

THE
SECOND CONGRESS
OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Proceedings of Petrograd Session
of July 17th, and of Moscow Sessions
of July 19th - August 7th, 1920

Publishing Office of the Communist International,
America, 1921.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

The Second Congress of the Communist International met in Russia at a time when she was in a state of war, and cut off from all other countries by the blockade. The difficulties arising out of such a situation told on the preparation of the stenographic reports now offered to the public.

In consequence of the complete isolation of Russia from the rest of the world, it was impossible to get in time a sufficient staff with a proper mastery of languages, and in particular of German, French and English, to take part in the work of the Congress. And so it happened that there were only two German stenographers, one French, and no English at all. This was the reason for the deplorable delay in bringing out this report. The transcription- from the shorthand notes alone has claimed two months' time.

By the time the work of editing commenced, most of the delegates had already gone. It was found that the text was in many places mutilated, and that there were many omissions – quotations by the speakers from the theses, from newspapers and books, amendments introduced, were missing altogether – and finally many speeches, particularly those delivered in English, were only in the German or French translation. To make the text read sense required a great deal of time. A whole number of omissions and gaps could not be reconstructed at all.

Our main attention was concentrated on bringing out a reliable text with all possible speed. The translation into English was done by different people with a varying mastery of the language. Style, form, and language had to be sacrificed accordingly.

We hope and wish that the next Congress of the Communist. International will take place under more favourable conditions, with a better organisation of the technical side, so that the next report may appear in better form than the present one.

Moscow, December, 1920.

Concerning the Convocation of the Second World Congress of the Communist International.

To all Communist Parties and Groups, to all Red Trade Unions, all Organisations of Communist Women, all Unions of Communist Youth, all Labour Organisations adhering to Communism, and to all honest workers:

Comrades, the Executive Committee of the Communist International has decided:

To convene the Second Congress of the Communist International in Moscow on the 15th of July, 1920.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has drawn up the following provisional agenda for the Second Congress:

1. – Report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.
2. – Reports of the representatives of different countries. The reports are to be submitted in written form.
3. – The actual world political situation and. the tasks of the Communist International.
4. – The question of Parliamentarism.
5. – Trade Unions and Shop Committees.
6. – The role and structure of the Communist Party before and after the workers have, won State power.
7. – The National and Colonial question.
8. – The Agrarian question.
9. – Attitude towards the new tendencies of the “Centre,” its pretence of accepting the Communist platform, and the conditions of joining the Third International.
10. – Constitution of the Communist International,
11. – The question of organisation (legal and illegal organisations, women's organisations, etc.).
12. – The Young Communist movement.
13. – Elections.
14. – Other business.

All the Communist Parties, groups, and Trade Unions which have officially joined the Communist International, and have been recognised by the latter's Executive Committee, are invited to participate in the Congress with a decisive vote.

All groups and organisations adhering to the Communist International, but in opposition to the official affiliated Communist Parties, are also invited to the Congress, which will decide the status of such groups.

Further, all groups of revolutionary Syndicalists, unions of the Industrial Workers of the World and other such organisations, are also invited, and the Executive Committee will enter into relations with them.

The Leagues of Communist Youth shall be represented, not only by the Central Committee of the Young Communist International, but also by the Communist organisations of all the different countries.

In connection with the forthcoming Congress, it is proposed to convene an international

conference of Communist Women, and an international conference of the Leagues of Communist Youth.

Also, if it is at all possible, it would be well to hold a first international conference of revolutionary Trade Unions.

All parties and organisations are invited to send the greatest possible number of delegates to the Congress. (The question of the number of decisive votes at the Congress will be settled, of course, without reference to the number of delegates.)

The Executive Committee of the Communist International strongly insists upon the condition that every Communist Party sending its delegates to the Congress, shall be bound to appoint one of its delegates as permanent representative of the Party on the Executive Committee of the Communist International, so that such representative may reside in Russia for a considerable time.

From the above outline it may be seen that the meeting will deal with most important problems which are now awaiting the decision of the Communist workers of the whole world. The rapid spread of Communist ideas compels us to hasten the convocation of the Congress, which will be able to give clear and precise answers to the workers of all countries as to the questions stated in the agenda, which demand immediate solution.

The First Congress of the Communist International raised the banner of Communism. At this moment millions and millions of workers in every country are followers of this banner. The question is no longer one of the propagation of Communist ideas; the time has now come for the organisation of the Communist workers and a direct struggle for the Communist Revolution.

The Second International has collapsed like a house of cards. The efforts of several "Socialist" diplomats to create a new bastard International, standing between the Second and Third International, are simply laughable, and meet with no support on the part of the workers. Divided one from another by military censorship, martial law, the calumnious campaign of the yellow Social Democrats and the capitalist press, the working men of the whole world are nevertheless stretching out their hands one to the other. During its short existence of little more than a year, the Communist International has won a decisive moral victory among the labour masses of the world. Millions and millions of workers are yearning to join us, the honest international association of workers, which is called the Third International.

Then let those workers compel their parties and organisations to make a choice once and for all. Let them put an end to the unworthy game which is being played by some of the old diplomatic "leaders" who are attempting to keep their parties from joining the Communist International.

Especially let the members of Trade Unions which formerly belonged to the "White Guard International organised in Amsterdam by the agents of capital – Legien, Albert Thomas and others – force their organisations to break with the betrayers of the workers' cause and send their delegates to the Congress of the Communist International.

Let the coming Second Congress, of the 15th of July, really be a world gathering of real revolutionists, believers in the true Communist programme and revolutionary Communist tactics.

Let the agenda proposed by the Executive Committee be discussed by every workers' organisation, every gathering of working people. Let the workers themselves propose their own resolutions concerning each of the proposed questions. Let the whole Communist press give up its pages during the next weeks to the discussion of these most important

problems. Start the preparatory work in real earnest. Only in such case will our Congress be able to summarise the experience of the intelligent workers of the world, and give voice to the actual will of the Communist workers of all countries.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International sends fraternal greetings to the workers of all the world, and calls to them to join the ranks of their brotherhood.

Long live the International Communist Workers' Association!

Long live the Third International!

With Communist greetings,

G. ZINOVIEV, President of the Executive Committee of
the Communist International.

K. RADEK, Secretary of the Executive Committee of
the Communist International.

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

Petrograd, July 17, 1920.

ZINOVIEV. – Comrades, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist International I declare the Second World Congress of the Communist International open. (Long, stormy applause, shouts of “Hurrah”; the International is played.) Comrades, our first words, the words of those workers who have assembled here, should be dedicated to the memory of our best friends and leaders who have perished in the cause of the Communist International. You are well aware of the fact that during this past year there is no country where the blood of Communist workers and of the best leaders of the working class has not been freely shed. It is sufficient to remember the names of our Hungarian friends, it is sufficient to remember such comrades as Levine, Tibor Samuelli and Jogiches, and many others who joined the revolutionaries who have fallen during the German and Hungarian revolutions. In Finland, Esthonia, Hungary and other countries hundreds of thousands of the best sons of the working class have perished during this time. In opening the congress we first of all do honour to the memory of those of our best men who have perished in the cause of the Communist International.

In honour of the fallen comrades I propose that the entire Congress rise. (All stand up. The orchestra plays the Funeral March.)

Furthermore, *we* remember to-day all our comrades who at the present time are sitting in the prisons of the various bourgeois republics. We remember our French friends, Loriot, Monatte, and a number of other comrades who have been thrown in prison shortly before this Congress. We send greetings to all those many fighters of the workers’ revolution who are now languishing in German, Hungarian, French, English, and American prisons. We fraternally shake by the hand the American Communist workers, who have been particularly cruelly persecuted during the past year. The American bourgeoisie is subjecting all Communists and revolutionaries generally to privation and starvation. Our friends can obtain no work there; they are in every way deprived of freedom. There is hardly any form of cruelty which the American bourgeoisie has failed to apply to those workers, who are working in the ranks *at* the Communist movement, or in the I.W.W., or other revolutionary organisations which follow the same road as the Communist International.

We expressed our firmest conviction that the words which were uttered not long ago by one of our French comrades, after the arrest of Loriot, Monatte and others, are being justified. This comrade said: “We are living through a period when the ruling bourgeoisie, the democrats, and the so-called Socialists throw into prison the best leaders of the Communist movement; but we are convinced that the tables will shortly be turned, and those who now form part of the bourgeois governments will be put in prison by the working class, whilst those who are now ⁱⁿ in prison will to-morrow be at the head of the Government.” (Applause.)

Comrades, the Communist International was established only one year and a quarter ago. It is quite natural that from the very start it was obliged to cross swords with the Second International with which we entered into an open struggle. In the face of to-day’s Congress, which has become a world Congress in the fullest sense of the word, in the face of the fact that there are here representatives of the whole of Europe as well as of America, both our friends and our enemies must recognise that our struggle against the Second International has been crowned by success. To-day we have a perfect right to

declare that the Second International has been completely defeated by the Third Communist International. (Stormy applause.)

What does this fact signify? What does it mean – that we have defeated the Second International? The struggle between us and the Second International is not a struggle between two fractions of one and the same revolutionary proletarian movement, it is not a struggle of conflicting views, not a struggle of tendencies within a single class; it is actually a struggle of classes. It is true that in the ranks of the Second International there are a large number of our class brothers. Nevertheless, our struggle with the Second International is not a struggle of fractions within a single class, but something much greater.

The failure of the Second International reflects the failure of the bourgeois system-itself. Here is where the gist of the matter lies. The reason of our victory over the Second International is that the twilight of the gods of capitalism has set in. The reason of our victory over the Second International is that the bourgeoisie of the whole world was not and is not capable of averting the consequences of the Imperialist war. The reason of our victory over the Second International is that the League of Nations and the entire Entente bourgeoisie are quite powerless to do anything serious towards the re-establishment of the economic life of Europe. The reason of our victory over the Second International is that the bourgeoisie had proved powerless to cope with those tasks which so imperatively confront it, unless it is ready, in an historical sense, to resign its position.

The Second International united its fate with that of the bourgeoisie at the very beginning of the war in 1914. The social patriots of every country supported their own respective bourgeoisie and their own respective fatherland.

This was the state of things until the very end of the war. And, at the end of the war, the Second International once again united its fate with that of the bourgeoisie, this time mainly with that group of bourgeois countries which had been victorious in the Imperialist war.

You remember the first attempt at the re-establishment of the Second International after the Imperialist slaughter had begun. You remember the conferences at Berne and at Lucerne, at which the so-called leading section of the Second International made every kind of attempt to establish “close relations” with the League of Nations. The leaders of the reviving Second International hung on to the coat-tails of President Wilson. You will recollect, comrades, that at the Berne Conference, at its opening of the Second International, the president greeted Wilson and ranked him with Jaures, hurling an insult in this manner at the memory of our dead tribune of the French workers. The Second International intended at the end of the war to unite its fate with the bourgeoisie, with that part of the bourgeoisie regarding which the Second International supposed, as the fable has it, that there is no more terrible animal than the cat – that is to say the League of Nations. This was its desire. That was the reason why those blows which the international working class and the Third International dealt the bourgeoisie were fully reflected in the Second International. The Second Yellow International has united its fate inseparably with the class which is perishing before our very eyes.

That is the reason why our victory over the Second International is so significant. We repeat, this is not the victory of one fraction of the labour movement over another, this is not the victory of one party over another; no, there is something of much profounder importance here: **every organisation which attempts to unite its fate with the bourgeois class is doomed to perish.** This is the historical meaning of the victory of the

Communist International over the Second International. The working class is a young class, its star is rising. It is acquiring power. Whereas the bourgeoisie, choking with the blood of the working class – its star is on the wane. It is decaying and collapsing. And, just as a dying man clings to the living, just so is the bourgeoisie clinging to the half-alive Second International, and stifling it in its terrible embrace. The two are dying before our eyes. Both the bourgeoisie and its agency, the Yellow International, are nearing this (historically speaking one year is no more than a minute); we may say that the two are in their death agony. Soon the earth will be cleared of the bourgeois yoke of all those organisations which kept the working class in spiritual captivity. Soon our International Association of Workers will be able peacefully to begin the construction of a new world, founded on the fraternal basis of Communism.

Comrades, within this year the idea of “democracy” has withered before our eyes, and at the present moment is living its last days. The most important document of the First Constituent Conference of the Communist International, as well as the most important document of the Communist movement of the recent years generally, I consider the theses on the part played by bourgeois democracy, which were passed at the last Congress. These theses have made the round of the whole world. The workers of the whole world, the class-conscious part of the peasantry and of the soldiers, have made a study of them. And the course of events, during these fifteen or sixteen months, took good care that the correctness of the analysis made by the First Congress of the Communist International, and of its appreciation of bourgeois democracy, as dealt with in these theses, should be justified at every step. When the American bourgeoisie, before the whole world, repealed all its own laws, all its constitutional guarantees for the working class – things reached such a state where the Socialists, elected in accordance with the acts of Congress, and on the basis of legal regulations, were nevertheless not allowed in parliament, but were thrown in prison – when such a classically bourgeois democratic country as America violated at every step the principles of democracy, it clearly proved how correct was the Communist International in all its programmes and theses which state the actual historical role of so-called democracy.

Comrades, we are here at a truly World Congress of the Communist International. The fighting advance-guard of the workers of the whole world are represented. We shall put a number of questions before the World Congress, questions which are at the present time debated within the ranks of the Communist movement. We have attracted to the Congress a number of labour organisations which are as yet not quite Communist organisations, but are in the process of being crystallised. The International position of the working class, after the long war and the most desperate crises, is such that in places the labour organisations stand at the cross roads; we may say that their voice is just forming, as is the case with youth; they have not as yet fully decided upon a tactic, they have not as yet selected their way. We have invited for common work all those labour organisations with regard to which we are convinced that they are honestly willing to struggle against capitalism. We shall speak to them as brothers in the struggle and in the common suffering as to brothers belonging to the same class; who are together with us, ready to sacrifice their lives for the cause of the emancipation of the working class. We are not going to be like the Second International, which was only able to persecute and to ridicule revolutionary workers who dared to think differently from them; the Second International, which may be said to have been a double-faced Janus – with a sweet smile on the right and a face showing furious fangs on the left. We are profoundly convinced – life teaches us

– that the Imperialist war has taught the workers a great deal. The honest revolutionary elements of Syndicalism, Anarchism, Industrialism, and the Shop Steward movement will join and are joining with the Communist movement. It is our business to help them to do so as soon as possible.

On the other hand, there are present at this Congress representatives of the German Independent Social Democratic Party, the French Socialist Party, the American Socialist Party – this latter has only recently left the ranks of the Second International – and we hereby state that we desire to form a Communist union with all honest revolutionary workers who are still in the ranks of the Second International.

Comrades, you know that with the strengthening and growth of the Third International, about ten large parties – there is no need to enumerate them – have left the ranks of the Second International. At the present moment a new stage is beginning. We see that old parties not only leave the ranks of the Second International, but make direct attempts to join the Third International. A number of representatives of these parties, as I have already mentioned, are present here. The Communist Congress will deal frankly with all pressing questions in the presence of the German and French workers. The Communist Congress will in no case permit in the least degree any ideological falseness, and refuses to make even the least compromise as to principle. The radical questions of the proletarian revolution must be presented in the most crucial form. What we want is clarity, and clarity again and again. We shall not allow the Third International to become a fashion and nothing more. The questions which are to be discussed interest millions of workers. We shall present to the German workers, to the French workers who form the French Socialist Party, our views upon all the pressing questions of the day. We shall wait until the great majority of the French and German workers clear their ranks of all undesirable elements and join the ranks of the Communist International, so that there should not be the least ground for suspicion that they are so much mere ballast for the Communist International, but join us for the express purpose of putting up together with us a firm struggle against the bourgeoisie.

We intend to submit to the present Congress the Constitution of the Communist International. It is our opinion that, just as in every individual country, for the purpose of defeating the bourgeoisie, it is indispensable first of all to have a centralised, welded, powerful party, just so is it necessary to attain such a complete centralisation on an International scale. We are carrying on a fight against the bourgeoisie, against a whole world of enemies armed to the teeth, and we must possess an iron international proletarian organisation, which will be capable of defeating its enemy everywhere, which will be able to afford the maximum of assistance to each one of its detachments, a centralisation which will elaborate forms of organisation which should be the most powerful, flexible, and mobile, so as to be fully provided against the enemy whom we are fighting. In the draft of the Constitution of the Communist International we quote a phrase out of the Constitution of the First International Association of Workers whose leaders were Marx and Engels. In this Constitution Marx and Engels said: “If up to the present time the struggle of the working class has not been successful, the main reason for this is the fact that the workers have lacked International solidarity, that they lacked a systematic International organisation, mutual support on an International scale.” Yes, comrades, this is an obvious truth; yet we had to wait for fifty years, we had to live through four years of bloody slaughter, to endure all the terrors which humanity has gone through during the last few years in order that this simple idea should not only become

accessible to units or individual groups, but should impregnate the working masses of the world. We are firmly convinced that at the present time this idea has become the heritage of the masses. We fully understand that for the purpose of achieving victory over the bourgeoisie it is necessary finally to realise this simple elementary idea which the First International pointed out – the First International Association of Workers, whose traditions and principles we accept in many questions in order to realise them now. There are here representatives of Petrograd working men and women who were the first to make the revolution of October, 1917. I say to them: Comrades, at Petrograd to-day a great historical event is taking place. The Second Congress of the Communist International marks a new epoch in history as soon as it was opened. Remember this day. It is a reward for all your suffering and for all the courage and manliness of your struggle. Let the present solemn moments be imprinted in your hearts.

A great and yet a simple thing has happened. What could be simpler? The workers of all countries are assembling to free themselves of the yoke of the rich. And at the same time, I ask, what can be more magnificent? The dawn of victory is approaching. Our earth shall be free. Wage slavery shall be abolished. Communism shall be victorious.

Comrades, in conclusion, I remind you that within a few months fifty years will be completed since the first great historic revolt of the European workers who had shown the right road to us and to yourselves. I am speaking of the Paris Commune. I am speaking of that heroic uprising of the Paris proletariat who, in spite of all their weakness and mistakes, which we, by the way, are making every effort to avoid, wrote a golden page in the history of the International proletarian movement and opened a road upon which at the present time millions of toilers are moving.

I will permit myself to express the wish that on the fiftieth anniversary of the Paris Commune we have a Soviet Republic in France (Loud and stormy applause.)

Comrades, in a certain article which was written directly after the Constituent Congress of the Communist International, and which was entitled, “The Perspectives of International Revolution,” I happened to say somewhat enthusiastically that it is probable that after one year we shall begin to forget that there ever had been any struggle for a Soviet Government in Europe, as that struggle will come to an end in Europe and will spread to other countries. A certain bourgeois German professor excavated this phrase, and recently I had the opportunity to read an article in which he cites this phrase, and remarks with some malice; “Well, soon there will be opened the Second Congress of the Communist International; more than a year has passed; and as it seems there is no complete victory of the Soviets in Europe.” We can calmly answer to this intellectual bourgeois that indeed we were over-enthusiastic, indeed it is likely that we shall require two and even three years before the whole of Europe becomes Soviet. But if you are so modest that you can wait for a year or for two, I can only congratulate you upon such modesty, and I assert with confidence that one year sooner or later, a little more patience, and we shall finally possess an International Soviet Republic, which will be guided by our Communist International.

Long live the working class of the world! Long live the Communist International !
(Long and stormy applause.)

OPENING OF THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL IN PETROGRAD.

ZINOVIEV – The Congress elects a presidium. Comrade Bukharin is given the platform on behalf of the Executive Committee.

BUKHARIN – The Executive Committee of the Communist International proposes the following candidates for the presidium: Levi, Germany; Rosmer, France; Serrati, Italy; Lenin and Zinoviev, Russia.

ZINOVIEV – Are there any more proposals in connection with composition of the presidium? (There are none.) The presidium is elected in the form proposed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International, as follows; Levi, Germany; Rosmer, France; Serrati, Italy; Lenin and Zinoviev, Russia.

Comrades, quite a number of organisations are anxious to greet this Congress, but we must economise time. In the name of the Executive Committee we propose to give the floor only to the representative of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, which has the happiness to-day to accept the Congress upon its territory. Comrade Kalinin, our president of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, has the floor. (Applause.)

KALININ – Comrade, In the name of the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia, I greet the Second World Congress of the Third Communist International. Comrades, members of the Communist International, I draw your attention to the fact that the Communist Party, the Bolsheviks and the Russian working class never in the past tampered with legal Parliamentarism. The last decades were years of cruel and direct struggle of the working class against Russian Tzarism. During this dark period the Communist Party, the Bolsheviks, never lost the hope that the time was not far when the workers would rally under the guidance of this party and would ultimately overthrow Russian Tzarism and the Russian bourgeoisie.

During the last three years, comrades, the Russian working class and the Russian peasants have made innumerable sacrifices; they experienced great difficulties and have evinced self-sacrifice in the struggle for the ideal of mankind. Comrades, this struggle of three years has inured the working class and the peasants of Russia, and taught them to fight in the interests of the peasants and workers. This struggle made it possible to create our glorious, unconquerable Red Army, which at the present time has dealt the enemy at the Polish front irreparable blows. Comrades, the Russian workers and the Russian peasants are being educated, better even than by books and speeches, by the struggle which is developing against the Russian bourgeoisie and international capital, in which struggle they form an ever greater part. While it was formerly necessary to explain amongst and to agitate the workers and peasants as to the necessity of overthrowing the international bourgeoisie in order to overthrow the Russian bourgeoisie – at the present moment it is obvious to every Russian working man and to every peasant that we are fighting not only against the Russian bourgeoisie, not only against the Tzarist landowners, with whom by the way we should have finished long ago had they not had at their backs and been supported by the international counter-revolution. It is therefore quite natural that at the present moment the Russian working class and the Russian peasant masses are looking up to the oppressed classes of the West and to the subjected masses of the East. They are awaiting the moment when these oppressed classes will, together with the Russian workers and the Russian peasants, throw themselves into the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. We heartily wish the Second Congress of the Third International that its opening should serve as a beginning and a pledge for the direct struggle of the oppressed classes of the East and of the West for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Long live the Second Congress of the Third International!

ZINOVIEV – The first business is the report of the Executive Committee, the second is the report of the affiliated parties. The Executive Committee has resolved to limit itself to

the distribution of written reports in connection with the first and second topics; reports in print have already been distributed by the Executive Committee. The reports of individual parties partly have been presented and partly have to be so. All the delegates will thus become acquainted with the reports in writing. We shall now deal with the third topic of the agenda, which concerns the international situation and the basic tasks of the Communist International.

COMRADE LENIN'S SPEECH.

Comrades, the theses and questions of the basic problems of the Communist International are published in all languages, and for the Russian comrades they present nothing substantially new, for they chiefly apply some basic features of our revolutionary experience and the lessons of our revolutionary movement to a whole series of Western countries, to Western Europe. Therefore I shall dwell in my report somewhat more fully, though in brief outline, on the first part of my subject, namely, the international situation.

THE LAST STAGE OF CAPITALISM.

The basis of the entire international situation, as we find it at present, is in the economic relations of imperialism. Since the beginning of the twentieth century this new stage of capitalism, the most highly developed and last stage, has become quite clear. You, of course, all know that the fact that capital has attained gigantic proportions constitutes the most characteristic and substantial feature of Imperialism. The place of free competition is taken by monopoly of stupendous proportions. A mere handful of capitalists could formerly concentrate in their hands entire branches of industry; these branches have passed into the hands of capitalist corporations, cartels, syndicates, trusts, which sometimes assume an international character. Thus with regard to finance, to rights of property, and partly to production, entire branches of industry, not only in separate countries, but throughout the world, were captured by monopoly. Upon this basis there developed a domination of a handful of the biggest banks, financial kings, financial magnates, a domination such as never was seen before; and these magnates were transforming even the freest republics into financial monarchies. Before the war this fact was openly recognised, for instance, by even such non - revolutionary writers as Lysis in France.

This domination of a handful of capitalists reached its full development when the entire world was divided by the biggest capitalists, not only in the sense of the seizure of the various sources of raw material and means of production, but also in the sense of completion of the preliminary division of colonies. Some forty years ago it was estimated that somewhat more than two hundred and fifty million of the population of the colonies was subject to six capitalist powers. Before the war of 1914 there were in the colonies already about six hundred million people, and if we add such countries as Persia, Turkey, China, which were then already reduced to a semi-colonial status, we will get in round figures one thousand million of people who were oppressed by the richest, the most civilised and freest countries through colonial dependence. And you know that besides direct dependence in point of rights, colonial dependence presupposes a whole series of dependent relations of a financial and economic character. It implies a whole series of wars which were not considered as wars, because they frequently assumed the character of a slaughter, when European and American imperialist troops, armed with the most perfect means of extermination, massacred the harmless and defenceless peoples of the

colonial countries.

THE WORLD SITUATION AFTER THE IMPERIALIST WAR.

The Imperialist war of 1914-1918 grew inevitably from this division of the whole world, from this domination of capitalist monopoly, from this unlimited power of a mere handful of the biggest banks, say, two to five in each country. The war was waged over the question of the division of the entire world. It was waged over the question as to which of the two groups of the biggest States – the British or the German – should secure the opportunity and the right of robbing, crushing, and exploiting the entire world. And you know that the war settled this question in favour of the British group. As a result of this war all capitalist contradictions have become immeasurably more acute. The war at one blow placed nearly a quarter of a milliard people in a state which is equal to that of a colony. In such a state it placed Russia, the population of which must be estimated at one hundred and twenty million, Austria-Hungary, Germany, Bulgaria, in which countries there are no less than one hundred and twenty million people. That is to say, two hundred and fifty million people in countries which (such as Germany) partly belong to the most advanced, the most enlightened countries, standing in point of technical development in the forefront of modern progress.

The war through the Versailles treaty imposed upon them such conditions that advanced peoples found themselves in the position of colonial dependents, of misery, starvation, and ruin, deprived of all rights because they are bound by the treaty for many generations and are placed in such conditions in which no civilised nation ever lived. Here you have the picture of peace after the war; no less than a thousand two hundred and fifty million people are suddenly put under a colonial yoke, are subject to exploitation by beastly capitalism which was boasting of its love for peace, and some fifty years ago had some right so to boast, so long as the world was not divided, so long as no monopoly ruled, so long as capitalism could develop comparatively peacefully without colossal military conflicts.

Now after this peaceful epoch we have a most monstrous accentuation of oppression, we see a return to colonial and military oppression, even worse than ever before. The Versailles treaty placed both Germany and a whole series of defeated states in conditions in which it is impossible economically to exist, into conditions where they are completely degraded and deprived of all rights.

How many nations have benefited by it? To answer this question you must remember that the population of the United States of America, which alone fully profited by the war, and which was transformed from a country deep in debt into a country to which everybody owes money – does not exceed one hundred million. The population of Japan, which gained very much, keeping out of the European conflict and capturing the tremendous Asiatic continent, is equal to fifty million. The population of England, which after the above countries has gained most, is also about fifty million. And if we add neutral states with a very small population, which grew rich during the war, we will get in round numbers two hundred and fifty million.

You thus get in its main features the picture of the world as it has developed after the Imperialistic war. One and a quarter billion people of the colonies, of countries which are being cut up alive, such as Persia and China, and countries which have been defeated and thrown into a status of colonial dependence. No more than two hundred and fifty million is the population of the countries which succeeded in retaining their former position, and

they all became economically dependent upon America, and were dependent in a military way all through the war, for the war engulfed the entire world. It allowed no country to remain really neutral. And we finally have no more than two hundred and fifty million of population of countries in which, of course, only those at the top, the capitalists, have benefited by the division of the world. All this makes up nearly one and three quarters billion, the entire population of the earth.

I would like to remind you of this picture of the world, of the basic contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism, which led to the revolution, the basic contradictions in the labour movement which brought us to the most cruel struggle with the Second International referred to by the Chairman – all this is connected with the division of the population of the world.

Of course it is only as a basic outline that these figures illustrate the economic picture of the world, and, comrades, it is natural that owing to such division of the population of the entire world, the exploitation of financial capital, of capitalistic monopolies has increased many times.

Not only defeated countries are reduced to the position of dependents, but within each victorious country more acute contradictions have developed – all capitalistic contradictions have become accentuated. Here are a few examples.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE VICTORIOUS COUNTRIES.

Take the national debts. We know that from 1914 to 1920 they have increased in the most important European states no less than sevenfold. I shall cite one more economic source which is now becoming particularly important. It is Keynes, the British diplomat, the author of the book, “The Economic Consequences of the Peace,” who by the instructions of his government participated in the Versailles Peace Negotiations, who observed them directly from a purely bourgeois viewpoint, who studied the matter in detail step by step, who, as an economist, participated in the conferences. He arrived at conclusions which are stronger, clearer, more instructive than any conclusion of a Communist, a revolutionist, for the conclusions are made by an avowed bourgeois, by a merciless antagonist of Bolshevism, which, being an English petty bourgeois, he pictures to himself in a distorted, ferocious, beastly form. Keynes arrived at the conclusion that Europe and the whole world with it is, as a consequence of the Versailles peace, approaching bankruptcy. Keynes, resigned, threw his book in the face of his government, and said: “You are committing an insane act.” I shall give you his figures which, in general, reduce themselves to the following.

What are the relative national debts of the chief powers? I express them in gold roubles, taking ten roubles as the equivalent of a pound sterling, and here is what we get: The United States has to its credit nineteen thousand million roubles and no indebtedness to other countries. Before the war it was in debt to England. Comrade Levi at the last Congress of the Communist Party of Germany, held April 14, 1920, justly stated in his report that only two countries remained which stand forth in the world as independent powers, Great Britain and America. Only America appears, in regard to finances, as an absolutely independent country. It was a debtor country before the war, now it is the only creditor. All the other powers of the world are in debt. Great Britain has reached the position in which she has seventeen thousand million roubles to her debit and eight thousand million roubles to her credit. She is already fifty per cent, in debt. Apart from this her credit account includes six thousand millions owed to her by Russia. The military

supplies which during the war were received by Russia are reckoned on the credit side of Great Britain. Recently, when Comrade Krassin in his capacity as representative of the Russian Soviet Government had occasion to speak with Lloyd George about an agreement with regard to repayment of loans, he made it strikingly clear to the savants and politicians, to the leaders of the British Government, that, if they expect to collect these debts too, they are greatly mistaken. And this mistake was already revealed by the British diplomat Keynes.

The question is not only, or not at all, that the Russian Government does not wish to pay the debts. No government could pay them, for these debts are usurers' profits which have already been paid twenty times over. The same bourgeois Keynes, who has no sympathy whatever for the revolutionary movement, says: "It is quite evident that these debts cannot be paid."

Concerning France, Keynes gives the following figures: Her credit account equals three and half billion, while her debit account equals ten and a half billion. And this is a country of which the Frenchmen themselves say that she is the world's banker, for her "savings" were enormous. Her colonial and financial plunder, making up a colossal sum, gave the possibility of lending thousands upon thousands of millions, especially to Russia. These loans gave her a gigantic income. But in spite of her victory, France has got into the position of a debtor.

An American bourgeois source referred to by Comrade Brown, a Communist, in his book "Who Should Pay the War Debts?" (Leipzig, 1920), sets forth the relation of the debts to the national property as follows: In the victorious countries, in England and in France, the debts form more than 50 per cent, of the national property, in Italy from 60-70 per cent, and in Russia the national debts make up 90 per cent, of the national property. But, as you know, those debts do not trouble us, for we have somewhat anticipated Keynes, and have followed his very good advice. We have annulled the debts. (Loud applause.)

Keynes, however, demonstrates the usual philistine peculiarity; in giving his advice to annul all debts he says that France, of course, would only gain by it and England would lose a very little, for there is nothing to be taken from Russia any way. America, Keynes goes on to say, would lose a good deal, but Keynes relies on "American generosity." In this respect we will have to differ from Keynes and the other bourgeois pacifists. We are of the opinion that the annulment of debts has nothing to do with the generosity of the capitalists; but something else is to be expected, and work must be done in quite another direction.

RISE IN PRICES AND DEPRECIATION OF CURRENCY. NO WAY OUT FOR CAPITALISM.

The figures above referred to are indicative of the fact that the imperialist war has made conditions unbearable even for the victorious countries. This is also manifested by the enormous difference between wages and the rise of prices. The "Supreme Economic Council," which is an institution to protect the bourgeois regime of the world against the growing revolution, passed a resolution on March 8th of this year which concludes with an appeal for thrift, orderliness, and effort, having in mind, of course, that the working men will remain the slaves of the capitalists.

This Supreme Economic Council being an institution of the Allies, representing the capitalists of the world, gives the following figures; in the United States of America prices have risen on an average one hundred and twenty per cent, while wages have gone up only

one hundred per cent. In England prices have risen one hundred and seventy per cent., and wages only one hundred and thirty per cent. In France the rise of prices amounts to three hundred per cent., and the rise in wages two hundred per cent. In Japan prices have gone up one hundred and thirty per cent., and the wage increase has been sixty per cent. I here set the figures given by Comrade Brown in his work above referred to against the figures of the "Supreme Economic Council" taken from the "Times" of March 10, 1920.

It is clear that under such conditions the indignation of the workers, the growth of revolutionary tendencies and ideas, and the growth of spontaneous mass strikes are inevitable. For the living conditions of the working people have become unendurable. They have convinced themselves that the capitalists have made excessive profits out of the war and are shifting the expenses and the debts on to the shoulders of the working people. Recently we have received a report by cable that America is about to deport to us into Russia five hundred or more Communists to rid herself of "dangerous agitators."

Should America send us not only five hundred but five hundred thousand Russian, American, Japanese, and French "agitators" matters would not change, for the disproportion between prices and wages will still remain, and nothing can be done for them. They cannot help that disproportion because private property with them is carefully guarded. They consider it sacred. It must not be forgotten that only Russia has done away with the private property of the exploiters. The capitalists can do nothing to change this discrepancy between prices and wages, and the workers cannot live under the old wage scheme. None of the old methods can alleviate this misery. No single strike, no parliamentary struggle, no voting can do anything with it, for "private property is sacred," and the capitalists have accumulated such amounts of it that the whole world is dominated by a handful of men. At the same time, the living conditions of the workers are becoming harder and harder to bear. There is no way out except by abolishing "private property" of the exploiters.

Comrade Lapinsky in his pamphlet, "England and the World Revolution," from which our "Vestnik of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs" of February, 1920, publishes valuable extracts, points out that export prices of coal in England have proved two hundred per cent, greater than those anticipated by official industrial experts.

In Lancashire matters have come to such a state that shares were quoted at four times their nominal value, and the minimum banking profit has been from forty to fifty per cent. It must be pointed out in this connection that banking officials in giving the profit of the bank know how to hide the Neatest pan of it under various disguises, calling it not straight income, but gifts, bonuses, etc., so that indisputable economic facts show that a small handful of men have enriched themselves enormously, that the extreme luxury they live in passes all limits, while the poverty of the working classes continually increases.

One must also point out in particular that circumstance which Comrade Levi has so clearly demonstrated in his report referred to above: I have in mind the change in the value of money. Money has everywhere lost its value owing to indebtedness, the issue of paper currency, etc. The same bourgeois authority, to which I have already referred, namely the declaration of the "Supreme Economic Council" of March 8th, 1920, states that the lowering of money values, taking the dollar as a unit, equals approximately one-third, in France and in Italy two-thirds, and in Germany it reaches ninety-six per cent.

This fact shows that the mechanism of capitalist economy has broken down entirely. The commercial relationships on which under capitalism the getting of raw material and the sale of finished products depend can be continued no longer; they cannot be continued

by way of subjecting a number of countries to any one country owing to the value of money. The very richest country cannot exist, cannot carry on trade because she cannot sell her finished products and cannot get any raw materials.

Thus it is that America, the richest country, dominating all others, can neither sell nor buy. The very same Keynes, who went through all the intricacies of the Versailles negotiations, is compelled to admit that such is the case in spite of all his determination to defend capitalism, in spite of all his hatred for Bolshevism. By the way, it appears to me that no Communist or revolutionary appeal could rival in force of argument those pages of Keynes where he pictures Wilson and Wilsonism in reality. Wilson was the idol of middle class pacifists of the type of Keynes, and a number of heroes of the Second International and even of the "Two and a Half" International, who worshipped the "fourteen points," and even wrote "learned books" on the "roots of Wilson's policy," hoping that Wilson was going to save the "social world," to reconcile the exploiters and the exploited and bring about social reforms. Keynes clearly showed how Wilson proved a simpleton and how all his illusions went to the winds, as soon as they came in contact with the actual business-like policy of capital in the person of Clemenceau and Lloyd George. The working masses guided by their own life experience see more and more clearly that the "roots" of the Wilson policy are nothing but clerical humbug, middle-class phraseology and utter incomprehension of the class struggle, while the learned pedants could have learnt the same thing even from the book of Keynes.

All this leads to two inevitable conclusions, two fundamental propositions. On the one hand the privation and the ruination of the masses have increased incredibly. This refers above all to the one and a quarter billion people, i.e., 70 per cent., of the population of the earth. These are the countries whose population is dependent, judicially deprived of all rights, and "mandates" over them have been given to some financial brigands. Besides this, the enslavement of the defeated countries has been established by the Versailles treaty, and by those secret treaties with regard to Russia which stipulate that we owe them so many thousands of millions. The latter treaties, it is true, are sometimes worth no more than the paper they are written on. The above represents the first time in the history of the world when the plunder, dependence, slavery, poverty and starvation of a billion and a quarter of people have been set up as a legalised system.

On the other hand, the workers in each of the victorious countries are in an unbearable position. All capitalist contradictions have become unusually acute as a result of the war. And this furnishes the ferment for the profound revolutionary movement which is constantly growing. For during the war people were put under military discipline, sent to death, or menaced with immediate military punishment. War conditions made it impossible to examine economic reality. Writers, poets, priests, and all the press devoted themselves only to apologising for the war. Now when the war is over the exposure begins. German imperialism was exposed by the Brest-Litovsk peace. Likewise the veil was taken off by the Versailles peace, which was to have been a victory for imperialism, but has proved its defeat. The Keynes case shows among other things how tens and hundreds of thousands of people from the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, from the intellectuals, above all the somewhat intelligent men, were compelled to follow the course taken by Keynes. He handed in his resignation and threw into the face of his government a book which nails it to the pillory. Keynes' case shows what is going on and what will go on in the consciences of hundreds of thousands of men, when they have understood that all that talk about "war for freedom," etc., was nothing but mere deception; that the result of the war

was the enrichment of an inconsiderable number of people, while all the rest were impoverished.

The bourgeois Keynes says that the English people, in order to save themselves and to save England's economy, must insist upon the renewal of free commercial relations between Germany and Russia. But how is this to be brought about? By means of annulling all debts, as Keynes proposes! This is the opinion not alone of the learned economist Keynes. Millions of people are coming and will come to this idea. Millions of people hear the bourgeois economists say that there is no other way out but to annul the debts, and therefore "curse the bolsheviki" (who annulled the debts) and let us resort to the "magnanimity" of America. . I am of the opinion that such an economist-agitator for Bolshevism should be handed an address of thanks by the Congress of the Communist International.

If on the one hand the economic conditions of the masses have become unbearable, and on the other hand increasing disintegration has set in among the insignificant minority of the all powerful victorious countries as illustrated by Keynes, then we have before us the ripening of both conditions making for the world revolution.

We now have before us a somewhat more definite picture of the entire world. We know now what it means to have a billion and a quarter of people depending upon a handful of rich men and put under conditions making life impossible for them. **When the constitution of the League of Nations was presented to the people and it was declared that the League had put an end to the war, and would henceforth allow no one to violate the peace, and when that document had been put into effect, it appeared as if it were the greatest victory we have won.** Before the constitution of the League of Nations had been put into effect it was said that Germany must be put under a special regime, but when the document **was** adopted (everything would be all right. But as soon as the constitution of the League of Nations was **published**, even **the most violent** opponents of Bolshevism had to repudiate it. For by that document an insignificant group, consisting of the richest nations, the "Big Four Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Orlando, and Wilson – was set up to establish new world relations; but when the machine was set going it led to complete bankruptcy. This is evident from the wars against Russia. She, a weak, ruined, exhausted country, the most backward of all countries, against the union of rich and powerful governments dominating over the whole world, has come out victorious. We could not oppose a power anywhere equal to theirs, and still we proved victorious. Why? Because there was not even a shade of unity among them, because one power was acting in opposition to the other. France wanted Russia to pay her debts and serve as a menacing force against Germany; England wanted to divide Russia. England attempted to seize the Baku petroleum and to conclude treaties with Russia's neighbours. Among the English official documents there are records enumerating with unusual carefulness all the governments (there were about 14 of them), which promised in December, 1919, to capture Moscow and Petrograd,

On these governments England based her policy, to these governments England loaned millions and millions. But all these calculations went to pieces and all the loans exploded. Such is the condition created by the League of Nations. This League of Nations agreement furnishes the best agitation for Bolshevism every day of its existence, for the mighty adherents of capitalist "order" show how they put stumbling blocks in each other's way upon every question. Japan, England, America and France are engaged in a mad fight over the division of Turkey, Russia, Mesopotamia, and China. The bourgeois press in these

countries is replete with the maddest attacks, the most bitter harangues against their “colleagues” for grabbing the prey from under each other’s nose.

Thus we witness a complete collapse among the upper layer, among the few richest countries. It is impossible for a billion and a quarter of people, making up' seventy per cent, of the population of the earth, to live in such a way as is wanted by domineering “advanced and civilised” capitalism. **One small clique of the richest countries, namely, England, America, and Japan, which had the opportunity of plundering the Eastern Asiatic countries, but have no independent financial and military power without the support of the remaining countries, were not in a position to put economic conditions into shape, and therefore carry on their policy in such a way as to frustrate the policy of their partners and colleagues in the League of Nations.** This is what makes for the world crisis. And these economic roots of the crisis are the prime causes of the splendid successes achieved by the Communist International.

THE WORLD REVOLUTION AND THE OPPORTUNISTS.

Comrades, we have now reached the question of the revolutionary crisis forming the basis of revolutionary activity. Here we must, first of all, dwell upon two widely-divergent conceptions. On the one hand, the bourgeois economists represent this crisis as mere “unrest,” using the euphemism of the English. On the other hand, some revolutionists at times try to prove that this crisis is an absolutely hopeless one.

This is erroneous. There are no conditions which can be absolutely hopeless. The conduct of the bourgeoisie is like that of a desperate robber who has lost his bearings. It is committing upon blunder, aggravating the situation and hastening its own downfall. All this is true. But one cannot “prove” that there is absolutely no possibility for the bourgeoisie to beguile this or that minority of the exploited, by means of some concession; that it cannot suppress this or that movement or crush an uprising of some fraction of the oppressed and exploited. To attempt to “prove” beforehand the “absolute” hopelessness is merely pedantry, mere play on ideas and phrases. The real “proof” in this and similar questions can be derived only from experience. The bourgeois regime all over the world is undergoing the greatest revolutionary crisis. Now the revolutionary parties must prove by actual deeds that they possess sufficient class-consciousness, sufficient power of organisation, are sufficiently in touch with the exploited masses, have enough determination and efficiency to take advantage of this crisis for a successful victorious revolution.

To get this “proof” ready is the main purpose of assembling here in the present Congress of the Communist International.

Ramsay Macdonald, the leader of the British Independent Labour Party, furnishes an example of the degree to which opportunism still prevails among the parties wishing to join the Third International, and to what extent the work of this party is remote from preparing a revolutionary class and from utilising the revolutionary crisis. In his book, “Parliament and Revolution,” devoted to the very same fundamental question which engages our attention at present, Macdonald presents the state of affairs as they would be presented by a bourgeois pacifist. He admits, that the revolutionary crisis is here, that the revolutionary mood is on the increase, that the working masses sympathise with the Soviet power and with the dictatorship of the proletariat (bear in mind that this refers to England); with the dictatorship of the proletariat rather than the present dictatorship of the present bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, Macdonald remains throughout a bourgeois pacifist

and middle-class reformer cherishing the illusion of a non-class state. Macdonald recognises the class struggle only as a figure of speech, just as do all the deceivers, sophists and pedants of the bourgeoisie. Macdonald passes over in silence the expression of Kerensky and the Mensheviki and Socialist Revolutionists in Russia, as well as the similar experience of Hungary, Germany, etc., in the matter of creating a "democratic" non-class government. Macdonald beguiles his party and those workers who have the misfortune to regard him as a Socialist and a leader by the following words: – We know that this (referring to the revolutionary ferment and the revolutionary crisis) will pass, will quiet down. The war, he says, has naturally given rise to this crisis, but once the war is over everything will become all right by and by.

Thus writes a man regarded as a leader of a party wishing to join the Third International. This furnishes an unusually frank and hence a very valuable exposure of what is no less frequently to be observed among the heads of the French Socialists, the German Independents, and the Social Democratic parties generally, namely, not an incapability but an unwillingness to utilise the revolutionary crisis in a revolutionary way. In other words, an incapability and unwillingness to carry **on** actual revolutionary propaganda in order to prepare the party **and the working class for the dictatorship of the proletariat.**

This is the fundamental evil characterising many parties which are now quitting the Second International. And this is just why, in the propositions I advanced before the present Congress, I devote special attention to the question of a most concrete and accurate definition of the problems concerning the preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

One other example. A new book against Bolshevism has appeared of late. Books of that kind are being published at present in Europe and America in unusual numbers, and the more such books are published, the stronger and the more rapidly grows the sympathy towards Bolshevism among the masses. I have in mind the work of Otto Bauer, "Bolshevism and Social Democracy." This book gives the German reader a clear conception of what Menshevism is, whose infamous role in the Russian revolution is sufficiently well understood by the working masses. Otto Bauer gives us a thoroughly Menshevist pamphlet, although he conceals his sympathy for Menshevism. But it is necessary to get a clearer conception of Menshevism in Europe and America, for this Menshevism is a generic conception comprising all the so-called Socialist, Social Democratic and similar tendencies hostile to Bolshevism. For us, Russians, it would be a dull occupation to write for the European reader about what Menshevism means. Otto Bauer has done that in his book, and we are thankful in advance to the bourgeois opportunist publishers who are going to publish that book and translate it into various languages. The book of Bauer will be a useful, though peculiar supplement to the manuals on Communism. To take any paragraph or any argument of Otto Bauer and to find out its Menshevist meaning, to discover the roots of those conceptions that lead to the practice of traitors of Socialism, of the friends of Kerensky, Scheidemann, etc., that would be a problem which could well be made use of for an "examination" to test a student's understanding of Communism. If you cannot solve such a problem, you are not a Communist, and you had better keep away from the Communist Party. (Cheers.)

Otto Bauer excellently expresses the essence of the views of the opportunists all over the world in one single phrase for which – if we had our way in Vienna – we would erect him a monument during life. "To resort to violence in the class struggle in modern

democracies.” says Otto Bauer, “would mean to violate the social factors of force.”

Perhaps you will find this rather strange and incomprehensible. This furnishes a sample of what can be done with Marxism, for what mean ends in the defence of the exploiters one can use the very theory of revolution. You can get a variety of German philistinism which will furnish you with the “theory” that “the social factors of force” mean – number, organisation, place and process of production and distribution, activity and education. When an agricultural labourer in the village or a working man in the city commits revolutionary violence toward the landlord or capitalist, this is not the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is not violence toward the exploiters and the oppressors of the people. Not at all. It is “violating the social factors of force.”

Perhaps my illustration has come out rather humorous. But such is the nature of modern opportunism, that its struggle against Bolshevism becomes ridiculous.

The most useful, the most necessary thing for America and Europe to-day is to get all the thinking elements of the working class engaged in the struggle between international Menshevism (of Macdonald, Otto Bauer and Co.) against Bolshevism.

BRIBING OF WORKERS' LEADERS. OPPORTUNISM OUR WORST ENEMY.

Here we may ask ourselves the question, why those opportunist tendencies persist in Europe, why« opportunism is stronger in western Europe than in our country. It is because these advanced countries have created and are creating their culture by living at the expense of thousands of millions of oppressed peoples. It is because the capitalists of these countries are getting much more than what they receive from plundering their own workers.

The amount of profits on the export of capital abroad derived by the three richest countries – England, France, and Germany – not counting other profits, equalled before the war from eight to ten billions.

Of course, out of such a nice sum it is possible to throw away half a billion on gifts to labour leaders to the labour aristocracy, and for other kinds of bribery. Indeed, the whole affair reduces itself to bribery in thousands of varied shapes and forms; the raising of the level of culture in the more thickly inhabited centres, the setting up of educational institutions, the creation of thousands of sinecures for cooperative, trade union, and parliamentary leaders. This is being practised wherever modern civilised capitalist relationships prevail. These billions of surplus value form the economic basis on which opportunism in the labour movement rests. The persistence of opportunism in America, England, and France among the leaders and the aristocracy of the working men is very great, and its resistance to Communist ideas is very strong. We must therefore be prepared for the fact that the liberation of the **American** labour parties from this idleness will be a much harder process than it has been in our country. We know' that enormous strides in the way of curing this disease have been made since the creation of the Third International, but we have not yet reached the end. The process of clearing the working men's parties, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat all over the world from bourgeois influence, from the opportunists within their own ranks, has not nearly been completed. I shall not dwell upon the concrete measures to be adopted in this matter. This forms the subject of the principles advanced by me which have been published. My business is only to point out the deep set economic roots of this phenomenon. The disease of opportunism has been retarded, its cure has been delayed longer than optimists would have expected.

Opportunism is our greatest foe. Opportunism in the upper ranks of the labour movement is not proletarian but bourgeois Socialism.

It has been practically demonstrated that the leaders of the labour movement siding with the opportunists are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than are the members of the bourgeoisie themselves. The bourgeoisie could not have maintained itself had it not been for the work of these leaders. A proof of this is furnished not alone by the Kerensky regime in Russia but also by the democratic republic of Germany with its Social Democratic government; this is also proved by the attitude of Albert Thomas towards his bourgeois government. It is manifested by similar experiences in England and in the United States. Here is where our greatest enemy is to be found, over whom we must win the victory. We must leave this Congress with the firm determination that the struggle against opportunism be brought to an issue in all parties. This is the main problem. In comparison with this the task of correcting the errors of the left tendencies within the Communist Party becomes a trifling matter. We find in a number of countries anti-parliamentary notions advanced not so much by representatives of middle-class men as by some advanced proletarian radicals, out of hatred towards the old parliamentarism, out of a natural process and inevitable hatred towards the conduct of parliamentary leaders of England, France, Italy and other countries.

The Communist International should give the guiding instructions, should familiarise the comrades with Russian experiences and with the actual meaning of proletarian political action. This will form our main task, and the fight to overcome these errors of the proletarian movement and these defects will be a thousand times easier than the struggle with those bourgeois representatives who have entered the old parties of the Second International in the guise of reformers, and are directing their entire work not in a proletarian but in a bourgeois spirit.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE EAST.

Comrades, in conclusion I shall dwell upon one other phase of the position. The Chairman has just said that this Congress deserves to be called a world Congress. I think he is right. For we have here among us not a few representatives of the revolutionary movement of the backward colonial countries. This is only a beginning, but it is important that this beginning has been made. A union between the revolutionary proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries and the revolutionary masses of those countries where there is a very small or almost no proletariat, this union with the oppressed masses of the colonial countries of the East has been brought about in the present Congress. It is up to us now to make this union a strong one, and I have no doubt we are going to do it. When the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers within each country, having overcome the resistance of an insignificant number of the Philistines of their labour aristocracy, will combine with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of humanity, which have hitherto been beyond the pale of history, which have been regarded as mere objects of exploitation – then imperialism will have to fall. The imperialist war has furthered the interests of the revolution. Out of the colonies, out of the backward countries, out of isolation, the bourgeoisie has recruited her soldiers for the imperialist war. The English bourgeoisie tried to make the Hindu soldiers believe that it is the business of the Hindu peasant to protect Great Britain against Germany; the French bourgeoisie tried to make the soldiers from the French colonies believe that it was the business of the coloured people to defend France. They have taught them the art of war.

This is an extremely useful acquirement, for which we might be grateful to the bourgeoisie – grateful in the name of all the Russian workers and peasants and particularly in the name of the Russian Red Army. The imperialistic war has drawn the dependent nations into the arena of history. And one of our chief problems is to consider how to lay the first foundation stone for the organisation of the Soviet movement in those non-capitalist countries.

