 or 25%. Delegates who joined Social Democratic parties between 1917 and 1919: 22 with a decisive and 3 with advisory vote, altogether 25. Before joining the Communist Party 115 delegates or 30% were members of Social Democratic or Socialist Parties (with the exception of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party). Two hundred and thirty delegates or 56% (in this respect, 393 questionnaires have been dealt with altogether) joined Communist Parties directly.

There is another section to which attention must be drawn: 48 delegates with a decisive and 25 with advisory vote, (altogether 73 delegates) are not organised in trade unions. I would like to deal more fully with this fact. We struggle in the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries for the adherence of all our members to trade union organisations, because Communists cannot very well agitate among the workers for their adherence to trade unions when they do not belong to them themselves. In many capitalist countries, 20—40% of Party members do not belong to trade unions. How is it possible to get them into the unions if even a section of Party representatives at the World Congress have not joined them? We must put an end to this state of affairs once and for all.

Delegates who have not yet joined trade unions must do so as soon as they get home (applause).

The following table shows delegates' participation in former Congresses:

	With a decisive vote	With advisory vote	Total
I. Congress	8	2	10
II. "	25	12	37
III. "	44	27	41
IV. "	51	31	82
V. "	74	40	114

Numbers of delegates with a decisive vote who participated in former Congresses: Once — 69, twice — 28, three times — 7, four times — 9, and five times — (i. e. in all congresses) 4. Number of delegates with advisory vote: once — 21, twice — 13, three times — 16, four times — 5, and five times — 2. Number of present delegates with a decisive vote who have not participated in any former Congresses: 209 (64%); with advisory vote: 69 (73%), altogether 278 delegates.

On what principle were credentials based at former Congresses? All Parties were divided into five groups. Countries in the first group had 40 votes each and in the fifth group, 5 votes each, regardless of the number of delegates present at the Congress. The fourth paragraph of point 7 of the Statute adopted by the V Congress introduced a new method for the distribution of credentials. The distribution takes place firstly, according to the membership of the Party and secondly, according to the political importance of the country.

The IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. elaborated the following distribution of credentials according to countries: to the first group which has 50 votes belongs only the R. S. F. S. R.; to the second group with 30 votes belongs the Young Communist International. France, Germany, Czechoslovakia and Italy were included into the group with 25 votes. In the next group, with 20 votes, are Great Britain, China and the United States. The group with 15 votes consists of Poland alone. In the group with 10 votes are India, Sweden and the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. The group with 7 votes consists of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Finland, Norway and Argentine; the group with 5 votes consists of Japan, Indonesia, Mexico and the White-Russian Republic. Four votes have Hungary, Belgium, Austria, Canada and Roumania; 3 votes, Holland, Australia, South Africa, Switzerland and the

Soviet Republics of Georgia and Azerbaidjan; 2 votes have Chile, Denmark, Spain, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Greece, Portugal, Turkey, Palestine, Persia, Egypt, Brazil, Columbia, Ireland, Korea, Uruguay, Cuba, Ecuador and the Armenian Soviet Republic. Syria has one vote.

But for various reasons, the numerical composition of the delegations looks somewhat different from what it was intended to be. The R. S. F. S. R. is represented by 50 delegates with a decisive and 4 with advisory vote; the Y. C. I. by 30 delegates with a decisive and 5 with advisory vote. The **French Delegation** (including 3 Indo-Chinese, 3 Algerian and 1 Tunisian delegate) has 31 members with a decisive and 6 with advisory vote. **Germany** is represented by 25 delegates with a decisive and 6 with advisory vote, **Czechoslovakia** by 25 with a decisive and 10 with advisory vote. The **Italian Party** has sent, instead of 25, only 18 delegates with a decisive vote. The **British delegation** has 19 delegates with a decisive and 2 with advisory vote. **China**; 20 with a decisive vote and 9 with advisory vote, the U. S. A. 20 with a decisive and 9 with advisory vote. **Poland** 14 with a decisive and 10 with advisory vote. **India**; 3 with a decisive and 3 with advisory vote. **Sweden**: 8 with a decisive and 3 with advisory vote. The **Ukrainian Soviet Republic** is represented by 9 delegates with a decisive vote. The **Bulgarian delegation** has 6 members with a decisive and 1 with advisory vote. The **Yugoslav delegation**: 4 members with a decisive vote; **Finland**: 7 delegates with a decisive and one with advisory vote; **Argentina**: 4 delegates with a decisive vote.

The **Japanese delegation** has 5 members with a decisive vote. **Indonesia**: 3 delegates with a decisive and 3 with advisory vote. **Mexico**: 3 delegates with a decisive vote. The **White Russian S. S. R.**: 4 delegates with a decisive and one with advisory vote.

**Roumania, Austria, Belgium, Hungary, Canada** are represented by 4 delegates each with a decisive vote. **Holland, The South African Union, Switzerland, Denmark**, and also the **Georgian and Azerbaidjan Soviet Republics** are represented at the Congress by 3 delegates each with a decisive vote.

**Greece, Persia and Brazil** have 2 delegates each, **Chile, Armenia, Spain, Turkey, Palestine, Ireland and Uruguay** have one representative each with a decisive vote. The **Esthonian delegation** has one member with a decisive and one with advisory vote. The **Latvian Party** has sent one delegate with a decisive and one with advisory vote. **Lithuania**: 2 delegates with a decisive and one with advisory vote; **Colombia**: 2 delegates with advisory vote; **Ecuador**: one delegate with advisory vote. The other delegates with advisory vote are from **New Zealand, Venezuela, Interior Mongolia, Paraguay**, and the Communist group of **Iceland**.

Not represented at the Congress are the Sections of **Portugal, Egypt, Korea, Cuba and Australia**. (According to information received, the Australian delegation is on the way and will arrive here before the end of the Congress).

The Credentials Commission has also admitted representatives of the **Mongolian People's Party** with guest tickets.

#### Chairman Comrade Remmele:

We are coming now to the discussion. Does any one want to speak on Comrade Piatnitsky's report? As no one seems inclined we will take the vote. I will first put to the vote whether the Congress agrees to the distribution of mandates given by Comrade Piatnitsky or if there are objections. (The vote is taken).

#### Adopted unanimously:

I will take now the vote on the report as a whole. (The vote is taken).

The report of the Credentials is adopted unanimously.

We are coming now to the second item on today's agenda — the report of the Statutes Commission. The reporter is again Comrade Piatnitsky.

# Report of the Statutes Commission.

## Speech of Comrade Piatnitsky:

At the V. Congress the commission on the organisational question introduced many changes into the statute elaborated at the II. Congress. But the introduction to the statutes, the commission left as it was before, and for the following reasons: the introduction has many points which must form part of the programme. But as the C. I. had not yet adopted a definite programme, the introduction to the statutes was left intact. As the programme of the Communist International is to be adopted at this Congress, the standing orders committee proposes that the introduction be eliminated from the statutes.

The first 6 paragraphs of the old statutes remain unchanged. On the proposal of several comrades, paragraphs have been introduced into the statutes concerning the work of Communist fractions in mass organisations. These paragraphs are as follows:

§ 7. In all extra-party workers and peasants organisations, as well as in organs (in the trade unions, co-operatives, in the sport associations, in the organisations of ex-servicemen, at Congress and Conferences in the municipalities and Town councils, in the Parliaments etc.) where at least two Communists exist, Communist fractions must be organised within these organisations in order to increase the influence of the Party and to carry out its policy.

§ 8. Communist fractions are subordinate to the corresponding Party organs.

Note I: Communist fractions in organisations of an international character (Red International of Labour Unions, the International Class War Prisoners' Aid, the International Workers Relief, etc.) are subordinate to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Note II: The Organisational structure of Communist fractions and the form of control over their work are determined by special instructions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and of the Central Committees of the Sections of the Comintern.

At the First International Org. Conference, instructions and rules were elaborated concerning rights, functions and mutual relations between Communist fractions and Party organisations, which were confirmed by the V. Enlarged Plenum of the Executive. Communist fractions in proletarian mass organisations exist already on an international scale and almost in all countries. It is therefore, expedient to introduce these two paragraphs.

From § 9 of the old text:

"The World Congress elects the President of the Communist International, the Executive Committee and the International Control Commission of the Comintern."

We have eliminated the words "The President of the Communist International", as already the 7th Plenum had decided to abolish the office of the President of the Communist International and to pass on his functions to a collective organ for the collective leadership.

The Statutes Commission decided also to eliminate § 19 regarding the Org Bureau, as the 7th Plenum had decided to liquidate the Org Bureau, to dissolve it and to pass its functions on to the Pol Secretariat.

The Commission further decided to include two new paragraphs regarding the permanent bureaux abroad. Such a bureau for Western Europe has been organised on the basis of a decision of the 9th Plenum and it has achieved positive results. It is possible that such bureaux will have to be organised also for South America, perhaps also for the East. The new paragraphs are as follows:

§ 19. The E. C. C. I. and its Presidium have the right to form a permanent bureau (West European, South American, Eastern and other bureaux of the E. C. C. I.) for the establishment of closer connection with the individual sections of the C. I. and of better guidance of their work.

Note: The sphere of activity of the permanent bureaux of the E. C. C. I. is determined by the E. C. C. I. or its

Presidium. The Sections of the Communist International to which the sphere of activity of the permanent bureaux of the E. C. C. I. extends, must be informed about the authority given to the latter.

§ 20. The sections are obliged to carry out the instructions of the permanent bureaux. Against the decisions of the bureaux an appeal can be lodged with the E. C. C. I. or the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. The sections are nevertheless bound to carry out the instructions.

We have replaced the former paragraphs 20, 21 and 23 by others. It was said there that "the E. C. C. I. elects the Secretariat, the Editorial Board of the periodical "C. I." and the International Secretariat of the Communist Women's Movement". Formerly, the E. C. C. I. could do this because, according to the statutes, it met once a month. But now, when — as you will see by our proposal — it is intended to convene the E. C. C. I. only every six months, the Presidium must be given this right. Therefore, we have replaced these paragraphs by new ones which, in the new text, will be: § 23 and 24. It is said in them

§ 23. The Presidium elects the Polit. Secretariat which is the deciding executive and preparatory organ of the E. C. C. I. and of its Presidium.

§ 24. The Presidium elects the Editorial Board of the periodical and of other publications".

In regard to the apparatus, as we have no definite and firm structure, we have to change and improve it as necessity arises. Therefore this right is also bestowed on the Presidium. § 25 says:

"The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. establishes the secretariat for the work among women and independent commissions for groups of countries (Länder Secretariats) and sets up the various departments.

The Presidium has the right to extend the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. in the most expedient manner."

The following point about instructors is added to the former paragraph 24, now paragraph 21.

"Apart from this, the E. C. C. I. and its Presidium have the right to send instructors to the individual Sections of the C. I. The rights and duties of the instructors are determined by the E. C. C. I., to which the instructors are responsible for their work."

The Statute Commission has decided to eliminate paragraph 26 on the Enlarged Plenums. Enlarged Plenums were introduced after the III. Congress. Most of the members of the Executive Committee were to be all the time in Moscow as the E. C. C. I. had to meet once a month. But the composition of the members of the E. C. C. I. who were in Moscow almost coincided with the composition of the Presidium. No Plenary Sessions of the E. C. C. I. were convened. Instead of them Enlarged Plenums of the E. C. C. I. took place which were attended by the members and candidates of the E. C. C. I. plus representatives of all Communist Parties.

These Enlarged Plenums were, to all intents and purposes, small congresses.