Soviets there are possible. They will be Soviets not of workmen, they will be Soviets of peasants, Soviets of toilers. Much work will be required, errors are inevitable, and many difficulties will have to be met with on this road. The fundamental task of the Second Congress is to work out or to point out practical principles, so that the work which has hitherto been going on among these hundreds of millions of people in an unorganised manner should be organised, combined, systematic. Now within one year after the First Congress of the Communist International, we are emerging victorious over the Second International; Soviet ideas have spread not alone among the workers of the civilised countries, not only by them are they known and understood. The workers of all countries ridicule the wiseacres among whom there are many who call themselves Socialists, and who discuss in a learned or semi-learned way the Soviet “system,” as the Germans systematically prefer to express themselves, or the Soviet idea according to the expression of the English “guild” Socialists. These discussions of the Soviet “system” or “idea” frequently dim the eyes and the minds of the workers, but the working people sweep away that pedantic refuse and take up the weapon furnished them by the Soviets. The understanding of the role and the significance of the Soviets has spread also in the countries of the East.

The foundation for a Soviet movement has been laid all over the East, all over Asia, among the colonial countries.

**SEVENTY PER CENT. OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE EARTH ARE BEHIND US.
FORWARD TO THE SOVIET REPUBLIC OF THE WORLD!**

The idea that the exploited must rise against the exploiters and create their own councils is not a complicated one. This idea, after our experience, after two and a half years of the existence of the Soviet Republic in Russia, and after the First Congress of the Third International, has become accessible to hundreds of millions of oppressed and exploited masses all over the world. While at present in Russia we are frequently forced to make compromises, to bide our time because we are weaker than the International imperialists are, we know at the same time that we are the defenders of the interests of a billion and a quarter of people. We are still hindered by those harriers, by those prejudices, by the ignorance which is hourly passing away, and, as time goes on, we are more and more becoming the representatives and the protectors of 70 per cent, of the population of the earth, of the mass of those who toil and are being exploited. We have reason to feel proud of the fact that while at the First Congress we were in reality only propagandists, only scattering our fundamental ideas among the proletariat of the world, only sounding the call for struggle, only asking where those people are who are capable of going our way, now we have with us the advanced ranks of the proletariat everywhere. We have a proletarian army all over the world, although at times badly organised and requiring organisation.

If our International comrades will aid us now in the organisation of a unified army, then no defects are going to prevent us from doing our work. This is the work of the world

proletariat, the work of creating a world-wide Soviet Republic. (Long continuous cheering; the orchestra plays the International.)

After Lenin's speech Comrade Zinoviev made a statement to the effect that Lenin's speech would not be translated orally in other languages at this session, but that a written translation of his speech will be distributed to the delegates. Comrade Zinoviev calls upon Comrade Rosmer.

ROSMER – In the name of the peasants and workers of France I express my thanks for the welcome accorded to the French delegates, which has deeply touched our hearts. It was a happy idea to greet the delegates here in Smolny, to show what suffering and misery the Russian proletariat has undergone before it achieved the victory which we are celebrating to-day. The words of Comrade Kalinin, that it is time, that the International proletariat should prove its solidarity with the Russian people, have cut themselves deeply into the memory of all present. The French workers know that they have not been energetic enough in aiding the Russian people, partly because they have not been well informed of the actual state of affairs, partly because they have been deluded by malicious propaganda, and partly because they have not been strong enough to realise their desires. Now the French delegates when they return to France will be in a position to inform the French peasants and workers of what is going on in Russia. We pledge ourselves to increase our efforts in making the workers and peasants of France understand that the comrades here struggle and die for the common cause of the entire world. We promise to strive with increased energy to get the workers of France join the ranks of the active proletarians. The French delegates consider it their duty to greet most heartily the proletarians of Red Petrograd, who have manifested unusual endurance, self-sacrifice, and heroism in dispersing the enemy, and have earned for themselves the special esteem of the proletarians of the world.

I propose the following greeting to be addressed to the Petrograd proletariat: –

TO THE WORKERS OF RED PETROGRAD.

Brothers! In opening its meetings at Red Petrograd the Second World Congress of the Communist International addresses its first greetings to you, Petrograd workmen, workwomen, Red Army soldiers, sailors, and all workers. We, the delegates of the labour organisations of the whole world, consider it our duty to open the first meeting of the Congress here in your city, as a tribute of respect and affection to the proletariat of Red Petrograd, which was the first to rise against the bourgeoisie, and by a mighty heroic effort of will and strength overthrow the rule of capital in one of the most important strongholds of the bourgeois world.

The proletarians of all countries know how much you, workers of Petrograd, have suffered during these last three years, how you have hungered, how many lives of your best sons have been lost at the battle fronts, defending the great cause of Communism. The workers of all the world love you most of all because, at the moment of the greatest danger for Petrograd and the whole Soviet Republic you never hesitated, but continued to defend the blood-stained red banner with a lion-like courage, with the fearless bravery and staunchness of Petrograd proletarians.

The Communist International says to you: The Petrograd Commune is worthy of the honour of continuing to do the work of the Paris Commune, avoiding the weaknesses and mistakes of the latter, leading the proletarian battalions to victory! The Communist

International is convinced that the workers of Red Petrograd will in the future remain the best detachment of the International Army of Labour.

Long live the glorious Petrograd Proletariat.

Long live the Communist International.

ZINOVIEV – The Congress desires to address a word of greeting to the Red Army of the Russian Republic. Comrade Serrati, representative of the Italian workers, has the floor.

SERRATI – In the name of the Italian Socialist Party, which is affiliated with the Communist International, I greet the valiant Red Army, the defender of the great ideal of the world proletariat. When the Great War broke out, the traitors to the working class tried to make the Italian workers join hands with the bourgeoisie. They propagated the idea that, when the workers once got hold of the rifles, they would then be able to fight for peace and would achieve all they had been struggling for. But the Italian Socialist Party would have nothing to do with these social-traitors. We said that we must fight on the side of the workers against the bourgeoisie, whether armed or unarmed. Now the grand Red Army has proved this in reality. That army has written with golden letters in the pages of history that the rifle in the hands of the proletarian becomes a weapon only when he knows how to use it, when he realises that it has to be utilised in the struggle against the bourgeoisie of the world for the great ideal of the world proletariat. This valiant army, which is achieving victory after victory on the southern front against Wrangel, and on the western front against the Poles, is not alone in its struggle; the workers of England and of Italy, and the German sailors at Kiel, are with it. Wherever there are proletarians they hinder the sending of deadly weapons to the Polish front. Wherever there are workers who refuse to serve the interest of the bourgeoisie, there are supporters and defenders of the Red Army. May the day be near when the proletarian Red Army shall consist not alone of the Russian proletariat, but of the proletariat of the entire world, when all the toilers united in their understanding of the great ideal of Socialism will represent one great invincible army, which will put an end once and for all to capitalism and to all that comes with it, when the workers of the world and the valiant Red Army men will be able finally to free themselves from military service, and will be able to release all the workers from every oppression not only by means of cannon, but by returning to peaceful labour.

In the name of this great ideal, independent of the service already rendered the world proletariat by the Red Army, I propose in the name of all parties represented at the Communist International that the following greeting be sent to the Red Army and the Red Navy of Soviet Russia.

**TO THE RED ARMY AND THE RED NAVY OF THE
RUSSIAN SOCIALIST FEDERAL SOVIET REPUBLIC.**

Brothers! The Second World Congress of the Communist International sends hearty greetings to the Red Army, the Red Navy, to each military organisation from the smallest to the largest, to you, Red soldiers and Red sailors, to all together and to each one separately – and especially to the comrades on the battle fronts.

The workers of all the world are following with bated breath your struggle against the capitalists and landowners, the Tsarist generals and imperialists. The workers of all the world have been suffering with you in your defeats; and now they are triumphing together with you in your victories. The working people of the whole world saw with joy how, by your tense efforts, you vanquished Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich, Miller, and confounded

all the intrigues of the English and French capitalists.

The Second World Congress of the Communist International sends warm greetings to the Red Army which at the present moment is struggling on the western and south-western fronts against the White Guard Polish landowners, sent by the bourgeoisie of the Entente to strangle the Workers' and Peasants' Russian Soviet Republic.

Brothers, Red Army soldiers, know this: Your war against the Polish landowners is the most righteous war that history has ever known. You are fighting not only for the interests of Soviet Russia, but for the interests of all the working people, for the Communist International.

The toiling masses cannot break the yoke of the rich and destroy wage-slavery except by force of arms. You were the first to turn your arms against the oppressors. You have organised a well-formed and powerful Worker-Peasant Army. You were the first to show the way to the oppressed and exploited of the whole world. For this the proletarians of all countries now express their gratitude.

The Communist International knows that your victories over the enemies of the workers and peasants have been bought at the price of immeasurable sacrifices and privations. We know that you are not sparing yourselves. We know how many of the best sons of the Red Army have given up their lives for our cause. Your heroism will never be forgotten by history.

Know, comrades, that the Red Army is now one of the chief forces of world history. You are not alone. 'The workers of the world are all on your side. The time is near when there will be organised an International Red Army.

Hail to the great invincible Red Army!

Hail to the Army of the Communist International!

ZINOVIEV – The Congress wishes to address a special appeal to the workers of the world concerning one of our detachments which is now in bad straits. I have in mind the Hungarian proletariat. Comrade Steinhart, the Austrian Communist, has the floor.

STEINHART – Comrades! It was in March of last year, when the First Congress of the Communist International had come to a close and the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of Russia had opened its sessions, that we received a despatch here in Moscow from Comrade Bela Kun, in which our comrades were informed that the working people of Hungary had taken power into their own hands and had established a Soviet Republic. We were all full of joy at this great event. But at the same time we were considering the circumstances under which this event occurred. The Soviet Government in Hungary was not achieved through continuous bloody class war against the bourgeoisie, but was taken over from the bourgeoisie without a struggle. The Hungarian comrades had as their associates the Hungarian Social Democratic Party, known in the International as the most backward among the Social Democratic parties of all countries. We anxiously anticipated what afterwards really happened. The Social Democratic Party of Hungary began its sabotage from the very first day. That it was allowed to join the Communist Party is a crime for which the Communist Party is to blame. The Hungarian trade Unions also sabotaged; the bourgeoisie, the intellectuals, international capital, all combined in an attack against the Soviet Government. What had to happen happened. Menaced by the Rumanians – these reactionary boyar brigands – threatened by England's hired troops headed by Horthy, whose infamy will be recorded by history, threatened from the north by the Czechoslovaks, and not supported either by the Social Democracy of Austria, who had

been at war with us, nor by that of Germany, the Hungarian Soviet Government had to fight desperately from the very start. But, comrades, it was nevertheless a great event; for it was for the first time in the history of Communism that a Soviet Government was established amidst the capitalist countries of Western Europe, in the very camp of the enemy, which was in the eyes of the capitalists of the west an evil to be disposed of by all means.

The atrocities now committed in Hungary are beyond any description; there is not an outrage that the bands of Horthy have not committed against the working people, be they Communists, or Social Democrats, or even Christian Socialists, as long as they are horny-handed; and the country is absolutely defenceless.

It is the duty of the Communist International, in this historic place and at this extraordinarily historical hour, to raise its voice in protest – not a protest of words, but a protest of mighty deeds against the Horthy bands. Just as we have united with the Czecho-Slovaks in an effort to prevent the delivery of either arms or any other war material to Poland, just as we have in Austria and in Germany, through our factory committees, united to prevent the transport of a single wagon against Soviet Russia – so we must now also unite in order that, together with our brethren, we may convert the Hungary of Horthy into a Soviet Hungary, into a land of culture. We must disperse these bands at all costs.

Comrades, I therefore ask you to accept the following appeal to the proletarians of all countries unanimously and without discussion, and to act accordingly in all countries. For only this is of importance, comrades.

TO THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES.

Working men and women!

At the time when Soviet Russia is vigorously repelling the attacks of the criminal clique of Polish landlords, at the time when a storm of indignation is raised by the workers of all countries against the capitalist governments, at the time when the revolutionary proletariat is building its great united labour army at the International Communist Congress, there is one country mourning the death of the foremost fighters of the revolution. That country is Hungary. International capital has brutally murdered the young Soviet Republic of Hungary. All the forces of the old world have united in their struggle against her; professional assassins in generals' uniforms, Christian priests, London bankers and the rabble of the Rumanian gentry, the French usurers and the social traitors of all countries, mercenaries and "civilised" "kultur" bringers. Surrounded on all sides, crushed and beaten, the Soviet Republic of Hungary died in terrible tortures on the Golgotha of counter-revolution, to be resuscitated only with our assistance. This bestial counter-revolution, led by the dregs of the officer clique, of the British mercenary Admiral Horthy, is now celebrating its horrible triumph upon the corpses of the workers. There is no brutality, no foulness or cynicism, which the unbridled government does not manifest. Thousands of men hanged and shot, thousands more cast into prison, assassinated and murdered, poisoned, violated, crippled by torture – this is the kind of order which the democratic League of Nations has instituted, with the aid of the Second International. "Woe to the vanquished!" said the British mercenary, and continues to execute thousands, of Communist workers. "Woe to the vanquished!" cries the bestial landlord, and violates the working women. "Woe to the vanquished!" – reiterates the White Guard gaoler, and fetters those workers who still remain alive.

Working men and women! At the time when the cries of the dying Hungarian workers ring in our ears, it is our duty to raise our voice and stay the criminal hand of the bourgeois executioners, whose deeds can only be compared to those of savage cannibals.

Alarmed at their own baseness, even the heroes of the Social-patriotic Amsterdam International of Trade Unions, those lackeys of Capitalism, have declared a boycott of White Hungary. Their commission has established thousands of the most criminal acts of the British Government and of the whole Horthy band. On the eve of the last decisive fight with international capital, the World Congress of the Communist International, in the name of millions of workers, appeals to *the* proletariat of the whole world

Arise like one man against the executioners of Hungary!

Make use of all means in the struggle!

Hold up all trains with war material!

Blow up all war transports intended for Hungary!

Disarm the officers whose aim it is to kill the workers!

Disorganise by means of powerful strikes the production of all arms and ammunition! Get your arms into your own hands! Make all efforts by word and deed to disorganise the army of imperialism. Surround that country of executioners and assassins by an impregnable wall of hatred!

Workers, by your indifference you serve as the assistants of these executioners.

Join the ranks of the fighters! Stand up for your proletarian honour! Stand up for the long-suffering Hungarian proletariat!

Be staunch, workers of Hungary! The proletariat of the world is with you! The Communist International sends you its expression of love and fraternity!

Soviet Hungary is dead!

Long live Soviet Hungary!

MARCHLIEVSKY – Permit me to picture to you here the position of Poland. The Russian workers know that the revolutionary workmen of Poland were in the first ranks in the revolution against Tsarism in 1905-1906. In spite of the fact that the liberation of the Polish state (that liberation is now only a mock liberation since the Polish state has become the tool of the Allies) was the cause of the revolution, the Polish workers were not in a position to take advantage of this happy turn of events. The imperialist war had scattered the Polish proletariat far and wide; hundreds of thousands of Polish workers had been evacuated to Russia, and hundreds of thousands more into Germany. Then those scoundrels, whose followers consist only of middle-class elements, succeeded in getting hold of the power of government, and with the aid of the Allies succeeded in recruiting considerable forces for war with Soviet Russia. From the very first minute the Polish Communists entered into a struggle against this crime, in which they have lost many lives. You know that the invasion of Russia was preceded by the treacherous murder of the Red Cross mission, headed by one of our best men, comrade Veselovsky, by the gendarmes. You have read that the atrocities committed against Communists in Poland can be equalled perhaps only by those of Hungary. You know that there together with the bourgeoisie, operate Daszynski and Company – social traitors that surpass perhaps your Mensheviks or the Scheidemann gang. But the hour has come when the Polish proletariat is beginning to see things in their actual light, when the imperialistic delusion by which a part of the Polish workers have been gulled is disappearing; and now, when the victorious Red Army is advancing and destroying the power which has ruled Poland hitherto, we may

expect that the cause of the revolution in Poland will go ahead.

But, comrades, ours is a hard task. We must not forget that there is a note of threat in the document of Curzon which the Soviet Government had to decline. They may not send any English or French troops to aid White Poland against the Polish revolution and against Soviet Russia, but they may try to move against us the Rumanian army, or the troops already organised by Noske. Perhaps hundreds of thousands of German volunteers will be marched to the front to fight revolutionary Poland and Soviet Russia. We must therefore remember, comrades, that we of the Communist International distinguish ourselves from the Second International in that we are an International not of words but of deeds. We must take steps now that this criminal war should come to a speedy end. Then I have no doubt that the hosts of the bourgeoisie that are now threatening us will end like all defeated armies have ended up to now. When the Russian, German and Austrian armies suffered defeats they became revolutionary. The same thing will happen in Poland, and then the Polish Soviet Republic will triumph. But for this consummation we will still have to struggle. We, Polish Communists, swear to you that we will not give up the fight, and we request your support, comrades.

ZINOVIEV – The Congress proposes to issue a political manifesto on the important question. I shall soon grant the floor for a motion on this subject to comrade Levi, delegate of the German Communists.

LEVI – Comrade Serrati has just expressed in ardent words sentiments which the European proletariat, as well as the proletariat of the whole world, feels towards the Russian proletariat. Your reply was an enthusiastic approval of these words, and **I must say that I am surprised that you still express approval when the sentiments of the European proletariat are in question**, as the sentiments of the European proletariat towards the Russian Revolution and the Red Army have been the same for some time past. Nevertheless, in spite of all sentiments, the European and the German proletariat in their time put Russia under the yoke of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. The German proletariat overran the Baltic provinces and suppressed the revolution in the Ukraine and the South of Russia. But the moment has now come for the German and the European proletariat to prove that it is capable of assisting the Russian Revolution by all means in its power, and not alone by sentiments and sympathies.

Just at this very moment the Russian Army is approaching ever nearer to Warsaw. Here in Poland will the Russian Army for the first time face European Imperialism. Those whom they have till the present time been defeating – Denikin, Yudenich, and Kolchak – were only its assistants. At the present moment European Imperialism has rallied around Poland, as generally speaking Poland cannot be said to be the erring servant of the Entente, but to be the advance-guard detachment of European Imperialism. We shall have here to measure our strength; and the European proletariat will have to show here the measure in which they understand this, and are able not only to defeat the Polish bourgeoisie in Poland, but also European capitalism, to deal it blow upon blow until it is finally and completely beaten. This will be the first step of the general attack, and in this the International proletariat will have to take an active part. We therefore submit to you from this Congress, upon which the eyes of the proletariat of the entire world is concentrated, to make the following appeal.

This is the action to which we summon the proletarians of the world, and “Russia expects that every man will do his duty.”

(Reads the Appeal.)

TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF THE WORLD:

“The Second Congress of the Communist International is assembling at a moment when White Guard Poland, the stronghold of capitalist world reaction, is collapsing under the powerful blows of the Red Army of the Russian Workers and Peasants. That which was so ardently desired by all the revolutionary men and women workers of the world has taken place.

‘ The Russian workers and peasants have engaged in as relentless a struggle against White Poland as they formerly did to crush the Russian counter-revolution, and the armies of Yudenich, Kolchak and Denikin. The Polish landlords and capitalists rejected the honest and conciliatory peace-offers of Soviet Russia; they did this in the full hope of the aid of international capital, and in full confidence that Soviet Russia had exhausted all its power in the struggle against the counter-revolution. They threw their armies against Soviet Russia, and now find themselves confronted with a stupendous military defeat.

Their armies have swept back in panic from the, Ukraine and from White Russia, and are being pursued by the troops of Soviet Russia. Aggressive International Capital and the Polish landlords and capitalists have raised a clamour that Poland is in mortal danger.

They are now making appeals to the governments of the capitalist countries, requesting as speedy help as possible in order to save European culture from the barbarians of the Russian Revolution. The English Government, which armed the Poles in their criminal crusade against Soviet Russia, together with her Allies, refused to restrain Poland, at the time when, on the 3rd April, Soviet Russia proposed to begin negotiations at London. We now see that this capitalist England is menacing a new attack by all the Allies, unless Soviet Russia consents to conclude an armistice with the Poles who made a raid upon Russia. The leaders of world capital, who are treating like pawns the fates of nations, are now appearing in the role of defenders of the independence of Poland. The French Government which only in the year 1917 was ready to leave Poland to the Tsarist Government of Russia, provided that that government would recognise the claims of France to the left bank of the Rhine; the British Government, which many times during the war made confidential declarations through its agents to the German Government to the effect that it would hand over Poland to the Central Empires on the understanding that German Imperialism would clear out of Belgium, where it would be a menace to England; all these dealers in human flesh and blood -have now raised a hue and cry that Soviet Russia is menacing the independence of Poland, and under this cry are trying to create public sentiment all over the world, to make possible a new crusade against Russian workers and peasants.

Working men and women of all countries! There is no need to explain to you that Soviet Russia entertains not the least of aggressive plans with regard to the Polish people. Soviet Russia stood up for the independence of Poland at Brest in face of the executioners of the Polish nation, in face of General Hoffman and Bessler. Soviet Russia was prepared to conclude peace even with the Polish capitalists, and in order to attain this state of peace it not only recognised the independence of Poland, but even offered to Poland extensive frontier provinces. Soviet Russia has in her ranks thousands of splendid Polish fighters. Soviet Russia is closely connected with the Polish working masses by dozens of years of common struggle. As far as Soviet Russia is concerned, the self-determination of the Polish nation is the sacred and inviolate right of that nation, if not even a single soldier stood up for the defence of Poland the Polish land would remain the property of the Polish people.

And the Polish people would be able freely to decide its own destiny.

But so long as Poland is ruled by a clique which has drawn her into a criminal adventure, so long as the Entente capitalists are supplying Poland with arms, Soviet Russia is in a state of defensive war. Should Soviet Russia allow the Polish White Guards a respite, should Soviet Russia give them the opportunity of restoring their beaten army and once more equipping it with the aid of the Entente – that will lead to the necessity of taking away her best sons- from the plough and from the lathe, and sending them to the front for a new, defensive war.

Working men and women! The fact that the capitalist rabble of the world raises the cry of menace to the independence of Poland, in order to prepare for a new crusade against Russia, means but one thing; Your slave-owners tremble, fearing that one of the pillars of their domination, of their universal system of reaction, exploitation, oppression, is collapsing. They are afraid that should the White-Guard Poland fall under the blows of the Red Army, and should the Polish workers seize the government power into their hands – then the German, Austrian and Italian workers will find it easier to free themselves from their exploiters, and they will be followed by the workers, of England and America. If the capitalist rabble raises a cry that the independence of Poland is menaced, it is done out of fear that your subjection, your enslavement, working men and women, will be substituted by liberation from capitalist slavery. It is the task of the proletarians of all countries to prevent the governments of England, France, America and Italy from giving help to the Polish White Guards. Proletarians of the Entente countries! – Your governments will mislead you as formerly they will swear, as before, that they are giving no assistance to Poland. It is your duty to stand guard at all ports, at all frontiers, and to take care that not a single steamer with products and ammunition be sent to Poland. Be on guard! Do not be deceived by false directions as to the destination of the transports. They are likely to be sent to Poland by roundabout ways. Wherever your governments fail to concede to your protests, call strikes, use violence, and in no case assist any longer the Polish landlords and capitalists to murder your Russian brothers.

Workers of Germany! When White-Guard Poland falls, the capitalists of the Allied countries will conclude peace with the German generals and with the German capitalists; they will assist them to equip a large mercenary army, and this army will crush the German proletariat and turn Germany into a base for the struggle against Soviet Russia. The capitalists of the Allied countries will not hesitate before converting Germany into a heap of ruins and to make of it an outcast in the struggle against Soviet Russia and against Soviet Poland. Working men and working women of Germany! The hour has come when you can fulfil that which you have promised many a time during your great demonstrations, that is to say, you can now take the part of your Russian brothers and fight for your liberty together with them. Do not permit any attempt to *give* assistance to White-Guard Poland on your territory; do not allow new recruiting of fresh mercenaries. Keep a sharp lookout upon all the trains proceeding eastward; take great care of what is going on in Danzig, and do everything that the circumstances demand. Let not a single carriage, not a single vessel, not a single steamer pass through Germany into Poland! Workers of all countries! Remember!

White-Guard Poland is the enemy of the moment. It is the problem of the present moment to crush this enemy. Workers of all countries! Remember! Now is not the time to be swayed by the delusive speeches of the traitorous and irresolute labour leaders, now is not the time to be influenced by deceitful government promises. Now it is necessary to act;

it is necessary to gather all force in order to blockade Poland. It is necessary to manifest **by** deeds the solidarity of the universal proletariat with Soviet Russia.

Working men and women! Your solidarity with Soviet Russia means at the same time solidarity with the Polish proletariat. The Polish proletariat has been constantly fighting under the guidance of the Communist Party against the war with Soviet Russia. The Polish prisons are filled with your Polish brothers, the Communists of Poland. The defeat of the Polish White Guards evokes the greatest delight and enthusiasm in the hearts of the Polish workers. The strike wave in Poland is growing. The Polish workers make every endeavour to utilise the defeat of their exploiters in order to deal the final blow to their weakened class enemy, so as to unite with the Russian workers for a common struggle of liberation.

The blockade of Poland is a direct aid in the struggle of emancipation of the Polish workers. This is the road to liberation of Poland from the chains with which she is bound to the chariot of the victorious capitalists of London and Paris; it is a direct aid towards realising the establishment of an independent republic of the Polish workers and peasants.

The Second World Congress of the Third Communist International sends to you the following appeal: Get out into the streets and show to your governments that you will allow no kind of assistance to White Guard Poland, that you will permit no intervention in the affairs of Soviet Russia. Cease all work, suspend all traffic; you will see that the capitalist clique of every country, in spite of your protests, is preparing a new attack against Soviet Russia. Let not a single train, not a single steamer be allowed to proceed to Poland. Show that proletarian solidarity exists in deeds, and not only in words.

Long live Soviet Russia! Long live the Red Army of the Russian workers and peasants! Down with White Guard Poland! Down with Intervention! Long live Soviet Poland!"

Upon this the voting on the appeals is taken, and they are accepted.

SECOND SESSION.
MOSCOW, JULY 23rd. 1920.

LENIN – I declare the session open, and call upon Comrade Serrati to read the standing orders.

SERRATI (reads the standing orders) – (1) The plenary Sessions of the Congress are held from 2 to 6 in the morning and from 6 to 9 in the evening.

(2) The Chief Speaker has one hour for his report and 30 minutes at the conclusion of the general discussion.

(3) The same length of time is allowed to the second reporter.

(4) To speak on the order of business, the floor is given for two minutes, and one can speak on the order of business only once.

(5) A delegate can have the floor to speak on any question only twice – the first time for ten minutes, the second for five.

(6) The floor must be asked for in writing.

(7) The roll-call can be demanded only by three delegations having full vote in the Congress.

(8) Every motion, even on the order of business, must be presented to the Bureau in writing in one of the two official languages. The floor will be given to the mover of the motion only after he complies with this formality.

The agenda proposed by the Bureau is as follows: –

(1) The Role and Structure of the Communist Party before and after the Workers have won the State Power.

(2) Trade Unions and Shop Committees.

(3) The question of Parliamentarism.

(4) The National and Colonial questions,

(5) The Agrarian question.

(6) Attitude towards the New Tendencies of the “Centre” Parties which pretend to accept the Communist Platform and the Conditions of Admission to the Third International.

(7) Constitution of the Communist International.

(8) The question of Organisation (legal and illegal organisations, Women’s organisations, and so forth).

(9) The Movement of the Youth.

(10) Elections.

(11) Miscellaneous.

JOHN REED (Communist Labour Party of America – In the name of 29 delegates, I demand a change in the order of business. We propose that the question of Parliamentarism be taken before the question of Trade Unions and Shop Committees. This is an essential point for us of the Western countries. It is necessary to have a full discussion on the Trade Union question, and much time is needed for the translation and study of the material that has bearing on it, and also to prepare amendments on the subject. I demand that during the discussion on this subject the English language be made one of the official languages. I have here a list of more than forty delegates who understand English. There are, for example, many more delegates who understand English and no French, than those who understand French and no English.

SERRATI – In the name of the Bureau, I ask that Reed’s proposition be rejected. The

comrades who demand to-day that the Trade Union question be made the third question in the order of business formerly demanded that it be taken up before other questions. The Executive Committee knew the arguments Comrade Reed advances for his proposition when it fixed the order of business submitted. As to the English language being made the official language, that would complicate very much the discussion. Besides, the English comrades can speak English while on the floor, and they have all facilities to have the speeches translated. This decision has been dictated by our desire to conduct the discussion as rapidly as possible.

(Reed's motion is put to the vote, and it is rejected by an overwhelming majority, against fourteen votes.)

ZINOVIEV – Unfortunately, I have to speak upon a rather complicated question in a language I have not full command of. There are exhaustive theses on the subject, in all four languages, and I can therefore limit my present remarks to some of the most important points of these theses.

We are living at a time when all values are being re-estimated, and when, in some circles, the question also is raised as to the part played by, and even as to the necessity for, a party. It is strange that even in the working class of the advanced countries – England, America, France – quite strong currents are noticeable, which not only do not understand, but directly deny the part to be played by their own political party.

It is perhaps the most characteristic fact in this complicated situation that such a question is raised at all. I see here the culminating point of the crisis which the Labour movement and Socialism have passed through during the war. It is in consequence of this crisis and of the bankruptcy of the Second International, that at the present moment this question is raised at all in quite wide circles, and frequently in quite an acute form. You know that many comrades who call themselves Communists, and who are in contact with the movement of the masses, still misunderstand or deny the necessity of a party. We find the fullest expression of their view in Comrade Pannekoek's pamphlet on the subject, which we have printed and will distribute to-day or to-morrow. You find in this pamphlet actual fetishism of the masses; and an attempt is made to put the masses in place of the party, as such. I think Pannekoek's pamphlet is, with regard to this question, the best means of propaganda against the group which, as for instance, the Communist Labour Party of Germany and Pannekoek himself does not understand and denies the part played by the party.

What the Communist Party is I have explained in my theses. The Communist Party is a part of the working class, the most advanced, the most class-conscious, and therefore the most revolutionary part. One may say against this: "It should be so, but it is not always so." And this is true. Some parties which belonged to the Second International have followed such politics, have developed backward so much that, in reality, not the best, not the most class-conscious part of the working class belongs to it. And still I believe that we must insist that the Communist Party in its development will organise the best and the most class-conscious part of the working class.

We believe it is impossible, in this respect, to oppose the "Party" to the masses. One cannot oppose the head to the entire body; one cannot oppose the right hand of a man to his body. And the Party is really the head of the working class. The Communist Party is the right hand of the proletariat in its struggle for emancipation.

In the Russian Revolution we saw masses by the thousand, by the million. We were working in close contact with them, at every turn. We suffered defeats with them; we

gained victories with them. But we observed at every turn that the masses of workers could only act successfully when they had among them a powerful organised party which showed them the way. The comrades who take a stand against the necessity of a party consider themselves sometimes as the Left opposition. In my opinion this is not the case. It is not an opposition from the Left but just the other way.

This sentiment against the party is the expression of the still lingering bourgeois influence upon the proletariat. The capitalists drink wine and preach water to the proletariat. Every good bourgeois when he gets to be twenty years old becomes a member of a political party. Yet he comes to the workers with the propaganda of "non-partisanship," and he quite frequently catches working men on this hook. Even now, after three years of revolution, we can state that even in Russia a rather large part of the working class can still be caught on this hook.

It is a well known method of the capitalists to preach non-partisanship to workers. They cannot come to the workmen and say to them; "Come into our capitalist party." The workmen will not follow them. Therefore, they put up a theory which tells the workers; "You need no party – you can be satisfied with the unions and societies – for a political party, you have not brains enough."

And, since the capitalist class has in its hands great means of propaganda, such as schools, press, art, parliament, etc., it has managed to prejudice a considerable part of the working class against the idea of a party, and to inject into their mind's the false idea that a working man needs no -party.

The elements of the working class, which take a stand against the idea of a party, and imagine that they take a stand to the Left, do not understand what is happening; and they repeat what the capitalists, through their apparatus in the course of decades, have been stuffing them with.

And another thing. The comrades who believe now that it is possible, in such an epoch, to fight without a party, show that they really do not understand and have a wrong idea of the revolutionary epoch. If they understood that we have really reached the epoch of most stubborn and violent class struggles, then they would realise before anything else that, in such an epoch we need a general staff, a centralised party. It is clear that when the Second International collapsed, when quite a number of parties, with the German Social Democratic Party and the French Party at their head, acted in a way to fill the workers with bitter disappointment, that, in such an hour, quite a number of working men would get the idea that it was the general idea of a party that was bankrupt. It is often said that it was the idea of a party, as such, that was bankrupt in this war. We answer this in Section 4 of the theses, as follows: –

"The Communist International is firmly convinced that the collapse of the old Social-Democratic parties of the Second International cannot be represented as the collapse of the proletarian party in general. The period of open struggle for the dictatorship of the workers has created a new proletarian party – the Communist Party."

And this we maintain also with regard to those revolutionary Syndicalists, and to the comrades of the I.W.W., and of the Shop Steward Committees, whom we regard as our friends and brothers, but who have taken an erroneous stand in this matter. The bankruptcy of the social patriotic parties and of the Second International does not mean the bankruptcy of the party system. One could turn the tables and say to the Syndicalists that, since Legien and the so-called independent, "free," yellow Trade Unions of Germany, and the French Syndicalists with Jouhaux at their head have become bankrupt. But we do

not therefore say that the very idea of trade unionism is bankrupt. Neither can we say that, since the Second International and a number of political parties have become bankrupt, that this signifies the bankruptcy of the party idea. The “left” muddle-head Ruhle has recently made a solemn declaration that, together with bourgeois, democracy, must also fall to the ground the party idea. This, of course, is nonsense. The Soviet system does not exclude the existence of a proletarian party; on the contrary, it presupposes a proletarian party; but, of course, one made up of different stuff than that of the Social Democratic Parties of the Second International; a real Communist Party, which organises the choice elements of the working class, and thus leads the entire working class to victory.

On investigating the causes of this negation of the party, we find them to be as follows: (1) The deepest cause lies in the influence of the bourgeois ideology to which we are still subject. With regard to this question, it lies in the fact that we have accepted what the bourgeoisie has been preaching to us for decades, namely, that the working men can be without a party, that there is no need for a political party, and that the Trade Unions alone are sufficient. It is nothing but a concession to bourgeois ideology. (2) The second cause lies in the fact that, during the epoch of the Imperialist war, a number of parties betrayed the cause of the working class.

We say to our comrades of the Syndicalist ranks, of the I.W.W., and of the Shop Steward Movement, that the characteristic sign of the times is not the negation of party. The sign of the times in which we live, in which the struggle is becoming ever fiercer, ever more stubborn, is that we must declare that the old parties have suffered shipwreck. Down with them! Long live the new Communist Party which must now organise under new conditions!

This is analogous to the case of Parliamentarism. The treachery committed by a number of Social Democratic parliamentarians has put a great part of the working class in opposition to parliamentarism as a principle. But it is becoming clear that the new epoch must show new figures in the bourgeois parliaments as well. It will bring to light comrades who will step forward as fighters; and, by their activity, will show the working class that, even in the bourgeois parliaments, there can be real Communists, that even there it is possible to render valuable service to the proletariat, as Karl Liebknecht has done. We must prove it not only by verbal propaganda, but by deeds. A number of parties are proving by their activities that it is possible to build a really Communist Proletarian Party. We say in our theses to the Syndicalists: “The propaganda against the necessity of an independent party, which the Revolutionary Syndicalists and the supporters of the Industrial Workers of the World are carrying on, has practically contributed and is contributing towards the support of the bourgeoisie and the counterrevolutionary Social Democrats.” In their propaganda against a Communist Party, which they seek to replace only by the union or by some kind of shapeless universal union, the Industrialists and the Syndicalists come into close touch with the avowed opportunists. The Russian Mensheviks preached for a number of years, following the defeat of the revolution of 1905, the idea of a so-called Labour Congress which was to replace the revolutionary party of the working class. The Labourites of all descriptions, in England and in America, preach to the workers the formation of shapeless workmen’s societies instead of political parties, while at the same time they practice in reality purely capitalist politics. The Revolutionary Syndicalists and the Industrialists wish to fight against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but they do not know how. They do not realise that, the working class without

an independent political party is like a body without a head.

Revolutionary Syndicalism and Industrialism are a step forward, only in comparison with the old, decayed, counter-revolutionary ideas of the Second International. But, in comparison with revolutionary Marxism, i.e., Communism, they make a step backwards. The declaration made by the Left K.A.P.D. (Communist Labour Party of Germany) at its inaugural congress, that they are organising a party which would be “no party in the traditional sense of the term,” was a capitulation before the reactionary views of Syndicalism and Industrialism.

Some of my good friends, Revolutionary Syndicalists, have said to me: “We will do everything you propose; we will lead the working class against the bourgeoisie; we will establish the Soviet Government; but all this will be done by our unions. What do we want the party for?” I ask these friends: “If it is true that you wish to establish a Soviet Government, then you must immediately have a programme for that government; you must have a programme on the agrarian question; on internal and foreign policy; you must explain to us your attitude towards the small land-holder; you will have to tell us how you are going to build an army; what your policy is going to be on the public school question, etc. The moment you begin to formulate and define exactly your position with regard to all these questions, you begin to transform yourselves into a party.”

The same thing we say to our non-partisan working men in Russia. We have in Russia many thousands of workers who still remain outside of the Party ranks, but who, nevertheless, support and follow us. We organise conferences of such nonpartisan workers, we discuss with them all complicated problems; we say to them: “We must solve the food problem, the question of the war with Poland; we must find a solution to the agrarian problem, to the public school question. Do you wish to consider these questions with us? If you do, let us discuss them. When we have found the answers to all these questions together, we will have worked out the greater part of the programme of the Communist Party.” If you wish to get the best elements organised you must have an organisation, and the organisation is the Communist Party.

The same thing we must say to those whom we yesterday admitted into our ranks, having granted them the right of vote, and who will, and must, advance towards Communism. We must say to them that, in order to find the easiest and quickest road to victory, we must have a strong class-conscious party, which, when the fight is on, will not have to work out our programme and gather around itself the most class-conscious elements of the working class during the stress of the battle; but will do it now, day by day, so that the Party can absorb the best elements when the decisive hour strikes. The members of our Party must be the best men in every industry. They will be in the minority at first; but since they have a clearly defined programme, since they are the best men, since they are known among the working people, they will, when the right hour comes, become immediately the leaders of the masses. The struggle that is coming is a gigantic one, and no one can tell now what its dimensions will be. Only now we feel the extent of the battle which we have to fight out. Not shapeless Labour Unions, which live from hand to mouth, but the Party is what we need most, the Party which comprises the best elements of the working class, who have been organised for years, who have formed the nucleus, and who will point out to the working class the right road. The task is to organise the advance guard of the working class, who will really be in a position to lead the masses in this struggle. In this fight we cannot do without a general staff; we must create it, meaning that we must organise at once the best elements of the working class.

It is clear that those comrades, who are opposed to the formation of a party, sometimes entirely unconsciously base their views, not upon the epoch of merciless struggle, but upon the old peaceful epoch when everything was done for the purpose of propaganda and that of a poor sort. They do not realise that propaganda must, of course, form now also a great part of our party activity; it is, nevertheless, not the only part; that now, when the civil war is on, action is required; that revolutionary deeds are required day by day, hour by hour; and that, therefore, we cannot do anything with colourless organisations which do not yet know to-day, themselves, what they are going to say to-morrow regarding the burning questions of proletarian policy. We cannot go into this struggle without a general staff; we must create it; and that means to immediately organise the best part of the working class.

We must have a party, but what kind of a party? We must say here quite clearly what we must say to the elements to the right from us. We need no such parties as those of the Second International, or such as some of the parties of the centre still are. Such parties play objectively a reactionary role. It is clear that the German Social Democratic Party, for example, has not only not been revolutionary, but has played, and is still playing to-day, a directly counter-revolutionary role. Must I prove it? I think it is entirely superfluous. It is evident that the struggle of the working class in Germany is meeting now with such great difficulties just because there existed such a large and well-organised but middle-class Social Democratic Party.

We need no such parties as wish to pursue further the worst traditions of the Second International; we need no parties which are actuated by the simple principle of getting into their ranks the greatest possible number of members, parties which degenerate into petty bourgeois parties, and in which the aristocracy of labour is organised, and in which the labour bureaucracy frequently becomes a dominant caste pursuing its own selfish interests. We want no such parties in which, for instance, during election campaigns, candidates are put up who only yesterday joined the party. We want no such parliamentary representation in which there are 46 professors and 45 attorneys, or more; where we feel constrained to exclaim in despair; "45 attorneys! Proletarian Revolution, thou art betrayed!" (Applause.) We want no parliamentary representatives like those in Germany, or in Italy, who in the most decisive hour line up with the bourgeoisie, or will stand mid-ways and will sabotage our struggle. We must carefully examine the social composition of our parties. We must see that no anti-proletarian elements get into our ranks. We must strive to have really proletarian parties.

It is no wonder that a large number of workers, not of the worst kind, workers who take the class struggle seriously and are willing to fight against the capitalist class, are in such a confused state of mind when they see such a party as the German party, such representatives in Parliament as those in the Italian Parliament is already nearly reached. The working people are for Communism, for the revolutionary political struggle, but in Parliament such a man as Turatti, who has carried on petty bourgeois politics for decades and is now carrying it on, is still speaking in the name of the working class. It is natural, under such circumstances, that currents directed against the party develop. The same is true in Germany with regard to the Independents, whose representatives in Parliament include such a man as Henke, who says essentially the same thing as Scheidemann, only using a little different phraseology. It is comprehensible why there too there are good working men who say, "It is better to have no party at all than to have such a party." They are, however, drawing a wrong conclusion when they say it is better to have

no party at all than such a party. And we say; No, if this or that party is bad, we must at all costs build a good party. We must first organise ourselves as a minority and then work step by step to get the elite of the working class to join our ranks.

So that, when we are asked what kind of party we must have, we must say that there are a number of parties that even wish to join the Third International, but which are samples of what a Communist Party should not be. In such a case we must at once sound the alarm, get the better elements of the working class on their feet, and see to it that by means of a cleaning, or by splitting it when necessary, a real Communist Party is built up-

One thing more I should like to add to the question of the kind of party we want. In this connection I must touch in a general way on the problem of organisation. What kind of party do we want from the standpoint of organisation? In every particular case we must adapt ourselves to given conditions. There are cases when we have to deal with purely International matters, but at times we must conform our activity to national conditions. I shall not deal with concrete cases.

There are tendencies opposed to the principle of strict party centralisation. In some circles the necessity of party organisation in general is denied; in others it is admitted that a party is necessary, but there is opposition to a centralised party with an iron discipline. This opposition comes not only from the ranks of the intellectual revisionists, but also from the I.W.W., and representatives of the Shop Stewards. Let us now consider the question in general. Do we need a centralised party or not? The experiences of the Russian Revolution are frequently referred to. The true experiences of the Russian Revolution show that had we not possessed a centralised, military, strictly disciplined party, which we have been organising during a period of twenty years, we would have been beaten many times by now. This is the experience of the Russian Revolution; this is the lesson which every worker in Russia has learned, and which every member of our party will recite to you; this is what we have learned.

We must bear in mind the full meaning of civil war and not take the matter lightly. Civil war is not an easy matter, especially when it has to be carried on for one, two, or three years, when tens of thousands of comrades have to be sent to the front, where thousands of them get killed, when heavy sacrifices have to be imposed on the members of the Party, when decisions of great moment must be made within twenty-four hours, or even within twenty-four minutes, when the absolute confidence of the workers must be had in order to accomplish anything at all. The fact that we are in the midst of a gigantic struggle, and that the hour has struck when we have turned our weapon against the bourgeoisie, leads us to declare, not only nationally but internationally, that there is need of a party which is disciplined and organised along military lines. This is the kind of organisation we need. We must learn from the enemy in this respect, and realise that the conditions are of such a nature that, in order to win the fight, we must have a thoroughly well-organised and disciplined organisation. In working out the constitution of the Communist International, we have to deal with this matter more in detail, and discuss these questions from an International standpoint.

The view is also expressed frequently among some comrades that as long as we live under the bourgeois regime, and have not yet taken the power into our own hands, we may perhaps need a party; but, as soon as we have gained the victory, then we no longer want any Party. I have heard some good German comrades express that view, and I wish to refer again to the experiences of the Russian Communist Party. The role of our Party has not diminished but has, on the contrary, risen and grown from day to day, even since

we conquered the power and formed our government. At no time has the role of our party been so great as just now, after we have won the victory. All questions are, in reality, under the control of the Party. As a matter of fact, men like Kautsky say to us: "You have established the dictatorship of the Party instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat." If this is said to our discredit, it is entirely off the mark. We have established the dictatorship of the proletariat because the dictatorship of the Communist Party is the expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Applause.)- Our party is not to be compared with other parties consisting of lawyers. Our party is composed of 600,000 to 700,000 of the best workers, the vanguard of the working class. It is evident that the business of the working class should be managed by its best elements. Consequently, the dictatorship of the proletariat is, at the same time, also the dictatorship of the Communist Party. It is a good thing for the proletarian revolution that the control and the purification of the organisation is in the hands of the party. The significance of the Party after the victory does not only not diminish, but on the contrary, it increases.

The Soviet idea has now become prevalent among almost all the workers of the world. Half-consciously and half-unconsciously, the working class adheres to the belief that humanity has come to the Soviet system. This is true. But sometimes this gives rise to the idea that, so long as we have Soviets, we no longer need any Party; that the Soviets should take the place of the Party; that the Party should dissolve itself in the Soviets. It should "adapt" itself to the Soviets. In this regard also we must refer to the experiences of the first victorious Proletarian Revolution: In 1917 we had Soviets in Russia which were opposed to Labour politics during eight months, but we won them over because we had an energetic and determined Party organisation. And, for the same reason, the influence of Communism has now become so strong in the Soviets. The Soviets do not take the place of the Party, but, on the contrary, they presuppose it. The Communist Party forms the motive power, the most important part, – the head, the brains of the Soviets. We want to say to the comrades that not only when we speak of Soviets, but also when we already have them we must, at the same time, possess a Communist Party which will keep on growing from day to day.

Frequently, the following objection is advanced: "The Soviets comprise almost all the working class, while the Party contains only a minority of them, and it will always be so." This is not true. The situation will not remain so. During the epoch of the Second International it was frequently said that the majority of the working class would never come into the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party. It was true then. So long as the power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, so long as the bourgeoisie is in possession of the press, of the school, of the parliament, and the arts, – just so long is the greater part of the working class lost for us, owing to the propaganda of the bourgeoisie and of its agents, beguiling them into the bourgeois camp. The press spoils for us a great part of the working class; but, after the press becomes the exclusive possession of the working class, after the schools and the press have got into the workers' hands, then the hour will come – and it is not so far distant – when large groups of the working class will join the Party, and when the majority of the working class will be organised within our ranks; for, you will observe the outlook has now quite changed. We shall need the Party after we have got our Soviets.

The old so-called "classical" three-fold division of the working class – Party, Trade Unions, and Co-operatives – is no longer applicable. A new division is to be made to-day, namely, – Party, Soviets, Industrial Unions. Perhaps there will be modifications, perhaps new forms will arise, perhaps some revolution will bring about some change in this

division; but, in so far as we can judge to-day, in so far as the Russian Revolution furnishes the example, the present division is just this – Communist Party, Soviets, and Trade Unions. We must propagate Communism in the Trade Unions, in the Party organisations, and in the Parliaments. But the guiding force, the spirit of the whole movement, is the Party.

Neither the Soviet Government nor the revolutionised Trade Unions can take the place of the Party. Perhaps some will say that if a party is needed at a time when the Trade Unions are yellow, it becomes unnecessary when the labour organisations are good, when they are revolutionary. This, however, is not so. When the labour organisations are revolutionary, when they are thoroughly, consistently Communist, as is the case in our country, then we especially need the Party. The I.W.W. gives us a graphic picture of Communism after the workers' victory. They picture to themselves the entire matter in the form of a central labour organisation with a number of unions grouped around it. Very well. But by what means are they going to win the power? How are they going to form a Red Army? It is evident that no proletarian revolution can be accomplished without the Red Army. Are they going to organise a red army of metal workers, a parallel red army of textile workers, and so forth; and a general staff of all the red armies of these labour organisations? This is, of course, impossible. Neither can we solve the food supply question on such a basis. We must have a State organisation which can be directed only by the Party, for a political organisation of the State can be only such in which the best elements of the working class of the entire State are organised. We now have in Russia labour organisations which stand close by our side. But it has not always been so. Preceding the October Revolution, the Trade Unions were in the hands of the Mensheviki. In the beginning of the July period, the Mensheviki controlled a majority in them. We formed Communist fractions within the unions, and now we have the greatest majority of them with us. But in spite of all that the role of the Party has not diminished; but, on the contrary, it has become even more prominent, for these labour organisations, being Communist, have put themselves at the disposal of the Party. It could not be otherwise. This conception was advanced by Marx when he said that the assertion that a party deals exclusively with political questions and the Trade Unions with economic questions was wrong. The Communist Party, according to the Marxian conception, is an organisation dealing with all sides of all questions, without any exception. The Party should be the guiding spirit of the Soviets, of the Trade Union, of the School, of the Co-operatives, and of all organisations formed by the working class. This is real Marxism. The Communist Party is not only a political party. It deals not merely with political questions. It is not an electoral or parliamentary machine, as the opportunists would have it. It is an organisation comprising the best elements of the labour movement, directing all social organisations carrying on the struggle of the working class in its entirety and in all its expressions.

To those who think that Trade Unions can replace the Party we say once more, you are wrong. We need a Marxian Communist Party which will lead the labour organisations, which will inspire them, which will point out the way, which will serve as their guiding star. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the Communist Congress should put it clearly and concisely. Since we are on the eve of a proletarian revolution, every working man must be conscious of the fact that we need a Communist Party before conquering power, during the armed uprising, and also, following it, after we have conquered power – a Party which shall in its entirety be a purely working men's party, without middle-class elements

in its ranks. The Party may have some external dealings with transitory political groups, but not within the Party itself. It must not admit any petty bourgeois elements and make any political deals with them within the Party itself. The Party must carry on revolutionary activity within counter-revolutionary parliaments, in the spirit of Karl Liebknecht, and it must send to the Parliaments ordinary revolutionary workers and not skilled lawyers, who are only skilled to fight the battles of the bourgeoisie. We must have a Party which will point out the way to the Soviets at every moment and in all difficult situations.

Comrades, imagine for a moment that we had had a Communist Party during the Paris Commune of 1871. It is of course clear that we could have had none at that time – important necessary pre-requisites were wanting. But, if we had had one, however small, but a pure Communist Party, then, though the French working class would still have been defeated, it would, nevertheless, have avoided a number of errors. We naturally do not wish to belittle the heroism of the Paris Commune, but we must not conceal the mistakes it committed.

We now live at a time when a number of countries are in such a state that an uprising can take place any day. If we do not have at least a small but class-conscious Communist Party in every country, then we shall be compelled to make unnecessary sacrifices. We must make up lost time. The fact that in England and in America we have no large Communist Party, and that the comrades oppose themselves to the formation of such a party, will have to be bitterly regretted. When the hour of struggle has struck, it will be realised how light-minded it was not to have forged the weapon in time, to have failed at the right hour to point out to the working people the course they should follow.

It seems to me, comrades, that I may conclude with this and recapitulate once more that if we want to make use of the experiences of the Russian Revolution we must, above all, get into our minds the main idea that we must have a Communist Party – a centralised ironclad party. It cannot be otherwise during a civil war, during this terrible crisis. We will not get along without an iron party forged from one piece. We must take from the Russian workers what is really worth imitating. We know, of course, that our movement has its weak points, and we have not come here in the role of school masters. But I tell you that during twenty years we have been forging this weapon, the Bolshevik Party, step by step, and this is an example worth copying. Our party has been our guiding star in the jails in Siberia, in emigration, and in exile. The best thing that we have fostered among the Russian working people is the love for the Party; the advanced Russian worker cherishes the Party as something sacred, something that is dearer than life, something lofty, a guiding star, and in this the working class of the entire world should follow the example of the Russian worker. (Loud continuous applause.)