Between the V. and VI. Congresses we had three Enlarged, and two ordinary Plenums. The first Plenum — V. — was in March-April, 1925. This Plenum was attended by 281 Party representatives, including 136 with a decisive and 145 with advisory vote. In February-March 1926, the VI. Plenum took place. It was attended by 246 delegates, including 98 with a decisive and 148 with advisory vote. Some Parties were represented by almost the same number of delegates as at the present Congress. At the VI. Plenum, the French Party was represented by 27 delegates, whereas at the present Congress it has 37 delegates. The VII. Plenum took place in November-December 1926. It was attended by 195 delegates, including 97 with a decisive vote. The VIII. ordinary Plenum took place in May 1927. It

was attended by 75 delegates, including 34 with a decisive vote, mostly members of the Executive. Finally, the IX. Plenum took place in February 1928, it was attended by 72 delegates, including 31 with a decisive vote, all of them members of the Executive.

The questions discussed at the May Plenum and at the February Plenum 1928, were as important as those of the preceding Plenums and were discussed quite as thoroughly. But their discussion was much more rapid, though not less thorough than at preceding plenums, owing to the less numerous composition of the plenum. This experience has shown that it will be better to convene the Plenum of the Executive and invite to it, on special occasions, representatives of local organisations or diverse tendencies than to convene Enlarged Plenums which would be — to all intents and purposes — Congresses. We have been blamed for not convening a Comintern Congress for four years, whereas practically three Congresses have taken place between the V. and VI. Congresses.

The standing orders committee is in favour of full plenums of the Executive being convened every six months, to discuss important questions in which principle is involved. At the same time, authoritative representatives of Communist Parties should be always in Moscow, so that in the period between Plenums, the Presidium shall be an authoritative organ capable of deciding all questions which have to be decided in that period. It is proposed to enlarge the composition of the Executive so that it should be directly connected with the work of all Sections, and that the experience of all Sections during the period between the Plenums should be placed before us at the Plenums.

The former § 27 (now § 26) on the I. C. C. (International Control Commission) appears in a different, more definite form. The I. C. C. was created at the V. Congress. After four years experience, we have been able to define better the functions of the I. C. C. In the former § 27, it was said that among the functions of the I. C. C. is

“examination of complaints from individuals or whole organisations about disciplinary measures applied to them by the Sections, and presentation, on this subject, of its own views in the E. C. C. I., which makes the final decision.”

One can see by this paragraph that the I. C. C. was not an

independent organ; it proposed to the Executive measures which had to be carried out by the latter. In the new statutes, it is given definite independent functions. The corresponding paragraph declares:

“Par. 28. The International Control Commission examines questions bearing on unity and harmony within the Sections adhering to the Communist International; it also expresses its opinion on the conduct of individual members of this or that Section, as Communists.

In this direction the I. C. C.:

a) Examines complaints concerning the actions of the Central Committees of Communist Parties on the part of Party members subjected to disciplinary measures on the basis of political divergencies.

b) It examines analogous cases concerning members of central institutions of Communist Parties, and also cases concerning individual Party members which, in its own opinion, require examination, or which reach it at the proposal of the deciding organs of the E. C. C. I.

This paragraph shows that independent functions are bestowed now on the I. C. C.

A change is introduced into Paragraph 29 of the Statutes (formerly Paragraph 30). The old paragraph said:

“Sections adhering to the C. I., especially Sections of adjoining countries, must keep up the closest possible organisational and informational connection among each other”.

At present these lines will be formulated as follows:

“Sections adhering to the Communist International, especially Sections of mother countries and their colonies and also Sections of adjoining countries, must keep up a close organisational and informational connection.

The remaining paragraphs of the statutes have not undergone any alteration.

\* \* \*

On being put to the vote, all the proposals of the Commission and the altered statutes as a whole were adopted unanimously.

(Conclusion of Session.)



## Forty-fifth Session.

Moscow, 29th August 1928.

Chairman: Comrade JILEK:

The session is open. Comrade Bell has the floor for the report of the War Commission.

# Report of the War Commission.

## Speech of Comrade Bell (Great Britain):

Comrades, in consideration of our first draft, the first reaction of the Commission was against the tendency, in some portions of the theses, to be rather academic and abstract. The new title "**The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists**" indicates or expresses the new perspective of the theses, and the new approach of the Commission. I must say, however, there has been no change in the fundamental principles of the Theses. All the revisions that have been made in the text are revisions along the lines of practical activities or underlining practical forms of activity, and as far as possible, eliminating what might appear to be construed as academic and abstract.

Our first draft was rather descriptive. The final text, however, gives a more direct and decisive indication of the practical lines of activity. For example, the League of Nations in our final text is made more clearly and directly an instrument in the preparation for war. Again, in the case of the war against the Soviet Union, our indications are that the whole of the forces of imperialism are being more directly concerned in a direct attack upon the Soviet Union. While the necessity for drawing in the agrarian workers, the importance of national minorities, etc., has been dealt with more extensively than in our first draft.

Some discussion arose in the commission on the classification of the types of wars in our first draft. Our first draft spoke of two particular categories of war — reactionary wars and revolutionary wars, and then proceeded to give a classification of each of these, dividing them into three particular types. The discussion which arose on this particular classification revealed an apprehension in the minds of a number of the comrades with regard to possible misunderstanding and confusion. It was felt as if we were attempting to make a too fine sub-division along scientific lines. To avoid this abstract classification, and also to express the unity of action of the proletariat along the different fields of action against the imperialists, we have simplified the text into three kinds of wars following the resolution of the 8th Plenum. These were: the fight against imperialist wars, second, the defence of the Soviet Union against the imperialists, and third, the national-revolutionary wars against imperialism. The tactics under each of these three particular heads have been worked out in considerable detail.

Then in this section, considerable discussion arose on the tactics of the struggle against the imperialists. Our first draft spoke at considerable length on the use of the "boycott". In this section our chief aim was linking up the resistance to the imperialist wars, that is to say, the refusal of supplies, the refusal of transport, of troops, etc.; and mass action on all fields of proletarian activity. I say that our first draft aimed at linking up all these with a refusal to enlist in "voluntary" armies, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries. This led us to make use of the term "boycott".

This particular question led to quite a long discussion. And while no one challenged the principle of resisting the imperialists in getting recruits, many comrades were apprehensive that the terminology was likely to lead us in some way to be identified with the camp of the pacifists; and therefore on these grounds we revised this particular section, giving a more clear formulation on the question of individual refusal to serve, on the question of mass refusal to serve, making quite clear that our fight along these lines has nothing in common with the pacifists. Our final draft makes clear that nothing is to be obtained by following the pacifist methods of individual refusal to serve, or mass refusal to serve on purely pacifist grounds,

and that the proletariat can only come to success by working in the armies. Mass resistance to recruiting in countries with voluntary or mercenary armies is in our text shown to be part of the general mass activity of the proletariat against war.

In this section we also had some discussion on the question of fraternisation and desertion. Here again there was no particular differences of principle, but only the necessity for a clearer formulation on quite a number of points. Some comrades took exception to the implication in our first draft that fraternisation was merely a question of activity at the front, and urged the necessity of linking up activity in the rear with activity at the front as part of the general proletarian struggle against war. Some comrades were afraid that, in speaking of fraternisation as an act at the front alone, that we were isolating and rather limiting the whole of the tactics concerning the fraternisation slogan. Others went to the opposite extreme of regarding fraternisation as being mainly the culmination of partial demands. In our final text we speak of fraternisation as the culmination of the whole of our activity in the rear of the armies, inside the armies and at the front. Our Thesis establishes fraternisation, not as a pacifist objective, but makes quite clear that fraternisation, desertion and partisan troops all lead in the one direction, the going over of the proletariat from the armies of the imperialists to the revolutionary armies; the passing over of the proletariat from the imperialist armies to the revolutionary armies represents the highest form of our activity concerning fraternisation.

On the question of the defence of the Soviet Union, here we had some little discussion on who are the allies of the Soviet Union. In our final text, we give a clearer re-grouping, so as to make it quite definite and clear that the international proletariat with the proletariat of the Soviet Union are the immediate defence forces of the Soviet Union, with the peasantry within the Soviet Union as firm allies in conjunction with the national revolutionary forces of the oppressed colonial peoples. In our estimation of the national revolutionary forces amongst the colonial peoples, we have borrowed very largely from the amendments proposed by our Chinese comrades, drawn from the experiences of the Chinese Revolution.

Then on the question of our attitude towards the armies, there were expressed some doubts by some comrades as to the use of the slogan: "Not a man, not a penny". There were suggestions that this slogan has an anarchist origin. We went into the question at some length and have simplified it much more, defining it more clearly in order to avoid any confusion.

On the question of the proletarian militia, the toilers militia, Red Guards, and the Red Army, the commission had quite a long discussion on these particular questions. What we were concerned with at the moment, and what the parties must have in mind and must see very clearly, is that the Social Democrats are now beginning to flirt with the so-called "popular armies", with "democratic militias", and so forth.

This is a great danger for us and it is necessary that we should mark off very clearly our conceptions of the proletarian militia from the "popular armies" and "democratic militias" of the Social Democrats. Here we put quite clearly in our thesis, the arming of the proletariat is our objective through the Red Guards, or the proletarian militia, or the toilers militia; workers and peasants militia — as suggested by some comrades in Latin America; — are **only slogans for the arming of the proletariat**. All of these are necessary stages in the military

policy of the proletarian revolution prior to the creation of the Red Army.

In some countries it may be possible to speak more directly of the Red Guards, in others, to speak as I have referred to, in Latin America, of workers' and peasants' militia, but the main line that the Commission has taken is that we cannot speak dogmatically of all these slogans. Our main objective, and this is properly underlined, is not to provide an alternative army to the bourgeois army in "peaceful" conditions, but to propagate the slogan of the Red Guards as the highest form of the proletarian militia, and that this means the preparation for carrying out the uprising.

Some comrades thought we were going contradictory to the line of the VIII. Plenum. This is not so. We believe on the contrary we have amplified and enlarged the correct line of the VIII. Plenum.

Coming to the question of **partial demands**, we had some discussion on the reduction of the period of military service. Some comrades were afraid that in putting forward the demand for shortening the period of military service, our Parties would be confused with the pacifist idea of abolishing military service and armies altogether. It is clear that the situation is different in different countries, and there is likely to be some misunderstanding amongst some of our comrades unless they adapt themselves to the concrete situation in their own particular countries. For example, in Germany, it is well known that the bourgeoisie would like to have a reduction in service to enable them to get more trained troops. This situation, however, in Germany, can only be regarded as an exception.

The main thing that concerns us is this: not to be afraid to put forward this slogan, applying it to the concrete situation obtaining in our countries, provided we have the clear idea and clear aim of putting the slogan for the purpose of mobilising the masses against imperialism. Our idea is not that of gradual reduction of military service until the army is ultimately abolished, but we consider it a means of mobilising and leading the masses towards the disintegration of the bourgeois armies. We must also keep clear the need, at the same time (and this is worked out in the thesis) for the proletariat to maintain and acquire the use of arms.

Section Three raised the question of the army in the colonial countries. Here we have learned from the Chinese struggle. We deal in this section with the national armies, as in the first period of the Chinese Revolution, the imperialist armies and the corruption of the national armies by sections of the imperialist armies, and a third type, a mixed kind, as in India, Egypt, Morocco, etc.

In the Fourth section we deal with disarmament, with the Social Democratic programme of disarmament, analysing the Trotskyist ideas and also the radical and so-called Left Social-Democratic attitude toward disarmament. We make clear in our final text the difference between the programme of the proletariat when in power, and the programme of the proletariat fighting for power. In all cases we underline the struggle against Fascism in its various forms.

In regard to our last section, the Special Tasks, here I want to say, we have had a number of important suggestions which have been passed to the Commission in written form during our discussion: women's work, work amongst the peasantry, fight against Fascism, work amongst national minorities, and a number of questions of this character which have been included in the special tasks before the parties.

But the Commission was particularly concerned with one paragraph in the special tasks, and that is the necessity for developing much stronger international action against war. This question is very important. We have said repeatedly from the tribune, and in our discussions, that not enough has been done by the Parties in developing action at home or action on an international scale. In this connection we discussed very fully the possibilities of developing some kind of international action round about some particular event or occasion. This is a question which the New Executive will no doubt go into in detail.

The Commission has proposed that in the course of our examination of the whole question of our anti-war activities there is a considerable amount of overlapping by various de-

partments: We are proposing that a special committee be appointed by the new Executive to co-ordinate this work in view of the present situation and the imminence of war.

Comrades, we have had a peculiar coincidence. While we were discussing here in plenary session, our attitude towards the war, the II. International was also discussing their attitude towards the question of war. In our discussion we have underlined and declared that rationalisation, international cartels, trusts and so forth, and that intensified competition arising out of capitalist rationalisation, is making for war. The II. International was discussing the same question at the same time, and were declaring that international cartels, large capitalist enterprises were the instruments making for peace.

In our discussions we had denounced the League of Nations as a direct instrument for the preparations of war. The II. International was declaring at the same time that the League of Nations assures the one single guarantee of peace, and, they added, that it was necessary to employ all means, including violence towards all those governments which refuse to submit to international arbitration.

You will see from this, Comrades, that our reference in our report to the possibilities of the **MacDonalds, VanderVELDES, Boncours**, and representatives of Social Democracy marching under the white ensign of the League of Nations against the Soviet Union was no exaggeration.

We, in our discussion, have urged the destruction of imperialism as the only means to realise ultimate universal disarmament. The II. International were declaring that under the League alone, is it possible to achieve disarmament by peaceful persuasion.

We had declared that the II. International was a direct instrument of imperialism, even more imperialist in some instances than the imperialists themselves. We know that while we were making such declarations the renegade, **Renaudel** was declaring against all governments who rejected the arbitration of the bourgeois States and in such instances, he affirmed, insurrection was a sacred duty.

It was quite clear from this, as we in our report and in our thesis have laid down, the general lines along which it is necessary for us to concentrate and intensify our activities.

Our Parties must give more attention not only to the understanding of the contradictions within capitalist economy that are making for war, but to pay more attention to the influences which the Social Democrats still exercise over large sections of the proletariat.

As our theses underline, the anti-war activities of the Communist Parties should not be treated and regarded as merely the business of the specialists. Anti-war activities of the Communist Parties must be the **work of the entire Party and must be part of the whole mass activity of the Parties**. In this connection it is necessary, and we must repeat it, to strengthen the mass action of our Parties in all countries. Moreover, to strengthen our international activity; to proceed with all possible speed to prepare our forces while we have yet time.

These theses which I present to you tonight are not the mere handiwork of any particular individual, but represent a collective product in which the majority of the leading Parties of this Congress have participated. Therefore these theses are not and cannot be regarded as an academic treatise but as an attempt to outline the practical tasks and to indicate the practical lines of activity for each Party to follow to realise our ultimate objective of the destruction of capitalism. It is for all our Parties to carry out these tasks under the banner of the Communist International. (Applause.)

\* \* \*

The war theses were then put to the vote and unanimously carried by the Congress.

(Note of the Editor: All the Theses and resolutions of the VI. World Congress will be published in Special Numbers of the "Inprecorr".)

Comrade Jilek (Chairman):

We have now to receive a report of the Political Commission on the political theses. Comrade Thälmann has the floor.

# Report of the Political Commission.

## Speech of Comrade Thälmann:

Comrades, the Political Commission has in several sessions dealt with the many amendments proposed to the Commission by various delegations, and has tried to insert into the draft the most important points of view, concrete changes in single paragraphs and other suggestions of an actual character. Almost all delegations took an active part in bringing in special amendments so that it was utterly impossible for us to include in the draft all the concrete and general suggestions, ideas and proposed changes. We worked on the following principle: firstly, to keep the theses as short as possible and not to enlarge them too much. Secondly, in the cases of general ideas which were included already in past resolutions and decisions, not to repeat them. Thirdly, to include in the different paragraphs only new points of view so as to amplify the different problems included in the draft of the Russian delegation.

It is understandable that in discussing the different amendments we could not accept many of them, thus for instance the proposal of the Austrian delegation demanding that a special paragraph on Austria should be inserted in the draft could, unfortunately, not be considered. The Commission did not refuse this on principle, but it was of the opinion that since there were already two resolutions on the Austrian question accepted by the Presidium and that there was another one in preparation which also will be accepted by the Presidium, the proposal of the Austrian delegation could not be accepted. We also could not accept the proposal to add a special paragraph on the Near and Arabian East. We proposed to the Colonial Commission to examine this amendment and to insert in the colonial theses a paragraph which is of special importance for the tasks of our Parties in the Arabian East.

In the Commission there were no differences of opinion on specific problems. There was only an exchange of opinion on several questions as to how far the demands and suggestions of the delegations should be considered.

The delegates see from the proposals of amendments submitted to them in written form that there were also suggestions to include in the general draft of the Russian delegation a few new paragraphs; among others a new paragraph on the splitting policy of the reformists and of the reformist trade union bureaucracy on an international scale, and on our tasks.

Then there is a special paragraph newly introduced on the international chronic mass unemployment. Capitalist rationalisation, which leads to an enormous enlarging of the productive forces, with the great intensification of labour, the murderous speeding up of work — the most criminal exploitation of the labour power, all this in connection with the progress of technique increases almost in all capitalist countries the number of unemployed. Thirdly, we have altered that important paragraph in the theses (No. 37) which treats the question of trade unions and our role in them. This paragraph has been improved in many points and we tried to introduce into it in the shortest way the newest and most important actual tasks and methods of the Communist Parties in the trade unions. The character of the theses has by no means been altered through this; through these additions above all the structure of the theses was made clearer.

Besides that, in connection with the estimation and declarations of the whole Congress that the danger from the Right is today the greatest danger of the labour movement, we have emphasised more strongly the struggle against the Right danger in a few sections dealing with the situation in the various countries and the inner situation of the different sections.

Now I wish to make a few remarks concerning the most important changes and new points of view which are submitted to you in written form.

In the 1st section of "The Introduction" the character of the different periods has been, upon the suggestion of the Russian and Czech delegations, more clearly defined. As to the contradictions of capitalism we have tried to make clearer the inseparable connection between the growth of productive forces and of the growing contradictions in order to complete the picture. Next to the "German Problem" the "decline of British Imperialism" has been better demonstrated. The English delegation brought in a special proposal on this subject. In the great antagonism on a world scale: America — England, the "German Problem" and "the decline of England" are of really great importance for the present period. This paragraph has been amplified and supplemented.

In the same section a new paragraph on international mass unemployment has been introduced. In connection with the progressing rationalisation, with the improvement of the apparatus of production and of the higher intensity of work connected with it, with the greater exploitation of labour power and the increase of unemployment resulting therefrom — we have to improve and to strengthen our work in this field. Owing to the social shifting in the process of production (instead of qualified workers unqualified are being employed, more intense exploitation of women and youth) we have to devote more attention to this field than has been done lately in the practical work of our sections.

In the 2nd section: "the interstate relations and the Problem of the so-called "foreign politics" we have tried to bring out still stronger the character of the world-hegemony of the United States, to define still clearer the contradictions between the United States and England.

Then we have included in section 3: "The State-power of the Bourgeoisie and the Re-grouping of Class Forces" in par. 14 a small but important item on the evolution of the "bourgeois State form". This small item gains a still greater significance through the fact that we have included in the next 4th section: "The Class Struggle, Social-Democracy and Fascism" a new paragraph on the splitting policy of the reformists and of the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

The above-mentioned item on the evolution of the "bourgeois state form" in section 3 stands in connection with the peculiar development of the social democracy in this present really serious period. Firstly, the merging of the employers' organisations with the bourgeois State apparatus. Secondly, in connection with it the importance of economic struggles, which assume a much higher political character and are much greater political factors now than they ever have been before; and thirdly, the fact that with this evolution of the bourgeois State form and in connection with the tactics and policies of the bourgeoisie the Social Democracy too changes its tactics and policy towards State problems and, consequently, it also changes its methods towards the revolutionary class front. The stronger the revolutionary class front, the more energetic and brutal is the struggle of the reformists against this front. For this reason we have brought in a new quite long item in par. 21 which especially points out the necessity of struggle on the lines of unity against the splitting offensive of the reformists and of the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

This new section is of extraordinary significance for the present and future tasks of the most important sections of the International for the following reason: as a result of the offensive and the splitting policy of the reformists and the reformist trade union bureaucracy we are bound to change and to strengthen our methods and tactics in the struggle against them and to take up the sharpest counter-offensive against the splitting activities of the reformists. We have to choose our tactics in such a way as to oppose to the reformist policy of splitting the extra-party mass organisations of the proletariat (trade unions, co-operatives, cultural and sport organisations, etc.), the

struggle of the masses for class unity. With the growing influence of Communists, with the strengthening of revolutionary opposition in these organisations, the danger of splits grows bigger, as the reformists do all they can to hinder the revolutionary opposition from capturing these organisations and converting them into organisations of revolutionary class struggle.

Of especially great significance in this section is also the altered paragraph on Fascism. In the original draft mention was mainly made of Fascism in Italy and Poland. **But the entire fascist problem, the whole development of fascism, the way it reveals itself in different countries under new aspects** — all this has not been treated fully enough. In this new paragraph the following new ideas are stated: firstly, that the general Fascist methods lead to a corruption of the masses as well as to the destruction of organisations of workers and poor peasants. Secondly, that the Congress states that Fascist tendencies and germs exist in almost all countries in the practice of the Social Democratic parties and of the reformist trade union bureaucracy. There are also comrades at this Congress who mechanically divide the two methods of fighting the working class by the bourgeoisie, who do not see the shifting from one method to the other. Especially, since the revolutionary class front keeps on growing, the contradictions of capitalism become sharper — the bourgeoisie, together with its helpers, at a moment when the means of the bourgeois democracy are not adequate any more, will employ new sharper methods in order to disrupt and to destroy the working class.

The Political Commission introduced this idea because we are unanimously of the opinion, that there are even functionaries in the most important sections who do not fully appreciate this new development, and in the name of the Congress we are obliged to call attention to the development of such sharper methods, so that we should not be taken unawares by the methods of the bourgeoisie which are being used against the growing revolutionary wave of the class conscious workers.

In section IV: "The tactical line and the fundamental tasks of the Communist International" the paragraph dealing with trade union activities has been revised and improved. The significance of this paragraph in the theses is shown especially clearly by the fact that almost all delegations brought in with respect to this paragraph special and numerous amendments. We have in the most important parts considered all these amendments and introduced especially the new methods and the most important tasks which we have to put in our strike-tactics and strike strategy, also our sharpened methods of struggle against the expulsion policy of the reformists and the struggle of the masses for class unity in all mass organisations not only on a national but also on an international scale.

In the VII., the last section: "A retrospect of work done, achievements, mistakes and the tasks of the individual sections" the largest number of amendments was brought in by almost all Sections. We have introduced various changes into some paragraphs. Firstly, the following new paragraphs have been introduced: **an item on the Balkan States and also on the Scandinavian Countries.** I do not think that I have to add anything as to the importance of these two groups of countries. The significance of our sections in the Balkan States is clear to everyone in connection with the growing danger of war and especially in the imperialist war preparations against the Soviet Union. The latest comparatively large strikes in the Scandinavian countries, and the fact of an alliance of the Finnish and Norwegian trade unions with the Russian also are of a certain significance in the present situation.