RAMSAY – I am sorry to say that the Communist International seems not to be sufficiently informed as to what the Shop Stewards' movement really is, in spite of the documents and reports it has in its possession. I must remind you of the fact that when the Shop Steward movement originated, labour organisations were in a state of disruption, and the Shop Stewards worked very hard to get a Communist movement started. We are continuing to-day to exert all our efforts to promote the growth of the Communist movement. Our entire propaganda work is carried on in this spirit, and we pledge all our members and organisations belonging to the Communist wing to carry on their activity with this end in view.

MACLAINE (B.S.P.) – Article 6, at the conclusion of this thesis, contains an instruction

to the Communist Parties to maintain the closest possible connection with the general working class movement, but, because it is not clear enough, it is convenient for me at this juncture to introduce an amendment which is of special interest to the English movement. We wish the Communist International to lay down without any ambiguity the line of conduct we ought to pursue in our special circumstances.

In England there is a great workers' party which is not Communist, but to which one Communist Party is affiliated. The British Labour Party to which I refer is the mass party of the British working, class movement. It is not a party in the ordinary sense, that is to say, its members have not joined as individuals fully pledged to support the party, but have joined in great groups as their trade unions have affiliated. The British Socialist movement has long discussed the question as to whether the Communists ought to join this movement or not. The B.S.P. has replied in the affirmative, but some other sections have said no. The Labour Party is not a Socialist Party, but it represents the general body of organised labour at the present stage of its political development. It is in fact the political department of the trade union movement our Shop Steward comrades agree that it is necessary to work inside the trade union industrial movement, but they deny the usefulness of working inside the trade union political movement. We say, on the contrary, that it is possible to use the machinery, national and local, of the Labour Party, use its conferences and meetings for the purpose of Communist propaganda, and by so doing lead the workers to Communism.

We do not remain in the Labour Party because we wish to strengthen that party, but because the masses are there and can be reached there. We can and do denounce' the leaders in the "Call" from the platform and wherever we have the opportunity. If we do not affiliate we lose a valuable field for Communist activity.

I wish to express my great satisfaction with the statement of Comrade Ramsay. He said that he is for Communist unity in Britain, and I am very pleased to hear it. In the past the Shop Stewards' movement has been anti-parliamentary and even anti-political in its work and propaganda. This has made the position of the Communists more difficult, and I state it that if his declaration means that he and his friends will join the Communist Party and will be loyal members of it, working for the victory over capitalism, no one will be more pleased, if this is so, than the members of the B.S.P.

The amendment I wish to move is signed by both delegates of the B.S.P., and it is as follows: –

“In those countries where the non-Communist organised working class political party is the dominant factor in working class politics, the Communist Party may join this party for the purpose of organising and giving expression to the growing Communist opposition within it and for diverting the political aims of organised labour into Communist channels. This should be done, however, only on condition that the Communist Party retains its freedom to conduct its work of Communist propaganda and organisation.”

PESTANIA (Spain) – The Labour Movement, the Right Wing as well as the Left, is a much more important factor than seems to be assumed. The Labour Movement is not to be judged by its remoteness from Communism. Russia furnishes the best proof of this. What matters most is that the spirit should be revolutionary. It has been stated that the unwillingness of the workers to form a political party is due to bourgeois influence. To designate revolutionary tendencies, as for example the Syndicalist movement, as reactionary is too elementary. It is a mistake. It is likewise erroneous to suppose that the leaders of the Trade Union movement assert that they wish to keep out of politics.

It does not usually happen that they refrain from all political activity. There are times when the bourgeois elements insist that they ought to take part in politics in the Interests of the workers. I must say that I find myself in a rather difficult position, since I am not a representative of any political party, and my position is likely to be misinterpreted. I never said that the Trade Unions are an end in themselves. It all depends on the spirit that animates them. I do not think that credit is due to the Communist Party for having created the Red Army of which it now disposes. I refer to the French Revolution, where a similar army and a similar political party existed. The important thing* is that the Trade Unions as such should be revolutionary and militant organisations, and that they further the cause of the revolution.

TANNER (Shop Stewards, England) – The main point of Zinoviev's argument was the absolute necessity for a strongly disciplined highly centralised Communist Party, and also that the dictatorship of the proletariat is synonymous with the dictatorship of the Communist Party. He has not clearly proved his argument. What has taken place in Russia and what is now taking place must not be set up as a model for all other countries. In England, we are sure, things will be quite different. The situation there differs altogether from the situation in Russia before the Revolution. For us in the Shop Stewards' Movement the dictatorship of the proletariat means something entirely different from the meaning conveyed by Comrade Zinoviev. We understand and realise that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be wielded by a minority – the revolutionary minority of the proletariat in England as expressed through the Shop Stewards' Committee movement. Members of the political parties may not agree with this, but they must understand that we have in England a much greater number of class-conscious proletarians than there were in Russia – who are prepared and who are capable of assuming the dictatorship. The dictatorship of the proletariat has a real and very definite meaning to us English revolutionary workers. MacLaine has said that the Shop Stewards are anti-political, alleging that we refrain from political activity. This is not true. Many of us are anti-parliamentarian, but that does not mean that we are against political action in the proper sense of the term. MacLaine said further he was glad to hear from Ramsay's speech that the Shop Stewards were coming back to work for them. Most of the active men in the Shop Stewards' movement have been members of the political Socialist parties, but have left them because they considered they were not travelling along the right path. We have never ceased believing or propagating the principles of Communism. There is no question of returning like repentant sinners to the fold. We have never forsaken our ideas, but by our activities amongst industrial workers we have done much more to put them into practice than most of the political parties. Did MacLaine mean to assert that the B.S.P. was the only revolutionary party in England or the only force making for revolution in that country? A number of those who are active in the Shop Stewards' movement are not greatly concerned about the formation of the party, because they have been convinced from their experience in other parties that it was a loss of time to share in the work of such parties, especially of the B.S.P. But, because these individuals are "unattached," it does not follow that they are less revolutionary; on the contrary, they are more so. They have come up against practical problems, and, tackling them from a revolutionary standpoint, they realise the difficulties they have to overcome and are preparing for them. Some criticism has been levelled against the Industrialists. But have they not proved their tactics and methods to be right? Have not the Socialist political parties learned anything from the Industrialists? Why, it was only quite recently in England that some of the

political parties have hesitatingly endorsed direct action, the general strike, etc. The Shop Stewards have always propagated "direct action," and the workers are beginning to understand its implications and adopt its methods. Now, efforts are being made again to get the workers to resort to Parliament, though all are agreed that it must be abolished M soon as possible. The English workers are losing faith in parliamentary action; strong efforts will have to be made to revive their faith – only to destroy it again later. You will get nothing but antagonism from the class-conscious workers on the question of affiliation to the Labour Party. They will say the Communists are trying to mislead them. And remember that the workers in the Shop Steward movement are going to be the shock troops in the Revolution. We have been the first to advocate direct action not only for economic purposes, but for political and general aims.

Zinoviev has said that only through a political party can one be active in the various spheres of social and cultural life. It depends what he means by "party." We have in England bodies under the name of Social Committees and Soviets where questions of a social character are dealt with. The Russian comrades must not base their judgments solely on the experience of Russia. They have been removed from all contact with the masses in other countries for some years. Only when Zinoviev has been in England and other Western European countries and has studied the conditions and the new outlook of the workers and compared them with the conditions in Russia, only then can he pass proper judgment on politics and their relation to the Revolution.

Let me ask the Russian and other comrades if there is nothing more for them to learn from the struggles, movements, and revolution of other countries. Have they come here not to learn but only to teach? We have to make the Revolution in England; our Russian comrades cannot do that. They can help, but we must do the act, and we are learning and preparing for that end.

In conclusion, let me point out the reasons why the Second International went down. I said the main causes were that it was without character, too loose in form, and its aims vague and indefinite. But it was necessary that the Third International should not go to the other extreme and become too dogmatic. We must provide that every organisation has sufficient freedom of movement within its respective country to deal with and adjust itself to any special conditions. The Third International must be founded upon such a basis that the different parties could find common ground on the most important principles and methods. Everything else must be left to the various parties themselves.

RAKOSI (Hungary) – As long as our Communist Party was strictly centralised and disciplined on the Russian model, and its members were accepted only upon a certain test, so long was our party like the Russian, the expression of the elite of the proletariat. From the moment, however, that the Party united with the Social Democrats, and thereby got into its ranks the backward elements of the proletariat and a large part of the middle-class men that had been organised in the Social Democratic Party, our Party ceased to be the expression of the elite of the proletariat. Besides, during the creation of the dictatorship, the necessity arose for class-conscious workers for various offices, so that many had to be taken from the Party for various Soviet functions, thereby quite depriving the Party of its strength. We are compelled to turn to the Trade Unions, comprising almost the entire proletariat. Thus a state of affairs was created approximately such as the I.W.W. and the Shop Steward men wish for. It came about that with the establishment of the dictatorship a change of functions and of problems was brought about in the Trade Unions. The unions had to solve a whole number of problems, such as the setting up of labour discipline, and

by the inclusion into their ranks of a great number of new members they were so occupied that they could not themselves perform the functions properly.

Following the establishment of the dictatorship, difficulties and disarrangements are bound to ensue in every country, partly because the Trade Unions are not in a position to solve the immense number of problems which they inevitably have to face, thereby creating a certain hindrance. When one is forced, as we have been in Hungary, to perform political tasks besides, such as the organisation of the Red Army, school education, distribution of food supplies, and so forth, which we were forced to transfer into the hands of the unions, then it comes to light that these problems cannot be solved by them. They have taken these problems upon themselves, but have failed to get a solution in any field, not only because they were mostly reactionary, for there were unions that had been revolutionary already before the dictatorship. After a lapse of two months, we began to feel the necessity of creating a new Communist Party. Thus we were forced to add a new problem to the many problems imposed upon us by the dictatorship – a problem which in Russia has been solved before that, since the Communist Party has previously been in existence. We were forced in a short time to set up a party which should in every respect be like the Russian model. Our downfall and our defeat on the battlefield have brought all this to nought. But I must repeat that the experiences of the Soviet Republic in Hungary have in every respect confirmed the Russian experiences, and because we were far away from you, we committed errors for which we had to suffer and which cost us many sacrifices. Later, when we started upon the re-organisation of our forces, we realised that the great mistake of the Hungarian Party consisted in the fact that during the dictatorship we had not been more strictly disciplined. We then began to organise along the lines of strict centralisation and of iron discipline. I am convinced that in our new Soviet dictatorship we will follow the lines of the Communist Party of Russia, and will continue to support and maintain the Russian experiences.

WYNKOP (Holland): I am told that I must speak German. I should put what I have to say in the English language, because it has reference to what the English comrade has said, it is my opinion that it would not be wise for the Congress to adopt the amendment proposed by MacLaine. In the theses of Zinoviev, there is nothing pertaining to this matter, and I should say that the English comrades are only too glad that the theses do not deal with this point, because it gives them the opportunity to fight out this thing for their own country. Comrade MacLaine says: "We wish the Congress to confirm that we may stay in the Labour Party, and we know that the B.S.P. desires to remain in that Party." Now it is my opinion that this ought not to be done here. It is very difficult, as Comrade Lenin has said in his booklet, "Leftism, the Infantile Sickness of Communism," it is very difficult to come to a conclusion ; therefore I leave it to the English comrades, for in England they strive to form a united Communist Party. Comrades Ramsay and Tanner have made fine speeches about this matter. They know that the question of the Labour Party is going to complicate the matter of unity. Should the Congress express itself in advance in favour of the B.S.P. remaining in the Labour Party, it would mean either that there will be no Communist Party in England or there will be one without the B.S.P. In my opinion both things would be wrong. The Communist Party in England will come into existence with the aid of the B.S.P., and as to the conditions this question should be settled in England itself. Should we accept such an amendment, contrary to common sense, we would have to discuss these things first, and it would be quite a problem to get all the history of the special conditions of the Labour Party unravelled here.

I have one other remark to make about the matter referred to by Comrade Tanner. I have listened to Tanner because I felt his desire to join the Third International. He has warned us against one thing, namely, against being dogmatic. In this he is right; Comrade Lenin has also warned us against this in the booklet I have referred to. He said, pure dogmatism was in reality only a phrase. How far one may go on this path must naturally be decided; but, when one does not recognise dogmatism of the Right, neither must he recognise dogmatism of the Left. Tanner has perfectly correctly said that one must consider that circumstances in other countries are different from those of Russia. The Russian comrades know this very well. It has frequently been said that however difficult the Russian Revolution was, it was still brought about easier than the Revolution in other countries will be. Reconstruction is a different matter from revolution. One must not follow the Russian example dogmatically. One must learn from the Russian Revolution, but not copy it in all other circumstances. It is impossible to adapt the Russian model to the conditions of Western Europe or America. Comrade Tanner has said that we must be flexible, adaptable, but not dogmatic; only in such a way can we reach such an International in which all the revolutionary groups can be and must be brought together.

LEVI: When speaking of the essence of the Party, we conceive the distinction between party and class, whose relation to each other is that of subject and object, or that of kernel and shell, which together form the fruit. When we ask what distinguishes the party, we must answer that the party as such is distinguished by clarity, concise thought, definite aims, a sharply outlined character, a clearly defined programme, a unified conception of meaning and aim. I agree with what Comrade Zinoviev has brought out in his theses: "Only in case the workers have for their leader an organised and experienced party, with strictly defined objects, and a practically drawn-up programme of immediate action, both in internal and foreign policy – then only will the acquisition of political power cease to be a casual episode, but it will serve as a starting point. Just as the kernel dries up when deprived of its shell, so also the party will shrivel and become a sect if it fails to find the channels through which it may penetrate into the lives of the masses, the living revolutionary masses." I believe that in so far as we all are Communists here, we will all agree that a party must be definite and determined. This need not be discussed here. The main question for us is to find the ways leading to the working class, and see that all ways be used. These are the Unions, the Soviets, wherever such organisations exist, parliamentary struggle, also non-party organisations that appear below the surface of social life, that grow out of the social and economic strata. There is one point on which it seems to me I will have to differ from the speaker, namely, his argument in thesis No. 6: "The most important task of a genuine Communist Party is to preserve constantly the closest contact with the widest masses of the workers. For that purpose the Communists shall carry on activity also within such organisations which are not partisan, but which comprise large proletarian groups. They consider it their most important task to carry on the work of organisation and instruction within such organisations. But in order that their efforts should bring forth the desired results, and that such organisations should not become the prey of opponents of the revolutionary proletariat, the most advanced Communist workers should always hate their own independent closely united Communist Party, working in an organised manner, and standing up for the general interests of Communism at each turn of events and under every form of the movement."

In this thesis which seems to me of utmost importance, nothing is mentioned of the formation of only such Labour factions and non-party Labour organisations which should

not become a sport, which should not be the outcome of a search for new forms of organisations but solely the outgrowth of economic and social necessity. It seems to me that on this point the utmost restriction is imperative. I speak from the experience which we have had in Germany. We must exercise the greatest care in the formation of such new organisations, and wherever such organisations arise, we must determinately widen out and re-organise those that have sprung up out of arbitrary inconsiderate striving for schism.

Perhaps more qualified comrades than I will tell you what this means in Germany where the Trade Unions have reached a membership of nine millions and where there are comrades hunting for new forms of organisation and direct us Communists towards new fields of activity. I am of the opinion that we must proceed very carefully not only in the formation of non-party organisations, but also in the matter of organising new parties. In this matter we can obtain some lessons from the history of the German Communists. The case brought up by the English comrades will also have to be decided by this Congress. I am decidedly of the opinion that the English comrades should remain in the Labour Party, through which they can keep in touch with the masses. In this regard we of the Western European Secretariat stand in opposition to the Amsterdam Bureau, which entertains the view that the English must be given the liberty to quit the Labour Party. We must be careful in this matter of creating new organisations calling themselves non-party organisations. I believe that there are working men at this Congress who will speak on the question of the necessity of forming non-party organisations, in place of party organisations with clearly defined political aims. I leave it to more qualified comrades, for example our Spanish comrade, to deal with this question. But I must say that I do not entertain any optimistic views on the matter, and I have had some experience. It appears to me that to unravel the differences between Communism, on the one hand, and the theses advanced by our Spanish comrade, on the other, is not in the interest of Communism, and is not in compliance with what the world now expects of Communism – a unified definite line of action. This will not be furthered by our getting into dispute here, instead of pointing out a definite unified road, and indicating ways which are regarded by most European workers as ways which they have already, in their largest masses, abandoned for years.

LENIN – Comrades, I wish to make some remarks on the speeches of Comrades Tanner and MacLaine.

Comrade Tanner said that he and his comrades are in accord with the dictatorship of the proletariat; but to them, however, it means something different than it does to us. He said that we understand the dictatorship of the proletariat to mean the dictatorship of a resolute and conscious minority. Under capitalism, where the masses of the workers are constantly exploited and are unable to develop their human faculties, every political party necessarily comprises only the minority of its class, and, in every capitalist country, the truly class-conscious workers form the minority of all the workers. We are therefore compelled to take it for granted that the great mass of the workers are to be led and guided by the conscious minority. When Comrade Tanner asserts that he is opposed to *n* party organisation, but admits, at the same time, that the proletariat, as a whole, should be under the leadership of the most resolute and class-conscious part of it, then I must declare that there is in reality no difference between us. That minority can be nothing but what we call a party. If this minority is really class-conscious, if it is able to lead the masses, and is capable of solving every question, it actually becomes a party. Comrades,

such as Tanner, are of particular importance to us, since they represent the mass movement – which would be difficult to say of the B.S.P. – and form an integral part of the minority which is to resolutely fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat and educate the masses. Such a minority, in reality, constitutes a party. Comrade Tanner has said that this minority should organise and lead the entire working class. This is exactly what I have emphasised. If Comrade Tanner and all the other comrades of the Shop Steward movement and of the I.W.W. recognise – and, in conversation with them every day, we see that they do recognise it – that the conscious minority of the working class alone can lead the proletariat, they should then, perforce, admit that this is the essence of our theses. The only difference between us is the question of avoiding the word “party” because of the prejudice against a political party prevailing in the minds of Englishmen. They probably think that a political party must of necessity resemble that of Gompers and Henderson, or consist of parliamentary careerists and traitors to the working class. If by parliamentarism they understand the present day English and American parliamentarism, then we are likewise opposed to it. We want new parties – and not parties like the British Socialist Party of to-day: we want parties that are in close touch with the masses and understand how to lead them.

I now come to the third question which I wish to raise here. Comrade MacLaine is of the opinion that the British Communist Party should affiliate with the Labour Party. I have dealt with this question in the theses concerning admission to the Third International. In my pamphlet I have left this question open, but, after having spoken - with several of the comrades, I am convinced that the only proper tactics are to affiliate with the Labour Party. Now, Comrade Ramsay tells us not to be too dogmatic. This expression is quite out of place here. Ramsay says: "Let the English Communists decide the question for themselves." What kind of an International would it be if a small part of it should be allowed to come and declare: "Some of us are for and some against; let us decide the question ourselves." What need would there then be for an International; for what would we want a Congress, and carry on discussions?

What MacLaine has said with reference to the political parties concerns the Trade Unions and parliamentarism as well. -It is, however, quite true that the vast majority of the best revolutionists are against affiliation with the Labour Party, because they do not accept parliamentarism even as an instrument of the struggle. It would therefore be better perhaps to leave this question to the Committee. Let the Committee discuss and study it. A decision, however, cannot be reached at this stage of the proceedings. It can be decided only after the English question, and especially the question of dictatorship, have been dealt with by a special committee. But at any rate the English question must be discussed and decided by this Congress of the Third International. This matter does not affect the English Communists alone. It is a question of proper tactics, and must be finally settled by us here.

I shall now deal with the argument of Comrade MacLaine concerning the British Labour Party. The conditions in England should be frankly dealt with here. The Communist Party can affiliate with the Labour Party on condition that it is allowed to remain free to criticise that party and conduct its own political propaganda. This is of the utmost importance. When Comrade Seratti declares that this means co-operation between the classes, I must say that there is no class co-operation in this case. The admission of opportunists like Turatti and Co., that is, of bourgeois elements, into the party in Italy, means cooperation of classes. But, in the Labour Party, we have a case of co-operation

between the advanced minority and the great mass of the English workers. All the workers, all the members of the Trade Unions, are members of the Labour Party. The Labour Party is a peculiar organisation, having no parallel in any other country; It comprises from six to seven million of organised workers of all trades. Political convictions are not required in applying for membership. You must prove to me, Comrade Seratti, that we shall not be able to criticise in that party. Prove it, and prove that Comrade MacLaine is wrong. Any member of the British Socialist Party can freely brand Henderson as a traitor and nevertheless remain a member of the Labour Party. That means the collaboration of the vanguard of the working class with the rearguard. It is a matter of utmost importance for the entire movement that we insist that the English Communists form a link between the party of the minority and the masses of the workers. When the minority is unable to lead the masses and incapable of getting into close touch with them, then it is no party, and is of no significance, whether it be called Party, or National Committee, or Shop Stewards. As far as I know, the Shop Stewards in England have their National Committee and central guiding organ, which is already a step towards the formation of a party. Therefore, since it cannot be denied that the British Labour Party is composed of workers, it is clear that working in that party means co-operation of the vanguard of the working class with the less advanced workers; and, when this co-operation is not systematically carried on, the Communist Party is worthless, and there can be no question of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It has not been proved here that the British Socialist Party must not remain in the Labour Party. If our Italian comrades can bring forward no other argument, we will have to make a final decision on the question later, and conclude, on the basis of our present knowledge, that the policy of affiliation represents the proper tactics.

But Comrades Tanner and Ramsay object that the majority of the English Communists are not going to agree with it. Must we in all cases follow the majority? Of course not. Rather than leave the question of tactics undecided, it were better, perhaps, to put up with the existence of two parties for a certain period until the question is properly understood. Naturally, no one will claim that we are able to form at once a unified Communist Party in all countries, only upon the basis of the experience of all the members of the Congress, and on the good arguments advanced here. But we can, nevertheless, express our opinions frankly and draw up proper instructions. We must study the question raised by the English delegation in a special committee, and then reach the conclusion that the proper tactics is that of affiliation. If the majority is opposed to it, we must organise the minority separately. This will prove instructive. Should the majority of the English workers persist in their old tactics, then we shall be able to compare results at the next Congress. We must not follow the bad example of the Second International, and declare that these questions concern England alone. We must frankly declare that, since the Communists in England are not of one mind, and the united party has not been created as yet, the split is unavoidable. It is preferable to have a split based upon a clear distinction of ideas and tactics than to maintain this confusion.

TROTSKY – Comrades, it would appear rather remarkable that the question as to whether we should have a party or not should be raised at a Congress of the Communist International now after a lapse of three quarters of a century, following the publication of the Communist Manifesto. Comrade Levi emphasised that point by stating that, as far as the great masses of the Western European workers are concerned, this question is already settled. He also expressed the view that the discussion of this question here is not going to

bring any light upon the situation in the Communist International. Now it seems to me that the Marxian confidence which prompts Comrade Levi to say that the great mass of the workers are well aware of the necessity of a party, is strongly refuted by historical events. It goes without saying that, if we had to deal with such gentlemen as Scheidemann, Kautsky, and their English partisans, they would not have to be told that the working class stands in need of a party. They have formed a party for the working class, and have put that party at the disposal of the bourgeois and capitalist society. With reference to the proletarian party, however, we find that it is undergoing different stages of evolution in different countries. In Germany, the classic country of Social Democracy, where there is a large working class standing on a very high level of culture, we see that it is constantly pushing forward, carrying with it large fragments of the old party. We see, on the other hand, that the party which pretends to represent the majority of the workers, that international party of the Second International, has created precisely the state of mind among the workers which forces us to raise the question as to whether a party is necessary or not. I know the necessity of a party and I recognise its value, and when I am confronted on the one hand by Scheidemann, and on the other hand an American, Spanish, or French Syndicalist which is prepared not alone to fight the bourgeoisie – something which Scheidemann also declares himself willing to do – but to put an end to it entirely, I must declare myself ready to discuss this subject with the Spanish, American, and French comrades, in order to prove to them that the performance of their historic mission – the abolition of the bourgeois order – necessitates the existence of a party. In the light of my experience, I would instruct them, but not tell them, that the question is already settled for the great majority.

Comrades, the influence of anti-parliamentarian tendencies has become very strong in such countries as France, England, etc., where parliamentarism and democracy are of long standing. At the outbreak of the war, at the time when the Germans were approaching Paris, the opposition to the war was raised by a small courageous group of French Syndicalists, among whom were my friends Monatte, Rosmer, and others. At that time the question of forming a Communist Party had not come up yet; the numbers were too insignificant. But there were comradely relations between myself and comrades Monatte, Rosmer, and the rest, in spite of the latter's recent adherence to Anarchism. What could I have in common with Renaudel, though he does understand the necessity of a party, or with Albert Thomas and the other gentlemen whom I cannot name without breaking parliamentary decorum? The French Syndicalists are doing revolutionary work within their organisations; and, in speaking to Comrade Rosmer, we can find a common ground. In contrast to the traditions of democracy, with its lies and delusions, the French Syndicalists declared: "We want no party; we want proletarian organisations or unions where we want to work with the revolutionary minority for direct action and mass activity." They did not clearly comprehend what that revolutionary minority really means. It was the presentiment of future development which caused these Syndicalists to play a revolutionary role in France, in spite of their prejudices and illusions, and out of this revolutionary minority we got representation here at the International Congress. What do our friends mean by a revolutionary minority? It is the elite of the French working class which have a clear cut programme and an organisation where questions are not only discussed but are likewise solved, and which possesses discipline. French Syndicalism has been forced to create a Communist Party under pressure of the experiences of the Trade Unions, by the conflicts between the working class and the bourgeoisie, by the experiences

of their own and foreign countries. Comrade Pestana says that he does not wish to touch upon the question, that he is a Spanish Syndicalist, and is not willing to deal with politics. This is extremely interesting. He does not wish to speak of the Communist Party in order not to offend against the Revolution; that is, he regards criticism of the necessity of the Communist Party affecting the Russian Revolution as an offence against the Revolution. That is really so. For here in Russia, in the course of the Revolution, the Party has become identified with the Revolution. The same situation prevailed in Hungary. Comrade Pestana, who is an influential Spanish Syndicalist, has come to us because we have here among us his fellow Syndicalists who have been to a greater or smaller degree fighters on the Syndicalist front. There are on the other hand comrades here who have been parliamentarians, and there are such that are neither parliamentarians nor unionists, merely representing the wide masses. Now what do we offer these comrades? We were offering them the International Communist Party; that is, a union of the more progressive elements of the working class, bringing together their experiences, exchanging views, carrying on mutual criticism and passing resolutions. When Comrade Pestana returns to Spain with these resolutions and his comrades ask him what he brought from Moscow, he will have to bring forth the theses and propose that a vote be taken on them; he will have to canvass for them and organise those of the Spanish Syndicalists who are willing to unite on the basis of them, and such an organisation will be the Spanish Communist Party.

To-day we have received a proposition from the Polish Government asking for peace. Who is going to decide upon this question? We have the Council of People's Commissaries, but that Council must be under a certain control. That control cannot be exercised by the unorganised working masses. We therefore have to summon the Central Committee of the Party, and have it formulate an answer to this proposition. Now, should we be obliged to continue the war, form new army divisions, choose the best elements, to whom will we have to address ourselves? To the Party, to the Central Committee which in its turn is to issue orders to the local committees for the mobilisation of Communists for the front. The same refers to the agrarian problem, to the food questions, and to all others. Who is going to solve these problems in Spain? It will be the Communist Party, and I am certain that Comrade Pestana is going to be one of its members.

Now Comrade Seratti, who is himself the leader of a large party, and who naturally does not have to be told of the necessity of a party, makes the ironical inquiry as to what we really mean by the term middle-class peasant, or semi-proletarian, and further asks whether it is not opportunism to make concessions to these elements. The working class, represented and guided by the Communist Party, is in power here in Russia. It comprises within its ranks not alone the progressive elements, but also the backward elements of the working class belonging to no party, who are working part of the time in the factories and part in the villages. It likewise comprises peasants of diverse social standing. All this is not of our making; we have inherited it from the feudal and capitalist past. The working class in power cannot change the conditions of the peasantry in one day, and must therefore concede to the relics of primitive relationships. Opportunism means to make concessions to the ruling class and help it to retain power. This is the accursed opportunism of the Social Patriots and Reformists, which is an entirely different matter from the concessions which the ruling proletariat is making to certain elements of the peasantry. Kautsky also accuses the Russian Communist Party of making concessions to the peasants. The working class in power must assist in the evolution of greater part of

the peasantry from feudal traditions towards Communism, and is therefore obliged to make compromises in favour of the undeveloped elements. Thus it seems to me that the question put by Comrade Serrati does not affect the role of the Communist Party in Russia. Even if that were so, even if we made a number of mistakes, it is only because we are faced with an extremely complicated situation. For the time that we have been in power, we had successively to retreat before German Imperialism at Brest Litovsk, then before English Imperialism, and to-day we have to manoeuvre among the various elements of the peasantry, drawing some of them into our ranks, rejecting others, and suppressing some with an iron hand. This is the strategy of a revolutionary class in possession of power, which is liable to errors peculiar to a party representing the accumulated experiences of the working class. Such is our conception of the Party and of the International.

SOUCHY – In studying the broad lines of the programme to be followed by the international working class, we should not make our point of departure some theoretical preconceived propositions, but we should attempt to find the tendencies which exist to-day in the working class movement of different countries, to find them and develop always further along the road towards revolution. Our theories should only be the conscious development of the tendencies and forms of struggle used by the workers against the bourgeoisie; such as the Shop Stewards' movement in England, the I.W.W. in America, the Council of Production in Norway. These are all tendencies born of the conditions of the struggle between labour and capital; no attempt should be made to direct this movement towards another goal, by starting from a theoretical point of view, by saying that this Movement is not Communist. By abandoning the experimental method and busying ourselves with the doctrinaire method, we shall not be able to create a fighting international. I should have desired less to theorise on this subject than to discuss the tendencies of the programme during the Revolution. We should endeavour to study them and develop them, we should attempt to choose the living spirit of the working-class movement, the spirit which is not found in the heads of the theoreticians but in the hearts of the workers. If I am here as a representative of the Syndicalists, and if I refuse to adhere theoretically to the arguments of the Russian comrades, that is because Syndicalism has been represented as a semi-bourgeois movement. I should endeavour to prove that such is not the case. I should put myself into a theoretic frame of mind, that I might deal with the theories which have been brought forward here. Comrade Zinoviev has said that the bourgeoisie told the working class that it should not be organised in political parties, and that if there was a tendency in Syndicalism not to organise the workers politically, it would consequently have to be believed that this tendency in Syndicalism has its origin in bourgeois influence. That does not correspond precisely with what the bourgeoisie says, for example, of the Syndicalist movement, I.W.W. and their analogous movements. Comrade Zinoviev, do you believe that the bourgeoisie greet the Industrial movement and would not attempt to fight against it as it would fight against the political parties? The bourgeoisie would not wish the proletariat to create new political parties. Would it wish the creation of an industrial movement? In any case, we can conclude from the persecution to which the Syndicalists of all countries are exposed, that the bourgeoisie fears this movement just as it fears the political movement. Therefore, we cannot recognise the point of view of Comrade Zinoviev, that the Industrial movement is not so dangerous for the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, as we can prove from the existing movement, the Syndicalist movement is quite as dangerous for the bourgeoisie as the

revolutionary movement is, whilst they have no fear at all of the political parties. On the contrary, the political parties have their beginning amongst the bourgeoisie. Let us consider the French Revolution and we see that the Jacobins, having seized the bourgeoisie by the throat, endeavoured to establish political parties and not an industrial movement. That was their bourgeois legacy. If I wished to juggle with the theoretical terms, I should have no difficulty in proving it. Fisher on, Comrade Zinoviev says that they wish to adopt *mw* parliamentary methods, and not continue the old methods. No longer desiring to clear up the situation by basing my arguments on theory, I prefer to return to the theories-existing in the heart of the modern Labour movement. It must be admitted, that the parliamentary inclinations tend to disappear more and more in the revolutionary working class. On the contrary, strong anti-parliamentary inclinations are seen to grow among the advanced proletariat. Let us look from the side of the Shop Stewards' movement, Spanish Syndicalism, which are anti-parliamentarian. The I.W.W. is absolutely anti-parliamentarian. And there is one thing more. You say the Syndicalists are of no importance in Germany. We number more than 200,000. I wish to prove by that, that thanks are not due only to the influence of Syndicalist theories, but also to the revolution itself that anti-parliamentarism gains ground every day in Germany. In addition the majority of the German Communists are to-day anti-parliamentarian. We should therefore consider the question in that manner, and not setting out from a theoretic and doctrinaire point of view to bring in parliamentarism under the pretext that it is good for propaganda after having put it out of doors to the sound of trumpets.

The most important points have been dealt with by Comrade Trotsky in his report. Comrade Zinoviev says that the Trade Unions have no programme for the morrow of the Revolution. He has supported the idea that the Trade Unions are not themselves in a position to organise the economic and social life. I should now like to ask what organisations are called to organise the economic life in a society. Some bourgeois elements which we organised into parties, who are not in touch with the economic life, or rather those which are near the sources of production and consumption? Each should confess that only those organisations which are in close contact with production will be called to organise the economic life and take it in their hands. There can be no doubt that the Trade Unions, just as we see in Russia, will play a great part in the economic life.

RAMSAY: I wish to be as concise as possible. I speak here on behalf of the Communists who do not share the point of view of the British Socialist Party, who do not recognise participation in the Labour Party. I insist that the British Socialist Party stands alone on this point. The various other groups are all against participation in the Labour Party. I believe it would be a tactical error if directions should be dictated from here on this question, for, in order to do so, and to find one's way in the matter, would be necessary to know the situation and state of things in England. Also it is necessary to recognise the right of the British Communist Party either to affiliate to the Labour Party or to have nothing to do with it. Affiliation would do the greatest harm to the British Communists because the whole working class is weary and disheartened by the tactics of the Labour Party.

SERRATI; It is proposed to close the debate. Those in favour show hands. Those against show hands. The proposal is adopted. The Bureau proposes to choose a commission to- of mind, that I might deal with the theories which have been brought forward here. Comrade Zinoviev has said that the bourgeoisie told the working class that it should not be organised in political parties, and that if there was a tendency in

Syndicalism not to organise the workers politically, it would consequently have to be believed that this tendency in Syndicalism has its origin in bourgeois influence. That does not correspond precisely with what the bourgeoisie says, for example, of the Syndicalist movement, I.W.W. and their analogous movements. Comrade Zinoviev, do you believe that the bourgeoisie greet the Industrial movement and would not attempt to fight against it as it would fight against the political parties? The bourgeoisie would not wish the proletariat to create new- political parties. Would it wish the creation of an industrial movement? In any case, we can conclude from the persecution to which the Syndicalists of all countries are exposed, that the bourgeoisie fears this movement just as it fears the political movement. Therefore, we cannot recognise the point of view of Comrade Zinoviev, that the Industrial movement is not so dangerous for the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, as we can prove from the existing movement, the Syndicalist movement is quite as dangerous for the bourgeoisie as the revolutionary movement is, whilst they have no fear at all of the political parties. On the contrary, the political parties have their beginning amongst the bourgeoisie. Let us consider the French Revolution and we see that the Jacobins, having seized the bourgeoisie by the throat, endeavoured to establish political parties and not an industrial movement. That was their bourgeois legacy. If I wished to juggle with the theoretical terms, I should have no difficulty in proving it. Further on, Comrade Zinoviev says that they wish to adopt now parliamentary methods, and not continue the old methods. No longer desiring to clear up the situation by basing my arguments on theory, I prefer to return to the theories* existing in the heart of the modern Labour movement. It must be admitted, that the parliamentary inclinations tend to disappear more and more in the revolutionary working class. On the contrary, strong anti- parliamentary inclinations are seen to grow among the advanced proletariat. Let us look from the side of the Shop Stewards' movement, Spanish Syndicalism, which are anti-parliamentarian. The I.W.W. is absolutely anti-parliamentarian. And there is one thing more. You say the Syndicalists are of no importance in Germany. We number more than 200,000. I wish to prove by that, that thanks are not due only to the influence of Syndicalist theories, but also to the revolution itself that anti-parliamentarism gains ground every day in Germany. In addition the majority of the German Communists are to-day anti-parliamentarian. We should therefore consider the question in that manner, and not setting out from a theoretic and doctrinaire point of view to bring in parliamentarism under the pretext that it is good for propaganda after having put it out of doors to the sound of trumpets. '

The most important points have been dealt with by Comrade Trotsky in his report. Comrade Zinoviev says that the Trade Unions have no programme for the morrow of the Revolution. He has supported the idea that the Trade Unions are not themselves in a position to organise the economic and social life. I should now like to ask what organisations are called to organise the economic life in a society. Some bourgeois elements which we organised into parties, who are not in touch with the economic life, or rather those which are near the sources of production and consumption? Each should confess that only those organisations which are in close contact with production will be called to organise the economic life and take it in their hands. There can be no doubt that the Trade Unions, just as we see in Russia, will play a great part in the economic life.

RAMSAY: I wish to be as concise as possible. I speak here on behalf of the Communists who do not share the point of view of the British Socialist Party, who do not recognise participation in the Labour Party. I insist that the British Socialist Party stands alone on this point. The various other groups are all against

participation in the Labour Party. I believe it would be a tactical error if directions should be dictated from here on this question, for, in order to do so, and to find one's way in the matter, would be necessary to know the situation and state of things in England. Also it is necessary to recognise the right of the British Communist Party either to affiliate to the Labour Party or to have nothing to do with it. Affiliation would do the greatest harm to the British Communists because the whole working class is weary and disheartened by the tactics of the Labour Party.

SERRATI: It is proposed to close the debate. Those in favour show hands. Those against show hands. The proposal is adopted. The Bureau proposes to choose a commission tonight to discuss this question, and to select the following comrades: –

FRAINA for the United States of America.
RAMSAY for England.
MACLAINE for England.
MEYER for Germany.
GRAZIADEI for Italy.
BUKHARIN for Russia.
KABATCHIEW for Bulgaria.
STEINHARDT for Austria.
WYNKOP for Holland.
ZINOVIEV for the Executive Committee of the International.

These comrades should meet to-morrow afternoon to discuss the suggestions made concerning the theses, and present them to-morrow at 8 p.m. at the Plenary Session.

It is proposed that Comrade LEVI take the place of Comrade MEYER.

Those in favour of this commission show hands.

The vote is taken. Who is against?

The commission is accepted. The comrades are asked to remain for two minutes yet.

The session is closed.



THIRD SESSION.
MOSCOW, JULY 24, 1920.

SERRATI – The committee elected yesterday has finished its work and is ready to report. As the members of the Bureau have not arrived yet, I propose that the opening of the session be postponed.

(Session opens at 10 p.m.)

SERRATI – We are two hours late. The Bureau therefore proposes to divide the work in such a way as to make it possible to considerably shorten the debates. For the discussion of the different theses five committees will be appointed, each consisting of eleven members. Each delegation should have the right of being represented in each of the committees by one of its members. The Bureau is to elect the committees nominated by the delegations. Each committee appoints one of its members to report, who is to be sanctioned by the Congress.

PESTANA – In my opinion the proposal of the Bureau is not logical. I propose that a delegation of each respective nationality should be allowed to determine the personnel of the committees.

SERRATI – The Bureau would willingly agree to this proposal if it were familiar with the delegates. But there are many here whom we meet for the first time.

PESTANA – Since the Bureau admits that it is not acquainted with the delegates, I consider it more logical to leave it to the delegations to take upon themselves the responsibility for representation in the committees.

SERRATI – The Bureau is not going to decide on the quality but only on the number, leaving the former to the decision of each respective nationality.

PESTANA – Are we going to open discussion on this question?

SERRATI – Certainly. The Congress may have a free discussion of the matter. I move that the proposal of the Bureau be put to the vote.

The proposal of the Bureau is accepted by a large majority.

The resolution adopted reads as follows: –

“The Congress is to be divided into committees to deal with the main principles of questions on the agenda.

Each committee is to be composed of eleven members. Each national delegation has the right of being represented in each of the committees by one of its members.

The final election of members of different committees is to be made by the Bureau.

Each committee appoints one of its members to report to the Congress concerning the decision of his committee.

The committees are to deal with the following questions on the agenda, and to bring in their resolutions on them:

- (1) Parliamentarism.
- (2) Trade Unions.
- (3) National and Colonial Question.
- (4) Agrarian Problem.
- (5) Conditions for Admission to the Communist International.
- (6) Constitution of Young People’s and Women’s Organisations.
- (7) The International Situation and the tasks of the Communist International.”

The Bureau has received the following declaration from the American delegation, addressed to the Second Congress of the Communist International:

“In accordance with the decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and the requirements of the American Communist movement itself, it is necessary to unite the two Communist Parties.

Accordingly we greet the formation of a united Communist Party, composed of the Communist Labour Party and a substantial portion of the Communist Party. But this unity is not complete.

The complete unification of the American Communist movement being imperative, we, delegates of the Communist Party and the Communist Labour Party agree:

(1) To work as one group in the Congress.

(2) To call upon the Executive Committee of the International to intervene again, in mandatory fashion, to compel any elements who may resist complete unity, to unite on the basis of the International.

(3) To abide by the decisions of the Executive Committee of the International on the question of unity.”

(Signed) Communist Party of America:

Louis C. Fraina.

Alexander Stokjitsky.

Communist Labour Party of America:

John Reed.

John Jurgis.

Alexander Bilan.

(Applause.)

The Bureau has also received the following telegram from the International Socialist League of South Africa:

To the Secretary of the Third International – Moscow.

Dear Comrades,

At the annual delegate meeting of the International Socialist League of South Africa, held in Johannesburg, January 4th, 1920, it was unanimously decided to affiliate to the Third International. I have been in communication with the Socialist Labour Party of Great Britain, and through them with Comrade Rutgers of the Amsterdam Bureau, who advises, me to send this request for affiliation through them to you.

We enclose constitution and rules, which will I think, convince you that our policy is on all fours with that of the Communist Parties of Europe and elsewhere. Any further information that may be required we will be pleased to supply on hearing from you.

For the Social Revolution, yours fraternally,

W. H. ANDREWS,

Secretary Organiser, I.S.L.S.A.

The different nationalities are requested to make their appointments for the committees.

The Bureau has proposed the formation of a Committee on Credentials, for which is requests the sanction of the Congress. The committee is to consist of the following members: Rosmer, Serrati, Bombacci, Bukharin, Radek, Rudniansky. The motion of the Bureau is adopted. We now proceed to the discussion of the question concerning the role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution.

JOHN REED – I propose that the English language be recognised as one of the official languages at the Congress. The number of English speaking delegates in this hall exceeds the number of those using French, for example. We have been promised an English translator, but we have not got him yet.

SERRATI – We shall try to comply with Comrade Reed’s request regarding an interpreter, but we have been informed on several occasions that his motion for the introduction of English as an official language cannot be entertained.

BALABANOVA – Comrade Reed, you are making this proposal for the third time, while the question has already been settled.

ZINOVIEV – Comrades, I am to report to you on the work of the committee which we elected yesterday. The committee consisted of representatives of eight countries: Germany, Russia, France, England, America, Italy, Holland, and Bulgaria. The Shop Steward and revolutionary Syndicalist movements were also represented. I am glad to state that the resolution has been adopted by the committee unanimously. (Applause.)

I shall now report to you the alterations which the committee has made. I must say beforehand that the editorial corrections are still to be made. The committee has elected an editorial sub-committee of three members, which had not yet finished its work. We had to deal mainly with editorial changes. The committee decided to write a new introduction to the theses, as the introduction written before the Congress must be formulated in a different manner.

The new introduction reads as follows: –

“The world proletariat is confronted with decisive battles. We are living in an epoch of civil war. The critical hour has struck. In almost all countries where there is a labour movement of any importance the working class, arms in hand, stands in the midst of fierce and decisive battles. Now more than ever is the working class in need of a strong organisation. Without losing an hour of invaluable time, the working class must indefatigably prepare for the impending decisive struggles.

The first heroic uprising of the French proletariat, during the Paris Commune of 1871, would have been much more successful, and many errors and shortcomings would have been avoided, had there been a strong Communist Party, no matter how small. The struggle with which the proletariat is now faced, under changed historical circumstances, will be of much more vital importance to the future of the working class than was the insurrection of 1871. The Second World Congress of the Communist International therefore calls upon the revolutionary workers of the whole world to concentrate all their attention upon the following.”

I shall now report on the further important changes made by the committee.

In the third thesis in which the ideas of “party” and “class” were confused, and in which examples are taken exclusively from Russian experience, we have decided to give also a number of parallel examples from the labour movement of other countries.

The fifth paragraph, dealing with the differences between us and the revolutionary Syndicalists and the adherents of the I.W.W., has also been unanimously adopted, with the addition of two sentences. The first points out that the ultimate weapon with us is not the general strike, but the armed uprising. This is an additional reason why we need a party with an iron discipline. It appears to us that the reason why some comrades from the ranks of the revolutionary Syndicalists, of the I.W.W., and perhaps also of the Shop Steward movement do not fully appreciate the significance of a strong political party, is

because some of them imagine that the tactics of folded arms- – the general strike – is to be regarded as a weapon of utmost importance. This is not the case. With us the armed uprising is of primary importance. This requires a concentration of forces, a military organisation, and hence a centralised party organisation. We have therefore decided to lay stress on this again, so that every working man and every revolutionary Syndicalist may understand it. The best elements of the Syndicalists have always asserted that the role of the revolutionary minority during a revolution is very great. This is true; and we take them at their word, and say that this being true, you must comprehend that it is the Communist Party that forms that revolutionary minority. Then again, the committee has discussed in detail paragraph 6, which was the object of much controversy here yesterday. This paragraph deals with our attitude towards the non-party organisations. In order to avoid misunderstandings, we have decided to substitute the word “non-party” by the word “extra party.” But this is merely a matter of style. The discussion by the committee of the question concerning the role of the Communist Party has proved to us that it is a subject of great importance on which some understanding must be reached. Some comrades thought that in speaking of non-party organisations we have in view the neutral trade unions. This, however, is incorrect. We are opposed to the neutrality of the trade unions, and moreover declare it to be impossible. When we speak of non-party organisations, we have in view something entirely different. A centralised party is absolutely indispensable. But such a party must be in close contact with the masses. The main thing to which we must draw the attention of the Communists of all countries is that, at every step Of the development of the class struggle, we must be in close touch with the working masses, making use of every possibility for this purpose. In order to achieve this particular aim, we must co-operate with non-party organisations, groups, and conferences. Let us illustrate this by a few examples.

A movement has sprung up in England, which has been aptly called by a Shop Steward comrade the “Hands off Russia” movement. This is a non-party movement which has embraced the wide masses of the workers. It is our opinion that the Communists should take the most active part in this movement and play the leading role in it.

Extensive national and international conferences have been called on the question of the invalids of the world war. This was an organisation embracing millions of people. Should the Communists stand aloof from this movement? Certainly not. We should on the contrary here exercise our influence in every possible manner.

A third instance, which we shall take from Austrian life, deals with the housing problem. The housing question in Vienna has become most acute, and there is considerable unrest as a result among the workers. There is in Vienna a Council of Worker’s Deputies which is, however, entirely under the influence of the social patriots, who refuse to meet the demands of the workers. This has resulted in great disaffection among the workers of Vienna and other cities. It is perhaps possible to form organisations of proletarian tenants. Should the Communists keep out of this movement? Certainly not. Disregarding the fact that there is a Communist Party organisation in Vienna, we should nevertheless give our support to this non-party movement, carry it on further with the aim of leading its participants along the road of Communism.

Still another instance is furnished by the Russian revolutionary movement. Our party is fairly strong, nevertheless we organise conferences of workers and peasants who belong to no party; these conferences are of great importance. We have a great number of workers who are proud to state that they belong to no party. To such we usually say, you belong to

no party, but you are nevertheless proletarians. We are going to call a non-party conference of all the working people of your industry, your district, or your town. Do you wish to take part in such a conference? They will say, Yes. The conference is called. What are the questions with which this conference is called. What are the questions with which this conference deals? The most urgent questions, such as the food supply, the war with Poland, the agrarian question, etc. Should we, as a party, stand aside? By no means. It is our duty to appear at this conference, to participate in it; we organise a Communist faction, and in this way we get into our party masses of workers who formerly belonged to no party. This is one of the best forms of getting into touch with the masses. These conferences are loose organisations, although, in accordance with our constitution, they enjoy extensive rights; they have the right to elect inspectors empowered with government authority in many important fields of state activity. Things could no doubt be done differently; but this example is nevertheless of importance. We wish to draw to this instance the particular attention of such parties as the English, American, and others which are still young and have unfortunately not established more or less close contact with the masses. It is important to bear in mind that this is the best way of getting into close touch with the workers and poor peasants. It is our opinion that much could be accomplished in this direction in a number of countries, including Germany; it enables us to draw into the Party not only the elite of the proletariat, but the vast masses of the working people in order to lead them to Communism.

The changes made in the other sections are rather slight. It is important that our English comrades know that when we speak of labour leaders we mean the "yellow" labour men, not the Shop Steward men, but the Hendersons. The "yellow" labourites advocate non-partisanship, and organise formless, parliamentary political societies. The Labour Party is precisely such a formless organisation; at least this is the way the Hendersons would like to have it.

These are the most important changes that we have effected. We have decided to discuss Comrade MacLaine's amendment separately, to which he has agreed. We shall discuss the situation in England, and perhaps also the situation in America more in a special Committee, and we shall give our English comrades a definite statement on this question.

This concludes my report on the work of the committee, and as I have pointed out the resolution was adopted unanimously.

I should like to add a few more words in connection with certain arguments which were brought up against my report yesterday, and which have not been dealt with yet. First, the objection of Comrade Pestana, the Spanish Syndicalist. This comrade said: "If we are at all to have a party, that party should come as the result of a revolution, as was the case in France, where the Jacobin Party arose as a result of the revolution." Comrade Pestana asserts that we should proceed in that way to-day. He makes the idea of party dependent on the Revolution. I do not believe that this is correct. I do not intend at all to dwell on the French instance. Had it ever been as Comrade Pestana has said – which it was not – can it possibly serve as an argument in favour of the view that the Party should come as a result of Revolution, now in the year 1920, when we have to fight against a whole world of bourgeois parties armed to the teeth? What are we to do during the Revolution? Who is to organise the best elements of the proletariat before the Revolution? Who is to draw up and advocate the right programme? It is my opinion that we should say to every working man and revolutionary Syndicalist who is a sincere sympathiser with the Proletarian

Revolution – and I am well aware that Comrade Pestana is one of them – that we must not wait for the Revolution to come and take us by surprise, that we must not wait for the Party to become crystallised out of the Revolution; but we must begin to-day without any delay to organise the Party. Comrade Pestana further says: “On the whole it was the Russian people and not the Communists who made the Revolution in Russia.” That is perfectly true. We do not intend to deny the fact that the Revolution was made by the people – that is if it is possible to speak of a Revolution being made. But the Communist Party is of the people, the best part of the working people, no more nor less. And this is not a trifle. The Communist Party is an organised body, the vanguard of the people, uniting within its ranks the best men, and leading on the working masses.

I should like to say a few words also on the subject of “autonomy,” which was raised here yesterday. It was asserted here by various comrades that the decision of certain questions he left with the particular parties of the given countries, and that party autonomy is inviolate. In my opinion these are echoes of the autonomy advocated by the Second International. We must declare this openly. It is obvious that every party should enjoy a certain amount of autonomy; there is no objection to this. But there are various forms of autonomy. We know that fifteen years ago the Revisionists stood for autonomy, and repeatedly demanded autonomy not only on an international scale but also within the parties themselves. They demanded autonomy for Berlin, Leipzig, in short, for every city. The experience of our Russian Revolution teaches us that had we acted in this manner, the result would be not one single party, but a number of parties. This is how matters stand to-day in France, where we have a party in Paris, Lyons, and other towns. This kind of autonomy is the tradition of the Second International. We do not want autonomous parties in each town, but a centralised party on a national and international scale. I know very well that should we even now establish a centralised constitution of the Third International, that would not mean yet that we have a unified revolutionary International. We will have to fight for this yet, perhaps even for several years. It is very important that we form a centralised International organisation, where every party voluntarily and fraternally abides by the discipline of the International. It cannot be done otherwise, and we will have to put up with it. It is better to commit some errors and nevertheless adapt ourselves than to introduce the kind of autonomy which would surely disintegrate the forces of the working class. The Marxian Constitution of the First International stated; “If we still remain wage slaves, if the struggle of the working class lasts so long, it is because we are torn asunder, because the working class does not understand the necessity of a firmly welded organisation.”