Comrades, we have examined from all points of view all chapters treating the individual sections, and we have introduced new chapters dealing with France and Italy.

In the paragraph dealing with the situation in Italy and of the Italian section it was, for instance, especially pointed out that the Party has neglected to recognise, on the basis of the general development of Fascism, the necessity of changing its organisational activities towards this Fascist regime and to adopt new methods.

In the paragraph dealing with France and the French Section it was especially pointed out that the main danger for the Party lies in the Right. On the basis of decisions of the IX Plenum some weaknesses and differences of opinion showed themselves in the tactics of the last election campaign, so that

it is necessary to carry out there a stronger activity on the lines of these tactics. From a deeper serious discussion in the Party on these tactical problems the Party will grow and win. Apart from this the Party must strengthen the struggle against the right deviations and should not forget at the same time the struggle against the "left" deviations which showed themselves especially in the Parisian organisation.

As to the Chinese Party, there were also introduced some changes which are partly in connection with the past, and partly they are important for the estimation of the future development. The Chinese delegation in the Political Commission was of the opinion, that the most important task of the future is to mobilise the masses, **also to strengthen the mass activities of the Party and to call the special attention of the Party to these tasks confronting it during the present development of the new revolutionary wave.** Besides that we have chosen in a few points other formulations, namely in the estimation of the mistakes made by the Chinese leadership.

These are the most important changes proposed by the Political Commission. I would like to remark that every one of us understands the significance of the theses. **These theses constitute the directives for our work, the directives for the large range of tasks and introduction of activities in face of the big imperialist preparations for war, for the revolutionary work in the colonies, for the defence of the Soviet Union. They include the directives for the creation of new large mass organisations also in Latin America,** — a task the whole significance of which is not sufficiently recognised by many delegates.

Comrades, I think that the theses represent an extraordinary favourable basis when we will understand and find the concretisation of the special tasks in the different continents and countries. With a true Bolshevik clearness and an embittered uncompromising struggle against reformism we will solve the tactical problems in a revolutionary manner, and we will put and fulfil our tasks in a Leninist spirit. Our main task is and must always be: to develop our revolutionary work on a higher level, to promote among the proletarian masses of the whole world the revolutionary strength and the energetic will to new revolutionary acts and deeds, and through this to the great development of the world revolution. (Applause.)

In this sense the Political Commission proposes to the Plenum, to accept unanimously the draft of the theses of the Russian delegation with the proposed amendments and the new additions.

(Applause.)

Comrade JILEK (Chairman):

We come now to the vote on the political theses including the amendments of the Political Commission.

(The vote is taken.)

I state a unanimous acceptance.

(Applause.)

\* \* \*

Comrade Johnstone has asked to be allowed to make a declaration on behalf of a part of the American Delegation and Comrade Lovestone for the Central Committee of the American Party. Comrade Johnstone has the floor.

Declaration of Comrade JOHNSTONE (America):

The Minority of the Delegation of the C. P. of U. S. A. agrees with and has voted for the theses of Comrade Bukharin but registers its disagreement with the section on the U. S. A. — paragraph 49 — for the following reasons:

a) The section fails to emphasise sufficiently the growing contradictions confronting American imperialism, the increasing radicalisation of the masses and the increasing prospects for mass struggles and the failure of the majority of the Central Committee to see these new developments and adopt policies in accord with them.

The section fails to condemn the majority of the Central Committee for its stubborn attempt to exempt our Party from the general line of the Comintern policy (Pepper, Lovestone, etc).

b) The section does not clearly repudiate the Right wing line of the majority leadership which has systematically magnified difficulties and minimised the possibilities of struggle.

c) The section does not condemn sharply the resistance of the majority leadership to the decisions of the IV R. I. L. U. Congress, especially on the question of the organisation of the unorganised into new unions.

There is no condemnation of the serious opportunist errors made in Negro work by the Central Committee. There is insufficient criticism of the almost complete neglect of this important work for two and a half years.

d) The section fails to condemn sharply the extreme Right Wing in the Needle Trades and co-operatives, and provides no means for the reorganisation of the Party's leadership in these two important fields of work.

e) The section does not correct the false line of the Central Committee in anti-imperialist work (U. S. as catspaw of Great Britain, U. S. support of Japan in China, etc.).

f) The section does not state clearly that the main danger in our Party is from the Right and that it is necessary to mobilise the Party for a fight against the Right danger.

g) We believe that a more correct formulation for the clause dealing with the Labour Party would be to say that

"the Labour Party slogan is no longer one of agitation campaigns or organisation but in this period can be used only in a propagandist sense."

h) We declare that we greet the proposal contained in the amended theses to the effect that we intensify the recruiting of proletarians into our Party and make a decided change in the matter of bringing forward worker elements into leading position in our Party.

We have recognised and have begun to correct those errors made by us and will continue to do so.

At the same time we shall continue to press forward for the further development of the Left turn in our Party's policies in full accord with the line of the Comintern.

(Signed) Jack Johnstone, Bill Dunne, Manuel Gomez, George Siskind, Schachmo Epstein, Alex Bittelman.

#### Declaration of Comrade LOVESTONE (U. S. A.):

Comrades, in the name of the Central Executive Committee of the Workers' (Communist) Party I declare on behalf of our Delegation, the full acceptance and the hearty endorsement of the theses on the political situation as presented by the Russian Delegation. In our opinion this registers first of all the successes of our Party: 1) in displaying a more revolutionary activity; 2) in taking advantage of the crisis in American industry; 3) The Party being the stalwart leader of a number of stubborn and fierce class battles like the miners' struggle; 4) A campaign against the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti in which the Party was the leader; 5) The weakening of the long-standing factional struggle; 6) The fight of the Central Committee has had a correct policy towards the Labour Party problem. Finally, the endorsement of the estimate of the economic situation and development of American imperialism as made by the Central Executive Committee. We emphasise that we are in full agreement with the criticism made of the Party by the theses, for the following errors:

1) By our insufficient energy in the campaign to organise the unorganised. 2) In the Negro work. 3) The insufficient

struggle against American imperialism's aggrandisement in Latin America. 4) In regard to the Right mistakes in relation to the Socialist Party it is correctly pointed out that these mistakes cannot be ascribed exclusively to the majority leadership. The American section of the theses means a rejection of the Opposition charge that the American Party has a Right wing leadership. The theses reject the opposition charge that the American Party has a Right wing line. The resolution properly speaks of mistakes, but these do not indicate a line, and mistakes which were shared in by comrades of all groupings. The opposition charge the Central Committee with being a brake on the masses, and the theses answer this charge by pointing out that the Party, though the leadership of the Central Committee has been the stalwart leader of fierce class battles. The opposition put forward the demand that the Congress should send an open letter to our Party to change the leadership. The theses do not do this, hence it means a vote of confidence in the Central Committee of the American Party. The Comintern has supported the present leadership, the Ruthenberg group basis, for four years continuously, and has considered the opposition group, the Foster group, as a trade union group with opportunist inclinations, protecting the Foster group organisationally. The theses correctly say we must abolish the two-group system in the American Party. We must put an end to factionalism. We are in absolute agreement with this, but for this, we need two pre-requisites: first of all, the Executive Committee to act as a Central Committee and not as a group, and this pre-requisite has already been made and will be continued, secondly, the minority must subordinate itself to the majority. We hope that after this Congress the Minority will do so. The present world situation and American imperialism, makes it imperative that we wipe out the two-group system and have a united policy. Under the present circumstances of the strengthening of imperialism, the Right danger is the greatest, and we pledge ourselves to fight most energetically against it, and for this we must have a united Party. It is imperative therefore, to carry out the C. I. line and to emphasise the struggle to wipe out factionalism. We say that the opposition must accept without reservation this section of the thesis of subordinating the minority to the majority, and we, in the name of the Central Committee, pledge ourselves loyally to continue to act as a Central Committee, to fight energetically against opportunism, to fight more energetically than ever to strengthen the proletarian elements in the leadership of the Party, to work for the organisation of the unorganised, to increase our activity among the Negroes.

We will not allow ourselves to be provoked by the opposition and will continue our present course of unifying the Party.

We consider that the theses and the work of the VI World Congress marks the beginning of a new period for our Party, which will usher in a more rapid development with the increasing favourable circumstances for a unified Bolshevik Party in the United States.

#### Comrade REMMELE:

Comrades, during the session of the Congress a commission consisting of delegates from all Parties has been elected, in order to discuss the work of Communists in the organisations of the Red Aid. The result of this is the following resolution which we submit to the Congress for acceptance (Reads the resolution).

#### Comrade JILEK (Chairman):

We vote on the resolution. (Vote.)

The resolution is unanimously accepted.

With this the present session is closed.

## Forty-sixth Session.

Moscow, Sept., 1, 1928.

Chairman: Comrade REMMELE:

I declare the 46th Session of the VI. World Congress open. We have on to-day's agenda the report of the Pro-

gramme Commission. I call on Comrade Bukharin to address the Congress.

# Report of the Programme Commission.

## Speech of Comrade Bukharin:

Comrades, we had a very thorough general discussion in the big programme commission. This commission held 11 plenary sessions. I have already reported on the work of the big programme commission and on the discussion at its sessions of the most contentious questions in my concluding speech at the plenum of the Congress. Apart from this big commission, the small commission has been also at work a whole week. The fact is that a considerable number of amendments, addenda, critical remarks and concrete proposals were submitted to the draft theses. There were over 600 of them. Thus, the small commission was confronted with the difficult task of another critical estimate of all these amendments in order to accept some, reject others and re-elaborate many before including them into the text of the programme. After a whole week's work by the small commission, I presented a report to the plenum of the big commission; there was another discussion: the work of the small commission was endorsed, but new proposals were brought forward at the same time; this meant more work for the small programme commission. In the process of this work we came to the conclusion that, apart from studying a considerable number of concrete proposals received from all sides, we were confronted with yet another task; when reading through the draft programme as a whole, we discovered a number of defects (mainly stylistic), and we were compelled to remove them so as to straighten out the text. It is utterly impossible for me to tell you fully about all the amendments, regroupings and small stylistic changes introduced into the draft programme. The new text of the draft is in the hands of all the comrades, and I take it that all of them have not only read but have pursued it critically. I will deal here only with some of the most substantial changes in the draft programme.

First of all, we have adopted an utterly new paragraph in that part of the programme which deals with the trend of capitalist development, a paragraph which describes the various changes in the general conditions and social relations which grow up on the basis of the capitalist order, changes in the sphere of family relations, culture, etc. In regard to this proposals were brought forward by Comrade Clara Zetkin and some other comrades. Therefore, in accordance with the wish expressed by Comrade Zetkin and our international women's secretariat, we have supplemented our draft programme as suggested by them. During the discussion in the big programme commission and at the plenum of the congress, one omission in the draft programme was pointed out, namely in the part which deals with the evolution of the existing bourgeois regime. This was a serious defect of our draft programme and we were therefore compelled — partly in connection with the analysis of the Fascist movement and Fascist regime — to add to the draft a fairly big paragraph devoted to the evolution of State power under conditions created by monopolist capital and the crisis of the capitalist order. A big piece of work was also done in connection with the paragraph devoted to the process of the development of the world revolution and the paragraph dealing with social democracy.

On this point a considerable number of comrades changed their original viewpoint: when we discussed these questions in the small commission, the majority was in favour of eliminating from the draft all those parts which contain the historical characteristic of the various stages of the process of the world revolution and of the treacheries committed by the so-

cial democratic parties, in order to replace these parts — especially in regard to the second question — by others giving not a historical description but a systematic characteristic. As this viewpoint was that of the majority, we adopted a corresponding decision in the small commission (I was with the minority): but after my report, during the discussions in the big programme commission where all the comrades had an opportunity to express freely their views on this question, the former viewpoint got again the upper hand, and the big programme commission decided to restore to the text the parts devoted to the characteristic of the process of the world revolution and of the treachery of the social democrats. However, in accordance with all the dialectical rules, this was no longer an ordinary but, so to speak, a "re-inforced" reiteration of the old, because the big programme commission decided not to brush aside the new, "systematic" text, but to give it another place — at the beginning of the VI. chapter which deals with various tendencies in the labour movement and gives a characteristic of various forms of social reformism, but does not contain a general systematic exposé of the reformist theory.