Fifty years (a considerable historical period) have passed. The Imperialist war has taught us a lesson, and every working man understands now that the destiny of the working class of each country is hound up with the destiny of the workers of all other countries. The war has made this all too clear. It is now for us to draw the conclusions, bring them home to the masses, and explain to them the necessity of such a centralised International organisation.

The unanimity with which the resolution dealing with the role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution has been adopted, and the harmony which we are witnessing here at the Congress, is of the greatest historical importance. Socialism has gone through a terrible crisis; trouble is fermenting everywhere; there are various groups of workers in various countries seeking the proper road. We must not follow the example of the Second International with regard to those comrades who are not completely with us yet, but who

belong to our ranks; we must not persecute or exclude them as the Second International did whenever left tendencies have manifested themselves. On the contrary, we must accept such comrades into our ranks, discuss various questions with them, argue with them, point out their errors with the aim of righting them. This attitude towards the left elements is the best proof of the vitality of the International. The essential feature of the Third International is that it unites the revolutionary elements of the working class, be they Syndicalists of yesterday or adherents of the Shop Steward movement, so long as they have a clear understanding of the revolutionary struggle, so long as they stand for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, so long as they have proved that they are willing to stand by us in the struggle. After we have begun to follow along those lines and have learned to convert every word into an appropriate deed, that will mean that we have at last begun an actual united International Communist Party. This is what we must strive for. We should form a single Communist Party branching out to various countries of the world. This is the essence of the Communist International. When the Russian Communists first changed their name from Social Democrats to Communists, there was a proposal not to name the party the Russian Communist Party, but merely the Communist Party. We should be a single party, with affiliated organisations in Russia, Germany, France, etc., a party systematically and consciously pursuing its aim. Only then shall we be enabled to concentrate our forces, only under such conditions shall each detachment of the international proletariat be able at any given moment to render assistance to the workers of other countries. We must explain it clearly and definitely to all our comrades, that the Communist International still contains alien elements among the parties which have joined us. I allude to the reformists. We repeat this in all our speeches and shall continue to do so until they are weeded out. At the outbreak of the Imperialist war we declared: "The enemy is within the country" – meaning the bourgeoisie. In so far as we still have reformists in a party calling itself Communist, such as the Italian party, in so far as bourgeois ideologists are still within our ranks, we must declare to the workers that the enemy is within our very house. We therefore say to our Italian comrades: "The enemy is within your very home; it remains for you to clear him out." We are on the road to victory, and the reformists are eager to join us. These gentry are endowed with a splendid sense of smell; they scent their approaching downfall. If you drive them out of the door, they will reappear through the window. At times they endorse our resolutions, but remain what they have been before – agents of the bourgeoisie in the proletarian camp. The bourgeoisie exists only thanks to the support of the social patriots who fail to understand the bourgeoisie in our enemy. The bourgeoisie would not have lasted even for half a year had it not been for the social patriots, had it not been for the Yellow Amsterdam International, and had there not been in our ranks workers and trade union organisations whose attitude towards our struggle was one of passive strike. I recently had occasion to speak with an ordinary working man from Helsingfors, one who had worked underground during the White Terror days for about a year and a half. He told me of the difficulties of carrying on the struggle there, and that the Finnish workers have succeeded in organising in spite of all. He then added: "There is now a clear understanding among us revolutionary workers, that when the hour strikes, it will be necessary to settle accounts with the White Social Democrats first and then proceed to fight the bourgeoisie. The last hour of the bourgeoisie is approaching, but we must first of all call to account these great traitors, who are responsible for the peril of thousands of our comrades and for the White Terror which is now raging everywhere." These simple sentiments of the Finnish worker constitute a

political maxim.

•Twenty-five years ago Turatti had composed a very good labour hymn; he is perhaps a very good father of a family today, perhaps he will still find himself. Perhaps Hilferding will sometime come to realise that the bourgeoisie can be vanquished not by writing thick volumes, but by crushing it according to the simple principle advocated by the Finnish workman after the terrible experiences he had undergone during that awful time. We must say clearly and frankly to our comrades that we realise that it is a great tragedy for some old comrades to break with these men without understanding the necessity for it. Many of these old comrades are personally perfectly honest, and this process is a hard one for them, but the sooner they break away from this past the better. You must understand that a new epoch is at hand; you must confess your errors, and come to us saying, "We are now prepared to carry on the Proletarian Revolution together with you." This idea has found its expression in the unanimous acceptance of the theses about the important role of the Communist Party in the approaching Proletarian Revolution.

RESOLUTION ON THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION.

(Adopted Unanimously.)

The world proletariat is confronted with decisive battles. We are living in an epoch of civil war. The critical hour has struck. In almost all countries where there is a labour movement of any importance the working class, arms in hand, stands in the midst of fierce and decisive battles. Now more than ever is the working class in need of a strong organisation. Without losing an hour of invaluable time, the working class must keep on indefatigably preparing for the impending decisive struggle.

The first heroic uprising of the French proletariat during the Paris Commune of 1871 would have been much more successful, and many errors and shortcomings would have been avoided, had there been a strong Communist Party, no matter how small. The struggle which the proletariat is now facing, under changed historical circumstances, will be of much more vital importance to the future destiny of the working class than was the insurrection of 1871.

The Second World Congress of the Communist International therefore calls upon the revolutionary workers of the whole world to concentrate all their attention on the following:

(1) The Communist Party is part of the working class, namely, its most advanced, intelligent, and therefore most revolutionary part. The Communist Party is formed of the best, most intelligent, self-sacrificing, and far-seeing workers. The Communist Party has no other interests than those of the working class. It differs from the general mass of the workers in that it takes a general view of the whole historical march of the working class, and at all turns of the road it endeavours to defend the interests, not of separate groups or professions, but of the working class as a whole. The Communist Party is the organised political lever by means of which the more advanced part of the working class leads all the proletarian and semi-proletarian mass.

(2) Until the time when the power of government will have been finally conquered by the proletariat, until the time when the proletarian rule will have been firmly established beyond the possibility of a bourgeois restoration, the Communist Party will have in its organised ranks only a minority of the workers. Up to the time when the power will have been seized by it, and during the transition period, the Communist Party may, under favourable conditions, exercise undisputed moral and political influence on all the proletarian and semi-proletarian classes of the population; but it will not be able to unite them within its ranks. Only when the dictatorship of the workers has deprived the bourgeoisie of such powerful weapons as the press, the school, parliament, church, the government apparatus, etc., only when the final overthrow of the capitalist order will have become an evident fact – only then will all or almost all the workers enter the ranks of the Communist Party.

(3) A sharp distinction must be made between the conception of “party” and “class.” The members of the “Christian” and liberal trade unions of Germany, England, and other countries are undoubtedly parts of the working class. More or less considerable circles of the working people, followers of Scheidemann, Gompers and Co., are likewise part of the working class. Under certain historical conditions the working class is very likely to be impregnated with numerous reactionary elements. The task of Communism is not to adapt itself to such retrograde elements of the working class, but to raise the whole working class to the level of the Communist vanguard. The confounding of these two

conceptions – of party and of class – can only lead to the greatest errors and confusion. Thus, for instance, it is clear that, notwithstanding the disposition or prejudices of certain parts of the working masses during the Imperialist war, the workers' parties ought to have counteracted these prejudices, defending the historical interests of the proletariat, which demanded of the proletarian parties a declaration of war against war.

Thus in the beginning of the Imperialistic War of 1914, the social traitor parties of all countries, in upholding the capitalists of their "own" countries, unanimously declared that such was the will of the people. They forgot at the same time that even if this were so, the duty of the workers' party would have been to combat such an attitude of the majority of the workers, and to defend the interests of the workers at whatever cost. At the very beginning of the twentieth century, the Russian Mensheviks (minimalists) of the time (the so-called "economists") denied the possibility of an open political struggle against Tsarism on the ground that the working class in general was not yet ripe for the understanding of the political struggle. So also has the Right Wing of the Independents of Germany, in all its compromising, referred to the "will of the masses," failing to understand that the Party exists precisely for the purpose of marching ahead of the masses and pointing out the way,

(4) The Communist International is firmly convinced that the collapse of the old Social Democratic parties of the Second International cannot be represented as the collapse of the proletarian party organisations in general. The period of open struggle for the dictatorship of the workers has created a new proletarian party – the Communist Party.

(5) The Communist International emphatically rejects the opinion that the workers could carry out a revolution without having an independent political party of their own. Every class struggle is a political struggle. The object of this struggle, which inevitably turns into a civil war, is the obtaining of political power. However, this power cannot be acquired, organised, and directed otherwise than by means of a political party. Only in case the workers have for their leader an organised and experienced party, with strictly defined objects, and a practically drawn up programme of immediate action, both in internal and foreign policy – then only will the acquisition of political power cease to be a casual episode, but it will serve as a starting point.

This class struggle likewise demands that the general guidance of the various forms of the proletarian movement (labour unions, co-operative associations, cultural-educational work, elections, etc.) be united in one central organisation. Only a political party can be such a unifying and guiding centre. To refuse to create and strengthen such a party and submit to its dictates would mean to abandon the idea of unity in the guidance of the separate proletarian groups operating on the different arenas of the struggle. Lastly, the class struggle of the proletariat demands a concentrated propaganda, throwing light on the various stages of the fight, realising a unified point of view, directing the attention of the proletariat at each given moment to the definite tasks to be accomplished by the whole class. This cannot be done without the help of a centralised political apparatus, i.e., a political party. Therefore, the propaganda of the revolutionary Syndicalists, and the partisans of the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) against the necessity of an independent Workers' Party, as a matter of fact, has only served and continues to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie and the counter-revolutionary Social Democrats. In their propaganda against the Communist Party, which the Syndicalists and Industrialists desire to replace by the trade unions, they approach the opportunists. For several years after the defeat of the Revolution in 1905, the Russian Mensheviks proclaimed the necessity of a so-called Labour Congress, which was to replace the revolutionary party of

the working class. All kinds of “Labourites” of England and America, while consciously carrying on a bourgeois policy, are propagating among the workers the idea of creating indefinite shapeless labour unions instead of a political party. The revolutionary Syndicalists and Industrialists desire to fight against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but they do not know how to do it. They do not see that the working class without an independent political party is like a body without a head.

Revolutionary Syndicalism and Industrialism are a step forward only in comparison with the old, musty counter-revolutionary ideology of the Second International. But, in comparison with the revolutionary Marxian doctrine, i.e., with Communism, they are a step backwards. The declaration of the “Left” Communists of Germany (in the programme declaration of their Constituent Congress in April) to the effect that they are forming a party but not one in the traditional sense of the word (“kein Partei im uberlieferten Sinne”) – is a capitulation before the views of Syndicalism and Industrialism which are reactionary. The working class cannot achieve the victory over the bourgeoisie by means of the general strike alone, and by the policy of folded arms. The proletariat must resort to an armed uprising. Having understood this, one realises that an organised political party is absolutely essential, and that shapeless labour organisations will not suffice.

The revolutionary Syndicalists frequently advance the idea of the great importance of a determined revolutionary minority. The Communist Party is just such a determined minority of the working class, which is ready to act, which has a programme and strives to organise the masses for the struggle.

(6) The most important task of a genuine Communist Party is to preserve constantly the closest contact with the widest masses of the workers. For that purpose the Communists shall carry on activity also within such organisations which are nonpartisan, but which comprise large proletarian groups, for example, organisations of war invalids in various countries, the “Hands off Russia” Committee in England, proletarian Tenants' Unions, and so forth. Of special importance are the so-called non-party conferences of workers and peasants held in Russia. Such conferences are being organised almost in every town, in all industrial districts, and in the country. In the elections to these conferences, the widest masses even of the most backward workers take part. The agenda at these conferences is made up of the most pressing questions, such as the food question, the housing problem, the military situation, the school question. The Communists exercise their influence on these non-party conferences in the most energetic manner, and with the greatest success for the Party. They consider it their most important task to carry on the work of organisation and instruction within such organisations. But, in order that their efforts should bring forth the desired results, and that such organisations should not become the prey of opponents of the revolutionary proletariat, the most advanced Communist workers should always have their own independent, closely united Communist Party working in an organised manner, and standing up for the general interests of Communism at each turn of events, and under every form of the movement.

(7) The Communists have no fear of the largest workers' organisations which belong to no party, even when they are of a decidedly reactionary nature (yellow unions, Christian trade unions, etc.). The Communist Party carries on its work inside such organisations, and untiringly instructs the workers, and proves to them that the idea of no political party as a principle is consciously cultivated among the workers by the bourgeoisie and its adherents, with the object of keeping the proletariat from an organised struggle for Socialism.

(8) The old classical division of the Labour movement into three forms – Party, Trade Unions, and Co-operatives – has evidently served its time. The Proletarian Revolution in Russia has brought forward the fundamental form of the workers' dictatorship – the Soviets. The new divisions which are now everywhere forming are – (1) Party, (2) Soviet, (3) Industrial Union. But the party of the proletariat, that is to say, the Communist Party, must constantly and systematically direct the work of the Soviets as well as of the revolutionised industrial unions. The Communist Party, the organised vanguard of the working class, must direct the struggle of the entire class on the economic and the political fields, and also on the field of education. It must -be the animating spirit in the industrial unions, labour councils, and all other forms of proletarian organisations.

The existence of the Soviets as an historically basic form of the dictatorship of the proletariat in no way lessens the guiding role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution. The assertions made by the “Left” Communists of Germany (in their appeal to the German proletariat of April 14th, 1920, signed: “The Communist Labour Party of Germany) that the Party must always adapt itself to the idea of the Soviets and assume a proletarian character, is nothing but a hazy expression of the opinion that the Communist Party should dissolve itself into Soviets, that the Soviets can replace the Communist Party. This idea is essentially reactionary.

There was a period in the history of the Russian Revolution when the Soviets were acting in opposition to the Party and supported the policy of the agents of the bourgeoisie. The same has happened in Germany and may take place in other countries.

In order that the Soviets may be able to perform their historic mission, a party of staunch Communists is necessary who should not merely adapt themselves to the Soviets, but on the contrary should take care that the Soviets do not adapt themselves to the* bourgeoisie, and to the white-guard Social Democracy; that with the aid of the Communist factions in the Soviets the latter be brought under the banner of the Communist Party.

Those who propose to the Communist Party to “conform” to the Soviets, those who perceive in such “conformation” a strengthening of the “proletarian nature” of the party, are rendering a bad service both to the Party and to the Soviets, and do not understand the importance of the Party, nor that of the Soviets. The stronger the Communist Party in each country, the sooner will the Soviet idea triumph. Many “Independent” and even “right” Socialists profess to believe in the Soviet idea. But we cannot prevent such elements from distorting this idea, except if there exists a strong Communist Party, capable of determining the policy of the Soviets and making them follow it.

(9) The Communist Party is necessary to the working class not only before it has acquired power, not only while it is acquiring such power, but also after the power has passed, into the hands of the working class. The history of the Russian Communist Party, for three years at the head of such a vast country, shows that the role of the Party after the acquisition of power by the working class has not only not diminished, but, on the contrary, has greatly increased.

(10) On the morrow of the acquisition of power by the proletariat, its party still remained, as formerly, a part of the working class. But it was just that part of the class which organised the victory. During twenty years in Russia – and for a number of years in Germany – the Communist Party, in its struggle not only against the bourgeoisie, but also against those Socialists, who transmit bourgeois ideas among the proletariat. has enrolled In its ranks the staunchest, most far-seeing and most progressive fighters of the working class. Only by having such a closely united organisation of the best part of the

working class is it possible for the Party to overcome all the difficulties which arise -before the proletarian dictatorship in the days following the victory. The organisation of a new proletarian Red Army, the practical abolition of the bourgeois governing apparatus and the building in its place of the framework of a new proletarian state apparatus, the struggle against the narrow craft tendencies of certain separate groups of workers, the struggle against local and provincial "patriotism," clearing the way for the creation of a new labour discipline – in all these undertakings the final decisive word is to be said by the Communist Party, whose members by their own example animate and guide the majority of the workers.

(11) The necessity for a political party of the proletariat can cease only with the complete abolition of classes. On the way to this final victory of Communism, it is possible that the relative importance of the three fundamental proletarian organisations of modern times (Party, Soviets, and Industrial Unions) shall undergo some changes, and that gradually a single type of workers' organisation will be formed. The Communist Party, however, will become absorbed in the working class only when Communism ceases to 'be the object of struggle, and the whole working class shall have become Communist.

(12) The Second Congress of the Communist International must not only serve to establish the historical mission of the Communist Party in general, but it must indicate to the international proletariat, in rough draft, what kind of Communist Party is needed.

(13) The Communist International assumes that, especially during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat the Communist Party should be organised on the basis of strict proletarian centralism. In order to lead the working class successfully during the long, stubborn civil war, the Communist Party must establish the strictest military discipline within its own ranks. The experience of the Russian Communist Party in its successful leadership of the civil war of the working class during three years, has proved that the victory of the workers is impossible without a severe discipline, a perfected centralisation, and the fullest confidence of all the organisations of the Party in the leading organ of the Party.

(14) The Communist Party should be based on the principle of democratic centralisation. The chief principle of the latter is the election of the upper party units by those immediately below, the unconditional submission of the subordinate units to the decisions of those above them, and a strong party central organ, whose decrees are binding upon all the leaders of party life between party conventions.

(15) In view of the state of siege introduced by the bourgeoisie against the Communists, a whole number of Communist Parties in Europe and America are compelled to exist illegally. It must be remembered that under such conditions it may become necessary sometimes temporarily to deviate from the strict observance of the elective principle, and to endow the leading party organisations with the -right of co-option, as was done in Russia at one time. Under the state of siege, the Communist Party cannot have recourse to a democratic referendum among all the members of the Party (as was proposed by part of the American Communists), but on the contrary it should empower its leading central organ to make important decisions in emergencies on behalf of all the members of the party.

(16) The doctrine of a wide "autonomy" for the separate local organisations of the Party at the present moment only weakens the Communist Party, undermines its working capacity and aids the development of petty bourgeois, anarchistic, centrifugal tendencies.

(17) In countries where the power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, of the counter-

revolutionary Social Democrats, the Communist Party must learn to unite systematically legal with illegal work, but all legal work must be carried on under the practical control of the illegal Party. The parliamentary groups of Communists, both in the central as well as in the local government institutions, must be fully and absolutely subject to the Communist Party in general, irrespective of whether the Party on the whole be a legal or an illegal organisation at the moment. Any delegate who in one way or another does not submit absolutely to the Party shall be expelled from the ranks of Communism.

The legal press (newspapers, publications) must be unconditionally and fully subject to the Party in general and to its Central Committee. No concessions are admissible in this respect. '

(18) The fundamental principle of all organisation work of the Communist Party and individual Communists must be the creation of Communist nuclei everywhere they find proletarians and semi-proletarians although even in small numbers. In every Soviet of Workers' Deputies, in every labour union, every cooperative institution, workshop, house committee, in every government institution everywhere, even though there may be only three people sympathising with Communism, a Communist nucleus must be immediately organised. It is only the power of organisation of the Communists that enables the advance guard of the working class to be the leader of the whole class. Communist nuclei, working in organisations adhering to no political party, must be subject to the party organisation in general, whether the Party itself is working legally or illegally at the given moment. Communist nuclei of all kinds must be subordinate one to another in a strictly hierarchical order and system.

(19) The Communist Party must always begin its work among the industrial workers residing for the most part in cities. For the rapid victory of the working class it is necessary that the Party should also work in the country, in the villages. The Communist Party must carry on its propoganda and organisation work among the agricultural labourers and the poorer farmers. It must especially endeavour to organise Communist nuclei in the rural districts.

The International organisation of the proletariat will be strong only if, in all countries where the Communists are living and working, the above principles of party organisation and activity are firmly established. The Communist International invites to its Congress all labour unions which recognise the principles of the Third International, and are ready to break with the yellow International. The Communist International intends to organise an International section composed of the red labour unions, which recognise the principles of Communism. The Communist International will not refuse to co-operate with purely non-political workers' organisations desirous of carrying on a serious revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. But at the same time the Communist International will never cease to emphasise to the workers of all the world:

(1) The Communist International is the chief and essential instrument for the liberation of the working class. In each country there must now be not only Communist groups, or tendencies, but – a Communist Party.

(2) In every country there must be only one Communist Party.

(3) The Communist Party must be founded on the principle of the strictest centralisation, and, during the period of civil war. It must introduce military discipline in its ranks.

(4) In every place where there are a dozen proletarians or semi-proletarians, the Communist Party must have an organised nucleus. ^

(5) In each non-political organisation there must be a Communist nucleus, strictly subordinate to the Party in general.

(6) While firmly and faithfully supporting the programme and revolutionary tactics of Communism, the Communist Party must always be closely united with the most widely spread workers' organisations, and avoid sectarianism as much as lack of principle.

FOURTH (EVENING) SESSION.

JULY 24th, 8 p.m.

(Continued after Recess.)

ZINOVIEV – I declare the session open. The point of discussion is the role of the Communist Party. But first we must decide whether we are to open discussions on the subject or put it immediately to the vote. Personally I am for voting immediately. It is up to the Congress, however, to pass the final decision.

SERRATI – Are there any other motions to continue the discussion? It seems there are none. We shall then proceed to vote. Those who are in favour of the theses as proposed, including the amendments, are asked to raise their hands. Those against? Those who abstain? The Resolution has been adopted unanimously. A half hour's interval is proposed to give the delegations the possibility of nominating their candidates for the committees, following which the Bureau, after having considered the nominees, will offer the list to the sanction of the Congress.

BALABANOVA – The motion of the Bureau is voted on. Those in favour raise their hand. Those against? Adopted unanimously. A half hour's interval is declared.

Serrati announces the list of the committees (Levi translates.)

SCHATSKY – I move that the personnel of the Organisation Committee be changed. I propose that the representatives of the Youth, who have proposed their own theses, should be given an opportunity of defending them in the Committee. It is very strange that the authors of the theses have not been put on the Committee in spite of their request.

ZINOVIEV – The Bureau supposed that two special sub-committees were going to be elected to deal with the Women's and Youth's organisations. These sub-committees are to have not one or two, but a considerable number of representatives of the Women's movement as well as of the Youths'. This is how we regarded the matter. The questions of structural organisation and constitution of the International is of great importance. I think that this method of procedure is the most reasonable, and hope that the Congress will approve of it.

(The question is put to the vote. The Bureau's proposal is unanimously accepted, without any amendment.)

WYNKOP – Comrades, if I understand the motion rightly, the German Independents and the French Social Democratic Party are to take part in the work of the Committee on the question of admission to the International. I must say that I do not understand this motion, and object to it in the name of my party.

We have already introduced a motion in the Executive Committee demanding that these parties, not being Communist, should not be regarded as a part of the Congress. My party entertains the view that we have nothing in common with the Independent Socialist Party, which forms a part of the Reichstag Presidium, for we can have nothing to do with a

government party. The case is different with regard to the French Party. Though the difference is not very great, there is still a difference.

I shall not touch at this juncture on the question of admitting these parties into the International, which is coming up for discussion at a future session; but it seems to me that the question of admitting such parties into the International can be raised and discussed only when an official declaration to that effect has been made by them. This refers also to the question of their participation at the Congress in general; that right can be given only such parties which have made a request for admission to the International. But I have not heard of any such declaration or application having been received.

We do not know as yet whether any applications for admission have been made by either of these parties. But should such an application come from the Independent Socialist Party, it certainly ought to be rejected. We cannot have any work in common with a government party. As far as the French Party is concerned, we must first of all have its application for admission, and since that is not forthcoming yet, how can we admit the participation in the Committee of a party which does not belong to us, which is not revolutionary, nor Communist, moreover since that Committee is to discuss the question of admission to the Third International. The Committee has rejected some of my propositions. I propose again that this party be not admitted to participate in the work of our Committee.

RADEK – Comrades, the arguments of the Dutch delegate are not in accord with the reasonable line of argument which the Congress is following. The Credentials Committee has given the delegates of the Independent Socialist Party a deliberative vote. But those who are granted a deliberative vote have the right to know on what conditions they are to join the International alliance. But even from the point of view of formality the reference to applications for admission is opposed to common sense. Every one of us knows that we are engaged in negotiations with the Independent Socialist Party regarding its affiliation to the Third International. Every one of us knows that millions of German workers, members of this party, have staunchly and insistently fought for that union with the Third International. Now, since these working masses of Germany have sent to us here their delegates in order to discuss together with us the conditions for admission to the Third International, it would be improper on our part, not alone with regard to these delegates, but also with regard to the German workers who have sent them here, to accept the proposition of Comrade Wynkop. It goes without saying that the delegates of the Independent Socialist Party should be given the possibility not only of informing us of their wishes, but also of learning from us what we require of them. Besides, the procedure of joining the Third International is not at all such as Comrade Wynkop imagines it to be: “What has the defendant to say in his defence?” It is nothing but an act of agreement between parties wishing to amalgamate. I propose that Comrade Wynkop's motion be rejected.

VAN-LEUVEN – Comrades, my co-delegate, Comrade Wynkop, expressed his opposition to the admission of the Independent Party of Germany and the French Socialist Party into the Committee. He said he spoke in the name of the Dutch Party. He is probably right. I say probably, but, of course, the fact must be finally established, for it is clear that the question could not have been subject to discussion in our party. For we couldn't have known, of course, that we might be up against such a case. But I personally look at the matter from a somewhat different angle. I think, for instance, that the delegates of the German Independent Socialist Party have come here under pressure of

the Left Wing of the party, that is, the labouring masses; but I am in agreement with Comrade Wynkop that these delegates should not be admitted. We had occasion to ask these representatives a number of questions in the Executive Committee. Comrade Radek proposed a list of nine questions, others asked no less, and finally I myself also put a number of questions concerning the Theses of Comrade Lenin, with regard to the conditions of complete amalgamation. As I have already said, other comrades also, including Comrade Levi, have put certain questions to the delegates. Now I am greatly surprised that these people are going to be admitted here now when they have not replied to any of the questions, and we are therefore in ignorance as to the actual reason for their arrival. I repeat, this astonishes me greatly. Comrade Radek says that the proposition of Comrade Wynkop is contrary to common sense. I am obliged to ask – is it logical to admit these people without having received an answer from them to the questions put?

GUILBEAUX – I am of the opinion that the representatives of the German Independent Socialist Party and the French Socialists must not be admitted to the Congress since they have not yet applied for admission into the International. The representatives of the French Party have been in Moscow long enough to be able to answer the questions put to them. The French Party moreover has found the time to send a batch of letters and telegrams to us, which have only brought confusion and hindered us in our work. I therefore move that the French Party be not admitted to participate in our work.

RADEK – Comrades, when delegates of a large party are given a deliberative vote, there is no reason for further wrangling on the question as to what that vote implies. But since two comrades of the Dutch delegation and Comrade Guilbeaux have advanced profound arguments to the effect that this right implies the absence of right of participation, I must return to the question again.

Comrade Van Leuven has said that the Executive Committee has received no replies as yet to the questions put by it to the German Independent Socialist Party. In my capacity of Secretary of the Executive Committee, I deem it my duty to state that they were not able to answer the questions, first, because there has been no session of the Committee since, and second, because we ourselves have asked the comrades to postpone the answer to these questions until the general problems of the Congress are elucidated. When one asks questions, one must be able to wait for the reply.

Comrade Van Leuven will have an excellent opportunity of getting a glimpse into the soul of the German Independent Socialist Party if it will be admitted to participate in the work of the Committee dealing with the conditions for admission to the Third International. We ourselves have made a number of complaints against the I.S.P., and I believe that we of the International have done more in combating the I.S.P. of Germany than Van Leuven and Wynkop taken together. But since the representatives of the Independent Socialist Party regard some of these accusations as false, we must give them the opportunity of defending and justifying their point of view. With regard to the French Socialist Party, it has likewise been said here that none of these parties have made any applications for admission. If this be so, why did we grant them a deliberative vote? Why do we negotiate with them? I consider that this discussion is not going to bring any light on the matter, but is merely an expression of verbal radicalism having no revolutionary force behind it.

DAUMIG – I do not intend to deal with the question under discussion as far as its essence is concerned. The Congress may decide on the question of our admission as it deems proper; neither do I intend to discuss the assumptions of Comrade Wynkop, which

are not founded upon any knowledge of the situation. One would expect a man with political experience to know that the I.S.P. is not a government party, but stands in opposition to the government, I protest with all my might against the assertion that my party is not a revolutionary party. Our party counts thousands of victims, thousands of dead and wounded, thousands who languish in penitentiaries, thousands who are up for trial. I therefore object to our party being designated as non-revolutionary. All other matters we shall discuss in the sessions of the Committee.

WYNKOP – Comrades, I think it is a shame that a man like Daumig should practise his demagogy at this Congress. As far as I know, I must state that this very Daumig is the man who during the Kapp coup d'état advised the working men not to arm themselves. Now this man stands up here in Russia, where we have learned that only by civil war can we get to victory, and defends himself. But Comrade Radek has said that we are here dealing with verbal radicalism. Now the comrades here don't seem to understand what it would mean for our Western European countries to have such men as Daumig and such politicians as Cachin put on the same footing here in the Third International with the Communists and revolutionary parties which have already been doing actual work. I warn the comrades against it. My time is up. I hope that these people will not be granted more than they deserve, and that is the Independent Socialist Party – nothing, and the French Socialists – the credit they deserve after they have applied for admission.

ZINOVIEV – Comrades, I need not repeat again that we have combated and will continue to combat all the vacillations and compromises of the Right Wing of the Independent Socialist Party. But what Comrade Wynkop has said here is simply ridiculous, and compromises not our Congress but Wynkop himself and the party that has sent him here. It is clear that we entertained the greatest respect for those 10 to 11 thousand members of the I.S.P. that are now in jail, and it is only right that we should do so, for they are proletarian fighters struggling for the cause of Socialism. I do not know how many members of Wynkop's party are now in jail, or how many times Wynkop himself has stood before a bourgeois court, nor how many times he has been arrested or put in prison for the cause of the proletariat. We will cross swords with the comrades of the I.S.P., and fight them twenty times, but we will not forget at the same time that thousands of the Independent Socialist Party have been shot down by the bourgeoisie and the capitalist executioners, and We shall never forget that the members of the I.S.P. have constituted the main detachments in all these fights. I state without hesitation that the objective revolutionary value for the Third International of the eight hundred thousand workers organised in the I.S.P., though badly led, with vacillations and compromises, still weigh more on the scales of history of the Proletarian Revolution than the couple of thousand Dutch Tribunists, including the Christian Socialists. We have said it and say it again that we are going to have dealings with every mass organisation, even though it may be in error, so long as they fight together with us for the cause of the Proletariat. We are going to treat the revolutionary workers of the I.S.P. just as we are treating the workers of the Shop Steward movement, who are not Communist as yet. Should we make any concessions to the musty ideology of Kautsky, then you would be right, but this we have not done. It is ridiculous for Wynkop, speaking in the name of a party which has one and a half thousand members after fifteen years of existence, against the admission of a party comprising hundreds of thousands of ordinary workers who have been fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Communists and who are sincere revolutionaries, as proletarians always are. I therefore insist on my motion that we invite the comrades, and

that we speak with them frankly and tell them of our conditions and try to convince them; and within two months the greatest majority of the workers of the I.S.P. will be with the International, not only spiritually but in reality.

LEVI – Comrades, up till this evening I thought that, though uninformed. Comrade WYNKOP was capable of learning something. For two days I have worked hard to explain to him that the composition of the Presidium of the German Reichstag is usually made up automatically, in accordance with the number of votes of each fraction, that this Presidium is in no way connected with the government party,, that the participation in the Presidium has nothing to do with participation in the government. Comrade WYNKOP for a period of two days acted as if he had profited by this information. But this evening he threw everything to the winds and comes out again with his government party, showing thereby that what he is after is verbiage and nothing else. He speaks of the German situation as one who has never read a German paper. You would not laugh so foolishly had you undergone even a tenth part of those revolutionary struggles which we have had to wage side by side with revolutionary independents. Of course, we have fought the I.S.P. We are fighting it at every step now. We are driving it forward, and we tell them to their faces wherein they err. But when men from Holland, men who have not raised a finger to help the German Revolution and the World Revolution in general, when such men come and make reproaches, then we must say, there are tens and hundreds of thousands of German workers fighting in the ranks of the Independents, and there are hundreds of German workers who have compelled these comrades to come here to Moscow, in face of the opposition of the entire party machinery. Now, when here in Moscow a man comes up, who was ready for great revolutionary deeds when it was a question of getting his credentials for Moscow, but who was against fighting the Allies at the time when Soviet Russia was in mortal danger, then I say to him: You have not justified your own conduct, and when we have occasion to speak with the comrades of the I.S.P. of their shortcomings and to tell them of our demands, then. Comrade WYNKOP, you should be the last man to deny them this opportunity. I must remind you of something else. Last summer, during the hardest period of our illegal existence, when almost all of our comrades were in jail, we appealed to your party for assistance; we asked your party comrades to come to us, those very comrades in whose name you have just now so hotly protested. We have asked that Pannekoek and Gorter be sent to us.

WYNKOP and VAN-LEUVEN – It is a lie!

LEVI – I say that in our hardest moment, when we could barely get together an editorial staff for our paper, we asked the Dutch comrades to send us an editor, but no one came.

VAN-LEUVEN – Dittman and Crispian are not dead yet!

LEVI – The comrade exclaims that Dittman and Crispian are not dead yet; for all that neither am I dead, nor the comrade himself. You also had an opportunity of dying in Germany where hundreds and thousands of workers of the I.S.P. have perished. You have remained in Holland sitting on your coffee- sacks, and now you have become revolutionary.

BUKHARIN – Comrades, it is my opinion that there is no need to make so much fuss about the representative of a party which is so revolutionary as to elect a member of the Christian Socialist organisation to Parliament. Therefore, I propose that we close the discussion immediately and proceed with the order of the day.

ZINOVIEV – The Bureau puts Bukharin's motion to the vote. The motion is accepted by an overwhelming majority.

Those who are for the admission of the representatives of the I.S.P. and the French Socialists to participate in the discussions should raise their hands. Against? The motion is adopted by a large majority. We will now proceed to the election of sub-committees. The Bureau announces the motion of Comrade MacLaine calling for the appointment of a special committee to study the question of the Labour Party in England. MacLaine's motion is adopted.

I would propose that we determine the hours of the sessions of the Committees. The Bureau proposes that the following four Committee* get to work to-morrow: (1) On the National and Colonial Question, at 12 noon; (2) on the Trade Union Question, also at 12; (3) Parliamentarism, at 12; (4) Conditions for Admission to the Third International, at 5 p.m. All the Committees will work here, two in the large hall and the other two in the adjoining rooms. The other three Committees remain for Monday. The Organisation Committee for 11 o'clock, the Agrarian Committee for 11, the Committee which is to deal with the Tasks of the Communist International at 1 o'clock. Should the Committees not be ready with their reports tomorrow, they will have to continue on Monday. At 8 p.m. on Monday there will be a plenary session. We hope that at least one or two committees will be through with their work by that time.

SERRATI – The session of the Congress is closed.

FIFTH SESSION.
JULY 26 (EVENING).

ZINOVIEV – I declare the session open.

I request all the delegates to hand in their written reports about their respective parties as soon as possible. We have received up till now only three reports, and we ask you to hand in the rest of the material within the next two or three days. Various committees have been working but they are not through yet. The Commission on the National and Colonial questions has carried its work furthest, and is in a position to bring in its report. We therefore propose that the Congress take up the National and Colonial question for discussion to-day. Is there any objection? As there seems to be none, I propose that we pass on to the discussion of the National question. Comrade Lenin has the floor.

LENIN – Comrades, I shall limit myself to a few short introductory remarks and then yield the floor to Comrade Mating, the secretary of our Committee, who is to report in detail upon the amendments to the theses adopted by the Committee. Then Comrade Roy will present his supplementary motions. Our Committee has reported the former and the latter by unanimous vote. As you will see from the theses, we have reached unanimous conclusions on the most important questions, and I shall therefore be rather brief.

What is the essence, the main idea of our resolution?

The fundamental difference between the policy of the Second International and that of the Third International is that the latter takes up the question of the liberation not only of the colonies but also of the small nations, which are financially, economically, or politically oppressed by the great capitalist powers. The essential nature of imperialism consists in the division of the entire world into a large number of oppressed nations and a very insignificant number of oppressing nations, which are enormously rich and powerful from a militarist point of view. The enormous mass of the population of the earth, more than a

billion, probably a billion and a quarter, forming 76 per cent, of the 'population of the earth – taking the population of the earth to be one and three quarter billions – belong to the oppressed nations. These belong either to dependent colonies or to semi-colonial countries such as Persia, Turkey, and China, or to the countries which have been defeated by the great imperialist hosts and are now in a condition of complete dependence. This idea of the division of nations into oppressors and oppressed is incorporated in all the theses, not only in those signed by myself and published previously, but also in those of Comrade Roy. The latter have been written from the standpoint of India and the great Asiatic nationalities, and are therefore of special importance for us. The second important point in our theses is that the present world situation and the relations between nations following the Imperialist War is based upon a struggle between a small number of Imperialist nations and those powers where there is a Soviet movement, or where the power of the Imperialists has been overthrown by the Soviet power. Only when we regard the question from this angle can we understand the colonial and national problems in the remotest parts of the world. Only from this point of view can the Communist Parties of the civilised as well as of the backward countries correctly put and properly answer these political questions.

Next I wish to lay special stress on the question of the bourgeois democratic movement in the backward countries. This matter was the subject of some controversy. We fought over the question as to whether it is proper theoretically and on principle to declare that the Communist International and the Communist Parties are bound to support the bourgeois democratic movements in the 'backward countries. The result of the discussion was that we came to the unanimous conclusion that we should not deal with bourgeois democratic movements but with revolutionary nationalist movements. There is no doubt that every nationalist movement can be only a bourgeois democratic movement, for the great mass in the backward countries consists of peasants, who are the representatives of small capitalist relations. It would be utopian to suppose that proletarian parties – as far as there is a chance of forming such – are in a position to carry on Communist activity and Communist politics without getting into definite relations with the peasants of the backward countries and without their support. The objection was raised that in using the phrase bourgeois democratic movement we lose sense of the difference between the reformist and the revolutionary movement which have of late sprung up in the backward countries and in the colonies. The Imperialist bourgeoisie has done everything in its power to create a reformist movement. An understanding has been reached between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and that of the colonial countries, so that most often the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, though supporting the national movement, nevertheless works together with the Imperialist bourgeoisie against all revolutionary movements. This has been clearly proven, and in order to take note of this difference the words "bourgeois democratic" should be replaced by the term "nationalist revolutionary." The idea is that we, as Communists, should support the bourgeois movements for liberation in the colonies only in cases when these movements are really revolutionary, when they are not opposed to our enlightening and organising the peasantry and the great masses of the exploited for revolutionary purposes. When this is impossible the Communists are obliged to fight against the reformist bourgeoisie in those countries, as well as against the heroes' of the Second International. There are already such parties in the colonial countries; they naturally represent the reformist bourgeoisie, although they call themselves Social Democratic or Socialist. This distinction has been emphasised in all

the theses, and I believe our point of view gets thereby a more precise formulation.

Another remark I wish to make concerns the question of the peasant Soviets. The practical work of the Russian Communists in the colonies formerly belonging to the Tsar, in such backward countries as Turkestan and others, has put us face to face with the question of how Communist principles, tactics, and policy are to be applied to pre-capitalist relations. For the most important feature of these countries is that pre-capitalist relations still prevail there, and that therefore there can be no question of a purely proletarian movement. There is almost no industrial proletariat there. Nevertheless we assumed and were compelled to assume the role of leaders. Our work there has shown that there are enormous difficulties to be overcome, but the result of our practical activity has likewise shown that it is possible, in spite of these difficulties, to awaken independent political thought and activity even in those countries where there is almost no proletariat. This activity has been for us harder than it would have been for other advanced countries, because the Russian proletariat has been overburdened with problems of State. It is self-evident that peasants in a semi-feudal dependent state are able to conceive the Idea of Soviet organisation and also to act upon this idea. It is clear that the masses in these countries are being exploited not only by commercial capital, but also by the feudal relations of the State, and that this weapon, this form of organisation, can be applied to these relations. The idea is a simple one, and can be applied not only to proletarian conditions but also to feudal and semi-feudal peasant relationships. Our experience in this field has not been very great, but the discussions in the Committee, where many representatives of the colonial countries were present, have proved to us quite definitely and absolutely that we must base the Revolution of the Communist International on the assumption that the peasant soviets, the soviets of the exploited, are applicable not only to capitalist countries, but can be adapted also to pre-capitalist conditions, and that it is the absolute duty of the Communists and of those who are ready to organise Communist parties to propagate the idea of peasant soviets and of soviets of the exploited everywhere, including the backward and colonial countries, and to make the attempt, wherever conditions permit, to create peasant soviets or soviets of the labouring people. This opens up a very interesting and important field of activity. The experience is not large as yet, but we shall accumulate more and more material, and there can be no doubt of the fact that the (proletariat of the advanced countries must help and can help the backward toiling masses. There is no doubt that when the victorious proletarian Soviet Republics will lend a helping hand to these masses, the development of the backward countries will pass out of its present stage. This question aroused quite a lively discussion in the Committee, not only in connection with the theses advanced by myself, but much more in connection with those of Comrade Roy, which he is going to advocate here, after some changes have been agreed upon. The question was whether it is correct to assume that the development of capitalist economy is inevitable in those backward countries which are now liberating themselves, and in which progressive movements have been started since the war; and we came to the conclusion that it is not inevitable, and that when the victorious revolutionary proletariat will carry on a systematic propaganda and the Soviet governments will assist with all the means at their disposal, then it is incorrect to assume that the capitalist stage is unavoidable for those nations. Not only must we form independent nuclei of party organisations, not only must we proceed at once to propagate the idea of peasant soviets and to adapt these soviets to pre-capitalist conditions, but the Communist International must declare on theoretical grounds that with the assistance of the proletariat of the

advanced countries the backward nations can arrive to the Soviet form of organisation and through certain stages pass on to Communism, obviating the capitalist stage. It is impossible to indicate beforehand the means to be used for that purpose; practical experience will show the way, but it is firmly established that all working masses, including those of the remotest nationalities, are susceptible to the Soviet idea, and that these Soviet organisations must be adapted to pre-capitalist relationships, and that the work of the Communist Parties all over the world must start at once in this direction.

The last thing I wish to mention here concerns the revolutionary activity of the Communist Parties not only in their own respective countries, but also in the colonies, and especially among the troops employed by the exploiting nations for the subjection of the colonies. In speaking on this matter Comrade Quelch of the British Socialist Party said that the average English worker would consider it as treason to render assistance to the dependent countries against the English authorities. It is true that the jingoist and chauvinist elements of the Labour aristocracy of England, America, and France form the greatest danger for Socialism, the strongest support of the Second International, and the greatest treachery toward the working class.

The colonial question had been discussed in the Second International also. The Basel manifesto made a definite declaration on the point. There were promises of revolutionary action. But the parties of the Second International and, I believe, also the majority of the parties that have left the Second International, and are now seeking to affiliate themselves with the Third International do not deal with the question of doing actual revolutionary work in order to assist the exploited and dependent peoples in their revolts against the oppressing nations. We must say it openly; and it cannot be denied. No one here will attempt to deny it, and no such attempt would succeed. We have had sufficient general talk about resolutions which have aroused natural distrust, and the strong prejudices against Parliamentarism are based on the fact that the revolutionary working men have seen in it nothing but systematic deception. We must emphasise that point. The Committee was unanimous in this matter, and has given emphasis to it in many passages of the resolution. Should there be any more motions made in this regard, they will be welcome.

The above considerations have served as a basis for the resolutions, which are undoubtedly too long, but I believe that they will nevertheless be of use and contribute towards the furthering and the organisation of real revolutionary activity in the national and colonial fields, which is our main problem.

ZINOVIEV – The floor is granted to Comrade Maring, secretary of the Commission.

MARING – Comrades, the Commission has studied Comrade Lenin's theses, as well as the supplementary theses of Comrade Roy. The following alterations and amendments were made in Lenin's theses: –

The first clause of the third section says: "The Imperialist War of 1914 has demonstrated very clearly to all the nations and to the oppressed classes of the whole world," and so forth. (Reads the text of the theses.) This was changed as follows: (Reads.)

Section 4, page 52 of the German edition, third line from the bottom, reads as follows: "Also the labouring masses of all countries and of all peoples."

Section 5, page 62 on the 16th line, delete "grouping around itself," and add "should group around themselves the oppressed peoples." The same paragraph on the 20th line: "There is no salvation for them outside of an alliance with the revolutionary proletariat and the victory of the Soviet Government."

Section 6, line 10 from top, instead of “bourgeois democratic movement” read “the revolutionary nationalist movement of emancipation.” Delete from the second line of this section the words “workers and peasants.”

In the 8th paragraph, the 9th line from the top, instead of “without any basis” read “on the basis.”

Section 9, from lines 7 to 11 read “by which the bourgeois democrats limit themselves – whether or not they call themselves Socialists.”

Section 10, line 2, add the word “exclusively,” to read “exclusively verbally.”

Line 12, after the word “prejudice,” add in brackets “which appear in various forms: race hatred or national persecution such as anti-semitism.”

In the first paragraph of Section 11 read, “with the assistance of all Communist Parties is necessary to the national revolutionary,” and so forth.

The second paragraph should read: The necessity of struggle with the reactionary and mediaeval influence of the clergy, of the Christian missions, and other elements.”

In paragraph 3 read: “The necessity of the struggle with Panislamism, the Pan-Asiatic movement, and other similar tendencies.”

In paragraph 4, after the words “the Polish character,” add “where it is possible organising the peasant and all those Soviets which have been previously omitted for some Reason or another.”

In paragraph 5 to change all through the words “bourgeois democratic” for the words “nationalist revolutionary.”

Paragraph 6, line 5, read: “Imperialist empires with the assistance of the privileged classes.”

In paragraph 12 delete the sentence which begins with the words “on the other hand,” and ends with the words “national limitations.”

Comrade Roy’s theses were thoroughly discussed by the Commission, and passed in the form in which Comrade Roy is going to read them to the Congress. I think that it is possible now to introduce all these alterations into the text of the theses.

ROY – Comrades, as a representative of British India I have submitted to the Congress and to the Commission certain supplementary theses which should be made public here, In view of the fact that they have not been published. I will now read them.

SUPPLEMENTARY THESES ON THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTIONS.

(1) To determine more especially the relation of the Communist International to the revolutionary movements of the countries dominated by capitalistic imperialism; for instance, India and China, etc., is one of the most important questions before the Second Congress of the Third International. The history of the World Revolution has come to a point when a proper understanding of this relation is indispensable. The great European War and its results have shown clearly that the masses of non-European subjected countries are inseparably connected with the proletarian movement in Europe, as a consequence of centralised World Capitalism (for instance, the sending of colonial troops and huge armies of workers to the battle fronts during the war, etc.).

(2) One of the main sources from which European Capitalism draws its chief strength is to be found in the colonial possessions and dependencies.

Without the control of the extensive markets and vast fields of exploitation in the colonies, the capitalist powers of Europe cannot maintain their existence even for a short time. England, the stronghold of imperialism, has been suffering from over-production

since more than a century ago. But for the extensive colonial possessions acquired for the sale of her surplus products and a source of raw materials for her ever growing industries, the capitalist structure of England would have crushed under its own weight long ago. By enslaving the hundreds of millions of inhabitants of Asia and Africa, English Imperialism succeeds so far in keeping the British proletariat under the domination of the bourgeoisie.

(3) Super profit gained in the colonies is the mainstay of modern capitalism, and so long as the latter is not deprived of this source of super-profit, it will not be easy for the European working class to overthrow the capitalist order. Thanks to the possibility of the extensive and intensive exploitation of the human labour and natural resources in the colonies, the capitalist' nations of Europe are trying, not without success, to recuperate from their present bankruptcy. By exploiting the masses in the colonies, European Imperialism will be in a position to give concession after concession to the Labour aristocracy at home. Whilst, on the one hand, European Imperialism seeks to lower the standard of living of the home proletariat by bringing into competition the productions of the lower paid workers in subjected countries, on the other hand it will not hesitate to go to the extent of sacrificing the entire surplus value in the home country, so long as it continues to gain its huge super-profits in the colonies.

(4) The breaking up of the colonial empire, together with the proletarian revolution in the home country, will overthrow the capitalist system in Europe. Consequently, the Communist International must widen the sphere of its activity. It must establish relations with those revolutionary forces that are working for the overthrow of imperialism in the countries subjected politically and economically. These two forces must be coordinated if the final success of the World Revolution is to be guaranteed.

(5) The Communist International is the concentrated will of the world revolutionary proletariat. Its mission is to organise the working class of the whole world for the overthrow of the capitalistic order and the establishment of Communism. The Third International is a fighting body which must assume the task of combining the revolutionary forces of all the countries of the world.

Dominated as it was by a group of politicians, permeated with bourgeois culture, the Second International failed to appreciate the importance of the colonial question. For them the world did not exist outside of Europe. They could not see the necessity of co-ordinating the revolutionary movements in Europe with those in the non-European countries. Instead of giving moral and material help to the revolutionary movements in the colonies, the members of the Second International themselves became imperialists.

(6) Foreign imperialism, imposed on the Eastern peoples, prevented them from developing socially and economically side by side with their fellows in Europe and America. Owing to the imperialist policy of preventing industrial development in the colonies, a proletarian class, in the strict sense of the word, could not come into existence there until recently. The ingenious craft industries were destroyed to make room for the products of the centralised industries in the imperialistic countries – consequently the majority of the population was driven to the land to produce cereals, fodder, and raw materials for export to foreign lands. On the other hand, there followed a rapid concentration of land in the hands of big landowners, of financial capitalists and the State, thus creating a huge landless peasantry. The great bulk of the population was kept in a state of illiteracy. As the result of this policy the spirit of revolt, latent in every subject people, found its expression only through the small educated middle class.

Foreign domination has obstructed the free development of the social forces; therefore

its overthrow is the first step towards a revolution in the colonies. So to help overthrow the foreign rule in the colonies is not to endorse the nationalist aspirations of the native bourgeoisie, but to open the way to the smothered proletariat there.

(7) There are to be found in the dependent countries two distinct movements, which every day grow farther apart from each other. One is the bourgeois democratic national movement, with the programme of political independence under the bourgeois order, and the other is the mass action of the ignorant and poor peasants and workers for their liberation from all sorts of exploitation. The former endeavour to control the latter, and often succeed to a certain extent, but the Communist International and the parties affected must struggle against such control and help to develop class consciousness in the working masses of the colonies. For the overthrow of foreign capitalism, the first step towards revolution in the colonies, the cooperation of the bourgeois nationalist revolutionary elements is useful.

But the foremost and necessary task is the formation of Communist Parties which will organise the peasants and workers and lead them to the Revolution and to the establishment of Soviet Republics. Thus the masses of the backward countries may reach Communism, not through capitalistic development, but led by the class conscious proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries.

(8) The real strength of the liberation movement in the colonies is no longer confined to the narrow circle of the bourgeois democratic nationalists. In most of the colonies there already exist organised revolutionary parties which strive to be in close relation with the working masses. The relation of the Communist International with the revolutionary movement in the colonies should be realised through the medium of these parties or groups, because they are the vanguard of the working class in their respective countries. They are not very large today, but they reflect the aspirations of the masses, and the latter will follow them to the Revolution. The Communist Parties of the different imperialist countries must work in conjunction with these proletarian parties of the colonies, and through them give moral and material support to the revolutionary movements in general.

(9) The Revolution in the colonies is not going to be a Communist Revolution in its first stages. But if from the outset the leadership is in the hands of a Communist vanguard, the revolutionary masses will not be led astray, but go ahead through the successive periods of development of revolutionary experience. Indeed it would be extremely erroneous in many of the Oriental countries to try to solve the agrarian problem according to pure Communist principles. In its first stages the Revolution in the colonies must be carried on with a programme which will include many petty bourgeois reform clauses, such as division of land, etc. But from this it does not follow at all that the leadership of the Revolution will have to be surrendered to the bourgeois democrats. On the contrary, the proletarian parties must carry on vigorous and systematic propaganda of the Soviet idea, and organise peasants' and workers' Soviets as soon as possible. These Soviets will work in cooperation with the Soviet Republics in the advanced capitalistic countries for the ultimate overthrow of the capitalist order throughout the world.

Certain of the alterations which the Commission has made in my theses have been accepted by me. I draw the special attention of the Congress to these most important questions. I am most pleased that I have the opportunity for the first time to take part in the serious discussion of the colonial question at the Congress of the revolutionary proletariat. Until the present time the European parties did not pay sufficient attention to this question; they were too busy with their own affairs, and ignored the colonial

questions. At the same time these questions are of great importance for the international movement. England is at the present moment the most powerful imperialist state, the chief reason being its vast colonial possessions. It has acquired great importance, power, and a firm social position. All this should be looked upon as the result of its colonial possessions. And although the same cannot be said of Germany, in view of the fact that this country is at the present time deprived of its colonies, the question of colonies is nevertheless of significance not only for England. It is necessary that the German comrades should devote their attention to this question, for it has acquired an International significance. The economic interrelation between Europe and the colonies is at the present time the foundation of the entire system of capitalism. Surplus value, which was in the past produced in England, is at the present time partly produced in the colonies. Furthermore, additional products which are manufactured in England itself are exported to the colonies. In this way England has organised her production in such a manner that articles of primary necessity are manufactured by her during the space of three months annually. England has at all times exploited its workers in the most brutal manner. The same system of expropriation, the impoverishment and oppression of human personality in the labourer is applied by that country to all subjected nationalities. British India alone possesses a population of not less than three hundred and fifteen millions. Along with British India, England exploits also several millions coloured people in the colonies. Since the Communist International has decided to take up this question, the next step is to find the best way of furthering the development of the colonial movement. Until lately there were in the colonies only bourgeois national revolutionary movements, whose only aim it has been to replace the foreign exploiters in order to be able to do the exploiting themselves.

During the war and immediately after it great changes have taken place in India. While formerly English capitalism had always hindered the development of Indian industry, of late it has changed that policy. The growth of industry in British India has gone on at such a pace as can hardly be imagined here in Europe. Taking into consideration that during recent times the industrial proletariat of British India has increased by 15 per cent., and that the capital employed in British Indian industry has risen 2,000 per cent., one gets an idea of the rapid development of the capitalist system in British India. The same also applies to Egypt, the Dutch Indies, and China.

At the same time a new movement among the exploited masses has started in India, which has spread rapidly and found expression in a gigantic strike movement. This mass movement is not controlled by the revolutionary nationalists, but is developing independently, in spite of the fact that the nationalists are endeavouring to make use of it for their own purposes. This movement of the masses is of a revolutionary character, although it cannot be said that the workers and peasants constituting it are class-conscious. But they are nevertheless revolutionary. This is evident by their daily activity. This stage of the revolutionary movement of the masses opens a new field of activity for the Communist International, and it is only a question of finding the proper methods for gathering the fruits of that activity. Naturally a revolution started by the masses in that stage will not be a Communist revolution, for revolutionary nationalism will be in the foreground. But at any rate this revolutionary nationalism is going to lead to the downfall of European Imperialism, which would be of enormous significance for the European proletariat. I conclude my speech with an urgent appeal to the delegates of the Congress in no wise to reject that support which the colonial peoples are now offering the

revolutionary proletariat.

REED – There are ten million negroes in America, mostly concentrated in the Southern States; but of late years many thousands have gone North. The negroes in the North are in industry, while the greater part of the Southern negroes are agricultural workers or small tenant farmers. The position of the negroes especially in the Southern States is a terrible one. They are barred from all political rights. The sixteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States grants the negroes full citizenship. Most Southern States, however, disenfranchise the negroes. In others in which the negroes may legally vote they do not dare to do so.

Negroes cannot travel in the same cars with white men, enter the same hotels and restaurants, or live in the same parts of the towns. There are separate and inferior schools for negroes and separate churches. This segregation of the negroes is called the “Jim Crow” system, and the ministers of Southern churches preach a “Jim Crow” heaven. In industry the negroes are unskilled workers. Until recently they were excluded from most unions of the American Federation of Labour. The I.W.W., of course, organised the negroes. The old Socialist Party did not seriously attempt to organise the negroes. In some states negroes were not admitted to the Party at all, in others they were organised in separate branches; and in the Southern States generally the Party constitutions forbade the use of Party funds for the propaganda among negroes.

The negro in the South generally has no right in the LAW, and no protection from it. Negroes can be killed by white men with impunity. The great institution of the Southern white men is the lynching of negroes. This consists in mobbed murder, which commonly takes the form of drenching the negro with oil, hanging him to a telegraph pole, and setting him on fire. The entire population of the town, men, women, and children, come out to see the show, and carry home pieces of the negro’s clothing and flesh as souvenirs.

I have too short a time to give the historical background of the negro problem in the United States. Descendants of a slave population, the negroes were emancipated while still politically and economically undeveloped – as a military measure in the Civil War. They were then given full political rights, in order to create a vicious class war in the South, which would prevent the development of Southern capitalism until the Northern capitalists had seized the resources of the country.

The negro displayed no aggressive consciousness of race until recently. The first awakening of the negroes came after the Spanish American War, in which the black regiments fought with extreme bravery, and returned home with the sense of equality as men with the white soldiers. Up to this time the only movement among the negroes had been a sort of semi-philanthropic educational movement, headed by Booker T. Washington, supported by the white capitalists, consisting in the establishment of schools to train the negroes to be good servants in industry, and mentally to train them to reconcile to the position of a subject people. Following the Spanish War there is an aggressive reform movement among the negroes, demanding social and political equality with the whites.

The outbreak of the European War sent half a million negroes, drafted into the American Army, to France, where, brigaded with the French troops, they found themselves suddenly considered as equals of white soldiers, socially and in every other way. American General Headquarters sent an order to the French Command asking that the negroes be excluded from all places frequented by white men and be treated as inferiors.

Returning from the war, after this experience, many of the negroes being decorated for gallantry by the French and Belgian Governments, the negroes went back to their Southern villages and were lynched because they had dared to wear their uniforms and decorations in the streets.

At the same time a tremendous movement was taking place among the negroes who remained. Thousands of them went North into the war industries, and there came in contact with the broad stream of the Labour movement. The high wages paid were more than offset by the immensely high prices of the necessities of life, and, moreover, the negroes revolted against speeding up, against the merciless driving to work, much quicker than the white workers, who had been used to the terrible exploitation for years.

The negroes went on strike with the white workers, and rapidly became identified with the industrial proletariat. They proved extremely susceptible to revolutionary propaganda. At this time was founded a magazine called the "Messenger," edited by a young negro Socialist named Randolph, which combined Socialist propaganda with appeals to the race consciousness of the negroes to defend themselves against the brutal attacks of the whites. This magazine, however, urged the closest possible union with the white workers, even though the white workers sometimes took part in pogroms against the negroes, pointing out that it was the capitalists who maintained race antagonism of both blacks and whites for capitalist interests.

The return of the army from the war threw immediately four million white workers on the labour market. Unemployment immediately followed, and the impatience of the demobilised soldiers grew so formidable that the employers were forced to turn this discontent away from themselves by telling the soldiers that their places had been taken by the negroes – thus provoking massacres of the negroes by the white workers.

The first of these outbreaks occurred in the national capital, Washington, where the petty Government office holders came back from the war to find their places occupied by negroes. Most of these office holders were Southerners anyway. They organised night attacks upon the negro quarters in order to terrorise the negroes into surrendering their positions. To the astonishment of everyone, the negroes poured into the streets fully armed, and a battle raged during which the negroes boasted that they killed three white men to every negro murdered. Several months later another riot broke out in Chicago, which lasted for several days, many negroes and white men being killed. Still a third massacre took place in Omaha later. In all those fights, for the first time in history, the negroes showed that they were armed, well organised, and absolutely unafraid of the whites. The effect on the negro resistance was in the first place belated Government Interference, and in the second place the opening of the labour unions of the American Federation of Labour to negro workers.

Among the negroes themselves a great racial consciousness arose. There was and is among the negroes now a section which advocates armed insurrection against the whites. Defence societies were organised everywhere by the returned negro soldiers for resistance to white lynchers. But while the Communists should energetically support the negro defence movement, they should discourage all ideas of a separate armed insurrection of the negroes. Many people think that a negro rising would be the signal for the general Revolution in America. We know that without the co-operation of the white proletariat it would be the signal for the counter-revolution.

The "Messenger" rapidly increased in circulation, with its tone of outright defiance, until at present more than 150,000 copies a month are distributed. At the same time

Socialist ideas rapidly spread and are spreading among the negroes in industry.

Considered as an oppressed and subject people, the negroes present a twofold problem: that of a strong racial and social movement, and of a proletarian labour movement advancing very fast in class-consciousness. The negroes have no demands for national independence. All movements aiming at a separate national existence for negroes fail, as did the "Back to Africa Movement" of a few years ago. They consider themselves first of all Americans at home in the United States. This makes it very much simpler for the Communists.

The policy of the American Communists towards the negroes should be primarily to consider the negroes as workers. The agrarian workers and tenant farmers of the South present problems identical to those of the white agrarian proletariat, although the negroes are extremely backward. Among the negro industrial workers of the North Communist propaganda can be spread. In both sections of the country, among all negroes, every effort must be made to organise them in the labour unions with the white workers, as the best and quickest means of breaking down race prejudice and developing class solidarity. But the Communists must not stand aloof from the negro movement for social and political equality, which in the present growth of racial consciousness enlists the negro masses. The Communists must use this movement to point out the futility of bourgeois equality, and the necessity of the Social Revolution, not only to free all workers from servitude, but also as the only means of freeing the negroes as a subject people.

FRAINA – The previous speaker spoke of the negroes as a subject people in the United States, but we have two other kind of subject peoples-^the foreign workers and the peoples in the colonies.

The terrible suppression of strikes and revolutionary movements in the United States is not a consequence of the war, but an intensified political expression of the previously existing attitude towards the unorganised unskilled workers. The strikes of these workers were brutally crushed. Why? Because these unorganised unskilled workers are mostly foreigners (constituting about 60 per cent, of the industrial proletariat), and the foreign workers in the United States are practically in the status of colonial peoples. After the Civil War (1861-1865) capitalism developed rapidly; the great undeveloped West was opened by the trans-continental railway system. The investment capital for this development came from the Eastern states and Europe; while immigrants became the human raw material precisely as the peoples in a backward colonial country are being "developed" by an imperialistic force.

Concentration of industry and monopoly arose – all the typical conditions of an internal imperialism, before the United States developed Its external imperialism.

The horrors practised upon colonial peoples are not worse than those practised upon foreign workers in the United States. For example, in 1912 there was a miners' strike in Ludlow; soldiers were used and the miners thrown out of their homes, being compelled to live in tents. One day, while the men were some miles away fighting with the mine-guards, a contingent of soldiers surrounded the tents, set them afire, hundreds of women and children being burned to death. Under these conditions the class struggle in the United States partly assumes a racial form. Precisely as in the case of a negro revolt being the signal not for the proletarian revolution but for the bourgeois counter-revolution, so in the case of a revolt of the foreign workers. The great task is to unite these with the American workers in one revolutionary movement.

The whole of Latin America must be considered as a colony of the United States, and

not simply the actual colonies, such as the Philippines, etc., in Central America; the United States is in complete control by means of an army of occupation. But this control also exists in Mexico and North America, exercised in two ways; (1) By means of economic and financial penetration, all the more powerful since the expropriation of German interests in these countries; (2) by means of the Monroe Doctrine, which from its original form of protecting the Americans from monarchical schemes, has been transformed into an instrument to assure the supremacy of United States Imperialism in Latin America. One year before the war President Wilson interpreted the Monroe Doctrine as giving the American Government power to prevent British capitalists acquiring new oil wells in Mexico. In other words, Latin America is the colonial basis of the imperialism of the United States. The economic conditions in the rest of the world become more and more disturbed; the imperialism of the United States recoups itself by increasing the exploitation and development of Latin America. It is necessary to strike at this imperialism by developing revolutionary movements in Latin America precisely as it is necessary to strike at British Imperialism by developing revolutionary movements in its colonies. The movement in the United States has up till now paid no attention to the Latin American movement, with the consequence that this movement ideologically depends upon Spain instead of the United States. The Latin American movement must be liberated from this dependence, as well as from its Syndicalist prejudices. The American Federation of Labour and the reactionary Socialist Party are trying to arrange pan-American organisations, but these are not for revolutionary purposes. The Communist movement in the United States in particular, and the Communist International in general, must actively intervene in the Latin American movement. The movement in the United States and in Latin America must be considered as one movement, war strategy and tactics must be envisaged in terms of the American Revolution, comprising the whole of the Americas, a fundamental task of the Communist International, the accomplishment of which alone will assure the World Revolution, is the destruction of United States Imperialism; and this destruction is possible only by means of a gigantic revolutionary movement embracing the whole of the Americas, each national unit of which subordinates itself to the unified problems of the American Revolution.

RADEK – At all the Congresses of the Second International protests were raised against the rule of the Imperialist governments in the colonial countries, and at the present time as well the question is being dealt with at the conferences of the Second International, where men like Huysman, Henderson and Co. are distributing independence right and left, even to nationalities which make no demand for it. Had we nothing more to do than continually to protest to the world against the imperialist policy, and to “recognise” independences, then our task would be quite an easy one. But we have assumed a different attitude in the practical struggle of colonial countries. What we have to do is to lay the foundations of a Communist policy based on the concrete stages of colonial relationships. We have to take steps towards the practical support of the struggle in the colonies. Comrade Lenin quoted an expression of Comrade Quelch, who declared to the Committee on the Colonial Question that, should an uprising start in India, the jingo press may succeed in influencing a great part of the English working men to participate in the suppression of that uprising. If Quelch made this statement merely to show that the English working class is still imbued with strong imperialistic sentiments, then there is nothing to say against it. But if this, assertion is made in order to justify our English comrades for being passive in the case of a colonial uprising, acquiescing in the opinion

that nothing else can be done to counteract this attitude besides adopting resolutions of protest against it, *we* would be compelled to say that the Communist International must begin by teaching its members the very A.B.C. of Communism. When the English workers, instead of rebelling against bourgeois prejudices, support the English Imperialism or passively tolerate it, they are contributing towards the suppression of every revolutionary movement in England itself. The English proletariat cannot free itself from the yoke put upon it by capitalism without entering into the fight for the revolutionary movement in the colonies. When the time arrives for the English workers to rise against their own capitalist class, they will find that England can at best provide only 30 per cent, of the necessaries of life by means of her own production. They will find that American capital will make an attempt to blockade proletarian England, for even if the American shipping trade will not be able to cut off supplies from proletarian Europe for any length of time because the American producers will want to do business, it is most probable that English capital will buy up American crops for a period of one or two year[^] in order to keep them out of reach of the English proletariat. In a situation like this the fate of the English Revolution will depend upon the attitude of the peasants and workers of Ireland, India, Egypt, and so forth. It will depend upon whether these peasants and workers will regard the English working men as their defenders or they will see in them the henchmen of the English imperialists.

The Labour Congress of Scarborough has adopted an important resolution demanding the independence of India and Egypt. There was not a Communist at that Congress to get up and state that the Macdonalds are supporting the English bourgeoisie while beguiling the English workers in speaking of the independence of India, Ireland, and Egypt. It is rank hypocrisy and deception when such gentlemen who, after the massacre in Amritsar, did not rise in parliament to brand General Dyers as a common murderer, stand up as the defenders of the independence of the colonies. We regret very much that our comrades in the Labour Party did not tear the masks from the faces of these hypocrites. The International will judge the English comrades not by the articles they write in the "Call" end in the "Workers' Dreadnought," but by the number of comrades who are thrown into prison for agitation of the colonial question. We draw the attention of the English comrades to the fact that it is their duty to support the Irish movement with all the means at their disposal; that it is their duty to carry on agitation among English troops; that it is their duty to oppose with all possible force the policy of English transport and railway workers allowing the transportation of troops into Ireland. It is very easy at present to take a stand against intervention in Russia, for even the Left Wing of the bourgeoisie is opposed to it. It is much harder for the English comrades to stand up for Irish independence, and to carry on anti-militarist activity. But just this hard work we are justified in demanding of the English comrades.

This question, as well as the question of parliamentarism, is going to be up for discussion here, but it is important to point out to the English comrades of the Shop Stewards wishing to support the Communists how childish it is not to take advantage of the possibility offered by parliamentary struggle.

The peasants of India are not in a position to find out that our Shop Stewards carry on a fight against their oppressors, but, if one of them should rise in parliament and call things by their own names, he would certainly be reprimanded by the Speaker of the House. But the Reuter would report to the entire world that a "traitor" had been discovered in the English Parliament, who called a murderer a murderer. English capital

based upon the great bourgeoisie cannot be beaten only in London, Sheffield, Manchester, and Glasgow; It must be defeated in its colonies. There lies its vulnerable spot. And it is the duty of the English Communists to go to the colonies, to put themselves at the head of the struggling masses, and aid them in their fight.

We know of no case in the old International where any one of the Social Democratic parties made itself the champion of the colonial nations, When the Herreros were being driven out into the wilderness by the thousands, the Social Democrats refrained from voting on the matter, declaring they did not know the reason for their uprising.

It is the duty of the Third International to create an atmosphere in which it would be impossible to be represented here without being able, to point to the fact of having practically participated and supported colonial uprisings. This is a question of vital importance for the International. Just as we must try to take advantage of the middle-class elements which are being driven into the ranks of the proletariat, so also must the Communist International serve as the pillar of fire leading on the rebellious peoples of Asia and Africa. The Communist International must attack World Capitalism not only by means of the European proletariat, but also with the aid of the Asiatic labouring masses. Capitalism will resort to the colonies not only for economic but also for military support. The Social Revolution in Europe may still have to deal with armed hosts of coloured people. It is the duty of the Communists to take immediate action in order to obviate that.

The Russian Soviet Republic has started on this course. And when our laborious work in the East, our agitation in Turkestan and in the Caucasus for the formation of Soviet organisations, when our attempts to prepare the ground in Persia and Turkey are being regarded in England as something which the Soviet Republic is doing for the purpose of creating trouble for England, that is an utter misconception of the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. All that work is part of the programme of the Communist International. The Soviet Government is fulfilling its duty as a detachment of the International. We regard our agitation in the Orient not as an auxiliary means in our struggle against European Capitalism – we regard it as a part of the struggle which we are pledged to carry on in the interests of the proletariat of Europe. This cannot be done by artificially creating Communist Parties in such places where there is no ground for Communism; it can be done only by rendering assistance to the peoples of those countries. Comrade Lenin has pointed out that there was theoretically no basis for the assertion that every nation must pass through the capitalist phase. Not all those nations which are at present capitalist arrived at that stage by passing through the period of handicraft. Japan passed out of feudal stage right into imperialism. Should the proletarian masses of Germany, France, and England succeed in establishing Socialism, then we shall go to the colonial countries equipped not only with those means of production inherited from capitalism but with the higher methods of production which Socialism will create. We shall help them to pass out of the barbaric stage directly into a system of production whereby they could apply the modern machinery without passing through the stage of handicraft and small trading. We stand on the edge of a new epoch. European Capitalism fears the wakening of the Oriental nations. Apprehensions are being entertained of the Yellow Peril, and one may say that should capitalism prevail any longer there really is ground for apprehension of the Yellow Danger. The proletarian peasants of China or Turkey will have to emigrate in search for work owing to the pressure of unbearable exploitation. They may rise up in arms. But there is no Yellow Peril for Communism. Communism can reach out a helping hand to all oppressed nations, and bring them

assistance instead of exploitation.

SERRATI – The motion has been made to close the list of speakers.

WYNKOP – I am of the opinion that the list of speakers should not be closed at this time. The question is of importance at least for the future. This debate has not even begun as yet. Perhaps there will be no debate.

SERRATI – I see that twelve speakers have given in their names. Perhaps Comrade Wynkop is right in saying that the discussion has not begun yet. But I observe that the discussion is not following the proper channels. We have been speaking of the negroes, of Korea, of the Aland Islands, and so forth, we have dealt with a number of national questions, but we have failed to discuss the main general questions. It seems to me that we can renew the discussion to-morrow, and close the list of speakers by requesting the comrades to deal with the question at issue.

GUILBEAUX – I propose that the session be closed, but not the list of speakers. The discussion has not begun yet. The question is of great importance and should not be trifled with. We could limit the time of the speaker but we should not deprive any delegate of the privilege of the floor.

MARING – I am opposed to Serrati's proposition. It would be wrong not to give all the representatives the possibility of saying a few words about the movement in their respective countries. I am surprised to hear such a proposition made by Comrade Serrati since the Italian delegation was not interested enough to attend the sessions of the Commission.

RADEK – I am also opposed to the motion made by the Chairman. I understand that there are some here who are familiar with the question; but we do not consider the fact in these proceedings as to whether this or that delegate is familiar with the question. We are concerned with the political significance of the Colonial question. We are interested in having the working people read the proceedings of the Congress and see that the representatives of the oppressed nations have spoken here and have taken part in our discussions. Even the average working man can contribute much in portraying the conditions of his country. We want everyone to say Just what he knows and the more concretely the better. I see that the Irish delegate wishes to speak on the subject. It is of great importance that English Imperialism should know that there are elements that throw in their lot with us and are ready to fight in our ranks.

SERRATI – I should not like anybody to think that I have proposed that the discussion be closed. Before everything I want to make it clear that I have not made the proposition in the name of the Bureau. Neither on behalf of the Italian delegation. One comrade spoke here for ten minutes on the question of the coloured people in Chicago. The question cannot be analysed. It must be taken in a general way. Neither did I wish to deny the right of speech to any of the representatives of the backward countries, as they have been named in the thesis of Comrade Lenin. If I propose to close the list of speakers it is because there are already the representatives of the backward countries included. There are Chinese, Persian, Korean, Japanese, and Turkish speakers on the list. If there are any more speakers who wish to get the floor, they shall be granted it. I propose that the session be closed, then at the next session we shall decide the question of closing the list.

WYNKOP – I propose we vote on the proposition of Comrade Serrati instead of renewing the discussion on it to-morrow.

SERRATI – Well, since the opposition is so great, I withdraw my motion.

ROSMER – The discussion on this question will be taken up to-morrow at the plenary

session, at 10 o'clock in the morning.
(The Session ends at 2.30 a.m.)



SIXTH SESSION.

JULY, 28th.

ZINOVIEV – The discussion on the National and Colonial question is continued.

SULTAN ZADE (Persia) – The Second International discussed the colonial question at almost all its congresses, and adopted excellent resolutions which were never put into practice. These resolutions were for the most part discussed and adopted without the participation or representatives of backward countries. Moreover, when after the crushing of the first Persian Revolution by Russian and German executioners, the Social Democratic Party of England addressed itself to the European proletariat then represented in the Second International, in the expectation of getting support for Persia; it obtained nothing, not even a resolution. It is here, for the first time, at the Second Congress of the Third International that this question is undergoing discussion with the participation of almost all representatives of colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East and of America. The resolution adopted by our committee is fully in accord with the aspirations of the toiling masses of the oppressed peoples, especially that part of it which concerns the encouraging of the Soviet movement in those countries. At first sight, it may appear rather strange to speak of a Soviet movement in countries which are still feudal or semi-feudal. But a more careful study of the social structure of these countries will clear away all doubt in this regard.

Comrade Lenin has already spoken of the experiences of the Russian Communist Party in Turkestan, Bashkiria, and Kirghistan. If the Soviet system has brought good results in those countries, there is no doubt that in Persia and in India, that is to say, in the countries in which class differentiation has made gigantic strides, the Soviet movement is going to spread to a very wide extent.

As early as 1870 these countries had reached the climax of commercial capitalism. The situation has changed very little ever since. The colonial policy of the Great Powers, not allowing these countries to develop their own industries, has reduced them to mere markets and to sources of supply of raw materials for the Great European industrial centres. The influx of European manufactured products upon the colonial markets has brought ruination to the poor artisans and small traders, and has converted them into recruits of the ever-increasing army of paupers. In the European countries, the painful period of “primary accumulation” of capital had not lasted so long, and the rapid growth of capitalist industry has quickly converted the old artisans and mechanics into proletarians and imbued them with a new ideology. In the Orient, however, this has not been the case, and the resulting situation is that thousands upon thousands of these unfortunates have emigrated to Europe and America.

In these colonial and semi-colonial countries, there are also great masses of peasants living in frightful conditions? Feudal slavery prevails all over the Orient. A heavy burden of taxation and feudal duties weighs upon the shoulders of the suffering population. The peasants, being the sole producers, are compelled to maintain hosts of merchants, exploiters, and tyrannical officials. In consequence of the oppression they have had to live under, the masses of the Orient have not been able until to-day to create a powerful revolutionary organisation.

At the same time a great diversity of interests prevails among the ruling classes.

The interests of the landed proprietors demand the continuation of the colonial policy of the Great Powers, while the bourgeois elements are opposed to foreign interference; the

clergy protests against the Importation of products from the infidel countries, while the merchants find their profits in a competitive struggle. There is no concord of interests, and there can be none in a country in which one part of the ruling class depends on the market of the metropolis for the exploitation of their workers, while the other parties dream of national independence. All these conditions create a tense revolutionary atmosphere; and, in view of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, the next national upheaval may easily turn into a social revolution. Such is the situation, in a general way, prevailing in most colonial countries of Asia. This, of course, does not justify the conclusion that the triumph of Communism in the rest of the world depends upon the success of the Social Revolution in the Orient, as Comrade Roy asserts, and as a number of comrades in Turkestan believe. It is true that the exploitation of the colonies arouses a revolutionary spirit, but it is also true that it fosters a contrary spirit among the labour aristocracy of the metropolis. By yielding an infinitesimal part of its booty to a small fraction of aristocrats of labour, capitalism tries to retard the course of the Social Revolution. But even supposing that the Communist Revolution breaks out in India, will the workers of that country be in a position to sustain the onslaught of the world bourgeoisie without the support of a simultaneous revolutionary movement in England and in the rest of Europe? Certainly not. The defeat of the Persian and of the Chinese Revolutions furnish sufficient evidence of this.

The fact that the Turkish and Persian Revolutions have thrown down the gauntlet to all-powerful England is not because they have become strong, but because the imperialist brigands have become powerless. The growth of the Revolution in the East has also strengthened the revolutionaries of Persia and of Turkey, for the epoch of World Revolution has begun.

The passage in the theses in which support is pledged for the bourgeois democratic movements of the backward countries appears to me to be applicable only to those countries where the movement has just begun. For in those countries where the movement has already been going on for ten years and more, or in those countries where, like in Persia, the power of government has already been attained, there it would mean leading the masses to counter-revolution. In such countries we must create a purely Communist movement in opposition to the bourgeois democratic movement. Any other attitude may lead to deplorable results.

GRAZIADEI – I must first of all declare that I speak in my own name.

Since the final alterations have already been made in Comrade Lenin's theses, and the Committee has brought in its corrections and explanations, particularly since the second thesis, which caused me much trouble in its original version, has been altered and elucidated, I am happy to be able to endorse it in a general way.

If I understand aright, Lenin put the question as follows; Just as there are in every nation exploiters and exploited, so there are also on an International scale nations who exploit and those which are exploited.

The abstract idea of human equality entertained by the middle class and the Second International tends to conceal the class struggle. In the same manner the idea of national right tends to mask the economic and spiritual struggle among the imperialist nations and those oppressed by them.

Formerly this question had been dealt with in two diverse ways. The Second International dealt with the question in accordance with the data presented by the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, some Socialists thought they could react upon this matter

and rid themselves of the fatal errors committed to dealing with it by merely ignoring the whole problem.

Comrade Leola on the contrary attempted to put this problem on a realistic and Marxian basis. Lenin's method of reasoning and his grasp of the situation remains true to Marxism, and corresponds to the state of affairs that prevailed before the war, and also to that created in the period following it. The Imperialist War in its nature was not the same for all countries. That should be clearly borne in mind, for the small and particularly the colonial countries were forcibly drawn into the war, and the consequences affected them more heavily than the imperialist countries themselves.

Only the strongest nations have derived some advantage from this long and ruinous war. But the smaller nations have lost their actual independence, and their condition has become aggravated even in cases where their territorial position has been somewhat improved.

The consequences are the following: On the one hand the struggle of the imperialist powers against Soviet Russia, into which the smaller countries (Poland, Rumania, etc.) are being dragged; and on the other hand, the revolt of the colonies and the smaller nations against the imperialism of the Great Powers.

The Third International, it seems to me, cannot be separated from the Soviet Government. The victory of the latter forms the foundation of the success of the Third International, just as the defeat of the Paris Commune brought about the downfall of the First International. It cannot be denied that the heroic efforts of our comrades in Russia in their struggle against 90 many enemies contains in itself the danger of a kind of opportunism of the Left, which the Third International should strive to avoid. A strict formulation of principles is therefore necessary. It is important to emphasise that in those countries where imperialistic capital prevails, the tactics must be different than in those countries where a colonial or backward state exists. The parties of the respective countries must be allowed some freedom of action. This leads me to make the following amendments to the theses of Comrade Lenin, in proposing which I am concerned rather with the spirit than the letter of the amendments:

LAOU SIOU TCHAO – China found herself towards the end of 1918 in the midst of an intense civil war.

A Revolutionary Government was organised in the South with the intention of carrying on war against the Government of Peking.

At the head of the Southern Government was the well-known leader of the first Chinese Revolution, Sun Yat Sen, but some time afterward Sun Yat Sen retired from the Government, owing to a conflict with some representatives of the old bureaucracy, and since that time has taken no official part in the affairs of the Government. The Southern Government is continuing its struggle against the Peking Government up to the present day. The slogans of that struggle are those advanced by the Sun Yat Sen group, of which the most important are to deprive the old parliament of its right and the former president of his authority, and to compel the Peking Government to resign. The struggle is being conducted with varying success, but there is no doubt that the Southern Government has more chances of winning, in spite of the fact that the advantages of the North are much greater from the financial standpoint. It has been recently reported that the Southern troops have occupied Hou-Nan, one of the central provinces, and are advancing towards Peking. When the reactionary Government of Peking at first joined the Allies against Germany in 1915, it promised the people of China all kinds of benefits which were to be

derived as a result. The revolutionary parties protested in vain. War was declared. The Chinese people believed the Government, and, when the Peace Conference was called in Versailles, great hopes were entertained. The people's disappointment was great when the Versailles Conference not only rendered nothing to China, but sanctioned the rights of Japan to the territory it had taken from China during the war. Upon the return of the delegation from the Versailles Conference a movement of considerable force was started against the Government and against Japan. Chinese students organised themselves into a union with headquarters at Shanghai, and put themselves at the head of the movement. The students started an agitation by means of demonstrations, strikes, petitions, and so forth. They also started an agitation for the boycott of Japanese goods. The movement was forcibly suppressed, but its results were considerable. On a number of occasions demonstrators were fired upon. On the whole the movement played a great part in arousing in the masses a feeling of revolt against the Government,

The students, understanding that they can do nothing by themselves, have started of late to draw the working people into the movement. The Chinese workers have proved that they can act, though representing a proletariat industrially still very young. Thus, during the last year, we have witnessed a number of strikes in Shanghai – of an economic character, of course. The Socialist Party of Shanghai has become more and more popular among the working people. The party is Marxian, and judging by the official party organ, modestly named the “Weekly,” the movement is of a serious character. In the issue of 1st May the following mottoes were published: “He who does not work, neither shall he eat. The world must belong to the workers.” This newspaper persistently advocates the idea of Socialism as opposed to nationalism. The paper also advocates a direct union with Soviet Russia, and protests against the treaty between China and Japan concluded last year for the invasion of Siberia. In all its articles this paper advances the idea that the proletariat must conquer the bourgeoisie, and that internationalism should take the place of nationalism and the State. As I have said, the paper is very popular.

A movement for organisation has been started not only among the industrial proletariat, but also among the handicraftsmen. The European industrial crisis reflects itself also upon China. An enormous quantity of foreign goods is being poured into China; as a result Chinese industry does not advance, and the Chinese proletariat is in a deplorable position. In a word, the intellectual classes of China, the students and the class-conscious workers, are in possession of very good material for revolutionary agitation and propaganda. As far as the peasants are concerned, although there are no big estates in China, we nevertheless observe that the richer elements are beginning to buy up small lots of land, thereby increasing the poverty of the peasants. It is natural therefore that this part of the Chinese population should follow willingly the course of the urban proletariat.

China at present represents a number of provinces with almost autonomous governments, ruled by governor-generals with unlimited powers. All these governors as well as the higher officials of the Government are members of Anfu, the militarist party, that is to say, the party of the old bureaucrats, many of whom occupied high positions at the time of the monarchy. All these governors are quite independent of the Peking Government, and in giving it their support in the war against the South they do so out of private considerations. The local finances are entirely in the hands of the governors, who use their own discretion in the matter of transferring the revenue to the central Government. As a consequence the Government's resources are so insignificant that it is

obliged to resort to loans, primarily from Japan. But these loans are not given for nothing. Japan is getting hold to an ever greater extent of Chinese concessions. In a number of Chinese provinces Japan reigns supreme, as in a conquered country. On the other hand, the autocracy of the governors which I have just mentioned, and the maintenance of an army of two million men badly disciplined and following only those who possess the money – all this forms a scene of complete anarchy, and explains the reason for the prevalence of revolutionary tendencies among the masses.

At present the elements opposed to both Chinese Governments have concentrated at Shanghai, where Sun Yat Sen with his group of the defenders of the First Revolution are located. There also is located the Students' Federation, the Working Men's Union, and the Socialist Party. These three organisations are united in their strong revolutionary sentiments and their struggle against Japan, against the Chinese Government, and against the bourgeoisie.

In summarising all I have just said I must emphasise the fact that the soil in China is prepared for revolutionary propaganda. The International Congress should direct its attention to this fact. The support of the Chinese Revolution is important not only for China, but also for the revolutionary movement of the whole world. For, at the present time, there is only one force that can oppose Japanese Imperialism, which has firmly established itself in Asia, and whose grasp is reaching out on the one side towards Siberia and on the other side towards the Pacific Islands, and even towards South America – that force is a strong and powerful revolutionary movement among the working masses of China.

DJICHOUN PAK (Korea) – We are dealing now with the colonial problem in an entirely new light. We have to rectify the errors committed by the leaders of the Second International, now ingloriously passing away. Experience has shown that so long as the bourgeoisie is able to hold reserve forces in the colonies, the conquest of power by the European proletariat is impossible.

The work of the Committee has shown that all the delegates are conscious of the necessity of raising the colonial peoples to the level of the struggle against imperialism and capitalism as carried on by the European proletariat. In this regard Russia has a great historic mission to perform. I hope that the Congress, in adopting our theses, will thereby greatly contribute towards the emancipation of the colonies. Now, may I be allowed to say a few words concerning the revolutionary movement in our country, Korea. About ten years ago the Korean people were rather indifferent to the fact of their country's annexation. They remained likewise indifferent to the question of democracy, of independence, and of freedom in general. But all of a sudden this very people has awakened, and for the last eighteen months they have been struggling with the greatest heroism. We cannot say that the cultural level of the Korean people has risen very much during the last ten years. Japanese rule has not contributed towards the rise of class-consciousness or of national sentiment. While, as our teachers have said, revolutions are the locomotives of history, we must add that the fuel causing the locomotives to move along the road of revolution is to be found in economics. At present Korea is a most unfortunate country. The peasants are overburdened with taxation and duties exceeding by 300-350 per cent, those prevailing before the annexation. Thus the peasantry is being ruined, and the policy of the Japanese Bank in transferring Japanese settlers to Korea greatly aggravates the situation.

The Japanese also deprive the Koreans of the possibility of getting a utilitarian

education, and do not admit the Korean youth into the higher technical schools to study engineering or military science. Therefore, the intellectuals and the students are opposed to Japanese occupation. The same refers to the bourgeoisie. The Japanese policy is to keep Korea in a colonial condition, and to prevent her from building her own factories and mills. This caused the bourgeoisie to side with the mass[^] in the struggle against Japanese occupation, so that it has been difficult to draw the dividing line between the two classes. Our Party, nevertheless, is going to draw that line. The revolutionary movement in Korea at present is of a distinctly agrarian character. Every feudal lord, every owner of a large estate, knows that the national movement of liberation in Korea is directed not alone against Japanese Imperialism, not only against the yoke of foreign imperialists, but also against the native bourgeoisie, the majority of which are owners of large estates. When Korea will have freed herself from national oppression, it will not take long for the Korean bourgeoisie to learn that independent Korea is not* going to be the Eden which they anticipate. Even to-day the Korean bourgeoisie is already becoming suspicious of the Korean Revolution, fearing to lose its material benefits, and is beginning to take sides with the Japanese Imperialists. The Versailles Conference last year helped to draw class lines. The Right Wing, comprising all the nationalists and middle-class organisations, were for the League of Nations, and expected that Wilson – that would-be Messiah – was going to free the oppressed nations of the East. These elements insisted upon the sending of a delegation to the Peace Conference. But we know that the imperialists of America, Japan, and England could in no way deny themselves those benefits which they derived from their colonies. Therefore, we insisted upon sending our delegates not to Paris but to Moscow. We have proved right. The Korean delegation has utterly failed at the Versailles Conference, and our influence among the masses has grown as a result, and is continuing to grow ever since. Our party is now the most influential party in Korea; and I hope that, guided by the theses which are going to be adopted at this Congress, our party will hasten the process of the revolutionary movement in Korea. Side by side with the revolutionary proletariat of the world, we will march towards the final goal – Communism; and our party will be one of the principal factors in converting oppressed Korea into one of the members of the World Federation of Soviet Republics.

X – (Ireland) – The theses of Comrade Lenin laid down the general tactics of the Communist International in relation to the national revolutionary movements in oppressed countries. The Communist International, in order effectively to apply these, theses, must have a correct statement of the economic and historic development of these countries, and besides must be able to form a correct estimate of the revolutionary importance of the different forces operating in the country- Therefore, we propose not to deal with the theses in general, but to give a detailed report of the situation in Ireland.

The solution of the question of Ireland as a subject nationality may be considered from three standpoints: from that of the national revolutionary movement, from that of the petty bourgeois Social Democrats and Liberals, and from that of the Third International.

The first considers Ireland as a separate national entity, oppressed by England for 700 years, politically and economically, and as such the only solution is absolute independence from the British Empire. To accomplish this it requires the establishment of a bourgeois' democratic Irish State, modelled on the democratic republics of Western Europe. Without such independence Ireland cannot develop economically or culturally.

From the Liberal standpoint, which was adopted by the petty bourgeois Social Democratic, with few if any essential amendments, Ireland was considered as having

become economically and politically a part of the Empire, and therefore only required, to satisfy its nationalist cravings, a few reasonable political concessions in the shape of limited self-government within the Empire, but not sufficient political independence as to become inimical to the safety of the Imperial State.

But, in the case of the Third International, the case is not so easy. The situation of all small nationalities, and of the colonies in this final stage of capitalism, is somewhat complex. In most of these oppressed nations or races, there are revolutionary movements directed against imperialism. Though the fight of the Communist International is directed along other lines, it must avail itself of these revolutionary upheavals that develop with the striving of these nations to liberate themselves from imperialism in order to strengthen the world revolution. Any force that tends to hinder the free play of the imperialist states against the developing world revolution must be encouraged and actively supported by the Communist International. But the Third International must not only help these nationalist movements as a whole, but in so doing must simultaneously strengthen and group together whatever Communist groups or tendencies there are in the struggle. The direct result of such a policy would be the formation of a Communist Party, which, suffering from the military dictatorship of the imperialists will be forced to be centralised- and strongly disciplined, and capable of waging a successful fight against the national bourgeoisie, in the struggle for power, for the State, following the release from the imperialist yoke.

Recognising this, we insist that the method whereby the Communist International shall assist these national revolutionary movements be stated. The only way which would lead to the result above indicated, is active assistance only through the agency of whatever Communist groups, however feeble, exist in these countries.

Especially is this the case in Ireland, where the failure of the International, or of its section in Britain, to assist the revolutionary movement only through the Communist groups, would lead to the weakening of these groups, as this is the only method whereby they may become prominent and important during, the first period of their existence in the revolutionary struggle. The nationalist revolutionaries avail themselves of every weapon against British imperialism, and if the weapon of the Communists, internationally or in England, can only be applied through the agency of the small Communist groups, then this will force them to remain neutral to the Communist groups gathering force and strengthening themselves, or they may have actively to assist this strengthening by unconsciously affording the groups propaganda facilities.

The direct outcome of the absence of a Communist movement in Ireland would be that Ireland may be made, whether it remains subject to the present military dictatorship or establishes a bourgeois State, the basis for counter-revolutionary activity against the struggling social revolution in England, especially when it is recognised that the fleet will play a large part in the English struggle and that Ireland possesses magnificent harbours and submarine bases for a black fleet blockading England.

This brings us to the first part of the report, where the strategic position of England is considered of importance to Communism. It cannot be denied, when we consider the world situation as a fierce struggle between Soviet Russia, as the centre of world revolution, and the smaller States grouped around her, on one hand, and the League of Nations dominated by British imperialism on the other, that Ireland in constant revolutionary upheaval, in the heart of the Empire, keeping 200,000 British troops engaged, is of positive importance to the International revolutionary movement. On the other hand, it is

necessary to do all possible to prevent Ireland being used as the base for the executioners of the English revolution, as outlined above.

As regards the nationals in Ireland and America and throughout the Empire, it is well known what active interest they take in the political development of the home country, and how quickly they respond to its lead. That being so, the tending of Irish politics towards Communism would result in a vast mass of the Irish in the dominions and U.S.A., following the lead from Ireland and so strengthening the Communist movements in these countries, and assisting the international proletarian movement in general.

(Comrade X then reads the report published in extenso in No. 12 of the "Communist International.")

Y (Ireland) – I beg to call the attention of the Congress to Clause 12 of the Theses, "The century-long oppression exercised over the colonial and weaker nationalities by the imperialist Powers, has left in the working masses of the oppressed countries not only a bitter feeling but a mistrust towards the oppressors in general, including the proletariat of the dominating nations." This illustrates very largely the attitude of the Irish working masses towards the English proletariat, that the Irish workers frequently fail to make a distinction between the governing classes of England and the English workers. This attitude on the part of the Irish workers he attributes to the fact that the English Labour movement has hitherto shown itself incapable of understanding the problem presented by Ireland.

Most Polish revolutionaries I have spoken to with regard to present-day conditions in Ireland, are struck with the similarity between those conditions and the Poland of 1905. The inference is obvious, and, while we have the present revolutionary epoch on our side, the possibility that Ireland's national aspirations may be made use of by the English bourgeoisie in a social revolutionary crisis, must not be lost sight of. Hitherto, the attitude of the British revolutionary movement towards Ireland has either been one of condescending tolerance or it has adopted the Social Democratic attitude of supporting by phrases the aspirations of the revolutionary nationalists. The fact that Ireland is an important weapon against British imperialism, and that on the other hand it may be transformed into a dangerous instrument against the social revolution, seems to have been entirely forgotten. The Shop Stewards seem to be the first movement to sense the importance of the Irish question and its relation to the British revolutionary movement. The discussion and the resolutions adopted by them at their conference in London, in the beginning of this year, had the effect of arousing the interests of the Irish workers in this movement, and has already done something towards creating better relations between the two proletariats.

It is of the utmost importance that the British Communist movement shows an active sympathy with Ireland, that it propagates among the English troops in Ireland, and prevents the English unions from transporting troops and munitions to Ireland. It is interesting to note that the action of the British Labour movement on this question has resulted in the break-away of the Irish railwaymen from the N.U.R., and that within the past few months the engineers in the southern part of Ireland have broken away from the A.S.E.

There must, however, be no connection between the British Communists and the Irish nationalist movement direct, but, only through the Communists in Ireland – or after a consultation with them. It is also important that while the British Communists support the nationalist struggle, they must differentiate themselves from it; pointing out that their

attitude towards Ireland is not a bourgeois humanitarian reaction against oppression. but the result of the common class interests of the proletariat and peasants of both countries.

The attitude of the British workers towards Ireland is the barometer of the social revolutionary feeling in Britain, said Herman Gorter recently; and it might be said' that the attitude of the English Communists towards Ireland is the measure of the clarity of Communist thought in England. With regard to the statement made in Committee that the British workers will regard as treason to England the support of the colonial revolutionary struggle against British Imperialism, the sooner the British workers get familiar with treason to the bourgeois State the better for the revolutionary movement; and, if it were for nothing else than the education of the workers, such support is very necessary.

With regard to the amendment proposed by our Italian comrade, Graziadei, that in clause (a) of section II, we should substitute the words "show active interest" for "render assistance," I would vigorously oppose it. It is a Wilsonian phrase, and, like all the phrases of that gentleman, means nothing. It is another way of cutting this clause out entirely, and savours of the Second International's method of dealing with the small nationalities.

There are several points that I wished to touch upon, but which the time at my disposal makes it necessary that I should only briefly mention them. The situation in Ulster, or at least the north-east portion of that province, differs from that in the rest of the country. In many respects it presents to Communists a less complicated problem than do the other parts of Ireland. The majority of the population of this section are antinationalist and antagonistic to the rest of the country. While this is itself a complication, the class issue is clearer cut; political oppression is not here confused in the mind of the worker with economic oppression. The fact that Ulster is the industrial centre of Ireland, that the nationalist issue is subordinated, and that it considers itself an integral part of the British Empire, makes the problem similar to that presented by any large industrial centre in England.

I would have liked to deal with the question of Co-operation, which is developing into an important part of Irish economy, but time will not permit. The growth of co-operation on the land is doing much to destroy the private property ideology which presents such a difficulty to Communists in dealings with the peasants. It is developing the idea of large scale communal production, and is an offset to the petty land-hunger of the agricultural labourers and semi-proletarians.

We support the theses, 'together with the additions made by Comrade Roy which have been incorporated therein.

ISMAIL KHAKKI PASHA (speaks in Turkish) – The theses of Comrade Lenin, especially that part which deals with Islamism, require a closer acquaintance. From the moment when the Turks seized Syria and Assyria, when the road to the sacred place of Islam had fallen into their hands, from this moment the Turkish rulers tried to unite all the peoples of the East, Africa, and other places, who are followers of Islam. From the moment that the sacred places, and latterly the railways, fell into the hands of the Sultans, from the moment that the heart of Islam fell into their hands – the Turkish Sultans made every attempt to spread Pan-Islamism, and desired to unite all nationalities around Turkey, as well as all the Moslem countries of the East and Africa. But with the outbreak of the Revolution of the Young Turks in 1908 the Government was transferred to the hands of the Young Turks. The young bourgeoisie *who had seized the Government power began to seek for new roads for the amalgamation of peoples. At this time in Russia various

nationalities were suffering under the yoke of Tsarism: Tartars, the nationalities of Turkestan and Bashkiria, the Caucasian Turks, and a whole number of others. This was the reason why at this time the idea of Pan-Turkey arose; this was in opposition to the idea of Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism was incapable of uniting the various nationalities, who speak various languages. On the other hand, the idea of Pan-Turkey, which had been taken up by the Young Turks, strove to unite all the Turkish nationalities from Kazan to the Caucasus, including Turkestan, the whole of Turkey, and part of Persia. The idea of Pan-Turkey strove to unite all these nationalities. But all these dreams were left on paper. After the Russian Revolution, after the division of Turkey by the European capitalists, when the real fare of the English and French capitalists had become apparent to the Turkish people – from this moment a new movement springs up in Turkey – a movement of liberation. The Anatoli movement, which is at the present moment headed by the democratic parties, is the best response to that shameless exploitation to which Turkey was subjected by the Entente. The seizure of Constantinople was the last straw, and gave impetus to the movement. The revolutionary government in Anatolia, which is grouping around it all the anti-Entente forces, and which is imbued with a long-standing hatred towards imperialism, is now preparing to enter upon a struggle against European Imperialism. The toiling masses of Turkey will never again submit to oppression on the part of the Entente. Thanks to the Russian Revolution, which is the 'best friend of toiling Turkey, the Turkish nation will shortly attain complete freedom, and together with the working masses of the remaining countries will begin a strong battle against the imperialists of the world.

SERRATI – A motion has been made that the debates be closed. There are still eleven speakers on the list. Is there any objection?

MARING – I would insist upon granting the floor to all the speakers on the list. It seems to me essential that everyone be given an opportunity to express his point of view.

FRUMKINA – I propose that the floor be granted only to those speakers on the list who wish to make a definite proposal.

SERRATI – I put the question to the vote.

The majority is for the continuation of the debate.

MARING – One of the most important colonial questions is that of Dutch India. The question is of interest from three different aspects: (1) The situation in Dutch India; (2) the question of principle; (3) the activity in the colonies. I hope that at the next Congress there will be representatives from Java and the Malay Islands taking part in our discussions. Since, however, my experience during the last seven years has been bound up with the movement in India, I hope that the Congress will find some interest in the observations made by a Marxist in those countries. It is my opinion that there is no question in all the proceedings of the Congress of greater importance for the development of the world revolution than the colonial and national question. The Dutch colonies are next in importance to British India; they are the richest colonies in the world, having a population exceeding /that of Japan and nearly equal to that of Germany. Of the fifty million inhabitants, the greater part live on the four main islands of Java Sumatra, Bali, Lombok, making up altogether a population of 40 millions. Holland's exploitation of these colonies has been going on for the last three hundred years, but the recent period is the most important. Capitalism there began to develop since 1870. In spite of what the Italian comrade has said, imperialism began to develop in Holland since 1915, and has progressed a great deal. In the course of ten years Holland's rule has spread over a great part of

Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, and New Guinea. This corresponds exactly to Comrade Rosa Luxemburg has written on this question concerning the accumulation of capital, as well as /to what H. Roland Holst has stated, namely, that the greed of capitalism knows no bounds; that capital becomes anxious as soon as it learns of goldfields or mines that are not being exploited, and begins to ask its government for new expeditions; that it is never satiated with the number of men and the quantity of money employed in the plunder of the world, and the oppression of backward tribes and nationalities. Since 1905 the growth of capitalism in the Asiatic countries has gone on at a very rapid pace. Considering that at the present time one and a half billion – that is a third part of the entire capital of Holland – is invested in /the colonies; considering that in 1917 the amount of at least 25 million pounds sterling was pumped out of the colonies for Holland; considering that, together with Holland, American, Japanese, and English capital is doing business in the sugar, cocoa, coffee, and other plantations – one gets an idea of what modern capitalism can accomplish in the colonies for international capitalism. I should like to point to a statement made by one of the most prominent capitalist papers in Holland, that even if it were possible to nationalise all private enterprises in Europe, there are still new possibilities for private enterprise in the colonies much greater than in Europe.

In concluding this short sketch I should like to say a few words concerning the condition of the population. There are a hundred and fifty thousand Europeans plundering the East, whose daily practice confirms the saying of Rudyard Kipling that East of the Suez Canal the ten commandments cease to be applied. Besides the Europeans there are a million Chinese and a number of Japanese carrying on industry on a large scale in Java. The fact that in Java itself there are two hundred large sugar refineries with a great number of workers working on them, is sufficient indication of the fact that the Eastern countries are of no mean significance for the Revolution.

Now, as to the condition of the peasantry forming the majority of the population. There are about 25 million of them, including families whose yearly total income amounts to 110 Dutch guilders each, twenty guilders out of 'that (number going for the payment of taxation. For their lodgings they spend 6 guilders yearly, and for their agricultural implements only 3 guilders. The peasants are in possession of their land, but, nevertheless, they are becoming more and more proletarian, renting out a part of their soil to European capitalists, and being thoroughly exploited 'by the privileged classes of Java, so (that, not being able to live on their land, they are driven into the sugar refineries.

Considering that there is now in Java a proletariat of about a million souls, with an average income of about half a guilder a day, considering that the rise in prices set in Java as well; that the inhabitants of Java nowadays get rice for their meals only once a day, one realises that the soil here is quite prepared for revolutionary propaganda. Considering further that the illiteracy there is very great, that out of a thousand adults only fifteen can read and write, and that only 10 per cent, of the children attend schools, one can understand perhaps that a Marxian, seeing the enormous work in the field of education carried on in Russia to-day, cherishes the hope that a similar fate should be the lot of the Eastern nations.