This is how we solved this task. We have, on the whole, the old text with the characteristic of social democratic treacheries in the old place, and a more systematic exposé at the beginning of the VI. chapter. This is the third series of substantial questions and changes in our draft.

The fourth question is the problem of Fascism. All the comrades will remember what a lively discussion took place on this question at the plenum of the big programme commission. There was a whole series of proposals. At first, there was divergence of opinion in regard to this question. But we succeeded in arriving at a uniform conclusion, and this conclusion is explained by us in the draft programme — in the paragraph devoted to Fascism.

I will not deal here with the questions themselves, because I did so already at the plenum of the Congress.

The fifth series of questions to which there are important addenda, concern the latest forms of the capitalist order, the forms of capitalist organisation, contemporary trusts, the question of rationalisation and its consequences etc. Our draft programme was at fault because it did not give enough room to these burning questions. We have remedied this defect: we have formulated corresponding paragraphs and have given them their right place in the programme.

Very big changes have been introduced into the text of the fourth chapter which deals with the transition period. As you all know, this chapter gives a characteristic of the general features of the transition period and contains also a whole series of subdivisions with a brief exposé of the demands and tasks of proletarian dictatorship. In this part of the draft programme we have not only addenda or changes but also two new sections: the section on labour protection and questions connected with it, a section devoted to the national and colonial questions, a series of other addenda of the same character. In this connection no objections were raised in the discussions in the big programme commission.

The seventh series of changes is devoted to the colonial question. In this respect our draft programme had many de-

fects: no concrete statement was made there about the various types of colonies. We had in view almost exclusively colonies where the capitalist order exists in a more or less developed form. The problems of proletarian hegemony, transition of the bourgeois democratic revolution into proletarian revolution, mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry — all these burning problems were to be found in our draft programme. But hardly anything was said in it about colonies where economic development is still proceeding to a great extent on a pre-capitalist basis, where the native population still lives according to the old economic and social traditions. This gap had to be filled, and we have done it. In regard to the substance of the question, we must say that we have brought forward here, among other things, the slogan of "people's councils" or peasants' councils and that we have brought all other questions into harmony with this.

We have made also fairly big changes in the sixth chapter. Apart from the question of style, I must say that here too we have introduced new ideas. There are new paragraphs devoted to religious tendencies in the working class — Catholic, Protestant, etc. We have given at the beginning of the chapter an analysis of the social character of the various currents in the ranks of the proletariat, which are hostile to us, of the influence of the big bourgeoisie on the proletariat and also of the ideological influence of the petty bourgeoisie and various other circles such as the slum-proletariat, the declassed intellectual bohemians, etc., in proletarian ranks.

In the analysis of the various forms of reformism, we made room for co-operative socialism which was not originally included in the draft programme. This change was made at the suggestion of co-operators and also of representatives of a number of delegations.

In the new text, a special point is devoted to Austro-Marxism and to the characteristic of this ideological current in the social democratic reformism. There has been a general regrouping of paragraphs in this chapter, and the idea of proletarian unity has been given prominence at the beginning of the draft programme as well as at the end. These changes were made in the first stage of our work, i. e. before their discussion in the big programme commission. In the second stage of the work of the small commission, we discovered, partly as a result of the discussion in the big programme commission — that even after all we had already done, there were still many gaps in the draft programme. For instance, after a series of changes made in the fourth chapter where we linked up more effectively the systematic part with the question of our demands, we discovered that the paragraphs dealing with universities, experts from proletarian ranks and various cultural tasks of the proletariat are thrust into the structure of the draft programme like a *deus ex machina*. It is easy to understand how this happened. The primary exposé was of a more historical character, but in the process of systematisation, we discovered that from the architectural viewpoint, our formulae were far from perfect. This compelled us to reformulate important paragraphs and give them their right place. We have now a special sub-section re the cultural revolution and its foundations, re the tasks of the proletariat in the period of this cultural revolutionary transformation. We have thrown light on the tasks of the proletariat in regard to work among the general masses, to quote Marx, on the problem of "the fashioning of man by man". This is an utterly new sub-section in the draft programme.

Before that, in the first stage of our work, several comrades pointed out in the small commission that in spite of the existence in our programme of special paragraphs devoted to Sun yat-senism and Gandhi-ism, its orientation is too "European". Some comrades pointed especially to the so-called Harveyism which has a certain influence among the Negroes of the United States. We raised this question in the big programme commission and the majority of the comrades voted for the inclusion of a corresponding paragraph. In accordance with this decision such a paragraph was formulated. The second

part of the last chapter on strategy and tactic which deals with the strategy and tactic of the Communist International, has a somewhat loose formulation, partly owing to the general exhaustion of the comrades. That is why we had to examine once more the whole text of the sixth chapter, deleting some items, systematising others, giving more prominence to some problems and arranging the whole material properly. Let the plenum of the congress judge to what extent we have succeeded in this.

Such are on the whole the most important changes proposed by us to the plenum of the Congress. There is no doubt whatever that after the rather difficult work performed by us, the draft programme is very much improved. This can be seen by a careful comparison of both texts. The bigger half of the text of the programme is either entirely remodelled or re-elaborated to such an extent that probably not more than 40% of the old text have retained their original form. I think that this is due to the fact that genuine collective work has been done by us at the congress and in the programme commission. We discussed collectively not only all substantial questions but also secondary problems, at first in the big and then in the small commission.

Of course it is a pity that this work has been somewhat protracted. The congress of the II. International, for instance, lasted only a few days. But having raised the question of the programme, we had to perform the necessary work carefully, and this takes time. We weighed almost every word, we analysed in a critical manner almost every idea and thoroughly discussed almost every proposal. Out of all the proposals, we selected what was sound, sensible and useful. As a result of this truly collective work we have now a draft programme which is much better than its predecessor. This does not of course mean that our draft programme is without blemish, that it is absolutely ideal. But relatively speaking, myself and the majority of the comrades here are convinced that this draft programme can be adopted. Each one of us now returns home. Each Party will pursue its course. But now we have a programme. This document will be, no doubt, of enormous world historical importance, which is in itself a justification of the protracted character of our labour.

On behalf of the programme commission, I ask the plenum of the congress to adopt the programme of the Communist International. (Loud applause which develops into an ovation; delegates rise to their feet and sign the "International".)

#### Comrade REMMELE:

Comrades, we have discussed at great length the Draft Programme both in the Programme Commission as well as at the Plenum. I therefore think that the vote can now be taken unless someone has to make any remarks.

As this is not the case, the vote will now be taken. Those who agree with the Programme elaborated by Comrade Bukharin and the Programme Commission, please show their cards.

(All delegates and the whole audience rise and sing the "International".)

Comrades, I think that voting by the singing of the revolutionary world proletariat renders it superfluous to ask for the vote against and abstentions. But if anyone is against the Programme or wishes to abstain from voting, he can say so now.

This is not the case. Thus the Programme of the Communist International is adopted unanimously. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

\* \* \*

Next comes the report of the Colonial Commission, Reporter, Comrade Kuusinen.

# Report of the Colonial Commission.

## Speech of Comrade Kuusinen:

My task here consists merely in giving a brief survey of the most important amendments and addenda proposed by the Commission to the original draft resolution. The Commission which was composed of representatives of almost all the most important Parties and colonial countries, has done really a big piece of work. I think that the draft theses have been greatly improved by this work which, unfortunately, has also added considerably to their length.

The most important addenda are as follows:

In the first chapter, the Commission has made clearer the most important incidents in the Chinese Revolution, in the revolutionary movement of India, Indonesia, Latin America, etc.

We have given now a more concrete form to that part of the theses which deals with tactical questions. This part of the theses applies now only to one group of colonial countries, namely, China, India, Egypt, and Indonesia — certainly the most important colonial countries. I think that this concretisation has been all to the good.

As to the second chapter, the commission associated itself completely with the fundamental line of the former draft concerning the character of the imperialist colonial policy. We have, however, elaborated a good many addenda, to make the subject clearer. Among other things, we have given a more exhaustive explanation of the role of the export of capital, showing that while accelerating capitalist development in the colonies, export of capital increases at the same time the imperialist enslavement of the colonies and their dependence on finance capital.

We have also made the theses clearer by emphasising the peculiarity of Dominion status. Export of capital to the Dominions has a direct effect on industrialisation. We must make a clear distinction between this question and that of the colonial regime proper, as it exists in India and also in China.

The strategy and tactic of the Communist Parties and the role of the national bourgeoisie in the various stages of the revolution is, as I have already mentioned, applied now concretely to China, India and Egypt. This has also made more precise some formulae re tactical questions. The tactical line given in the original proposal has been approved by the Commission.

Much has also been added to the chapter on the immediate tasks of the Parties in the colonial countries, not only in regard to general tasks, but also — according to countries — in regard to the tasks of our Parties, especially in China, India, Indonesia, Egypt, Korea, Latin America, etc. We have also added a whole chapter about the Negro question in the United States and also about Negro colonies in Africa.

We have also adopted various addenda on the role of the petty-bourgeoisie and peasantry. Such are the most important addenda. As I have already said, the fundamental line of the draft has not been altered by the Commission. You remember that in the discussion at the Plenum much prominence was given to contentious questions, and I think that this was all to the good. It was, of course, but natural that many one-sided attacks were made in the discussion. But I think that after the unanimous adoption of the resolution in the commission, this will not make itself felt.

In regard to that part of my concluding speech in which I dealt with the development of the British Party on the basis of the new policy and which might lead to a one-sided interpretation, I wish to say: I am aware of the fact that the British Party is making great efforts to adopt the new policy. The

recent by-elections have shown that the Party is doing this successfully. I have also been always prepared to admit that, for instance, in regard to trade union work, the British Party can set an example to the other Communist Parties, and this is not a small thing. We can admit with a good conscience that our British comrades have to their credit considerable successes in regard to the Bolshevisation of their Party. But they are also under the obligation of continuing their efforts.

I have in fact nothing much to add to what I already said in my former speeches. There is only one thing which I would like to reiterate: our weakness in the colonies and semi-colonies in regard to the formation of Parties — a shortcoming which must be remedied as soon as possible. The new Executive will be responsible for the fulfilment of this task. By the time of the next Congress, we must have strong Communist Parties not only in China, but also in India and other important colonies. If we do not do justice to these tasks, the revolutionary movement cannot make progress in these countries. No resolutions, no matter how excellent will help us if we do not succeed in consolidating our Parties in the colonies in the next few years. To achieve this the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries must be able to give adequate help to the Communist movement of the colonies.

I would like, for instance, to draw the attention of the comrades to the fact that the French Party, which, in my opinion, has done the best work in the colonial sphere, has one serious defect: the Parties in Tunis and Algiers are not independent Parties officially, but only sections of the French Party. This is not right. Lenin's instructions concerning the ways and means of overcoming the distrust of native workers including those who are revolutionary, are a reminder to us to bestow complete independence on the Parties of the colonial countries. Comrades from the imperialist countries are in duty bound to help, by advice and collaboration, the comrades in the colonial countries in the building up of their Parties and in the struggle against imperialism and the propertied classes. But they must at the same time grant complete independence to their Parties. The French Party, while continuing its good work in Algiers, Tunis and Morocco, must be mindful of this.

When elaborating the draft theses in the Commission, our chief concern was how to develop in the most adequate manner our Parties in the colonial countries, in the immediate future. This is also the most important question for the practical work of the Executive in the immediate future. The directions which are contained now in the theses are to be interpreted from this viewpoint. It is from the same viewpoint that we have also emphasised the necessity of exposing the national-reformist bourgeoisie in the colonies and have indicated the manner in which this exposure campaign should be carried on, so that through it the masses be really wrested from the influence of national reformism.

After these brief explanations, I ask you to adopt the theses.

**Chairman: Comrade REMMELE:**

As no one has given notice of remarks and declarations the vote will now be taken. (This is done.)

I declare the colonial theses to be **adopted unanimously.** (Applause.)

We are coming now to the resolution on the situation in the Soviet Union and in the C. P. S. U. I call on Comrade Thälmann to speak to this resolution.



# Report of the Commission for the Elaboration of the Resolution on the Situation in the Soviet Union and in the C. P. S. U.

## Speech of Comrade Thälmann:

The Commission proposes the following resolution:

The VI. World Congress of the Communist International notes with extreme satisfaction the enormous progress made in the four years since the V. World Congress in the U. S. S. R., the only fatherland of the proletariat led by the Communist Party. Total production of industry has exceeded the pre-war level and the rate of the increase exceeds that of the capitalist countries. The economy of the country as a whole is developing rapidly, but the development of the socialist sector is even more rapid than that of the economy of the country as a whole. Big industry and electrification are making big strides. Large enterprises like the Volkhov and Dnieper schemes, and the Siberian-Turkestan Railway and the erection of large new factories demonstrate the creative power of the victorious proletariat and are evidence of the great successes achieved in the work of building up socialism.

Unlike that in capitalist countries in Europe, the reconstruction of industry in the U. S. S. R. has been accomplished without the aid of foreign loans, it has been accomplished exclusively by means of the country's own resources, while at the same time having to maintain a strenuous resistance to the constant outside pressure of capitalist environment.

The conditions of the proletariat have greatly improved. The 7-hour day and a 6-hour day for miners working underground is being introduced. Real wages have doubled since 1923 and now considerably exceed the pre-war level, (quite apart from the grants made for social services). The conditions of the working rural population, i. e. of the small and middle peasants to whom the revolution gave land, whom it freed from indebtedness and who now enjoy the full support of the proletarian dictatorship in their efforts to develop their homesteads, have also considerably improved.

Raising the standard of peasant farming is closely linked up with developing the organisation of the peasantry on a co-operative basis and especially with the development of collective forms of agriculture, which has already commenced, with encouraging the existing and creating new Soviet farms, and on the other hand with a still more intensified struggle against capitalist elements in the countryside, i. e. against the kulaks.

The proletarian state power has succeeded in restricting within narrow limits the upstarts of capitalism that unavoidably spring up in town and country as a result of N. E. P. and has exposed and crushed the counter-revolutionary sabotage of a section of the higher technical experts who were financed by the ex-owners and hostile governments. The hopes of the capitalists and of the Social Democrats that the New Economic Policy would lay the foundation for a return of capitalism have been definitely crushed. The capitalist elements are not developing to the detriment of the socialist sector. The very opposite is the case: the significance and the relative strength of the socialist sector in the economy of the country are steadily increasing and it is spreading its influence more and more over the private economic sector.

The VI. Congress declares that the successes achieved in socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. help to strengthen the position of the international working class in its struggles — led by the vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party — against international capitalism; they help to revolutionise the broad working masses in the capitalist and colonial countries and to transform the U. S. S. R. even to a greater extent than ever before into a stronghold of the world revolution and the C. P. S. U. into the Leninist vanguard, from whose colossal experience all Sections of the Communist International are able to obtain their ideological and practical training.

Fully and completely endorsing the decisions of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. the VI. Congress of the Comintern declares in unison with it that:

“Notwithstanding the leading and constantly growing role of the socialist economic core of the country, the in-

crease in the productive forces of the U. S. S. R. is unavoidably accompanied by a partial growth of class antagonisms. The capitalist sections in the towns and villages establish contact with certain bureaucratic elements in the government and economic apparatus, strive to increase their resistance to the onslaught of the working class and to influence certain strata of the office employees, intellectuals, backward artisans, peasants and workers against the proletarian dictatorship... The working class, led by the C. P. S. U., has counter-acted this hostile influence and growing activity of the capitalist elements by still further consolidating the regime of the proletarian dictatorship and by stimulating the activity and initiative and raising the cultural level of the proletarian masses.” (Resolution of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. on the report of the C. C.)

The capitalist environment and growing pressure of world capitalism on the stronghold of all the workers,— the U. S. S. R., a pressure which stimulates the activity of the urban and rural capitalist elements against the proletarian dictatorship, and the difficulties connected with the work of socialist construction, such as were manifested in the recent grain collection, renders it necessary that the proletarian State shall conduct an active policy directed towards the transformation of social relationship into collectivist relationships. These difficulties can be overcome only by strenuously combating the capitalist economic elements, by strengthening the alliance with the basic peasant masses (the middle peasants), by strenuous struggle against the kulak and by securing that the rural poor shall serve as a genuine and durable bulwark of the proletariat.

The VI. Congress of the Comintern notes the growing authority and influence of the C. P. S. U. among the working classes of the U. S. S. R. and throughout the whole world. The Congress notes an increase in the proletarian section of the membership of the C. P. S. U., a development and strengthening of proletarian democracy, and a growth of the profound confidence the working class of the U. S. S. R. displays towards its glorious, Leninist Party, the C. P. S. U.

The VI. Congress of the Comintern declares that thanks to its consistent Communist policy the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has succeeded in consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and in proceeding successfully with the building up of Socialism. By their unstinted support for the correct policy of the C. P. S. U. all the Sections of the Communist International assist the latter in the work of building up socialism.

Endorsing the decisions of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. and reaffirming the decision of the IX. Plenum re the expulsion of the Opposition from the C. P. S. U., the Congress condemns the counter-revolutionary Menshevik activities carried on by the ex-opposition after their expulsion.

The Congress calls upon the C. P. S. U. to continue strenuously to combat the already numerically insignificant Trotskyist tendency, and calls upon all other Parties of the Communist International ideologically and organisationally to combat and to prevent every attempt to establish a Trotskyist opposition in their ranks.

The dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. is not menaced by degeneration, as is slanderously alleged by the ex-opposition, but by the armed attack of the world bourgeoisie, whose rule is being more and more threatened by the success of the State of the proletarian dictatorship. The VI. Congress of the Comintern therefore calls upon the proletariat of all countries and upon the oppressed and exploited of the world to exert all their efforts to frustrate the attack that is being prepared on the Soviet Union, the only proletarian fatherland.

The toilers of the whole world must do all in their power to defend and protect the U. S. S. R., which is the first victoriously won position of the world proletariat and a sure base for development of the proletarian world revolution.

**Chairman: Comrade REMELLE:**

As no one wishes to speak, the vote will now be taken. (This is done.)

The resolution is adopted unanimously. (Applause.)

\* \* \*

# Report of the Commission for the Consideration of Appeals.

## Speech of Comrade Kolarov:

The Commission for the examination of appeals proposes to the World Congress to adopt the following resolutions:

### DECISION IN REGARD TO THE CASE OF TROTSKY, SAPRANOV AND OTHERS.

Having examined the declaration of Trotsky, Sapronov and other members of the Opposition expelled from the C. P. S. U. and now applying for reinstatement, the VI. World Congress of the C. I. resolves:

1. The World Congress fully approves the decision of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. and the resolution of the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. concerning the incompatibility of adherence to the Trotskyist Opposition and the propaganda of its views with the membership of the Bolshevik Party. In its views on questions of the programme, policy and organisation the Trotskyist group has sunk to the position of Menshevism and objectively has become an organ of struggle against the Soviet Power. Therefore, their expulsion from the C. P. S. U. was proper and inevitable.

2. The declaration submitted by the expelled members to the World Congress is fresh proof that Trotsky and the handful of his followers who, unlike the overwhelming majority of the former opposition, refuse to submit to the conditions laid down by the XV. Party Congress, are continuing their struggle, their disruptive work and their slanderous campaign against the C. P. S. U. and the proletarian dictatorship. The Congress considers it superfluous to discuss with the enemies of the C. I. the counter-revolutionary political content of the Trotskyist platform, after the mass of the membership of all the Communist Parties has repeatedly and resolutely rejected their point of view.

3. The VI. World Congress endorses the decision of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. on the expulsion of the Trotskyists. It is of the opinion that the measures taken subsequently against the leaders of the opposition were dictated entirely by revolutionary necessity and rejects the application of Trotsky, Radek, Sapronov and the other expelled members for reinstatement in the Party.

\* \* \*

**Comrade REMMELE:**

I put up the resolution for discussion. As no one wishes to speak, the vote will be taken. (This is done.)

I declare the resolution adopted unanimously. (Loud Applause.)

**Comrade KOLAROV (reads):**

### DECISION IN THE CASE OF MASLOW AND RUTH FISCHER.

After having examined the communication received from Maslow and Ruth Fischer, dated August 23, 1928, the VI. World Congress resolves:

1. The World Congress endorses all the decisions passed by meetings of the Plenum and of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. and also by the Communist Party of Germany concerning the Maslow-Ruth Fischer Trotskyist group.

2. The whole of the counter-revolutionary, splitting activities of the leaders of this group preclude all confidence in the sincerity of their declarations, and show that they are

We are coming now to the reading of draft resolutions concerning various appeals. Comrade Kolarov will lay these draft resolutions before the Congress.

neither willing nor able to become Bolshevik fighters in the ranks of the Communist Party of Germany.

3. The World Congress therefore resolves to reject the application for reinstatement made by Maslow and Ruth Fischer and to pass on to next business.

4. At the same time the World Congress approves the declarations made by the C. C. of the C. P. of Germany that the way back to the C. P. of Germany shall be kept open for all workers expelled from the Party on account of their adherence to the Trotskyist groups, providing that they break with Maslow, Ruth Fischer and the other renegades of Communism and will unreservedly submit to all the decisions of the Communist Party of Germany and of the Communist International.

**Comrade REMMELE**

(after the voting):

The resolution which has just been read is adopted unanimously. We are coming now to the resolution on the expelled French oppositional group.

**Comrade KOLAROV (reads the resolution).**

### RESOLUTION ON THE CASE OF SUZANNE GIRAULT AND OTHERS.

Suzanne Girault, expelled from the Communist Party of France for her profoundly anti-Communist conduct and for her factional activities, together with a small group that published the Opposition organ "Leninist Unity", has made application, jointly with a number of her political friends, for re-instatement in the Party.

In view of the fact that Suzanne Girault and her political friends continue stubbornly to adhere to their former oppositional political platform, refuse to admit their errors and deviations and to condemn the international factional struggle carried on by the Opposition, and particularly in view of their refusal to admit the correctness of the decisions of the VIII. and IX. Plenums of the E. C. C. I. and of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U., which have been endorsed by the present Congress, the VI Congress rejects the application for reinstatement submitted by Suzanne Girault and her fellow members of the "Leninist Unity" group.

The VI. World Congress also rejects the application of the Treint group as well as that of the "Class War" group, which continue to adhere to the platform of Trotskyism.

\*

**Comrade REMMELE:**

The resolution on the French opposition group is adopted unanimously. We are coming now to the resolution on the appeal of the Dutch Wynkoop group.

**Comrade KOLAROV (reads the resolution).**

### RESOLUTION ON THE CASE OF THE WYNKOOP GROUP.

The VI. World Congress of the Communist International has read the telegram and letter sent by the organisation calling itself "Communist Party of Holland, Central Committee", i. e., the so-called Wynkoop group in Holland.