I shall not elaborate any more on the condition of the inhabitants. A written report on the matter has been handed by me to the Secretary, which is going to be published in the "Communist International." I am giving these facts here merely because I received the impression that with a few exceptions, this Congress of the Third International has not fully realised the significance of the Oriental problem. Concerning the movement in Java,

I wish to say that in 1907 it began as a nationalist movement bearing a revolutionary character from the start. An Indian "Zoubatov," however, has succeeded in changing the trend of this movement, so that there is at present no real revolutionary nationalist movement in the Dutch Indies. But much more important is the mass movement now comprising about one and a half million persons of the combined peasants and workers, which has been making rapid progress since 1912. This organisation, in spite of the fact that it bears the religious name of "Sarekat Islam," has nevertheless assumed a class character. It is the duty of the Socialist and revolutionary movement to get into close touch with that mass organisation of the Sarekat Islam in consideration of the fact that it includes in its programme a struggle against the capitalists, against the Government, and also against the Javanese nobility. In 1916 the Government attempted to make use of this movement for military propaganda, but a strong opposition to that has developed among the younger members. When the European Socialists, in 1914, finally decided to do their duty with regard to the Far Eastern countries, and to start a movement there, two or three of them succeeding in getting in touch with some of the local organisations of the Sarekat Islam. The majority of these mass organisations are not consciously Socialistic. But they are revolutionary in the same sense in which Comrade Roy has pictured British India to be.

Yesterday I heard the English comrades in -the Committee say that the mass movement in India would lead only to misfortune and massacres. I am of the opinion that only through mass action can a real socialist movement be organised, that only by this means can we create an actual force to oppose capitalism. We stated that the middle class in Java did not succeed in its attempt to get the masses interested in the nationalist question. But after we went to the proletariat in the sugar refineries and spoke to them about low wages and about their high rate of mortality, of heavy taxation, etc., then we gained their confidence and interested them in the Socialist revolutionary movement.

The capitalists realise the significance of the development of the East for capitalism. In 1917 a strong movement was started among the revolutionary Mussulmans, in which the reformists openly sided with the Government. The latter referred to our • comrades there, saying that they will bring misfortune to their country as Trotsky and Lenin have brought to Russia. In the year 1918 there was not a mass meeting held in the centre of the sugar industry, where there were not at least three or four thousand workers of the various factories present. A new spirit has arisen in the masses, which is of great importance for our entire movement.

We naturally carried on propaganda among the sailors of the colonial fleet, but were driven away by the English. Later we learned that the movement we started has developed further, owing to the fact that economic conditions have prepared the ground for 'mass movement.

Coming to the second point of my argument, I wish to state that I find no distinction between the theses of Comrade Roy and those of Comrade Lenin. They are alike in essence. The difficulty lies only in finding the precise formula for the relationship between the revolutionary national and the Socialist movements in the backward countries. This difficulty does not exist in reality. In actual practice we find it necessary to work together with the revolutionary nationalist elements, and our work would be half done if we should deny the nationalist revolutionary movement and play the dogmatic Marxists. In our colonial policy we must not follow the so-called "Marxism" of Kunow. We must realise that in the colonies the capitalist phase of production can be averted. I was happy to hear

Comrade Radek make it clear to the Congress last night that we go to India not to take but to give. The best that we can give to the proletariat is the hope for cultural and economic freedom and for a new life. I was glad to hear him remind the English workers of their duties in saying that the English working men must not forget the colonies in their political and trade union work. As long as the English fail to understand this, they may perhaps draw many votes during elections, but they will not be doing any work of real revolutionary value. We need no long-winded resolutions. We must attempt to do practical work in the Far East.

We are going to have a Congress at Baku, but do not cherish the Illusion that this Congress is going to have very big results for the Far East. I would propose that the theses accepted here by the Third International be published in the Oriental languages, and distributed especially for the Chinese and Indian movements. I propose further that a Bureau of Propaganda of the Third International be organised for the Far East and for the Near East. For the movement has now become of great importance, and it would be very useful to concentrate the propaganda there, for it cannot be sufficiently well carried on from Moscow.

In conclusion, I have one request to make. Yesterday Comrade Reed has said that the negroes should come over here to Russia in order to see how things look. I would propose that the Third International give the leaders of the Far Eastern movement the opportunity of staying here for half a year, and go through some course in Communism so that they get a proper understanding of what is taking place in Russia, that they may be able to carry into life the ideas of the theses and extend their work in the colonies for the realisation of soviet organisations. Moscow and Petrograd have become a new Mecca for the East, and we must give the Eastern Communists the opportunity to get a theoretical education in Communism so as to help make the Far East an active member of the Communist International.

FRUMKINA – I should like to have minority nationalities taken in consideration. I am surprised to see the fallacy of the Second International repeated here with regard to this matter. Much has been said on the question of territorial autonomy, but no attention has been paid to the minority nationalities in the various countries. I therefore wish to amend article 9 of the amendments. But before making my amendment I wish to refer to the attitude of the Communist Party and of the Soviet Government on this question. In Russia there are departments of national minorities in the respective commissariats dealing with national minorities, such as Jews and others.

The following is the amendment I wish to make. On page 48 (French text) at the end of the thesis I wish to make the following insertion; “At the same time, the Communist Parties in all countries should combat in their propaganda and in their general policy the bourgeois idea of the rights of this or that national majority over the minorities living in their countries and the notion of the social patriots considering the national majority as the absolute master of the workers of the minority nationalities, regarding them as strangers (Poland, Ukrania).”

The once oppressed middle-class masses may themselves become oppressors, if we should give support to their national aspirations, even if they be of a revolutionary nature, without making perfectly certain that they are going to guarantee the rights of the minorities living on their territory.

All Communist Parties should base their programmes concerning the national question on the practice of the Soviet Government; and of the Russian Communist Party, giving the

workers of all nations the possibility of unhampered development, by creating departments of national minorities in all State institutions (Department of Education, Commissariat of Nationalities, etc.), and thus laying the basis for a real brotherhood of nations.

Paragraph 2: Following the words "in these countries," add the sentence "also the struggle of the minorities to secure their rights." Paragraph 6: Following the words "backward countries," add "and nations." Add the following remark to paragraph 6: "The Palestine affair furnishes striking evidence of the deceit and treachery practised by the Allied imperialists and the bourgeoisie of the Allied nations. Under the mask of creating a Jewish Government in Palestine, the Arabian workers of that country have been made a subject of England's exploitation. This is to be expected the more because the Zionists are active in all countries; they adapt themselves to every regime, and carry on an agitation for Zionism among the backward Jewish working masses, and at the same time try to form proletarian groupings (Paole Zion), appropriating to themselves a Communist phraseology.

MURPHY – It is one of the ironies of this Congress that the delegates most vitally interested in the most important questions before the Congress are hindered from following the discussions by the exclusion of the English language. I cannot say all I would wish to say, and therefore must confine myself to certain leading factors. No one will dispute the fact that England and America are the greatest imperialist nations of the world. All will agree that the Revolution cannot extend very far without vitally affecting the colonies and subject peoples under their control. Of America I shall say nothing at this moment. England has, besides her colonies, India, Ireland, Egypt, South Africa, etc., subject to her domination. The liberation of the peoples of these lands means the fall of her Empire. This task of liberation is thrust equally upon the proletariat of Britain as upon the proletariat of the colonies in the countries I have named. It was once easy to subscribe to internationalism, but to-day we have passed from the day of pious resolutions to that of revolutionary practice, and it is useless to say we sympathise with subject peoples, etc., unless such sympathy is translated into deeds. Within Ireland, India, and Egypt revolts have been repeatedly occurring, yet one cannot say that the English proletariat or the revolutionary movements have done much to render real assistance to these peoples. Rather have we heard complaints about premature uprisings, and so on. Such parochialism must be swept away. It is necessary to affirm that not only is it necessary "to sacrifice the interests of the one country to the interests of the world proletariat," but also that the proletariat of dominant powers must make a supreme effort to assist by deeds the strivings of the subject peoples to be free.

The best way for such as the English proletariat to avoid "Amritsar incidents" is to create a movement capable of challenging the perpetrators of such incidents, and to be in such contact with the colonial movement and those of the subject nationalities that simultaneous proletarian action be attained.

The tempo of the revolutionary movement varies in different countries. Ireland has been revolutionary for years, whilst the English movement has in its insularity extended little more than pious sympathy. This will not do. It is essential that the Communist Parties in these countries rid themselves and their proletariat from insularity. The Communist International must be organised in such a way that organic contact can be maintained between the masses of the dominant and subject nations and colonies, in order to make possible the break-up of Empires and instituting the practice of internationalism.

MACLAINE – I shall not waste any time on the subject of whether one section of the British movement has done more than another to combat British imperialism and to aid the subject colonial peoples. The British revolutionary movement is not a very strong movement, and it has not done very much in this connection. I must, however, join issue with Comrade Radek who said that the British workers had done nothing to hinder British attacks on Russia except pass resolutions. The answer to that is, that General Golovin in his secret report to Sazonov, describing his interview with Churchill, reported that Churchill regretted that he could not give more assistance to Kolchak and his friends because of the opposition of the British working class. Such aid as Britain now gives to the Whites had to be given secretly.

A wrong construction has been put on the words of Comrade Quelch who, in Committee, said that a great revolutionary uprising in India would be regarded as treason to Britain, and would enable the British Government by their control of the press, to rally the British people against the Indian workers. Quelch did not mean that we should desist from revolutionary activity on that account, but that we should recognise facts and take care not to have several “Amritsars” on a large scale.

The task of the Third International is to suggest lines of action and to lay down principles guiding towards the world revolution. The greatest obstacle to the world revolution is imperialistic Capitalism, and the greatest imperialist capitalist State is Britain. Therefore the colonial question is very largely a question of how best to attack British capitalism. British capitalism receives its support from the exploitation of the workers at home plus the exploitation of the colonial peoples. In the early days of development, British capital was self-supporting; now it draws tribute from all the world. Subject races everywhere are exploited to support parasitic British capital. Imports are now much greater than exports, which proves that Britain as such is a parasite. In the future British capital will try to arrange for the British workers to receive the full value of their labour, on condition that they will agree to the exploitation of the subject races.

Our duty, therefore, is to fight in the revolutionary struggle at home and to assist all real colonial revolutionary movements. Any revolutionary national movements that are fighting for real separation from the British Empire are helping the development towards the world revolution, because they are striking at the fountain head of imperialist reaction, viz., Great Britain. All such movements should be helped.

WYNKOP – Comrades, what I said yesterday evening concerning the importance of the subject under discussion has proven perfectly correct. The world war and imperialism may have made it impossible for the industrial countries to continue shipping the necessary machinery and manufactured products to the agrarian countries, while on the other hand, the political consequences of the war have been hindering the transportation of the products of the soil to the proletarian masses of the industrial countries. Taking this into consideration, we realise that this problem exceeds in importance all others on the agenda. The theses, which I for my part fully endorse, differ fundamentally from the point of view of the Third International on this question. They do not deal with the creation of new national governments, but with supporting whenever possible the development of Communist and Soviet ideas.

There is one question to which I would like to draw the attention of the Congress. The economic development in some countries may not follow the same course as that of the European countries; some may arrive at Communism without passing through the capitalist stage.

I am not altogether in agreement with Comrade Graziadei. I do not approve of the way he formulated his objection, and his amendments lack clearness. The theses presented are theoretically correct. Comrade Graziadei said that the Communist Party has no right to support the revolutionary nationalist movement of the colonial peoples. To my mind it is the duty of the Communist Party to do that.

I was glad to hear Comrade Roy declare that in the struggle against imperialism we must transfer the centre of gravity to the colonies. From this it follows that the small Communist Parties in the colonies are of great importance.

It seems to me that when a Communist Party of a colony has proved itself efficient, as in the case of the Dutch Indies, it must be given particular attention. I am for the acceptance of the theses, to which, it seems to me, no valid objection has been raised, and for a most energetic support of the revolutionary movement directed against imperialism.

I therefore ask the Congress to reject the amendment of Comrade Graziadei, which lacks clarity and precision. The substitution of the words "active interest" for "assistance," is only going to bring in ambiguity, and I therefore ask that the Congress accepted the theses presented without any alteration.

MEREJIN – The views expressed by Comrade Frumkina with regard to Zionism and the Poalei-Zion are in perfect accord with those entertained by the Jewish section of the Russian Communist Party. I shall therefore not dwell on that matter. But I wish to refer to the (question of the rights of national minorities in countries with mixed populations. The parts of the Second International have devised a way of defending those rights by means of national individual autonomy (theory of Otto Bauer and Renner). In the Ukraine, White Russia, and Lithuania, attempts have been made to put this theory into practice. The Central Rada and other petty bourgeois governments of the above countries instituted national individual autonomy which has proved an utter failure.

National oppression has not diminished one iota with the passing of power from the big manufacturers to the republican- democratic petty bourgeoisie. The social traitors in power exceeded all limits. Having granted all national individual autonomy, they have in their fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat surpassed even the cruelties of Tsarism. They resorted to violent national oppression in spite of the national individual autonomy proclaimed by them officially. They have gone even so far as to try to exterminate the national minorities by means of cruel pogroms, raids, etc., as was done for example by the so-called "Ukrainian National Directorate" and the government of Pilsudsky, Morachevsky, and others.

But this is not all. It is important to point out that national individual autonomy is generally aggravating the position of the proletariat of the national minorities. This is due to the fact that the petty bourgeoisie of the national minorities consists mainly of city inhabitants. This urban petty bourgeoisie is much less revolutionary than the small bourgeoisie of the majority nation. For the latter consists chiefly of peasants who have become revolutionary in their struggle against the large landowners. The proletariat of the national minorities was frequently forced to appeal for help to "foreigners" against the national individual autonomy "granted" to them. Faced by its own big and small bourgeoisie, the proletariat has proved in a much worse condition under that autonomy than before.

These considerations prompt me to propose the following amendment to thesis No. 3:

"The attempt made to settle the relationships between the nations of the majority and the minority nationalities in territories of a mixed population (Ukraine, Poland, White

Russia), has shown that the transfer of the power of government from the hands of the big capitalists to the groups of the petty bourgeoisie constituting the democratic republics not only does not diminish, but, on the contrary, aggravates the friction among the nationalities. The democratic republics oppose themselves to the proletariat, and attempt to convert the class war into a national one. They become rapidly impregnated with nationalistic exclusiveness, and easily adapt themselves to the practices of the previous dominating nations, which fermented discord among nationalities, and organised pogroms, with the assistance of the government apparatus, to combat the dictatorship of the proletariat (the anti-semitic movement in the “democratic” Ukraine towards the end of 1917 and the beginning of 1918, organised by the Central Rada). The savage pogroms during the end of 1918 and the first half of 1919 were organised by the “Ukrainian National Directorate.” The pogrom movements in the Polish democratic republic have been furthered by the Polish Socialist Party, the Party belonging to the Second International, as well as by the coalition regime of Pilsudsky. Experience *has* likewise shown that there is no democratic form of government which would defend the rights of the minority nationalities in a territory with a mixed population. The national autonomy granted by the Austrian Social Democracy under a democratic republic cannot insure the protection of the interests of the minority nations and grant them actual equality of rights, and an influence equal to that of the majority. National autonomy based on universal suffrage divides the proletariat into national units and weakens the revolutionary struggle; it also frustrates the efforts of the proletariat and aggravates the position of the proletarian minority, in matters of culture. This comes as a result of the fact that within every national minority there is a middle class national bourgeoisie more numerous and more powerful than the proletariat. They live preferably in cities, and are more reactionary than the middle-class bourgeoisie of the majority nation, which is made up of peasants that have become revolutionised in the struggle against the large landowners.”

Concerning the question of Jewish pogroms, the Jewish Section of the Russian Communist Party proposes the following resolution:

1. In its bloody campaign against the dictatorship of the proletariat, the international counter-revolution has dealt most cruelly with the poorer elements of the Jewish population in Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, Palestine, and elsewhere.

2. By means of these atrocities .perpetrated upon the Jews, exceeding in cruelty not only the deeds of Tsarism, but surpassing even the Inquisition of the Middle Ages, the world counter-revolution is endeavouring to introduce discord and hatred into the ranks of the workers of various nationalities in order to divert their attention from the immediate struggle against the bourgeois order.

The .Second Congress of the Third International therefore declares before the entire world that –

Whereas the blame for the recent Jewish massacres in the Ukraine. Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Palestine, and others falls entirely upon the Allies which are responsible for all counter-revolutionary attacks against the Communist Revolution; and whereas the Allies are supplying the White guards of all shades and colours with instruments of extermination and are rendering moral support to those who are murdering hundreds of thousands of innocent people in all parts of the world, and are ignoring the protests of the toiling masses against the massacres nor do anything to put a stop to them; moreover, the agents of the Allies in the ranks of the counter-revolutionary armies of Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, and other countries are the immediate participants in these massacres,

a fact which has been particularly pronounced in the Jerusalem massacre of April, 1920, which was organised by the agents of an Allied Government; and whereas the parties affiliated to the Second Yellow International which were or still are in power in the Ukraine – “the Ukrainian National Directorate” and in Poland – the Government of Pilsudski are participating morally and materially in these massacres, exterminating hundreds of thousands of women and children and shedding seas of innocent blood in the Ukraine and Poland in their endeavours to stifle the proletarian dictatorship, –

Therefore, be it resolved that the Second Congress of the Third International expressing the will of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, hereby protests most energetically against the Jewish pogroms which are the handiwork of the world counter-revolution. We call upon the toilers of all countries to carry on an energetic struggle by word and deed against these massacres and to tear off the mask from the hypocritic diplomatists of the League of Nations, exposing their infamous role, and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat everywhere, which alone is able to put an end to all massacres, do away with all national prejudices, sweep away all national boundaries and institute a brotherhood of nations all over the world. The Second Congress of the Third International calls upon the workers of all subject countries in particular to close their ranks and rally round the (banner of the Third Communist International which is to bring to mankind delivery from all the injustice of the capitalist regime.

COHN – I regret that the discussion touching on the Jewish question has taken a turn not anticipated by the revolutionary Jewish elements and by the members of the Committee. Some of the protests which we have heard were addressed by a party which had recently been a member of the Second International, while we ourselves have never refrained from maintaining the Communist programme. In a general way, it seems to me that the theses have not taken sufficient account of the minority nationalities living in various countries. We have been accused of having formed a national state in Palestine. In the interest of the International movement I would like to see the Jewish workers in Palestine instead of remaining under foreign exploitation, be able to organise a Communist Party in Palestine.

I ask you to reject the amendments of Comrade Frumkina and Merejin. The resolution of protest against the agents of the Allies who have participated in the Jewish massacres seems to me out of place. The Congress should adopt resolutions only of a realistic nature. It would mean to lower the prestige of the Congress if it were to vote on simple resolutions of protest.

FRUMKINA – I protest against the accusation against the Jewish Bund. The Bund has always sided with the Soviets, even before it entered the ranks of the Communist Party.

ZINOVIEV – I propose that a vote be taken for and against the theses, after which they should be sent back to the Committee. I hope that the (Committee will be able to reach a unanimous conclusion. Should it find it impossible to agree, they will then have to bring the matter up again before the Congress.

SERRATI – I was supposed to make a speech, but I prefer to limit myself to a brief remark.

In the theses proposed to the Congress on the National and Colonial questions by Comrades Roy and Lenin, I find not only some contradictions but also a grave danger for the Communist proletariat of the advanced countries, for the proletariat which should be constantly opposed to every class compromise especially in the pre-revolutionary period.

The definition of the term “backward countries” is too vague and too indefinite not to be

confused with the Chauvinistic interpretation of the term.

On the whole, the entire struggle for national liberation carried on by the democratic bourgeoisie, even when insurrectionary methods are employed, is not a revolutionary movement. It usually serves the interests of national imperialism striving to rise to the surface, or it serves the interests of capitalist imperialism of another country in competition with the dominating nation. The movement for national liberation can be revolutionary only when the working class maintains its own class lines.

The class struggle in the so-called backward countries can be carried on only when the proletariat preserves its independence of the exploiters, even of those bourgeois democrats calling themselves revolutionary nationalists.

Only by means of a proletarian revolution and through the Soviet regime can the subject nations obtain their freedom. This' cannot be done by temporary alliances of the Communists with the bourgeois parties called nationalist revolutionists.

These alliances only demoralise the class consciousness of the proletariat, especially in countries where the proletariat has not been tempered in the struggle against capitalism. The lack of clarity in the theses may serve as a weapon in the hands of the chauvinist pseudo-revolutionaries of Eastern Europe against Communist International activity. For these reasons I shall have to abstain from the vote.

WYNKOP – Not having taken part in the discussion, Serrati now declares our theses counter-revolutionary and of a compromising nature. I move that the Congress open a discussion on Serrati's declaration. (Applause.)

PESTANA – Being the- representative not of a political party but of a labour organisation, and not being able to take upon myself an obligation which I am not sure of being able to live up to, I shall refrain from voting.

GRAZIADEI – I intend to adhere to my previous statement I shall vote upon the theses and support the amendments which I have proposed.

SERRATI – I don't know whether Comrade Wynkop respects me as much as he himself is respected by Comrade Levi, according to the latter's statement. My policy has never given the opponents of my party grounds to compromise it, and my activity in the Communist International movement is sufficiently clean so as not to give the enemy an opportunity of misinterpreting my public announcements. I have never endorsed declarations in favour of Germany, nor in favour of France, for the purpose of procuring votes. I have always been true to myself. This is why my statements carry weight for the International Communist movement. I know my duties towards the movement; these duties I have always fulfilled in spite of everything. I do not care what the bourgeoisie thinks of me. I rather like the Italian bourgeoisie to regard me as a traitor. But I have no liking for argumentation. Comrade Wynkop has argued a good deal, and no one interferes with him. But as far as I am concerned I have not taken part in the debate. I am convinced that the Congress ought to vote on the theses presented. You have the right and the privilege of voting; you cannot abstain from it. But as far as I am concerned, my position is different. For a period of six years I have been advocating revolutionary Socialism in my paper, and have fought against such principles. I do not wish to abandon my views now. I do not fear to take up my policy again when I return to Italy. I ask you therefore, dear comrades, to pass on to the order of the day.

WYNKOP – You are bound to explain yourself before the Congress.

SERRATI – If you insist on calling me out for discussion I shall have to discuss, but I am at a disadvantage. I must tell you, my Dutch comrade, that I have come here to do the

work of solidarity and not to criticise. I will therefore allow myself to maintain the same attitude to the end.

ZINOVIEV – I am taking the floor on behalf of the Russian delegation. I put the blame on Comrade Serrati for not having participated in the discussion of this question in the Committee. The International Congress has been called together for the purpose of considering matters on common grounds. The majority of the Communist workers of Italy will not approve of Serrati's conduct, and will agree with the Congress.

I absolutely deny that the theses, which are nothing but a summary of some propositions of Marx and Engels, can furnish any ground for misinterpretation.

WYNKOP – No representative of the revolutionary movement has a right to speak thus. Serrati has boasted of never having made any declaration in favour of either France or Germany. This phrase contains an insinuation on my account. I energetically deny all such allegations, and demand that an investigation be made.

I request that the announcement of Serrati be not inserted in the proceedings, for the Congress has no possibility of discussing it. At the next Congress of the Italian Communist Party Comrade Serrati will have every opportunity of explaining himself.

ROY – Serrati has referred to my theses and to those of Comrade Lenin as being counter-revolutionary.

SERRATI – Oh, no!

ROY – I am sure that no proletarian can regard the assistance rendered to the oppressed peoples in their struggle against foreign oppression as being reactionary. Every national revolution in a backward country is a step in advance. It is unscientific to distinguish the various forms of revolution. Every revolution is one of the varieties of the Social Revolution. The peoples of the exploited countries, whose economic and political evolution has been hampered, must pass through the stages which the European peoples have passed long ago. One who regards it as reactionary to aid these people in their national struggle is himself reactionary and the advocate of imperialism.

I protest against Serrati's declaration, and request that it be not inserted in the proceedings.

SERRATI – I have no objection to an enquiry being made on the accusation against the Dutch Party. I did not make the accusation. I only referred to what Comrade Levi said. Since the comrades have given me the occasion, I must state that a discussion cannot be opened on a point of order preceding the vote. I did not raise the question out of love for discussion, but I find it peculiar that the comrades should insist on my speaking when they have no right indeed to discuss my point of order. I find it still more strange that the Congress should insist that my announcement be not inserted in the proceedings. I propose that none of the nonsensical things just said here inserted in them. I could propose that the accusation made by Comrade Levi against Wynkop be deleted. It is much more serious than the frank and precise statements which I have made and upon whose insertion I insist.

Comrade Roy did not understand my announcement. I said that the theses in the form in which they are presented are not sufficiently clear, and they could therefore serve as a source of misinterpretation by chauvinists and nationalists. If I believed that the theses themselves were counter-revolutionary, I would find enough, courage and frankness within me to vote against them, and it would not be such a great evil either to have some one in a Communist Congress voting against this form of proposition.

Comrade Roy has said that every revolution has a social character, but this is exactly

the argument which, during the war, all the compromisers and the accomplices of the bourgeoisie used to advance against us. They told us that a revolutionary war is a social war, that one must take part in it. But we said no; we would not take part in it.

Comrade Zinoviev has made a statement, in the name of the Russian Communists, that one has to speak clearly and definitely. I have always done that. But I have already stated that I feel myself at a disadvantage to speak on a question which cannot be discussed properly here.

I intended to propose a resolution here, but I have not done so because I do not think that the questions can be discussed here with the necessary impartiality. I was going to propose the following resolution; "The Congress sends its fraternal greetings to all the peoples suffering under the oppression of the Imperialist Powers. It stands ready actively to support every movement directed against all exploiters, and it declares that in this struggle against capitalist oppression the proletariat may take advantage of every national insurrection in order to turn it into a social revolution." The thought I express here is perfectly clear. Instead of saying that the Communist Party and the working class can, under certain conditions, and in a certain measure, join a petty bourgeois movement, I say the working class can take advantage of a bourgeois revolutionary movement in order to turn it into a social revolution, but one must not support the bourgeoisie even in backward countries on peril of losing one's class position and class consciousness. In backward countries the masses are even more susceptible to lose their class consciousness than in the advanced countries. The proletariat of those countries has not yet worked out a sufficiently strong class consciousness, and consequently can be easily misled by its leaders.

Comrade Zinoviev has said that the proletariat will have to judge about the conduct of their representatives in the International Congress. That is self-understood, for the delegates to the Congress will have to give an account to their constituents on returning to their respective homes. Then the masses will pass judgment on our work. I have never made any concessions to the petty bourgeoisie. I have staunchly maintained this attitude in the National Congress of Florence, and the Congress approved of it.

BOMBACCI – I must declare that I do not share the opinion of Serrati in the way he has formulated them in his announcement.

WYNKOP – I am surprised that Comrade Serrati has taken the floor twice after the debate had been closed.

ZINOVIEV – I move that the debate be closed, and that we proceed to the vote. The question is not worth dwelling upon. We cannot hinder the insertion of Comrade Serrati's announcement in the proceedings. I move that the debate be closed. Motion adopted.

LEVI – The theses are known to everyone. They have been published in all languages. The Chairman proposes that we vote on them and pass to the order of the day.

ZINOVIEV – I put to the vote the Theses on the National and Colonial questions.

The Theses are adopted unanimously with three abstaining votes. (Applause.)

ZINOVIEV – All doubtful points will be referred back to the Committee. If a unanimous decision is reached by the Committee, a final report will be brought in before the Congress. If the Committee fails to agree, the question will be re-submitted to the Congress. I propose this mode of procedure. Motion adopted.

ZINOVIEV – At 11 a.m. in the morning to-morrow there will be a plenary session for the discussion of the question of the conditions for admission to the Third International. It is necessary to hasten the discussion, for the French delegates must leave Moscow to-

morrow.

The session closed at 5 p.m.

**SEVENTH SESSION.
JULY 29th (EVENING).**

MILKITCH – I did not intend to speak on this question. I wanted to limit myself to expressing my opinion by vote. But it is my duty to declare from this tribune that, contrary to what has been said by Comrade Zinoviev, the Yugo-Slav Party is not an opportunist party.

ZINOVIEV – That is true.

MILKITCH – I am happy to hear Comrade Zinoviev confirm my statement. In 1905 the Yugo-Slav Socialist Party expelled some of its leaders who stood for the co-operation of classes. The same was done in 1912. Certainly, many will say: “It is true; it was once a courageous party, but it has ceased to be so.” Well, comrades, that is a mistake. To-day Comrade Zinoviev handed to me some Serbian papers in which I noticed that the Yugo-Slav Party has changed its name and now calls itself the “Communist Party.” And the first action of the Executive Committee has been to issue a vibrant appeal in favour of the Hungarian Communists.

After I have taken note of all documents, I can say without being accused of exaggeration that the Yugo-Slav Communist Party may be considered a model for all parties. I am quite sure that its former attitude will yield good results. Our comrades have spread among the masses of the peasants a proclamation in which they urge them to emancipate themselves from the yoke of the landlords. The Government profited, by this occasion to persecute the authors.

I finish this short declaration by saying that the Yugo-Slav Communist Party is a party of which the Communist International can be proud. It does not deserve what Comrade Zinoviev said about it. And without doubt he wanted to console the German Independent Socialists when he added the Yugoslav Communist party to the number of parties which he criticised.

BOMBACCI – I do not believe it could be really useful to raise deep theoretical questions about the subject we are dealing with. Does it agree with the interests of the Third International to accept such and such a party? That is the question. It is a serious one when it concerns parties with a tradition of 30 years of reformist habits, which prevents them from adapting themselves to the mentality of the revolutionary epoch. The Italian Socialist Party belongs to the Third International; but, since the Congress in Bologna, where, contrary to Comrade Bordiga, I was in favour of the expulsion of the reformists and the change in the name of the party, nothing has been changed. This fact shows clearly that certain of its constituent elements are not capable of being really faithful to the Communist International. It would not be sufficient to expel Turrati, Modigliani, and 50 to 60 persons to eradicate the reformistic tendency. One would have to purify the whole party without stopping at the old heads of reformism.

For still stronger reasons, I am the adversary of the admission of the French Socialist Party and of the German Independent Socialist Party to the Communist International, because these parties cannot adapt themselves to the revolutionary Communist mentality.

I would propose on this subject an amendment to the theses which have been discussed, i.e., to have a number of enquiries made among the ranks of the members of the parties in question, and to authorise the Executive Committee to expel from the different parties those members which can evidently not be tolerated in the Communist organisations. With these great reservations, I would rigorously admit the affiliation of these parties of which I disapprove on principle.

I find it also inadmissible for any Communist to adhere to Freemasonry, which is a purely bourgeois institution. (Applause.)

POLANO – I am speaking to-day in the name of the Italian Socialist Youth in order to inform you of its activity. This organisation has existed since 1907. In its general lines it is in full agreement with the Italian Socialist Party, which it has, however, continually pushed to the Left. We have not ceased to demand that the Italian Socialist Party should be purified of its reformist elements, and we hope that the Communist International will come to our assistance. The International must demand more coherence from the Italian Socialist Party, which will result in a clearer understanding of its historic mission. The main function is to prepare the Revolution. This work is hindered by the fight within the ranks of the Party between the two ideologies, the one of Social Democracy and the other of Communism. There is not the least possibility of reconciling these two tendencies. How does it come that the Marxian elements of the Socialist Party have not yet noticed this contradiction? How could they not understand its seriousness? How could they not take measures to remove from the Party all those elements which are a hindrance to the action they are engaged to carry on?

The Italian Socialist Party has affiliated en bloc to the Communist International. In spite of this fact there are still men in the Party, like Modigliani, who have not ceased to carry on the most energetic propaganda against the Communist International and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the same Modigliani who has recently declared that a close contact between the Socialist Party and the petty bourgeois elements would have to be established. Turrati, who, as you know, belongs also to the Italian Socialist Party, affirmed quite recently that Communist tactics are childish and foolish. A real Communist Party cannot be composed of such heterogeneous elements.

The Communist International must come to the assistance of the Socialist Youth in its work of purification. I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Congress to paragraph 7 of the Theses, which says that all parties willing to affiliate to the Third International must break at once with the opportunist elements and with the elements of the Centre.

Further, I draw the attention of the Congress to paragraph 18, which says that all parties affiliating to the Third International must adopt the name, "Communist Party." And I have the firm hope that the Italian Socialist Party, in conformance with the above-mentioned theses, will really represent a Communist Party.

But for the accomplishment of this task we need support. This must not be forgotten. However, the Communist International will not be able to help the Socialist Youth and the Italian Socialist Party in its work if it admits within its ranks such groups as the French Socialist Party and the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, because it is really impossible to purify the Italian Socialist Party of its opportunist elements on the one side, and on the other to admit fresh elements of such nature to the Communist International.

RAKOVSKY – The question with which the Third International is faced now resembles

in many respects the problems which we had to face about sixteen months ago, when the Social Democrats of all shades, including those elements who are getting dangerously near to the I.S.P., utterly failed, and under pressure of the masses were compelled to abandon their old programme and declare themselves for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Third International. Then it came to light that those gentlemen had yielded to the pressure of the masses, not because they have realised that their former views were wrong, but solely because of their desire to continue in power. We have had our sad experience with the Left Social Democrats, and I wish to warn the comrade not to follow the same example on a much larger scale. I feel impelled to make this warning the more emphatic, because in the speeches of Crispien and Dittman I have detected in every word the characteristic features of our own Social Democrats. They declared unhesitatingly for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but spoke in opposition to terror just as Daumig has done, and demanded a "mild form" of dictatorship, and that at a time when the atrocities of the Finnish, Hungarian, and Ukrainian White Guards were well known. Now, when after three years of revolution, after the murder of tens of thousands of Independents and Communists, Comrades Dittman and Crispien come to Moscow and speak with the greatest equanimity against terror, this shows that these gentlemen are not capable of understanding our system. They will speak against terror even when they have their Soviet dictatorship, and they will wait until the White Terror instils into them a real understanding of the meaning of terror. I learn from the example of Comrades Crispien and Dittmann that they have drunk from the same source as their Hungarian comrades, and that their minds work in the same manner. Our Hungarian comrades studied carefully the Russian experience, not in order to avoid mistakes, but to find justifications for their own conduct. Just as Comrade Crispien got the notion that the Russians were the greatest compromisers, so also did our Social Democracy reason in a similar way. It has done everything to justify itself. Besides an utter lack of understanding of proletarian dictatorship, these coincides are characterised by a most dangerous habit of routine, which has enabled them to force the other Left comrades to yield to the acceptance of a preposterous resolution against the Executive Committee of the Third International presented as the general viewpoint of the Social Democratic Party – (Dittmann interrupting: "Where did you get that story?") I have it from you and Comrade Dauming. I have given my warning because I know by the example of the Hungarian proletariat that when, after three years of a world revolution, people don't know what terror and dictatorship mean, they are not going to become any wiser in the succeeding years, and are going to commit the same blunders, for which the German proletariat will have to bleed. Our Social Democrats have not learned any wisdom after the fall of the dictatorship and after seeing that they were wrong. I don't know whether Comrade Dittmann is acquainted with the fact that some of the members of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party call themselves "Independents," and that one of their leaders is the worst foe of dictatorship, and has caused the proletariat great harm. He is the Vienna correspondent of the "Freiheit," writing columns upon columns on international relations in Eastern Europe in the Kautskian spirit. These articles do not attract any attention, because they are adapted to the spirit of the "Freiheit." I should like to say that I am in favour of the motion of comrade Levi, where he proposes that the admission of the I.S.P. be made dependent upon a new condition not contained in the theses, and I would support any condition which would limit the admission of the I.S.P. and similar Centre organisations into the Communist International, for I know from experience that eventually these

people are going to change only their phraseology, and will make it appear as if they are fighting for dictatorship, while in reality they will be doing what they are now doing in Germany and what they have done in Hungary during the Hungarian Dictatorship.

SERRATI – I have read in the Russian evening papers a declaration alleged to have been made by the deputy Dugoni of the Italian delegation about his visit to Russia.

I doubt whether this declaration of Dugoni is authentic. In any case, I declare that deputy Dugoni was not authorised by any member of the Italian delegation to make such declarations. We have sent wireless messages informing the “Avanti” about our sojourn in Russia, in which we expressed our opinion quite candidly. Any other declaration attributed to us is absolutely false. This morning I heard about this matter, and have therefore commissioned Comrade Daragona, who immediately started for Italy, to ask the Party presidium of the declarations which were published in the Italian press and which have been attributed to Dugoni really emanated from him.

In the case of an affirmative answer, I demanded that he be immediately expelled from the Party.

MEYER – Comrades, when we discussed to-day the question whether the I.S.P. should be admitted to the Third International, we were shown how utterly difficult it is to get a clear idea of the whole character of the I.S.P. In reply to all arguments and to any criticism, the representatives of the I.S.P. refer to other utterances and declarations of other members, and altogether one gets the impression that the I.S.P. is not in the least a homogeneous or definite organisation, but takes everywhere an indefinite attitude. Their attitude towards the Third International is typical of this character of the I.S.P., which it proved to have from its foundation. It is true that the Conference of the Party *in* Leipzig decided for affiliation to the Third International. But a close examination of this resolution shows that is not a proper resolution of affiliation, but a resolution for the initiation of negotiations with so-called revolutionary parties, in order to accomplish unification with them. In case these negotiations fail, the Party should communicate with Moscow. In the declaration made by Comrade Crispin in Leipzig on this point, he laid stress on the statement that the resolution does not mean affiliation to Moscow immediately, but to start negotiations first. This resolution is not clear, and if we look at its realisation, we walk again in the dark. What has been done by the Independent Socialists since the Conference of the Party in Leipzig for carrying out this resolution? Why have they sent here their representatives? From the attitude of the representatives present here it is not apparent what they want. The representatives did not bring with them a communication m- a motion to the effect that the I.S.P. wants to affiliate now to the Communist International. When we asked them in the Commission whether they want to negotiate about their affiliation to the Communist International – the same question has been put in the Executive Committee – we did not receive a plain reply, but the following declaration was made: “These negotiations do not mean that we make special conditions for affiliation to the Third International, but are intended to do away with misunderstandings which exist in Moscow and in the Third International towards us.” From the new letter of reply of the Central Committee of the I.S.P. it does not appear either what is the attitude of the Central Committee of the I.S.P. towards Moscow. They try to contradict certain sentences in the reply of the Executive Committee, but nothing is stated about their intentions, in what form and under what conditions affiliation to the Third International should be made, and why the affiliation has not yet been made. The reply is given by the discussions which have been carried on between the Right and the Left Wing of the I.S.P. It is quite

plain that men like Kautsky, Hilferding, and Strobel, who are still leaning upon the Second International, would much prefer to go to Basle or to Geneva instead of to Moscow, and it is only because the masses have blocked the way to Lucerne that they are preparing slowly the way to Moscow, in order to meet the desire of the masses for affiliation to the Third International, for there can be no doubt about it, the rank and file of the I.S.P. wish for direct affiliation to Moscow. When the letter of reply from Moscow addressed to the I.S.P. was published by the K.P.D. and discussed at public meetings, the members of the I.S.P. stated nearly everywhere, it is not right that our Central Committee has taken the way of mere negotiations and has not published this letter.

A great many leaders of the I.S.P. lean upon the Second International, and that is the reason why they do not come to the Third International straight away. This part feared and still fears to show solidarity with Russia and with the Communist International. In the reply of the Central Committee to the Executive Committee of Moscow all kinds of criticism are made about the attitude of Moscow, not only as far as the reply is concerned, but also about the policy which is being carried on here. The Executive is reproached with having tried to transfer Moscow methods to other conditions. But the people refuse solidarity with Russia, and criticise – though in an anxious manner – the attitude of the Communists. They refuse to transfer the so-called purely Russian methods to Germany, i.e., refuse generally purely Communist tactics, and try to use opportunist methods, which mean in fact a negation of Communism altogether. What most restrains the Independents from going to Moscow is the plainly expressed desire which was shared by the whole International to exclude the reformist elements from the I.S.P. They do not want this split within the I.S.P., which is necessary. The I.S.P. replied through their Central Committee that they do not want to have dictation about a split, that they consider this demand as an interference with the private affairs of the German Party, and that the unity of the Party ought to be above purely Communist tactics. This is pretty plainly expressed in the letter of reply.

Thus, it results that we have a Right and a Left Wing in the I.S.P., a Right, which still stands for bourgeois dictatorship, and which has only made certain concession in words to the dictatorship of the proletariat; and a Left which, it is true, stands for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but in practice continually makes concessions to the Right, i.e., to bourgeois democracy. At the Conference of the Party in Leipzig even representatives of the Left Wing declared quite plainly that they refused to carry through the dictatorship of the proletariat with all its consequences; the same idea is expressed in the letter against the use of terror. In the reply emphasis has again been put upon this antagonism between force and terror, an antagonism which does not exist in reality. It has been artificially constructed in order to hide their separation from the Russian Party, and from all the Communist International, and not to prove solidarity with the Revolution and the Communist International. When Comrade Radek in the discussion expressed to-day the hope that the Left Wing might at last decide to adopt a clear policy and refuse to accept the ideology of bourgeois democracy, I confess that I do not share this hope. The Left Wing has practically yielded to the policy of the Right Wing. The Congress here has given us the example, for the speakers were not the representatives of the Left Wing but of the Right, Comrades Dittmann and Crispian. It is true we learnt that sharp discussions have frequently taken place between the Right and the Left Wing, but not in public. The Left Wing renounces an open discussion before the rank and file about these divergencies. At the Congress here the delegates of the Left Wing also declared that they do not want a

split in the Party, and the same thing has been stated in the letter of reply signed by Comrades Daumig and Stocker. If we take here the same view as in Germany that the I.S.P. should split off from the opportunist elements in order to become Communist, it is not because we take a narrow party point of view. The criticism which is made within our own party shows that we are not afraid of expressing ourselves as to what has been mistaken in our own ranks, or of correcting ourselves. If we criticise another party in such a way, we do not do so in order to ruin it but in order to promote the revolutionary movement, and lead the whole working class on the right way. The Left Wing neglected to publish the reply of the Executive Committee in Moscow to the workers; itself signed the letter of reply to Moscow and hid it from public opinion. This letter is written with a certain arrogance which has its reason in the success of the elections, in the great number of votes obtained, and perhaps also in a certain fear of a radical change within the party if the masses of the I.S.P. are addressed directly from Moscow.

This is typical; the I.S.P. does not march at the head of the Revolution, it marches behind the masses. The Soviets of workers and soldiers asked them in 1918 to work together with the Scheidemann crowd. The I.S.P. obeyed and followed the unconscious part of the masses. If the letter from Moscow criticises further the combination of Shop Committees (Betriebs-Rate) and Parliament, the I.S.P. finds also an excuse for that. In the situation there was danger lest the Shop Committees be abolished altogether, and therefore such a compromise was necessary.

Within the scope of a short speech it is not possible to go into all these questions, but it is sufficient to point to some details in order to conclude that we must be careful with the admission of this party. The I.S.P. cannot be admitted simply on the condition that they carry on a purely Communist activity, and that they are not afraid of excluding reformists and opportunists. We from the K.P.D. do not say definitely that this activity will not be obtained by means of negotiations, but we take the point of view that the masses of the I.S.P. will themselves find their way to Moscow, and that we here have to get into direct touch with the masses in the same way as in the first letter of the Executive Committee. We do not believe negotiations will lead to any considerable result, but we wish that the Executive Committee would address the masses of the I.S.P., and tell them what is its opinion of that party, telling them also that they expect the workers of the I.S.P. and not the officials to carry out what they want, i.e., to march together with the Communists of the world, with the Russian Communists, with Soviet Russia.

WYNKOP – Many remarks have already been made which I wanted to make myself. I must say that in case we had to vote now, the proposal of the Executive would be thoroughly defeated. We have listened to people here who have all used good arguments against this proposal of the Executive. At least their arguments opposed it, but whether they have drawn the consequences themselves, this, of course, I do not know. Now we are told if myself and others were against this proposal of the Executive it is because we only consider the past and not the present psychology of the masses. But I agree in this respect with Comrade Radek, who said, it is a fact that the masses of the I.S.P. are marching towards revolution, that they are becoming more and more revolutionary. Comrade Meyer explained very well that the leaders of the Left Wing of the I.S.P. do not march at the head of the Revolution, and are not revolutionising the movement, but that they are running behind the unconscious part of the masses. Now the question is how to continue the work of revolutionising the masses, and I believe that the way the Executive Committee wishes to take is wrong. In such a way the work of revolutionising, the masses behind the I.S.P.

in Germany and in other countries will not be continued, but will be held back. That is my opinion. Do not tell me that I do not consider the masses who are really behind this party. I do consider them, but I say if the Executive Committee of the Third International gives new support to these deceitful leaders of the German Independent Socialists and of the French Socialists, the result will be that the masses will again be disappointed over what they have already been taught by the great Revolution and by the Third International. It is on this ground that our opposition is based. It has already been mentioned by other comrades that the leaders in all these countries are always applying the brake. If one fights with these gentlemen without considering their feelings, they will be beaten down, and then the masses will be freed for the revolutionary struggle. But if one meets them in any way, it will strengthen their own wrong attitude; then they will return and continue their work with more courage than before. Comrade Bombacci has communicated an experience from Italy. He repents his weakness in this matter. He knew very well that he was weak at the time, but now he feels that he acted wrongly, for the party in Italy has not become more revolutionary by his yielding disposition, but less revolutionary, and he feels that he must now take the way which he did not take at the time. He stated quite correctly that we of the International should learn from our mistakes. For what else should we exchange our experiences? The Swiss comrades have got this experience by means of a signature. What is a scrap of paper to an opportunist? He signs, if necessary, and does what he wants. He is always ambiguous and deceitful. That is what the gentlemen in Switzerland, Troelstra in Holland, the Cachins, the Crispiens, and all the lot are doing. In order to get influence upon the masses, they sign everything, and afterwards they act according to their own opinion. Of course, I know that the Executive Committee is convinced it has the power as an Executive Committee, if they have only signed, to force them to stick to what they have signed. That is a mistake. I quite agree with the Executive Committee of the Third International that greater discipline should be exercised, and that the Executive Committee will have and ought to have more influence. But I am of the opinion that the Executive Committee has not got this influence yet, and that it has shown, by making concessions to these gentlemen, that it is not able to compel them really to take the way which they ought to take as revolutionaries. I must say, if one considers the results hitherto obtained, one cannot help coming to the conclusion that this matter is an absolute failure. The French comrades have been severely criticised this morning, but the gentlemen of the Independent Socialists have been criticised much less, though they are worse. Of course, there is not a big difference between them, but while the one side gets a sharp criticism, the Cachins get a much sharper one. That is a result of the attitude of the Executive Committee, which ordained that the criticism of the K.A.P.D. against the K.P.D., should not be heard here. We ought to hear it, but we have not heard it. The attitude of the I.S.P. has been discussed, but a friendly criticism should also be made of the Communist Parties. That is the best way to teach masses what they have to do with leaders, i.e., to throw them out. Whilst concentrating criticism on the I.S.P., one could not very well find the opportunity to listen to the good, though not friendly, criticism of the K.P.O. by the K.A.P.D. Has the K.P.D. always been leading the masses? That is a question which must be raised and answered here. But now in presence of the I.S.P. it would not, do very well. We are not among friends here; we are together with Messieurs, the Government Socialists, and we should be among friends only, and tell each other the truth. This has, been prevented by the attitude of the Executive Committee. Comrade Serrati gave this morning a very good reply to the question why Turatti remained in the

Italian Party because he can make propaganda in this way. Comrade Meyer has given a reply to the question why the opportunists have come here now; and we put questions before them. We never get a plain reply from them; they are here even more insolent than in Germany. That is just the reason why these gentlemen here want to take up negotiations with the International, because they want to make propaganda for themselves in the big Communist Party which should and must come in Germany. As has been pointed out so well by Comrade Meyer, one should go to the masses over the heads of the leaders, who want to stay with them in order to make their propaganda against revolution. They cannot say that plainly, but it is the truth. If they said it plainly, we should reply; "Thank you, go back to your country." Therefore, they must talk diplomatically.

Comrade Zinoviev this morning stated something else which is very correct: he described the whole machinery of the Independent Socialists as a philistine machinery. It is just this philistine machinery which we want to take over. This would not do. We must take the basis given by Comrade Radek, that we should go to the masses. Therefore we must not settle the matter in this way with the leaders. I point to the fact that an exceptional position has been given (to these gentlemen of the I.S.P. and also to Cachin and Frossard. That is wrong and will have bad consequences in the future. Besides, we have to deal with two questions here which have been mixed up. The one question which has been dealt with in general is. What should be the conditions for affiliation to the Third International? This is being included in the Theses, and generally I believe that the Theses contain very much that is good indeed. Of course, it may happen that they will be changed to some extent by one or another amendment. And a further question is what we want the parties to become, which already belong to the Third International. Resolutions are expected from us Communists about this question, in which these gentlemen cannot co-operate. Yet, these gentlemen take part in the Commission for the consideration of these Theses. The other question which was to be discussed here first, is, whether we shall continue to act this way with these gentlemen or not, and these questions have been mixed up. I said already that the Executive Committee has given these gentlemen an exceptional position. I have already made my protest in the Commission, but in vain. These gentlemen are among us Communists; they are here. I have nothing against persons, but I have something against deceitful leaders, because history has demonstrated that these people cannot lose their old weaknesses, unless they are compelled by the masses, and this will come about in a different way than that which has been tried here.

Before I come to the end, I want to state that not only in Germany and France, but throughout the world this attitude of the International will have a bad effect. It will make a very bad impression in England and America. For one feels that the International, with the leaders of the Independent Socialists here, is moving towards the Right. There is no difference between Hilferding and Crispin; yet Hilferding has been attacked here, but not Crispin. How can the masses in all these countries be revolutionised? Only by refusing support to the deceitful parliamentarians, but support is given here to the Independent Socialists and also to Cachin. When Cachin returns to France, the masses, which have just been taught that parliamentarism must be dealt with in a different way than it has been up to now by Messrs. the Social Democrats, will see that this new International compromises again with the old leaders. The old deceitful parliamentarism will be strengthened again in this way, and the masses will feel it and will turn away from us. One must not go only by the size of the masses (interruption by Radek) who are nominally

behind a party, but in reality have already come to us in consequence of the experiences of the Third International. Therefore, I hope that the negotiations with the leaders of these parliamentary parties will be broken off, that the Congress and the Executive Committee will not approve of the tactics which have been employed up to now, and that all means which were used at first be applied, and the masses in France and in Germany be directly addressed.

MUNZENBERG – I do not understand Comrade Wynkop. How could he reproach the Executive Committee with the non-representation of the Communist Labour Party of Germany? If it is not represented, it is the delegates themselves who are to blame. It was decided to admit them to the Congress with a consultative vote, and to allow them to have their own speakers on all questions of a controversial nature. They have not availed themselves of that opportunity; they have not come to the Congress. They have deserted the battlefield before the battle began. I don't know what the members of the Communist Labour Party of Germany will think of it, but the great majority of the German workingmen are sure to condemn this procedure, and in my opinion the two comrades that have behaved in such an irresponsible manner should have no place in the revolutionary movement of Germany.

Now as to the question of the conditions of admission to the Third International. The year just passed and the political events of that year, have furnished splendid evidence of the fact that the programme and the tactics of the First Congress of the Communist International in Moscow were rightly conceived. The manifesto has the following to say with regard to those tactics: "Just as the First International foreshadowed future development and strove to find a way, just as the Second International gathered together and organised the proletariat, as is the Third International called upon to carry on mass activity, to be the International of revolutionary action."

Comrades, this method of revolutionary propaganda, this tactic of appealing directly to the labouring masses regardless of party offices or institutions, of criticising all the errors of the labour movement without mercy – all this has contributed greatly to the awakening and the development of the subjective forces of the Proletarian Revolution. The progress made by the Communist International during the past year consists, in my opinion, not so much in the present Congress as in the fact that regardless of the precariousness of the organisations of the Communist Parties and in spite of the fact that <the line between Right and Left has been more sharply drawn – that line separating not Turatti, Longuet, Crimm, but Daumig, Nobs – hundreds and thousands of workers in Germany, Hungary and other countries have stood up for the programme and the aims of the Communist International, fighting and bleeding for them in armed struggle. This is the great practical result of the revolutionary propaganda which is of much greater value for the Proletarian Revolution than thousands of newly issued membership books. The influence of the Communist International on the German workers has been so strong that, even when they were called out into the streets by the I.S.P., they made demonstrations not for the ideology of that party, but for the Communist International. The cries of "Long live Soviet Russia!" "Long live the Communist International!" "Long live the Proletarian Revolution!" were raised all the time.