In these documents, "assurances" are given of "loyalty" to the Programme and policy of the Comintern, and the World Congress is requested

"to find ways and means for restoring the Dutch section of the Comintern also in Holland, on the basis of the unconditional application of international Communist tactics".

These documents represent a clumsy attempt to deceive the Dutch workers. The "Wynkoop group" has no right whatever to describe itself as a Communist Party; it has nothing in common with Communism or with the Communist International.

In the course of several years the Communist International repeatedly examined the policy of the leaders of this group. This policy has always been replete with gross opportunist deviations even in regard to very important political questions like the colonial and trade union questions. Moreover, the leaders of the Wynkoop group repeatedly violated the decisions of the International, and finally placed themselves outside the ranks of the Communist world organisation by a number of open breaches of discipline. Since that time they have opposed their sectarian schismatic organisation to the Dutch section of the Communist International. There is no need for "restoring" the Dutch section of the Communist International, it exists as the Communist Party of Holland (section of the Communist International). There is only one way by which the revolutionary workers of Holland still outside our ranks can participate in the struggle of the Communist World Party and that is by

joining the Dutch section of the Communist International, by unconditionally recognising national and international discipline and by conscientiously carrying out the decisions passed by the Congresses of the Party and of the Communist International. The criminal splitting tactics of the Wynkoop group not only hinder the revolutionisation of the Dutch proletariat but also damage the revolutionary movement of our heroic Indonesian comrades who in their struggle against Dutch Imperialism stand in need of a strong and united Communist Party in Holland.

The VI. World Congress of the Communist International therefore calls upon all revolutionary Dutch workers not yet in our ranks to join the Communist Party of Holland, the section of the Communist International. (Vote.)

**Comrade REMMELE:**

The resolution is adopted unanimously.

**Comrade KOLAROV:**

The Commission proposes to hand over to the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. the appeal for re-admission of Vassilkiev and other expelled from the West-Ukrainian Party (adopted unanimously).

## Report of Comrade Humbert-Droz on the Admittance of New Sections.

Comrades, the Brussels Congress of the Second International ended in protests by comrades representing the colonies and semi-colonies who had been invited to the Congress. Our Congress can end with the adherence of seven new colonial and semi-colonial Sections which ask for affiliation to the Communist International.

Between the V. and VI. World Congress, the Executive of the C. I. and its Presidium were asked to admit provisionally to the Communist International the Parties of Korea, Cuba and Ireland. At the VI. World Congress, four new Parties have asked for affiliation: the Communist Parties of New Zealand and Paraguay, the Social Revolutionary Party of Columbia, and the Socialist Party of Ecuador.

The Communist Party of Korea was established in 1925 and was admitted provisionally to the Communist International by the Presidium in March 1926, on the understanding that it would rally, group and organise all the Communist forces existing in Korea.

In Cuba, the Communist Group which has been working several years, has become a Communist Party. It has been active in the labour movement and has worked consistently for the unification of the trade union movement. By its revolutionary action it has drawn upon itself repressive measures and white terror on the part of the government of Cuba which is in the pay of Yankee imperialism. At the VIII. Plenum of the Executive, the C. P. of Cuba was admitted provisionally as member of the Communist International by a decision of the Plenum.

The VIII. Plenum of the Executive also decided to recognise the Workers' League of Ireland as the only Section of the C. I. in that country, and enjoined it to become as soon as possible a Communist Party, (Section of the Communist International).

In New Zealand, the Communist organisation was for several years attached to the Communist Party of Australia. But this Communist organisation has developed into a Party which has gained new forces and now asks the VI. World Congress for affiliation to the Communist International as an independent section.

In Paraguay, a Communist group has existed since 1922. It has grown and developed and has gained influence in the

ranks of the working class and in peasant circles. A few months ago it constituted itself as a Communist Party. This Party is still weak ideologically and organically, but it is asking for affiliation to the Communist International and also for the support of the C. I. in its further development.

In Colombia, a labour movement has developed during the last years at the initiative of the American Federation of Labour and the Government of Colombia. This movement has held several congresses. At first these Congresses were entirely under the influence of the Government of Colombia, but at the Third Workers' Congress in 1926, a Communist fraction carried with it an overwhelming majority of the congress which decided to form a social-revolutionary party. This Party embraces the whole trade union movement which is based on collective adherence of trade unions and on the organisation of the best active forces of this movement. It decided unanimously at its II. Congress, in 1927, to affiliate to the Communist International. At the end of 1927, the Social-Revolutionary Party of Colombia had two daily and ten weekly organs and had under its influence the entire working class and the organised trade union movement of Colombia. Owing to the growing propaganda and revolutionary influence of this Party the Government has been taking lately repressive measures; it has just introduced emergency laws so as to outlaw this movement and combat the Communist propaganda in Colombia.

In Ecuador, we have a somewhat similar situation. The Socialist Party of Ecuador was established in 1925, on the basis of collective adherence of trade union organisations and individual adherence of the most active elements of the labour movement. A Communist group has been working energetically in its ranks with a view to making it accept the C. I. platform of the C. I. It carries with it the mass of the workers and a considerable section of the peasantry. At the first Congress, in May 1926, it voted unanimously for adherence to the Communist International. This decision was ratified in the autumn of 1928 by a referendum of all the provincial organisations of the Party.

The Standing Orders Committee of the Congress, having examined and verified the demands for affiliation on the part of these various parties, proposes to the congress the following resolution:

## RESOLUTION ON THE AFFILIATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF CUBA, KOREA, NEW ZEALAND AND PARAGUAY, OF THE IRISH WORKERS LEAGUE, THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF ECUADOR AND THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONARY PARTY OF COLOMBIA TO THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

The growth of influence of the Communist International in the colonies and semi-colonies has found organisational expression in the rise of new Communist Parties and in the affiliation of revolutionary workers' Parties to the International.

The VI. World Congress welcomes the formation and affiliation of these new Sections to the Communist International as further proof of the confidence the workers and peasant masses and the oppressed peoples have in the Communist International and in its leadership in the struggle against colonial oppression, and as a confirmation of the truly world character of its work.

The VI. World Congress therefore endorses the decisions taken by the Executive Committee in the period between the V. and the VI. World Congress concerning the admission as sections of the C. I.,

of the Communist Party of Korea,  
of the Communist Party of Cuba,  
of the Irish Workers League,

and furthermore resolves to admit to affiliation to the Communist International the Communist Party of New Zealand and the Communist Party of Paraguay.

The decision to affiliate to the C. I. taken by the last Congress of the Socialist Party of Ecuador and endorsed by a referendum of the organisations throughout the country and a similar decision taken unanimously by the last Congress of the Socialist Revolutionary Party of Colombia, demonstrate the determination of the mass of the workers of these two countries to fight under the banner of the Communist International, as the only leader of the international revolutionary movement.

The VI. World Congress also welcomes their decision to affiliate to the C. I. as an expression of the revolutionary enthusiasm of the oppressed masses of these countries in the fight under the banner of the Communist International, which alone is able to help and guide them in their striving towards

liberation, and as an expression of the firm determination of these mass parties to become genuine Bolshevik parties. The VI. World Congress accepts the Socialist Party of Ecuador and the Socialist Revolutionary Party of Colombia as Sections of the C. I., but, in view of the fact that neither of these mass parties are as yet genuine Communist Parties in their organisational structure and in ideology, the Congress instructs the Executive Committee to give these Parties the necessary direction, advice and help to enable them to become genuine Communist Parties by changing the form of and consolidating their organisation, by raising their ideological level and by increasing their class consciousness. At the same time the mass character of these parties must be preserved and even strengthened.

By admitting these seven new Sections the Communist International is able to establish closer contact with additional millions of workers and peasants in countries exploited and oppressed by the brigands of imperialism.

By co-ordinating the struggle of these workers and peasants with that of the proletariat in the imperialist home countries, with that of the workers and peasants and the emancipated nations in the U. S. S. R. and of the millions of colonial slaves, the Communist International develops and organises on an ever increasing scale the revolutionary solidarity of all the oppressed, which is the necessary pre-condition for their victory over the bourgeoisie and imperialists the world over

\* \* \*

The Congress adopts the resolution **unanimously**.

\* \* \*

On behalf of the newly admitted South American Parties,

**Comrade PAREDES (Ecuador)**

expresses the satisfaction of the delegations and declares that the new Parties will join in the struggle of the world proletariat. The Sections of Ecuador and Colombia will pursue the path of Bolshevism under the leadership of the Communist International.

# Report of the Commission for the Preparation of an International Action against War.

## Speech of Comrade Bell:

During this Congress the question of war has occupied the central part in all our discussions. In the discussion on the international situation, on the programme, the question of war has occupied a prominent place. In our war thesis, the practical lines of activity have been laid down for the conduct of the general struggle against imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, and for support of the colonial countries.

In these circumstances, we are face to face with a situation in which the imperialists, with their lackeys of the Second International, are united in new preparations for war against the Soviet Union.

In our discussions on the war thesis during the Congress, we have underlined the fact that many of our Parties are still

very weak in the conduct of their anti-war work. I believe that this VI. Congress should mark the end of the indifference and apathy of many of our Parties, and that we should go from this Congress with a firm determination to do more in our own countries, and on an international scale to prepare the workers for the defence of the proletarian revolution against the imperialists, to fight against the imperialist war and to prepare for the world revolution. The presidium therefore proposes a resolution for the preparation of an international action against war. (He reads the resolution the text of which we will publish in a special edition together with the war theses. Editor of the "Inprecorr".)

The resolution was **adopted unanimously**.

## Election of the E. C. C. I. and of the I. C. C.

Comrade THOREZ (France):

After careful examination of the proposals of individual delegations, the Presidium proposes the following composition of the new E. C. C. I. and I. C. C.:

Members of the E. C. C. I.

Americo-Ledo, Barbé, Bell, Blenkle, Boshkovitch, Bukharin, Campbell, Carillo, Cioldo, Chitarov, Dengel, Ercoli, Ferdi, Fermin - Araya, Foster, Furubotn, Gomez, Gottwald, Hsing, Humbert-Droz, Jaquemotte, Jilek, Katayama, Kato, Kilboom, Kolarov Kopenig, Bela Kun, Kuusinen, Lensky, Li Kuang, Lozovsky, Lovestone, Manner, Manuilsky, Mitzkevitch, Molotov, Musso, Pieck, Piatnitsky, Popescu, Prukhnjak, Remmele, Rust, Rykov, Samuelson, Sénard, Serra, Skrypnik, Smeral, Spector, Stalin, Sypheios, Thälman, Thorez, Thaterdje, Tzui Vito, Wieser, Clara Zetkin.

Candidates to Membership in the E. C. C. I.

Assano, Billoux, Boshnitch, Darsono, Dimitrov, Doriot, Ewert, Frachon, Garlandi, Gitlow, Gyptner, Guan Li, Gussev,

Hansen, Heckert, Horner, Huiswood, Yaroslavsky, Kavanagh, Lopez, Lovitzky, Malakka, Moirova, Monmousseau, Naorodji, Pascal, Pollit, Purmann, Guilio Riasco, Schneller, Silen, Sokolik, Tolgersen, Chang Pyao, Shauki, Chen-Kuang, Turni, Ulbricht, Varga, Vertchik, De Visser, Zapototsky.

International Control Commission.

Angaretis, Anwelt, Cachin, Codovilla, Eberlein, Flieg, Gorkic, Hsu-Yuen, Iskrov, F. Kohn, Maggi, Mondok, Murphy, Shargi, Sirola, Soltz, Stefanescu, Stutchka, Cheng Chen, Weiß, Weinstone, Tzakhaya.

(Voting takes place.)