The same is true with regard to the conduct of the workers of England, France, and America. Though we have not succeeded up till now in getting the masses to a point where they would pass on to the final revolutionary battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie of those countries, the revolutionary propaganda has raised them to such a moral level that

they would use all possible means to prevent military intervention by their Government against Soviet Russia. This is evident from the resolutions recently passed by the various organisations in favour of refusing to supply and transport munitions to Poland. This is, of course, not all that we expect of our comrades in those countries, but it is the beginning of International solidarity in practice. This is the more significant because the impending epoch of Proletarian World Revolution is going to be characterised by a series of revolutionary wars. The Polish war is only one of (the links in the chain of unfolding military attacks of the Allies and their vassals on Soviet Russia.

Comrades, an examination of the preceding year of the development of Communism shows that we have no cause to make any alteration in our tactics for the sake of winning over some groups or parties, which would interfere with the winning over of large masses for live revolutionary activity. Someone said at a session of the Executive Committee that the organisation of the Communist International was a premature thing. I do not share that opinion, but I do think that the circle of the Communist International has been widened out too soon. Comrade Zinoviev has pointed out in his speech the various opportunist occurrences in the Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, and Yugo-Slav Parties. Reference has been made to enemies in our own camp. Furthermore, there are no strong disciplined Communist Parties in existence either in England, America, or France. Now the Socialist Party of Spain has come out in favour of affiliation with the Third International, as did likewise the Swiss Party, trying to smuggle itself into the Third International. Then come the French Socialist Party and the Independent Socialist Party of Germany in their present composition. All this forces upon me the fear that the Third International is in great danger, the danger of adulteration, of weakening the revolutionary propaganda and revolutionary activity – (Lenin, interrupting; “Who is going to admit the I.S.P.?”) This came to light in the proceedings of the 'Executive Committee. The fact that comrades who have only a few weeks ago or even a few days ago fought against the Third International now declare themselves ready to sign without any difficulty the conditions put to them is a sure proof that these conditions have not been formulated rigidly enough. At the present juncture of the revolutionary struggle we are concerned not merely with carrying on Communist propaganda and organising Communist Parties, but mainly to start mass action in order to accelerate the political development of the masses, to develop their revolutionary forces and thereby pile up obstacles on the road of advancing imperialism, to accentuate the conflicts and thereby hasten the realisation of the Revolution. This is what we must demand above all of those parties and organisations that wish to become members of the Third International. The great importance of revolutionary mass action is evident also from the report of the Executive Committee. It was the E.C. that emphasised in its Manifesto that it was on account of the failure of the International mass action planned for July 21, 1919, that thousands of Petrograd workers had to shed their blood. Another mass action, planned for November 7, 1919. and also on the day when Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were killed, failed. It is therefore essential that rigid conditions be put to all parties, especially regarding this point.

Equally insufficient is the condition regarding military preparations. It is not enough to carry on Communist propaganda and organise groups for agitation in the bourgeois armies. The present state of the civil war imperatively demands that 'we pass on in all countries to military preparations and organisation for the final conflict with the .bourgeoisie. In the above spirit I propose 'two amendments, which I shall hand to the

Presidium.

LOSOVSKI – The question of the admission of the Socialist Parties of the Centre is one of the most serious questions which have been put before the Congress. If we take the French Socialist Party as a model of parties developing at present towards Communism, we see that this party represents a very heterogeneous mixture of various tendencies. When Comrades Frossard and Cachin presented themselves to the Executive Committee, quite a series of questions were put to them. They were particularly asked what they were going to do with Albert Thomas, the present director of the Labour Bureau of the League of Nations, and if they did not think it impossible to bring Socialists of such quality into the Third International. Frossard officially replied that the case of Albert Thomas would be settled at the next national congress of the French Socialist Party. The French Socialist Party contains elements of the Centre like Cachin and Frossard, together with avowed enemies of Socialism, members of the League of Nations – men, in one word, who in the course of these last years have fought every movement of the working class, whether it be revolutionary or Syndicalist.

The French Socialist Party suffers from an illness which is not only opportunism, but which may be called “unity at any price” with anybody.

When in the Executive Committee the question of national defence was put to Marcel, Cachin, and Frossard, they took good care not to commit themselves for the future. They only replied in an ambiguous way. This question is however an essential one; it is the key of the arch, the very meaning of every Communist movement, the basis of the Third International.

It is evident that even after the purification (Goldenberg: “They will not make it”) which will be made at the next Congress they will not enter the Third International. But with the French workers lies the duty to come alone to the Third International, and to leave those leaders who cannot decide to take the necessary steps.

There is another capital point upon which I should like to draw your attention. If you read “Humanite,” you will see how they have fought (as Cachin said) against the Peace of Versailles. That is a strange battle, which reminds one too much of a children’s sham fight. It is true that the Socialist deputies have voted against the Treaty of Versailles, but one must know in which way. They have limited themselves to protests against certain articles of the Treaty, and not against the Peace of Versailles altogether.

There is another fact which you must ascertain. Cachin has read to us here this morning a new declaration which does not resemble in the least that which he made some days ago. As he knew that this declaration would be published in France, he put down much vaguer formulas than he did a week ago, when he was not on the point of returning to France.

This declaration, which avoids all questions of an awkward kind, proves evidently that the Socialist Party in France is in its majority incapable, with regard to ideas and to actions, of acting within the ranks of the Third International;

Cachin did not say a word in his declaration of the future tactics of the Party. He passed silently over the question of the class struggle and of the destruction of capitalism as if it was a trifle.

With regard to the Socialist Parties affiliated to the Third International, much has been spoken from this tribune about the Italian Socialist Party. I wish to emphasise that Bolshevism and Menshevism are to be seen in this Party in close association.

However, if we asked our Italian comrades whether one can unite the Bolsheviks and

the Mensheviks, they would certainly reply in the negative. They would probably add that Italy is not yet in a revolutionary spirit. But in Russia it was not the Revolution which separated us from the Mensheviks; the trench between them and ourselves was dug long before.

And we who have this experience can tell our Italian comrades, "Take good care; it will be during the revolutionary period, in the most serious moment when the masses will be in the streets, that you will feel the strokes of opportunism." This subject reminds me of an unforgettable fact which took place in Petrograd during Revolution of October. Negotiations had been carried on between the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks, and the Socialist revolutionaries with regard to common action. Do you know what the Mensheviks proposed officially? The disarmament of the workers of Petrograd and the entrance of Cossacks into the working men's quarters. I can speak about it with knowledge, because I took part in the negotiations. I was even in this period a fanatical believer in a conciliation policy, and I raged against the intransigent attitude of our comrades in the Bolshevik Central Committee. They told us that, if we disarmed the workers, they would give us a guarantee that the workers would not be assassinated. That is what our opportunists proposed.

And, comrades, our revolutionary experience makes us fear that the opportunists of your country will make you some day some similar proposal in the course of the decisive fights which you will have to carry on.

CRISPIEN – Comrades, to the question as to why we are in Moscow and what we want here I should like to make a short reply. I must, however, say that this question sounds rather strange. Of course we have not come to Moscow to look about the city, but, as we reported officially to the Executive Committee, on the invitation of the latter, resulting from the correspondence carried on between us. Our business is to negotiate with the Third International regarding our affiliation, in conformity with our party's decision. I shall in the course of my discourse explain what prompted us to proceed by way of negotiations.

By way of introduction let me say a few words about our party. From, all that was said here I gather that the comrades abroad are not posted on German conditions in general and on the condition of our party in particular. It is a well known fact that the German Social Democracy abandoned its positions at the outbreak of the war. But it is probably less known that, from the moment there were comrades within the old Social Democracy who at once took up the gauntlet against the old party, and against the war, without hesitation; not only by means of protests and resolutions, but by means of practical work. Picture to yourself a once powerful party which had been drawing the most advanced ranks of the German proletariat in its wake during many decades; one million members were in the old Social Democratic Party, two and a quarter million members in the old labour organisations, besides a large number of indifferents. The war confounded the minds of a great number of workers, the military dictatorship, the rigid persecution of everyone who did not favour the war – then you must imagine what it meant and how difficult it was in such a situation to maintain the banner of Socialism. It was a small circle that became active in circulating illegal literature and "Spartacist Letters" – (Fuchs, interrupting: "Who was it that did that?"). We, too, participated. The comrades will have to testify that I also had my share in that. (Remark from Walcher: "But at that time you did not believe in common work"). I am speaking about the beginning of the war, and ask you, "Can you deny that I did my duty as a revolutionary Socialist?" Even during the war we

were conducting mass actions against it. Not only were the masses sacrificing and bleeding, but also the leaders, the so-called notorious swindlers and scoundrels, who are sitting amongst you – they too participated in mass actions and had to suffer because of it, just as the rest of the workers who were receiving the usual punishment meted out by the capitalists to every revolutionary worker. Around this small group of Social Democrats fighting against the war the opposition grew steadily, and it was natural that this opposition should be joined by elements who recognised war as a matter of principle and were in favour of defending the Fatherland. But during that trying struggle we neither had the time nor was it possible to guide the workers on the proper path by means of propaganda at mass meetings. We were not permitted to hold any meetings at all. Persecuted as we were, we had to work underground, and could approach the masses only in a precarious and inadequate manner. The comrades in the Parliament who obeyed Party discipline carried on written propaganda in favour of the class struggle during the war. Then came the military collapse. That gave us the possibility of acting openly – (Interruptions – Fuchs: “You acted against Liebknecht.” Dittmann: “I am going to refute that.” Comrade Dittmann who was then in Parliament says he is going to reply to that.)

When the war was brought to a close by the uprising of the workers and soldiers, the German proletariat was confronted with a stupendous task. That this task -was not accomplished by the proletariat in favour of Socialism was due in the first place to the impossibility of pushing forward the great step taken by the workers -and soldiers in a conscious, proletarian, revolutionary way. We must not consider that this was an easy matter, and suppose that the treachery of a few leaders was the cause of the failure – (A voice; “You were against dictatorship”). The dictatorship of the proletariat is not a new discovery of the Communist International; we had it already in the old programme of the Socialist Party, where it says that the seizure of political power by the working class is the prerequisite for the realisation of Socialism. It is an old Marxist doctrine. Whether it was lived up to by the Social Democrats in practice is a different matter. We, the Social Democrats, were for the dictatorship of the proletariat. That it could not be realised immediately after the termination of the war was due to the fact that it had nothing to depend on. The soldiers could not support it; the majority of them did not consist of revolutionary Socialists. They had not reached that stage yet, and we were not able to approach the masses until the outbreak of the Revolution. Then began the process of enlightenment, and our party began to get its proper bearings. We took a definite stand at the party conference in March, and already then put into our programme the dictatorship of the proletariat in unmistakable terms – (A voice: ‘An abortion of the Soviets’). At that time we pointed out that parliamentarism is not going to achieve Socialism, that it is only one of the weapons used by the proletariat in its struggle. Amidst the confusion of unfolding events, we certainly could not appear on the stage in angelic purity and act without any mistakes and blunders.

I must tell you that whosoever stands in the thick of the political struggle can always be criticised – that’s easy. The same criticism which is applied to us by the Communists is being applied in the fullest sense by the K.A.P.D. to the Communists of Germany. In their eyes we are traitors; in the eyes of the K.A.P.D. they are traitors to the working class. That our party was making progress during the period between the March and Leipzig Conferences and started out on a clearer formulation of our programme cannot be denied. But I must call your attention to the fact that this was done under the guidance of the leaders. They presented the programme. It was not forced from them by the masses but

presented and maintained by the party executive at the party conference. We of the party executive acted honestly and justly in accordance with the decision of the party conference. We had mass actions in Germany, in many cases in conjunction with the Communists. If we are reproached with irresolution in our policy and tactics, I can say that we can make the same reproach to the Communists, who declared themselves against parliamentarism in the past, and at present are in favour of it. The German Communist Party vacillated on many questions, and if we resorted to introspection we might discover many a sin in the mirror. It was said here that the masses are unlike the leaders, the swindlers, who have come here. It remained only for Comrade Wynkop to declare that we are police agents. You are making a grave mistake if you believe that the tactics of deprecating the leaders here at the Congress is going to make an impression in Germany, so that the masses will turn away from us. In Germany you have to present facts to the masses. We have been known to the comrades and workers of Germany for decades, and they would not re-elect us to responsible positions repeatedly if we were traitors. The rank and file of the Independents are Communists according to your opinion, and it is these Communists of the I.S.P. who elect these leaders that you are endeavouring to discredit. There must be something wrong here. The tactics of setting the masses against the leaders of the party is not going to get you anywhere. We are going to take up this matter in Germany, and we feel confident that we shall straighten things out.

Now as to your excitement over our letter of reply. Why suddenly such maidenly sensitiveness? We received a spicy letter from the Executive. We did not cry and take the thrashing as our due, but we replied to it very clearly, plainly stating our views. We did not say – as Comrade Zinoviev put it – that only the leaders of the Right are in opposition to the masses. The Executive in their letter to us said all the leaders of the I.S.P. are in opposition to the masses, and the entire policy of the masses is being determined by the Right leaders of the I.S.P. Now I have put up with having myself put down here as one of the leaders of the Right. You can say that here in Moscow. But you could not do it in Germany. The policy of our party is settled at the party conference, and resolutions are passed by the comrades, members of the party, and whoever does not intend to carry out these resolutions cannot be admitted to the Party Executive, cannot be elected.

Radek says that I was in favour of the League of Nations at Lucerne. That's a mistake. I spoke against the League of Nations at Lucerne – (Radek, interrupting: "I –) Comrade Radek, I don't know whether you possess the text of my speech. I spoke there against the League of Nations. As far back as the winter of 1915 I wrote in our paper at Stuttgart that the League of Nations is an instrument of the Capitalist Governments for the oppression of nations and not a League of Nations at all. This I said then, and I maintain the same standpoint to-day. I protested against the League of Nations. We went to Lucerne for the purpose of exposing the German Right Socialists before the international proletariat, and on that we laid great stress. Because we assumed that conditions in Germany are not sufficiently known abroad and that the German Right Socialists could make capital out of that in order to win other nationalities for their ideas, that, in my opinion, was no crime. We have stated that the Second International cannot be resuscitated, that it has outlived its time. If I wrote in my pamphlet that the Moscow International is a premature organisation, I have to say that I am of the same opinion to-day. But Comrade Radek would have to read further to see why I said that the Moscow International was founded too soon. I explained in my pamphlet that the organisation of a new International must be preceded by setting the tasks of the new International clearly before the workers of every

country. The workers must be enlightened about the idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, about the international class struggle, and only after they have become enlightened within their own respective countries can they play an International role. That this would not be so very harmful has been proved by the whole speech of Comrade Zinoviev. Who are, in fact, among the chosen ones for the Communist International? Only the Russian Communists; only they alone have not been criticised. Outside of them not one of the affiliated parties escaped criticism. And these very parties which have been criticised here are passing judgment upon the misbehaviour of the Independents of Germany. They overlooked entirely the fact that we have separated from the Right Socialists, that we did not shrink from this break as soon as it became historically inevitable. Just the same, this break should not be treated slightly. I admit that a separation was a necessity. The proof is the existence of the I.S.P. in Germany. But it was a bitter necessity. Before we separate, we should try to convert the workers to a clear fundamental standpoint. The workers can be split much easier than they can be won and kept together for the Revolution in Germany. It's one of the saddest sights in Germany that the whole Left Wing of the workers is split into three or four parts – the I.S.P., the K.A.P.D., the K.P.D. and the recently proposed Labour Union. This is very harmful to the German movement and the Proletarian World Revolution, but particularly to the International. What we need is an International of action which requires a unified organisation of the workers. Otherwise we cannot carry out any International action at all. It is imperative to keep the masses unified and lead them to realise the idea of proletarian revolution, in case they have not yet realised it. That I objected to the immediate affiliation with Moscow at Leipzig is true. For what reason? Why, comrades, it was decided at the first Congress at Moscow that the I.S.P. must be destroyed, cut to pieces, wiped off the face of the earth. You will readily understand that a representative of a party which is to be destroyed would desire to meet the comrades who expressed that idea in order to get some understanding before any affiliation. We did not reject the idea of affiliation, but desired primarily to dispose of the hostile resolutions against us. You can't give us a thrashing and then expect us to be told that we are your friends because you have chastised us. All these are things which must be understood. (Interruptions.)

As regards the signing of the Peace Treaty, the masses of Germany stood solidly behind us in this matter. At that time it was a fight against chauvinism in Germany, and we were glad to have at last defeated this nationalism. At that time the German nationalists intended to make of this question a nationalist and chauvinist issue. We regarded it our duty to oppose this. (Walcher, interrupting: "You helped them out of their embarrassment.") That's nonsense. Germany was so weakened through the war that in case we should be blockaded once more the misery of the masses in Germany would have become far more terrible. We believed it to be important to make the masses fit for the struggle, to raise their conditions of life to a certain level by means of a continuous fight against the capitalist tendencies of deterioration. The lower strata, down to the "Lumpenproletariat," are not in the front ranks. Not they are going to make the Revolution, but that class of workers whose position can be relatively elevated. For that reason, the accusation advanced against us for signing the Peace Treaty is not justified.

Now as to the question of terrorism and violence. We are of the opinion that these are entirely incompatible things. We cannot dispense with violence when we want to maintain the dictatorship. Wherever violence is applied it may under certain conditions strike people who should have been spared, had there been the opportunity of probing carefully

into facts of guilt or innocence. But to declare before we have come to power that we have to resort to terror as a political principle, that we must establish a reign of terrorism to say that we cannot dispense with violence, is an entirely different matter. The necessity of the moment is the only gauge for the application of violence. I can state that we have never slandered the Bolsheviks. Furthermore, I can declare that I have always felt myself in solidarity with the Russian comrades. When the Communists were reproached at Wurttemberg with having taken money from the Russians, I said that I should be proud of that, for it would be an act of international solidarity. We have always stood up for the Bolsheviks, saying that they are forced to carry on a hard struggle, and we have no right to slight them. (Interruption: "Kautsky!") Kautsky, certainly, he criticised them, but he does not determine the policy of the party. That's a great mistake. (Voice: "Ledebour!") Neither has Ledebour slandered the Bolsheviks; you are mistaken. Ledebour fought openly for the Revolution, endangering his life. He is of the opinion that terror cannot be set up as a political principle.

I should like to state here that our Russian comrades are also guilty of opportunistic sins. You accused us that we do not represent your views in the agrarian question. To this we have said in our written reply the following:

As regards the agrarian question, we have to state, to our astonishment, that the methods the Executive Committee is recommending to the German workers are a direct retrogression to middle-class principles discarded long ago. We are advised to explain to the small farmers that the proletariat will improve their conditions – at the expense of the large estate owners – immediately after the seizure of the institutions of Government. They shall be liberated from the large estate owners, as a class; will become proprietors of large estates; will be freed of debts, etc. This plan means nothing else but the negation of our Marxist conception according to which the large estates will be socialised immediately, i.e., made common property and worked on co-operative lines. Instead of this, we are to tell the small farmers that they will become proprietors of large estates, will be freed from debts, etc. This is equivalent to sacrificing the interests of the proletariat to those of the peasants. It means transferring Russian conditions – where the land was given over to the peasants – to Germany, whose social and economic development could be severely impaired by such a measure. Do you think it revolutionary for Germany to give the land to the small peasants? (Walcher; "To get the small peasants on our side.") We can't get them to side with us by means of opportunism. The large estate owners must be expropriated, the estates must be worked on a co-operative basis and divided up among the agricultural workers and small farmers. These must be educated for the co operative cultivation of the land for the benefit of society.

Comrade Meyer asked what we have done to bring about affiliation. I believe that Comrade Meyer also read our official report about this. What have we done? We have been striving all the time to affiliate with Moscow. After four months we at last received a reply. We were then in the midst of staving off a military coup d'état, and working on an election campaign; immediately after that we came to Moscow. That we were conferring with other parties was in accordance with the decision of the party conference which we were charged to execute: decisions of the party conference must be carried into life. We avoided holding an international conference with other parties. We wanted to leave Moscow the preference. What Konen said in Switzerland, that we were going to found a new International, is not true. We said that if Moscow rejects us, we will have to consider what's to be done further. Shall we permit ourselves to be expelled from international

politics? Do you think it possible that such a mighty movement as represented by the I.S.P. can remain inactive internationally? Of course, you Communists of Germany have pronounced us dead ever since we were born as a party. Your hope that we shall be dead soon does not cause us any trouble.

Now I would like to mention in general that I do not find the consideration of historical development in the discussions here. Many a comrade believes that the Third International suddenly brought Marxism into the world, and that something quite new has sprung up; that is not correct. The First International was founded on the belief that the bourgeois revolution would immediately be followed by a proletarian revolution inaugurated for the immediate realisation of Socialism. It ceased to exist through causes which Zinoviev has enumerated. Then it was found – and Marx said it himself – that at that time the proletariat did not possess the pre-requisites for taking over and exercising political power, and consequently the first step to be taken was the organisation of the proletariat in order to develop its abilities for the struggle and conquest of political power. This was done by shortening the hours of labour and raising wages, by the struggle for political and economic reforms in general, etc. These were the historical tasks of the epoch in which the Second International predominated. Now the working class is in a condition to take over and retain political power, just as the conditions for Socialism are ripe in capitalist society. At present we are in an epoch in which the seizure of political power is possible. It has already been accomplished in Russia; let us hope that it will be done in other countries shortly. We must consider the evolution of the labour movement from a point of view which will make us perceive that the Third International is continuing just where former preceding epochs left off. If the parties which are still Socialists of the Right do not realise their tasks, they will have to pay for their ignorance with collapse and downfall. We have realised it, act accordingly, and are conducting revolutionary policies in Germany. This I maintain very emphatically, and we can prove it documentarily at any time. You can formulate your reply in any manner you desire. We have the sincere ambition, the sincere desire to form a united front with the Third International. You cannot deny our revolutionary convictions, principles, and activity. We shall remain revolutionists even though we may be regarded as opportunists. Judge as you may, we are not going to relax our efforts to bring about the Social Revolution in German)". But should your answer be such as would be received with joy by the German proletariat in our ranks, it would be so much more conducive to the establishment of an International proletarian front.

DITTMAN – Comrades, accidentally I have got the floor immediately following my friend Crispien. I beg you not to draw from this fact the conclusion made by Comrade Wynkop that we intend to behave here even more shamelessly than in Germany. (Laughter.) It really was a mere accident that we followed one another on the speakers' list.

We have been blamed, especially Crispien and myself, for having failed to come out at the Leipzig Party Conference in favour of immediate and direct affiliation to the Third International. But the same persons who have made that reproach have come up here and presented a long list of crimes of which they hold us guilty, in order to prove that we are not worthy to be accepted in the Third International. There is a glaring contradiction in that, and it seems to justify the decision passed by our party in Leipzig; to negotiate with the Third International with a view to establishing whether affiliation, resulting in a unified front, is possible or not. For that purpose we have arrived here equipped with a

draft of the programme adopted by our Conference at Leipzig, which was to serve as a basis for negotiations. This programme – I believe you are all familiar with it – is based on the conquest of political power by the proletariat, on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and on the Soviet system. It is clear and unequivocal, and I believe that not very many of the parties whose representatives have censured us here can produce a programme which is equally definite, equally direct as ours on the above points.

Comrades, after the exposition of my friend Crispin, I need not elaborate on the general propositions. I asked to speak chiefly in order to refute some of the accusations made against us by some of the speakers in the course of the debates. I must dwell particularly on the speech of Comrade Radek. He made above all two accusations against the Independents and their representatives in the first revolutionary Government of Germany. He reproached the Independent Socialist Party with the fact that its representatives turned down the symbolic offer of the Russian proletariat, consisting of two trainloads of corn presented to the German proletariat. Another censure of Comrade Radek was that the Independent Socialist Party prevented the establishment of diplomatic relations between Germany during the first revolutionary week of November, 1918, and Soviet Russia. I know that Radek is one of those comrades who is more familiar with German relations than any other foreigner. But at the same time it appears very frequently that he does not know German conditions sufficiently well in order to render an authoritative judgment. I say this not as a reproach, but merely to establish the fact. As a matter of fact, I know of no man in this hall who is capable of reviewing the conditions in all countries in such a universal manner as to be able to establish the proper line of action for every given situation, and the way which the proletariat of every single country must go in order to accomplish the Revolution. This is above human power. Therefore I did not intend it as a reproach. Whoever wishes to analyse the conditions that prevailed in Germany in the months of November and December, 1918, cannot limit himself to the few facts communicated to him by some comrade when he was on a visit to Germany, and he must not expect to be able to come to a correct decision on the ground of these facts. How were things? When Germany suffered defeat on the field of battle, there was economic collapse within the country. The nation suffered a physical and moral breakdown. It was threatened by immediate starvation. In spite of what happened the German militarists never gave up hope until in October, 1918, they were informed from an authoritative source that our food supplies would hold out only till January, 1919, after which we should be at the end of our resources and the people exposed to starvation. The Government which was then at the helm of the State realised that it was its duty to take care that the people should be spared the pangs of famine. It had to get supplies of bread from some source, no matter which, before the existing stores had been entirely consumed. No one could take upon himself the responsibility of adopting a policy which might have exposed the whole nation to death from starvation. It was at this juncture that Comrade Radek called up Haase on the Hughes apparatus. Now what did Haase answer? I wish Radek had reproduced that statement. He declared: "We regard this offer as an act of solidarity of the Russian workers towards the German workers, which symbolises to us the idea of international solidarity. But we are aware that Russia is likewise suffering from starvation, and as far as Germany is concerned America has already pledged itself to supply her with food in such quantity as would enable us to keep up the prevailing rations till the new crops." This is what Haase told Comrade Radek over the telephone. Now I should like to know in what way this can be represented as treachery to international

solidarity? Comrade Haase did the proper thing when he said that we know that you are yourselves in need of the com, and that we have been assured of supplies being delivered to us. So keep your bread for your own needs. The value of the offer lies in the fact that it was made and that the trains were on the way. This is sufficient indication of solidarity. Haase said that we appreciate this as an act of solidarity and are grateful for it. I therefore cannot understand how Comrade Radek can reproach us with having become influenced by Wilsonism because we as a Government accepted American corn. Of whom else could we have expected to get food supplies and save our people from starvation if not from the only country that was then in a position to deliver bread to our half-starved nation? You may think of America what you will, but she did deliver not only bread but other foodstuffs besides.

Now as to the expulsion of the Russian embassy. It was on the 4th or 5th of November, 1918, I believe, that Prince Max Von Baden's Government, the last imperial chancellor of Wilhelm's regime, ordered the expulsion of the Russian embassy from Berlin on the alleged ground that Joffe had abused his ambassadorial prerogatives by carrying on revolutionary propaganda in Germany. This is why the Imperial Government of Germany ordered this expulsion. When the German Revolution broke out, Comrade Joffe was on the German-Russian frontier, for the questions of the boundaries had to be attended to. When Joffe learned that the Revolution had broken out in Germany, and that the Independents were in the Government, he sent telegrams to Berlin addressed to Comrade Haase. The latter immediately brought up the question before the Council of People's Deputies – as the Government of that time was called, of which Haase, Barth, and myself were members – declaring that we, the Independents, are all of the opinion that Joffe should be immediately recalled. This was the attitude which we assumed at once. But the Right Socialists, supported by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Solf – (Interruption: "Which? The report seems to tell a different story") – declared that this was out of the question. As to the report, I shall touch on that too. Permit me to explain the situation, which I as a participant know much better than any one here. As I said, Solf, seconded by Landsburg, Scheidemann, and Ebert, said that it made no difference whether Joffe was acting in support of the German Revolution or was carrying on reactionary propaganda. An ambassador, according to their opinion, must under all conditions refrain from interfering in the internal conditions of the country. It was in vain that we emphasised that such a formalist standpoint is unjustifiable, and that we, as revolutionists, cannot agree to it. Joffe has acted in the interests of the German and the world Revolution, we said. We are in accord with him, and must insist upon having him called upon. During the months of November and December we had many a fight on this question.

(Wolfstoen, interrupting: "How about the vote?") The Council of People's Deputies was composed of three Socialists of the Right and of three Independents; this would have enabled us to prevent any move on the part of the Rights to get Joffe out of Berlin, if this had not been done already. But to carry the positive motion of calling him back to Berlin, we lacked the needed majority. We were three against three, and it was impossible for us to get a motion through to have Joffe returned to Germany. Your clapping there at the presidential table is not to the point. You cannot require of anyone to stand up for a thing which cannot be carried through. I must wait the pleasure of the comrades interrupting me to be able to make myself understood. What would you have us do in a situation of that kind? Why, only as much as could be accomplished, and we had gone as far as was possible. We had emphasised that we were going to take up the matter again, that the

question was not settled as far as we were concerned, and we indeed raised it at every suitable occasion. But it was the attitude of Comrade Radek himself that made the thing difficult for us. One day we said to Comrade Haase in quite an indignant tone: "Can you imagine that Comrade Radek, whom you have known as a wise man, should commit such folly?" It was in connection with the following affair. Comrade Radek called me up from Moscow through the Hughes apparatus – an apparatus which simultaneously inscribes the message on paper so that no part of the conversation can be lost – a fact which was undoubtedly known to Comrade Radek, and should have made him exercise caution with regard to what he was going to communicate. The communication of Comrade Radek was to the effect that a delegation would be sent to Germany for the first Congress of the Councils, and that this delegation contained a number of people familiar with foreign languages charged to carry on revolutionary propaganda in the war prisoners' camps among the English and the French.

(Interruption: "Bravo!" Remark by Radek: "How terrible!")

I would approve of such an act as a revolutionary Socialist, but it is quite different when it comes from a Government official, and is being communicated at the same time to those who are not on the side of the Revolution. The intention was to send agents for revolutionary propaganda into the war prisoners' camps. That meant in other words to bring the matter to the knowledge of the whole bourgeois world of Germany, and also to the Allies, with whom Germany had been compelled to conclude a four months' armistice. Should that propaganda have been permitted by the German Government, it would of course have been regarded by the Allies as a violation of the Armistice Treaty. So nothing was left for Comrade Haase to do except to answer Comrade Radek that the thing is out of the question, as we cannot entertain that offer. Radek then replied that if so, the plan will have to be given up.

(Levi and Radek, interrupting: "Well.")

That of course proves nothing, for the offer became known to Solf in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the bourgeois officials, whom we had to take into consideration.

(Radek, interrupting: "Why didn't you chase 'em out?")

This is another matter. I am the last man to oppose any revolutionary propaganda, but -we must take into account the circumstances and the situation we were in. We all agree as to what we are striving for. But this case created a situation for us Independents which put extreme difficulties in our way and thwarted our efforts at renewing relations with Soviet Russia. For Landsburg, Scheidemann, and Ebert, and Solf into the bargain, pointed out at once – "Now you see what consequences the return of this Embassy may have for us. It will get us into all kinds of difficulties with the Allies, and may lead to the breach of the Armistice Treaty at a time when our troops have been made to clear the left bank of the Rhine. The Allies will advance and occupy the country." To be the cause of such a state of affairs would have meant to arouse the whole public opinion in Germany, including the working class. This must be clearly home in mind. So that when Solf and the others declared that there can be no question of the return of Joffe, there was nothing left to do but to put off the question. We were not going to give it up. We still hoped that the opportunity might arise for us to carry the thing through. This state of things gave rise to the report that was published in the "Vorwarts." But the "Vorwarts" failed to publish the other reports, which would have brought to light everything I just explained.

(Malcher and Radek, interrupting – "Barth confirmed it.")

I did not wish to be so indecorous as to quote Barth, for he is rather harsh in his

expressions concerning you. Comrade Radek. I suppose that you have clipped a citation quoted by the Vorwarts. Barth says in his book, with reference to the matter: "The Right Socialists produced a radio from Radek declaring for a united struggle on the Rhine against the capitalist Entente. It was asinine to make a stupid statement of that kind which might have the most deplorable results for the World Revolution." Thus Barth expresses himself on this matter. It would have been wiser for you not to have referred to Barth. There is another passage with reference to Joffe stating that he had given money to Haase and Barth for revolutionary purposes. It is verbatim as follows: "I declare Joffe's wireless message is more than stupid. Should I mention names, those comrades would surely not be among the living, for the counter-revolution would murder them." My closest scrutiny of Barth's pamphlet could not reveal anything favourable to you. Comrade Radek. I only found these passages which I would not have quoted had it not been for your interruptions.

In the meantime, we have left the Government and are not responsible for its further actions. In the Party press, we have come out several times for the renewal of diplomatic as well as economic relations with Soviet Russia. Just recently, we again introduced a motion in the Reichstag to the same effect. Comrades Stacker and Crispian were charged to support that motion in the Parliament. We shall, of course, take up the standpoint that the relations between Soviet Russia and Germany must be resumed. Just lately, when Polish Imperialism started its piratical campaign against Russia our party arranged a gigantic demonstration with the slogans – "Hands off Russia" and "Long live Peaceful Relations with Russia." I don't know whether the comrades who are crediting those reports and rumours about the Independents being hostile towards Soviet Russia are acquainted with all that. I hope that they are not, for otherwise I cannot understand how they reached the conclusions concerning the Independents which have been expressed here.

Now one more word in conclusion. A number of speakers have said here that according to their opinion our party, alongside with some others, should not be admitted into the Third International, because it is not revolutionary. My friend Crispian has already proved in a general way how baseless this reproach is. If it were possible to unroll before you the entire history of our party ever since the beginning of the German Revolution, some of you would change your opinion. They would have to change it in all honesty. You may be sure that a party would not be chosen by five million men against which the papers of the Communist Party are raising the accusations which have been brought up and others in addition, if they had not formed their opinion regarding the justifiability of those accusations. We have won our position in a most arduous struggle against the majority Socialists and against the bourgeoisie. We are justified in our claim that the revolutionary masses of the German proletariat are with the Independents. And because we know that the World Revolution is progressing and that the proletariat of all countries must form a united front for the overthrow of capitalism, this is why we have come to Moscow, and not, as you say, because we have yielded to the pressure of the working masses. We are ourselves workers and proletarians. We are workers by descent and breeding. For a quarter of a century we have been in the labour movement. All our life we have spent in the movement, and in the most trying hours of the war we have stood our ground, sparing no sacrifices in exposing ourselves to the capitalist henchmen. Now when one is represented here as devoid of all revolutionary sentiments' one feels justified in pointing to the scars received in the fight of the revolutionary proletariat. If your desires

coincide with ours to get the Russian and German proletariat, and then the proletariat of the whole world, together in closed united ranks, then exert your efforts as earnestly as we have done, to find a way in our further negotiations which will enable us to rally our forces as soon as possible for the coming battle against capitalism, for- the emancipation of the world proletariat.

ROSMER – It is one o'clock.

The session ends.

EIGHTH SESSION (PLENARY).

July 29th.

SERRATI – The discussions are to deal with the conditions of admission to the Third International. Comrade Zinoviev is to open the debate.

ZINOVIEV – We are now coming to one of the most important problems on the order of the day. It is, namely, the question as to what the Communist International really is and what it ought to be. But, first of all, a few words of information concerning the work of the Committee. As you know, the Committee was enlarged by the representatives of the Independent Socialists of Germany and the Socialist Party of France. Both delegations participated in the sessions of the Committee, and took a lively part in the discussions. Some changes have been introduced in the Theses, but on the whole they have remained unaltered. The alterations will naturally be brought up for discussion here, and you will have the opportunity of passing judgment on them. You will see then that the changes inserted are only nominal. In those cases where the suggestions of the above-mentioned comrades appeared justifiable, we naturally accepted them. In the German edition, paragraph 2 has been omitted, but it has been preserved in the French edition and reads as follows:

“Every organisation desiring to join the Communist International shall be bound systematically and regularly to remove from all responsible posts in the labour movement (party organisations, editors, labour unions, parliamentary fractions, co-operatives, municipalities, etc.) all reformists and followers of the Centre, and to have them replaced by Communists, even at the cost of replacing at the beginning ‘experienced’ men by rank and file working men.”

Then an important change was made in Section 7 where it formerly read:

“The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to the fact that such avowed reformists as, for instance, Turatti, Modigliani, and others should be entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International.”

Now the Commission thought it would be right to mention not only the Italian opportunists, but, being an International, it is our duty to brand the reformists of other countries as well. The Committee therefore decided to name at least one of these men from each country. It therefore should read: Turatti, Modigliani, Kautsky, Longuet, Macdonald, Hilquit, Hilferding, and others,” – (Interruption: “Grimm.”) It is true that the list is not complete. The Congress might perhaps supplement it. Then paragraphs 18 and 19 were added. They read:

“18. All the leading organs of the press of every party are bound to publish all the most important documents of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

“19. All those parties which have joined the Communist International as well as those which have expressed their desire to do so are obliged in as short a space of time as possible, and in no case later than four months after the Second Congress of the Communist International, to convene a special congress in order to discuss these conditions. In addition to this, the central committees of these parties should take care to acquaint all the local organisations with the regulations of the Second Congress.”

Then the following proposition was made by Comrade Lenin:

“With regard to such parties as came over to the ranks of the Third International,

conditionally or unconditionally, but have not radically changed their old tactics (the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the French Socialist Party, the Independent Labour Party of England, the Swiss Socialist Party, the American Socialist Party, etc), the Congress holds that for their actual coming over on the side of Communism it is necessary that not less than two-thirds of the members of their Central Committee and of all the more important committees should consist of comrades who had declared themselves as Communists without any reservation before the Second Congress of the Third International.”

This proposition was discussed in the Committee and it was carried by 5 votes against 3 with two abstaining. But I must declare that we are inclined to withdraw it in its previous form and to express it only as a wish and not as a condition or instruction. This will be quite sufficient.

Then some more changes in style were introduced, especially in the point referring to legal and illegal work. They shall be presented to you in their final edition.

I come now to the introductory part of these Theses. Originally it read;

“Under certain circumstances, the Communist International may be threatened with the danger of dilution by vacillating and half-hearted elements who have not yet abandoned entirely the ideology of the Second International.”

The Committee has changed that and decided to be more explicit and to say not only “under certain circumstances,” but that there is danger even now that Communism might be adulterated. In this the Committee was right. It is perfectly true that the Communist International is threatened with adulteration through the admission of parties which have just recently belonged to the Second International and which are now coming to us under the pressure of the masses, out of necessity. They cannot rid themselves even if they would of the philistine petty-bourgeois nature of the Second International. During our first Constituent Congress we faced a number of dangers. But we were not menaced at that time with the contingency of becoming watery and of admitting within our ranks a variety of elements. Fifteen months ago we were only a handful with regard to which the facetious saying was: “Your entire International can be accommodated on ten chairs; it has no influence whatever.” The big old parties remained in the Second International. Now things have changed. Those parties want to join the Third International, and, in as far as the masses are becoming Communistic, we must admit them into our ranks. But we must not forget that they are coming to us with all their bag and baggage, that is, with their old leaders who have stubbornly fought Communism during the war as well as after. What was the Third International at the time of its foundation in March, 1919? It was nothing but a propaganda society, and remained such throughout the first year. It is indeed not a small matter being a propaganda society on an International scale at a period when the working class was at the cross roads following the most horrible experiences of the war. I must emphasise that it was a great organisation of propaganda which brought the ideas of Communism home to the masses. Now we want to become something different and of much greater significance. We are no more a mere organisation of propaganda. We are the military staff of the International proletariat. In this regard the Second Congress is to turn a new leaf. We must organise as a fighting organisation which not only propagates Communism, but which is making Communism a reality by means of an International organisation.

In an article by Paul Louis which I have recently read, the author points out that the

collapse of the First International was due to the fact that it proved unable to avert the war of 1870- 1871. The Second International met with, the same fate. It broke down because of its inability to prevent the war. The First International, the author asserts, was in a position similar to that of the Second International. This statement, however, is a social-patriotic lie. The First International endeavoured to prevent the war. It struggled against the war and fell in the fight. The Second International, on the other hand, did not try to avert the war and did not avert it. The First International fell heroically. Its best representatives were slaughtered. But the Second International went down to its defeat with infamy. This fact we must make perfectly clear to the masses, and we must denounce the analogy between the First and Second International as being characteristic of social-patriotism and Kautskianism. The First International was in a critical position. The year 1870 has gone 'by; and the four years that have passed since this European War are of greater significance than four centuries in another situation and under different historical factors. But the tradition and the goal of the First International have remained, and I wish to say that we are now applying these traditions in our great work of organisation, with certain modifications, of course. The First International was a highly centralised organisation; it was trying to direct all economic strikes from one common centre; In this it was successful to some extent so long as the movement was young and weak. At the present time, we can have no such centre from which to conduct great economic struggles. Every day, every hour, economic struggles break out, of which we have even no knowledge, for the movement has grown to gigantic proportions. But the Second International was no centralised body at all, and was the antithesis of the International. The present period is one of synthesis of social relations for which we must create appropriate conditions. This we must bear in mind in discussing the conditions for admission to the International.

A number of leading comrades, who till recently belonged to the Second International, imagine that, adherence to the Third International does not involve any great responsibilities. Comrade Herzog, of Zurich, has brought with him a cutting from the "Berliner Tagewacht" containing an article by Grimm in which the author compares the Second International and its Executive to a letter-box. This is true. But what does the author think the Third International ought to be? The Third International, according to Grimm, must organise for important activities in various countries; it must see to it that various measures be simultaneously proposed in the parliaments of various countries. But this amounts to the same thing: it is again nothing more than a letter-box, though somewhat larger, more bulky than the former. We must have an information bureau; I have nothing against that. Our information bureau is in bad shape. We must better it. Also with regard to parliamentary action it would be very well that simultaneous steps be taken; in, branding, for example, the League of Nations as a band of robbers, or in drafting measures in opposition to the reformists. But this would be only a formal distinction. It would not make for a fighting organisation on an international scale. Neither is financial support at the present time of prime importance. The idea which Grimm and the men of his school have of the Third International does not distinguish it in essence from the Second International; it would be a large and better organised mail-box painted red. This is what the Third International should not be. Similar assertions have also been made by various Left reformists, as for example by Claud Treves in the "Revue" of the French Radicals. He stands for the immediate affiliation to the Third International, but on condition that the Party be not fettered, and that no political mottoes be imposed on various countries. The trend of all this is that they wish to enter immediately but without

binding themselves, retaining such autonomy as will enable them to go on in the same old way. In this respect, Modigliani has been most outspoken; he is a member of the Third International, but he is no company for us. While in Paris he wanted to get Longuet to join the Third International, reasoning in the following manner. Why not join the Third International? It does not bind us to anything; all that is required is mailing a post card to the Executive Committee every two weeks. Why not do that? Whoever knows Modigliani, with his opportunistic cynicism, will acknowledge that it is just like him to say such things. They regard the entry into the Third International like coming into an hotel.

All the past fifteen months of our existence – a brief period, but fraught with great significance – should have proved to every earnest political thinker that the Third International is nothing of the kind, that we are not going to accept into our ranks any members who are about to persist on their former line of action. We wish to build up an International of deeds. I do not share the opinion of Kautsky, that the International is an instrument of peace; on the contrary, it should be a fighting organisation in peace time, during the uprising and following the uprising. It should be a rallying ground for that part of the international proletariat which is conscious of its goal and which is prepared to fight for its achievement. The notion is very often entertained that there is a difference between the West and the East. Attempts have been made to instil into the minds of the workers that the Third International is an organisation of the Eastern proletariat, which does not concern the workers. The French comrades and the members of the Independent Socialist Party have tried to put the matter in the following manner; we must wait until the entire working class of the world joins the Third International, and we can do nothing till then. As a matter of fact, there is no distinction at all between the East and the West. The only distinction there is is between Communism and Reformism, between social pacifism and Communism. The distinction between the East and the West is utterly baseless. The movement to-day consists of three divisions in all countries alike – an outspoken opportunist wing comprising the main bulwark of the bourgeoisie, a more or less outspoken middle section, the swamp, the centre, which also serves as a support to the bourgeoisie, and a left wing which is more or less definitely Communistic or is tending towards Communism.

The working class of the West, say of England, knows very well what is taking place in Moscow. It knows what the Soviet Government means. Every demonstration shows that the working people of England have a clear knowledge of it. It is high time that this mythical division of “East” and “West” be done away, and that we stop talking to the German workers about waiting until all the Western workers rally together. We must not forget, above all, the lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The delegate from Hungary has referred to that matter while speaking on the role of the Party. It is a problem of great historic significance. Let us review the facts. The Hungarian Republic made the conditions of admission very easy. At the session of the Committee on Admission some of the comrades remarked that some parties of the Second International are making light of the conditions of admission, just as it was in the Hungarian Soviet Republic. We must be careful. The Hungarian Party called itself Socialist-Communist. It appeared as if it was only a matter of difference of opinion. They were at that time in the midst of a struggle, and we could not then interfere. Our Executive committed the error of acquiescence, saying that there is nothing in a name. But it proved to be a question of great moment, and played a decisive part in the fate of the Soviet Republic of Hungary. The Socialist-Communists accepted the great majority of the old Social Democrats into

their ranks, and in the most critical moment those gentlemen went over to the side of the bourgeoisie. Some of our Italian comrades said that at the next congress they are going to propose that their party, which now calls itself Socialist, should assume the name Socialist-Communist. Here is where we will call to mind the Hungarian example. We are not splitting hairs about words, but it is a question as to whether we can have confidence in such Socialists who are averse to break away, and are trying to smooth over the contradictions. The lesson has cost the working class of Hungary and of the entire world too big a price not to realise that, when one gives reformists a finger they grasp the whole hand and then the head, and hurl us to perdition. We are out for a pure Communist International. Communism is not going to be brought about in a month. Many a battle will have to be fought, and this will have to be done with the aid of an organisation as centralised as possible and of clearly defined tactics. The gentlemen who wish to treat us to a postcard affair will be shown the door before they enter. There is danger indeed that the Third International should come in vogue after the ignoble collapse of the Second International, which has left behind it a putrid slough, a decaying corpse. It is natural that parts of it should break off and attempt to continue the old policy in a changed form within the Third International. Some of them are not fully aware of it, but this does not change the situation. The danger is there and we must face it. I have read to-day an article in the "Freiheit" of July 13th entitled the "Task of the International."

I declare quite officially, and I hope the Congress will take the same stand, that we are going to adhere on the whole to the conditions of admission which we have advanced in our letter of February 5th. I must state most emphatically that we will repudiate every cooperation with the leaders of the Right Wing, such as Longuet and the like. We are told that Longuet may have altered his views. Should that be so, should Longuet accept our views, we would welcome him, provided he is sincere and earnest. I say the same thing to the German comrades. We refuse to collaborate with the Right Wing or have anything to do with the leaders. I make these declarations, not as a speaker of the Committee, but as a representative of the Russian delegation. In discussing this matter in the Central Committee of our Party, we reached the following conclusion; In case the Italian or other comrades demand a union with these elements, our Party prefers to remain all alone rather than be forced to accept into its ranks petty bourgeois elements. With regard to the revolutionary elements, however, our stand is quite different. This declaration I wish to make in the name of our Party.

Now I wish to consider concretely the position of those parties that are applying for admission to the International, as well as of those who have already joined it. I shall deal with each group separately. First, regarding those parties which have not belonged to us hitherto and which desire to join us. I have collected a good deal of material dealing with the French Party. Not being able to read it all to you, I shall limit myself to the most important items. First of all, I must make it clear that we do not intend to pass too severe judgment on views expressed at some former period. To err is human, and there is always the possibility of making reparation. But I shall cite those things which deal with matters of principle. I must mention first Comrade Cachin, of whose personal uprightness there is no doubt whatever. Whoever knows anything about his past knows that though he has made mistakes, he has nevertheless been an honest fighter. In an article written by him on the League of Nations on January 7th, he refers to Mr Wilson as one of the "last great men of the bourgeoisie of our times." He further goes on to say that American democracy did everything in order to avert the events that have taken place. This coming from a

Communist is quite incomprehensible; it is an outspoken social- pacifist statement. It is in the spirit of the deceased French Socialist, Jaures, who was a social-pacifist. This we must say with all due respect to his great merits. The ideas of Jaures traditionally prevail in France and other countries. Pacifism and Wilsonism are very persistent notions of which even some Communists cannot rid themselves. At the previous Congress the following episode took place. Fritz Flatten, a Swiss comrade of the Left Wing, presented a stenographic report of the speech made by him in Parliament, in which he stated that Wilson is an honest man who could find a peaceful solution to the (European) problem. Many of those now adhering to Communism are still being led into temptation by this social-pacifism, because it has been fostered for many a decade by great masters. It has not been sufficiently resisted because of predominating bourgeois ideas. We must put an end to it, and say very definitely to our French comrades, it is much easier to yield to formal conditions than to combat social-pacifism, which is a dangerous bourgeois ideology hindering the class struggle. One may accept thousands of conditions, but, so long as one remains a social-pacifist, he is no Communist and does not belong to the Third International. It is necessary to determine candidly to do away once and for all with all that.

There is something else I should like to say concerning the French comrades. There was an article by Frossard published on February 13th dealing with the attitude towards the Third International. In this article Frossard says: "As far as the policy of our party is concerned, it will probably not change after joining the Third International. In the coming elections the Third International cannot prevent us from concluding alliances with other parties." Apparently the notion prevails that the Third International is a kind of inn where representatives of various countries chant the "International," make one another compliments, then – part and carry on the old practice again. But we shall never allow the accursed practice of the Second International to go on. I could refer to a great number of other quotations concerning the practice of the French comrades, but I shall limit myself to the one already cited. The leading articles in the "Humanite" are divided up among the various parties in somewhat the following proportion; The Centre parties get 8 leaders a week, the Left 4, and 2 or 3 fall to the lot of Renaudel. You understand that a thing like this is utterly preposterous. It is like a mixture of eight drops of water and three drops of poison, and then as an antidote four drops of milk. Such a state of affairs cannot go on. Perhaps it finds its explanation in the history of the French movement. But the main thing is that it is argued that since the Party consists of three tendencies, why should they not unite? Frossard stated that he would rather go to Moscow without Renaudel. He said it would be a difficult matter to explain things to the Russian comrades; it is better that he stay at home. Renaudel is referred to as our friend. This French decorum does not suit us. But this is not peculiar of the French alone. Modigliani writes to Serrati in the same terms. This French and Italian mannerism is alien to us. I hope that the Executive Committee will be charged to present a monthly account of the activity of each party so that we have before us a mirror reflecting what is going on.

I shall read to you a few passages of the last official communication of the Central Committee of the I.S.P. handed to us by the representatives of that party.

The first reproach says:

"It touches particularly

"A sentence which runs like a red thread through the whole letter!"

It is true, this sentence really runs like a red thread through all our declarations of

principles. If at the present moment of relative calm there are some 10,000 comrades of the I.S.P. in the prisons, then I pay these comrades my utmost respect. I declare that they are true fighters, and true working men at that. We must try to get in touch with the working men. But this does not contradict my statement that it has a Right Wing with Kautsky, Hilferding, Strobel at its head. Crispin attended Lucerne with Hilferding and did not want to quit the Second International. There is a Right Wing.

We are told that no one considers Kautsky any more. But this is not true.

Kautskianism has become an international phenomenon, and some of the leaders of the Central Committee of the I.S.P., who believed to have rid themselves of the Kautskian ideology, are in their deeds carrying out the policy of Kautsky. We could not do better than take into consideration the fact that there are in the ranks of the I.S.P. working men who are struggling in earnest and are opposed to the leadership of the Right Wing, which sabotages the revolutionary struggle and which has rendered the best services to the bourgeoisie. It is claimed that there are no Right leaders in Germany. "It is a breach of loyalty on the part of the Executive Committee (so we are told) to introduce that division of Right and Left." We must of course be loyal to our brethren in other countries who are really struggling against the bourgeoisie, but "loyalty" towards such men as Kautsky, Hilferding, and Strobel would be equivalent to treachery towards the working class. Such "loyalty" we do not intend to foster. There is a wide gulf between us and Hilferding, who managed to establish comradely relations with the English higher officials. What is running like a red thread through our letter is precisely that distinction between the workers who are fighting alongside with us and the Right leaders who are sabotaging the struggle. The Central Committee writes: "We are utterly puzzled to understand what the reproach is based on.

When we, in Kunia, were confronted with the Peace Treaty of Brest the situation was clear. The State power was in the hands of the working class, which continued to fight in spite of starvation. German Imperialism had us by the throat, and the German working class was too weak to render us immediate assistance. We then said to ourselves that we must make a deal with these robbers in order to gain a breathing space – a phrase then coined. But how was the state of affairs in Germany preceding the Versailles Treaty? Power was in the hands of the bourgeoisie or in the hands of Scheidemann & Co., which is the same thing. The wily Scheidemann said, "I shall wash my hands of the whole affair and will refuse to sign the Treaty." He had thus twice deceived the heroic working class of Germany. Matters were presented in such a way as if Scheidemann was against the Peace, and the I.S.P. exerted all efforts to come to the aid of Scheidemann. It shouted from all the housetops that peace must be concluded. Now that party declares that- the position in Germany was at that time the same as that of Russia before the Brest Peace. The German comrades seem to leave out of consideration this one distinction, that in Russia the working class was in power and the bourgeoisie was laid low, while in Germany the power was in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the working class was powerless and betrayed a thousand times. This happened as a result of misconceiving the situation in March and judging somewhat as follows: Scheidemann or any Socialist, it makes no difference, all are a part of the same working class, of the old Social Democracy. This confusion of ideas within the Independent Socialist Party has made it possible for such an assertion to be made, and for the failure of realising the difference between a situation where the working class is in power and one where power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, where the Hindenburgs and Scheidemanns had their heel on the neck of the

working class. We were often told that there was no great difference of opinion, between us, that Kautsky has no great influence in the I.S.P. But isn't the spirit of Kautsky in evidence in this document handed us by the delegates of the I.S.P.? And just in the same manner the question of dictatorship is dealt with.

To write such stuff after the January uprising, which snatched away the dearest and the nearest out of the ranks of the working class; after the experiences of the civil wars in Russia, Finland, Georgia, and Hungary! Such words do not issue from the heart of a revolutionary. They must have been reproduced from an inanimate petty bourgeois machine. It would be more fitting for them to speak of the predominating interests of the bourgeoisie and not of the interests of Socialism. All this declaration is based on Kautskianism. If it is true that Kautsky has lost his influence, why does this document contain all the platitudes, all the nonsense, all the counter-revolutionary stuff that Kautsky has written? When we asked the representatives of the Left Wing as to whether they signed the document, they were not in a position to state that they had not done so. They merely answered that they had no time, that the thing was done in a great hurry. These, of course, are very poor excuses. It is a very bad thing to have the Central Committee decide such questions in a hurry. We see how the defunct Kautsky is dragging the live Dauming out of the water by the hair of his head, while the latter is energetically shoving off the old dotard Kautsky together with his counter-revolutionary rubbish. We have to apply the same gauge to all parties, whether they belong to us or not. The fact that a party has joined us does not exempt it from our criticism. We must criticise and be frank.

Now I am going to deal with the Italian Party. We have been emphasising all the time that this is one of the best parties within the ranks of the Third International. The Italian working class has endeared itself to us all by its heroism, for we know that it has taken an earnest stand on the Revolution and Communism. This, however, does not refer to the leaders. Now it may seem to you a dull thing to deal with Turatti and Modigliani. But we cannot leave this matter so long as these leaders are still in the ranks of the Party. At present they are considered as members of the Third International. In issuing membership cards for the members of the Third International, Turatti and Modigliani will also be in possession of such cards. But these people are carrying on anti-revolutionary propaganda. Turatti has come out in parliament with a lengthy oration such as he has made many a time before. In speaking, as is his wont, in the name of his mother, uncles, etc., Turatti said something to the following effect: "You, gentlemen of the bourgeoisie, are in a difficult position; the same is true of the working class. Let us then stretch forth a helping hand to each other. I therefore propose that you adopt a semi-bourgeois programme on the agrarian question, on the housing and food questions." The "Avanti" does not report how this speech was received by the Italian bourgeoisie. Turatti was called to trial by the Italian Party. A party that is taking itself seriously could not proceed in such a manner, for there are other things for a party to do than putting to trial such people for saying things which they have kept repeating for thirty years and which are in keeping with their reformist ideas. I have a considerable collection of clippings, about from two to three hundred. I am not in a position to present them all. We are about to issue a Red Book on the Italian and other parties. Serrati is going to get a copy, which I suppose he will enjoy very much. "When Turatti was asked why he remained in the Party he said, "Because I can exercise influence upon the working class." He does not conceal the fact that he belongs to the Party because it enables him to appear in parliament and at various gatherings as a reformist in a Socialist garb, and as a member of the Party. He can attend

to his little affairs while being in the Party. Why should he leave it? We would advise our friends to keep in mind what Turatti himself has said. We must not allow such gentlemen to stay in our party and sabotage our struggle. We have too many outspoken enemies, and must not allow covert foes to remain within our ranks. Comrade Bombacci, representing the Chemical Workers' Union, was addressing an assembly of trade union representatives of the entire country; and following that speech Turatti came out babbling forth his reformist nonsense, Bombacci made a rather mild retort. Why should Turatti be allowed to deliver reformist speeches in a gathering of trade union representatives and have Bombacci follow up that speech with a mild retort? So long as Turatti remains a member of the party Bombacci naturally cannot say this is our class enemy. We have something more important to do than to grant the platform to such gentlemen and give them the opportunity to speak to ordinary members of trade unions.

Let me now say a few words about the Swedish Party. Unfortunately the comrades who had been with us at the foundation of the International are not present here now. But we must speak out in this case also. The Swedish Left Wing has failed to adopt the name of Communist Party. This is not accidental. These comrades have published a review entitled "Zimmerwald," but did not go any further. The review contains a number of articles by the Right German Independents. This is not accidental either. It comes as a result of mutual sympathies. But the main thing is that outspoken reformists are occupying a place in the Party. I shall not speak of Lindhagen, who is a member of the Party. On March 3rd he proposed that the Party join the League of Nations, and had carefully elaborated five amendments to the Covenant of that League. (Reads):

It is true that there was an article written by the Party, disclaiming those views, but Lindhagen still remains a member of the Party and thereby also a member of the Third International. A deputy of the Swedish Party, Comrade Einberg, wrote an article advancing the social patriotic demand for disarmament, and declaring that it would be very easy to put an end to the War Ministry. He goes on to say that he expects the Right Social Democrats, meaning Branting, to support him in this matter. Then there is another well known deputy or leading comrade, Ivars Wengerstrom, whose speeches induced Branting to remark that he was under the impression that the Left Wing in Sweden 'is trying to conclude a marriage with the Social Democratic Party. Lindhagen retorted to this that he personally was averse to marrying old Branting. Nevertheless there was some talk in the Party to the effect that such conditions may arise where such a marriage could be made a matter for discussion. With all that, we cannot overlook the merits of the Left Wing of the Socialists of Sweden. It is a young movement having its origin in the Young People's movement. We are aware that there are a number of comrades in it who are real revolutionists. But we must tell them definitely that we must have a Communist Party that could not think of discussing the possibility of a marriage with Branting, that has thrown the idea of disarmament on the rubbish heap, and that does not consider itself called upon to amend the statutes of the League of Nations, but rather to bury them.

The programme declaration of the Danish Left Wing states that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot come as a result of historic upheaval nor by the conquest of power. The Party declares that with the abolition of militarism would come the possibility for a bloodless revolution. You have only got to abolish bourgeois militarism and the prospects for a peaceful revolution are at hand. But the question arises as to how militarism can be abolished without bloodshed either on our part or on the part of the bourgeois.

Now as to the Norwegian Party, in which the Central Committee forms the Right Wing

of the Party. It was said by Schefflo that the Norwegian Party consists only partly of Socialists, because the Party admits into its ranks entire labour unions. This of course is a grave blunder. We may be in the best of relations with the labour unions, we may form fractions in them, but to accept entire bodies of organised labour. Including Christian unions and other elements, would be of course the height of folly. We must say this to the Norwegian Party without equivocation.

Now about the Yugo-Slav Party. It calls itself Communist. There were a number of reformist articles published by the Slav comrades. The party comes out in opposition to those comrades carrying on the controversy in somewhat the same style which the "Avanti" uses in regard to Turatti. This is the state of affairs for which we cannot and must not stand. We must warn our Yugo-Slav Party that it is not permissible to have outspoken reformists in its ranks and put the party press at their disposal.

It is quite possible that other parties can point out some faults in our work as well. Every party belonging to the Third International has the undeniable right as well as the duty of calling attention to any error we may commit. The International is a party that has its affiliated organisations in all countries, each of which should have the right of intervening and criticising frankly. We have Communist Parties which are truly Communistic and form the backbone of the Communist International. But we have a number of other parties about which we have no guarantee that they may not deceive the working class, and thus rob us of some of the confidence which we are, now enjoying in the working class. It is evident that Treves is doing that very thing every day as a member of the Senate, and that Bombacci's influence is being impaired by Turatti and Modigliani. There are again a number of great old parties applying for admission, a part of whose membership is with us and stands for dictatorship, but another part is vacillating. We do not propose that the French Party be at once admitted, but that the Executive Committee be given the authority to continue the negotiations and to ascertain to what extent they fulfil the conditions, to study the Party press from day to day and then draw its conclusions after a certain time. The French comrades have declared in the Committee that they would be satisfied with such a procedure. The representatives of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany have made similar statements. We shall do everything possible to facilitate closer relationships. The most important thing is to study carefully and conscientiously all the Party publications that are being spread and that we be given the official authority by the Congress to follow up the matter during a certain period of time, and see how far our conditions are being fulfilled. One can accept any number of conditions and still remain a disciple of Kautsky. The conditions we have put up are merely to serve as a gauge by which to measure the extent to which the decisions of the Congress are fulfilled. I am confident that the Congress will make the matter perfectly clear so that every workingman will understand exactly what the Third International stands for. I declare with full confidence that no matter what the Centre parties are going to do and what the leaders will say, the voice of labour in all countries is on our side. The working people will join our ranks day by day because the hour of the bourgeoisie has struck and the semi-bourgeois Second International has outlived its time. The time of the actual struggle for Socialism has arrived. The working men are going to realise this sooner or later and will come to us in spite of their leaders to form with us an effective fighting organisation of the revolutionary proletariat. (Prolonged applause.)

BALBANOV – The following motion is made That the Parties of the Third International are called upon to exclude from their ranks Freemasonry as a petty

bourgeois organisation, that is, that the comrades who belong to the Third International, especially those of the West, cannot belong to the Freemasonic organisation. The mover of the motion is Comrade Serrati. The question is going to be discussed later on, but has been announced at this juncture so that the comrades may be prepared for the future discussion.

RADEK – Following the session of the Committee on Conditions of Admission to the Third International, when the French and German comrades expressed their agreement with these conditions, we who were present at the Committee all recalled to mind almost simultaneously the words uttered by Bela Kun after the alliance with Hungarian Social Democracy. He said he had the impression the thing came off too smoothly. This same impression prevails with us at the present moment and we cannot rid ourselves of it.

He who has learned to know the French Party and the Independent Socialist Party of Germany not merely from press items, will understand that I do not assume the attitude of letting bygones be bygones, but that I wish to present here at the Congress before the German workers the course of development of the I.S.P., as we have witnessed it. For it is impossible that a party should change its nature in a single day by the mere signing of a piece of paper, by affixing its signature to certain conditions. We have here two considerations to bear in mind: one is the fact of the continued revolutionising of the German working class, a fact which compels us and makes it our duty to strive to make common cause with the Independents and regard them as our comrades in arms. The workers belonging to the Independents took the war-path against the Ebert-Scheidemann government within a short time after its inauguration. When I visited Germany, I got the impression that nine-tenths of the population were up in arms against the Government. In the fights of January and March, the workers of the Independent Party fought shoulder to shoulder with the Communist workers, arms in hand. In all the prisons where our comrades were confined they were together with Independent workers. This fact we must not overlook. It forms the basis of our attitude towards the German Independents. On the other hand, we find that the majority of the leaders of that party, who are still externally playing predominating roles in the party, have not been progressive factors in the development, but have on the contrary retarded it; that, at every step forward which they are taking under compulsion, they seek to confuse the workers. Comrade Zinoviev has quoted a few passages from the reply of the Independent Socialist Party. I wish to add a few very brief statements. That document contains a denial of the fact that the Independent Socialist Party has broken solidarity with Soviet Russia, and disclaims any responsibility for those diplomatic relations which culminated in the expulsion of the Russian Embassy. The Scheidemann Government under Prince Max Von Baden had made the first breach. But the Independent Socialist Party already formed a part of the Government at the time when the Russian Embassy under the protection of the German machine guns at Borisov addressed numerous telegraphic appeals and negotiations with representatives of that Party, who did not raise a finger in the matter. They said that Joffe must go back to Russia, that before negotiations are renewed, it must be established whether or not he had offended the Majesty of Sessel. In addition, let me quote the following from the proceedings of the Session of the Council of National Representatives on November 19th, 1918;

"Continuation of discussions on Germany's relations with the Soviet Republic. Haase recommends the policy of circumspection. Kautsky seconds him. The decision must be put off. The Soviet Government is not going to last much longer and will disappear within a

few weeks.”

This is an official report of a Government session which is confirmed in the Recollections of Barth, the Independent, who participated in the Government together with Haase and Dittman. When we reproach the Independents with having directed the German Revolution on to the Rock of the Entente, we base it on the following fact: When the Soviet Government had notified the Government at that time that it was sending two trainloads of foodstuffs, by which it did not intend to assert that it was possible for it to send two such trainloads every day, but that it was sending that bread as a symbolic act of uniting the destinies of both nations, Haase replied to that, notification that the American Government had pledged itself to send com to Germany: that he expressed gratitude for the gift, which, however, should be utilised to satisfy the hunger of the suffering population of Russia. When we received this reply, we felt as if the tie which held fast in spite of criticism from Zimmerwald to Stockholm, had been cut asunder. We were given to understand that the Germans prefer to throw in their lot not with us, who were starving, but with the mighty ones of the capitalist world, with American Capital. We shall find a common ground with the Independent workers, but there are things in the history of a Labour party which are not easy to forget, and we want to have nothing to do with those leaders who were, together with Haase, responsible for this.

The breach of solidarity with the working class offering its assistance is something that no revolutionary can forgive, however much it may be mitigated by misleading circumstances. When the Independent Socialist Party says that it is opposed to the League of Nations, we must answer that it is no great thing nowadays to be in opposition to that League. Hilferding, Dittman, and Longuet had already attempted to revise some paragraphs in the Covenant when they got together at Lucerne soon after the Versailles Treaty. How is one to explain that the Independents, whilst clamouring for the World Revolution, at the same time never lose hope of coming to terms with Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau? The nature of the Independent Socialist Party has come to light especially during this period. We must not forget that, after our comrades had been defeated in Berlin in the month of March, at a time when the guns of Noske were still firing, the Independent Socialist Party incorporated in its programme the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, but, when the workers came out to fight for that dictatorship, the Independent Socialist Party got in the way, trying to bring about confusion. It behoves us therefore to be on our guard, and to caution the workers of the I.S.P. Be ever prepared, be ever on your guard, for there are leaders in your party who may direct you on the wrong road, who are capable of betraying your confidence either because of lack of revolutionary insight or because of absence of revolutionary initiative.

The question was put as to why the comrades did not join the Third International right after they had left the Government and declared themselves to be a revolutionary party. I have before me the discussions at the National Conference of I.S.P. of September 10, 1919, published in the “Freiheit” of Sept. 11. At this conference Hilferding, – of whom it cannot be said that he is dead for the Party, as it has been said of Kautsky, because, as a matter of fact, he is the leading spirit in it, – Hilferding said concerning the question of joining the Moscow International that it would mean to tie our boat to a sinking ship. The Third International, he said, was nothing more than Russian Bolshevism. That was at the moment when the counter-revolutionary hosts especially those of Denikin and Koltchak were making their onslaughts on Soviet Russia, at the time when every working man felt in his heart and soul that all possible assistance should be hastened to Soviet Russia. At

such a moment a leader of the I.S.P. comes out and says that the Soviet Ship is threatened by the storm, – for heaven’s sake don’t have our boat tied to it, lest we perish with it.

That conference pledged itself to make up a list of those comrades whose expulsion we demand. But it made no pledge to call upon the workers not to put up as leaders such a revolutionary charlatan who could recommend the German workers not to unite with the Russians because the latter are in danger. We must say to the German workers that if they rely on written conditions and at the same time allow such people at the head, who could act like this in a moment of danger, then they are sold out and betrayed. At the critical moment there is no knowing – or rather we know too well – what these speculators are going to do. It has been suggested by the opposition that we must take into consideration Party autonomy, that the parties must do their own house-cleaning. Do clean your house, but use not a broom, but a red-hot iron, for it is a matter not merely of throwing Hilferding out of the Party but of banishing from the Party the petty bourgeois spirit and vacillating indecision. Should the I.S.P. fail to adopt that attitude, its joining the International will be a mere sham, adding a dead weight to the International. I feel confident that the workers of the I.S.P. and their Left Wing will radically change their behaviour in the future. We must frankly declare that it is not a matter of placing the Right Wing of the I.S.P. on one side, and the masses tempered in the revolutionary struggle on the other. The Party has failed up till now to start an open struggle for power because it expected to get the undesirable members out of the Party by various methods. Not confining themselves to mere verbal declarations, the Independents must fight shoulder to shoulder with the Communist against the Party traditions which amount to nothing else but calling for revolution without believing in it, and expecting it to come of itself like manna from heaven.

It is not enough that Stocker is theoretically in agreement with the Third International, and that Daumig is writing articles about Soviet dictatorship, it is necessary that their party carry on a policy in opposition to those leaders who are hampering it; The leaders of the I.S.P. spoke in the Committee for unconditional amalgamation with the Third International, but Crispien has written in the second edition of his pamphlet that the foundation of the Third International was a premature act. "How easy it appears" – says Crispien further – "to solve the question of joining the Third International by going to Moscow, but that road does not lead to solution of the problem unless we wish to commit suicide as a revolutionary party." There are many living corpses in the International; Crispien is our guest and we are glad to see him here alive. The fact that he came here is due to the pressure exerted by the workers. At the Party conference he declared; "The road to Moscow has been blocked for us, for the Moscow comrades themselves by their decisions and their attitude to the Independents. On the basis of these decisions, we can find a place in the Kremlin only by blindly submitting to the Communist International and by allowing ourselves to become dissolved in the Communist-Syndicalist organisations."

The Independent Socialists have been forced by their rank and file to go to Moscow. They came here after having learned that the French delegates had likewise been sent. They had no fault to find with our programme or tactics. This should lead the workers to draw their own conclusions and to introduce a radical change in the conditions that prevailed among them up till now. It is a case of leaders that have been discredited, not by us but by their own revolutionary workers as misleaders. We consider the Independent Socialist Party a good revolutionary party as far as the rank and file of the workers is

concerned. The German workers must see to it that the work begun be brought to a successful issue and their party become really revolutionary also with regard to the leaders who should be keen in the struggle, who should not leave their principles on paper, but try to embody them in practice from day to day.

CACHIN – Comrades, sent to you, with Frossard, with the definite and exclusive purpose of mutual information, we can only make here, as you will understand, comrades, a short declaration in our own names.

We have read very attentively the Theses on the conditions of admission, which have been presented in the name of the Executive Committee and of the competent Commission. We have thoroughly discussed them with numerous comrades who can speak with authority. We have just now heard the comments of Zinoviev. We have not been commanded to discuss them at length. From various sources of information, we get the main and directing idea.

You demand that the parties desirous of joining you that they first renounce in their press, and in their propaganda, reformist and opportunist ideas. You wish them to show some pride in that; that they combat their manifestations on every field, and that they bend every effort on the necessity of revolutionary action among the workers.

We are in full agreement.

This essential demand will have practical consequences, to which these parties asking affiliation will have to conform. In the first place, it will be necessary that each militant makes his choice, and chooses clearly between reformism and revolution. This is not a question of persons, and you are right to insist on it. But in the present historic moment, he who still strives to collaborate with bourgeois society, at the moment when the decisive social fight is taking place everywhere, he cannot find a place in the ranks of the Party of these workers.

We are prepared to demand from all our comrades that they act as Socialists in their unions as well as in the Party. We are prepared to collaborate fraternally with the revolutionary militants of the Syndicalist organisation which admits the necessity of political action.

In the second place, more energetically than ever must propaganda be carried on against the ideology of the imperialists and all that supports and protects it.

In two years our Socialist group in Parliament has voted against the credits and the whole budget. Our party has definitely condemned participation in the Ministry. That is, in peace times.

If the general War could be precipitated again one day, the present criminal imperialist policy of the French bourgeoisie would bear the essential responsibility. We should refuse to be associated with it under any form whatever (votes of credit, ministerial collaboration). We should call to memory that, in such circumstances when the national interests are confused with those of the plutocracy, there should be no duty for the proletariat superior to its duty towards its class.

It will be necessary to revise the programme of our Party, to make it harmonious with the spirit of the Third International. Strong centralisation, strict control of parliamentary action, of the press, iron discipline imposed on each member, such seem to us to be the fundamental conditions of renewed action and which the present times rigorously impose. You ask us to assist unreservedly the Soviet republics in the struggle with the counter-revolution. More rigorously than in the past we shall warn the workers of the necessity of refusing to transport munitions and equipment for the counter-revolutionaries.

Among the troops charged with the fight against the Soviet revolutions, we shall carry on our propaganda against intervention by all possible means.

Comrades, such are the declarations which we can make to you respecting the narrow limits of our mission among you. We are convinced that if our friend Longuet had been able to be here, his opinion, after examination, would not have been different from ours.

We shall return to France carrying your conditions. Faithfully, shall we submit them to the Party as well as the complete literature of the Third International. At the same time, we shall carry on an active ardent campaign on the situation of the Russian Revolution.

In some weeks a congress will be called after all the sections of the Party have been made aware of the facts and have discussed them. As for Frossard and myself, we shall support affiliation to the Third International. Nothing would be gained by multiplying to you verbal affirmations and promises. We are going to undertake a break with the past, a determined action on which the Third International will afterwards have to pass judgment.

LEFEVRE – Comrades, at the Strassburg Congress, the Socialist Party of France decided to get in touch with certain Socialist Parties to effect – as the majority of the French Party put it – the reconstruction of the International. For this purpose a visit was also to be paid to Moscow, the seat of the Third International. During this visit, comrades Cachin and Frossard dazzled by the greatness of the Russian Revolution, seem to have completely changed their attitude. They have abandoned their former views on the matter, and the other day Comrade Cachin was heard to say at this very table: “Reconstruction is folly.” This is a precise and frank sentence rendered on all the old ideologies. As a matter of fact, since the Strassburg Congress the French Socialist Party, I mean its majority, has constantly evolved towards the Right with mechanical rapidity. The Left faction, the faction which we are in the habit of calling the Loriot faction, which has declared its adherence to the Third International, has increased and keeps on growing all the time, while on the other hand the old faction, of Renaudel, if one is to employ a personal term, has decreased to such an extent that it has become of no account in our party, at any rate among the revolutionary elements; for, among the parliamentary Socialists and in the municipalities, that faction still predominates. It was quite natural that the majority of the Party turned against those whose growing influence caused it some embarrassment, and so we witnessed a union concluded between Renaudel and Paul Faure, and the mixed approval of the Right and Centre factions given to Paul Faure, who said in referring to those who stood for the Third International: – “You speak all the time to the masses of revolution, you do not know what revolution is; you have no idea of the actual meaning of the mass movement in France. The masses are conservative – they have shown it on November 10th, and do not trust you (for the Majority of the French Socialist Party attaches a religious importance to all matters pertaining to elections. The masses are not going to follow you in your demagogic course. You imagine that you are doing propaganda by holding meetings resembling ritual assemblies where the same people always come to cheer the same agitators; but you try to ask of the working class to take drastic and efficient measures to stop the expeditions to Russia, or, better still, to seize power, and you will then see how far they are going to follow you.”

Pressman, speaking of the French peasants, had recourse to similar arguments, and he made it appear before the masses that the “extremists” of the Third International are a kind of maniacs possessed with the spirit of frantic opposition towards the venerable revolutionists, having no idea of the meaning of a political organisation. Pressman failed

to add that he and his friends, following the safe demagogic tradition, refrain from speaking to the masses of revolution, touching it just enough to obtain applause, but never do anything effective which might lead to any definite revolutionary gains.

I should like to ask the permission of the Congress to state this matter here more precisely and to give a rapid outline of the inner workings of the French Socialist Party. The masses think that the activity of the French Socialist Party means the activity of the parliamentary group. What is taking place within the Party is known to no one but to the leaders themselves or becomes known when a special occasion presents itself in the course of propaganda. But the man who attends no meetings, who reads no revolutionary papers, the man of the street, he knows only the parliamentary group and its discussions, and that for him is the whole of Socialism. It was no exaggeration to say that the parliamentary Socialist faction is no less conservative than all the other bourgeois factions of the Parliament. I must state that in speaking thus I am not actuated by an animosity or rancour which comes, as the result of constant struggle against the opposition. If I were allowed the time, I would present here in brief the biographies of the chief leaders of the Socialist faction in Parliament, of such as Paul Boncour, Varenne, and Albert Thomas who is the undisputed head of this faction. The career of a man like Varenne, of which hardly anyone in the International has any knowledge, is that of a journalist, manager of a number of bourgeois papers 'which appear and disappear one after the other, but which are all financed by Albert Thomas, who in his turn collaborates with Jouhaux in the publication of "Information Ouvriere et Sociale," and is being maintained by Monsieur Dulot the editor of the "Temps," the mouthpiece of the French bourgeoisie. Each of these men retains his seat in Parliament owing to a strange electoral system, not so much by the will of the Socialist workers as by the support of some bourgeois anti-clericalists. This explains why men, for instance, like Leon Blum, attach so much importance to the trifling questions of the renewals of relations with the Vatican. I have not the time to give you individual examples. But here is a typical one. Aruby, a young teacher who came to Parliament from the extreme Left Wing of the Socialist Party, had in the course of a few weeks become perverted by the contaminating treachery of the parliamentary faction. Shortly after his election, we find him signing together with General de Boissoudy and the Archbishop of Rennes an appeal for the National Loan. Such things occur regularly in the Socialist faction, and cause no surprise. Some time ago we witnessed a comical scene in the Chamber which is indicative of the utter lack of sincerity in the revolutionary expression made by a French deputy. The law courts of Rouen instituted a case against the Deputy of Pas-de-Calais, Barthelemy, who had organised a public meeting in Sotteville in conjunction with Comrade Meric. Barthelemy was accused of having declared that, in the event of a revolution breaking out, he would place himself in the first ranks and would die on the barricades at the head of the proletarian troops. This case was brought before the Chamber, and Barthelemy immediately mounted the tribune and exclaimed: "Do you really believe that a French Socialist deputy could do or say such things? I never said anything of the sort." And the Parliament believed him immediately, so sound is the reputation of the Socialist faction. Such piquant occurrences can be witnessed in the Chamber very frequently. Some time ago Maurin spoke in the Administrative Committee of the Party of the manner in which propaganda is to be carried on in France. He said with a cynical frankness that propaganda is to be carried on with a view of re-electing those men who are already in office and for preparing the ground for new elections. He further said that before making an electoral address, one has to enquire of the local authorities

about the temper of the given district and select some matters pertaining to the immediate material interests of the electorate. But there are more important matters than the activity of the discredited parliamentary faction of the French Party. (A deputy is regarded to-day, with two or three exceptions, as a traitor and as a man of no account. The Parliament has been thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the masses. This is perhaps the most tangible result of the treachery of the Socialist parliamentary faction.)

The Socialist Party has had great success in the municipal elections. Most of the large cities of France have elected Socialists. We have from 15 to 18 thousand municipalities. Before I left for Russia, a conference of these municipalities was held at Boulonge for the excellent purpose of co-ordinating the activities of these municipalities. A number of questions were discussed at this conference. First of all it was decided that, in order to save from bankruptcy a number of companies holding concessions in the municipalities, additional taxation should be imposed upon the workers of these municipalities. The idea of allowing some of these companies to fail has been promptly put aside as revolutionary. When the question came up of preventing the Socialist municipalities from taking part in the chauvinistic celebrations of July 14th, the motion to that effect was withheld, and it was a member of the majority. Mistral, who refused to have the motion brought up before the National Council. As far as the majority of the conference itself is concerned, it was altogether opposed to it. (I am citing these things haphazardly to give the Congress an idea of the value of the gift that the French Party is about to make to it.) It was just after the May strike when the Government meted out such severe treatment to the revolutionaries, that a deputy, who is well known to you, the Honourable Delory, solicited the honour of receiving in the city of Lille, of which he is the mayor, two ministers to discuss the question of conferring the military cross on the city. Such things are being done in the municipalities governed by the French Socialist Party.

It is no wonder, therefore, comrades, that the best revolutionary elements turn away from the Party in disgust. And when one hears the reproach thrown at the Third International that it is going to destroy the unity of the Party, we must reply that one cannot destroy a thing that does not exist. There is no unity in the French Socialist Party, for there are men in it who should not be there, and there are men not there who should be there. There will be no unity until an effective expurgation in the Party has been accomplished – (this expurgation has been promised by the majority, and we are still waiting for it) – and until a Communist Party, thoroughly disciplined and comprising in its ranks all the revolutionary Syndicalists who are now drifting towards the Anarchists, will have been established and act in accordance with the Theses which we have drawn up here.

I should like to tell you about the May strike, of the consequences it had (which have been rather great) and of the lessons which can be derived from it. But time does not allow me to do that. I only want you to know that those who asserted at Strassburg that the masses did not participate were lying. They did take part and marched out in close ranks, and it was only the failure of the leaders to stand by that caused its defeat. One comes to the conclusion that the only party that could have saved the working people that deplorable experience would have been a Communist Party.

The conversion of Comrades Cachin and Frossard is only an individual case. They will go back to France and will bring their declarations before the attention of the Party. There is reason to fear that, owing to their long opportunistic past and to the old habits of thought (while being perfectly sure that these comrades are sincere), it is still to be feared

that, left to themselves to direct their party towards the Third International, they will suggest such a programme which will be rather disconcerting for us Frenchmen in making us platonically adhere to the Third International, but which will be much more serious for you, comrades, in getting the spirit of treachery of the Second International into your ranks. I am telling you that we are living in a stifling atmosphere, which has all got to be changed. The change in the point of view of two men will have no influence upon your decision. We must adopt a firm line of action, and I assure you that the French masses will follow us unflinchingly if we ourselves will not waver. We must not have these Marxian Theses supplemented by a French notion from the Palais Bourbon, and the carrying out of these Theses into life should not become a trifling matter by being put into the charge of men who have during six years so discredited the word "Socialism" as to have made it necessary to change it for the word "Communism."

GRAZIADEI – I have asked for the floor in order to discuss a question to which Comrade Serrati has already alluded. But as Comrade Serrati has dealt with the subject in a manner which excludes discussion, I now wish to promise to add the following thesis to those which are discussed by the Congress;

"All parties wishing to join the Communist International should prevent their members from belonging to the Freemasons. As a matter of fact, in many countries the Freemasons constitute a political organisation, which in its abstract, formal, and bourgeois conception of the social conditions, as well as by its actual construction, serves the aims of the national and international system of the bourgeoisie. Its influence can prove all the more dangerous, from the fact that this organisation is secret."

A simple reference to the text is enough to explain my idea. This question does not concern the Russians, but it is of immense importance in the Latin countries, as well as in England and America. The Freemasons exercise a great influence in these countries. They form a political organisation, which tends toward the conquest and the preservation of power; it unites statesmen, men of science, and men of business. It is based on a conception completely opposed to that of Marxism. It tries to disguise the difference of conditions between different classes and nations, under an abstract and formal conception of their theoretical rights. Finally, it is a secret organisation; and remembering the fact that in many lands we ourselves have no secret forces, we can easily be at a disadvantage. Comrade members of the Freemasons will be able to establish a control over us, without giving us any opportunity of controlling their organisations/ In Italy we have had some interesting experience in this direction. At the Congress of the Party assembled at Ancone before August, 1914, we declared the incompatibility of comrades belonging both to the Party and to the Freemasons. In a couple of months, war commenced. How we are convinced, that without this decision we should not have been able to present such an irreconcilable attitude towards the War. In any case our course would have split at a critical moment. One of the chief reasons of the crisis which at such a moment took place in the French Socialist Party is also the presence of a great number of Freemasons in its ranks. I request the comrades to consider Comrade Serrati's motion, and I propose to accept it as a thesis to be added to those presented by the Commission. The Congress must completely decide this question which is of the greatest interest to many countries.

GUILBEAUX – The first year of the Third International was devoted to the formation of parties and groups. I think that at present we are entering upon a new phase of the development of the Communist International, – the period of the struggle of tendencies within the International itself. The discussions we are witnessing since the opening of the

Congress proves the existence of this struggle between a Right and a Left Wing, and I consider it after all as a sign of the great vitality of Communism. But it seems to me that a tendency is to be observed in the Right Wing which is liable to grow and which it is the duty of the Left fighters to combat from the very start.

The Manifesto of the First Constituent Congress of the International declared that we must fight against centrism, considered, for good reasons, to be the most dangerous tendency of the Socialist movement. This Manifesto recommends a break with the Centre and to form in all countries strictly Communist groups or parties. I think it is symptomatic that the Second Congress of the Communist International discusses the new attitude which is to be adopted towards the Centre.

The very fact that we allow the possibility of admitting into the Communist International some elements of the Centre is nothing else than the beginning of a compromise with reformism and centrism. In the proposed Theses, on the other hand, we reject the Right Wing of the Italian Socialist Party represented by Turatti; and, on the other hand, we address an appeal to such parties of the Centre, as the Independents of Germany or the French Socialist Party. This appears to me to be a contradiction. The difference between Cachin and Turatti is, of course, great. During the War, the Italian Socialist Party displayed much more respectable behaviour than the French Socialist Party, the latter having made itself guilty of the meanest treacheries. On the other hand, in the Theses presented here, it has been emphasised that no Communist must forget the lesson of the Hungarian Soviet Republic which had to pay so dearly for the amalgamation of the Communists with the reformists. There is a great danger involved in dealing with the representatives of the parties of the Centre. I know very well that you are trying to point out to them all the faults committed by them since the beginning of the War, but I also know that in the Communist International and even in the Russian Communist Party there are some Right elements expecting very much from the French Socialist Party and the German Independents. They argue that these parties have the masses behind them, whereas, in reality, the French and German Communist Parties are of little importance as far as the masses are concerned. On my part, I think that it is a very artificial method of attracting the masses to speak to them through their old leaders.

I don't think that there is reason to exult at seeing the representatives of certain centrist parties, transported into the revolutionary atmosphere of Moscow, declaring to have been won over for Communism. I have no doubt of their sincerity, but I wonder whether in Paris, in the putrid atmosphere of the Socialist Party or of Parliament, they will not relapse into their former aberrations. We must not forget that the ground for the foundation of the Second International in 1884 was being prepared for several years. The comrades dealing at present with the Socialist Parties imagine that they will be able to create in one day an organisation and a press which could be utilised for revolutionary purposes. They are preaching a kind of futurism. We must organise the framework of a strong Communist Party and into it the masses, but not only by artificial means. I adhere to the view, as already expressed by Comrade Lefevre, that the French Socialist Party is essentially a parliamentary party, and we must not admit it here in spite of the declarations of its representatives. The indispensable split unfortunately did not come off, and only when this split will have become a fact will there be in France a Communist Party comprising the partisans of Comrade Loriot and the Syndicalists of the Rosmer-Monatte faction, and which will have the masses on its side. We cannot win over the French masses to our side by means of artificially converting the French Socialist Party

into a Communist Party. If after six months' or one years' trial, we accept parties which were betraying and erring for years, I fear that they will finally gain the majority in the Communist International and will succeed in covering the red banner of the Third International with another banner closely resembling that of the Second International. We must not start dealings with parties which, in spite of their assertions, do not give any guarantees for the future,

HERZOG (Switzerland) – In this whole discussion, it is also necessary to enlighten shortly the Party relations in Switzerland. As you know, the last Party conference of Switzerland drew up the resolution to leave the Second and join the Third International. But a further resolution has been accepted, according to which the above resolution is first to be presented to the members of the Social-Democratic Party for decision by referendum. The first voting decided to leave the Second, but not to join the Third International; on the contrary, the Party presidium must be given the right, and it must take up the duty of entering into connections with all revolutionary parties for composing a great revolutionary International, i.e., a Fourth International. Then the Party presidium did all in its power in order to execute this resolution. At Bern, negotiations took place with French Socialists. The party presidium sent Comrade to Germany to carry on negotiations with the I.S.P. When we Communists exposed the manoeuvre, they tried to smother it, especially the “Baseler Vorwaerts.” Also the Party presidium has been white-washed in this affair. Such vacillating policy, as we see it in Switzerland, on the leaving of the Second International, such policy of hesitation, has recently always been carried on in Switzerland by the Social-Democracy. As is well known, it decided to join to Kienthal and Zimmerwald, and when we, the revolutionary workers, urged that these resolutions be executed in practice, saying that the affair is not yet settled by joining Kienthal and Zimmerwald, but the whole programme must be realised, they must try to be active in a revolutionary way, they must address themselves with propaganda to the army and revolutionise the soldiers, then the Party did all in its power to render impossible our activity. We were obliged to unite the revolutionary workers into groups.

We have tried in all bigger places to join together these Communist groups; we have built of them a central organisation and have drawn up a programme. But we did not stop at that. We said that we must begin activity and propaganda in the army, according to the leading principles drawn up in Zimmerwald. We have to say to the workers, if the Party leaders do not execute the great mass actions, you must do it. That is the reason of the conflict and of the exclusion of the Communists from the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland. This propaganda we have systematically carried to the end. We have distributed in the army tens of thousands of leaflets, which was our duty, being revolutionary Communists. That is the reason we have been thrown out. In Zurich there was a great general strike. I have said that the general strike had to be carried out, and when we made propaganda for it, we were excluded from the Party. The whole organisation of the old revolutionary group was excluded. In order not to become dead politically, we were compelled to enter upon the foundation of the Communist Party. By intensive work our party succeeded in organising Party sections in all bigger places. We succeeded in winning the sympathy of great workers' masses. The old Party Central Committee is afraid that the great mass of the workers will pass over to us; this was the reason of the manoeuvre at Olten to convene a Party conference consisting of Left Socialists and of the Centre, and they resolved to send two representatives to Moscow, in order that Switzerland be admitted to the Third International. Afterwards these people

declare we are in the Third International, we are revolutionary Communists. They think that by joining the Third International they will keep the workers' masses with them. It is a task of this Congress to declare also to these people of the Swiss Social-Democracy: You are to prove in the practice that you really want to fight in a revolutionary way. Only after having proven this can you be admitted into the Third International. A very great danger prevails, namely, that a great deal of opportunist Centre elements are coming into the Third International, and this will have the consequence that these elements will be preponderating in the Third International. We have to fight quite energetically against this danger and the same principle we employ against the Independents, against the French Party, we must employ it also against the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland. By sifting severely these elements, we can prevent the germs of dissolution from penetrating into the Third International, and we can make it that the revolutionary activity existing actually in the masses be not weakened in the next years to come.

GOLDENBERG – As far as I am concerned, I shall not vote for Comrade Zinoviev's Theses, I shall not vote for them, as I see therein a great mistake in the method. I shall try to explain shortly this mistake.

If we, the adherents of the Third International, are asked what is the significance of our conduct in the Socialist Party, we answer as follows: –

The War has divided the international proletariat into two hostile camps; on one side, the counter-revolutionary faction consisting of the workers' aristocracy, that layer of the proletariat which the development of capitalism brings ever nearer to the likeness of the lower strata of bourgeoisie, and on the other side the revolutionary faction consisting of the lower strata of the proletariat. Before the War, these two factions stood side by side within the various national parties: after the War they represented no more the conflict of tendencies, but came out in armed fight. Using Comrade Lenin's words – controversy by arguments has been replaced by controversy with arms. Out of these two antagonist factions, one allied itself with the bourgeoisie, the other proved to be the real representative of the revolutionary proletariat. We are with the latter.

How must the Third International, being the International organisation of the revolutionary proletariat, behave towards the Socialist Parties in which the split between the counterrevolutionary reformist Socialists and revolutionary Communist Socialists has not yet been effected? That is the question on which we have to give an answer to-day.

The Theses proposed by Comrade Zinoviev determine a number of conditions, by means of which the so-called "centrist" Socialist parties will be admitted into the Third International. It is this manner of procedure I cannot agree with for my part.

The Third International, being the international organisation of the revolutionary proletariat must be comprised exclusively of representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries, and cannot contain non-Communist elements which have proved to be counter-revolutionary elements, agents of the bourgeoisie.

The conditions put to the centrist parties are such as to enable the French Socialist Party, the German Independent Socialist Party, the Norwegian Socialist Party, etc., to enter into the Third International provided they declare themselves ready to accept and follow Communist tactics.

I declare that in this way we only increase the confusion already prevailing in these parties. I want to speak to you here particularly of the French Socialist Party, which I know better than the others.

The French Socialist Party is made up nearly entirely of this stratum of the Labour

aristocracy, which during the War proved to be extremely reactionary. During the War, all the leaders of the French Socialist Party without exception were standing in the ranks of the bourgeoisie against the international proletariat. They have voted the War credits up to the end of the War, and even some months after the Armistice. We even have here such a representative of the parliamentary faction, who has voted the War credits. There is here even a French deputy who, last year, declared in the French Parliament that the preliminary three-twelfths demanded by the Government should not be voted for, but who was willing to vote for two-twelfths. Now a party of such merits is truly fit to stand for the counter-revolutionary campaign of Koltchak and Denikin.

Whilst the Russian proletariat was waging a desperate fight against the enterprises of these international brigands, the representatives of the French Socialist Party in Parliament voted the credits which were to supply these counter-revolutionary armies.

What has been the behaviour of the French Socialist Party since the War? Lefevre said just now that the Congress at Strassburg was a step backwards. As to me, I say it was not a step backwards; it has unmasked the French Socialist Party. The leaders of the French Socialist Party in order to deceive the masses used a revolutionary phraseology. They declared themselves to be in favour of proletarian dictatorship and 'against the bourgeoisie. They declared themselves to be adherents of historical materialism, but when they found themselves confronted with the problem of national defence, it was then seen that the alliance between Paul Faure and Renaudel was no criminal alliance, but it reflects the true spirit of all those who put themselves either in the Right Wing, in the Centre, or even in the Left Wing of the Party. The French Socialist Party is a party decomposed by reformist, petty, bourgeois elements. Its entry into the Third International will contaminate the latter.

Comrade Zinoviev's Theses put a number of conditions for its affiliation. You have seen how easily they have been accepted by those very persons who only the other day were so rabidly opposed to them. The representatives of the French Socialist Party who are present at this Congress belonged to the group which stubbornly, and with all means at its disposal, endeavoured to discredit the Third International. They are not here because their hearts are with us; they are here only because they have the feeling that the Third International is the only revolutionary force in the world, and that no other organisation is able to resist it. They have tried with all their might to oppose this Third International by a counter organisation which was to accept everybody desiring to join it on the condition that they were to declare themselves against the principles of the Third International. They searched over the whole of Europe for parties which they could lead against the Third International. I still recall their activity in the Party and in the Socialist mess. They endeavoured to discredit, not only the ideas of the Third International, but even those of its fighters who had the greatest authority within the French Socialist Party. I recall the campaign of calumnies waged against all those in France who represented the Third International.

And we are going to ask these men to come into the Third International solely because they pretend to accept its principles – solely because they verbally gave their assent to these principles. It is not my intention to criticise the sincerity of Cachin and Frossard. I don't want to enter on this domain. I simply assert that men who in spite of their revolutionary phraseology proved to be tried counter-revolutionists cannot become Communists in the course of some weeks. The tone of the declaration you listened to just now gives you an idea of the real value • we have to attribute to the acceptance of the

Communist principles by Cachin and Frossard. What will be their attitude once returned to France, in front of those who for a long time were defending there the principles of the Third International? There is a committee in France which has placed before itself the task to spread amongst the masses and within the Party the ideas of the Third International. How is Cachin and Frossard going to behave towards this committee and its fighters – the same Cachin and Frossard who were their most stubborn adversaries? But I also ask what will be our attitude when Cachin and Frossard return to France and say; “But we are in the greatest accord with the leaders of the Third International. We have discussed everything with them; there are no real divergencies between us.” I was just reading some numbers of the “Humanite” in which there are some reports on the visit of Cachin and Frossard to Russia where our Russian friends gave them a splendid reception. They have been admitted to a session of the Moscow Soviet and there only some friendly remarks were exchanged between comrades who are not separated by any divergence of importance. That is what the “Humanite” asserts, and that is what – once at home – Cachin and Frossard will be asserting too. They will take up again their opinion which they were maintaining before their departure to Russia, namely, that Comrade Lenin, if he were in France, would agree with them and not with us.

I raise my voice against this artificial manner of getting into the Communist International such elements who are not even in favour of it. In the name of my imprisoned comrades, in the name of the veritable interests of the French proletariat, I declare that I cannot agree with such proceedings.

The only means at the disposal of the French revolutionary proletariat adapted to the fight on the side of the Third International are to constitute a firmly organised Communist Party containing only Communist elements. The tragical side of the situation in France is that till now it was impossible for us to realise this task. We were obliged to confine ourselves to a struggle of inner tendencies within the Party. We could not take upon ourselves the work of organisation and education which alone will render possible the constitution of a firmly organised Communist Party.

The standpoint I am defending here is that we ought not to say to the French Socialist Party: on such conditions we are willing to admit you into the Third International – but we must take an attitude that would compel both the reformist and the revolutionary elements of the Party to make the split, which as yet could not be made, for only this split will render possible the creation of a Communist Party comprising the Left Socialist and the Communist Syndicalists. It will render possible Communist organisation and educational work which we were not able to begin, and which alone is a source of strength and success, not only for the Communist International but for the whole Proletarian Revolution.

BORDIGA – I wish to present to you some remarks which I propose to add to the introduction to the Theses presented by the Committee. I also wish to incorporate one more concrete condition in the part which reads: “The parties which have up till now preserved their old democratic programmes should pledge themselves to revise them without delay, and to work out a new Communist programme adaptable to the peculiar conditions of their respective countries and conceived in the spirit of the Third Communist International. The programmes of the parties affiliated to the Communist International should as a rule be submitted for sanction to the Congress of the International or to the Executive Committee. Should the latter decline to sanction, the Party has the right of appeal to the Congress.”

The present Congress is of primary significance, for it has to put the main principles of the Third International on a firm foundation and is the champion of those principles. It was in April, 1917, I believe, that Comrade Lenin returned to Russia, and, having drawn up the main principles of the new programme of the Communist Party, he told us that it was necessary to reconstruct the International. He said that this work has to be carried on towards the goal, first, of getting rid of the social-patriots, and second, of those Social Democrats of the Second International who consider it possible to liberate the proletariat without resorting to arms in the class war and without bringing about the dictatorship of the proletariat following the triumph of the Revolution. The conquests of the Russian Revolution have placed us on Marxian basis, and the revolutionary movement, which has been saved out of the ruins of the Second International, must be based upon a new programme leading on to the formation of a new International organisation. I believe that the situation we are in to-day has nothing fortuitous about it, but has been determined by the course of history. But we are in danger of having the elements which we ought to banish penetrate into our ranks.

When the war cry of the Soviets was heralded by the Russian and international proletariat, we witnessed a spontaneous revolutionary rising in all countries, and we saw the proletariat fall in line and march towards the same goal. We have seen that the old Socialist parties in all countries were breaking up, giving birth to Communist organisations which are engaging in the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. This happened right after the war.

Unfortunately, however, the movement was somewhat checked in the succeeding period, for the German, Bavarian, and Hungarian Revolutions were put down by the bourgeoisie. And now the parties of the Second International, in seeking to affiliate with us, declared that they accept our mottos concerning the war and the Revolution.

The war is now over. Questions of militarism and national defence are of no immediate importance. It is therefore very easy for them to assure us that in case of another war they are not going to repeat the same blunders in the matter of Civil Peace and National Defence. The Revolution also – the Centre parties think – is a question of the distant future, which one is not called upon to face immediately, and they therefore declare themselves ready to accept the Theses of the Third International; that is, Soviet power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, revolutionary terrorism, etc.

It would therefore be rather dangerous for us should we commit the blunder of accepting such gentlemen in our ranks.

The Third International cannot force the course of history. It cannot forcibly bring about the Revolution. All we strive for is to prepare the proletariat. But it is essential, comrades, that our movement should take into account past experiences and the lessons of the war and of the Russian Revolution. It is to this that we must give close attention.

The Right elements accept our Theses, but are doing it in a very unsatisfactory fashion. They are doing it reluctantly, but we must demand that the acceptance should be complete without reservations, either theoretical or practical. We have seen the first grand application of the Marxian theory and practice in Russia, in a country where class lines have not been so very distinctly drawn. It follows, therefore, that in Western Europe, where the development of capitalism has reached its apex, this method should be applied with much more vigour and precision. People are accustomed, after the fashion of citizen Prospero, to make a distinction between reformists and revolutionaries, but this terminology is obsolete. There can be no reformists now, for the crisis of the bourgeois

world makes all reform work impossible. The Socialists of the Right Wing know this, and declare themselves to be for the overthrow of the existing regime; they call themselves “revolutionaries,” but they hope that the nature of the impending revolution will be different from that of Russia.

I am of the opinion, comrades, that the Communist International should be unwavering and should resolutely maintain its revolutionary policy. We should erect firm barriers against the intrusion of the Social Democrats.

We must get these parties to make definite declarations of principles. We should as a matter of fact have one common programme for all Communist Parties of the world, a thing which is unfortunately impossible at the present time. The Third International has no practical means to guarantee that those gentlemen are going to follow the Communist programme. At any rate the condition that I propose to include is as follows: In These 16, where it says; “The parties which have up till now preserved their old Social-Democratic programme should be pledged to revise them without delay, and work out a new Communist programme adapted to the peculiar conditions of their respective countries...” I propose that the phrase “adapted to the peculiar conditions of their respective countries,” etc., be substituted by “in which the principles of the Communist International he formulated in an unequivocal language and in thorough keeping with the resolutions of International Congresses. The faction of the Party which will declare itself in opposition to the programme should be excluded from the organisation”; this to follow directly after the phrase, “to work out a new Communist programme,” and further:

“The parties which, having changed their programme and joined the Third International, have nevertheless failed to fulfill that condition, should convene a special congress and adopt uniform tactics.”

It is necessary to put this question concerning the conservative minorities of the Right in a very concrete form. But I have not heard the representatives of the French Socialists make any explicit statements that they were going to drive out of the Party Renaudel and his like.

Those voting against the new programme should be asked to leave the Party. The programme is not a matter of discipline. One accepts it or declines it. In the latter event, the comrade must leave the Party. The programme is binding for all of us. It is not a thing which is imposed only upon the revolutionary majority of the Party. All parties wishing to be admitted into the Third International must be pledged to it. It has been finally established to-day that wishing to join the Third International does not necessarily mean being accepted by it.

I am of the opinion that after this Congress the Executive Committee should be given the opportunity to see to it that the obligations imposed by the Third International be fulfilled. Until that period of organisation is over the doors must be barred, and there should be no other road for admission than personal membership in the Communist Party of a certain country.

I propose that the condition drawn up by Comrade Lenin which had been withdrawn be re-introduced: that is, that the parties desiring to be admitted should have a certain proportion of Communists in the leading organs of the Party. I would rather have them all Communists.

It is imperative that we combat opportunism everywhere. But that task would be rendered very difficult if we should open the doors to admit those who had stood outside it at the moment when we are about to purify the ranks of the Third International.

In the name of the Left Wing of the Italian Socialist Party, I demand that we take upon ourselves to combat and banish opportunism in Italy, but we do not wish that this should be confined to Italy alone, for the opportunists driven out in Italy may join the Third International elsewhere. We declare that we must return to our respective countries following our joint work here, and we must close our ranks against the social traitors, and against all the enemies of the Communist Revolution.

SERRATI – Permit me to announce that the International Conference of Women Communists is to open its sessions to-morrow at six o'clock at the Grand Theatre. You are invited to attend.

ZINOVIEV – The Session is adjourned to reconvene at 8.30 p.m.