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

I declare the E. C. C. I. and also the International Control Commission elected unanimously.

We are coming now to Comrade Bukharin's concluding speech and the Manifesto of the VI World Congress.

## Comrade Bukharin's Closing Speech.

Comrades, we have come to the end of the work of the VI Congress of the Comintern. We certainly can say that it has been a "long Parliament" of revolutionary Communism. But our work has been real work, and a work extremely useful for the further development of revolutionary Communism. At this Congress, perhaps more than at any one of the past Congresses of the Comintern, we had a general review of all forces of the international Communist movement. If during the period of the Second International discussions at the Congresses usually amounted to speeches of the most prominent leaders from a few so-called "advanced", i. e., imperialist countries, the toiling masses of the entire world have seen at our Congress and on its tribune, representatives, leaders and fighters of the revolutionary proletariat from literally all countries of the world. From the largest, the most powerful, the most ruthless and most "civilised" countries to the remotest, most suppressed colonies whose peoples only now are entering the arena of history. From the powerful strongholds of capitalist development to the remotest corners of our planet, from all these places there came to our Congress representatives of the revolutionary working class and of the toiling masses. And they all took the liveliest and most active part in the work of our Congress. The questions which we had on the agenda were questions of an extraordinary scale, of an extraordinary significance, of an extraordinary dimension. The question of the Programme of the Comintern alone, the adoption of which represents a historical turning point in the development of the international working class this question alone is so extraordinary, and at the same time so all-embracing and difficult, — that this question alone would have justified the convening of a Congress of the Comintern. This question alone, could have provided material for the labours of an entire Congress.

In the history of our movement, if we should consider it not only from the specific point of view of the history of the Comintern, but in the history of the international revolutionary movement of the working class in general, the adoption of a programme which is a law to the great number of our Sections, for millions of proletarians who march under our revolutionary banner, — the adoption of this document will probably represent a whole epoch.

The fact alone, that the Comintern was able — even if after a very considerable preparatory period, after a great amount of effort, after a number of not quite successful attempts — to elaborate and accept finally its international programme, this fact in itself expresses and manifests a great external and internal growth of our movement. The external growth of our movement is shown in that we worked out our Programme Draft at this Congress, in the process of long collective work, with the participation of representatives of the most varied detachments of the great international revolutionary army. The internal growth — in that our discussion, as well as the entire work of this Congress, revealed an undubitably, unquestionably large ideological growth of our movement.

If we compare the work done by us in this question at the IV. and V. Congresses with the enormous work which we accomplished at this Congress, we can see the big change which has occurred not only from the point of view of the amount of work, but also from the point of view of the quality of the work. In the remotest corners of the earths, in the Communist Parties recently formed or now in the process of being formed, in the distant colonial periphery of our movement, tens of thousands of miles away from industrial centres — we see how the ideas of Marxism and Leninism are penetrating the profoundest depths of the working class, embracing certain circles of the revolutionary peasantry, forming the spiritual and ideological axis of the Communist movement growing throughout the world.

At this Congress we had to draw the balance of an entire big historical period in the development of our movement, for during the few years which passed since the V. Congress, the whole world, the imperialist countries as well as the colonial sector of the world economy and the powerful State of the working class — the proletarian dictatorship of our country, have lived through a great deal.

Not without debates and not without discussion, which is a sign of growth and of the active life of our great Communist organism, did we finally arrive at a unanimous estimate of the historical period in which we are living. We had to weigh carefully on the scales of Marxist analysis what was called in the adopted resolution "the third period" in the de-

velopment of the world capitalist crisis. We tried — and we think that we succeeded in this with the help of collective efforts — to weigh and to analyse on the basis of an exact Marxist analysis all those peculiarities which mark the present historical period. We weighed and evaluated the new technical development which raises the productive forces of capitalism; we weighed and evaluated the new organisational form of capitalism; we gave an exact evaluation of the specific period of capitalist stabilisation through which we are now passing; we gave an exact evaluation of what, in everyday language, is called the “negative sides” of this stabilisation, and what we call in our language the imperative course in the development of the contradictions of this stabilisation. Out of a number of facts we disclosed the fundamental tendencies of development; we stated the general sharpening of the class struggle. All this confirms the fact that new and new human cadres will march out to the battlefield and will finally put an end not only to the development of the capitalist society, but to the capitalist society itself. We evaluated the numerous, growing, strange, and sharp contradictions of the present development. In our resolutions, in our decisions we created a firm ground for our tactical line of a revolutionary war to the death with the capitalist regime.

We had before us the task to deal in the light of these fundamental tendencies with the question which is the clue to the present situation — the question of war. More than once has the Comintern discussed this question of war. The Comintern itself is a child of war — it was born in the storm of the first big imperialist war and of the beginning revolutionary crisis of capitalism. It is not a child of the old, decayed, stabilised epoch of pre-imperialist development. It is a product of an epoch which is filled with storm. The Comintern will have to put this question again in the future and, probably, in a more concrete way than it was put at this Congress. But, comrades, this time also we had to put this question of war danger not “eventually” but from the point of view of a specific entourage which is being created now. The world-wide war preparations, the present war in China, the mobilisation of armed imperialist forces for the future fight between imperialist States, for an offensive against the Soviet Union — all this finds place now under the cover of, in its dimensions, the most extraordinary ideological fraud. Never before were there so many plans, official declarations, affirmations of “peace”, “peace projects”. Never before did the pacifist phrases pervade the cities and villages of the whole world as they do now. And never before has the thoroughly rotten, bigoted, hypocritical, lying and false pacifist ideology been spread as energetically by the official heralds of imperialism as it is being done now, when imperialism is doing all it can in order to let loose the storm of a new imperialist war. And never before was this pacifist lie, which is being used as a screen for the imperialist war preparations, covered up with so much insistence, energy, and even cynical frankness by the imperialist agency among the working class — the Social Democratic Parties.

This is why we had to treat the war problem in specific conditions; to solve it from the point of view of that specific historical period which we have now entered; and, as in a number of other questions, we had to sharpen the war problem also from the point of view of a direct fight against imperialism, as well as against its even stronger agent — Social Democracy; this latter we have to break down, to put an end to it, because it is only over its corpse that the working class will be able to come to a victorious Communist revolution.

Comrades, we had before us the Colonial Question, but there is a great difference between the way in which we discussed this problem at our past congresses — even at the II. Congress under the direct leadership of Lenin — and the present situation. Many questions of our work in the colonies are now seen in a different light. During this period our international revolutionary movement on this colonial sector lived through immense, titanic events; our horizon widened enormously, the parties which were, are now, or are soon going to be in the fire of bitter class battles in the colonies or in a direct battle with foreign imperialism, have gained such immense experience that we were obliged to bring up and to solve a number of new questions.

The Chinese Revolution and the Insurrection in Indonesia, alone placed before us a number of new problems. And if previously we took up the colonial problems as very general problems, without any detailed examination; if previously we drew the most general, approximate plan of our strategy and tactical line in the colonies — the events of the Chinese Revolution before all brought out a number of concrete, more detailed questions, strategical as well as tactical. And it was the task of our Congress to take into consideration this really tremendous experience.

Finally, comrades, at this Congress, we had to draw, I hope, the last line on that page of our inner history which can be called the Trotskyist crisis in the Comintern.

At the V. Congress we had to bring up this question, but since then it had grown into a very important problem for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. as well as for the entire Comintern. Very long ago, in one of his fragmentary passages, the great prophet of scientific Communism and its creator, Marx, wrote that finally the real development of revolutionary Communism will start only when in one country the working class will seize political power, and the entire international movement will have its most firm powerful foundation. The international Communist movement has obtained this foundation in the form of the proletarian dictatorship in the land of former Tsarist tyranny.

But, comrades, if on one side the international labour movement and the revolutions in the colonial countries have here a powerful support, it is, however, perfectly clear that all shakings and unsteadiness in the basic party framework in the very foundation of the international labour movement inevitably affects the whole system of our movement, the entire international Communist army. The Parties passed through this crisis not without convulsions, pain and friction. The sound instinct of the working class, the sound instinct of its Communist vanguard which has to face now the perspectives of great decisive battles, this instinct of class unity, of the necessity of unity above all in the Communist ranks — this has had the effect that the Trotskyist opposition was absolutely destroyed here, and that it almost at the same time collapsed in all other parties which drove out of their midst the former objective helpers of the Social Democracy.

The Congress summarised all this. We have lost a number of our former comrades, and the list mentioned in Comrade Kolarov's speech and the vote passed on it mean the political death of these people.

We do not know whether they are destined to rise again. If it should prove so, we certainly will not regret it. Quite the contrary. But at the same time we are glad to state that, while having lost a number of individuals, we have gained a number of new parties; we have won new collectives in Korea and New Zealand, in Ireland, Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador, Colombia. We won important new detachments of fighting comrades and we enter the coming period with new strength, with a new powerful conviction of our final victory.

Comrades, in summarising the work of our Congress, we can say: Our day will come. It must come. The time has passed already when the Social Democratic prophets of capitalist stabilisation could prophesy the collapse of our Party. Our Parties are being hardened and tempered on the anvil of world history; they are becoming more and more compact. They are developing gradually into powerful factors in political life. And if the international bourgeoisie should attempt — and it probably will do so, its whole attitude indicates this — to lead against us all its serfs, if it resorts to arms, if it plunges humanity into a new war, if it endangers the existence of the Soviet Union, — it will thereby hazard its own historical existence — that is our absolutely deep conviction and absolutely firm hope.

\* \* \*

Many years have already passed since the first imperialist war, and the Soviet Union counts already more than ten years of its existence. The Comintern, created in 1919, will soon also celebrate its tenth anniversary. And if we now compare the forces which we possessed at the time of the first imperialist war, the small groups, sometimes even individual comrades who marched under the banner of revolution — with

the great detachments of the international revolutionary movement which follow the Comintern, we can say with full conviction: we are now unvanquishable. Never, not for a second, are we afraid of any attacks against us, because we know that our strength has grown immensely during this period, that our cause is an historically progressive cause, that our class is the bearer of the greatest historical mission, that our class is the class which will win the power in the entire world. It has nothing to lose but its chains, and it will win a whole world! (Tremendous applause, delegates rise and sing the "International").

\* \* \*

Comrades, in the name of the Presidium of the present Congress, I propose to adopt at this plenum of the Congress the manifesto of the VI. Congress. It is addressed to: "The workers of the whole world, to all toiling peasants, to the suppressed peoples of the colonies, to the soldiers and sailors of the capitalist armies." (Reads the manifesto. Applause. All delegates rise and sing the "International").

\* \* \*

Comrades, I propose to take the vote on the text of the manifesto. Who is for the text of the manifesto of the VI. Con-

gress of the Comintern brought in the name of the Presidium? (Applause.) Who is against? Who abstains from voting?

The manifesto of the VI. Congress of the Comintern to all workers of the world, to all toiling peasants, to the oppressed peoples of the colonies, to the soldiers and sailors of the capitalist armies, is **adopted unanimously.** (Applause.)

\* \* \*

Comrades, in closing the Congress and in thanking all the co-workers who have accomplished a great deal of work here, in thanking the entire apparatus in the name of the Presidium and in the name of the Congress, — permit me to wish to all our comrades in our Parties a most successful struggle in Europe as well as in America, and in all other parts of the world, where our banner is raised high already and where it has to rise still higher. Our task is to break the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to achieve a **final world victory of the working class.**

**I declare the VI. Congress closed.** (Stormy and prolonged applause. The delegates sing the "International" and other revolutionary songs.)

---

#### TO OUR READERS!

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

England . . . . .	2 sh.
Germany . . . . .	1.50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 sh.
Norway . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R. . . . .	1 rouble

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

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 subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager.