It should be borne in mind that, particularly in these countries which have still maintained a stable currency, the imperialist interests insist upon such a policy. In England or Holland, for instance, the necessary funds could not be raised for an aggressive imperialist policy, without cutting down the expenditures on social legislation.

This development of events knocks out the bottom of the labour parties and even of the reformist and pacifist bourgeois groups. Thus we have seen in the last elections in Holland a small but effective example of an imperialist country, where such men as the head of the Royal Dutch Shell Petroleum Company, are complete rulers of the country in spite of universal suffrage and democratic institutions.

This seems to me to be the trend of events also in England. The Labour Party is being brushed aside and pressed against the wall, so to speak. Can anyone expect a Henderson or a Clynes to succeed where the much more capable men such as Troelstra in Holland have failed, namely, to come to the helm by the aid of the petty bourgeois Catholic centre, which forms the strongest party in our country, and has hundreds of thousands of workers under its influence. This is entirely out of the question now as well as in the future, so long as the imperialist state and imperialist interests maintain their positions.

The same trend of development we witness in France. Also there, in my opinion, the time has gone for a bloc of the left and will never come back again. The radical-socialist party there disappeared even before the war. During the war the openly reactionary parties gained considerable strength. There are no signs even in the Western countries for a revival of bourgeois reformism, radicalism and pacifism.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that it is an altogether mistaken idea to expect either Henderson and Clynes in England or Longuet and Blum in France, to be able to form a government relying upon the bourgeois reformist elements. The Hendersons and Clynes, Longuets, Vanderveldes and Troelstrases could only serve their highest purpose as ministers in an imperialist United Front. But the Imperialist United Front could certainly not be brought within the strict definition of the terms of Workers' Government.

I, therefore, come to the conclusion that the proletarian United Front is the great tactical line of guidance in all capitalist states, where the proletariat has not yet been victorious without any distinction of their respective history, culture and tradition. On the other hand, the workers' government can be considered only for special circumstances that may arise in Central Europe and perhaps in other countries. For these countries it has its greatest value. But only under the method of the United Front of the entire proletariat can the Communist International fight and win throughout the world.

Stern (Austria), declared that the capitalist offensive was the last desperate attempt of the bourgeoisie to save
capitalism. In Geneva, the world bourgeoisie came together to help Austria. An international action of the Comintern is necessary in this question. Austria shows that even a small Communist Party can apply the policy of the United Front with success. The slogan of the workers' government is a counter move against the slogan of a coalition government. The United Front is no longer a measure of defence, it has already become a weapon of offence.

Webb (England): Comrades, I want to speak upon the offensive of capitalism, not only from the point of view of the development of the capitalist offensive in Britain, but also from the point of view of the offensive of capitalism in other countries. In England, the capitalist offensive during the years 1921 and 1922, has been more intensified than in any other country in Europe. In 1921 we witnessed a combination of the government and the mineowners to defeat the miners and divide the forces of the working class. The triple alliance upon which the workers placed great hopes failed them.

During these days 1,800,000 tons of coal were imported into Great Britain. (Comrade Radek: From America.)

The Amsterdam International, along with the Second International, proved their complete bankruptcy by their inability to rally the industrial forces to the aid of the miners. Frank Hodges, of the Miners' Federation, speaking at the recent Trade Union Congress, when the question of affiliation to the Red International was at issue, declared that he had made efforts to get joint action to prevent the coal from being imported into Britain. Hodges had to admit the total incapacity of the Amsterdam International to measure up to the situation which then existed. At the same time we members of the Communist International must fully recognise that there is something as yet very defective in our own international machinery, for, when in those days the Amsterdam International was incapable of meeting the situation, the Communist International, with its influence in the Red International of Labour Unions, was also incapable of rallying the workers. It is true that in those days the Red Trade Union International had only just been born, but the fact remains that there was not the co-ordination between the Communist parties in existence, and between the revolutionary workers that there might have been.

(Radek: There was not the power to act.)

The capitalist offensive in 1922 was reflected in the great engineering lock-out just as it was reflected in the miners' lock-out in 1921. These are the outstanding instances of the heavy offensive of capitalism against the British proletariat. At the very moment when the engineers in Britain were fighting against the capitalist offensive there were proceeding in seven European countries the struggle of the metal workers against different sections of the international capitalist class. But this year, 12 months after the period of the miners' lockout, when there had been a considerable measure of advance with regard to the
upbuilding of the Communist parties, we still find that there is that same lack of co-ordination between the Communist parties where sections of the proletariat were fighting against the capitalist offensive. We now find in England that the capitalist class, having delivered their blows against the miners, having broken the resistance of the engineers, are about to turn their attention to the transport workers. The most centralised organisation, the most powerful section of the transport workers' movement in Britain, is the National Union of Railwaymen.

Now we find that the spokesmen of the capitalist class, the economists of capitalism, are brutally and frankly telling the working class that the railwaymen's conditions must come down to the level of the miners and engineers.

Not only do we get the brutal offensive of capitalism, naked and unashamed, in these days of 1922, but we also get the Amsterdam leadership and the leaders of the Labour party who are amongst the chief representatives of the Second International informing the working class that these economic conditions are what they should expect. Mr. Henderson has propagated the idea of an industrial truce based upon an economic status which is considerably worse than pre-war days. They are making frantic efforts to assist the bourgeoisie to standardise the slavery of the working class upon a lower level.

Comrade Zinoviev and others have characterised the capitalist offensive also in political forces like the Fascisti. Britain, along with the United States of America, has always claimed that the representative democratic institutions would enable the working class movement to satisfy its demands without travelling the path of revolution as in Russia. We find at this moment on the statute book the Emergency Powers Act. The law enables the government of the ruling class to declare in any acute crisis a state of emergency which entitles them to call upon the army reserve, the naval reserve and to organise special defence corps, mobilise the middle class forces and make all preparations to cope with a situation of civil war. The use of the Black and Tans in Ireland clearly indicates that when English capitalism is threatened to the extent that capitalism in other countries has been threatened, it will apply even more severe measures than have been applied elsewhere.

Now I want to say a word about the requirements of the Communist parties in Europe and the International. The International should insist upon mutual representation on the executive committees of the parties in Western Europe in particular, so that the Communist parties of Britain, Germany, France, Italy and Scandinavian countries, can secure the mutual consideration of problems and a real United Front, that will enable the workers to make a real defence against capitalism. Furthermore, it is necessary that the Communist International should do more to co-ordinate the Communist groups that are being established in those countries where there is a revolutionary nationalist movement. They should speedily tackle the
coordination of Communist groups in Egypt, Lebanon, and Palestine have not been planned because the role of the Anti-Imperialist Bloc, which is the policy of the Communist International, is not within the Communist parties. I would urge the reformist parliamentary parties and the national parties to stand in the name of the Communist International and stand up to this policy that we finally got rid of the K.A.P.D.

Himmler (Germany), speaking for the majority of the German delegation, declared: The German opposition is also an international opposition, representing the will of millions and millions of people and the interests of the masses of the workers. The German opposition is not an opposition to the Communist International, but an opposition to the Communist leaders. The German opposition is not against the Communist leaders, but against the Communist International. The German opposition is not against the Communist leaders, but against the Communist International.

Roemer (France): We ask permission to say that a telegram from Warsaw states that Comrade Elenka Kukolowska, elected in Warsaw by 27,000 votes, is in the Communist party. After the appeal of Comrade Kukolowska, who has courageously proclaimed the cause of the K.A.P.D., the German opposition has been gained the strength of the United Front because it involves danger, but we owe it to the Social Democratic Party that we stand.
for the eight-hour day, are only defensive fights against the
catastrophic depreciation of their standard of living.

So long as we represent the weaker section of the working
class movement we will have to treat with the social democrats,
although we know that the leaders of the social democracy are
conscious enemies of the revolution. But it may happen that the
social democrats should betray the bourgeoisie instead of the
working class. The internal opposition against the United Front
prevents the organisation of our fighting front and may harm the
party. Should the pressure of the masses force the social demo-
crats to give up their coalition policy, we will be ready to fight
our common enemy, the bourgeoisie, together with them. We
must not only maintain our ideological purity; we must take
part in the daily struggles of the workers. We are always faced
with the danger of "Otsovism," which always expects the revolu-
tion to break out at once. The Communist Parties must act
all the time and they must unite all the revolutionary forces
against the dangers from the right.

Upon these dangers I wish to say a few words. The British
delegate, Comrade Webb, spoke here and admonished the Execu-
tive to keep to the 11 conditions. I heard to-day for the first
time that our good Comrade Webb was robbed of his sleep
for fear that there might be 20 conditions. I can reassure him.
Comrade Zinoviev said that at the next negotiations with groups
coming from the right, there will be 42 conditions. Perhaps
this will satisfy Comrade Webb. However, the party which he
represents is not as radical as he is. We are obliged to criticise
a little the party which he represents in connection with a serious
error of action. I have before me the election address of the
Communist Party of Great Britain.

How does the British Communist Party apply its United
Front tactics? It says: "We are a section of the working
class, namely, its left wing. Nevertheless, we want to stand
together with all the other workers' parties." Whither Naomi
goes thither goes Ruth also. I do not mean Comrade Ruth
Fischer—(laughter)—but, the kindhearted biblical Ruth. And
then the election address goes on "What is the Labour Party?
The workers are fine fellows, they want to fight, but the leaders
are not quite so fine." And then it says: "In the past as
in the present there was treachery on the part of the leaders.
Such treachery might happen once. But, nevertheless, the
Labour Party is against the capitalists." By jove, if
this is a sample of unity tactics, perhaps we had better
leave them alone. The Executive has shown in its man-
ifestos to the workers that the entire policy of the Labour Party
is nothing but a continuous betrayal of working class interests.
But the Executive also said to the workers: "If the Labour
Party is victorious and forms a government, it will betray you
in the end and will show to the workers that its aim is the
perpetuation of capitalism. Then the workers will either desert
it, or the Labour Party will be compelled to fight owing to
the pressure of the workers, and in that case we shall back
it. We issued a definite watchword: vote for it, but prepare to struggle against it." If, thereupon, Comrade Webb comes here and warns us against the opportunists, we can only say to him: "Comrade Webb, book your berth as quickly as possible and return to England, in order to fight against opportunism there, and you will have our heartiest support."

Our policy is laid out for the coming period, but we never lose sight of the more distant future. We must continue our negotiations with the social democrats as long as we are not the decisive factors in the working class movement. The way of the United Front leads ultimately to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Zinoviev (Chairman): Comrades, I have just received a telegram from Comrade Walton Newbold, of Glasgow, saying that our party has won the election in Motherwell, Scotland. (Applause.)

An independent candidate of our English party has been elected there. We do not overestimate the value of parliamentarism, but this victory has nevertheless a significance for our principles. The Red Star appears to be rising in this most capitalist of all countries. I believe that under present circumstances in England this election is not an unimportant victory of the Communist International. (Applause.)

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE VERSAILLES TREATY

SESSIONS 25 & 26, NOVEMBER 28 & 29, 1922,

Chairman: Comrade Markhlefsky.
Speakers: Comrades Cachin, Gennari, Smeral, Radic, Murphy, Keller, Connolly, Friedlander.

Cachin: Comrades, we shall examine the consequences of the Versailles Treaty and of the other Treaties which followed it.

From the first we may observe that these treaties—and especially that of Versailles—appear to be implausible and to have wrought grave mischief in Europe.

It is truisms that we are by no means certain whether the results of the Versailles Treaty have not been worse than those of the war itself.

These treaties show such an ignorance of the economic and political necessities of the present time that the Entente bourgeoisie is now compelled to consult together for the third time...
in Lausanne in order to try and modify these texts which they thought were decisive. And this is by no means the last effort of this kind.

Above all, I would like to deal with the attitude of one of the Entente countries, which since 1918 has shown the most grasping proclivities and, at the same time, a profound misunderstanding of actual needs. I wish to speak of France.

The political rulers of France maintain that it is the most stable country in Europe, suffering less than any other from social convulsions. The French bourgeoisie officially present an attitude of mental tranquillity and serenity.

But, in reality, France is ravaged by the economic and financial aftermath of the Versailles Peace.

One can easily foresee that within three or four years the French budget will hardly suffice to pay the interest on the total National Debt.

In order to understand the evil which affects modern capitalist France, one should understand the illusions of her bourgeoisie.

They have always thought—and the official economists and financiers have not disabused them of this notion—that they would be able to extort sufficient sums from Germany to enable them to pay the capital of the National Debt.

We remember the unheard of sums which France demanded from England up to the time of the Treaty of London in May, 1921; they told the credulous folk of France that something like three or four hundred milliards of francs would be obtained from Germany by a continual pressure exerted until they had received the last sou. The Ministers of Finance contended that the whole policy of the country should be exerted towards one supreme end: to make Germany pay in silver and gold.

In May, 1921, they began to reduce the mad claims with which they had started.

They then fixed the definite figure of the sum which they said Germany should pay, namely, 132 milliards of gold marks of which 52 per cent. was to go to France, that is to say, 68 milliards.

And this payment has been until recently the only theme of the Ministers of the Republic, the servile press and all the public opinion which has been encouraged in this belief.

Then, little by little, when they saw that no money was forthcoming they began somewhat to modify their original conception. When they realised that until this year, 1922, not a single gold mark had come to France, that there were no payments in specie, and that the sole gold payments which Germany had made, amounting to a little more than one milliard, had been paid to Belgium and England, and that France had not received anything, then the public began to doubt that Germany would pay her debts.
Up to the present France has paid about 80 milliards as advances on payment for war indemnities. Since December, 1918, she has maintained an army on the Rhine of 90,000 men, which has cost her 12 milliard gold francs.

Under these circumstances, one understands how it is that France, misled by the stupidities of officials, has commenced to lose faith in the dogma that Germany will pay.

Capitalist France finds itself hard pressed. A violent campaign has been initiated by the worst of our jingoes, by French employers and those of the capitalists who fear to let slip from their hands the exploitation of reconstruction activities in the north which they wish to reserve for themselves. Therefore, they are carrying on an energetic campaign against the Stinnes-Ebersac agreement.

In fact, one of the most influential experts in France has declared that our armies at present occupy that portion of the Ruhr in which there are 45 steel mills, and that by extending our occupation of the right bank to a small extent we should have under our guns, not merely 45, but 60 plants.

"And," he continued, "if you establish a strict customs barrier on the further side of those 60 plants, you will break up the relationship of the German metal industry, you will sever the artery of the greatest German industry."

But it is not only these consequences of the Versailles Treaty upon which we should dwell. There are others which are obvious to all and of which our comrades from other countries can bear witness. French capitalism has not wished to extract from Germany only money and commodities; it also wishes to dismember her. At the same time France wishes to profit by her victory by securing economic and political hegemony over these little European countries, of which she created a whole patchwork after the war. These countries have neither an independent economic life nor a free political existence.

It would be gratuitous for me to remind you here of all the consequences, so well known to all communists nowadays, of the Versailles Treaty and of all those treaties which accompanied it or followed it. The essential thing is to emphasize the impossibility of European Capitalism to extricate itself from these accumulative ruinous results.

Naturally, in the face of these facts and their consequences, the class struggle becomes sharper in all its forms. On us in France it imposes the duty of making a most energetic campaign against the Treaty of Versailles as such, to point to the concrete results of it, to show the growing influence of the militarists in our country, and to struggle in even more forceful fashion against this militaristic development, to demand the immediate liberation of the six million Rhinelanders who are under the heel of our militarists. We must combine more and more frequently the actions of the two great working classes most directly concerned: the French and the German. We have met together only two or three times and until recently, especially in France, we have
been so absorbed by internal disturbances, that we have not been able to give to this most necessary measure that care which it imperiously demands.

As a result of this Congress there should be a more intimate union and a more stable and detailed understanding between the two delegations representing German and French Communism. It will be necessary to increase the number of demonstrations in the two countries, to send more and more French militants to Germany and have more German militants come to France, in this way to ensure the reciprocal interchange of propaganda between the two parties.

We believe it possible to bring before this Congress a clear and simple resolution which shall be practical and concrete in its conclusions. It is this concrete plan, capable of immediate realisation, which I beg to submit to this Congress. (Applause.)

Chairman, Giara Zekini: Comrades, I have a pleasant surprise for you. Our Italian Comrade Gennari has just arrived after having been persecuted and wounded by the Fascisti. I am sure that the Presidium voices your sentiments by bidding him welcome and inviting him to take his place in the Presidium. (Loud Applause.)

In general we greet the brave, persecuted, and maltreated Italian proletariat, which, in the face of the white terror, is preparing to rally all its revolutionary forces for a new advance against capitalism and for ultimate victory. Comrade Gennari, we bid you a hearty welcome! Long live Communism in Italy! Long live the Italian proletariat! (Loud applause.)

(While Comrade Gennari was ascending the platform, all those present stood singing the International, and broke out into renewed storms of applause.)

Gennari (Italy): Comrades, allow me to express my thanks for your hearty welcome, particularly since it applies to all the other comrades, to all the revolutionary Italian workers who have struggled for many years under terrible conditions, to all those who were beaten and wounded and who in spite of all this never left the trenches of the social revolution.

When the Congress will sit in judgment over the conduct of the Italian Communist Party, it will have to point out the mistakes which were made, but it will also have to bear in mind under what conditions the comrades were fighting in Italy.

I can assure you all that in spite of the fact that the political situation in Italy has grown worse, the Party has remained intact. The Communists and the revolutionary workers are still ready to fight together with you for the cause of the world proletarian revolution. (Applause.)

Smolar (Czecho-Slovakia): The Versailles Peace Treaty has brought into being the Czecho-Slovakian State. For this reason, a large part of the population of Czecho-Slovakia is labouring under the illusion that the Versailles Peace is a factor of social progress and the basis and guarantee of national self-
determination and national emancipation. The Czech Communist Party has done fairly successful work from its inception, and will continue the work of freeing the Czech-Slovak proletariat from this illusion, which is nothing but a bourgeoisie lie. The decisive factors in the formation of the Czech-Slovak State were not the economic interests of the population, but those of militarism and imperialism.

Only military and imperialist considerations prevailed in Versailles. When the States of Central and South-East Europe were being formed, no attention was paid even to those economic conditions which would have been logical to consider even from a capitalist point of view. The chief cause of the world war was the fact that even the big States were too small for the development of the productive forces. This war ended in the Balkanisation of the territory of Central and South-East Europe instead of bringing about its economic unity. While a number of States are undergoing a severe economic crisis owing to the lack of manufactured goods, Czechoslovakia has a good technical industrial apparatus capable of supplying 70 million consumers, while the country has only 14 million inhabitants. The ruling bourgeois clique, instead of endeavouring to escape from its state of isolation by an orientation towards the East and Russia, is ready, by orders of the Entente capitalists to destroy at least half of its splendid technical apparatus instead of developing it.

The Versailles Treaty has not carried out in Czechoslovakia the bourgeois principle of national self-determination for minorities. Neither has it solved the national question for the Czech nation which is ruling to-day. Even in the national circles of the Czech bourgeoisie a feeling of uncertainty exists about the future of the country and of the nation. The bourgeois is aware that by its alliance with the principal forces of reaction and counter-revolution, it has landed the small nationality in the cul de sac and has exposed it to the danger of being crushed in the great social storms which have reached their most acute stage and will decide the future fate of Europe and of the world.

The Czech workers are beginning to realise that the Versailles Peace Treaty has not solved the national problem, and that it has brought only misery to them as a class.

The national problem will be solved only when the forces of capitalist anarchy and industrial competition inevitably leading to armed conflicts will have been overcome. A reconstruction of Europe, which will stabilise production and will make free and peaceful co-operation between nations possible, will arise from the ruins of the Versailles Peace Treaty. It will not be an isolation and a "sovereignty," which only is another name for vassal dependence of the small States on the big Powers, but a universal federation of the United Soviet Republics of the world.

Radio (Yugo-Slavia): The numerous Conferences of the Entente States since 1919 have shown the impossibility of carrying
out the Versailles Peace Treaty, which was to assure the hegemonymy of French imperialism in Europe, and of British imperialism in the Near East and on the seas. The Peace Treaties are entirely in a state of liquidation.

All these treaties strain the relations not only between the different nationalities, but also between the races that make up a nation. A classical example is furnished by Jugo-Slavia, where the struggles between the Serbians and the Croatians, although they are of the same race, have reached such a stage that the strongest Croatian parties are demanding complete independence. The grounds for this demand are not only political. The Serb bourgeoisie are interested in the integral carrying out of the Treaties of Versailles, Neuilly and Trianon because of the reparations they guarantee to Serbia. This causes them in this question to go hand in hand with France and blindly follow the French imperialistic policy. The bourgeoisie of Croatia and the other regions of Jugo-Slavia which are not directly interested in the question of reparations stand in strenuous opposition to the Government. This found its most acute expression during the Genoa Conference, when the Croatians presented a separate memorandum to the Conference.

All these new states, financed and founded chiefly by France for the purpose of furthering her imperialistic interests, are totally dependent on French capital and are in the position of French colonies. France makes use of these states to carry on her policy of domination in Europe, and is trying to have the Versailles Treaty enforced. French interests against Soviet Russia are taken care of by Poland and Rumania. Jugo-Slavia watches over French interests against Italy in the Near East; Czechoslovakia against Germany. Their common dependence upon France, their common interest in the rigid enforcement of the Versailles Treaty, as well as the common danger which threatens them from the side of Hungary, were the principal reasons for the military alliance between Czechoslovakia, Jugo-Slavia and Rumania under the segis of France, which not only finances the militarism of these States, but actually organises and controls it. Poland is also in close League with these States.

But in spite of the alliance there are differences between these States, which frequently come to the surface. The Banat district is a constant bone of contention between Jugo-Slavia and Rumania. In the same manner the Czech question aggravates the situation between Poland and Czechoslovakia. All this goes to show that the equilibrium of these States is unsettled.

We must tell the proletariat and the semi-proletariat of the Balkans and of the Danube region, that their national, political and economic emancipation can only be achieved by revolutionary fighting under the banner and leadership of the Communist Parties, and that the guarantee of peace and normal development, as well as the solution of all the controversies in the Balkans and in the Danube Basin, can be found only in a Federated Soviet Republic of the Danube and Balkan-countries.
Murphy (Britain): Comrades, the issue on the Versailles Treaty is inseparable from the struggle of imperialism for world power. It is not a treaty of peace, but a treaty of war, continuing the military conflict of 1914-18 in the domain of economics and politics. If we attempt to approach this subject from any other angle than this we shall be involved in the same difficulties as the leaders of the Second International. Their attempt to deal with the Versailles Treaty has shown that there is to be nothing more nor less than instruments of allied imperialism. For example, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, voicing the Labour policy, as expressed in the Amsterdam and Frankfurt Conferences of 1921 and 1922 respectively, states: "The principles upon which the Labour policy regarding reparations are founded are briefly as follows:—"

"(1) The amount and form of reparations required two sanctions—the first that of justice, the second that of economics.

"(2) The sanction of justice must be limited by the pre-Armistice negotiations.

"(3) The sanction of economics is limited not only by what Germany can pay, but by what we can receive without damage to our own people and by what forms indemnity can safely take."

This language is essentially the language of liberals among the capitalist countries which have been victorious, and not the language of the working class which has suffered all the consequences of the treaty in both victorious and defeated countries. It is further based upon the assumption that Germany alone was responsible for the war, a theory already exploded even by leaders within the fold of the Second International.

It may be very interesting to prove that the guns went off on their own, but even that does not help us with regard to the struggles arising out of the Treaty of Versailles. We can only view it as a continuation of the imperialist war, and the Communist International has no alternative but to offer the same unrelenting opposition to the treaty that it offered to the war. Just as it was the task of the Communists to transform the imperialist war into civil war, so it is the task of the Communist International to utilise every political and economic consequence of the treaty as a rallying force among the masses and as a means of developing international mass action against, not only allied imperialism, but world imperialism. The justification for such a policy is quite clear to us.

The war of 1914-18 started with Britain and Germany as the principal contestants for world power. The military conflict ceased in 1918 with new protagonists in the field. Britain had not only to face a defeated Germany, but a victorious France, America, Japan, and the proletarian revolution. Mr. Wilson came to Europe carrying the twig of peace, but the predatory instincts of the participants in the Versailles Conference were not in the least modified. It was not a meeting of friends but a meeting of thieves keenly reaching for spoils. The big chiefs were Clemenceau and Lloyd George, who made short
work of Wilson's dream of a league of nations under the hegemony of America, and produced instead, a caricature of a league as an instrument of the Allied Supreme Council for the purpose of side-tracking the dreamers and bluffing the workers as to their real objectives.

Having dismissed the idealists they proceeded to defend themselves against the revolution. For this purpose they "Balkanised" Central Europe and created a number of small states and called them a "cordon sanitaire," to prevent the spread of the revolution from Russia to Western Europe.

Then Mr. Lloyd George forced the pace on behalf of the British Empire. He secured the transfer of the German colonies in East Africa and the mandates for Palestine and Mesopotamia— to Britain. Australia secured the German possessions in the Pacific south of the Equator, and New Zealand got the island of Samoa.

All these things are not incidental to the conference, but the deliberate pursuit of a definite policy which had been formulated in the minds of the leaders long before the conference.

If we can just grasp the significance of these mandates and transfer of territory, we can take the measure of the efforts that are made to bring the great dreams of British Imperialism to fruition. Their deeds pave the way not only for a Cape to Cairo railway but its continuation to Calcutta, joining up the continent of Africa with the continent of Asia, and driving all the time towards those new markets of the East upon which both America and Japan and the rising capitalism in China have got their eyes. Coincident with this expansion is the development of industrial capitalism in India and also the difficulties which are facing British capital at home.

The last twelve months or more have witnessed a tremendous export of capital to India and the rapid growth of industries. Within twelve months manufacturers of textile machinery in Lancashire have increased their export to India some 400 per cent., whilst the British papers have openly announced that Cammell Lairds, well known as steel magnates of Britain, will lay plant in India to produce the cheapest steel in the world.

In these developments there is a two-fold aim, one in the direction of the markets of the East, and the other against the proletariat of the West. The East offers untapped markets in the Malay Archipelago, whilst to capture the markets in the West it is necessary to utilise the cheapest labour possible. Where can they find cheaper labour than exists in the countries of the East? Hence, while the proletariat of Britain and Europe is pushed downward in its standard of life, capital sweeps towards the East, and utilises cheap labour there, as a means to capture markets and to defeat the proletariat in their own countries.

But this is not all the story. There are more imperialists than Britain. There is opposition both from France and America. Britain may turn to the cornfields and cottonfields.
of Egypt, and the oil wells of Mesopotamia, as a means of
relieving herself of her dependence on America for her corn
and an industrial oil, but someone else is looking to the
East and seeking to prevent the development of the British
Empire according to the dreams of the British Imperialists.
Clemenceau, standing for French Imperialism, also looked to-
wards the East and continued the struggle which has been
going on for many years, ever since Britain wrested parts of
India from French control, and ever since England got con-
trol of the Suez Canal. The Near Eastern crisis of to-day and
the Lausanne Conference are the modern setting of the difficul-
ties which reach back to the early struggles of French and
British Imperialism.

In 1876 the British Government purchased a large number
of shares in the Suez Canal. Then the Canal practically became
the property of British Imperialism, and her gateway to the
East. "The Times," of November 20th, 1875, declared:

"It is impossible to separate in our thoughts the purchase
of the Suez Canal shares from the question of England’s future
relation with Egypt, or the destinies of Egypt from the shadows
that threaten the Turkish Empire... Should insurrection
or aggression from without or corruption from within bring a
political as well as a financial collapse of the Turkish Empire,
it might become necessary to take measures for the security
of that part of the Sultan's dominions with which we are most
nearly connected."

On December 18th, 1914, England declared Egypt to be a
British protectorate. So, when we come to the Versailles Treaty,
France, struggling against the development of British Imperial-
ism and equally anxious for oil, secured the mandate for Syria
and made more difficulties for Britain with regard to the develop-
ment of her Empire.

Thus the Lausanne Conference continues the war intensified
by the Versailles Treaty. This struggle in the Near East for
gateways of Empire, for oil fields and markets, is directly related
to the struggle in Western Europe. France not only secured a
mandate for Syria by the Versailles Treaty, but also acquired
Alsace-Lorraine and Morocco.

France has become by means of the Versailles Treaty poten-
tially an industrial as well as an agricultural country. She can
now see herself becoming the second steel-producing country in
the world. The first is America. The second will be France.
By the development of her industrial forces, she is becoming a
factor in the markets of the world, a keen rival to England in
the place of Germany.

These movements and struggles have not taken place without
affecting the masses of the population. The East has been
awakened by all these tremendous changes of the last few years,
and brought the problems of the East into closer relationship with
the proletariat of the West. The important problem before the
Communist International, therefore, is to transform the uncon-
scious process to a conscious process and to make the workers
of the West and East conscious of the unity and mutuality of their interests. We have to draw all these forces of the East nearer to those of the West and strive to produce a situation where we can get simultaneous action against imperialism.

Still further. The repercussions arising from the application of the Versailles Treaty to the countries of the West give rise to equally important mass movements.

By means of this treaty, Britain took away from Germany her navy and her merchant fleet. She sold 2,000,000 tons openly in the market at 11 pounds a ton. Shipbuilding at 25 pounds a ton could not compete with that. There immediately followed a tremendous drive downwards in the standard of living of the workers of Britain. The repercussion to this was a further drive on to the standard of the workers of Europe. Equally disastrous was the effect of reparations coal. Two million tons a month has to be supplied to France by Germany under the Treaty. The immediate effect of this was to inundate France with coal. The British export coal trade collapsed. Then followed a violent attack upon the miners, who were forced downwards to terrible social conditions. Immediately after the dispute in England when the miners’ wages were drastically reduced, what do we find in France? Pit closures, attacks upon hours, attacks upon wages, and the whole market glutted with British and Reparation coal.

Nor does it end there. Immediately the miners are crushed in France, Britain and Germany, there followed an attack upon the miners of America. There are no limits to the effects of this Treaty, with regard to the economic disintegration of the world, and in the development of the movement of the masses.

Hence we re-affirm that the struggle against the Treaty of Versailles is inseparable from the struggle against imperialism. To end it is to end imperialism, and the only weapon to end imperialism is world revolution.

Kaiser (Poland): French Imperialism is for the Poles only a substitute for Czarist despotism. For Western Imperialism Poland serves merely as a weapon against Soviet Russia. For this reason, Great Britain and France have supplied arms and munitions to Pilsudsky’s Army, which is also used against Polish workers and peasants. Upper Silesia, Danzig, East Galicia, Teschen and Vilna are new areas of conflict. French capital is buying up all Poland. National minorities are oppressed. The French-Polish military convention implies the armed counter-revolution. The main object of Polish Imperialism is to erect a barbed wire fence around Soviet Russia. The Polish bourgeoisie support all counter-revolutionaries. When the Polish proletariat struggles against the regime of Pilsudsky, they are conducting a struggle both for Soviet Russia and for their own freedom at the same time.

Connolly (Ireland): The bourgeois Irish Nationalists believed in Wilson’s Fourteen Points. But the Versailles Peace
brought no self-determination for Ireland. After two-and-a-half years of civil war, Lloyd George made an agreement with the Irish capitalists. He only, however, satisfied the large capitalists, therefore the Irish revolutionists split. The poor peasants, workers and petty bourgeoisie are maintaining the struggle. The British-Irish Treaty places the executive power in the hands of the English Governor-General, and places the Irish seaports under British control. The Free State Army now fulfills the function of an English army of occupation. The Irish civil war will finish as a class war.

Friedlander (Austria) stated that the Treaties of St. Germain, Trianon and Neuilly have brought about political and economic chaos. The social-democratic fulfillment policy has brought about shipwreck. The counter-revolution, disguised as the League of Nation's policy, is now proceeding against the working class of Austria. International reaction wishes to annihilate the achievements of the working class. They wish to make Austria a basis for counter-revolutionary activity, and to secure an alliance of the reactionary powers of Bavaria, Yugoslavia, Italy and Hungary. The representatives of the League of Nations are building up the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through the strengthening of the gendarmes and police, the dissolution of the proletarian militia, taxes, tariffs and the leasing of State enterprises. The Communists fight alone against the Treaty of Geneva. The Communist Parties of those countries which guarantee the Geneva Treaty must support the struggle against it.

The resolution on the Austrian question was unanimously adopted.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

SESSIONS 14 & 15, November 18, 1922.

Chairman: Kolaroff.

Speakers: Bukharin, Thalheimer, Kabatchev.

Bukharin (Russia): Comrades, the fact that we have placed so important and difficult a question as that of an international programme on the agenda of the World Congress is in itself the best evidence of our mighty growth. We may express our perfect confidence that the Communist International will also solve this problem, whereas in the camp of our adversaries of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, we observe complete theoretical impotence. (Comrade Clara Zetkin: Perfectly true.)

Generally we may distinguish three phases in the development of the Marxist theory and its ideological construction. The first phase was the Marxism of Marx and Engels themselves.
Then followed the second phase, which was the Marxism of the Second International. At the present time we have the third phase of Marxism, the Bolshevik or Communist Marxism, which is to a large extent reverting back to the original Marxism of Marx and Engels.

This was the child of the European revolution of 1848, and therefore possessed a highly revolutionary spirit.

This revolutionary character of the 'Marxian' theory is explained by the fact that the doctrines of Marx and Engels were evolved at a time when the whole of Europe was in the throes of revolution and the proletariat as a revolutionary class was entering the arena of world history. Then followed a different period with a different ideological tendency. Following the revolutionary epoch of the middle of last century, an entirely different historic epoch in the development of the capitalist system set in. It was the epoch of the gigantic growth of capitalism. This growth was chiefly based upon the colonial policy of the bourgeoisie, and the stupendous development of continental industry which was chiefly stimulated by the exploitation of the colonial peoples. This created a certain community of interests between the continental bourgeoisie and the continental proletariat which was the basis for a great psychological and ideological tendency manifesting itself within the working class and, ergo, within the Socialist Parties.

Then came the second phase in the development of Marxism, namely, the phase of Social-Democratic Marxism, the well-known Marxism of the Marxist theoreticians. The struggle between the orthodox tendency and the reformist tendency, the great struggle between orthodox social democracy represented by Kautsky on the one hand against the Revisionists as represented by Eduard Bernstein on the other. I support the thesis that in this struggle, which took place a long time before the war, so-called orthodox Marxism, i.e., the Marxism of Karl Kautsky, surrendered to Revisionism in the most fundamental theoretical questions. This we failed to notice. Now we see clearly and distinctly, and thoroughly comprehend the underlying reasons of this phenomenon. Let us for instance consider the question of the impoverishment theory! You are all aware that Kautskian Marxism argued this question in a milder form than that stated by Marx himself. It was asserted that in the epoch of capitalist development the working class suffers a relative deterioration of its condition. Marx, however, in his theory analysed an abstract capitalist development which leads to a deterioration of the condition of the working class. What did Kautskian Marxism do? It limited the term 'working class' to the continental working class. The condition of those strata of the proletariat went on improving, but Kautskian Marxism did not realise that this improvement in the condition of the continental working classes was bought at the price of the annihilation and spoilation of the colonial peoples. Marx was speaking of capitalist society as a whole.
Then take, for instance, his varying opinions on the general strike in his book on "The Social Revolution," where Kautsky asserts that if we are in a position to make the general strike then we need no general strike. If not—we do not need one either. What does it mean? It means nothing but pure opportunism, which we did not quite notice before, but which we see quite clearly now.

Let us take the third theoretical question, namely, the theory of the State. Here I shall have to speak at somewhat greater length. On the outbreak of the war we thought that Kautskianism had suddenly betrayed its own theories. This is what we thought and wrote at the time. But we were wrong. We can now quite calmly admit that we were wrong. Quite the contrary happened. The so-called betrayal by the social-democrats and the Kautskians were based on the theory which these theorists had already maintained before the outbreak of the war. What were their statements about the State and the conquest of political power by the proletariat? They represented the case as though there was some object which had been in the hands of one class, and later passed into the possession of another class. This was also the way Kautsky saw it.

Let us now take the case of the imperialist war. If we now consider the State as a homogeneous instrument which changed hands in passing from one epoch to another, i.e., as almost a neutral thing, then it is perfectly conceivable that we should protect this instrument on the outbreak of war when the proletariat has the prospect of conquering the State in this manner. During the world war the question of protecting the State was brought to the forefront. This idea was thought out to its logical conclusions, and it was quite a logical consequence of this theory when Kautsky raised the question of national defence and answered that question in the affirmative.

The same with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even in debate with the Revisionists, Kautsky never developed this question. He almost failed to say a single word upon this most important question and most important problem during the whole of that controversy. He said something to the effect that this question would be solved by future generations. That was his way of "stating the problem."

Comrades, when we examine these mental excursions and attempt to discover in them the sociological equivalent, we must declare that we have here an alleged Marxian ideology that was based on the aristocratic position of the continental workers, whose improved condition was secured by the spoilage of the colonial workers.

They are unable to analyse the revolution, they cannot produce an analysis that would furnish the basis for practical revolutionary decisions. They are evasive when they say: There is no logic in the events of our time.

Let us take for instance the theory of the crisis. With regard to this theory, Kautsky asserts that in our present theoretical consideration of the development of the capitalist system, we
should admit quite frankly that the theory of crises should assume "more modest dimensions" in our argument. What does it mean? It means that Kautsky asserts that the capitalist world has become more harmonious in recent times. This assertion is naturally the embodiment of pure stupidity. The facts prove the opposite. We now find complete vindication of the theses and the theory of crises. They have been proven up to the hilt. We can even maintain now that the war itself was a specific form of economic crisis, and it is this specific form that we should theoretically conceive and theoretically analyse.

Let us now proceed to the theory of the State. This theory of the State has now been transformed by all the theoreticians of the Second International without exception into a direct plea for a bourgeois republic. In this respect there is absolutely no difference between the bourgeois liberal scholars and the social democrats. On reading the writings of Cunow, for instance, we find that some of the bourgeois professors, like Franz Oppenheimer and others, notably those of the Gumplovitz school, are much nearer to the Marxist position than he. Cunow in his book claims the State to be a sort of universal welfare institution, a good father to all its children, whether of the working class or of the bourgeoisie. So the matter stands. I once said that this is a theory that was represented by the Babylonian king, Hamurabi. And this is the theoretical level of the representatives and principal sages of the Second International.

But there are theoretical betrayals which are even more flagrant and ignominious. I refer to the conception of Kautsky with regard to the proletarian revolution and to the coalition government. To write such stuff one has indeed to lose the last vestige of theoretical consciousness. Take for instance Kautsky's theory about the revolution. Do you know what is his latest discovery on this question? (1) The bourgeois revolution has to act by violence. (2) The proletarian revolution, precisely because it is a proletarian revolution, must not employ violence, or as another of these gentlemen has said, violence is always a reactionary force. We know what Engels has written about the revolution, in an Italian article entitled "Dell Autorita." He wrote: "The revolution is the most authoritative thing in the world; for revolution means an historic event, when one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part of the population by means of bayonets, guns and rifles." Such was the conception of revolutionary Marxism. And now we hear what the miserable Herr Kautsky has to tell us: "Bayonets, guns and other means of violence are purely bourgeois means. They have not been invented by the proletariat, but by the bourgeoisie. The barricade is a pure bourgeois institution." (Laughter.) In this way one could argue almost anything. Kautsky might, for instance, say: "Before the bourgeois revolution the bourgeoisie fought with ideas; consequently this is a purely bourgeois method. It would follow then that we must discard all ideas." Perhaps Kautsky has discarded all ideas now.
(Laughter.) It would be really ridiculous to adopt such a method of reasoning.

Now we come to the question of the coalition. Here we reach the apex of all the discoveries of Kautsky. Kautsky believes himself to be the representative of orthodox Marxism. Marx maintained that the spirit of his teaching consisted of the doctrine of the proletarian dictatorship. There is a passage in Marx which reads: "The class struggle was known to many others before me, but my teaching consists of the knowledge that the development of capitalism leads inevitably to the dictatorship of the proletariat." This was the way Marx himself conceived his theory. This is the sum and substance of the Marxist doctrine. Now listen to what Kautsky writes: "In his famous article on the criticism of social-democratic programme, Marx wrote: 'Between the capitalists and the communist society intervenes the revolutionary stage of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the State can be nothing else but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.' " So said Marx.

And Kautsky, what has he to say? Let me quote him literally: "This sentence we should now modify on the basis of our recent experiences, and on the question of Government we should say: 'Between the time of the pure bourgeois and the time of the pure proletarian democratic State, there is a period of transition from one into the other. This has its corresponding period of political transition, when the government as a rule should take the form of a coalition government.' " (Laughter.)

This is indeed not a form of transition from Marxism to Revisionism, but it is even worse than the purest Revisionism.

I now turn to another question. Having disposed of the theoreticians of the Second International, I wish to say a few words on the new analysis of the present epoch, with particular reference to a point which has not been as yet fully elucidated. I think that the capitalist development as a whole should be considered from the standpoint of the expanded reproduction of capitalist contradictions, and it is from this standpoint that we ought to consider all the processes of capitalist development. We have now reached a stage of development when capitalism is breaking up. To some extent we already consider capitalist development in retrospect, but this does not prevent us from considering all the events of the capitalist epoch, including even the prognosis, from the standpoint of the steady and constant reproduction of capitalist contradictions. The war is the expression of the contradictions inherent in capitalist competition. We ought to explain the meaning of war solely as the expanded reproduction of the anarchistic structure of capitalist society. If this accentuation of the contradictions has already led to the impossibility of continued existence of capitalist society, this standpoint can also serve the purpose of elucidating all the other questions, such as the grouping of the working class, the social divisions of society, the position of the working class and the structure of modern society.
The second question to my mind is the question of imperialism. Political economy in the past, including also the Marxian theory, treated the subject of capitalist contradiction as something peculiar to industrial capitalism. It was an epoch of competition between the various industrialists whose methods consisted of lowering the price of commodities. This is almost the only sort of competition mentioned by Marx. But in the epoch of imperialist capitalism we find many other forms of competition wherein the method of reducing prices is of no significance. The main groups of the bourgeoisie are now in the nature of trusted groups within the framework of the State.

It is quite conceivable that such a form of enterprise, such a construction of competing groups, should resort chiefly to violent methods of competition. The policy of low prices is almost an impossibility. Thus arise the new forms of competition which lead to military attack by the State.

I would now like to touch upon a third point that ought to be mentioned in the programme, namely, the emphasising of the role of the State in general, and the role of the State at the present moment in particular. We should admit quite frankly that the Marxian theory, and even orthodox Marxism, did not investigate the question of the State quite thoroughly. The role of the State is very important from all points of view, from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie as well as from the standpoint of the proletariat. On the other hand we are to destroy an organisation, and it is therefore important for us to know the situation as it existed previously so that we may create something of economic relations. All these circumstances should urge upon us the necessity of emphasising the question of the State and giving it prominent place in our programme.

I would further urge that we include in our programme something about the monopoly of education by the ruling class. We used to ignore this question in discussing our programmes in the past, but now, when the proletariat is striving for power and for the reorganisation of society, such questions as the training of our officials and administrators, the standard of education of our leaders before and after the conquest of power, must play an important part. All these questions are of great importance, yet they were never discussed before, because they did not appear to us to be practical questions. Now they have become absolutely practical questions, and for this reason we should give more place to this question than we have given before.

I think that in our programme we should touch upon the question of the specific symptoms of the maturing of Socialism within the capitalist society. It is a classical passage in the Marxian doctrine that the germs of the new society are generated in the womb of the old. But this theory has caused so much confusion in the ranks of the Second International that we should state the question more concretely than we did before. I cannot touch upon the question in its entirety, but this much I would like to say: We all know that the proletarian revolution imposes
many demands upon us, that the proletarian revolution is at times accompanied by deterioration of productive forces. This is an inherent law of proletarian revolution. But our opponents want to tell us that this is due to the fact that capitalism is not yet ripe for Socialism. This is their main theoretical thesis in which they confuse the maturing of capitalism within the feudal system with the maturing of Socialism within the capitalist society. But we want to emphasise the difference of principle between the two phenomena. The proletariat can become the leader of society as a whole, the real creative genius of society, only after the dictatorship. It cannot be in any other way. This is the cardinal difference between the maturing of capitalism and the development of Socialism that we ought to emphasise.

I would further like to touch upon one more point which has not been sufficiently analysed, even in our literature, namely, the problem of growing into the Socialist state. The revisionist conception was that the capitalist state would gradually evolve into Socialism. We say that it begins only after the proletariat has established its dictatorship. The proletariat should first of all destroy the old bourgeois state and capture the power, and by this means change the economic relations. There is yet another point which has direct bearing on the preceding question, namely, the question of the national types of Socialism, as a form of production, of course. Before the revolution we discussed methods of systematic production, collective economy, etc., without having any concrete idea. Now, particularly after the experiences of the Russian Revolution, we see that we have before us a long period of various national types of Socialist production. Socialism can grow exclusively upon that which is already in existence, and therefore it may be assumed that the various Socialist forms will in a certain sense be the continuation of the previous capitalist forms, but under a different aspect; which means that the specific features of capitalism of the different countries will find their expression in the specific forms of Socialist production in those countries. Later on, of course, these differences will be obliterated by the onward march of proletarian rule. If we take all this into consideration, we may then pass to the discussion of other questions, such as the question of the new economic policy. This is the eighth point upon which I intended to say a few words here. This new economic policy may be viewed from totally different standpoints, from the standpoint of revolutionary tactics or from the standpoint of economic rationalism. These are two standpoints which do not always appear to be identical. From the tactical standpoint we have already heard the views of several comrades, including Comrades Lenin and Trotsky. I would like to examine this question from the standpoint of economic rationalism.

I maintain that the proletariat of every individual country, after gaining political power, will be confronted by the important problem of economic organisation, the problem of proportion between the forms of production, which the proletariat should organise upon a rational plan. This is the most important
economic problem with which the proletariat will be confronted. If the proletariat fails to fix this proportion aright, if it undertakes too much, it will eventually be confronted by the situation in which the productive forces will not be developed, but rather hampered, and lead to a gigantic administrative machine, with too many officials and functionaries to take the place of these small producers, small peasants, etc., in their economic functions.

The new economic policy is on the one hand a specific Russian phenomenon, yet on the other hand it is also a universal phenomenon. (Quite true!) It is not exclusively a strategic retreat, but it is also the solution of a great problem of social organisation, namely, the proportion between the various branches of production which we should nationalise, and the branches of production which we are not able to nationalise. Could we, for instance, proceed right away with the organisation of the American farmers? Of course not! For such strata the free economic movement should remain. The same would be the case in Germany. Do you believe that the victorious proletariat would at once be able to organise a communist basis all the bourgeois economies, particularly in Bavaria? Of course not! But this problem is also connected with yet a different problem. It happens that in a revolution the principle of economic rationalism clashes with another principle that is of equal importance to the proletariat, namely, the principle of the pure political expediency. Of this I have frequently quoted examples. For instance, if for the purpose of erecting barricades you saw down telegraph posts, it stands to reason that you are not thereby increasing the productive forces. (Laughter.) The same thing happens in a revolution. Here we get the irrational thing, which is economically inexpedient, but which from the standpoint of the political struggle and the triumph in the civil war is quite a means to an end. These two standpoints, economic rationality and political expediency, are not at all identical, frequently they come into collision. The prime consideration, however, should be political expediency, if only for the reason that it is impossible to build up Socialism without previously establishing the proletarian State.

I now come to the fourth sub-section, which I designate as the new universal tactical problems.

Firstly, quite briefly, on the question of the colonies. For this question we must devote more space in our programme than we have done hitherto. (Quite right.) We are now making the attempt to write an international programme. We must therefore deal with this question far more exhaustively than has been the case hitherto.

The second tactical problem is that of National Defence. This problem was to us Communists quite clear from the outbreak of the war, and our attitude was almost a flat rejection of the national defence, but now we see something modified and more complex. The essential complicating factor in this question is the fact that in one country we have a proletarian dictatorship,
and the existence of a proletarian state changes immediately the whole situation.

When the bourgeoisie speaks of the national defence, it means the defence of the bourgeois state; and when we speak of national defence we mean the defence of the proletarian state. It ought therefore to be stated clearly in our programme that the proletarian state should and must be protected not only by the proletariat of this country, but also by the proletariat of all countries. This is the new situation of the question where it differs from the situation at the outbreak of the war. The second question is: Should the proletarian states, for reasons of the strategy of the proletariat as a whole, conclude any military alliances with the bourgeois states? Here there is no difference in principle between a loan and a military alliance. And I maintain that we have already grown so big that we are in a position to conclude a military alliance with a bourgeois state for the purpose of destroying some other bourgeois state with the help of the bourgeois ally. What would happen later on, under a certain readjustment of forces, you can easily imagine for yourselves. This is a question of purely strategical—and tactical expediency. In this manner it should be stated in our programme.

Under this form of national defence, i.e., the military alliance with bourgeois states, it is the duty of the Comrades in every country to aid this alliance to victory. If in its subsequent phase of development, the bourgeoisie of such a country should be overthrown, then other questions arise—which it is not my duty to outline here, but which you will readily conceive.

Next we should make mention of a technical point, of the right of Red Intervention. This is in my mind the touch-stone for all Communist parties. There is a widespread outcry about Red militarism. We should make it plain in our programme that every proletarian state has the right of Red intervention. (Radek interposes: You are the Honorary Chief of a regiment, and that is why you talk like this! Laughter.) In the Communist Manifesto we were told that the proletariat should conquer the whole world. Now this could not be done with our bare hands. (Laughter.) This has to be done with bayonets and rifles. For this reason the spread of the system on which the Red Army is based is also the spread of Socialism, of the proletarian might, of the revolution. This gives the basis to the right of Red intervention under special circumstances which makes the technical realisation of it possible.

Now I have done with the various problems, and I will now pass to a general survey of our problem. The programme of the national parties should consist at least of two parts:

(1) A general part which is suitable to all parties. The general part of the programme should be printed in the membership book of every member in every country. (2) A national part, setting out the specific demands of the labour movement of the respective countries. And possibly also (3), but this is really not a part of the programme—a programme of action
which should deal with purely tactical questions, and which might be altered once every fortnight. (Laughter.) Some Comrades want us to define in our programme also the tactical questions, such as the capital levy in Germany, the tactics of the United Front, or even the question of the workers' government. Comrade Varga said it would be mental cowardice to protest against it. (Radek interposes: Quite right!) Nevertheless, I maintain that the desire to settle these questions is nothing but the outcome of the opportunistic goerilities of the respective Comrades. (Laughter.) Such questions and slogans like the United Front or the workers' government, for instance, or the capital levy, are slogans that are based on very shifting ground. This basis consists of a certain depression within the labour movement. These Comrades want to make this defensive position of the proletariat a plank on the programme, which would make it impossible to assume the offensive. Against such a proposition I will fight with all means at my disposal. We will never allow the adoption of such planks in our programme. (Radek, interposing: "Who is the "we"?) We, that is, all the best elements of the Communist International. (Laughter and cheers.)

Comrades, I think that in the theoretical part we should include the following sub-sections. First a general analysis of capitalism, which would be of particular importance to the colonial countries. Then we should have an analysis of imperialism and the decay of capitalism, and, further on, the analysis of the epoch of the social revolution.

In the second part of the programme we ought to have a sketch of the future Communist society. I take it that a picture of the Communist society in the programme would be necessary in order to show what Communism really means and the difference between Communism and the various transitory stages.

The third part should contain the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the struggle of the proletariat for power.

The fourth part should be devoted to general strategic questions, not such questions as the workers' government, but such basic questions as, for instance, the attitude towards social democracy and the trade unions.

Because these two questions are not of a fluctuating nature, the strategical and technical questions can be laid down in the programme.

With regard to the national part of the programme, it is not my task to touch upon these problems, for a special investigation will have to be made according to the country and the programme.

I conclude my lengthy report with the hope that we will emerge from the Fifth Congress with an effective, truly revolutionary orthodox Marxist programme. (Prolonged cheers.)

Chairman: Comrade Thalheimer has the floor.

Thalheimer (Germany): Comrades, I do not wish to repeat Comrade Bukharin's excellent speech to prove the theoretical
bankruptcy of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals; I only wish to bring out a few typical examples.

First of all I would like to point out that in his programme, Kautsky rejects even the fundamentals of the Marxist conception of capitalist economics. For instance, one of our basic conceptions is that the regulating law of capitalism is the production of surplus value. Suddenly, Kautsky discovers that capitalism is based upon the needs of consumption. There could be no more absolute, no more fundamental capitulation to capitalist economics than this.

Today, Kautsky totally agrees with Bernstein on all points. He has accepted all Bernstein's reformist proposals and declares them to be the true Marxism. I will not discuss these things any longer theoretically, but practically. What is the purpose of these proposals? They go along the well-known paths of Municipalisation, and secondly of Guild Socialism, a new importation. To prove his new theories à la Bernstein, Kautsky, who is usually a very sober thinker, writes the most fantastic nonsense. For instance, take Guild Socialism. The Guild Socialists believe that, without the conquest of political power, the trade unions may introduce Socialism step by step, so to speak, behind the back of capitalism. One need only look at the trade unions and realise their financial situation in the disruption of capitalism to see that this is a pure phantasy. At a time when the trade unions had the greatest difficulty in gathering strike funds, who can expect them to introduce Socialist economy behind the back of capitalism?

Another favourite hobby-horse of the reformists is Municipal Socialism, Municipalisation. Anyone who has any knowledge of the situation in the West knows that the most striking characteristic of the Western countries is the bankruptcy not only of the State, but also the municipalities; and this is the problem of to-day for the municipalities; not the transformation to Socialism, but the defence against the attacks of capitalists who wish to gain control of the municipal industries.

A third point. To render the transformation more easy, it has been proposed to take over capitalist property, and pay compensation. You all know that Karl Marx has said that eventually the English landowners would be bought out. But he did not mean this in the sense that this could take place before the conquest of Power, but only after the proletariat had captured political power. Everyone knows that the first requisite for the reconstruction of the Socialist Society is the liquidation of the tremendous weight of debts which weighs upon industry. This mild method of buying out the capitalists is just as much a Utopia as Kautsky's idea of Guild Socialism or Municipalisation.

A few more remarks to bring out more clearly what Bukharin said on the theoretical capitulation, especially as it appeared in the programmes of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals and the Göttingen programme. All that Bukharin has emphasised and argued here as if he were lecturing to a class
of boys, the dismissal of the impoverishment theory, of the crisis theory, etc.; all this has appeared clearly in the commentaries on the Görler programme.

Comrades Kampffmeier, Bernstein, Stapfer, have shown clearly this capitulation.

Now, with regard to debatable questions, I will deal with the following:

1. The basic section—the theoretical explanation of imperialism in connection with the theory of accumulation.

2. The question of temporary measures, of partial demands before the conquest of power, which I consider as the main question for the preparation of a general programme, as well as the programmes of the individual parties.

3. A few brief remarks on economic measures after the conquest of power, war and communism, and N.E.P.

4. The form and construction of the programme.

I will speak at once on the first point, the theoretical explanation of imperialism. There were two main questions which entered here: first, the more important, is imperialism an inevitable phase of capitalist development? The second question is a theoretical explanation of this inevitability of imperialist development.

When we say imperialism, we do not mean only the colonial expansion of the capitalist States, but the special form of expansion under the present imperialist conditions. Comrade Luxembourg formulated this special form of expansion as follows:

"In the Imperialist era, we are confronted with a struggle for the rest of the non-capitalist territory, for its new division, and finally, in connection with this, with the expansion of the capitalist and political basis of power."

These facts have been known for a long time and cannot be contradicted.

So the question presents itself in the following manner: Can capitalism expand without limit, or are there certain necessary theoretical bounds to this growth? Some people have objected to this theory of accumulation as a sort of fatalism, according to which capitalism reaches a point when it breaks down mechanically. What it actually means is something different. It means that capitalism is forced into an imperialist phase which sharpens the class antagonism, that it is forced into the most severe political and social catastrophes. It follows therefrom that it is not this limit which will determine the end of capitalism, but the severe crisis into which imperialism leads it.

This is one side of the question. And now, comrades, let us examine for a moment the opposite position occupied by the staunchest opponents of this theory. Hilferding, dealing with the Marxist theory in his book "Financial Capital," says that capitalism has in it the possibilities of unlimited expansion. As to Bauer—not to miss the Austrian head of the school—he
has advanced a remarkable theory, namely, that capitalist development is conditioned and regulated by the increase of the population. This means turning upside down the Marxian theory of population, which says exactly the opposite.

What is behind all this? It is the idea that it is possible to direct imperialism backwards to free trade and its theoretical consequences. The toiling masses must not struggle forward towards socialism, but backward, allying themselves with the corresponding sections of the bourgeoisie, following the same course. The fullest fruition of this theory was reached in an article by Hilferding, in the beginning of 1922, in which he claims that the period of imperialistic antagonisms had come to an end, and that now the era of imperialistic harmony was beginning.

I now come to the point relating to the general program and the programs of the individual parties. Here I stand in sharpest opposition to Comrade Bukharin on the question of the demands of the minimum program. Comrade Bukharin takes the position that one must separate the transitory or immediate demands from the program proper. He assigns them to a separate room, on the door of which he affixes the inscription, "Program of Action." Here, one may commit all kinds of iniquities. (Comrade Bukharin, interrupting: But admission is free!) Free admission is all right. Then let us open the door and see what things programmatically admissible we are going to find there. ( Interruption: What do you consider admissible things?) That is just the point. We had opposition in Germany to the inclusion of the transitional demand for the conquest of power in the program. In this, some have seen, as Comrade Bukharin has, a certain danger of opportunism. We must, therefore, very carefully examine the question as to how far it is possible to separate the tactical principles from our general principles and aims. I am of the opinion that those who see any guarantee in this division of tactics, principles and aims are in great error, and are exposing us to just those dangers that certain of these which they seek to avoid will be neglected. (Hear, hear.) One need only look at the history of the Second International and its decay to realise that it was precisely this division of the tactical clauses of the program from the ultimate aim which accelerated its deterioration into opportunism. How did this process start in Germany? In the Bernstein Kautsky debates on tactics, the final goal remained. And to-day, when we wish to emphasise the difference between communists and social reformists, we say: We differ in our final aims; we want socialism and communism, while they do not want it. How do we prove this statement? By pointing to the tactics and the road which these people followed and which are quite different from ours. That is the principal point. I claim, therefore, that specific difference between us and the reformist socialists lies not in the fact that we keep our immediate aims to a separate compartment, apart from our program but in the fact that we bring
our immediate aims and preliminary demands into the closest relationship with our principles and final aims.

Comrades, the question of these transition demands and the minimum program is not new. This question was already fought out once even on Russian ground, and I think that it will be of interest to read the documents bearing on it. It was in the autumn of 1917 that the question of the Russian Party program was discussed. The question arose then, should the Russian Party, which was on the eve of assuming power, retain only the maximum program and eliminate the minimum program. I believe that it will be as well to quote Comrade Lenin's statement in this connection. Comrade Lenin said then—you will excuse me if the question is rather long: "Our entire program would be nothing but a scrap of paper if it were not to serve us in all eventualities and in all the phases of the struggle by its application, and not by its non-application. If our program is the formulation of the historic development of society from capitalism to socialism, it must naturally also formulate all the transition phases of this development, and must be able to explain to the proletariat at any time the process of the transition towards socialism. Hence, it follows that the proletariat must not be put in such a position where it would be forced even for a single moment to abandon its program or be itself abandoned by it.

This fact finds expression in the fact that there is not a single moment in which the proletariat having, by force of circumstances assumed the power should not be obliged to take some measures for the realization of its program, which would be in the nature of transition measures of a socialist nature. Behind the assertion that the socialist program may during some phase of the political domination of the proletariat, fail to give any directions for its realization, colours unconsciously the other assertion—that the socialist program in general can never be realised.

From the general or fundamental part of the program, we shall now go over to the program.

We are going into the battle, i.e., we are struggling for the conquest of the political power by means of our Party. This power would be a dictatorship of the proletariat and of the poor peasantry. When we assume this power, we are not only not afraid to go beyond the limits of the bourgeois order, but we declare, on the contrary, quite openly and precisely that we will go beyond these limits, that we will march fearlessly towards socialism and that our way towards it leads via the Soviet Republic, the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, workers' control, obligatory labour, the nationalisation of the land, confiscation of the big estates, etc., etc. It is in this sense that we formulated a program of transition measures towards socialism.

But we must not brag while going to battle. We must not eliminate the minimum program, for this would be tantamount...
to bragging. (Hear, hear.) We do not want "to demand anything from the bourgeoisie, but we must create everything ourselves, and our work must not be a tinkering within the limits of the bourgeois order."

Such an attitude would be nothing but empty bragging, for, first of all, one must conquer power, and we have not yet done that. In the first instance we must put the transition measures towards socialism into practice and we must lead our revolution to the final victory of the international socialist revolution. It is only "when the battle is won" that one can put aside the minimum program as useless.

I shall now give you yet another quotation which will be useful for our further discussion of the program. Comrade Lenin continues:

We do not know if we will be victorious to-morrow or a little later. I, personally, am inclined to think that it will be to-morrow (I am writing this on October 6, 1917), and that we might be too late in taking over the power. However, to-morrow is to-morrow, and not to-day. We do not know how soon after our victory the revolution will come in the West. We do not know if after our victory there will not be periods of reaction and of counter-revolutionary victories. There is nothing impossible in that. Therefore, we shall, after our victory, construct "a triple line of trenches" against such eventualities.

As yet we do not know and we cannot know anything about this. No one can know it, and, therefore, it is ridiculous to throw out the minimum program, which is very much needed as long as we are still living within the bourgeois order, as long as we have not destroyed this order, have not laid the foundation for the transition to socialism, have not beaten the bourgeois and having beaten it, have not totally destroyed it. All this will come and will probably come much sooner than some of us expect. I am myself of the opinion that it will begin to-morrow, but to-morrow is not yet with us.

Let us deal with the minimum program on the political field. It is intended for the bourgeois republic. We add that we do not confine ourselves to its limits, but that we begin at once to struggle for the higher type—the Soviet Republic. We must do this. We must march towards the new republic with boldness and determination, and I am convinced that we will do so. However, the minimum program must not be thrown out on any account, for the Soviet Republic is not yet with us. Moreover, the possibility of "attempts at restoration" are not excluded, and we must go through with it and remove it. It is also possible that during the transition from the old to the new, "combined types" of government will make their appearance as pointed out in the "Rabochi Put" a few days ago; for instance, the Soviet Republic as well as a constituent Assembly. All this must be outlived, and then there will be ample time to throw out the minimum program.
And, in conclusion, there is the following statement:

"The same is the case on the economic field. We are all agreed that the fear to march towards socialism is tantamount to ignominious betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. We are also all of us agreed that the first steps in this direction must be measures such as the nationalisation of banks and trusts. Let us first of all bring into being these and similar measures, and then we can consider further steps, for experience will have broadened our outlook. Practical experience is worth a million times more than the best programs. It is quite possible and even probable that even here we shall not be able to do without "combined types" for the transition period. For instance, we cannot at once nationalise the small industrial concerns, employing a few workers, neither can we put them under a real workers' control. These concerns may be tied hand and foot through the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, but there is no reason for throwing out the minimum program, as long as there are even small relics of bourgeois conditions. As Marxists, who enter boldly into the greatest world revolution and yet take a sane view of facts, we have no right to throw out the minimum program.

"If we were to throw it out now, we should only prove that we have lost our heads even before we could achieve victory. But we must not lose our heads, neither before nor during nor after the victory, for if we lose our heads, we shall lose all."

Comrades, thus wrote Lenin, on October 6th, 1917, at a time when he could say: "The proletarian dictatorship, our victory, is a thing of to-morrow, but we are not yet there, it is still to-day with us." Comrades, looking at it on a world scale, we are certainly justified in saying that the victory of the world revolution is not a matter of to-day. Perhaps, it is not even matter of to-morrow, at least not in the sense as this was said in 1917. If we consider things on a world scale, we are obliged to say that the interval between the present state and the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship on a world scale must be measured by years, and perhaps even by decades, at least if we include in addition to the big capitalist countries also the colonial and semi-colonial countries. For the enormous field which lies before us we must lay out exact land marks, and I am asking myself what kind of land marks and fundamental rules we should have. Comrade Bukharin's chief objection consisted in the assertion that we cannot include concrete everyday demands in the general program, because the latter are only temporary and might change every month or every week. He also said that these concrete everyday demands vary in the various countries, and that we cannot, therefore, bring them under one heading. My answer to this is: We need not bring into the general program nor into any national programs the concrete everyday demands in all their details, but we must give the fundamental tactical rules,
the tactical principles and the methods (if you will allow me to say so) from which all these concrete separate demands may be unmistakably drawn.

Comrades, a second important matter relating to the transition period is our relation to bourgeois democracy. I find in the program submitted by Comrade Bukharin an admirable critical analysis of bourgeois democracy, but do you regard the Communist International as a solid whole, so that it suffices for all its Parties, let us say from India to Sweden, from Russia? (Bukharin: No! Not by a long way!) First we must have a guide as to the relations of the Communists to the democrats in those countries where bourgeois democracy has not yet been established, that is to say, where the struggle must still be against absolutist and feudal forms of the State. Secondly, we must have some direction for the policy of the Communists in such a situation as that in Germany, in connection with the defence of the republic against monarchist attacks. And, thirdly, we must have some guidance for the Communists in a situation similar to that which prevailed in Germany in November, 1918, when there was an opportunity of breaking up the democracy and establishing a dictatorship. I repeat that all these transitional phases must be dealt with in their general fundamentals, not in detail. And that this is quite possible, is proven by the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Take, for example, the last chapter, which deals with the relation of Communists to other parties, to bourgeois democracy, to the petty-bourgeois, etc. In a few pithy sentences the path is indicated.

I now come, finally, to the construction of the program. I would like to remark here that, on the whole, one can agree with Comrade Bukharin's proposals. We have ceased analysing the capitalist system in our program. We have begun to analyse its imperialistic stage. We have come to the conclusion that this analysis is necessary and must be undertaken.

I believe that it will be necessary to consider the proposition of Comrade Varga, and also to return to preface our program by an analysis of the pre-capitalistic methods of exploitation. If we really want an international Communist program, we shall have to do this.

I agree that it is absolutely necessary that the program should be short, perhaps even shorter than that of Comrade Bukharin. It should also, of course, be as simple as possible. And we also admit that the German program needs improvement.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasise that we must make our Communist Party invulnerable. But we cannot hope for this if we leave a long stretch of our revolutionary path un-illuminated, or, to use another term, if we omit a substantial portion of our road from our chart. (Loud applause.)

Comrades, we are faced with the question whether the Communist Party should have a maximum and minimum program for the period of transition. The Communist Party cannot
accept a minimum program such as that of the social democratic parties before the war, because the Communist Party bases itself on the conception that capitalism has entered a severe crisis, which inevitably and rapidly will cause its final disruption. The duty of the proletariat to-day is not adaptation—for this was the sense of the old minimum program—but to accelerate the downfall of capitalism and the victory of the revolution.

Furthermore, political demands in the minimum program cannot be realised so long as the bourgeoisie maintain their power by a class dictatorship. Even the minimum program cannot be realised because of the economic crisis, the high cost of living and the destruction of capitalism.

The Communist Party believes that capitalism has entered the revolutionary crisis and that we are witnessing the beginning of the proletarian world revolution.

This is why the main task of the proletariat and of the Communist Party is the conquest of political power and the realisation of the Maximum program.

Can the Communist Party have a Minimum Program?

This is the question before the conquest of power—which now seems longer than in 1918 and 1919—may the Communist Party renounce all demands within the limits of capitalism? Of course not. But these demands have not the same significance nor the same importance as in the old minimum program. They are only transitory demands from which the working class will rise to the larger demands of the maximum program. To-day, these demands have revolutionary significance; they are a step in the growth and intensification of the proletarian struggle.

Among these demands some are of a more temporary nature and depend upon the momentary condition of the struggle. They must be put up as slogans (demands of the hour).

The others are more durable. They contain the more important demands for which the Communist Party will fight until the conquest of power; they have a place in the program. But, being of a temporary nature, they do not determine the maximum demands and the conditions of the struggle. On the other hand, since the struggle for their realisation always brings us inevitably to the question of the conquest of power, and the realisation of maximum demands, we cannot give those major minimum demands an independent place in the program. They must be added to the maximum program and come at the end of the maximum demands.

In the program we must give the general lines of our tactics, taking into consideration the principles of the Communist Party and the conditions of the present historical epoch, but we cannot now designate the special application of these outlines at any given moment.

In conclusion, it is true that no programs are worth anything without a real revolutionary movement of the proletariat.
On the other hand, it is also true that every proletarian movement, which has no substantial theoretical basis and a clear revolutionary aim, is condemned to impotence, and to be a tool in the hands of the capitalists.

Kolaroff (Chairman): Comrades, we have heard the three reports on the Communist program. The next question is, what will be our procedure? Shall we open general discussion, with the object of leading to a vote by the Congress on a proposed program? Or shall we postpone the discussion of the program and the decisive vote until the next Congress?

The Congress decided to postpone further discussion.

**Reorganisation of the Executive Committee of the Communist International**

Sessions 26-27, November 29-30, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Markhovsky.

Speakers: Comrade Eberlein, Bordiga, Grün, Katayama.

Comrade Eberlein: Comrades, the committee appointed by the Congress to report on the reorganisation of the Executive took it to be self-evident that the organisation of the Communist International must be put to the test at every World Congress, in order to make sure that the organisation and the machinery of the Communist International are quite equal to the tasks entrusted to them.

It was from this standpoint that the Committee dealt with this matter. We have resolved to submit to you substantial modifications in the organisation of the Executive, modifications which should indicate the way that is to lead towards the appointed goal of a centralised World Party.

That this is necessary is an obvious thing to the Communist International. The Second International was to us a constant warning example in this respect, and an International that was rather a federation than a centralised body, an organisation whose activity in the main consisted of regular or casual conferences at which the finest speeches were delivered and the finest resolutions adopted, but which nobody ever thought of putting into action. This is a thing which does not suit the Communist International, and which should teach the affiliated parties to consider the central leadership of the International as a real central leadership.

That we are a long way from this the last year's experience is sufficient to make clear. Some sectarian did not carry out the
decisions of the Second and Third Congresses with the necessary vigour and goodwill. In some cases even the appeals of the Comintern have not been published. Then we have had leading comrades, when in disagreement with the discussions, deserting the field and resigning from their posts.

These kind of things should be done away with in a real World Party.

The Commission considered also the question of the Party Conferences of the sections, which was the cause of a debate. The Comintern, through its Executive, passed a resolution last year to the effect, that in future the Party Conferences of the sections shall take place after the World Congress. Some parties opposed this resolution, demanding that the Party Conference should be held before the World Congress. They asserted that only by holding the Party Conferences before the World Congress itself would there be furnished a clear picture of the attitude and activity of the individual sections. The Commission was of a different opinion. Firstly, because it would make it more difficult for the World Congress to arrive at an understanding on the individual questions after the various parties had already made up their minds on this question at their conferences. Secondly, it would create difficulties for the parties in question if the World Congress, taking place after the Party Conference, should adopt other decisions than those adopted by the Party Conference, putting before the Party the alternative of either submitting to international discipline and annulling the decisions of their Party Conference, or of putting themselves in opposition to the decisions of the International on the ground of their Party decisions. As International discipline must be our chief concern, we are of the opinion that the best solution for the future would be to hold the Party Conferences of the various sections after the World Congress.

There is another evil which has become evident at the present World Congress, namely, that several sections have sent their delegates to the World Congress with an imperative mandate. The Commission rejects this kind of mandate, and requests you to lay down that imperative mandates should not be recognised as valid at future Congresses. It is intolerable and entirely against the spirit of the Communist International for some delegations to come with an imperative mandate and to refuse to listen to explanations, discussions, or attempts to arrive at an agreement on the plea that the delegates are under the obligation not to vote against the instructions of their respective parties. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the Congress must declare in future imperative mandates as void, and annul them.

But, comrades, this strict centralist lead of the Communist International can only be instituted if, at the same time, we endeavour to make the leadership of the Communist International a body consisting of people who are really capable of taking upon themselves the enormous responsibility for the
leadership of the Communist International. The Commission is, therefore, of the opinion that in the future the Presidium and the Executive of the International should consist of the representatives of the various parties as heretofore, with the difference that these representatives should no longer be delegated to the seat of the Executive, as hitherto, by the various sections, but that they should be elected here by the World Congress, thus becoming, as the elected representatives of the Executive, the truly responsible workers and leaders of the Communist International.

We trust that this will contribute to making the various sections take a keener interest in International affairs in the Communist International. In fact, it has been a great drawback in many of our sections that the best comrades have confined themselves within the boundaries of their own organisation, working exclusively for the party without taking sufficient interest in International work as a whole. It is absolutely necessary that the various sections should show a keener interest in the International work, and be more ready to collaborate in it than heretofore.

Basing ourselves on this viewpoint, we propose that the composition of the leading organ of the Communist International shall be as follows:

We propose that you elect a chairman and an Executive of 24 members, including two representatives from the Young Communist International, these 26 representatives to be elected at this World Congress. The various sections have, of course, the right to send in nominations. But the final elections must be carried out here by the World Congress. As it may happen that some of these members of the Executive should have to return to their sections on important political business, or be sent by the Communist International to do work in other sections, we further propose to elect ten substitutes, who will remain in their respective countries until they be required as deputy representatives of their countries.

The Commission also proposes that the Plenary session should elect a Presidium out of this Executive. The number of members for the Presidium has not yet been definitely decided upon, probably there should be nine to eleven members. It is the duty of the Presidium, which is at the same time a kind of political bureau, to solve the political problems of the International. It will establish an organisational bureau, which will probably consist of seven members. It has been proposed that two members of the Presidium should form part of this organisation bureau. This bureau will have new tasks before it, and will deal with matters to which the Communist International and its leading organ have not paid much attention hitherto. It has become evident that the Communist International must exercise more influence on the organisational form of the various sections, that it must assist them with advice and otherwise at the establishment of their organisational bureau.
We are of the opinion that this task is a very important one, for many of the sections at present attached to the Communist International, do not as yet have the organisational apparatus needed for becoming Communist Parties in the full sense of the word. There are still many sections, the organisational apparatus of which does not differ very much from that of the old social democratic electioneering society. This must not be allowed to go on. We do not require any electioneering societies within the Communist International, but fighting organisations. All the sections must endeavour to become such organisations. The Executive of the Communist International must concentrate next year on the organisational structure and consolidation of the various sections, and must assist them in this work by word and deed.

The organisation bureau has also another task to fulfil, which is of the greatest importance, viz., the organisation of the illegal work in the various sections. Former Congresses repeatedly adopted resolutions concerning this question, but as far as we know, very little was done in this direction by the various sections. Therefore, the organisation bureau will have to pay much more attention to this work.

We further propose the establishment of a general secretariat, as an auxiliary organ of the Presidium, with a general secretary, who is to be elected by the Enlarged Executive, and who is to have at his disposal several assistant secretaries. The general secretariat itself has not the right to arrive at binding decisions. It is an auxiliary organ of the Presidium, and must not be anything else. We further propose the establishment of a department for agitation and education. This department should be under the direct control of the Presidium, and should endeavour to centralise and unify as much as possible the agitational work in the Communist International, at the same time assisting the various parties with counsel and instructions.

The same task will confront the education department, which should be in close connection with the agitation department. It must endeavour to issue instructions and co-ordinate the educational work within the Communist International.

One other department, about which we must arrive at a definite decision, is the Eastern department. The work on this field has greatly increased during the last year, and the political significance of the East has been recognised more and more within the Communist International, so we are of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to have a special Eastern department, the head of which must be a member of the Presidium taking an active part in the entire work of the International.

We also propose an enlarged Executive. Last year's experience has shown that the sessions of the Enlarged Executive have done very useful work. Moreover, it is desirable that in connection with important political decisions, a larger circle of responsible party workers from the various sections should meet, in order to decide on important political questions. The
Enlarged Executive shall meet twice a year, with an interval of four months between its sessions. Thus, in addition to the World Congress, two sessions of the Enlarged Executive would be held during the year.

In our opinion, the composition of the Enlarged Executive should be as follows: 25 members of the Executive, plus three representatives each of the parties of Germany, France, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Italy, as well as three representatives of the Young Communist International and of the Proletarian, provided the decisions arrived at by the Congress of the latter are not such as to cancel the present form of collaboration. To these there are to be added two representatives each from Great Britain, Poland, America, Bulgaria and Norway, and one representative each from all the other sections of the Comintern with a right to vote. In connection with the composition of the Presidium and the Executive, we took great care in the Commission that there should be a proper distribution of work among the members of the Executive, in order that the representatives sent here by the parties should be made to feel that they are not only representatives of their respective parties, but responsible members of the Executive. It shall not be obligatory on all the 25 elected representatives of the Executive to remain permanently attached to the seat of the Executives. According to our proposal, 15 representatives must be permanently present, while the remainder may be sent by the Executive to do work in other parties. They can also be sent as plenipotentiaries, and are also free to return to their own parties in order to work within them.

The Commission proposes still another innovation to the Congress, namely, its proposition that the Executive be given the right to send plenipotentiaries to the various sections. The experience of the last year has shown that correspondence and the despatch of delegates to Moscow are not sufficient, and that it is absolutely necessary to empower the Executive to send its plenipotentiaries to the various sections.

We also put before you the proposal to change the composition of the present control commission. We propose that two sections should elect alternately the control commission every year, the next World Congress appointing two other parties from which this control commission is to be formed. The Executive must confirm the members of this control commission. For this year, the Executive proposes that the German and French Party should be asked for this control commission, each party electing three representatives. We are of the opinion that in this way the commission will be enabled to do better work.

Another question contained in these theses is that pertaining to the matter of communications. We recommend that the bigger parties should have a mutual exchange of representatives. This, naturally, applies only to the more important and biggest parties. It is quite impossible that all the 61 parties adhering to the International should have their representatives within
all the other parties. We are not proposing a binding resolution, but the wish of this Congress should be expressed, that we are in favour of the great parties establishing such mutual relations.

We further propose that the parties shall, in the future, be obliged to send minutes of the proceedings of their central organs to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in the same manner as they send in their reports for the sections—although, unfortunately, in many cases this has not been done—so that one may be informed as to the current work of the various sections. These minutes must be so drawn up that persons not directly connected with the central committee of the section may also clearly understand them.

We have, furthermore, a proposal to put before you, which forbids the resignation of members of central Executive Committees of the various parties, but makes such resignation conditional on the decision of the International Executive, and, even when these Central Party bodies are willing to accept such resignations, they can still only be considered as valid after the International Executive has endorsed them.

Finally, I wish to mention that we advise the International Executive to have two representatives of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International. Thus we shall have an exchange, by which the representatives of the Young Communist International will have advisory votes in the Presidium and the Executive, and full votes in the Enlarged Executive, and the Executive of the Communist International will have its representatives of the Executive of the Young Communist International in order to secure harmonious co-operation.

A representative of the International Communist Women's Secretariat shall be elected here. The International Communist Women's Secretariat shall remain in its previous location.

It is hard to say just at present as to what extent our relationship with the Profointern shall extend, as the Profointern Congress has not yet dealt with these proposals, and we can only deal seriously with this matter when their resolutions come before us. However, it appears to us to be very important that, as it becomes more apparent that we must relate the economic struggle closely to the political struggle, there should be close contact between the Communist International and the Red International of Labour Unions in the future.

With regard to the holding of the World Congress, we propose to hold the World Congress again next year. Whether it will be possible, within the next few years, to increase the interval between Congresses must be taken up next year. We believe it may be possible to hold such large and unwieldy Congresses, such as this, less often, perhaps every two years in the future.

The number of participants in the Congress shall be fixed, as previously, according to the numerical strength and political
situation of each party. So far, these are the proposals which
the Reorganisation Commission wish to lay before you.

Another question came up on the Commission as to whether
it might not be advisable to revise the statutes of the Communist
International. This proposal was unanimously recognised as
justified, but we do not believe it possible to undertake a
thorough revision of the statutes so soon after the conclusion
of the Congress. We, therefore, propose that the Executive
assume the task of the preparatory work for the revision and
extensions of the statutes, and that they transmit their pro-
sals to the various sections of the International, so that
the next World Congress may be in a position to adopt them.
Until then, of course, the present statutes are recognised as
the only binding rules for the conduct of our affairs.

Bordiga (Italy): I find the organisation proposals very satis-
factory throughout. They are satisfactory inasmuch as they
eliminate the last remnants of the Federalist method of organisa-
tion prevailing in the old International.

But there are two questions I must raise.

First, we must consider the question of the resignations.
I agree that resignations must be prevented. But it would be
as well to adopt the method which our experience in Italy has
proved very successful. Our method is to immediately accept
all resignations with the provision that the resigned member
cannot be reinstated for a year or two. I am of the opinion
that the resignations would not be as plentiful under such a
system.

Second, there is the proposal to hold the World Congress
every other year.

Comrade Zinoviev, in an article published at the beginning
of the Congress, indicated the final goal of the reorganisation
of the Executive. The Executive should be transformed from
its present federative form into a strictly organised Central
Committee of one great International Communist Party. The
proposal made by the German delegation in the Organisational
Commission asked for the immediate creation of this Central
Committee. But this is quite impossible for the present. We
have not got yet the consolidated International Party that could
have a strictly centralised committee composed without consulting
the different parties.

The proposals worked out by the Organisation Committee,
which are submitted to the Congress, represent the transition
from the present system, under which the Executive is made
up entirely of representatives of the Sections, to the final goal
of the uniform Central Committee, which should be composed,
not according to the wishes of the Sections, but in accordance
with the wishes of the International Congresses.

The proposals of the Commission are for us a groundwork
which halfway meets our needs and which, with a certain amount
of diligence and application, may be converted into that which
the future demands.
Katayama (Japan): Comrades, we agree with the proposals made by Comrade Eberlein. I want to impress upon the Comrades here the necessity for the unification of the work of the Comintern and for the economy of its forces. We want the centralisation of the work of the Comintern. Many communist parties of the West do not look beyond their national borders. That is not the idea nor the principle of the Comintern. That is why we support this organisation of the Comintern.

When you elect 28 Executive members at this Congress and ten substitutes I want you to elect men who are acknowledged to be strong communists, men who can be executive members of the Comintern, not only for their own countries, but also for all other countries. Strong communists are a necessity, but at the same time they must be men of large vision and wide horizon.

Eberlein (Germany): Comrades, I gather from the discussion that no proposals for the alteration of our theses have been made. We may, therefore, conclude that you are in agreement on the whole with our proposals.

A word with regard to the proposals that were made during the debate. I believe that Comrade Bordiga misunderstood me when he said that he thought we would hold Congresses every two years from now on. No, our resolution was to have a Congress next year, but to consider, in the meantime, whether it would be suitable later on to have longer intervals between Congresses.

If I have understood Comrade Bordiga rightly, he said, with regard to the question of resignation, that in his opinion resignations should be accepted by the Executive and that the resigning members should be suspended from the party for a certain time—one or two years. In other words, they should be punished for their resignation.

We are not in agreement with this point of view. For one reason, we have not a superfluity of political ability in the International so that we can suspend members in this way. Besides, on the grounds of discipline, our Comrades must learn to subordinate themselves to the will of the whole, even if on one or two questions their individual opinions conflict with accepted ones.

Resignations are not generally forbidden in our resolution; we only state that the agreement of the International Executive must be obtained. We believe that this will provide the possibility of ascertaining the nature of the grounds for this action on the part of those comrades wishing to resign as to whether the reasons are political or personal, for instance.

Therefore, I shall not propose in the Commission that Comrade Bordiga's proposal be accepted.

We shall, of course, examine once more in the Commission the few proposals which were made here during the discussion, and we ask you to carefully examine once more the theses, which will be put before you to-day or to-morrow, and to endorse subsequently the proposals of the Organisation Commission.
THE AGRARIAN QUESTION
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Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speakers: Comrades Varga, Renaud Jean, Teodorvitch, Joss, Rieux, Pauker.

Comrade Varga (Hungary): The Agrarian question was thoroughly discussed at the Second Congress of the Communist International. We adopted theses then which even now form the basis of our work. The program of action proposed by the Agrarian Commission is not a change from these theses, but are complementary to them. These additions are made necessary by the historical changes which have taken place in the last two years.

It is not sufficient to draw up a good program to approach the peasantry; it is absolutely necessary to convince them of our interest in their welfare and to destroy their distrust of the Communist Party by participating in their daily struggle. For that purpose it is necessary primarily to win over the agrarian proletariat and the poor peasantry, that is, such peasants as do not possess sufficient land to provide them with a living, but are partly dependent on wage labour.

The second group to win over, is the poorer section of the small peasantry. To win them over, it is first necessary to remove them from the intellectual leadership of the large land owners. This is a very hard task in Europe. The European peasantry is not such a large loose mass as the Russian peasantry before the revolution. They are organised politically, economically and co-operatively, and the large land owners have the leadership of these organisations. It must be our work to connect up the interests of the poor peasantry with ours and remove them from the influence of the large land owners. This task is exceedingly difficult. These difficulties arise primarily from the nature of the European Communist Parties.

This work of participating in the daily struggles of the various sections of the agrarian workers also presents great objective difficulties. The greatest of these is the vagueness of the class divisions of this section of the population. There is a constant passage from one class into the other.

I would like also to point out the quantitative difference which exists between industry and agriculture in respect to the size of the middle class. In the cities, we can practically ignore the oscillating mass of the petty bourgeois, the petty shop-keepers, the petty manufacturers, etc. In certain countries, on the other hand, the agrarian proletariat is very small, and the small and middle peasantry constitutes the great majority.
of the population. This forces us to give this rural middle class greater attention than we do to the urban middle class.

I would like to say a few words on the economic cause of this vague division of classes in agriculture. The cause of it is that the most important means of production of agriculture, the land, is easily divisible. It can be divided without producing a noticeable decline in production. The industrial worker could never think of dividing up a railroad, an electric station, a large wharf or a machine shop. It is quite apparent that this would be ridiculous because it would destroy production. In agriculture, however, the chief means of production, the land, may be divided up without any noticeable diminution of production. Landed estates can be diminished or increased by sale or purchase and may be divided up by legacy. This easy division of the means of production is the cause of the division of classes among the peasantry according to kin.

Another great difficulty lies in the different conditions prevailing in the various districts in various countries. While the problems of the industrial proletariat, the conditions on which it lives are very much the same in all countries, agriculture presents profound differences. We may distinguish three main types. First, the colonial country with an oppressed native peasantry. In those districts the struggle against imperialism is, at the same time, the struggle of the oppressed peasant against his own feudal lord; and the struggle for national liberation is also a struggle for the liberation of the peasantry from their old social bondage.

A second type is formed by the countries where considerable relics of feudalism still exist, where the bourgeois revolution has not yet accomplished its work. These relics of feudalism still exist in Germany, and they increase as we go eastward to Poland, to the Balkans, to Rumania, to Asia Minor.

The third type is found in purely capitalist countries, as in America, where agriculture is a branch of capitalist production, as also in the British colonies, like Canada and Australia, and in England itself. There the relation is the same as in industry: exploiters and exploited. Jugo-Slavia shows exceptionally well the confusion of conditions prevailing in agriculture. In the newly acquired sections of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the peasants live practically in a state of servitude in relation to their old Turkish feudal lords. Serbia itself is a purely democratic land of peasants; and in the newly acquired sections of Hungary, i.e., South Hungary and Croatia, we find a fully developed capitalist agriculture, large land holdings with modern equipment, so that in this small country we have three different political and social types existing side by side. This makes our propaganda in the country, especially difficult, because our slogans must be quite different in old Serbia form those in Bosnia, or capitalistically developed Croatia and South Hungary.

The second great difference arises in the land problem. There are countries where the demand of the peasantry for
land is the chief point of interest, while in others the land question plays absolutely no role. For instance, in Poland and other eastern provinces of Germany and Italy, the most important question is that of land, while in America or Canada this problem does not arise, because there is plenty of land. The same applies to France, where the population decreases steadily, the existence of which state is also a factor which makes it necessary for land to be absolutely purchased. The chief characteristics of the poorer classes are the uncertainty and the instability of their class position. This has determined also their political role. They are often seen and used in the same. This is a direct result of the instability of their position at another in times of prosperity they feel better to the large proprietors. They are also a determining element which must be comprehensively dealt with, both with political making and the maintenance of the question.

On the other hand, I also see certain dangers from the left. Certain countries seem to entertain an actual fear of the pauperization, which insists on the idea that only the land, industrial and agricultural, can be the active unit for the revolutionary for which the poor and small peasant classes have so little. I believe this to be a big mistake, for there is a great number of countries where the revolution is impossible without the active support of these classes. I can only say that with the exception of England there is no single European country where the dictatorship of the proletariat can maintain itself by the bourgeoisie. The poor masses, the middle and small peasant classes, are opposed to it. Thus, I consider the fact of the collaboration of the peasant the basis for the possibility of revolutionizing the wide peasant masses, which is necessary just as great as the market of the internal and the rural workers. The man who wants, who wants the rural proletariat will have to rely only on the absolute power taken, that as soon as the revolution is in course of the widest possible sections of the working rural population are to be drawn into it. If this is not done, it will be impossible to convince many countries for the working-class party, and it will be impossible to maintain the proletarian dictatorship without their active participation.
I am of opinion that our chief work must consist in supporting the various demands of the peasant population in their struggle against capitalism. This also raises the solution of the difficult problem of prices. Of course, we must not say that the peasants must receive high prices for their produce, but we must make use of the question of prices in order to draw the peasantry into the struggle against capitalism. We must say: “Capitalism must be compelled to provide the peasantry with cheap means of production, cheap machinery, artificial fertiliser, etc., in order to enable them to sell their produce at a low price.” We must say that we want to fix a definite price, but that the capitalists should provide the peasantry with all manufactured goods which they need for their production at low prices.

But, Comrades, the chief factor of our work must be our attitude on the land question; for land-hunger is the most active factor of all revolutionary movements in the rural districts. The question is not quite clear; should or should not the Communist Party support the movement of the poor peasantry for the acquisition of more land within the capitalist system? Should it oppose this movement or should it declare itself in favour of it? All evasion of this question is admissible. In most countries this question is put so pointedly that the Communist Party must say either yes or no. And I say: Comrades, that the Communist Party must come forward with a definite yes.

The Communist Party must give active support to all the efforts of the working peasantry to obtain more land. Our tactics must consist in putting our revolutionary solution of the agrarian question against the bourgeois agrarian reforms and direct the activity of these strata of the population in our favour. The land-poor peasants, such as the small and partial landholders, demand a reduction in rents. The Communist Party cannot put itself in opposition to this. It must say that it is for it, but at the same time it is obliged to tell the peasantry that this is not a solution of the problem, and that the only solution is the expropriation, the revolutionary confiscation of the land, which it is now leasing.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about the organisational measures contained in our programme of action. Comrades, it is of course our task to organise the rural proletariat into trade unions wherever this was not done already, and also to form committees in these agricultural unions, in order to bring them under our influence. I must also point out that...
it is in our interests to develop the agricultural unions into industrial federations, in order to organise within them all those industrial workers who are permanently employed within the agricultural system, such as locksmiths, blacksmiths, woodworkers, builders, and mechanics on the large estates. Thus, these trade unions will afford us greater support.

On the other hand, it is to be desired that Communists living in the country enter the yellow, the bourgeois, the fascist, the counter-revolutionary trade unions in the country, form communist factions within them, and work to destroy them by showing that these trade unions do not accomplish their purpose, that they conduct no fight against the employers. In the same way, the Communists must enter the various organisations of the small peasants, agricultural und co-operative, form factions there also, and bring these organisations under the leadership of the Communist Party. It is self evident that the Communist Party should attempt to take the leadership in the activities of the poor peasantry. They must try to direct the struggle, to give it a more and more revolutionary purpose in order to prove to the rural population, to the proletariat, and to the poor peasantry that the Communist Party represents the interests of all the workers in the country not only in their programme, but also in their actions.

Joan: Various sections of the Communist International have published statements on the agrarian question in their respective countries. It appears that Communist work in the rural districts presents certain special difficulties. But in building up a revolutionary movement it is impossible to leave out of account the peasants, at least in countries like France where nearly one half of the population live from working the land, for this would mean to relinquish the revolution.

Therefore, the Communist International should consider work among the peasants—propaganda, agitation, extension of Party membership—as one of its essential tasks. The French Communist Party realised this ever since its foundation. The Party Congress at Marseilles last year discussed and adopted an agrarian programme which had already received the approval of the Executive.

The majority of the French peasants have become conscious of the fact that our present political and economic institutions are effected by a grave crisis. A large number of them accept the probability of revolution without fear, and often with sympathy.

This fact, based not merely on my own experience, but also on the reports received from a great number of rural federations, explains the position taken by the French Party in the question of the agrarian programme. While in some other countries the agricultural worker can be led to the ideas of revolution only through the stake of minor demands, such as working conditions, taxation problems, etc., the French peasants, for reasons which we are about to discuss, are inclined to dispense with these preliminary stages.
The agrarian question in France presents another peculiarity. It is possible to win over to Communism not merely the agricultural proletariat, but also the well-to-do peasants who own their fields, houses and machinery.

It is true that the landless peasants have a special incentive to organise for the overthrow of the present system, taking the same attitude as the wage earners in industry and commerce. Dispossessed of tools, land, cattle and the buildings necessary both for living and working, they are proletarians in the same sense as their comrades of the factory and shop, notwithstanding all the exaggerated notions spread by the bourgeoisie concerning the wealth of the peasants.

In 1906 the number of agricultural wage earners was estimated at 1,000,000. At the end of the war, how many of these remained? Perhaps 1,000,000 or 600,000. If one adds to this total the hundreds of thousands of small farmers and tenants, the number of agricultural workers would be for 1920 about 3,700,000. We see then that the agricultural proletariat forms one-third of the total rural population. To about one-third of the French peasantry the question of private property presents itself in the same way as it does to the city proletariat.

Last year we attended the birth of a new union movement, in the departments of the South-West. It is impossible to tell how this movement will develop, but its particular nature gives us a curious example of the solidarity between various categories of landworkers. A conflict had arisen between the large landholders and the tenants and farmers over the division of choice livestock.

On the ground that the war constituted force majeure and of the impossibility of foreseeing the sudden variations in prices, the large landholders refused to honour their signed contracts. Therefore the tenants and farmers took part in this struggle.

Out of this, organisations grew up in which small landowners, farmers, tenants and labourers were united. It was a real peasant bloc, a union of all the exploited against the exploiters. And this was not an isolated case. The same thing appeared in other parts of France.

To sum up, for varying reasons the agricultural proletariat and the small peasants in France may be won over to the revolution. Therefore the Communist Party should conduct a special agitation among them, it should seek to form a bloc of all kinds of land workers and to connect them with the city proletariat.

It is possible to win over a large number of peasants to the revolution within a short space of time, be they wage-earners, small landowners or tenants. Disabused of their faith in universal suffrage and parliamentarianism by three-quarters of a century of experience, they hardly believe any longer in reforms and in the declarations of the different political parties. In order to lead them to Communism, however, it may be necessary
to show them that they will enjoy an improved existence after
the struggle will have been won.

It is after an examination of peasant psychology and of the
material conditions of French agriculture—analysed in the report
transmitted to the commission appointed by the Executive—that
the French Communist Party has drawn up an agrarian pro-
gramme which, like that which you are about to adopt, seems
to answer the principal demands of Communist agrarian policy.

Teodorovitch (Russia): Comrades, the success of our revolu-
tion was greatly due to the fact that the movement of the
industrial proletariat of the cities was splendidly backed by
a grand agrarian movement. On the other hand the agrarian
movement was victorious in Russia because it was supported by
the organised proletariat led by the Communist Party. The
revolution at one blow solved the fundamental problems of the
village. You know that in 1917 we were even the first to carry
out the nationalisation of the land, exactly fifty years after the
Lausanne Congress of the First International in 1867, which had
proclaimed this idea. We confiscated the land from the squires,
from the monasteries, the imperial estates and the crown lands,
and handed over to the peasantry a fund of land valued at five
billion gold roubles. At the same time, we annulled the peasant
mortgages which (without including Siberia) amounted to 1 1/4
billion gold roubles. We relieved the peasants from paying
rent—which (without including the Ukraine, Circassia and the
Caucasus) amounted to 200 million gold roubles per annum.
Finally, we handed over to the peasantry live stock and equip-
ment to the value of over 300 million gold roubles. This was
how we succeeded not only in neutralising the peasantry, but
also in getting its active support to the revolutionary conquests
of the Republic. By the united efforts of the proletariat and
the peasantry, all the attacks of the counter-revolutionary bands
organised by landowners and capitalists were beaten back.
Realising that the conquest of power will make it possible to
create conditions enabling the workers and peasants to work
for themselves instead of working for the exploiters, our Party
acted as it did in the full knowledge that we were to have a
temporary decline of production. We knew that our peasantry,
obviously to its backwardness, would not adopt the method of large
scale capitalist farming on the confiscated large estates, but will
rather proceed to parcel out the land. Indeed, we witnessed a
scene which cannot be characterised otherwise than was done by
a certain Russian scientist, who describes it as the transformation
of the land into a molten state. It resulted in a peculiar cutting
up of the land into very small lots. Statistical data indicate
that in Russia at the present time the number of farms exceeding
eight desiatins of cultivated land does not exceed two to four
per cent. On the other hand, the group of the totally landless
peasants has been greatly diminished. In the Central, Western
and Eastern provinces we have an average farm area that does
not exceed four desiatins per homestead and the Southern pro-
vinces not over eight desiatins. Thus the land represents a
picture resembling a honeycomb—petty producers who already at the time of the French Revolution had advanced the slogan: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" (For this is truly the slogan of the petty producer.) This parcelling out of the land has resulted in curtailed production of grain. At the same time a situation was brought about which made the proletariat feel the power of the peasantry as the owner of the means of subsistence. It was the period of the revolution when the country was in a precarious food condition, as a result of the imperialist war and the civil war imposed from the outside. The difficult food situation compelled us to resort to the food levy, to which the peasantry reacted in a peculiar fashion, i.e., by reducing the area of cultivation. Reducing the area by 30 per cent. as compared with 1916, the peasantry at the same time began to sow chiefly grains, while rye took the place of wheat and oats the place of barley. The peasantry confined itself to the preceding period. The peasantry reduced the cultivation of vegetable fibre plants and neglected the cultivation of seed. It is true that it was not all the result of deliberate calculation, but rather to the destruction of the productive forces of the countryside by the imperialistic war, by the civil war, bad harvest, etc. Nevertheless, the fact ought to be stated that the peasantry did not grasp the magnitude of the proletarian ideals. The situation was precarious, with the land parcelled up, with production on a decline, and with the peasantry breathing discontent against proletariat struggle. It was at this stage that the proletariat, led by the Communist Party, resolved to revise the principles of its policy and to create the new form of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. The situation was fully summed up by Comrade Lenin when he said: "Capitalism is an evil when compared with Socialism. But Capitalism is a blessing and a step forward when compared with Medievalism." Since the Russian village was permeated by the most glaring of mediocrity, the admission of capitalist production in the village meant the creation of facilities for combating these survivals.

Now, after two years' operation of the new economic policy, we may summarise some of the results. I base my summary of the latest statistical data on the latest budget investigations. First of all we notice an equalisation of prices. Until the arrival of NEP, commercial cultures became worthless as compared with rye, and Russia became a veritable rye country; now we witness the tendency of equalisation of prices, which is a fact of colossal importance by creating the foundation for the intensification of agriculture. Intensification in its turn solves the fundamental problem of our peasant economy during the transition period towards Socialism. The second tendency observed as a result of the new economic policy, may be characterised as the slowing down of the process of reducing the areas under cultivation. Another tendency is the discontinuance of the exodus of population from the city to the village; on the contrary, we see the first symptoms of the town again attracting
the surplus population from the villages. Another tendency is the development of small-holding. Already in 1917, when promulgating our land laws, we proclaimed the principle of complete freedom of choice as to the forms of land tenure. Nevertheless, the peasantry went in for land re-distribution, and there was no sign of any tendency to the break-up of the old village commune. Now this tendency becomes fully manifest, and it may be said to be closely related to the process of intensification, of which I have already spoken. It stands to reason that the petty proprietors will prefer that form of agriculture which is the most flexible, and which will give him the greatest possibility of manipulating his produce in the market. Such a form of agriculture is that of small-holdings, and not of communal land tenure.

Finally, we see a tendency of differentiation among the various groups of the peasantry. Under conditions that are determined by the fluctuations of the market, we have to take a certain attitude. For instance, our decree against usurious mortgaging of harvests, which shows that we are determined to control and guide this elemental process, preventing the exploitation on the one hand and of backwardness on the other. All the tendencies I have enumerated are the direct results of the new economic policy.

Our agriculture is in an advantageous position on account of the overthrow of the dictatorship of the exploiters. There is a total absence of the artificial factors of economic exploitation. On the other hand, the co-operative activities of the population are controlled by the workers' and peasants' governments, which means that our co-operation has been emancipated from the bondage of bourgeois ideology prevailing in capitalist countries, where co-operation is used as a weapon to stultify the class struggle. In our country it is a form of Socialist construction. All these economic and political factors entitle us to the confident hope that this process of banishing the survivals of mediavalism in our country will be a painless one. (Cheers.)

Joss (England): Comrades the question of the agrarian problem in relation to England has two aspects. One national, and the other international in character. During the past 150 years the development of the industrial resources has gone on at the expense of the development of agriculture. Today, 80 per cent. of our people are engaged in industrial pursuits, and only a matter of 20 per cent. are engaged in agriculture and the production of food. Therefore, we find that the problem of today in relation to the possibility of the proletarian revolution in England is such that we will either have to develop the resources inside our own country or else become greatly interested in the agrarian development of other countries.

We have in England and in different parts of Scotland a great demand on the part of the workers who formerly were agricultural workers to be resettled on the land. Many of these workers who were soldiers during the period of the war and why
were told that after the war there would be a land fit for heroes, have, as a result of the non-fulfilment of these promises, seized the land in these areas. In those particular areas in which are the agricultural workers the task of the Communist Party is either to press for the development of the resources nationally or the extension of smallholdings for these landless people.

The majority of the agricultural workers are agricultural proletariat. They stand on the same basis as the industrial proletariat, they act in common through the trade union movement, and voice their demands through it, and therefore the linking up of the industrial and agricultural proletariat is a simple matter as far as England is concerned. The cost of living in England to-day is 80 per cent. above pre-war level. The wages of the coal miners, iron and steel workers and agricultural labourers have been reduced from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent above the pre-war level, demonstrating that they are about 60 per cent. worse off. We find the bourgeoisie beginning to understand that here is a problem that they must tackle. The deputy chairman of Lloyds Bank, one of those massive organisations which control industrial capitalism in England, said, when looking up the figures of the census of 1921, that if England did not get back the trade she had in 1913 there was only room in Britain for a matter of 16,000,000 people. It is because of this fact that we insist when dealing with the agricultural problem not only of maintaining our close relationship with the agricultural proletariat of England, but also of retaining our contact with the agrarian workers on the international field. While Prof. Varga has told us that no country in Europe, with the exception of England, can have a revolution without the peasant proletariat, we are faced with the problem that when we do have the revolution we want to have the necessary means of retaining it. The retaining of that proletarian revolution in England will be dependent upon the success of the Communist Party in relation to their agrarian problem, nationally and internationally.

Rieux (France): I do not agree with the exposé of Comrade Renaud Jean. Or at least with that part concerning the communist and the revolutionary capacity of the French peasant. Comrade Renaud Jean wishes us to believe that the French peasants are revolutionary. As long as the small landowners enjoy better conditions of life, we will only be able to neutralise them by promising them that the revolution will not take their land, but in no case will they become revolutionary and participate in the revolutionary struggle for power as the workers of country and city. Comrade Renaud Jean still claims that he would be able to draw the peasants along the path of revolution by means of anti-militarist propaganda.

I do not believe this to be true. I believe that Comrade Renaud Jean does not recognise the necessity of civil war, of armed conflict, without which the working class will not be able to overthrow the bourgeoisie and conquer power.
Comrade Renaud Jean declares that the peasant more forcefully opposes the expropriation of life than the expropriation of the land. During the war, the French peasants as well as all the other peasants agreed to send their sons to death; they allowed themselves to be robbed of their children, but not of their money; while they have given their children without compensation, they only lent their money upon interest.

I believe that we must strive especially to draw to our side the rural wage workers (by fighting for their interests in the question of wages, of housing, etc.). They possess nothing, and we should fight them along the slogan of the land they work on which they work. Our second task is to neutralise the small landowners; but above all we must apply all our strength for the conquest of power. To conquer power, we must set into action the working masses of city and country.

Pauker (Rumania) Comrades, Comrade Vargo stated that especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries the question of transport and railways, which are in private hands, are of particular importance owing to the fact that the private capitalists are clever enough to deprive the peasants of part of their earnings by regulating the railway tariffs according to the rise and fall of the corn prices.

There is a similar situation in Rumania. The Rumanian bourgeoisie reckons with the fact that the Rumanian peasants export most of their produce, Rumania being a corn exporting country.

As to the question of the rural propaganda in general, I believe that our conception may be correct, although we have not as yet practical experience. We must certainly pay more attention to this question, because we can exist as a party and as a revolutionary movement only if we know how to approach the rural population. Therefore, the important question for us is to find out which section of the rural working population is amenable to revolution and which only to neutralisation, and on this point we find it impossible to agree with Comrade Renaud Jean. In fact, I believe that there must be some misunderstanding on this point. What Comrade Renaud Jean told us here about the details of the question is quite correct. It is possible to win over the peasantry through anti-militarism, and to get the small peasants to side with us by promising them that the revolution will not deprive them of their land. But in plain German this means—neutralising the peasantry. The peasants will not take the revolution by the throat, they will not oppose it if it can say to themselves that they have nothing to lose by it. But neither will they take the bourgeoisie by the throat, which means that they will not be an active element previous or during the revolution, that they will not be among the barricade fighters. If, of course, the peasants who have enough land to keep themselves and their families.

Comrade Kosorov: Comrades, I wish to discuss the agrarian question from a special standpoint. I wish to draw the
attention of the Congress to the disproportion between what we say—particularly between what the most eminent and penetrating spirits of our International have to say on the importance of the rural population during the revolutionary period—and the theoretical and practical attitude of our Communist Party upon this question.

Lenin told us at the Second Congress of the International that the most essential and profound problem of the present time, and of every revolution—not only of the Russian revolution, but of every social revolution—is the problem of the revolutionary alliance of the workers and the peasants. These words of Lenin did not meet with sufficient response in our International.

I think I am right in saying that the slowness with which the idea of the revolutionary alliance of workers and small peasants has made headway in our Communist International is the indication of the slowness with which our Young Communist Parties transform themselves into real general staffs of the revolution. For the general staff of the revolution ought to face all these problems and to understand all these questions in their entirety.

It was for this reason that the agrarian theses of the Second Congress have in a sense remained a dead letter to us. These theses have not sufficiently influenced the practice and activity of our parties.

Every time we take up the agrarian question we are immediately confronted with the tendency of restricting its scope by declaring that in the villages, just as in the cities, we must rely solely on the proletariat, that is, on the hired labourers.

Comrades, the essential task of every Communist Party is to organise the proletariat of the cities and villages. This is only a problem of organisation, and is quite clear. But there is a political problem which is quite different. It is the problem of finding the means of approaching other strata of the oppressed population, a problem we have always tried to evade.

When we speak of the possibility of winning a part of the peasantry for the revolution, what do we mean by it? It means that the period of disintegration of capitalism creates conditions that increase the discontent of the peasant masses, render the class antagonism in the village more acute, and bring a part of the peasantry close to the workers. To increase and to encourage this discontent to point out to the peasants the identity of their essential interests with those of the workers, is what we mean by winning them to the revolution. Let us not forget that the stability of the bourgeois regime rested always on the immobility and the complete inertia of the villages. To shake this inertia is to shake the foundations of the present regime.

It is a difficult problem. We should take advantage of every political opportunity to accomplish this task.

Comrade Katayama (Japan): Comrades, we, the Japanese delegation, approve the report of Comrade Varga. Japan is a
new capitalist country, and, as I reported before, it is still dominated by the agricultural population. Sixty-three or sixty-four per cent of the entire population are engaged in the agricultural industry. Of these, 3,750,000 families out of 6,000,000 families cultivate less than two and a half acres of land each, which shows that they are very small cultivators. Of these, about 1,000,000 families own the land. The rest are mostly tenants or half tenants. They are exploited because they must pay high taxes, consumption taxes, income tax and other local taxes. These poor peasants have no political rights; they have not even the parliamentary franchise. We must take these facts into consideration when we consider the work of revolutionising Japan.

The Japanese poor peasants are connected with the industrial workers. This is greatly due to the fact that Japanese industry has been built up only within the last 40 to 50 years. The Japanese revolution will be conducted not by the proletariat alone, but by the peasants and agricultural workers of Japan as well.

Varga (Hungary): Comrade, the discussion which has taken place here has not come up to expectations. It would have been the right thing for the comrades of the various countries who have done actual work among the rural population to put before us the methods, the obstacles, and the results of this work for our mutual benefit. Instead of this, the discussion concerned itself mostly with generalities.

In surveying the various expressions of opinion, I find that those perils from the right and from the left, to which I referred in my report, have been fully confirmed. The fact is that many comrades are quite unfamiliar with this question. The chief reason for this is that the Communist Party came mostly into being in the cities as a party of the industrial proletariat. There is a certain ideology which seems to follow only the interests of the industrial proletariat, and is quite wrongly of the opinion that the industrial proletariat, which is destined during the period of dictatorship to have a decisive influence on the policy of the state, will also be able to accomplish the revolution by itself and without the support of the rural population. This is certainly an error. We cannot carry out a successful revolution in any country of Europe without the collaboration of the rural proletariat, and without the support of considerable sections of the poor peasantry, the small farmers, and the poorer sections of the small peasantry. Neither can we retain power without their assistance.

There was a strange clash of opinions on the question as to whether the peasants are revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. The discussion on this question as applied in France between Comrades Renaud Jean and Rioux assumed an acute form. I should like to say that one cannot treat a question in this fashion. One cannot approach a subject in this uncompromising, unhistoric and undialectic fashion as was done
by Comrade Rieux, who asserted that Comrade Renaud Jean was wrong, and that the French peasant was not revolutionary, but conservative and counter-revolutionary. This is not correct. The chief characteristic of the peasant population is its vague and always shifting class attitude. At certain historic periods it is counter-revolutionary. One cannot say once and for all, as Comrade Rieux did, that the French peasant is conservative or counter-revolutionary.

To say this is tantamount to a denial of the possibility of our own revolutionary activity. How are we to approach the rural population if we are ourselves of the opinion that nothing can be done with it, that these people are counter-revolutionary or conservative, and that at best we can only neutralise the small peasantry? I venture to say that this is an absolutely unhistoric conception, which at the same time is a great obstacle to our own work. Therefore, I am of the opinion that fear and distrust of the peasantry and the small peasantry has no justification whatever. We must bear in mind that the peasantry, as Comrade Koscheva quite rightly said, is not the corps d'elite of the revolution, but at certain historic periods, it is the great reservoir of revolutionary forces from which we can replenish our ranks and take whatever can be taken.

For this reason, I should like to lay special emphasis on the statement made by Comrade Koscheva that we cannot proceed to attract the rural masses without a continuous and exhausting analysis of their conditions. If we omit to do this, we shall arrive at an uncompromising conception of Comrade Rieux, and partly also of Comrade Renaud Jean, one of whom says that the peasant is revolutionary, while the other says that he is conservative. It is impossible to work in this fashion. One must continuously study the attitude of the rural population, submit it to a careful analysis, and draw the rural masses into movements when they are politically sympathetic to them.

For this reason I am not at all inclined to condemn the work of Comrade Renaud Jean as some comrades seem to be inclined to do. Certainly, some of the opinions expressed by Comrade Renaud Jean are not quite communistic. Nevertheless, we must admit that he is doing good work among the rural masses, that he is winning over people for the revolution. He is organising sections which it is difficult to approach, and this is certainly very important work. I am also of the opinion that what he said theoretically about the peasant having emerged from the war with a changed psychology, is a very important statement. It is wrong to take up an uncompromising attitude and to say: The peasant has always been like this and he will always remain the same. We must, on the contrary, take facts into account and treat the question from a historic viewpoint.

I will deal quite briefly with the various statements, but wish to make special reference to our British Comrade's speech,
which was to this effect: The question of revolution is made very difficult by the fact that Great Britain could not hold out longer than a few months without the importation of food. In this connection, I should like to say that Great Britain's position is not so desperate as statistical data would imply.

The German professor, Oppenheimer, once showed in a treatise, that even if the import of food into Great Britain were completely cut off, it would by no means be doomed to starvation. He mentioned particularly that there are large tracts of uncultivated land in Great Britain on which could be assailed within a year. He pointed out that there are always large stores of food in Great Britain that could easily maintain itself; of course, not at the standard of living of the English people, but, for instance, according to the standard of Italy. Therefore, I maintain that the country must not think of revolution becoming a part of itself. (Interjection by Comrade Badec: "But not so soon.") Naturally, there would be an extensive shortage of food, but the people of Great Britain would not die of hunger if the dictatorship were lost for a time to its poor resources.

The Romanian commune was the only one to make certain objections to the programme of action. It pointed out that we did not want to take up a definite attitude in the Commission on his proposals against the Yugoslav levies by the Romanian State. I was very much against it, for what would be the result if it were said in Romania: "We do not want the State to levy a tax when it is exporting necessities of life."

I am not going to deal with the economic-hygienic question of who pays this tax, the foreign buyer or the domestic seller, for I say that the whole question is one of the necessity to protect against this year's large increase in the price of food paid by the foreign buyer and file. The necessity of the Romanian State to increase the production of this tax would mean that the Romanian State should have no increase in taxes on the workers. On the other hand, if it affects the home prices, it affects the revenue of the big peasants and big landowners from the sale of corn, but it does not affect the revenue of the workers and of those sections of the community who have not much surplus provisions to sell.

Comrades, there is not much in the fact that we have drawn up a programme of action.

It will become a reality when the various parties will have come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary for the success of the revolution to win over to our side wide sections of the rural population; when the parties will not accept the
hints contained in the program mechanically, but will take
them in conjunction with the continued analysis of the political
situation, as well as of the situation of the rural population.
(Applause.)

THE EASTERN QUESTION

SESSIONS, 19-20, November 22-23, 1922.

Chairmen: Comrades Kolaroff, Carr.

Speakers: Comrades Van Ravenstein, Van Overstraaten, Roy,
Katayama, Tahar Boudengha, Webb, Liu-Yeu-Chin,
Hosn-el-Orah, Earsman, Saferot, Nik-bin, Radek, Num-
berg, Dovz, Bunting.

Ravenstein (Holland): Comrades, our incomparable pioneer
and theorist, Rosa Luxemburg, has proved in her greatest and
best theoretical work, that the process of the accumulation of
capital is impossible without non-capitalist surroundings, which
it proceeds to destroy.

The entire colonial policy of capitalism from the 16th
to the 20th century is a long series of proofs. The destruction
of primitive economy, as well as of all pre-capitalist forms
of economy is one. Capitalism is using various ways and means,
and the ever-increasing taxation is everywhere one of the most
important of these means, as in British India, in the Dutch
Indies, in the French North American possessions and in all
the new colonial countries. This development has also taken
place in the Turkish empire. The well-known radical British
writer, Brailsford, in his excellent work of "Macedonia," came
to a Marxist conclusion. He described the struggles of the
revolutionary Slav nationalities in Turkey under Abdul Hamid.
He says, for instance:

"In so far as European influence succeeded since the
Crimean war to press on the Turks an illusory semblance of
culture, it has only furthered weakness and disintegration."

And he adds:

"An even greater influence was perhaps exercised by the
so-called capitulations, which created for the subjects of the
so-called cultured Powers a State within the State."

The position of these foreign capitalists does not differ in
the least from the privileged condition of the nobility in the
old aristocratic monarchies previous to the bourgeois revolu-
tion. The nobility was also exempt of all taxation, and among
citizen rights, had also the right to crush the common people
underfoot. The only difference is that this modern capitalist
aristocracy in Turkey, as well as in the other Eastern countries, consists of elements alien to that country. This state of affairs would have been introduced after the war by the West European capitalism also in Russia, if it had succeeded in crushing the proletarian revolution. In fact, the capitulations are so to speak the crux of the domination of foreign capitalism over the East, which it not only exploits but also debases.

It is self-evident that the new Turkey, which with the support of the peasant masses has won a victory over the hirelings of European capitalism, will demand at the peace negotiations, the abolition of the capitulations, and make the fulfilment of this demand, so to speak, a condition sine qua non.

As long as they are not annulled, the state of abject subjection to European capitalism remains.

But the Turks, who, according to the English statesman, Asquith, had been for ever banned from the European paradise, are now returned. The national rivalries in the Balkans are as bloody and as terrifying as ever. Once again Bulgaria has been overthrown and humiliated, the slave of European capitalism. And when one considers the situation of the other Balkan peoples, one notices only one apparent difference—between now and 1913—their position is much worse and far more insecure. Greece has been once more crushed to death by her latest war against the Turks which her bourgeoisie forced upon her.

Comrade Radek has recently given us a description of the contemporary financial and economic situation of that country, which gave us a clear view of its present aliment. One may obtain a clear historical view of the situation by comparing the present condition of Greece with its conditions previous to the Balkan war. In 1909 Greece had borrowed 670 million francs, of which she only received 413 million. Every inhabitant of this small and poverty-stricken land was burdened with a share of this debt amounting to 200 gold francs. This debt necessitated in 1893 a fund of 58 million per year in gold francs, and as the total national income was much lower, bankruptcy appeared to be inevitable.

A new war, that unhappy war, which, in 1897, Greece declared against Turkey, and which burdened the country yet more heavily, gave an opportunity to international finance once more to fasten upon Greece the financial shackles from which she had previously freed herself. An International Financial Commission was formed with full control over the fixing and imposition of taxes which had become necessary for the payment of the national debt, as well as for the payment of war indemnity to Turkey. Thus the Greek people were once more flung into indebtedness. Nowadays, Greece has a shattered economic life, is financially helpless, and is burdened with an atrocity indebtedness and with a population of ragged refugees from Anatolia and Thrace. In fact, the country is now in a state far worse than any in which it found itself since the War of Independence. Such are the results of imperialism and the war for one of the victors of 1912-13.
Turning to Palestine and Mesopotamia, which in name are mandatory countries of the League of Nations, they are in reality under-British domination. However, it cannot be said that imperialism, and especially British imperialism, has hitherto derived much satisfaction from these new conquests.

The occupation of Mesopotamia, which was the inevitable consequence of the war, has created for the British Empire a situation against which Brailsford uttered a warning even during the war, in his book, "A League of Nations," in which he said: "The occupation of Mesopotamia would weaken Great Britain strategically and politically."

There is every reason to believe that Great Britain is endeavouring to establish at all costs its supremacy on the mighty Arabian Continent. A well-known explorer, Mrs. Rossita Forbes, who is in the service of the British Government, left recently for the Arabian desert, carrying secret instructions. Probably her business will be to drive the Bedouin chiefs into a renewed alliance with Great Britain by means of gold and dourly presents. In the Arabian Continent, nothing less than the route with India will be at stake during the next few years for Great Britain. If during the next few years the Arabian tribes and the Arabs in general desired to get rid of the British guardianship, the strategic bridge, which took Great Britain two hundred years to build, would collapse.

Such mighty questions are now at stake in the Near East. Imperialism cannot endure unless the imperialists retain their political dominion over the Asiatic peoples, unless they can continue to exploit the Mohammedans, the Hindus, the Chinese and the other nations of the Far East. Why is this? Because the liberation of the Mohammedan and other Oriental peoples will imply the cessation of the tribute they pay to European capitalism, and without this tribute the accumulation of capital cannot continue.

Now an arrest of accumulation is the most deadly wound that can be inflicted on capital. It cuts off the blood supply, as we have been taught once more by the happenings of the last two years.

The movement, the revolution, which is now affecting the whole of the East, both Near and Far, and which will bring complete political independence to these regions, is irresistible.

The Mohammedan peoples aspire towards economic as well as towards political emancipation. That is why the movement among them is such a menace to Western capitalism.

For some decades there has been in progress a powerful movement throughout the Mohammedan world. From time to time it has been so extensive as to bridge material and racial differences. I refer to the Pan-Islamic movement.

Stoddart, one of the most recent historians of Islam, has pointed out how greatly the events of the years immediately preceding the world war increased the sense of
solidarity among the Mohammedans and stimulated their hatred for Europeans.

"We must not," writes Stoddart, "allow ourselves to be misled by the fact that the revolts of the Mohammedan peoples of the Near East during the years from 1918 onwards have at first sight a nationalist aspect. Mohammedan Nationalism and Pan-Islamism, however different they may be, are identical in their aspiration towards the complete freeing of Islam from European political control. Islam is capable of constituting a sort of unity as against the capitalist world; for the bond which unites all the Mohammedans is something more than a religious bond. Islam is more than a religion; it is a complete social system; it is a civilisation with its own philosophy, culture and art. In the course of many centuries of struggle with the rival civilisation of Christianity it has become an organic and self-conscious whole."

This bourgeois student of Islam is at one with the most noted Mohammedan men of learning in his conclusion: "The relationship between Western capitalism and the Eastern world, which for a century has been passing through its age of renaissance (a renaissance which may be said to have begun in Arabia at the opening of the 19th century of our era) the relationship between a capitalist world which is exhausted and undermined by the excess of its labours and the deepness of its wounds, which is profoundly disintegrated and has an enemy within its own household, the revolutionary proletariat, and a Mohammedan world which in every respect, alike religious, cultural, political, and economic is rising out of the abyss of decay into which it has sunk during the eighteenth century—this relationship is once again as greatly strained as it was in the days of the Crusades, when, after the appearance of the Turks in the Moslem world of the eleventh century, one hundred years' war ensued between East and West."

In the century of warfare during the middle ages, the West bore off the palm of victory, and gathered strength from the struggle; even though deep and incurable wounds were inflicted on world civilisation.

Now the relationship has been reversed. Decadent Western capitalism is faced by the menace of the young and increasingly vigorous world of the East and of Islam, where countless millions have for decades been debased, misused, and exploited by imperialism, until at length they turn in revolt.

The West is weakened in energy and diminished in greatness. It has a foe within its own household, the revolutionary working class, which would have overthrown the whole structure long ago but for the support given to the tottering edifice by the socialist traitors. Nevertheless, the contrast with the years before the war is notable. Prior to the war Czarism was quite as dangerous as Western imperialism to oriental freedom, to the freedom of the Mohammedan peoples. But Czarism has been destroyed, and prote-
tarian Russia has taken its place; proletarian Russia, the friend of genuine self-determination of the freedom of oriental nations.

The international proletariat, therefore, acclaims the political aspiration of the Mohammedan nations towards complete economic, financial, and political enfranchisement from the influence and dominance of the imperialist States; acclaims it as an aspiration which, even though it may not aim at the abolition of wage slavery and at private ownership of the means of production in Mohammedan lands, none the less menaces the foundations of European capitalism.

Roy (India): Comrades, at the Second Congress of the Communist International the “general principles concerning the struggle for national liberation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries were laid down. The general principles were formulated by which the relations of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian movement of the industrially and economically advanced countries to the national struggle of the backward peoples, should be determined and the experience that we had in 1920, that is, at the time of the Second Congress of the Communist International, did not permit us to develop those principles to any great extent.

But since those days, during the last two years, the movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries has gone through a long period of development, and in spite of all that has been left undone, and in spite of all that ought to have been done by the Communist International, and particularly by the Communist Parties of the Western countries, to establish closer relations with these movements, and to develop them, we are, to-day, in a position to speak with more knowledge and more experience and understanding of these movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The task before us to-day in this Fourth Congress is to elaborate those fundamental principles that were laid down by the Second Congress of the Communist International.

With this in view all the Eastern delegations present at this Congress in co-operation with the Eastern section of the Communist International have prepared a thesis which has been submitted to the Congress. In this thesis the general situation in the East has been laid down and the development in the movement since the Second Congress has been pointed out and the general line which should determine the development of the movement in those countries has also been formulated.

At the time of the Second Congress, that is, on the morrow of the Great Imperialist War, we found a general upheaval of the colonial peoples. This upheaval was brought about by the intensified economic exploitation during the war.

This great revolutionary upheaval attracted the attention of the whole world. We had a revolt in Egypt in 1919, and one of the Korean people in the same year. In the countries lying between these two extreme points there was to be noticed
a revolutionary upheaval of more or less intensity and extensiveness. But at that time these movements were nothing but big spontaneous upheavals, and since those days the various elements and social factors which went to their composition have clarified, in so far as the social economic basis has been developing. Consequently we find to-day that the elements which were active participants in those movements two years ago are gradually leaving them if they have not already left them. For example, in the countries which are more developed capitalistically, the upper level of the bourgeoisie, that is, that part of the bourgeoisie which has already what may be called a stake in the country, which has a large amount of capital invested, and which has built up an industry, is finding that to-day it is more convenient for its development to have imperialist protection. Because, when the great social upheaval that took place at the end of the war developed in its revolutionary sweep it was not only the foreign imperialist, but the native bourgeoisie as well, who were terrified by its possibilities. The bourgeoisie in none of those countries is developed enough as yet to have the confidence of being able to take the place of foreign imperialism and to preserve law and order after the overthrow of imperialism. They are now really afraid that in case foreign rule is overthrown a period of anarchy, chaos and disturbance, of civil war will follow that will not be conducive to the promotion of their own interests.

This, naturally, has weakened the movement in some of the countries, but at the same time this temporary compromise does not fundamentally weaken the movement. In order to maintain its hold in those countries, imperialism must look for some local help, must have some social basis, must have the support of one or other of the classes of native society.

The temporary compromise between native and imperial bourgeoisie cannot be everlasting. In this compromise we can find the development of a future conflict.

So, the nationalist struggle in the colonies, the revolutionary movement for national development in the colonies, cannot be based purely and simply on a movement inspired by bourgeois ideology and led by the bourgeoisie.

This position brings us face to face with a problem as to whether there is a possibility of another social factor going into this struggle and wresting the leadership from the hands of those who are leading the struggle so far.

We find in these countries where capitalism is sufficiently developed that such a social factor is already coming into existence. We find in these countries the creation of a proletarian class, and the penetration of capitalism has undermined the peasantry and is bringing into existence a vast mass of poor and landless agrarian toilers. This mass is being gradually drawn into the struggle, which is no longer purely economic but assumes every day a more and more political character. So also in the countries where feudalism and the feudal military clique are still holding leadership, we find the development
and growth of an agrarian movement. In every conflict, in
every struggle, we find that the interests of imperial capital are
identical with the native landowning and feudal class, and
that, therefore, when the masses of the people rise, when the
national movement assumes revolutionary proportions, it
threatens not only the imperial capital and foreign overlordship,
but it finds also the native upper class allied with foreign
exploiters.

Hence we see in the colonial countries a triangular fight
developing, a fight which is directed at the same time against
foreign imperialism and the native upper class, which directly
or indirectly strengthens and gives support to foreign
imperialism.

And this is the fundamental issue of the thing that we
have to find out—how the native bourgeoisie and the native
upper class, whose interests conflict with imperialism or whose
economic development is obstructed by imperial domination,
can be encouraged and helped to undertake a fight? We have
to find out how the objective revolutionary significance of these
factors can be utilised. At the same time we must keep it
definitely in mind that these factors can operate only so far
and no further. We must know that they will go to a certain
extent and then try to stop the revolution. We have already
seen this in practical experience in almost all the countries.
A review of the movement in all Eastern countries in the last few
years would have helped us to develop our point, but the time
at our disposal will not permit that. However, I believe most
of you are fairly well acquainted with the development of the
movement in those countries. You know how the movement
in Egypt and India had been brought to a standstill by the
timidity, the hesitation of the bourgeoisie, how a great revolu-
tionary movement which involved the wide masses of the
peasantry and the working class and which constituted a serious
menace to imperialism, could not produce any very serious
damage to imperialism simply because the leadership of this
movement was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Hence it is proved that although the bourgeoisie and the
feudal military clique in one or other of these countries can
assume the leadership of the nationalist revolutionary struggle,
there comes a time when these people are bound to betray the
movement and become a counter-revolutionary force. Unless
we are prepared to train politically the other social element,
which is objectively more revolutionary, to step into their places
and assume the leadership, the ultimate victory of the nationalist
struggle becomes problematical for the time being. Although
two years ago we did not think of this problem so clearly,
this tendency remained there as an objective tendency, and
now, as a result of that, we have in almost all Eastern
countries communist parties, political parties of the masses.
We know that these communist parties in most of these countries
cannot be called communist parties in the Western sense, but
their existence proves that social factors are there, demanding
political parties, not bourgeois political parties, but political parties which will express and reflect the demands, interests, aspirations of the masses of the people, peasants and workers, as against that kind of nationalism which merely stands for the economic development and the political aggrandisement of the native bourgeoisie.

We have to develop our parties in these countries in order to take the lead in the organisation of its United Front against Imperialism. Just as the tactics of united proletarian front leads to the accumulation of organisational strength in the Western countries and unmasks and discloses the treachery and compromising tactics of the Social-Democratic Party by bringing them into active conflict, so will the campaign of united anti-imperialist front in the colonial countries liberate the leadership of the movement from the timid and hesitating bourgeoisie and bring the masses more actively in the forefront, through the most revolutionary social elements, which constitute the basis of the movement, thereby securing the final victory.

Katayama (Japan): Comrades, I rise to present the Japanese case and also the case of the Far East. Japan occupies a very important place in the coming socialist revolution. Japan is important in the revolutionary movement of the world because in the near future the workers of Japan may rise against the capitalists. This is the reason why I want your serious attention. We all know, and I do not need to tell you, that we must protect the Russian revolution. Soviet Russia is menaced by Japanese Imperialism, and for this reason alone the Fourth Congress and the Communists of the world should pay more attention to this subject than it has done hitherto. During the Congress Japan is represented here in order to make progress in the social revolution of the world. This is the reason I want to read what I presented in my report on Japan and Japanese conditions. I want to give you a few facts. They are facts which will give you some idea of what Japan is:

Population ... ... ... 56,000,000
Wealth estimated at ... ... ... 87,000,000,000 yen
Products, 1917 ... ... ... 8,372,000,000
" 1918 ... ... ... 8,608,000,000

Japan is the most industrialised country in the Far East. The following figures show how the workers are classified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Men.</th>
<th>Women.</th>
<th>Total.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Employees</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory employing 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>314,000</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>554,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Workers</td>
<td>2,375,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrarian Workers</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>1,492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are wage workers, exploited in some cases very much. The working day in the spinning factory consists of 11 and 12 hours and there are also night shifts. Women and young girls work these hours in the factory. Besides this there are 4,160,000 families of poor peasantry and combined tenantry.

In 1920 there were 838 unions, with a membership of 289,000, and in 1921 671 unions, with a membership of 246,000, and 229 tenant unions, with a membership of 24,000. There has, of course, been an increase since that time. The landowners' union which is really a peasant proprietors' union, has a membership of 1,422,000. There are also mutual aid associations. In 1920 there were 686, with a membership of 2,000,000. These unions aided 3,169,000 persons, with money amounting to 1,681,000 yen.

Comrades, these are bare facts based upon a government report. Of course, as to the labour unions, the government has tried to minimise their number; we have more. The Japanese workers are organised and exploited by the militarist government. They are suppressed whenever they start a liberal movement, but they are awakening.

Our union leaders understand the capitalist conditions and are showing the workers that the capitalist system cannot remedy the unemployment problem.

I want to say a word now about the women's movement, because it has been somewhat neglected at this Fourth Congress. Japanese women workers are very much exploited. They are prisoners in the companies' dormitories and they work twelve hours, both in day shifts and night shifts. Formerly, Japanese women were prohibited from attending political meetings and forming political associations. But these restrictions have now been abolished. Japanese women are being educated in the highest educational institutions in the country, and they are utilising their education for the improvement of their position. They are not only taking part in the political life of the nation, but they have already joined trade unions. There are several thousand women members in the Japanese Federation of Labour.

When a strike occurs the women are very active.

The Japanese imperialism has become very unpopular amongst the Japanese workers, but is still very strong. I will give you an instance. Formerly, when a Japanese mother wanted to frighten her child she would say that she would put him to prison, but to-day she threatens that she will make a soldier of him. The imperialists are preparing for the next war. Therefore, we, in conjunction with the Chinese Delegation propose that this Fourth Congress of the Communist International should pass a resolution against the occupation by Japan of Northern Sakhalin, and encourage the Japanese revolutionary workers to fight against imperialism, and to prepare for the coming revolution in Japan.

Tehar, Boudengham (Tunisia and the French colonies): Comrades, I do not think that it is necessary to read to you my report, as each of the various language groups have received
a copy; I will therefore limit myself to elaborating certain points.

French imperialism has colonies not far distant from the Homeland, which enables it easily to recruit its forces either for future wars or for stifling the proletarian revolution in France.

At the same time there is an insurgent in North Africa. The communist nucleus, which was formed in Tunisia after the Conference, has taken advantage of this movement. Owing to the seriousness of the situation which may arise in the event of a proletarian revolution, it is doing its utmost to prevent French capitalism from getting the native population of North Africa entirely into its power. In order to accomplish this task, we have approached the workers and peasants, either through our Arabian dailies or through public meetings. We were so successful that the government became alarmed and made domiciliary visits and arrests. It even proclaimed our Party illegal, which forced us to carry on underground work. I must admit that this act of the government as well as the suspension of our Arabian papers has done us great harm, for our activities were not limited to Tunisia, but extended throughout the whole of North Africa.

Here I must complain of the French Communist Party, both for its lack of assistance and the character of its press articles dealing with our struggles.

I trust that the French Comrades, regardless of any tendencies, will set to work immediately after the World Congress, in order to initiate a policy of communist action in the colonies by the establishment of a central organ and the collaboration of colonial Comrades in the Managing Committee.

The French Comrades must understand once and for all that a proletarian revolution in France is bound to fail as long as the French bourgeoisie will have at its disposal the colonial population. Likewise, the liberation of the latter will only be possible when there will be in France a Party of revolutionary action and not an opportunist Party.

The Communist International must also take the matter in hand by attaching to itself a permanent representative of the French colonies.

I am also of the opinion that the British party has not done everything which should have been done. What has the British party done in order to support the revolutionary movement in India and in Egypt? The Communists must not limit their actions to their home territory while ignoring the thousands of people who are oppressed by their bourgeoisie and groan under the yoke of their own imperialists. I am of the opinion that to abandon peoples whose liberation and future depend on a communist party, as is the case for the British party, is nothing but cowardice.

On the other hand, Comrade Malaka was not quite sure the other day if he should support Pan-Islamism. You must
not be as disfident as all that. Pan-Islamism at the present juncture is nothing but a union of all the Mussulmans against their oppressors. Thus, there is no doubt whatever that they must be supported.

On the other hand, questions of a religious nature came to oppose the development of communism. In Tunisia, we had the same difficulties as you in Java. Every time people came forward to discuss with us the non-assimilation of communism with Islamism, we invited these mischievous people to meet us in public debate. We proved to them that the Mussulman religion prohibits the exploitation of labour, this being the principal basis of this religion. Secondly, we told them that if they are so religious, they must begin by applying the religious principles and paying one-tenth of their fortunes, including capital and interest, for the benefit of those who are not able to work. I can assure you that every time they debated with us by bringing forward their religious principles, they came off second best.

I think that Comrade Malaka's fears are unfounded. The progress of our ideas among the Mussulmans has exceeded all expectations. We have received from all parts of the Mussulman world, especially when we still had our Arabic papers, numerous letters of congratulation for our methods of applying communism in Mussulman countries.

I trust that the Congress will accept the conclusions of my report, which are necessary if the communist idea is to triumph among the oppressed peoples.

I conclude my statement by greeting the Congress of the International. (Applause.)

Webb (England): Comrades, at the risk of again incurring criticism from Comrade Radek because of my reference to the 21 points on this important question—the oriental question—it is my intention to refer to them again and especially No. 8, as presented by the Second Congress of the Communist International.

It reads as follows:

"In the colonial question and that of the oppressed nationalities, there is necessary an especially distinct and clear line of conduct of the parties of countries where the bourgeoisie possess such colonies or oppress other nationalities. Every party desirous of belonging to the Third International should be bound to denounce without any reserve all the methods of 'its own' imperialists in the colonies, supporting not in words only but practically a movement of liberation in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of its own imperialists from such colonies and cultivate among the workmen of its own country a truly fraternal attitude towards the working population of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, and carry on a systematic agitation in its own arm against every kind of oppression of the colonial populations."
Such was the decision of the Second Congress of the Communist International. Since those days we have had the development of the revolutionary nationalist movements in Egypt, in Persia, in Mesopotamia, in India and in Turkey. Yet it is safe to say that even the most mature Communist Parties, not these small parties or these revolutionary groups which are in the process of becoming Communist Parties, the more developed Communist Parties affiliated with the Third International have not fulfilled these obligations to the revolutionary nationalist movement in the ways enumerated.

It is true that a criticism has been levelled at the Party which I represent with regard to its attitude to the national and colonial question. It is within the framework of the British Empire that you have the liberation, movements of Ireland, Egypt, and at other parts of Africa apart from Egypt, and India as well as the colonies making up the British Empire. But our sins of omission can in the main be attributed to the fact that our party is only a very small party and a very young party which has been faced with numerous internal difficulties which it was necessary to overcome before we could pay the necessary attention to the colonial problem.

Comrade Trotsky, in the book he wrote prior to the Russian Revolution, criticised the strongest section of the Second International, the German Social Democratic Party, and pointed out that the Social Democracy had developed into socialist imperialism.

I will stress the note this morning that we must do everything to prevent those elements coming into the Communist International which would endeavour to make the Communist International an International for Communist Imperialism equivalent to the Socialist Imperialism which characterised the social democracy.

In a recent number of the "Fortnightly Review," there was a very significant article. In this article entitled "Kemal, the Man and the Movement," the Review says: "There can be no doubt that while the Kemalists are sincerely pursuing nationalist aims, the Bolsheviks are taking advantage of Turkish national aspirations in order that Western civilisation might be attacked at its weakest point, and that amid fresh emotions revolutionary activity might be renewed in an exhausted Europe." It concludes by saying that England and the Allies may hand over Constantinople to the Turkish nationalist Kemal Pasha, but before doing so they must prove to the world that Kemal Pasha is no longer a pawn in the hands of Soviet Russia.

A statement of that description from an authoritative capitalist periodical like the "Fortnightly Review" proves that the bourgeoisie are awake to the dangers of the transformation of a revolutionary nationalist movement into a revolutionary proletarian movement directed against the bourgeoisie. Therefore, these points in the theses spoken to by Comrade Roy in reference to the need for helping the proletarian elements in these countries
themselves, but also by those Communist Parties that belong to these countries that are oppressing the countries in which these movements are operating at the present time.

Lin-Yen-Chin (China): Comrades, owing to the limit of time I have at my disposal, I can only give you a general idea of the present situation in China.

First, I must speak of the political situation. From May of June of this year we have witnessed the downfall of two governments in China.

First was the downfall of the Southern Government, that is, the revolutionary government headed by Sun Yet Sen. This government was overthrown by a subordinate military member of the government, a member of the Nationalist Party. The downfall came owing to the differences of opinion between the leader, Sun Yet Sen, and this subordinate member concerning the plan of military expedition against the North. This signifies the complete failure of the military plan of revolution. The Kuomintang Party, the nationalistic revolutionary party in China, entertained for years a scheme of making military revolution. That means that by military conquest of the provinces they could realise a democracy in China. They did not carry on mass propaganda in the country. They did not organise the masses. They only strove to utilise military forces to achieve their aim. Before they had conquered Kwantung in 1920, they established a government, and they wanted to exhaust all the resources of the Kwantung province to raise an expedition against the Northern Government which is the government of the feudal militarists and the agent of world imperialism.

Civil war was waged during April and May in the North between two factions of the feudal militarists. One faction of the militarists was pro-Japanese, the other pro-American. This ended in the victory of the pro-American group.

The Chinese Northern government was dominated for about five years by the Japanese imperialism. This imperialism maintained its influence by lending money to the Northern Government to strengthen it in the civil war. The Japanese Government bribed officials to secure rights and interests in the Chinese mines, the right to construction of railways in Shantung, etc. Hence the Chinese population maintained a hostile attitude towards Japanese imperialism and the pro-Japanese agents in the Northern government. Owing to their deep hatred of the Japanese imperialism in China, they tended to be more and more in favour of giving support to the American imperialism. Owing to the fact, also, that the Northern government is more reactionary and this government is headed by Chao-So-Lin, the people are more and more sympathetic to the militarist group—the Wu-pei-fu group, the more progressive one which advocates the reduction of the army and the abolition of the tuchunate, i.e., the feudal division of the provinces, and who have the support of the Americans.
Second, I must mention the labour movement. This movement in China this year progressed very rapidly. At the beginning of this year we witnessed the Hongkong seamen's strike, which lasted more than fifty days, which was first limited to economic demands and soon became a nationalist factor against British imperialism. This strike was at first only limited to the seamen, but it became a general strike against British imperialism in the Hongkong colony, involving a spread to the North. There was the Peking-Mukden railway strike, and the trouble then spread to the centre of China. There was a strike in the iron and steel works in Hongkong, of the textile and tobacco industries in Shanghai, and another in the mines. All these strikes succeeded each other very rapidly. The spread of revolt against the capitalist class indicates the awakening of the labouring masses. This shows that the mass movement in China is not a dream of the Socialists, but that it has already come into being. It also shows that the Communist Party can be successful in agitating among the masses. It shows that the Communist Party in China will progress favourably, unlike in the previous years, when it was merely a study circle, a sect. This year we can witness our Communist Party developing within the masses.

Hosni al-Orabi, speaking in Arabic, said: The Egyptian worker suffers under the capitulations; he suffers under the yoke of British imperialism, foreign companies, and his own bourgeoisie.

Egypt is now ripe for the advent of Socialist ideas. One proof which I can give you is the growth of the Egyptian Socialist Party. The Party was legally established in August of this year, and during the few months of its existence has attracted 1,000 members to its ranks. In view of the ripeness of Egypt for the reception of Socialist ideas, we are anxious that no obstacle shall be placed in the way of a steady inflow of Communist propaganda and a development along Communist lines. We feel that if Egypt is left out of the brotherhood of the Communist International and her present eagerness allowed to run to waste, her backwardness may interfere with the development of the revolution in the East and may greatly retard the advent of the revolution in the West.

The marvellous uprising of 1910 and 1920 shook the power of British imperialism and taught the Egyptian capitalists a salutary lesson. Alarmed by these events, the British Government, in collaboration with the Egyptian capitalists, grandiloquently granted the complete independence of Egypt. But the people were not deceived by these hollow promises. What did they amount to? First, the protection of communications; this was concealed because Great Britain wished to safeguard her passage to India. Secondly, a co-government of the Soudan; this was to provide England with another source of raw cotton to feed the Manchester cotton mills. Thirdly, the protection of the minority populations. Fourthly, abolition of the capitulations.
The last two claims were advanced in order to give Great Britain a legal right to interfere in Egyptian affairs.

The Egyptian capitalists now formed a Liberal Party, whose object was to protect the new constitution and to ratify the treaty between Egypt and Great Britain. In order to do this, they had to draw up a programme and to select candidates to represent this opinion in a parliament—the elections to which are likely to take place in January next.

We intend to utilise the coming elections to the first Egyptian parliament. In the weeks that must still elapse before the events, we are going to prepare the soil in the hope of seeing some of the Comrades elected to represent the workers in the new body. If we are successful in winning one or two seats it will give an added prestige to Communism in the East and will consolidate the basis of our Party in Egypt.

Earaman (Australia): There are two points in the theses which have been drawn up and submitted to the Congress on which I wish to speak.

The first is the developing of the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries, particularly those oppressed in the Near and Far East.

The second point, the one we are particularly interested in, is the problem arising from the conflict which is developing in the Pacific. The most outstanding difficulty that we have to overcome is the prejudice arising amongst the white workers from the fear of cheap coloured labour. We find that in the countries most concerned, Australia, America and Canada, they have laws prohibiting the immigration of coloured labour into those countries, the workers believing that the importation of this labour is to be used against them for the breaking down of the conditions and the standards of living which have been set up in those countries.

Those of you who have given any attention to the Pacific must realise the danger of another world war in the Pacific. And if you realise that you will come to this conclusion: that the "fear of a Yellow invasion," would be sufficient to gather behind it numbers unequalled in the past. Because of that, it is our particular mission at the present time and in the next few months to have these slogans broken down, to get the workers to fully realise them and understand what they mean.

In the theses is made a proposition which we believe will be most successful in combating the work of the capitalists in those countries, and the Trade Union Congress in Melbourne this year passed a resolution deciding that the best method of bringing about a solid understanding between the workers of the North and South Pacific would be by the calling of a Pan-Pacific Congress. Such a Congress would bring the workers of Japan, China, Malay, India, America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand together, and then they would be able to thrash out the problems that they are faced with and arrive at understand-
ings which would be the means of getting the workers to realise how reactionary their past ambitions had been as far as coloured labour is concerned.

In making that proposal in the thses we hope and trust that every assistance will be given to the workers in these countries will be held and a definite programme worked out in a practical fashion.

Our first duty is to unite all the national revolutionary movements in the colonies into a united anti-imperialist front. In these backward countries the elements furthering the petty bourgeois development have not yet sufficiently separated themselves from the feudal elements, and these feudal elements are partisans of foreign imperialism. The struggle against the agrarian feudal regime is necessary. In Persia this struggle is taking place conjointly with the struggle against imperialism.

At the time of the Second Congress we had no Communist Parties in those countries.

The Second Congress of the Comintern declared that we must support the independent working class movement in the most backward countries in all its forms. We have followed this policy. The small Communist Parties have already become a political force. They are capable of organising the revolutionary nationalist movement and of pushing it forward.

We must organise the working class of these backward countries because the proletariat of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples is of vital importance for the victory of the proletarian world revolution. (Applause.)

Okhran: Comrades, the Third International has recognised the liberation movement of the colonial peoples as being of capital importance to the world revolution. It is quite inexplicable, therefore, why the Communist Parties of the West have not till now devoted to the Eastern and colonial questions as much attention as they should.

As startling proof of this, we greatly regret to say that the British Communist Party has not as yet inserted in its programme of action the special plank concerning the work of Communist Parties in the colonies.

In order that the masses may be led to understand the significance of the anti-imperialistic United Front, the situation must be visualised and made concrete by inserting the practical demands of the masses, such as agrarian reform, administrative and taxation reforms, parliamentary reform, etc.

Taking into consideration the fact that the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, now see themselves obliged to take a stand against imperialism in the West and the East, the anti-imperialistic front must be proposed to the opportunist European parties on the basis of the independence of the Oriental and colonial countries.

It should then be proposed to the British Labour Party that it exert pressure upon its government in order to (1) compel the Lausanne Conference to formulate peace terms in conformity
with the National Pact; (2) immediate evacuation of Constantinople and all of Thrace; (3) the settlement of the question of the Straits in conformity with the Russo-Turkish Treaty and with the participation of all states bordering on the Black Sea; (4) to publish articles on this question in working class periodicals; (5) the evacuation of Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine, and the recognition of the nationalist independence of all colonies and semi-colonies.

The Communist Parties of those countries which possess colonies and semi-colonies, and particularly those of France and Great Britain, should support every revolutionary movement for independence, and should aid by every possible means the Communist Parties of those countries and should endeavour to assure their legalisation.

The following are the essential tasks of the young Communist Parties of the Eastern countries:

(1) To support the movement for national emancipation by all means, and unite all forces in an anti-imperialistic United Front. To exert the most careful vigilance so that the movement for national freedom be not sabotaged by the ruling class.

(2) To demand democratic reforms for the broad working masses. These tactics will bring to the Party the sympathy of all labouring classes, and will transform the Communist Party into a mass party of the people.

Nik-bin (Persia): Comrades, Persia is at present in the transition stage from the patriarchal order to capitalism. In Persia there is dual power. The Communist Parties have not only to struggle against their own feudal lords, but also against the imperialists, especially with the British who have allied themselves with the Persian feudal lords and who are impeding Persia's transition to the capitalist order. The world economic crisis was reflected in Persia in the sense that the Persian market was to a certain extent neglected by the capitalists. This led to the development of the native home industries, and with it to the awakening of the working class. For this and various other reasons, the Communist Party came into being in Persia. At present, this organisation has 1,000 members throughout Persia. There are also trade unions with a membership of 16,000 throughout Persia, Teheran, the capital, claiming 12,000 of it. The Persian Communist Party has the following policy. From a strictly party point of view, it would be wrong to organise in Persia a wide Communist Party. The organisation there has a strong nucleus, mostly consisting of workers. On the other hand, there are in Persia organisations on the model of trade unions and also trade unions which are entirely under the influence of the Communist Party. The Party directs the policy and has a great influence on trade union activities.

The Persian Communist Party has proved to be stronger than the bourgeois parties. The bourgeois parties, as
represented by the so-called social-democrats, who have a democratic programme, are themselves seeking to form a bloc with us. It is safe to say that in the very near future the Persian Communist Party will be very successful.

Radek (Russia): Comrades, our way of dealing with the movement in the East, since the Second Congress, should now be subjected to the test. You will recollect how at the Second Congress of the Comintern we discussed the Theses on the great revolutionary importance of the movement in the East and on the necessity for the Comintern to support that movement. Our attitude at that time caused a clamour not only in the world of capitalism, but also in the parties of the Two and Two-and-a-Half Internationals. While the entire Two and Two-and-a-Half Internationals are helpless against capitalism, the struggle in Turkey has upset the equilibrium of the whole of Western Europe. This is the answer to the question whether the movements in the East are of revolutionary importance in the fight for the overthrow of capitalism or are merely the political game of Soviet Russia and the Communist International.

Now there is an important point raised by our Turkish Comrade. Our theses stated that the exploited East must and will fight against international capitalism, and that for this reason we ought to assist it. Now, we find at the head of the oriental national movements neither Communists nor even bourgeois revolutionaries, but for the most part representatives of the decayed feudal cliques belonging to the military and bureaucratic classes. This fact brings our aid to the Eastern peoples into contradiction with the question of our attitude towards the ruling elements. The question was brought to a head by the persecution of Communists in Turkey and by the military suppression of Chinese strikers by Wu Pei-Fu troops. As Communists, we may clearly and frankly state our attitude upon such matters without resorting to diplomacy. In promising our aid to the awakening East, we did not for a moment lose sight of the class struggles that will yet have to be fought out in the East.

The persecution of Communists in Turkey is part of the class struggle which is only beginning to develop in Turkey. There is bound to be a struggle not only between the working class and the young bourgeoisie, but also within the camp of the ruling clique. It is no secret that the Minister of the Interior, Rouf Bey, and Refar Pasha are primarily responsible for the Communist prosecutions, and that they were the ones who favoured compromise with the Entente and opposed the dethronement of the Sultan. We tell the Turkish Communists: "Let not the present moment obscure your outlook on the near future!" The defence of the independence of Turkey, which is of paramount international revolutionary importance, has not yet been achieved. You should defend yourself against the persecutors, you should deal blow for blow, but you should also realise that the fight for freedom is not yet over, that you have a long road before you which you will have to follow together
with the other revolutionary elements of Turkey for some time to come.

Let us now turn to the situation in China. Comrades, recall to your minds the march of events. When Wu-Wei-Fu defeated Chang-So-Lin he gained possession of the Yang-Tse arsenal, but he failed to gain possession of the railways in the North, which were in the hands of Japanese hirelings. What did he do? He asked the Young Communist Party of China for support, and it gave him commissaries who kept the railways clear for his troops during the revolutionary fight. Everyone who fights against Japanese imperialism in China fights for the revolutionary development of the country. This was understood by the Communists, and they kept the working class alive to the realisation of the importance of the fight for independence. Later on the workers presented their demands to Wu-Wei-Fu, and partly won them. Our comrades in Northern China have won their influence over the historic mission, which was as yet bound up with the mission of the revolutionary bourgeois forces. When the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals continually chide us with our undue confidence, in the Enver-Pashas and Wu-Wei-Fus, our answer is: "Gentlemen of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, as there is a petit-bourgeoisie of which you are a part, it will be oscillating between capital and labour, and you who call yourselves socialists and have already a thousand times betrayed the working class, and yet after every betrayal we still come to you and try to win you for the United Front, which you oppose. It is the irony of history that you are being whipped to advance, whether you like it or not, although you have betrayed us in the past, you will have to come along with us once more and serve our cause.

We, therefore, say not only from the standpoint of Soviet Russia, but also of the Communist International: You need have no anxiety. We do not stake on the ephemeral policy of this or that clique, but on the great historical stream which is bound to bring together the toiling masses of Western Europe with the awakening peoples of the East in the fight against world capitalism.

Comrades, I will now say a few words about the reports we heard here about the conditions of our parties and their activities in the East.

I will start with my usual warning: Comrades, do not indulge in too rosy expectations, do not over estimate your strength. When our Chinese comrade told us here: "We have struck deep roots in China," I must tell him: "Exercised comrade, it is a good thing to feel confident of one's strength when one starts to work." Nevertheless, things have to be seen as they are. Our Chinese party has developed in two parts of China in relative independence from one another. The comrades working at Canton and Shanghai have failed to associate themselves with the working masses. For a whole year
we have been arguing with them, because many of them said: How can a good communist waste his time on such trivial things as strikes. Many of our comrades out there locked themselves up in their studies and studied Marx and Lenin as they had once studied Confucius.

In the first instance, it is the duty of the Chinese comrades to take into consideration all the possibilities of the Chinese movement. You must understand, comrades, that neither the question of Socialism, nor the Soviet Republic are now on order of the day. Outside of our ultimate aim, for which you must stand up with all the fervour of your communist faith, the immediate task is the uniting of the forces which are beginning to come to the fore within the working class, for two special aims:

1. To organise the young working class, and
2. To regulate its relations with the revolutionary bourgeois elements, in order to organise the struggle against European and Asiatic Imperialism.

We are only beginning to understand these tasks. Therefore, we must recognise the necessity of adopting a practical programme of action, by means of which we shall gain in strength. The Communist International orders the Western communist parties to go into the masses, and the first thing we must tell you is: Get out of the Confucian study room of communism, and go to the masses and coolies, and also to the peasant masses, which are in a state of ferment, caused by present day events.

Now as to Japan and India. In both these countries the grouping of the forces is very similar. In Japan, as well as in India, there is already a strong working class. In both countries there is a great social crisis, and struggles for power between the various sections of the bourgeoisie and of the nobility, and, nevertheless, we have not yet a communist movement in these countries. This is a fact. You have only to study the manifestoes which Comrade Katayama published recently in the "Communist International" about the situation in Japan. They are very interesting, for you will find in these manifestoes, which were legally published by various groups of workers, a whole rainbow of shades, from Tolstoyanism through syndicalism and communism to the simplest social reform. And I must admit that in this concert of voices, the voice of communism is still the weakest.

Why? Hitherto we did not know how to take advantage of the mood of the workers (who were going through similar experiences as the British Chartists) in order to prepare them for the tasks with which they are now faced. These tasks consist in the organisation of the working class as a power which could intervene in the class struggle in Japan, in order to establish, first of all, a democracy. I am of the opinion that the development in Japan will not be a mere repetition of the development of Great Britain.
A hundred years have passed, and it is self-evident that the tempo of the development in Japan will be more rapid. History is being concentrated, and even in this bourgeois revolution, now brewing in Japan, we shall probably have soviets established, not as organs of power, but as organs which will unite the working class. But now we must establish trade unions, and a Communist Party, and adopt a program clearly defining the immediate tasks of the working class. The immediate task before us is—to lead the working class into the struggle as an organised body.

In India we have already an ideological centre; I must say that Comrade Roy has succeeded in achieving a big piece of work during the last year in the Marxist interpretation of Indian conditions given in his admirable book, and also in his organ. In no other Eastern communist party has this kind of work been done. It certainly deserves to be supported by the Communist International. However, it must be admitted that as yet we have not done much in connection with the great trade union movement in India and the large number of strikes which convulsed the country. We have not yet understood to make use of the rights which our British overlords are compelled to concede to us. The reception accorded there to Comrade Roy shows that there are some legal opportunities there. But we have not even taken the first steps as a practical workers' party. And all this means that: "It is a long way to Tipperary."

Comrades, I trust that we will succeed at this Congress to put the work which our Eastern section has done, with your assistance, on a practical basis, and that we will then be able at the next Congress to put before you practical organisational achievements. When this will have been achieved, the International will not only recognise the great importance of the Eastern question, but will also have the conviction that you are doing the work which is commensurate with the enormous importance of this question.

FAMINE RELIEF.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.  
Speaker: Comrade Münzeberg.

Comrade Münzeberg reported on the famine and economic relief. The famine, he said, affected 40 million people, 3 million of whom died. The famine was not liquidated by the relief from abroad, but almost entirely by Soviet Russia itself. The relief from the entire world amounted only to 33 million pounds of food stuffs, while Soviet Russia alone provided 156 million pounds, viz., 6 times as much as the whole world. The famine relief produced a remarkable solidarity in the working class ranks, which gave remarkable evidence of self-sacrifice. This resulted as follows:—

1. The reactionary governments were obliged to change their attitude towards Soviet Russia,
2. The Amsterdam International, under the pressure of the working masses, supported Soviet Russia politically and economically.

The Amsterdam International assumed an anti-Soviet Russia attitude as soon as the pressure of the masses waned. At the same time the efforts of the International Relief also relaxed. The Social Democratic Parties made use of famine for a savage campaign against Soviet Russia. The Communist Press has not done its full duty in connection with this campaign. The agrarian relief was made use of for counter-revolutionary propaganda. Likewise the relief of the Amsterdammers. The Amsterdam representative travelled for weeks throughout Russia in order to collect expressions of political sympathy from the starving people, although the sum collected by the Amsterdammers for famine relief amounted only to 1,400,000 Dutch guilders, while the Dutch Communist Famine Relief Committee collected 300,000 guilder in Holland alone. The difference in the collections was as striking in Switzerland. The Communist Workers' Relief collected by itself 25,000,000 dollars. The workers committee combined famine relief with reconstruction. This constituted the great difference between this committee and other relief committees.

At present the famine relief is liquidated, and we must only fight against the consequences of the famine. In America 20,000 people (and in Europe as many) have been enlisted for further help. It is quite out of the question that political support for Soviet Russia can be replaced by economic relief. Economic assistance can never be of very great importance. The speaker was decidedly against mass immigration in Russia. He said that no more collections will be made for economic relief. He hoped, however, that they would succeed in raising as soon as possible 40 million gold roubles for the reconstruction of Soviet Russia by means of loans. The undertaking of the workers' relief gave at times employment to 30,000 workers. There was no doubt whatever that the dollar loan will be over-subscribed before next spring.

TRADES UNION QUESTION

SESSIONS HELD, November 28-21, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speakers: Comrades Lozovsky, Clark, Lansing, Kucher, Heckert, Sturm, Taska, Lauriden, Palk, Garden, Rosner, Lozovsky.

Lozovsky (Profiintern): The Profintern, which is fighting against the destruction of the Trade Union movement, opposes equally any movement which would liquidate its organisations. We must realise that the capitalist offensive and
the policy of the Trade Union reformists, have resulted in a
great diminution of Trade Union membership. The Amster-
damers courageously defended the interests of the bourgeois,
but they lost courage when it came to fighting for the interests
of the proletariat, and the more cowardly they are before the
bourgeoisie, the more courageously they attack the Left. Events
in France, in Czecho-Slovakia and in Spain prove that the
Amsterdamers are trying to split the Trade Unions. For in-
stance, the correspondence of the A.D.G.B. (General German
Trade Union Federation) shouts that the enemy stands left and
deduces therefrom the "necessity of a clean-up in our ranks."
The Miners' Union in Germany prefers to co-operate with the
Catholic and Polish-national federations than with the "Union
of Hand and Brain Workers."

The Russian Trade Union Federations have been excluded
and expelled from the International Unions of their industries
because of their membership in the Profintern. The anarchist-
syndicalists who in France, Italy, Spain, Holland and America
have opposed the Profintern and set against it their slogan of
Trade Union independence, who demand the strict separation
of party and Trade Union and are attempting to create a new
Trade Union International, unite everywhere with the reformists.
Anarchism is a petty bourgeois ideal. The anarchists are
nothing but a small group of political vegetarians. Their
political ideals are best represented by the bandit leader Machno.
The anarchists and the syndicalists do not recognise the role
of a revolutionary party. Many of them, however, recognise the
necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We are ready to
form the United Front with these elements in spite of our
theoretical differences.

The relations between the Trade Unions and the Communist
Parties must naturally be fitted to the different conditions of
the individual countries. The policy of the German Party, for
instance, must differ from that of Belgium, America or England.

Consider Britain, for instance. Here we have a country with
a gigantic trade union movement, old anti-political and anti-
socialist traditions, and with a very small Communist Party.
As far as Britain is concerned, to speak of relationships between
the Party and the trade unions, in the full sense of the word,
is almost meaningless. The trade unions are hostile to the
Party. In such a land we must speak not of relationships be-
tween the Party and the trade unions in general, but of relation-
ships between the Party and that part of the revolutionary
unions, which is growing upon the soil of the developing class
war. In this respect in each country the practical problem is a
different one. As far as Britain is concerned, we see clearly
that it would be disastrous if the Party were content to organise
its forces only within its little Party nuclei. The aim here must
be to create a more numerous opposition trade union movement.
Our aim must be that our Communist groups should act as a
point of crystallisation round which the opposition elements will
concentrate. The aim must be to create, to marshal, to integrate the opposition forces, and the Communist Party will itself grow concurrently with the growth of the opposition. There must be established a relationship between the Party organisation and the opposition, which by its very nature is heterogenous—in such a manner that the Communists could not be charged with striving to mechanically dominate the entire opposition movement. This goal—i.e., the goal of winning the working masses for Communism—we must work for under these circumstances with the utmost care, definiteness and staying power.

The French Communist Party and the French Trade Unions may settle their relations according to their relation of forces. But the members of the French Party must remain Communists in the Trade Union also. In France, we have the situation that the Trade Unions form nuclei in the Party, instead of the Party in the Trade Unions: This is an absurd situation which must be changed. We must organise party nuclei, not only in the French and Italian General Federations of Labour, but in the Fascisti Trade Unions also.

The Communists have fought against splitting in the Unions where expulsions have already taken place; they must do more, they must demand the reunion of split Trade Unions. Those workers who have been expelled from the Trade Unions must be speedily reorganised under the slogan of reunion of the old organisation. However, if Amsterdam continues to expel the Red Trade Unions from the International Industrial Unions, we will be compelled to organise Red Revolutionary Industrial Federations. We oppose not only splitting in the Trade Unions but the voluntary exit of Communists from the Trade Unions.

The Party press must pay the greatest attention to the problems of the Trade Union movement. The adhesion to the Proletariat is possible and advisable only when the majority may be won over to our organisation. Where this is not the case we must insist on a longer stay in the old Federations. The Comintern is only a union of Communists; but the Proletariat should include every revolutionary worker who is willing to fight against capitalism and reformism. This is why the liquidation of the Proletariat would be a crime. Amsterdam is the last stronghold of capitalism. We must win over those workers who to-day still adhere to the Amsterdam International. This can be accomplished, not by splits from the Trade Unions, but by the penetration of our ideas into the working masses.

Clark (England): Comrades, in speaking on behalf of the British Delegation, I have to say that, as far as the general theses that have been presented here are concerned, we are in complete agreement. But I want to say a few words with regard to the Amsterdam leaders and the British Trade Union movement. There seems to be a great misunderstanding regarding the position that the British Trade Union movement occupies in relation to the Amsterdam International,
but, it must be understood that the whole of the British Trade
Union movement is organised into one British Trade Union
Congress, and, by virtue of being members of the Trade Union
Congress, each and all of us organised in the Trade Union
movement are affiliated to Amsterdam.

I should like also to say a word as regards the Shop-
Steward movement and the Workers’ Councils in Britain. Some
30 years ago in the British Trade Union movement we organised
a Shop-Steward movement, and following this period of organi-
sation we found that, when the war broke out and the officials
of our trade unions refused to allow the machinery of those
unions to operate, we had to call into being our Shop Stewards
and our Workshop Committees.

There has been a great deal of criticism at this Congress
of the inactivity of the Shop-Steward movement in Britain at
the present time, but, comrades, let me tell you that this is
a result of the fact that over 35 per cent. of those who are
normally employed in the great engineering and shipbuilding
industries are now unemployed. It is impossible to have a
Workers’ Committee when so many members of the working
class who understand the meaning and the functions of the
Workers’ Committees are unemployed. But, comrades, we are
reorganising our forces. We are endeavouring to get them
together not only inside the workshops, but, for the first time
in the history of the British Trade Union movement, we are
taking our revolutionary propaganda into the unions.

The observation has been passed here that, although there
has been a great trade union movement in Britain, we as a
Communist Party are few, and that we have practically no
control within the unions. That is quite true, but there are
many things that could be said in explanation of it. But by the
activity of the Communist Party after having decided within the
last twelve months, or since the last Congress of the Red Trade
Union International, to enter the fight and permeate the whole
trade union movement, we have within our ranks 140 branches
in the industrial belt of Scotland of the various trade unions
that have affiliated. We have almost 200 of the branches of the
different unions in the London area affiliated to us. In every
industrial belt and coal field the forces of the Red Trade Union
movement are being slowly organised and they are gaining a
power they have never hitherto obtained in the proletarian move-
ment.

Lansing (America): Comrades, after Comrade Lozovsky
has dealt with the labour union question in such a
thorough manner, there are only a few points regarding the
tasks of the Communists in the trade unions in America, that
I want to touch upon. In America, as you perhaps know, despite
the highly developed state of capitalism and the militant tradi-
tions of the workers, we have a very reactionary, a very backward
labour movement. The leadership of these unions has remained

in practically uncontested control for years. Despite their reactionary character these unions have not been spared the capitalist offensive in the United States. They became the centre of violent attack with the avowed object of their complete destruction. They have suffered both in loss of membership and deterioration of conditions. The organised labour movement has now dwindled to less than four million organised workers out of a total of 110,000,000 population, of whom at least 30,000,000 are wage earners.

The unions suffered defeat upon defeat. In the spring of this year a marked change took place; then the workers actually began to resist the capitalist offensive, and even forced the reactionary leaders to come out in open resistance.

Much has been demonstrated in the last strikes of miners and railroad men. These struggles furnish extremely valuable lessons for the American Communist Party. The strikes demonstrated very clearly that the masses of workers possessed the will to fight and that their tremendous latent energies can be utilised if given proper leadership.

The injunction which was issued against the railroad workers, actually prohibiting participation in any kind of strike activity, has tended a great deal to show the workers their class position in society. Many labour unions and central bodies demanded a general strike, which would mean a strike against the Government. But this was rejected by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L.

These rapidly developing objective conditions furnish the basis and possibilities for the creation of a broad left wing movement.

As a matter of fact, the left wing movement is now established in the United States and is making its influence felt throughout the unions. Of course you can readily understand that in America we have had to adopt slogans of the most elementary nature. These slogans of unification of labour's forces based on better forms of organization and better methods of struggle have been endorsed to-day by eleven State federations assembled in convention, and by two international unions, by thousands of local unions and many central labour bodies. The ideological struggle against Gompers and his reactionary policies is thus developing rapidly.

In making such survey we find that in America the struggle of the Communists against the bureaucrats is in its first stage of development and the methods of expulsion for revolutionary activities have not as yet been adopted as a definite policy. Therefore when Communists or militants are expelled for such activities, they should refuse to recognise the validity of these expulsions. They should call upon the militants within the unions to remain there and to carry on the struggle for their reinstatement, and in that fight utilise all the means afforded by the constitution of the union.
In some European countries the independent revolutionary unions have become a solution in the struggle against expulsion. In America they are yet a problem.

We have a number of independent unions more or less revolutionary. It is one of the most vital problems for the American Communist Party to find a satisfactory combination of all revolutionary forces and make the most effective use of the militants who are now in the independent unions and in organisations where larger masses can be reached. At the first Congress of the Proletarian a programme was outlined which has been adopted by our party—a programme of unification of labour forces to the end that there be only one united union within each industry. This is the programme we now have to carry out in actual practice.

Garden (Australia) Comrades, speaking on behalf of the Australian delegation, I may say that we affirm the theses as given by Comrade Lozovsky. Although the Australian Communist Party is a small party, I believe it has found the keynote to organisation so far as the Anglo-Saxon movement is concerned. The Communist Party in Australia has a membership of nearly one thousand, and yet it is able to direct just close on 400,000 workers—that is, including 237,000 in the State of New South Wales—all organised workers—and 110,000 organised workers in Brisbane, Queensland.

The Communist Party is based in Australia on the nucleus system. Every union has its nucleus from 20 down to 2. Every nucleus leader must meet once a week with other nucleus leaders from the unions and discuss the problems of their organisations and the problems of the working class of Australia.

The Communist Party, along with the leaders of the nuclei, formulate the policy. On every burning question that affects the working class you will find that the nuclei leaders are the first in the field to give direction to the working class how to meet the situation.

The Labour Council of New South Wales constitutes 120 unions. Yet the Communist Party has full control of the Executive. Out of the 12 members of the Executive eleven are members of the Communist Party and they direct these 120 unions and the policy of each union.

We have the same basis of organisation in the Labour Party of Australia as in the English Labour Party—that is, the party is based on the Trade Union Movement; and we have the same difficulties confronting us as the English Party has. When we quarrelled with the Australian Labour Party in 1919, when we were beaten by six votes at the conference, we isolated ourselves, took no part in politics whatsoever, and directed all our energies to the industrial field. Everybody set out for the organisation of the workers, to break down craft barriers and make one union in every industry. The moment we decided to make political activity there was the
A.S.P., S.L.P., and the Breakaway section of the Labour Party to contend with. The A.S.P. called a conference of all militant workers of New South Wales to come together to form a Communist Party. The trade union movement decided to be represented and sent delegates.

In June, 1921, the Labour Party put out a signal of distress. They called upon the workers to give all their aid, and we decided that we would attend this conference called by the Labour Party. In Melbourne in June, 1921, the largest conference that has ever been held in Australia assembled and there were present delegates representing 700,000 workers. What did we find? We found that we were able to change the policy of the Labour Party. The Labour Party believed in the maintenance of a White Australia, believed in nationalisation. We changed the objective from nationalisation to socialisation of industry by revolutionary political and industrial action. But the Labour Party was not satisfied—they went aside from the conference and called a conference of their own in October, 1921. They deleted the words "by revolutionary political and industrial action" and inserted the words "by constitutional means." Another congress was held in June of this year, and the Trade Union movement, along with the Communist Party, said to the Labour Party that they would only endorse the policy of the June Conference of 1921. The 1922 Conference endorsed the policy of June, 1921, and went further—they instructed the Labour Party to throw open their doors for the affiliation of the Communist Party with freedom for the Communist Party for propaganda and organisation.

Again, when the capitalist attacks against the workers were launched, we got all the workers together and, instead of allowing one section to go down one after another, we said, "The working class of Australia must stand solid, speak with one voice and act together." We decided on these lines. The employers appealed to the Government. A conference was decided upon. Some of the Unions objected. We authorised delegates to go to the conference, and our of eighteen delegates from Australia the workers' side found nine Communists from different parts of Australia. And what were the results of that conference? The employers left the conference. They said that all that we were doing there was enunciating the doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky. We were nothing more than in the pay of Russia and that we were not there for the good or the benefit of the working class of Australia. We came back with the propaganda message to the masses. The masses rallied round our banner, and Australia is the first country in the world that was able to withstand the offensive, and able to say, "No longer will you reduce our wages, no longer will you tamper with our hours, no more will you lengthen our hours. We will shorten our hours instead of lengthening them." It was the only country in the world which resisted the capitalist offensive, because the masses rallied round the slogan "Hands off wages.
and hours." And the whole policy was directed by the Communist Party in Australia—small in numbers but strong in power and influence.

The result of this militant activity has been the linking up of the union forces into one big union which is breaking down all craft barriers. We believe that if the Anglo-Saxon countries—England, America, Ireland, etc.—develop the same lines of policy that we have developed, it will be found that the Anglo-Saxon Communists will have the power to direct the future policy of the masses in those countries.

Reamer (France) stated that the Lozovsky resolution pointed out the proper way for regulating the relations between the C.G.T.U. and the French Party. The C.G.T.U. has greater influence on the masses than the Party. There are still theoretical differences between the Party and the C.G.T.U., but this agreement is the first step on the way of recuperating the French Party.

Comrade Kucher (America): Comrades, I am not here to tell you any long story but present a few facts as briefly as possible. As a matter of fact, I requested the privilege of speaking only because the speaker who claimed to represent the American labour movement absolutely misrepresented the situation and distorted the facts, whether through lack of understanding or deliberate intent, I leave it to your judgment.

I would like to have it understood that I am not here as an opposition force from America, but as the representative of a distinct movement—the Independent Unions—and on behalf of the United Labour Council of America, I am here rather to protest against the opposition of the propaganda group who have come here claiming to speak for all American labour.

The Independent Unions, who are industrial unions in structure and activity, are being accused of being the cause of weak trade union movement in America because the militants are within them. You are informed "dual unionism" is the root evil—even if that were so, the unions now known as Independents are not the cause of this, in so far as they are in no way "dualist."

In their origin they are partly the results of countless expulsions for many years of militant individuals and minority groups who, unable to get back to the Federation Unions, were forced to combine and form themselves into organisations.

In order to unite and combine the activity of all these groups it was necessary to form the United Labour Council. The existing Independent Unions have never followed the policy of "splitting" or inducing minorities to withdraw from the so-called "general movement." To say, in the face of these facts, that the United Labour Council of America can only expand at the expense of federation unions, proves the lack of knowledge of these self-appointed spokesmen from America.
We are in accord with the programme as laid down by the R.I.L.U. and protest against certain elements in America distorting the intent of the programme to serve their own ends.

I wish to state that, as far as the Independents are concerned, we applied for admission to the Red Trade Union International when it was formed.

Another point that should be emphasised is this: It has been mentioned by a previous American speaker that the independent unions should disband, liquidate, and go into the American Federation of Labour. The slogan they use is "Go to the masses." But we do not find the masses in the American Federation of Labour. The previous speaker on the American question stated that there were 30,000,000 eligible workers. Yet at no time have there been more than 4,500,000 workers in the American Federation of Labour, and to-day you will hardly find much above 2,000,000 workers, if that. The masses will not join the Federation. They are opposed to the Federation. Any thought of reforming the Federation is futile.

The Independent Unions must be given sole responsibility for the activity amongst the Independent unions and amongst the unorganised workers. With such an alignment, the Trade Union Educational League proving itself by activity within the Federation, and the Independents prompted and backed in their activity amongst the Independent and unorganised workers carrying on activity in their respective groups, ultimate unity becomes a possibility.

That is our viewpoint, and we think that the entire problem should receive a thorough consideration, especially in the face of the development in other countries where the splitting of the movement is taking place, and it is a problem that we will have to face in America just as well as in Europe.

Heckert (Germany) said that the Union of Mental and Manual Workers at first opposed the formation of Communist fractions in their organisations. But the recent agreement forms a favourable basis for the co-operation of Communists with the Union. The French Communist Party had neglected to form Communist fractions in the trade unions when the time was ripe for it. We see now that this was a great mistake. The Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia is on the way to making the same mistake. The speaker advocated the formation of Communist fractions in every trade union. The Congress must forbid inter-union squabbles among the revolutionary trade union organisations.

Herter Sturm (Germany) declared that the capitalist offensive affected the women workers most of all. They were the first to suffer from the reduction of wages, the prolongation of working hours. The Communist movement has not yet reached the working women. Only about 10 per cent. of the membership of the Communist Party are working women,
in spite of the fact that it is easier to win over and organise them than the men.

Taska (Italy), speaking in the name of the Italian Delegation, declared that they were in agreement with the resolution of Comrade Lozovsky on the activity of the Communists in the trade unions. The speaker expressed the idea that the Communists should enter Fascist Trade Unions in order to destroy them from within. He protested, however, against Article 20 of the Lozovsky resolution dealing with the relations between trade unions and the Communist Party in France. We should not withhold from the French Communists the right to influence the trade unions. A Communist must remain a Communist in the trade union also. Every compromise in this respect is very dangerous.

Lauridan (France) criticised the attitude, policy, and activity of the French Communist Party. The French Communist Party, he said, had forgotten its best traditions. Since the Congress of Tours, the Party had been totally unconcerned about what was going on in the trade unions. This indifference of the Party strengthened the anti-Communist elements in the working class movement. The attitude of the Party during strikes, at the time of the trial of the social-revolutionaries, and at the time of the Saint Etienne Congress, was below all criticism. The only real solution of the crisis in the French Party would be to unite the best elements of the C.P. and the real Communists in the C.G.T.U. (Unified General Federation of Labour).

Pavelik (Czecho-Slovakia) expressed the opinion that the Lozovsky resolutions were not sufficiently clear. The Amsterdamers are trying to split the Czecho-Slovakian unions, and in many cases they have already succeeded. The Congress must state clearly what the Communists should do in this matter. He defended the Czech Party against Comrade Heckert's accusations.

Wortchenik (Czecho-Slovakia) stated that the Red International of Labour Unions followed no clear-cut policy in the Czecho-Slovakian question. The refusal to pay dues into the trade union treasury was a poor measure. The Congress should realise that the split in the Czecho-Slovakian Trade Unions is unavoidable.

Lozovsky stated that he was able to announce the unity of the Congress on this question. There were differences of opinion on some minor organisational questions. Comrade Lauridan's speech was an expression of outraged Communist dignity. The French Party feigns its inferiority to the trade unions. The French Party had only good resolutions on the trade union question, but no policy.
Marcel Cachin interrupted the speaker, declaring that the Chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Party was Comrade Tommassi, an adherent of the left group.

In answer to the interruption, Comrade Lovovksy said: "It does not matter in the least if anyone belongs to the left or to the right group, for whoever does not do his duty must be eliminated"; and the whole party, and not this or that group, is responsible for the trade union policy. The French Party has many good traditions. All honour and homage is due to the memory of Comrade Jaurés. Nevertheless, his trade union policy was not a Communist but an opportunist policy. The French Party must retain its glorious traditions and must get rid of the bad traditions. In our opinion, the traditions of the highly industrial North are of more value than the traditions of the petty bourgeois South. The speaker defended paragraph 20 of his resolution, and stated that Comrade Taksos is wrong in seeing the spectre of opportunism. Disagreeing with the statements of the Czech delegates, he stated that the tactical line of the Red Trade Union International on the trade union question was perfectly clear and did not lend itself to various interpretations. However, the Czech Party was afraid of the majority in the trade unions. The Red Trade Union International always wanted and still desired to prevent a split in the Czecho-Slovakian trade unions. If, however, this split does occur, the responsibility for it will rest with the reformists. The Communists must take into consideration that an error committed by a party in one country does harm to the interests of the other parties and to those of the entire International. We are a Communist International because we hold international interests to be of greater importance than the national interests of the separate parties.

**TURKISH QUESTION**

**SESSION 18, November 19, 1922.**

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speaker: Comrade Orhan (Turkey).

Orhan (Turkey): Comrades, you have read in the received. Over 300 Comrades have already been imprisoned. In Constantinople. In order that you may well understand the significance of this new turn in the policy of the Kemalists and of these recent persecutions in particular, I find it necessary to inform the Congress of the general activities of the Communist Party of Angora and of Constantinople as well as the policies of the Nationalist Government.

The Turkish Communist Party was formed at the time when the bourgeois Nationalist Government, initiated by the workers
and peasants, took a position detrimental to the vital interests of the toiling masses. The Turkish Communist Party therefore, at the time of its formation, found itself faced by two enemies—imperialism and bourgeois nationalism. The Party, considering that the struggle against imperialism, our greatest enemy, was of world-wide importance, decided to support the government so long as it fought imperialism, while demanding democratic reforms for workers and peasants and trying to organize them. These decisions were in conformity with the resolutions of the Second Congress concerning nationalist and colonial questions. The Party has not changed this policy from the time of its formation until the present. As proof of this, I might refer to the proclamation issued by the Party to the army, and to the workers and peasants, summoning them to the struggle for the final victory. In another Party proclamation addressed to the Greek army and working masses, the latter were invited to rise and to disorganize their army, which was fighting only for the Greek bourgeoisie and British imperialism.

Still another proclamation was issued by the Party calling upon the people of Constantinople to form a united front against reaction and imperialism, and not to allow the Sultan to escape but bring him before the supreme tribunal of the people.

The government of the Great National Assembly, born out of the struggle for independence and proclaiming that it is fully for the "National Pact" and against imperialism, has shown during the last three years by its conduct that its policy has been one of betrayal. The following facts are instructive in this respect:

(1) When their relations with the Soviet Government were just started, the representatives sent by the government to Moscow stated that there was a large Communist Party in Turkey, that this Party had a numerous following among the peasants, and that peasants' soviets were already functioning in several localities.

(2) In the first period of its existence, trying to deceive Soviet Russia, the government formed, under the name of the Green Army, a would-be Bolshevik Party consisting exclusively of bourgeois elements.

(3) After the arrival of the first soviet ambassador at Angora the government formed an official Communist Party composed of the remainder of the Green Army, high government officials, and intellectuals.

(4) The delegation sent by the government to the London Conference, to please the imperialist Powers, announced in all the European capitals through which it was passing on its way, that a score of Communists, among whom were our brave Comrades Soubhi and Ehden Nejat, had been slaughtered and that they were going to put an end to all the other imprisoned Comrades, so that the plague of Bolshevism would no more infest the country.
(5) The agreement with the French in 1921 proves that the government is betraying the East, and that it has given away the "National Pact."

(6) Finally, we have the recent persecution directed against the Communist Party, and the Turkish Labourers' Union, coinciding with the convocation of the Lausanne Conference.

As to its home policy, the activity of the Angora government consisted in checking all free activity on the part of all parties and groups favouring democratic reforms, in annihilating all opposition before it had time to crystallise, and in deceiving the people by solemn promises. This policy has found its concrete expression in the following facts:

1. The government strangled the "People's League," which had been formed within the great National Assembly and which advocated a programme of extensive reforms.

2. It rejected the electoral system of occupational representation proposed in the original draft of the constitution.

3. In order to stifle the opposition in the Great National Assembly, the government organised the "Group of Solidarity," and, in order to ensure its domination over the masses, it formed in all parts of Asia Minor groups, so-called Defence of Law and Order groups, composed exclusively of capitalists, landholders and speculators.

4. In spite of its promises, the government inaugurated no reforms for the benefit of the working masses. On the contrary, it prevented by every means the establishment of working class organisations, and it is crushing the peasants under an unendurable burden of taxation.

The slogans advanced by the Party found an echo among the masses of wage-workers and exploited masses, of whom the most enlightened are joining the Party. In spite of the campaigns of persecution which the government has launched against the Party, the workers and peasants supported it in ever greater numbers. Within a very short time the Party had gained important victories. During the period of its activity from March to October, 1922, it did good work of education and propaganda and advocated also the Red International of Labour Unions and the Young Communists. Because of its influence on the masses, the government felt it necessary to put an end to its activities.

I wish to say a few words on the working class movement in Constantinople, and on the influence of the Communist group in that city where the government has recently dissolved the Turkish Labourers' Union on the ground that it was conducting Communist propaganda. But, in spite of all these difficulties, in spite of the terror, the Communist Group of Constantinople, working illegally for two years, has attained great influence among the masses by forming nuclei within the factories, workshops, and everywhere where there are workers, by publishing legal and illegal pamphlets, magazines, manifestoes and leaflets,
and by distributing Communist publications which they receive regularly from other Communist organisations.

In summing up the new orientation of Kemalism, we may say that the imperialist bourgeoisie which at the London Conference was full of hatred against imperialism, anticipating now the possibility of getting its share in the exploitation of the toiling masses of Turkey, has changed its policy of relentless warfare into a policy of concessions and treason. Since the London Conference the nationalist bourgeoisie is no longer revolutionary.

At the opening session of the Congress, when Comrade Clara Zetkin condemned the execution of Communists in Italy, Poland, Roumania, Greece, Latvia, etc., we were already in receipt of the telegram which informed us of the barbarous repressions carried on by the government of Mustapha Kemal against the Communist Party of Turkey. We cannot describe these repressions otherwise than barbarous, because police officers armed with razors and iron nails tortured their prisoners.

The government of Mustapha Kemal, in carrying out wholesale arrests, has accused our imprisoned comrades of espionage on behalf of Soviet Russia, and consequently of high treason. The arrests are still going on, according to the latest news received. Over 200 comrades have already been imprisoned. In no other country was there so large a number of arrests made in time of peace. But notwithstanding the repressions and terrorism, the workers and peasants, having learned to distinguish their true friends from their enemies, have rallied to their Party with increased devotion. In proof of this we may mention the following new facts:

1) During the arrest of Communist workers at an Angora ammunition factory, the non-Communist workers demanded the reason for these arrests. On being told that our comrades were arrested for being Communists, they declared: "Since you arrest those who defend the interests of the proletariat, you arrest us too. Until now we were not Communists, but now we have become Communists too."

2) The proclamation of protest against this brutal act, calling upon workers to rally to the Communist Party, was supported by the majority of the workers present. A scuffle occurred, and the police had to work hard to restore order.

3) During the arrests among the peasant organisations the latter offered formidable resistance.

4) At Constantinople, in spite of the combined terror of foreign imperialism and the native bourgeoisie, the Communists remained at their posts.

Comrades, the Turkish delegation proposes to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International to send, on behalf of the world proletariat, an open letter to the toiling people of Turkey languishing under the dictatorship of imperialism and
the treacherous national government, and to the imprisoned comrades who in their dungeons courageously await the imminent breaking of the dawn.

"(Letter is reprinted in separate volume with the resolution and theses of the fourth Congress.)"

REPORT ON COMMUNIST ACTIVITY AMONG WOMEN

SESSION 24, November 27, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Speakers: Comrades Zetkin, Sturin, Smidovitsh, Kasparova.

 Clara Zetkin: Comrades, before I begin my report on the activities of the International Women's Secretariat and the development of Communist activity among the women, allow me a few short remarks. They may seem unnecessary, for they only repeat much that has been said and decided before; nevertheless, they are necessary because our work is still misunderstood not only by our opponents but even by our own comrades. They misunderstand the work of the Communist among the women and the tasks of the national sections and of the International in this connection. This is with some the remains of an old view, and with others it is wilful prejudice because they do not sympathise with our cause, and even partly oppose it.

The International Women's Secretariat is not as many believe, the union of independent organisations of the women's movements, but a branch of the Executive of the Comintern. It conducts the activity not only in constant co-operation with the Executive, but under its immediate leadership. What we usually designate as the Communist women's movement is not an independent women's movement and has nothing to do with any feminist tendencies. It exists for systematic Communist propaganda among the women. This has a double purpose: first, to incorporate within the national sections of the Comintern those women who are already filled with the Communist ideal, making them conscious co-workers in the activity of those sections; second, to win over to the Communist ideals the indifferent women and draw them into the struggles of the proletariat. The masses of working women should be mobilised for these fights. There is no work in the Party, no struggle of the movement in any country in which we women do not regard it as our first duty to participate. Moreover, we have the ambition to take our place in the Communist parties and the international where the work is hardest and the bullets fly thickest, without shunning the most menial, most modest every-day work.
One thing has become apparent: we require special organs to carry on the Communist work of organisation and education among women and to make it a part of the life of the Party. The Communist agitation among the women is not only a woman's task, it is a task of the whole Communist Party of every country, of the Communist International. To accomplish our purpose it is necessary to set up party organs as Women's Secretariats, Women's Departments, or whatever we may call them, to carry on this work.

During the last year we have had evidence of the good and bad sides of Communist work among the women. We have seen the good sides in those countries where the Communist sections of the International have created such separate bodies, as in Bulgaria and Germany, where the women's secretariats have carried on the work of organising and educating the women Communists, mobilised the working women, and led them into the social struggle. In those countries, the Communist women's movement has become one of the strong points of the general life of the Party.

In those countries we have many women members and militants in the Party and still larger masses of women as Comrades in arms outside the Party. This is also true for the country which for its importance should be mentioned first—Soviet Russia. In Soviet Russia the Women's Department of the Communist Party, acting with and under the leadership of the Party, have proved how important the co-operation of the women is, especially in this difficult period of economic and social transition to Communism. The problems and the tasks which the Communist Party and the proletariat of Russia has to face will be forced upon the Communist Parties and the proletariat of other countries which are still suffering under the capitalist rule. This is why the report of Comrade Smidovitch on the activity of the Women's Department of the Communist Party of Russia is especially important.

And now, Comrades, let me give you a few examples of the bad effect of the lack of special organs for work among women in Communist Parties. Whenever there are no women's secretariats or similar bodies, we have observed a falling-off in the participation of women in the life of the Communist Party and the withdrawal of the feminine proletariat from the struggle of their class. In Poland the Party has refused until now to set up special bodies for work among women. The Party was content to allow women to fight in its ranks, and participate in strikes and mass movements.

In England organisation for conducting systematic agitation among the feminine proletariat are altogether lacking. The Communist Party of England excused itself by its weakness and has continually refused or has postponed the setting up of a special body for systematic agitation among the women. All the efforts of the International Women's Secretariat have been in vain. No women's secretariat was established; the
I will give you a single example of this. We have in Czechoslovakia, for example, 30,000 women members, which makes 20 per cent. of the total membership; Germany, with 25,000 women members, has 11-12 per cent. of the total membership.

In the Norwegian Party there are 15,000-18,000 women members, forming 15 per cent. of the total membership. Contrary to this example there is a whole group of parties, including France, Italy, England and Belgium, which shows us quite different results. In France there are only 18,000 women members, making 2 per cent. of the total membership; in Italy there are from 3,500 to 4,000 members—a percentage of one and a half. In England the number of women members is not definitely ascertained, but it is undoubtedly very small. In Belgium about 300 women members form 6 per cent. of the whole Party.

I can make this even clearer by showing how the proportion of women members varies, not only from party to party, but also in various districts according to the amount of organisation and activity. For example, in the biggest sections in Berlin the women make 30 per cent. of the membership as against the national average of 10 per cent. On the other hand, in some districts where organisation is weak and party policies are not clearly defined, the percentage is below. Similarly, in Czechoslovakia, of the German-speaking district of Aussig, which has for long had a well-organised women's movement, the women formed 50 per cent. of the membership, as against the general average of 20 per cent., while in Czech and Slovakian districts there are many party sections with much less than that average.

It is evident that the more intensive the work of the Communist Party, the more firm and definite the stand of the Party or of any particular branch, the stronger is the influence of the Party on the women, and consequently the larger the number of women in the Party organisations.

What shall we conclude from these facts? And what lesson shall we draw from them to guide our future work?

The organisation of the women of the proletariat has not been considered by the Communist Parties as a task of first importance. On the contrary, one had to fight rather vigorously within the ranks of the party for its recognition.

Still another lesson is to be drawn from the way in which our women members are recruited. They are partly politically unschooled fighters. The great majority of them are not workers but housewives, the wives of our comrades, who have joined the Party less out of conviction than because they were persuaded to do so. By their very nature such elements are passive, they lack the experience and the training for any agitation, and first of all they are out of touch with the masses of the women workers of the factories and of the Trade Unions.

This makes it all the more necessary to make systematic use of those weak forces, to organise them in such rational
fashion as to obtain the greatest amount of work from the expenditure of energy. The women's committees of the Communist Party have been created for that very purpose. The first task of the International Women's Secretary since the time when its centre was removed to Berlin has been to increase the effectiveness of these organisations on an International scale. We can say that the preliminary conditions have been created to win over the large masses of the women workers. At least one thing has been accomplished; we have convinced our Comrades of the necessity of special women's organs. There is still a long way to the practical activity of these committees and here I must speak on certain points which Comrade Zetkin has already somewhat dwelt upon.

I wish to point out that in England, a country especially important for the International struggle of the proletariat, no central women's committee has been created by the Executive to conduct the work systematically for the whole country.

I wish to point out that in France to-day there are only 15 women's committees as against many hundred local organisations of the Party, and that the central women's secretariat in France has been jeopardised and actually dissolved by the crisis in the Party.

I wish further to point to Czechoslovakia, where the Party is strongly organised, and where, in spite of this, only one-seventh of the local groups have deemed it necessary to answer a questionnaire sent by the women's secretariat, that only one-tenth of the local organisations have women members, and that 47 in all, i.e., only 2 per cent., can boast of a women's committee.

It is no wonder then that when the work of organisation among the women is so much neglected in a strong Party like that of Czechoslovakia, that in the smaller Parties, like Austria, Holland and Denmark, their activity is confined to the capital of the country, to the seat of the Central Executive.

The coming period of intensified proletarian struggle over all Europe demands that the number of women's committees be increased to extend into the smallest local organisations.

What are the tasks of these committees? The most immediate, the most elementary task is that the few active Comrades should do all the necessary work; they must become maids of all work. They must carry on organisation and propaganda work throughout the whole country; they must speak, they must write, they must issue instructions for definite activity within all branches of political life. We cannot hope to accomplish the tremendous work before us with the few active comrades which we have. It must be another task of these comrades to educate the inexperienced women in the Party and prepare them for definite tasks. For this purpose discussion evenings, courses, and circles for women must be organised, in order to prepare them for their work among the masses outside of the Party. It is a sign of strength in the English movement, or at least a positive beginning of the work, when our comrades
with true instinct begin their activity by creating the small Party schools for women comrades of which Comrade Zetkin spoke.

The third task, however, is the most important. The women's committee must see to it that agitation among the large masses of the women proletariat be included in the general work of the Party; that it does not remain a special task of a small handful of communist women. They must make all efforts that the agitation among the women becomes a branch of the whole movement, that it be carried on by all organisational and political means at the disposal of the Party, and be supported by the full authority of the Party and its various organs.

The most important task which we have to fulfil in order to get the women into general party work, is the work within the factories and unions. It was no accident, but the result of a definite plan of the International Women's Secretariat that we proceeded as soon as the resolutions on the women's movement had been adopted in the International, to organise immediately, common action of the Women's International with the Trade Union Section, which were entrusted by the Party with the work of agitation and education in the factories and Trade Unions.

It is no accident that Bulgaria, which possesses the model party of the International—of course, relatively, as Comrade Zinoviev has said—is that country where the organisation of the working women in the labour unions and the factories has been farthest extended. In Bulgaria there are special organs in the Party and in the Trade Unions which are completely controlled by the Party; the co-ordination between the Party and Trade Union Committees is definitely defined by rules and statutes; and the greatest care is taken of the special conditions and needs of the working women and the task the Communist Party is to accomplish for the mobilisation of women in the unions and factories.

In the illegal parties the work within the Trade Unions is of special importance. In Finland, Rumania, and Spain, where the Party is not able to function openly and obtain contact with the working women, the Trade Unions are practically the only field through which they may influence the women workers from the Communist standpoint.

The Czech women comrades on the Executive have quite rightly requested the International Women's Secretariat and the Red International of Labour Unions that the R.I.L.U. sees to it that the demands of the working women be more seriously taken up by the unions affiliated with it, among which, for example, the agricultural workers alone have 30,000 women members.

Comrades, the necessity of mobilising the working women for the struggle forces us to organise the work among the unions systematically. This means that the Communists must absolutely take active part in the most important portion of the general
party work. So long as the construction of Communist frations is not accomplished as the foundation of our work within the labour unions and factories, the Communist women, with all their special plans and proposals for the revolutionary education of the working women in the factories and unions, are merely beating the air. Just a word on the question of the consumers’ co-operatives. The co-operatives differ from the trade unions inasmuch as their members consist not only of working women but of great masses of proletarian housewives. Here we have a field for work which contains large numbers of women whom we could not reach through our work in the factories and unions.

A second factor causes us to undertake work within the co-operatives at the present time. This is the daily increase in the cost of living and the general suffering which may be found in nearly all countries. The co-operatives are one of the means by which, working together with the proletarian political parties and the unions, the struggle will be made against the deterioration of the standard of living of the working masses.

The work of education, among the women members of the co-operatives, will build up a revolutionary consciousness which will strengthen the United Front of the proletariat among the women of the working class who are not yet engaged in the productive processes.

Comrades, a few words on the question of the press. The press is one of the most important means to win over the unorganised masses and influence them in the Communist sense.

We must increase the importance of the women’s movement so that we secure in the general section of the Party press and in every other organ of the Party, in the Trade Union magazines, in the scientific publications, in the agrarian publications, etc. The women’s movement will not attain its due importance until it receives the full support of the Party, until all the problems of the women are thoroughly discussed in the Party organs and the importance of agitation among women has been recognised.

In conclusion, I would say that the prospects for the women’s movement are very favourable.

At the preceding congress, everything still remained to be done in the Communist women’s movement. To-day, the foundations have been laid for agitation among women, and at the next World Congress we must be able to declare that the work among women has become an integral part of the general Party work, that we have been able to mobilise the women and lead them into the revolutionary movement to fight in a United Front for the final victory of the proletariat.

Smidovitch (Russia): In Russia the propaganda and agitation among the women workers are conducted by special departments under the auspices of the Communist Party, which use special methods in their work owing to the backwardness of the female masses. These departments work on equal terms with all the other departments of the party committees.
The methods of the working women's sections consist in directing the activity of the working women in the accomplishment of the practical tasks embodying the aspirations and demands of the working class. This method of attracting the working women in practical activity has greatly contributed towards increasing the influence of the Communist Party among the masses of the working and peasant women. In each Communist nucleus there is a Comrade whose duty it is to carry on political agitation among the working women, who is, in fact, the organiser of these women. The women workers of every workshop have elections of delegates at their general meetings two or three times a year. These delegates are subsequently convened to delegates' meetings by the women's section of the Party Executive. There are 70,000 such delegates throughout Russia. These delegates' meetings are in the nature of practical and political schools. At these meetings reports are presented on all political economic questions, and it is here that the women are encouraged in their first attempts at social activity. The delegates are sent on practical work in various commissions and organs of Soviet construction.

At the Soviet elections it became evident that the women delegates were very active, that they were taking part in the elections, that they vote for Communist candidates and that a considerable number of them were becoming members of the R.C.P.

The Russian Communist Party has 29,773 working women in its ranks. The number is not very considerable, but one must take into consideration the fact that the Russian Communist Party demands regular party activity from all its members.

The number of working women in the trade unions is growing from year to year, and we have at present about a million and a half women trade union members.

A considerable number of working women are members of workshop committees and of Administrative Councils of Trade Unions. The Central Trade Unions. The Central Trade Union Committees have also some women members. The new economic policy imposes upon us the task of preventing the women workers becoming scattered owing to unemployment caused by the reduction of industrial activity. The working women's sections displayed much energy on this field. It is owing to their initiative that arrears, i.e., women's co-operatives were formed for the benefit of the unemployed women. By this means thousands of working women have remained under the influence of the party.

In the present conditions of the new economic policy, when the Soviet State is temporarily being deprived of the means to come to the assistance of the mothers, it is precisely in the field of co-operation that the activity of the working women can find its expression. In Petrograd, 24,000 working mothers are organised within the co-operative society, "The Mother and Child," which is part of the network of the Petrograd Consumers' co-operatives. This co-operative society provides the
necessaries of life at reasonable prices, and proposes to establish homes for infants.

Such co-operatives exist also in some of the towns and countries of the Pekov Province, and also in one of the communes. Since the International "Women's Day" in 1922, the working women's sections were given the right to send working women as apprentices to the co-operative sections. A certain number of these working women are already in the co-operative societies. In many instances the working and peasant women are members of the administrative councils in the workshop and village co-operatives.

Moreover, a considerable number of working women are attending courses on co-operation. We consider our work on the co-operative field as a means of bringing together the urban and the rural workers, and to bring them under the Party's sphere of influence. Therefore, we convene our peasant women conferences by village or by county, and do house to house canvassing, getting the more advanced among these women to attend lecture courses and agricultural colleges.

The working women's sections do their utmost to attract the working and peasant women into the schools for adults. Preparatory courses are organised for them. There are 5,699 working women at the working women's faculty (Rabfak), and a considerable number are sent to the Communist Universities, where they receive their education. The Central Committee of the Communist Party publishes two periodicals for women: one for the peasant women and the other for the working women. There are also several provincial magazines and about 80 working women's papers. These publications have several hundreds of working and peasant women correspondents.

At present there is not a single field of Soviet construction on which the Russian working women do not display their remarkable capacities and activity. Neither is there a front at which the working and peasant women did not prove themselves excellent comrades. Thousands of working women fell in our struggle, whose names have remained unknown to history.

The thoroughly awakened working women are animated by an entirely Communist spirit, and the energy which they have displayed in Communist and Soviet construction knows no bounds.

Being convinced of the importance of this work, I call upon all Communist Parties to pay the greatest attention to the agitation and propaganda among the working women. Their participation in the united proletarian front is indispensable for its success in the final victorious struggle.

Kasparova (Russia): Comrades, in the great struggle for the proletarian revolution, the Communist International has always devoted particular attention to the national-revolutionary movement against imperialism, which in recent years has drawn into it the masses of working men and women, and
men and women of the peasant class in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East. Inasmuch as the Third International supported this movement, inasmuch as it protected the interests of the large masses of workers in the East, it could not fail to take part in the women's revolutionary movement in those countries for, as Karl Marx has already pointed out, no social revolution is possible without the aid of the women.

But since the Second World Congress of the Communist International laid down the guiding principles of the colonial-national question for the period of the struggle between imperialism and the proletarian dictatorship, the following events have taken place in the East:

(1) The development of the struggle against imperialism in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries, such as Korea, British India, Dutch East Indies, Egypt, and Syria, China and Persia, with the extension of the independence of Turkey.

(2) The beginning of a proletarian class movement in nearly all the countries of the East, starting in the capitalist country of Japan, and the simultaneous formation of Communist Parties in nearly all these countries.

At the same time we observe an ever-increasing participation of the women in the movement, who have been languishing under the oppression of slavery, particularly in those Eastern countries where the industries are beginning to develop. As far as Japan is concerned, the following figures may be taken as an illustration: 3,947,902 male workers and 3,225,363 female workers, out of a population of 28,042,306 men and 27,918,146 women.

The working population of British India in 1911 was approximately 101,322,424 men and 47,339,682 women, out of a total population of 329,000,000. Out of that number there were 11,000,000 men and 6,000,000 women engaged in industry. The weaving trade alone employed 1,764,133 women, the spinning trade 1,415,714, the food preparing industries 2,200,000, the women working on the land were 12,000,000, as against 13,000,000 men employed in the same industry.

In Egypt, as well as in Syria, the number of women employed in the cotton factories and in silk spinning, as well as in tobacco industries, has been continuously on the increase. Even in China, where there has been a weaker development of industries, there are already over 200,000 women in the factories. The ever growing participation of women in industrial pursuits has resulted in a correspondingly increasing participation of women in the general labour movement. This is shown by the strikes in Japan in 1918 and 1920, in the great weavers' strike in China in 1921.

In India, after the weavers' strike at Bombay and at Achmedabad in 1916, we had the strike of the Madura Factory at Madras in 1920 (700 working women), then the strike at the pottery works at Bombay in 1922. An All-Indian Union of
working women was organised at Bombay in 1922. Many more similar instances could be quoted.

At the same time, even in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East, which have as yet no big industries, as, for instance, in Persia and in Turkey, owing to the economic conditions of the post-war period, the women are becoming an ever more indispensable factor in industrial production. In all the Eastern countries where a strong national-revolutionary movement exists, as in Korea, India, Egypt and even in Turkey, the woman takes an active part.

In almost all these countries there are illegal or legal revolutionary women’s organisations, which are under the influence of the national bourgeoisie, although they embrace large masses of working women and peasant women. The economic condition of working women and peasant women is very bad in all the countries of the East. They form a cheap labour force for European and Japanese capitalists and a defenceless object of exploitation.

Thus the development of the women’s movement in the Eastern countries has furnished us with fruitful soil for Communist propaganda and agitation. Then experiences of Communist propaganda activities in the regions of Soviet Trans-Caucasia and Turkestan may be made use of in the other Eastern countries in a majority of cases, in so far as Mahomedan women are concerned. We draw the attention of the Communist Parties and groups of the Eastern countries, as well as of the Communist Parties of England, France and other colonising countries, to the extraordinary importance of the work among women during this revolutionary period. In this work the diverse objective conditions in every country are to be taken into consideration. Where there are already organised Communist Parties and a labour movement, as, for instance, in Japan and partly also in China and India, the Communist Parties may create special organs for work among the women. Where there is chiefly a national-revolutionary movement embracing large masses of working women, the Party should take advantage of this movement to get into closer contact with the masses, to emancipate them from the influence of the bourgeoisie and to lead them into the fight against alien imperialism and for the proletarian revolution under revolutionary and democratic slogans.

In the East, where it is the task of the Communist Parties to deepen and broaden the popular national-revolutionary fight by establishing close contact with the national liberation movement, the Communist women’s groups, by taking part in this struggle and attracting the other women’s organisations (cultural and educational associations as well as the suffragists) should make this the basis of their activity and train cadres of intellectual revolutionary women.

The United Front against imperialism, like the United Front of the workers, can be realised only by the attraction of the largest masses of women. (Prolonged cheers.)
THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SESSION 22, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.
Speaker: Comrade Schueller.

Schueller (Austria): Comrades, the Communist International has regarded the question of communist work among the masses of the working Youth and the situation of the Youth International as important enough to be placed on the agenda of this Congress.

I should like to deal with the following three points: (1) The development of the Young Communist International from the Second World Congress until to-day; (2) The present situation of the Youth and their struggle against the capital offensive and reaction; (3) The practical relations between the Communist Parties and the Communist Youth.

The Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International achieved a certain amount of renown among friends and enemies, which it has well merited. This Congress brought with it a radical transformation in the activity of the Communist Youth. You know, that during the war when the Social Democrats went over openly into the ranks of the reformists, the Communist Youth were the first to pick up the banner of the class struggle, the first to declare war against war and to struggle for the social revolution. You also know that the Youth were the first to renew International organisation and have become the enthusiastic supporters and defenders of the Russian revolution and the Third International. In that period a definite type of Socialist—we may just as well say Communist—Youth movement was created as the political vanguard of the proletariat. It was the time when Communist Parties either did not exist or were very weak, and when the Communist Youth assumed a leading political role in the working class movement.

The Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International opened a new era in the activity of the Youth. Communist Parties had been created, and the Communist International had become a strong International organisation. The leading political role of the Communist Youth was no longer necessary, and they had to surrender the political leadership to the Communist Parties. This first important point was decided at the Second World Congress of the Communist Youth International.

Politics were to remain the fundamental, practical basis of the activity of the Youth organisations, which were to remain the heart of the Communist Youth movement, but they could now devote themselves to their proper tasks, concerned...
directly with the Youth. The most important of these tasks are: (1) To defend the economic needs of the Youth; (2) To educate the Youth systematically in the Marxist doctrine; (3) To carry on anti-militarist propaganda among the young workers in and outside the bourgeois armies.

The third important result of the Second World Congress must be especially emphasised: The Communist Youth decided to enlarge its organisation. During the war and in the first years of the revolution, the Communist Youth was forced, just as the rest of the Communist movement, to organise into small narrow groups of a comparatively sectarian character. This was the motto of the Communist Youth: "First clarity, then majority." This means that the Communist Youth should consist only of a small number of chosen and tried elements. During the war and the year following, when Communist parties did not exist, this slogan was historically justified. But it had no more justification when the parties began to organise the masses. Their new slogan became: "To the masses!" To win them, to organise them, to become a mass organisation both in size and in leadership. This slogan of the Third Communist Congress, "To the masses!" was adopted by the Communist Youth, but not as a matter of temporary tactics, but as a basis for the Youth movement in general. We must keep in mind that the organisations of the Youth must be wider than those of the organisations of the Party. The Communist Party embraces within its ranks only members with a clearly defined Communist creed and a certain degree of Communist class consciousness. The Youth organisation must go to the large masses of the young workers, win the still indifferent elements, draw them into the class war, give them the first elements of Communist education in the class war, gradually train them to become class conscious workers.

Well, Comrades, let us see whether the development of the Communist Youth International since the Second World Congress justified the resolutions of that Congress. We must answer this question in the affirmative. In spite of all the difficulties we have met, we must acknowledge that the decisions of the Second World Congress were the correct ones and have brought us nearer to our true goal.

We must, however, admit that the political activity in the Y.C. Leagues of Central Europe has grown weaker, and that a decline of political interest is to be observed, not only among the masses, but also among the members of our organisation and even within our central committee. It is this fact which is troubling our comrades in the Communist Parties most. For instance, whenever one meets comrades who have come from Central Europe and has something to do with the Youth movement, they will invariably say: The young people do not trouble much about politics, they are only concerned with their education. Naturally, these comrades are very concerned about this state of things. To some extent, such statements
are exaggerated. This is due to the fact that the tasks of
the Y.C. Leagues in the present phase are not quite correctly
understood by many of our Party Comrades. How are we to
account for this? First of all, we must establish the general
facts. Our Y.C. Leagues are, of course, part of the working
class youth, and are, therefore, influenced by the moods and
conditions prevailing among the working class youth as a whole.
As has been already said, these moods and conditions and the
entire position of the working class youth have undergone a
change since 1921 which served to detract their interest from
political matters, and caused them to concentrate their attention
on the questions more immediately affecting the working class
youth, such as the economic, the educational and the social
questions. This is the foremost reason.

The Y.C. Leagues have made great strides on the economic
field. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that
the question of the economic struggle, viz., of the struggle for
the immediate needs of the working class youth, was a very
contentious question at the Second, as well as the Third Con-
gress of the C.I., and was the subject of lively discussion,
even after those congresses. This task was something new for
the masses of the Y.C. Leagues, excepting, of course, Russia,
Austria, and Germany. However, we are justified in saying
to-day that the necessity for the economic struggle through the
Y.C. Leagues, has not only been recognised by all our organisa-
tions, but that a beginning has already been made to put this
recognition to a practical use. To-day the economic question
and the economic struggle of the working class youth are every-
where the centre of the interest and the activity of our Y.C.
Leagues.

Comrades, I must deal now with our anti-militarist work.
This work has remained the same in the various Y.C. Leagues.
As before, this work was conducted with great enthusiasm, and
our young Comrades have their press and continue their anti-
militarist campaign. This work has exacted many sacrifices and
victims. It is only in Central Europe that we must admit a
lessening in the interest for the anti-militarist question, and a
decreased activity on this field. This is as grave a feature as the
slackening of the interest in politics in general, which we must
combat by the same methods.

A beginning has also been made on the field of education.
However, we soon saw that we could not do as much on this
field as on the economic and trade union field, because the
educational work demands forces which we ought to get from
the parties, but which were not forthcoming. Many improve-
ments were also made in the work of organisation. Let us take,
for instance, the Y.C. Leagues in France and Great Britain,
which, like the parties, had a federalist basis. In those countries
we were successful in establishing centralised collaboration within
the organisation. A division of labour was introduced, and we
were successful in achieving increased individual activity of
the members, as well as centralisation. We have also made progress on the international field. The collaboration between the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International and the Leagues is to-day as close as that between the Central Committee of a League and its districts and groups. The Young Communist International is justified in saying that in many questions it works better than many a Central Committee of a national section, especially in the matter of giving advice.

Nevertheless, we have not yet become mass organisations. By mass organisations we understand an organisation that has a mass membership and exercises constant influence over the masses of young workers, and leads them in their struggles.

I now come to the position of the young workers, and to the campaign led by the Young Communist International in this connection. You all know that the condition of the young workers, along with the condition of the adult workers, have not improved during the 16 months that have passed since the Third World Congress, but have rather become worse in the economic sense, under the pressure of reaction and the menace of war and militarism.

During the same period the campaign of the reaction against our Young Communist Movement has become more acute. We witness a systematic reactionary attack in all countries directed against the Young Communist Movement. For instance, we have to register persecutions of the Young Communist Movement in France, Poland, Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia. In France and in Czecho-Slovakia the Young Communist organisations were dissolved by the authorities on account of their anti-militarist propaganda, while the Party carries on its activities quite legally.

We thus see that the position of the young workers has grown worse everywhere, but we must emphasise another fact of importance, namely, that the young workers are used as a lever to bring down the standard of living of the adult workers. The wages of the young workers are the first to be reduced, thus paving the way for a reduction of the wages of the adult workers. Reports of this kind will be found in abundance in the young workers' journals.

There have also been cases where the young workers were left at work while the older workers were discharged. It means that the young workers were used as a means of increasing the unemployment among the adult workers. There has also been cases where young workers were pressed in the service as strike breakers against the adults and were made to serve as a weapon of capitalism against the adult workers. The reactionary trade unionist bureaucracy, the Amsterdam International, did not give a lead in this question, but rather sacrificed the interests of the young workers in all these matters. Whenever it is a question of fixing wages, conditions of labour, the right to strike, etc., we see the reactionary trade unionist bureaucracy everywhere taking passive attitude in regard to the young workers.
Instead of calling the working youth to the United Front with the adult workers, they carried out their manoeuvre of amalgamation. Now we stand before the amalgamation of the Second-and-a-Half Youth International and the Workers’ Youth International, i.e., before the final capitulation of the centralist Eunuchs of the Second International.

We have examples where the young workers have taken militant action in spite of the dictates of the social-democratic trade unions and the social-democratic youth organisations, and unfortunately also without our direct impulse. We have such an example in the English Engineers’ Strike. The trade unions forbade the apprentices to strike. The apprentices, mind you, in a place where there was and there is no youth movement, spontaneously met and declared: “No, we won’t stay at work, we will strike!”

What conclusions are we to draw? The first conclusion is the one that I have pointed out, namely, that the young workers today are anxious to take part in the struggle against the impoverishment of the young workers.

Secondly, we should draw the conclusion that the adult working class organisations do not protect the interests of the young workers, and the young workers are no longer willing to wait until their demands will finally be taken care of.

I must also say a few words about the anti-militarist campaign. This is still a sore point with most of our parties. On this field we must have more mutual understanding than before, because the present situation is such that this struggle must not be left entirely to the Young Communist Leagues. It is absolutely necessary that the parties intensify the struggle. Closer cooperation is an absolute necessity.

I must say also a few words about the Party press. I am able to report a considerable improvement in the party press in connection with the treatment of young peoples questions, as most of the papers are paying much more attention to these questions than heretofore. Germany is no doubt the focus of the economic struggle of the young workers. And yet it happened in Germany that a newspaper editors’ conference arrived at the decision to stop all young people’s supplements in the entire German Communist press. We have been told that the Berliner “Rote Fahne” is very loth to accept articles on young peoples’ questions, and that it is almost impossible to get anything in that line accepted by the “Rote Fahne.” The young peoples’ supplement cannot get any permanent foothold in that paper. Long ago was the struggle on this score, the political bureau said “yes,” and the editors said “no.” Neither has the central organ in Czecho-Slovakia a young peoples’ supplement, nor was it possible to get a single article about the organisation of the youth workers into the British press. Even an article on the formation of the Y.C. League was rejected. It is even more difficult to get something about the Y.C. movement in “Humanités” than the “Rote Fahne.” Thus, there is room for improvement in that direction.
Therefore, the Communist International must make a clear statement on this question, and it is ready to do so. It declares that the united front of the young and the adult workers for a common struggle against capitalism and reaction is an absolute necessity, and calls upon all its parties and the entire working class to stand up for the interest and demands of the working class youth as well as for their own and to make them the subject of their daily struggle.

There is now the practical side to the entire question of the struggle in the interests of the young workers. It is the practical collaboration between the young Communists and the Communist Party. Generally speaking, the practical collaboration between the Communist Party and the Young Communists have greatly improved during this year. Nevertheless, we must not relax in our mutual efforts to attain the ends which to us is both a necessary ideal and a practical demand. I will adduce one illustration in connection with this question. We had a very protracted discussion in Czechoslovakia with the Party officials as to whether the existence of the Young Communist League was a necessity or not. Many leading Party members adopted an attitude which practically meant that the Young Communist Leagues were not needed, that it was sufficient to have a Party, trade unions and sport organisations which could be entrusted with the training and organisation of their young members. Such an attitude is a complete misunderstanding of the tasks of the Young Communist Leagues as an organisation which is to attract the wide masses of the working class youth and to give them a Communist political training.

We had to work hard in Great Britain before we were able to persuade the Communist Party of the necessity of bringing into being a proletarian young people’s movement, and it was only after a struggle lasting for several months that the Party Congress endorsed this idea.

All this goes to illustrate the fact that in some countries there is no proper appreciation of the Young Communist movement.

In conclusion, I must touch upon the question of the organisation of the children’s groups. This movement has been firmly established in the course of this year in many countries and the Parties are beginning to take an interest in this work. This interest is very welcome, and we should insist that the Parties should not encourage the tendency of a vague general education for working class children, that they should throw overboard the bourgeois nonsense of a general rational education and that they should insist on a purely Communist education for the children. We trust that the resolution will meet with your approval and will be put to practical application.

In this way, the Communist youth will fulfil its duty towards the Party more eagerly than this year, and the co-operation with the Party will be more pronounced.

Three years have passed since the Communist Youth International was formed in Berlin. We met in a small smoky back-
room of a suburban inn, forced to underground methods by the Noske reaction. Since that time the Communist Youth International has grown tremendously. Its membership has been nearly quadrupled, it has grown in strength, definiteness of purpose, and determination. We hope that the Communist International and the Communist Youth will be able to penetrate the ranks of the working youth, to arouse them to action, and replenish the Communist Movement with powerful fighting troops. And we hope that we will be able to prove to you at the next Congress that the Communist Youth International, assisted by the Comintern, has fought for the interests of the masses of the young workers, has drawn them into the struggles of the adult workers, and won them over to Communism. (Applause.)

THE NEGRO QUESTION

SESSION 22, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.
Speakers: Comrades Billing and Mackay.

Billings (America): In the Negro question we have before us another phase of the race and colonial question to which no attention has been paid heretofore.

Although the Negro problem as such is fundamentally an economic problem, it is aggravated and intensified by the friction which exists between the white and black races. It is a matter of common knowledge that prejudice does play an important part. Whilst it is true that, for instance, in the United States of America the main basis of racial antagonism lies in the fact that there is competition of labour in America between black and white, nevertheless, the negro bears a badge of slavery on him which has its origin way back in the time of his slavery.

There are about 160,000,000 negroes throughout the world. Approximately 25,000,000 of them reside in the New World, and the rest reside in Africa. The negroes in America and the West Indies are a source of cheap labour supply for the American capitalist, and we find the capitalist class has always used and will always continue to use them as an instrument in order to suppress the white working class in its every-day struggle. They will be the source from which the “white guard” elements will be recruited in the event of a revolutionary uprising anywhere and everywhere.

The capitalist class as a class has recognised the valuable aid that the negro masses will be to them. Therefore, for years they have made it their business to cultivate a bourgeois ideology in the mind of the negro populace. This, of course, was
done in their own interests and not in those of the negroes. They have carefully planned out and planted organisations amongst the negroes to carry agitation in favour of the bourgeoisie as against the white workers. They have what is known as the Rockfeller Foundation and the Urban League. The first organisation supplies grants of money to negro schools; the second is a notorious strike-breaking institution.

Facing this condition, it was inevitable that the negro population would have some sort of reaction against the oppression and the suppression to which they were subjected throughout the age. The first reaction was, of course, in the forming of religious institutions, the only forms permitted at certain times for their own enjoyment, but later we find that there has been a continuous development of organisations on the part of the negroes, which, although purely negro, are to a certain extent directly or indirectly opposed to capitalism. The three most important negro organisations operating to-day are, firstly, what is known as the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, an organisation which is composed of a large proletarian element led by bourgeois intellectuals. It bases its action upon the principle of seeking redress from the capitalist class by means of petitions and what practically amounts to begging that something may be done for them. Then we come to the other more interesting form of organisation which is known as the Garvey Association, an organisation that is ultra-nationalist, yet composed of a rebel rank and file element. It is an organisation which, in spite of the fact that it has drafted on its programme various cheap stock schemes, is influencing the minds of the negroes against imperialism. This organisation came into existence after the world war. Of course it did not take any definite radical form, it was saved in time by its own leader; but, notwithstanding this, the race consciousness has been planted and used to a very large extent far into the interior of Africa, where hardly anyone could expect that an organisation could be planted which had its origin in America. The third organisation is the African Blood Brotherhood, a radical negro organisation which bases its programme upon the abolition of capitalism. It was the one organisation which, during the time of a race riot in Tulsa Oklahoma, put up a splendid and courageous fight, and the one to which the capitalist class in America is going to turn its attention next.

We have also in Africa certain small organisations which get their direct inspiration from America, the headquarters and centre of political thought among negroes; these organisations are stretching out and developing as far as the Sudan. These can be utilised by Communists if the means of propaganda are carefully, deliberately and intensively used to link up these movements. We see in them a sort of organisation which will react, that is imperialism throughout the world.

There are in the United States about 450 negro newspapers and magazines, and, while they are mostly strictly racial, they have a great influence upon the negro masses everywhere. There
is, for instance, the "Chicago Defender," which issues 250,000 copies weekly which are spread out all over the world, wherever there are large groups of negroes. Then there is the "Crisis," a monthly magazine which has a circulation of over 600,000. These papers, and especially the "Chicago Defender," and others with a smaller circulation, have constantly used radical propaganda material that we sent out.

The negroes feel the impending crisis which will break out in the south between black and white. It was in the south that the seed was sown and the results are bound to come in some way. It will probably take the form of race rioting on a very large scale.

In the United States, of the approximate number of negroes (12 millions), two millions live in the northern industrialised part of the country, and the other nine or ten millions in the south, and I suppose that all of you have a picture in your mind of what the south is like. When you enter there it is like Dante's Inferno. Eighty per cent. of the negroes live on the land. They are discriminated against and disfranchised, and it is there that the class struggle is waged in its most brutal form. The relation between blacks and whites is one of constant conflict and of fighting to the death. The lynching of a negro is something to be enjoyed in the south as a picture show is enjoyed elsewhere. The white population in the south is so saturated with this idea of white domination over the negro that this question must engage our attention. At the present time when there are big strikes in the north United States, the capitalist class and its henchmen hurry to the south in order to draw the southern negroes into the northern districts as strike-breakers. They promise them higher wages and better conditions, and so induce them to enter those areas in which strikes are in progress. That is a constant danger to the white workers when on strike. Of course, the entire blame for this must not be placed upon the negroes. The labour unions in America, and I am speaking of the bona fide trade unions, have for the last few years insisted that, although a negro is a skilled worker, he cannot by virtue of the fact that he is a negro enter the trade union. It is only recently that the American Federation of Labour has made a weak attempt to try to get negroes into the regular trade unions. But, even today, such an organisation as the Machinists' Union still has, if I am not mistaken, the assertion in its programme that the qualification of membership is that every white brother shall introduce for membership other white men, or something to that effect. This means that the negroes are permanently excluded from the unions simply on account of the fact that they are black, and the capitalist class and the reactionaries negro press use this to the fullest extent in order to prejudice the minds of those black workers against the labour unions. When you speak to a negro about his joining a trade union, or about the necessity of his becoming radical, the first thing he throws at you is the assertion: "Don't preach to me. Preach to the whites. They need it and I do not. I am always ready to fight alongside of them so long as they agree to take me."
into the trade unions, but as long as they do not I will scab, and, by God, I have a right to scab. I want to protect my own life." That is one of their arguments, and it cannot be ignored. While theoretically we may use all the beautiful phrases that we know, nevertheless these are hard concrete facts in the everyday struggle.

The Negro Commission therefore prepared certain definite proposals to which I hope you will agree.

McKay: Comrades, the negro race in the economic life of the world today occupies a very peculiar position. In every country where the whites and blacks must work together the capitalists have set the one against the other. It would seem at the present day that the international bourgeoisie would use the negro race as their trump card in their fight against the world revolution. Great Britain has her negro regiments in the colonies and she has demonstrated what she can do with her negro soldiers by the use that she made of them during the late war. The revolution in England is very far away because of the highly organised exploitation of the subject peoples of the British Empire. In Europe we find that France has a negro army of over 300,000, and that to carry out their policy of imperial domination in Europe, the French are going to use their negro militias.

In America we have the same situation. The northern bourgeoisie knows how well the negro soldiers fought for their own emancipation, although illiterate and untrained, during the Civil War. They also remember how well the negro soldiers fought in the Spanish American war under Theodore Roosevelt. They know that in the last war over 400,000 negroes who were mobilised gave a very good account of themselves, and that, besides fighting for the capitalists, they also put up a very good fight for themselves on returning to America when they fought the white mobs in Chicago, St. Louis and Washington.

But more than the fact that the American capitalists are using negro soldiers in their fight against the interests of labour is the fact that the American capitalists are setting out to mobilise the entire black race of America for the purpose of fighting organised labour. The situation in America today is terrible and fraught with grave dangers. It is much uglier and more terrible than was the condition of the peasants and Jews of Russia under the Czar. It is so ugly and terrible that very few people in America are willing to face it. The reformist bourgeoisie have been carrying on the battle against discrimination and racial prejudice in America. The Socialists and Communists have fought very shy of it because there is a great element of prejudice among the Socialists and Communists of America. They are not willing to face the negro question. In associating with the comrades of America, I have found demonstrations of prejudice on the various occasions when the white and black comrades had to get together; and this is the greatest difficulty that the Communists of America have got to overcome.
—the fact that they first have got to emancipate themselves from the ideas they entertained towards the negroes before they can be able to reach the negroes with any kind of radical propaganda.

However, regarding the negroes themselves, I feel that as the subject races of other nations have come to Moscow to learn how to fight against their exploiters, the negroes will also come to Moscow. In 1918, when the Third International published its Manifesto and included that part referring to the exploited colonies there were several groups of negro radicals, in America that sent this propaganda out among their people. When in 1860 the American government started to investigate and to suppress radical propaganda among the negroes, the small radical negro groups in America retaliated by publishing the fact that the Socialists stood for the emancipation of the negroes, and that reformist America could do nothing for them. Then, I think, for the first time in American history, the American negroes found that Karl Marx had been interested in their emancipation, and had fought valiantly for it. I shall just read this extract that was taken from Karl Marx's writing at the time of the Civil War:

"When an oligarchy of 300,000 slave holders for the first time in the annals of the world, dared to inscribe 'Slavery' on the banner of armed revolt, who on the very spot hardly a century ago the idea of one great democratic republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century, when on that spot the counter-revolution cynically proclaimed property in man to be 'the corner-stone of the new edifice'—then the working class of Europe understood at once that the slave-holders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy war of property against labour, with their hopes of the future, even their past conquests, were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic."

As Marx fought against chattel slavery in 1861, so are present-day Socialists, his intellectual descendants, fighting against wage slavery.

The work among the negroes of the south will have to be carried on by some legal propaganda organised in the north, because we find at the present time in America that the situation in the Southern States (where nine million out of ten million of the negro population live), is that even the liberal bourgeois and the petty bourgeoisie among the negroes cannot get their own papers of a reformist propaganda type into the south on account of the laws that there discriminate against them.

The fact is that it is really only in the Southern States that there is any real suppression of opinion. No suppression of opinion exists in the Northern States in the way it exists in the south. In the Northern States special laws are made for special occasions—as those against Communists and Socialists during the war—but in the south we find laws that have existed for 50 years, under which the negroes cannot meet to talk about their
grievances. The white people who are interested in their cause cannot go and speak to them. If we sent white comrades into the south they are generally ordered out by the southern oligarchy, and if they do not leave they are generally whipped, tarred and feathered; and if we send Comrades into the south they won’t be able to get out again—they will be lynched and burned at the stake.

I hope that as a symbol that the negroes of the world will not be used by the international bourgeoisie in the final conflicts against the world revolution, we shall soon see a few negro soldiers in the finest, bravest and cleanest fighting forces in the world—the Red Army and Navy of Russia—fighting not only for their own emancipation, but also for the emancipation of the working class of the whole world.

Kolaroff (Chairman): I call your attention to the fact that this is the first time that the negro problem has been brought before the World Congress of the Comintern; I do not believe it necessary to prove the importance of this question. We have to win over to our side a race which has lived till now in a state of oppression. The Negro Commission has adopted the resolution which is somewhat too theoretical in form and may not be wholly understood by the working class and the lower section of the black race. The Presidium therefore decided to refer this resolution back to the Commission to be altered and simplified.

There being no objections, the motion is adopted. (Final resolution on Negro Question printed in volume of Resolutions and Theses of IV. Congress of the Communist International.)

CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

SESSION 23, November 25, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Markhlavsky.

Speakers: Meshtiriskoff, Lauridan, Henriet, Khintchuk.

Markhlavsky (Chairman): I declare the session open. I call on Comrade Meshtiriskoff to report on co-operation.

Meshtiriskoff: Measured not by the power and discipline of its organisation, but by the number of its members, the co-operative movement represents one of the strongest forms of the labour movement.

It is no exaggeration to state that the co-operative organisation has tens of millions of members throughout the world.

The co-operative is not merely a movement whose members combine from time to time for making necessary purchases in common, it is an organisation which endeavours to create its own ideology, to permeate all its work by that ideology, and to
inculcate it into the minds of its members. The view persistently advocated by the old leaders of the co-operative movement, i.e., that the co-operation should be "the third form of the labour movement," entirely independent from the two other forms, the Party and Trade Union organisations, tended to create in the mind of every active co-operator a special co-operative domain wherein the old co-operative leaders ruled supreme. Of course, no human head can be divided by impenetrable walls into entirely separate compartments. Then new ideas of the revolutionary struggle forced their way even into this secluded "co-operative sector," but this process developed with extreme slowness.

The experience of the Russian revolution has shown clearly what colossal difficulties arise in the organisation of public feeding and exchange of commodities, in case the proletariat captures power without having preliminarily gained control over the co-operatives.

Under such conditions the proletariat is compelled to carry on the struggle for this position at a time when all its forces should be concentrated on the retention of political power and the organisation of the new society, when it is imperative that co-operatives should immediately begin to perform their useful functions at the command of the new proletarian government. The conquest of the co-operatives cannot be achieved at one blow. It is impossible during a brief period of time to thoroughly clean up the swamp of the old co-operatives. Many of the important co-operatives remain for a long time in the hands of the old co-operatives—the enemies of the proletariat who sabotage the work, and the organisation of public feeding and of the exchange of commodities is carried on inefficiently. This provokes the resentment of the masses, but weakens the power of the new revolutionary government.

The Communist International is fully aware of the importance of the co-operatives. At the Third Congress of the Comintern, held during the summer of 1921, the question of the co-operatives was placed on the agenda and the Congress adopted the theses presented by the speaker on this question.

These theses chiefly dealt with the work which Communists should carry on in the co-operatives. The questions of tactics and of organisation was dealt with only very generally. The theses mainly conveyed the idea that the co-operatives should cease to be "the third form of the labour movement"—entirely independent and isolated from the other forms, that the work of the revolutionary co-operatives should be most closely united with the work of the revolutionary political and trade union organisations of the proletariat. The theses emphasised that the old slogan of the opportunist co-operatives as to the political neutrality of the co-operatives should be decisively repudiated, for under the screen of this slogan the social-traitors boldly carried out without any hindrance the policy of transforming the co-operatives into the hand-maid of the bourgeoisie. In respect to the form of organisation, the theses urged that the Communist co-operatives should organise Communist nuclei which
should unite into district organisations and also nationally, and that the entire movement must be headed by the co-operative section of the Comintern.

This section was instructed to convene the First International Conference of Communist Co-operatives.

In compliance with this instruction, the first international conference of international co-operators convened in Moscow on November 1st, 1922. At this conference 30 delegates representing 20 countries were present. Delegates with voting power represented Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, the Far Eastern Republic, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Bulgaria, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania and a representative of the Anglo-Saxon countries and the members of the co-operative section of the Comintern. Of the countries with a large co-operative movement, Czecho-Slovakia and Belgium were not represented. There was also no special representative from England.

The conference continued for six days, November 1st—6th, holding two sessions every day.

The agenda of the conference was as follows:
1. Seating of delegates.
2. Reports by the delegates on the status of the co-operative movement in their respective countries and on the work of the Communists in the co-operatives.
3. Communism and Co-operation.
4. Tactical questions.
5. Organisational questions.

The reports of the delegates brought home the fact that the co-operative movement is undergoing a big crisis due to the following causes: The economic crisis, the sharp fluctuation of the currency and the violent capitalist offensive. The assistance given to the membership by the co-operatives limited to their former narrow functions has under these conditions become illusory. So long as the co-operatives continue to employ the old methods of work, they are unable to render any substantial aid. The bankruptcy of the old co-operatives has been felt even by the old leaders, who are totally unable to discover any new methods of work. All this facilitates the growth and development of new revolutionary ideas in the co-operatives.

From the report on "Communism in the Co-operative Movement," and from the discussions which took place on this report, it is evidence that the Third Congress of the Comintern laid down correct fundamental lines on this question. The First International Conference of Communist Co-operatives did not introduce any amendments to this statement. There was not even a single motion in that direction.

On the question of tactics, the conference laid down very emphatically that the co-operative movement must intervene
very energetically in all questions connected with the co-operatives or with the consumers. They must conduct this struggle side by side and in close contact with the Communist parties and the red trade unions. Of special importance is the struggle against everything which contributes to the rise in the cost of living and which hinders the struggle against it. This applies to the struggle against all forms of increased taxation, to import duties, export duties and indirect taxation, to the struggle against the attempts to impose excessive or special taxes on the co-operatives and to the demand that the distribution of the necessaries of life among the population should be entirely in the hands of the consumers’ co-operatives, and finally to the participation of the co-operatives and their members in all the forms of this struggle.

On the field of organisation, the Conference has drawn up the outlines for Communist work within the co-operatives, from the nucleus to the co-operative section of the Comintern. The latter must consist of 20 representatives of the various countries who are to be elected at the International Conferences. For current work, the section has appointed a Presidium consisting of seven members.

Thus, basing itself on the experiences of the first year of Communist work within the co-operatives, the conference has taken two important steps in connection with the elaboration of the tactics of the form of organisation of the movement.

On the strength of this work, the section invites the Plenum of the Fourth Congress of the Comintern to adopt its resolution on the question of co-operation.

Lauridan (France) declared that the co-operatives cannot be more than auxiliaries to the Party. The Communists oppose the political neutrality of the co-operatives. He regretted that the previous speaker had not spoken of the Peasant Producers' Co-operative. The Congress, he said, must express its opinion on the question of Guild Socialism.

Henriet (France) declared that he opposed the Producers' Co-operative because they neutralised a section of the working class in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. He also opposed Guild Socialism, which menaced the existence of the trade unions in times of a crisis. The French Socialists make use of the co-operatives for the support of the Social Democratic Parties. In an era of capitalism, the Co-operatives foster dangerous illusions in the minds of the workers. They can acquire importance, but only during the proletarian dictatorship. A developed co-operative system in Russia might have enabled us to avoid NEP.

The Chairman: Since no other speaker has sent in his name, I call upon Comrade Khintchuk, in view of the agreement, to conclude the debate.

Khintchuk: This argument between Lauridan and Henriet has nothing to do with the question. So far they have not spoken to the question.
Comrade Lauridian was wrong in reproaching us with having forgotten the producers' co-operatives. We have not mentioned this question in the resolution because it has not yet been studied. We spoke of it at the Conference of Communist Co-operators, and we adopted a resolution which states in paragraph 11: "The producers' co-operatives and credit associations, which are nearly always organisations of the petty bourgeoisie, are not capable of leading a struggle against capitalism, and for this reason are doomed to extinction, or to become capitalist joint stock companies." I will read you only part of the resolution, and you will see from it that we are acquainted with the subject.

"If we have not mentioned the subject in the resolution presented here, it is because we did not wish to speak at this Congress on a question which has been insufficiently studied.

We shall postpone this question to the Fifth International Congress, to which we shall present a special resolution. Comrade Henriet was not right in saying that we now have the "NEP" because we did not have co-operation before. The object of the "NEP" is to construct State capitalism, and the co-operatives cannot aid in this.

Comrade Henriet is right when he says that, with Communist co-operatives well developed beforehand, the task of the revolution will be easier; but "NEP" does not enter into this question.

Comrade Lauridian observed that we must preserve the unity of the co-operative movement. He is quite right on this point. We are in favour of that unity and have mentioned it in the resolutions of the Third Congress. We did not repeat these matters at the Fourth Congress because one does not wish to say the same thing over and over again.

We are with you in the idea that Communists should stay in the co-operatives, that we must capture the co-operative societies just as we captured the labour unions. We have no right to abandon the power of the co-operative to our enemies.

The importance of the co-operative movement is not yet thoroughly realised by Communists. It is nevertheless an extremely powerful and useful instrument, which we must develop and use for the revolution.

EDUCATION QUESTION

SESSION 25, November 20, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Neurath.

Hornia (Germany): Comrades, the Education Commission arrived at the unanimous conclusion that the question before the Congress should not be the entire scheme of the Communist education policy, but only the question of Communist educational work done by the Party itself, namely, the
question of the political education of the members and functionaries of the Party, and of the political education which is carried on by the members and functionaries of the Party among the masses outside the Party.

The Communist policy differs from the bourgeois and reformist policy not only by its aim but also by the fact that it has a strictly scientific basis; that it rests on a careful analysis of the historic situation and on a thorough knowledge of the social forces which are at work within the capitalist system. Its methods are the methods of Marxist research and of historic materialism. Thus, the Communist International can only fulfill its task as leader of the revolutionary proletariat and as the defender of the masses of the oppressed and exploited if it puts its policies on a strictly Marxist basis. For this reason, it is essential that the Communist parties should give their members and functionaries a careful theoretical training.

The Communist educational work is very different from that carried on within the reformist parties. The reformists make the workers believe that in spite of the exploitation and the poverty of the proletariat, it has the opportunity within the capitalist system to emulate the bourgeoisie at least on the field of knowledge and art, and that perfect equality and freedom exist at least in this respect under the capitalist system. The aim of Communist educational work is the training of revolutionary fighters, the education of every individual for class solidarity, the development and intensification of the fighting, agitational and organisational power of the Party. Thus, while the result of reformist educational work is a greater dependence of the working class on bourgeois ideology, the aim of the Communist educational work is to free the workers from the thrall of bourgeois ideology.

The Communist educational activity, being strictly dedicated to the struggle, must confine itself to certain limits. It is quite impossible for a financially weak party, engaged in a hard political struggle, to indulge in teaching any branch of science that might be quite useful in itself, but serves no direct purpose in promoting the task of the Party. It must confine itself to such subjects as will be of direct interest to the fight. For instance, it should give the membership instruction in the history of the revolutionary labour movement, in the principles of Marxian science, in the principles and tactics of the Communist International, and where the large masses are still illiterate, attention should also be given to elementary education, at least among its own members, in order that they be enabled to become propagandists and agitators, as well as reporters for the Party, for, otherwise, they will not be in a position to carry out their political and revolutionary tasks. Communist educational work should always be revised in the light of experience gained in the daily struggle and propa-
ganda of the Party. It should therefore be closely related to daily practice and to daily conflicts. Under no circumstances should the educational activity of the Party run on parallel lines with the political work, but the former should always be subordinated to the latter. This should be achieved by purely organisational means, by seeing to it that the responsible officials of the educational work of the Party should not be composed of unknown literatures, aestheticists, etc., who form, so to speak, the unattached intellectual fringe of the revolution; but of the best political officials and fighters of the Party, so that the entire educational work should be strictly subordinated to the political fighting interests of the Party. This would at once bring to light the necessity of adapting the educational policy continuously to the political experience under given circumstances. When the Party is engaged in action which demands the straining of all the forces, which calls every member to the front, where the centre of gravity is in the street, in the factories, etc., all must temporarily be put in the background, and renewed theoretical work during the ensuing quiet period in order to analyse the past experiences and to draw the proper lessons from the victory or defeat, so as to turn it all into a source of new knowledge and new force for action.

To sum up, the minimum educational demands upon Communist Parties to-day should be stated as follows: Centrally guided and organised educational work among the members; special training for the officials, scientific Marxian intensification of the agitation, associated with a really popular form of propaganda and supported by all the technical means of the magic lantern, music, the stage, etc.

It would be wrong to allow free play to the initiative of individual groups of persons in the publishing of textbooks, etc. This work should also be centralised and carried on by the united forces of the Party.

The educational work of Communist Parties should also include the educational work among the young workers and the children. The independent educational work of the Young Communist organisations should be strongly supported by the Party financially as well as by supplying teachers, books, etc. Every member of the Communist Youth must be attracted and admitted to all the educational institutions of the Party. The Communist Parties should also take care of the revolutionary education of the proletarian children organised by our local Communist children's groups.

The Commission submits the proposal to the Congress—a resolution in that sense will be handed to the Presidium—that in order to organise, to guide and control Communist educational work of the different parties, the Executive of the Comintern shall create a section which shall take charge of the educational work of the different parties, making it an international organisation. The Commission deems it exceedingly desirable that a Socialist academy should be established here in Moscow, the seat of the Executive, the place which brings together all the
threads of the International and where the international outlook
of the comrades is most wide awake. The exact details will be
discussed later on. But we deem it necessary that the individual
countries should have the possibility of sending some comrades
with the necessary practical and theoretical preparation to obtain
their thorough Marxian training here, at the seat of the Execu-
tive. For all the Western parties, all the parties outside of
Soviet Russia, know that they suffer because they have quite
large numbers of revolutionary comrades who lack proper
Marxian science, and this need should be satisfied by establishing
the academy.

Comrades, this systematic and centrally organised educa-
tional work, guided by the Executive, will be a great source of
strength to the theoretical training of the militant forces of the
Communist Parties and of the Communist International. (Pro-
longed cheers.)

Krupskaya (Russia): Comrades, I should like to add a few
words to what has been said by Comrade Hornle. Our Com-
munist Party has had a great deal of experience in the line of
agitation and propaganda. The distinctive feature of our Party
has been that every member of the Party is obliged to carry on
active work. Twenty years ago Comrade Lenin, in his book
"What Must Be Done," emphatically stated that every member
of the Party must be active in Party work. At the Second
Congress of the Party in 1903 it was the question of Party
membership that became the cause of the split between the
Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The proposition introduced by
Comrade Lenin stated that every member of the Party must not
only subscribe to its programme, but must be active in one of
its organisations. On the other hand, the position of Martov
was that a member of the Party should recognise the programme
of the Party and work under its directions. From the first
glance it appeared that the difference of opinion was very insig-
nificant. Indeed, many comrades were then of the opinion that
the whole argument involved minor details and had no serious
background. But, the subsequent history of the Party proved
that the issue involved was of a very vital character. Every
member of the Party must work either in the field of agitation
and propaganda or carry on organisation work. I shall dwell
on the question of agitation first. Owing to the proper organisa-
tion of its agitation apparatus, the Communist Party succeeded
in gaining an immense influence in the masses. Agitation is
calculated to act upon the sentiments and the emotions. By
means of agitation, the broad masses are drawn into the Party.
The question of agitation has first arisen when a large economic
movement began to manifest itself. The first agitation on a
large scale was conducted in the struggle for the improvement
of the material conditions of the working class. This was in the
nineties of the last century. Then many of our Comrades paid
too much attention to this particular phase of the struggle, and
as a result we had a special faction, the so-called "Mysäl" or
group. The latter over-estimated the significance of the direct
elemental movement of the masses. They were too much carried away by the colossal successes of their agitation and began to believe that theory was altogether unnecessary, that the entire thing is in the elemental movement of the workers. This "Mysl" group went so far as to express the famous idea that we have no need for Marx and Engels and that the working class will achieve Socialism without them. Then the Party directed an energetic campaign against this tendency. Another question which arose then was how to deepen our agitation. This controversy also occurred during the same period, i.e., 30 years ago. Then a part of our Comrades maintained that we should not force the agitation and confine ourselves to those questions which find an immediate response among the masses. At the time the masses were mostly interested in economic questions, and, therefore, some of our members insisted that we should limit ourselves to this phase of the struggle and not go any further in our agitation, i.e., to stand on the level reached by the working class at this given time.

These were the so-called economists (the group of the "Workers' cause") who maintained that it was unnecessary to deepen our agitation and that all we had to do was to follow behind the working class. During this time the "Iskra" group conducted an extremely determined and passionate campaign against this tendency, considering it productive of the greatest detriment. Indeed, if the Party would have taken this standpoint of the economists, it would have meant that the Party would not be leading the masses.

Marxism helped the Party to correctly estimate the value of agitation. How did we conduct that work? We always defined the central issues of our agitation, which required much time. At the end of the nineties, the economic demands were the central issue of our agitation. In 1905 the central issue was the political demands of the working class, and, finally, during the world war it was the war that became the central issue. But the central issue was only one of a number of questions into which it was divided. We gathered a select element of agitators into a group where we discussed all the questions of our agitation. Our Party was capable during the war to accomplish colossal work, because during the preceding period we devoted the utmost attention to all the questions of agitation. Discussing the forms of agitation, we shall consider first verbal agitation. The success of agitation depends not so much upon the eloquence and the artistic ability of the orator, but it depends much more to what extent the question is of vital interest to the masses.

We have in our Party still another tradition. Not only agitation, but also propaganda played in our Party a great role. Prior to the time when our agitation began to attract large masses, we were conducting propaganda in our illegal circles. Usually a Marxian student would come to the circle and read Marx and Engels and lead discussions on the questions of the day. He would speak on the history of civilization and on political economy. This tradition took deep root in the working class, not only among the adult workers, but also among
the youngsters. I had a chance to observe how in a far-off village the boys and girls demanded of their teacher that she teach them the subjects which they were taught formerly in the circles, i.e., political economy and the history of civilisation. They thought that without such study there is no salvation.

The studies in the circles were very frequently interrupted due to arrests, and the workers had to complete their education in exile or in the prisons. The tradition of our Party is such that the jails and the places of exile were converted into a sort of universities and schools in which the workers who were later to become prominent leaders acquired a solid Marxian training.

The "Workers' Cause" group was unappreciative of the importance of propaganda. Comrade Lenin, arguing with them, pointed out that Engels in his introduction to the "Peasants' War" states that parallel with the economic movement of the working class and the political struggle, equally important is theoretical grounding. The Communist Party has never separated the questions of agitation and propaganda from its fundamental work. Agitation and propaganda constituted the essential work of the Party.

At the present time, when the Party has become legal and the working class is in power, all our education work, our work in the trade unions, is permeated by the same traditions.

We are today witnessing generally a fundamental transition. In the first years of the revolution our attention was concentrated on the agitation on the fronts and among the entire population; at the present time when we entered upon the work of economic construction, questions of a more involved character have come to the fore. Now the interest in theory and in the study of Marxianism is extremely intense. I am working in the Chief Political Education Department and there we receive every day abundant confirmation of the fact that the masses are today striving for fundamental education. This is perfectly natural.

In 1905 the revolution stirred the masses to the very depths and brought the entire country into an upheaval. This was followed by years of reaction. During these years the intelligentsia lost heart. It imagined that all the conquests of the revolution were lost and that there was no hope for victory. But the masses cannot be made to forget the revolution. We saw that in 1912 the Lena events stirred the masses anew and proved that the masses had grown stronger. Throughout this period of time colossal internal work was going on unobserved.

The impressions of the revolution were thought out and digested by the masses, and in 1912 the masses represented an entirely different phenomenon from what we observed in 1905. At the present time an identical process is manifesting itself. We see that the masses withdrew into themselves. At the present time the entire attention is concentrated on building up of this material basis under the conquest of the revolution. But the building up of this material basis is closely bound up with the transformation of the human element, with the
elevation of it upon a higher cultural level, with a modification of the habits of work and the change of the entire psychology.

To-day we are passing through a definite stage when a deeply intensified, internal and invincible work is going on among the masses. The working class and the working youth of Russia is at the present time engaged in self-education. This fills us with the hope that at the time when the world revolution arrives we shall be ready for the occasion.

REPORT ON FRENCH PARTY

SESSIONS HELD, December 1-2, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Trotsky (Russia): Although the crisis in the French bourgeois government should have favoured the development of the Communist Party, the French Party is going through a severe crisis. The number of its members and the subscribers to its papers has diminished. The Party is in a state of lethargy, and its critical state is marked by violent factional conflicts. The bourgeois newspapers can make use of the arguments against the Party. This factional fight, however, is only a reaction against the passivity and the conservatism of the Party, and indeed the Executive predicted this crisis. The situation is the same as that of a year and a half ago. The conservatism and passivity became apparent after the Congress at Tours. Some say that the chief causes are the traditions and individualism of the French workers. But if the French bourgeoisie was able to conquer this individualism for its purpose during the war, the Communist Party should be able to conquer it in the interest of socialism and the revolution. Our incapacity for organisation is the chief cause of our failure. The good revolutionary traditions of the French movement made possible the organisation of the Communist Party.

The French Party has made terrible mistakes in its trade union policy. At the Party Congress Jacob declared that trade union problems have nothing to do with the Party, and Lafont added that in the economic field the Party played only a secondary role. These views explain the attitude of the French Party during the strike in Havre. We acknowledge the importance of the trade unions, but we also know that the organised workers need the leadership of a party, and that the Communist Parties are the ones to permeate the unions with the Communist spirit. It is only the reactionaries who declare that the trade unions and the workers' parties terrorise the working class. He who maintains that the Party is oppressing the trade unions furnishes an argument for the reaction. Agitation in the trade unions is not only a right, but a duty of the Communist parties. The Communist Party cannot win the confidence of the working
class so long as it denies that it is best fitted to defend the interest of the proletariat. After the murder of strikers in Havre, under the pressure of the Union of Building Workers, the C.G.T.U. called a general strike for the Tuesday, and the Communist Party signified its agreement with that decision although no preparation had been made for it. The attitude of the Party can only be explained by bureaucratic distrust of the working class by the Party. The Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. themselves rendered real action impossible, and the treacherous dissidents and the C.G.T. of Jouhaux felt themselves justified. This action was a repetition of the badly prepared May demonstration in 1920. The Party has learned nothing from its past mistakes. At the Paris Congress, Frossard declared that he had hesitated for the past two years between his duty to the Party and his duty to the International. These two years, he said, have been so much time gained, for the Party would have run its head against a wall if it had obeyed the instructions of the International. This speech was to pave the way for a breach with the Comintern. The same Frossard signed a resolution jointly with Souvarine to the effect that the French Party had suffered such losses because it had not fulfilled the instructions of the Comintern. Frossard will have to declare which declaration he will stand by.

Comrade Trotsky quoted the number of letters and telegrams which had been sent to the French Party during the last year and a half. No less than eight were sent in connection with the Havre affair. Frossard and Cachin had been invited to Moscow many times. The letters of the Executive enlightened the problem of the unified front, criticised the passivity, the press policy, and the trade union tactics of the Party. The attitude of Sellier, Lafont, and of the mayors of the Parisian suburbs, as well as the attitude towards the syndicalists and the anarchists.

The French Party did not answer the letters. Frossard should tell us what there is in these letters that can be described as an offence against the French Party. The French Party always maintains that the Executive exaggerates. Yet all these exaggerations were weighty facts, as shown by the examples of Sellier and Fabre. With regard to the protest against the interference of the Executive, it was not considered as a slur upon the dignity of the Russian Communist Party when Cachin sat as a member of a special commission to consider the question of the Workers' Opposition in the Russian Party. The decisions of the enlarged Executive were of the utmost value for the Russian Communist Party. The interests of the Party and the Comintern stand higher than the falsely rated dignity of the Party. The French Party now finds itself in the following position: There is much passivity and conservatism among the leading elements of the Centre, but there are also good revolutionary working class elements in the same faction. The Left, even if it has made many mistakes, stands for pro-
gress towards a genuine Communist policy. The Randol group opposes the findings of the Comintern, but there are also genuine revolutionary working class elements among them. The proposed resolution means that the Congress condemns the errors of the Centre, emphasises the fault of the Randol faction, and maintains that the Left, even if they have made minor mistakes, have on the whole represented the policies of the Comintern on important questions correctly. The Centre in the Paris Congress rejected the proposal of the Executive with regard to the distribution of posts.

In placing responsibility upon the Centre, Comrade Trotsky stated that Kerr tried to throw the responsibility for the events of the French Congress upon the Left and upon the Comintern. With regard to the Jaures' incident at the Congress, Comrade Trotsky stated that the memory of Jaures belonged to the oppressed classes of all countries, and not to the dissidents. Jaures was the greatest figure in the Second International but we should only accept his revolutionary spirit, and not inherit his failures. In the name of the Commission, the speaker proposed that the Party posts should be proportionately divided, although the Comintern was against proportional representation in principle. The leading elements of the French Party must blow up all bridges leading to bourgeois conceptions; also the break with Freemasonry must be thoroughly carried out. The Communist Party must realise the gulf between the working class and the bourgeoisie, but some of the leaders of the French Party have thrown bridges across this gulf by means of the Masonic Lodges. Freemasonry is the most pernicious and infamous fraud on the working class which the bourgeoisie has perpetrated. A decisive struggle against Freemasonry is necessary. This would bring about a crisis in the French Party which would have good results. The Communists must leave the plane of bourgeois and human rights. This measure is most important as it will rid the Party of amateurs, dilettantes and careerists. Workers, who really work in industry, must represent the Party in parliament and in the municipal councils, to the extent of nine-tenths of the Party candidates and nine-tenths of the posts in the Party must also be occupied by real working men. Party journalists must not write for bourgeois papers. The Party must carry out a clear agrarian and colonial policy. The C.G.T. and the dissidents can only be won over by a strong Communist Party, and not just by the C.G.T.U. alone. The formulated programme of action for the French Party is not tactical and revolutionary. Factory Councils are absolutely necessary. The Party must thoroughly practice the tactic of the United Front. The slogan of workers' government must not be construed in the sense of a party coalition, but in the sense of mass action against the bourgeois government and a struggle against the Left bloc. The Centre is mainly responsible for the adoption of resolutions. Independence and Party dignity have so far been merely disguises for anti-Communist and anti-Comintern policies. The Com-
munist Parties must guard their independence and Party dignity against the bourgeoisie and against petty bourgeois criticism.

In France, the Centre will be responsible during the next few weeks for this energetic action in the ranks of our French Communist Party. I am sure that the painful explanations which we had with our French Comrades in the commission, and which I submit to you in the shape of a report, cannot be repeated again. The danger was clearly indicated in the speech of Comrade Frossard, which I have already quoted and interpreted. It is the business of the Centre to definitely obviate and remove this danger. I see no reason for a break. On the contrary, I believe the situation is extremely favourable for our French Communist Party. The national bloc is breaking down. There is absolutely an impossibility of exacting the reparations. The Left bloc finds itself in a difficult situation, and I believe that our Party holds in its hands the future of France, which means the future of humanity at large. We feel confident that, inspired by such grand and glorious prospects, the Centre will do its duty to the last, and by the time the next Congress will meet, we will have a unified, homogeneous revolutionary party, faithful to its duty until the complete triumph of the revolution of the French proletariat. (Prolonged cheers.)

Cachin (France) declared, on behalf of the Central Committee, that it would carry out unreservedly and according to strict discipline all the decisions concerning the United Front tactics, the trade union question as well as the Freemasonry question, and decisions of the Red Trade Union International. The Central Committee was not alone to blame for the mistakes which were committed. He was in favour of the liquidation of the factions. Renouil declared, on behalf of his faction, that the latter was convinced that the United Front tactics were right also in France. His faction will submit to all the decisions of the Congress. He said that his faction endeavoured to prevent all factional struggles.

Souvarine declared that the Left was proud that its tactics were recognised as the right tactics. It promised to observe discipline in future as heretofore.

Jean Renaud considered the decisions which were taken rather doubtful. However, he submitted to the decisions of the World Congress.

Trotsky, in his concluding remarks, reiterated that the proportional distribution of posts did not create a precedent. The resignations of the Left group were a mistake. He emphasised the fact that the factions themselves had agreed on the list of candidates for the vacant party posts, and he expressed the hope that the factional struggles would cease.

Resolution and Programme of Action concerning French Communist Party are included in the volume of “Theses and Resolutions of the IVth Congress of the Communist International.”
Humbert-Droz announced that all the factions of the French Party have agreed to propose the following list of candidates for the National Council of the Party:—In the Central Committee, for the Centre: Frossard (as secretary and delegate to the Executive), Louis Sellier (as provisional secretary and substitute for Frossard during the latter's stay in Moscow), Cachin, Jacob Garbary, Leissaye, Maranne, Gourdeaux, Laguessa, Parqueroux. As candidates of the Centre: Pierpont, Dupillet, Plais. As representatives of the left in the Central Committee: Rosner, Treint, Vaillant-Couturier, Souvarine, Tomasi, Christen, Deportier, Cordier, Boucher. As candidates of the Left: Amedee Dunois, Sailes. To the Central Committee of the Renoult Group: Barbaret, Fromont, Dubois, Werth, and as candidate, Lespagnol. Cachin will be the director of "Humanité," and Amedee Dunois the General Secretary. Frossard will be the General Secretary of the Party, with L. Sellier as his substitute. Trent was appointed as the representative of the Left.

All the commissions were appointed on the basis of proportional representation. The resolution on organisation was carried.

Kolov (Chairman) announced that Victor Meric had been condemned to 13 months' imprisonment. On behalf of the Congress he expressed sympathy with the convicted Comrade.

Humbert-Droz moved the resolution on the Spanish question. It declares that the Spanish Communist Party must not make any concessions in principle on the question of parliamentarism and anarcho-syndicalism. It further declares that the Communists must work on the trade unions. The resolution was carried unanimously.

Kuusinen (Finland) moved a resolution on the Danish question which declares that the Congress recognises the United Communist Party as the only section in Denmark, and invites the non-affiliated groups to join the Party within three months. The resolution was carried, as were also the resolutions on the reorganisation of the Executive and the resolutions on the Young Communist Leagues.

ITALIAN QUESTION

SESSION HELD, December 4, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.
Speaker: Comrade Zinoviev.

Zinoviev declared that the history of the last year in Italy, written in the blood of the working class, has shown clearly all the weaknesses and the whole tragedy
of the working class movement. Numerically, the working class is strong enough to overthrow the bourgeoisie, but they are still weak intellectually and politically because they have not yet overcome the influence of bourgeois thought. This appeared especially clearly in Italy. In 1914 the Second International drove the workers into the war. In 1919 the social democrats stood protectingly in front of the bourgeoisie and declared to the workers that they could attack the bourgeoisie only over their bodies. In this way, the social democrats saved capitalism. In 1919 the revolutionary spirit ruled the Italian masses. The Socialists recognised this fact. Serrati wrote then to the Executive that the Italian workers were no longer willing to work for their exploiters. The Socialist Party grew from 68,000 members in 1914 to 216,000 at the end of 1919. During the same period the membership of the Trade Unions increased from 320,000 to 2,250,000. The masses placed their hopes in the Party to lead them to victory. The resolution of the Party Congress at Bologna demanded the revolutionary struggle and adhesion to the Third International. But the reformists remained in the Party, even after Bologna, in order to destroy it from within. The reformists knew quite well how to disguise themselves as Communists. D'Aragona cheered Communism in Petrograd and was one of the R.I.U. The Communist International was the style of the day. This is what made the 21 conditions so necessary. They rendered us great service because it made more difficult the entrance of reformists and centrists into our organisations. When the occupation of the factories and the creation of the Red Army began in Italy, the comedy of the reformists stopped. Five days and five nights the Trade Union leaders negotiated with the leaders of the Socialist Party. D'Aragona and the Trade Union leaders managed to withdraw from the struggle, whereupon the Socialist Party capitulated. D'Aragona began a series of treasons; he negotiated first with the Ministry, then with the leaders of the Trade Unions, then with the Socialist Party. This betrayal of the leadership was a signal for the beginning of the capitalist offensive, which has now terminated in the victory of Mussolini. What has been the activity of the Communist International during this period?

Already, before the occupation of the factories, the Executive had pointed out that Serrati's basic error laid in his fetishism for the unity with the reformists. He demanded unity at any price, complained of the lack of personalities to take over the State apparatus, made an idol of unity, and used it as a cover for a frivolous attack against the Comintern. In Livorno, Serrati spoke against the split and defended Turati, although the latter's magazine, "Critica Sociale," was an organ of bourgeois counter-revolution. The split in Livorno was an absolute necessity, and the Comintern would insist upon it again in any similar situation. Lenin sent a letter which insisted that the Party, though it should not make an immediate revolution, should nevertheless prepare it, and must therefore
expel the reformists. Serrati answered with this question, "Who are the reformists?" To-day, every sparrow on the roof knows what reformism is, and so does Serrati. We do not regret the split in Livorno because the young, weak Communist Party of Italy has, nevertheless, saved the honour of the revolutionary working class.

But what has reformism led to? The Socialist Party has lost three-quarters of its membership; a million and a half members have left the Trade Unions. We see then that reformism has not only betrayed the revolution but also destroyed the Party. Serrati set his hope upon the agreement between the Trade Unions and the Socialist Party. But the speeches of Mussolini, Turati and D'Aragna in Parliament prove that this agreement has been broken, and that the reformists wish to sell the Trade Unions to Mussolini. The reformists declare that they wish to spare the workers the unnecessary sufferings of the revolution. Well, the revolution has not taken place, but many of the workers have fallen as victims. The most important lesson of the Italian tragedy is the recognition that our chief enemies are reformism and centrism.

It is the wish of the Comintern to see a rapid reunion of both parties in the near future. The majority of the Communist Party oppose this reunion. This is easily understandable. The atmosphere is much too loaded with enmity; too much has been lost; too much anger has remained. But we must not allow ourselves to be guided by emotions. It takes much courage, honesty and decision to be a Communist to-day.

The commission proposes that the Vella group be expelled because they refused to accept the 21 conditions.

The speaker expressed his hope that, as a result of the reunion, a new gathering of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat would begin; but he declared that the Comintern was not yet through with the Italian problem. We may have difficulties with the most prominent leaders of the Italian Socialists, for although the sickness of centrism has been overcome, this does not exclude the possibility of relapses. The Comintern would always support the real Socialists.

Our main tasks in Italy to-day are:—(1) To defeat the reformists; (2) to realise the political and economic United Front; (3) to issue the slogan of the workers' government; (4) to change the Fascist Trade Unions into enemies of the bourgeoisie by the formation of nuclei and the policy of the United Front; (5) to unite the "Araldi del Popolo" and every anti-Fascist element against the reaction; to restore to the working class its courage and its class consciousness by the union of the Socialist and Communist Parties.

The speaker finished his speech by expressing the hope that the power of the Fascists might soon be overthrown.

In the name of the majority of the Italian Delegation, Comrade Bordiga declared that although they were against the fusion, they would accept the decision of the Congress without
any further discussion and would carry it out as loyal and disciplined members. As a proof of this, they voted for the resolution.

In the name of the Socialist Party, Comrade Serati declared that the Party Conference in Rome had expelled the reformists, accepted the 21 conditions, and demanded the fusion of the Communist Party of Italy and the Communist International. The delegation has already informed the leadership of the Party of the decisions of the Congress, and hoped for the approval of the Congress. The speaker believed that as a result of necessary guarantees, the Party would evolve towards the Left; the polemics of the past will remain only as a useful lesson.

In the name of the minority of the Italian Delegation, Comrade Graziosi declared that the fusion was bound with difficulties and dangers, but that the guarantees should give us hope for the best. For that reason he also welcomed the fusion.

Under great applause the resolution was unanimously adopted.

**QUESTION OF THE OPPOSITION IN THE CZECHO-SLOVAKIAN PARTY**

**SESSION HELD, December 4, 1922.**

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Speakers: Comrades Radek, Sturz, Smeral.

Comrade Radek declared that the Czecho-Slovakian Party was built of the Left Wing of the Social Democrats, and that there still remained a certain distrust for the leaders who were fighting honestly for Communism. The political centralisation at the present time is too slight; the activity of the Party shows many defects; the Trade Union cells are not sufficiently organised; the fight against Amsterdam is conducted without any unified policy; the Parliamentary group neglects its agitation and demonstration activity.

Although the soldiers possess the suffrage right in Czecho-Slovakia, the agitation of the Communist Party in the army is still very weak. The opposition is partly responsible for all these mistakes. The unemployment crisis led to the sharpening of the situation. Nevertheless, the opposition undertook the responsible steps and spread lies against the majority of the Party. After a thorough investigation, the commission finds the accusation of the opposition thoroughly unfounded, and establishes the breach of confidence of the opposition. However, since there are good proletarian elements in the opposition, the commission demands that the expulsion of the opposition be revoked, but that its members be suspended from every Party office for their breach of discipline.
The speaker ended the speech with the exhortation to root out the distrust in the Party, to stop their dispersed action, to fight the anarchist syndicalist tendencies, and to proceed unitedly against the reaction.

In the name of the opposition, Comrade Sturz declared that, although the resolution did not remove the dangers which menace the Party, and would therefore remain understandable for the large masses of the workers, the opposition would nevertheless submit to the decision of the Congress.

Comrade Gmeral stated that the majority accepted the resolution, for they did not want to expel the Left Wing at any price but only wished to preserve discipline and the authority of the Party leadership which are absolutely necessary to remove the defects which have existed until now. The majority, therefore, will vote for the resolution.

The resolution was adopted against one vote.

SPANISH QUESTION

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.
Speaker: Comrade Humbert-Droz.

Comrade Humbert-Droz: The Spanish Commission was appointed at the request of the Spanish delegation, not for the purpose of investigating into an interior conflict, but for the purpose of discussing and settling, together with the International, certain tactical points and certain important political questions connected with the activity of our Party in Spain.

One of the most important questions now before the Party is the attitude to the anarchist syndicalist movement.

We are witnessing a breaking away of the working masses from the anarchist syndicalist organisations, and the leaders of this movement are turning towards a kind of neo-reformism.

Thus, the moment is propitious for propaganda and Party activity in this sphere. A tendency has come to the surface in the Spanish Communist Party which demands that the latter should relinquish its Communist intransigence on certain points, in order to meet the anarchist syndicalists half-way, especially by concessions on the parliamentary field, thus winning them over to our side.

The Commission was of the opinion that, while one of the essential tasks of our Party consists in attracting the elements which come from the anarchist syndicalist movement and from the masses who had been deceived by the tactics of the Spanish anarchist leaders, our Party must not try to achieve this end by a deviation from our principles. On the contrary, it would be better if our Party won over these elements less rapidly, but really converted them to Communism.
The Commission was unanimous in recommending to our Party not to make concessions to the bankrupt anarcho-syndicalist ideology, but to work in the anarcho-syndicalist organisations on the lines of pure Communism. The Commission advised our Party to set forth in its propaganda that the parliamentarism of the Communist Party is not that of the old social-democratic parties, supporting this contention by the theses of the Second World Congress.

The second problem before the commission was the attitude of our Party to the Spanish trade union movement.

You are aware that the Spanish trade union movement has two great central organisations—the reformist General Confederation and anarcho-syndicalist National Confederation.

In addition to these two central organisations, there are a few autonomous trade unions.

There is a tendency in the Party to abandon the reformist trade-unions owing to the attitude of the Amsterdam leaders who are not any better in Spain than they are in the other countries. The Commission was unanimous in recommending to our Party to combat this tendency within the Party, and recommend to our comrades not to leave the ranks of the General Confederation, but to remain in it in order to form nuclei and to make it amenable to the Communist ideal.

If trade unions are expelled from the General Confederation, as has happened recently in the case of the trade unions that had participated with the Communist Party in the United Front action, we advise our Party not to make its members resign from the General Confederation for the sake of solidarity, but to instruct all its members to remain in the General Confederation and to fight within this organisation for the re-admission of the expelled comrades. Should this struggle for the re-admission of the expelled not have any result, we advise our Comrades to direct these expelled trade unions to join the National Confederation, and by no means to establish a third central organisation in addition to the two already existing.

The Commission also deemed it necessary to deal with the attitude of our Party towards the United Front tactics.

On February last our Spanish Party voted, together with the French and the Italian Party, against the tactics of the United Front. But already towards May or in the beginning of June, on the occasion of the great strikes of the Asieris, our Communist Party applied United Front tactics with great discrimination, and not simply because it was ordered to do so by the International. We want to emphasise this fact.

Attention was also drawn to the fact that the interior crisis which for a time had undermined the existence of our Party, was settled satisfactorily by a stricter application of Party discipline.

The Commission therefore puts before you its resolution, which it has adopted unanimously.
REPORT ON JUGO-SLAVIA

Khomi: The Jugo-Slavian Party arose in the period of 1919–20, when the Communist slogan attracted the masses, when the wave of the workers' movement—exemplified in the Italian movement—created in every country the possibility of the widest development for the Party. We saw how the Jugo-Slavian Party, hitherto very insignificant and only recently purged of the reformist elements, became suddenly one of the mightiest parties, capturing many municipal councils and sending to parliament of deputies. On the whole it appeared to be a big force.

During the whole of this time, in spite of the quite clear indications that the easy victory may end in a similarly easy defeat, the Party took no measures to form an illegal organisation in preparation for fighting not by means of resolutions, but by action. When the notorious Defence of the Realm decree was promulgated—a decree is in force only for six months, and has yet to be approved by parliament to become law—instead of at once starting the fight, the Party hoped that parliament would refuse to approve it and prevent it becoming law. Meanwhile the Communist and municipal councils were dissolved, and the Communist deputies were thrown out of parliament. All this took place under circumstances which were unheard of in other countries. No appeal was made to the masses, no sign of life and protest, no attempt was made in Jugo-Slavia to fight in the usual Communist way. The victory scored by the anti-proletarian class without a fight and without resistance seemed to surprise even the victors themselves by the ease with which it had been achieved. Repressive measures were undertaken against the working class. The reactionaries began to suspend newspapers, to dissolve trade unions and to hand over their property to the reformist organisations. People were thrown into jail, while the Party did not manifest even the least hint of a fight against the raging counter-revolution. The major part of the active comrades had to flee abroad to escape imprisonment.

Emigration set in, with all its characteristic features. This was a new experience to the Jugo-Slavian organisation, but to the parties that had passed decades underground it was nothing new. The leaders, detached from direct activity and direct contact with the proletarian masses, were musing in exile over the causes of their defeat, and, as usual, shifted the blame from one to the other. There was no Marxist analysis of the events that had occurred in Jugo-Slavia. Instead of this, the emigrants indulged in fruitless squabbles. Regardless of the absence of any differences of principle, there were quarrels that resulted from mutual mistrust, as one group differed from the other in the interpretation of the common experience. There were no tactical differences, but the mistrust of one group of leaders towards the political tact and ability of the other group. This was lamentably manifested during the Vienna Conference.
Happily, the Conference was called. In this connection we have to state that at that Conference they worked out certain political and organisational resolutions which obtained the sanction of the Executive of the Comintern, and it should also be stated that these resolutions did not cause any difference of opinion on either side.

Since there are no political differences, there is nothing to prevent the comrades from working out those organisational methods which will enable them to work together, and by working together forget all the sentiments of mutual distrust. For this purpose, the Commission worked out a series of proposals of an organisational character, which have been submitted to the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

With regard to the political position of the Party, I will read to you the resolution elaborated by the Commission, expressing at the same time not only the hope, but the profound conviction that from the moment that the highest authority of the Party—the Fourth Congress—will have said its final word, all the mistrust will vanish and the Jugo-Slavian Party will tackle the great tasks before it.

**DANISH QUESTION**

Kolarev (Chairman): The next item of the agenda is the Danish question, and I call on Comrade Kuusinen to address you.

Kuusinen: We have at present two Communist Parties in Denmark, and both have appealed to this Congress. On the ground of these appeals the Presidium has drawn up a resolution on which I would like to make a short report.

The Danish Communist movement originates from two sources—the opposition wing of the Social-Democratic Youth Movement and the Revolutionary Wing of the Syndicalists. It was most fortunate for the Communist movement in Denmark that it was able to enlist the greater number of the Syndicalists on its side. It must, however, be said that the leading Danish Comrades, who came from the Youth Movement, were not capable of fulfilling the tasks which confronted them. These comrades formed the small original Communist Party, and under this leadership the revolutionary wing of the Syndicalists was attached to the Party in the form of a Federation.

These organisations on our instruction united into a single Party, but later, during a crisis last February, split asunder. The E.C. again ordered unity, and we are now faced with the task of finishing the work which the E.C. began, and propose the following resolution. This is one of the main tasks for the Danish Party in the near future. The resolution is quite short and contains two points. I shall now read it to you—

"(1) This Congress declares that the present Communist Party of Denmark, which was formed under the directions of the Executive of the Communist International, by a union of
the Communist "Enhedsparl" and a part of the so-called old Party, one which has loyally carried out all decisions of the Communist International, is recognised as the only section of the Communist International in Denmark. The Party's chief publication, 'Arbeiderbladet,' and other recognised organs of the Party, shall be issued as Communist Party publications.

"(2) The Congress demands that all Communist organisations at present outside of the United Party shall join the United Party.

"Such organisations and members of the so-called old Party, who within the next three months decide in favour of this United Communist Party and declare themselves as prepared, loyally to execute all directions of this Party and its central organs, and of the Communist International, shall be received into the United Party without further conditions."

Kolosov. I will now put to a vote the Kusmin proposal offered on the Communist Party of Denmark.

The proposal is unanimously adopted.

NORWEGIAN QUESTION

Neurath (Chairman): Comrade Bukharin has the floor.

Bukharin (Russia) (greeted with applause): First of all, I would like to characterise briefly the two Norwegian factions. The existence of these factions has deep historical roots and can be understood only by knowing the history of the Norwegian Party. The first tendency, forming the majority in the Norwegian Party, is partly syndicalist and partly reformist. The existence of these tendencies in the Norwegian Workers' Party finds expression in certain minor phenomena. First is Federalism, which is a result of syndicalist traditions. This explains the specific and original structure of the Party. Until very recently, and even now, our Norwegian brother-party has been having its basis in the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions had entered the Party en bloc, and this produces the peculiar situation that there are no Communists in the Communist Party. This finds its explanation in the whole history of the Norwegian movement.

The third political tendency which is characteristic of this group is a separation of politics from economics, and of politics in general from parliamentary politics. This can also be easily understood from the standpoint of the historical development of the Party. This standpoint is absolutely incorrect. We all know that politics is only a concentrated expression of economics. But such a tendency does exist within this group.

The second group in the Party, the second faction, finds its basis, historically considered, in the development of the Youth Movement. While the first group originated from the
old Trade Unions and more especially from the Trade Union opposition, this group grew up from the Youth Movement. While the first tendency shows a sort of anti-political policy, the second advances the importance of politics and the conquest of political power. From a Marxian standpoint, we can say that the second faction is more orthodox, more imbued with the Marxian principles.

This, then, is the general situation of the Party. In the first faction we have various elements, some with syndicalist, some with reformist tendencies. The third tendency within that group combines peculiarly the reformistic element with a syndicalist cover. The first faction controls now the majority of the Party, that of the Executive, and many tactical and theoretical mistakes of the Party have their cause in this leadership.

I would like to say a few words upon the concrete mistakes of the Party. First the question of federalism. This federalism appears most crassly in the attitude of the Party towards the Comintern. We are developing towards ever-increasing centralisation. Our Congress has adopted a resolution on the question of organisation, which shows clearly our tendency to stricter centralisation. This is also the opinion of most delegations, of most parties. But it is not the view of the Norwegian Party.

The Congress may express its view on these resolutions, etc., but the Comintern must not interfere with the internal business of a Party. This is the application of the purest federalism to our International organisation, and this federalism will suffer no criticism. We all must protest sharply against this.

We next come to the question of the organisation of the Party. In this regard it is quite evident, as I have already remarked, that we must reorganise the Party. Under the present circumstances we must have a completely unified Party; and a Party is not unified when it has non-Communists among its members, who are automatically drawn into the Party with the rest of the comrades. When Comrade Zinoviev was for the first time in Halle, as a representative of the Executive of the Communist International, an agreement was entered into with Comrade Tranmael personally that the Party must be reorganised. A long time has elapsed since then, and the reorganisation of the Norwegian Party proceeds but very slowly. So far this task has not been accomplished.

Then comes the question of the name of the Party. Already at the Second Congress of the Communist International it was resolved that in all cases the word Social-Democratic should be struck out. Since then we have written several letters to the Norwegian Party, but about two years have already passed and the old names are retained. The Commission proposes, therefore, that the name be altered in the shortest possible time, as this is for us no trifle but an important matter.
I shall now proceed to the question of general tactics. As I have already remarked, there is a difference of opinion between two factions. The antagonism between those two factions may be described somewhat in the following manner:—The first faction, the majority faction, says, "We are a real proletarian Party, and must carry on the class struggle against the entire bourgeoisie. We are against all manoeuvring, etc." The other faction, the minority, represented by Comrade Schefflo, says, "We must fight, of course, against the whole capitalist system, but we must distinguish between the various sections of the bourgeoisie; and especially must we distinguish between the large capitalists and the large landowners on the one hand and the peasantry and its various groupings on the other." The Executive has supported this second tendency.

On the other hand, we must once again tell our Comrades of the Schello tendency, that in their parliamentary activity, based upon a proper political orientation, they nevertheless committed several grave mistakes. Their biggest mistake consisted in supporting the compulsory arbitration law. We must therefore repeat that it was a mistake that cannot be denied. But at the same time we must say that it is absolutely Marxian and Communist to take advantage of the antagonism between the contending bourgeois forces.

I now come to the question of the "Mot Tag" magazine. With regard to this magazine, we resolved that it should not continue to exist as an organ independent of the Party. In the Commission we quoted various articles from this review—e.g., an article by the editor of the review in which he designated our entire German Party as an intellectual clique. Naturally this ought not to be tolerated, and the spreading of such "false reports" about our two Communist parties should not be tolerated.

In the first draft we outlined two possible solutions—either to discontinue this review or to convert it into a party organ. Our Norwegian Comrades declared themselves in favour of the second solution, and we have acceded to their desire in the matter.

Now I come to the Communist press and to the central organ. On this subject we will merely say the following:—The Norwegian Comrades must carry out the decisions of the previous Congresses of the Communist International with regard to their Party press and their central organ.

With regard to the "personal" matters there are two Comrades, Karl Johansen and Halvor Olsen. The first was formerly a bourgeois journalist. He writes articles now directed against the Comintern. We recommend the Congress to expel him. With regard to Olsen, he is a worker who has made mistakes. He must be told of these but we recommend that he be not expelled.
EGYPTIAN QUESTION

Reporter: Comrade Katayama.

Katayama (Japan): Egypt holds the key to the East and the Far East. Therefore the Egyptian Communist movement is important.

For forty years the Egyptian people have been exploited by English and French imperialists. The late war brought about a change of attitude on the part of the Egyptian people. They revolted against English imperialism. The Egyptian petty bourgeoisie and the Egyptian capitalists are satisfied with the nominal independence of Egypt, but the Communists and the revolutionary workers are not satisfied with nominal independence. They want a real independence and on this point the Comintern should support them. We, the Egyptian Commission, agreed that the Communist movements in Egypt should be helped and encouraged. A strong Communist movement should be built up in Egypt in order to hold the key to the East and the Far East. In the case of revolt in India, Egypt, by reason of the geographical position it occupies, would hold the key to the Indian revolution and could assist it by blockading the Suez Canal. Therefore, we want to help the Egyptian Communist movement, and we want you to recognise the Egyptian Socialist Party. The Egyptian Socialist Party is young, it is inexperienced in many ways, although the Egyptian Comrades are working for the Comintern on Comintern lines. But we want to make certain conditions as to their admission to the Comintern and so after several sessions the Commission has reached the following conclusion:

1.—The report of the S.P.E. delegate, made available to the Commission, is satisfactory evidence that the S.P.E. represents a substantial revolutionary movement in conformity with the Communist International.

2.—The Commission considers, however, that the affiliation of the S.P.E. must be postponed until—

(a) the Party has expelled certain undesirable elements;

(b) the Party has convoked a Congress at which an attempt shall be made to unite with the S.P.E. any Communist element in Egypt that may at present exist outside the S.P.E. and will accept the 21 demands of the C.I.;

(c) the Party has changed its name to "The Communist Party of Egypt."

3.—The S.P.E. is therefore instructed to summon a congress for the above purposes at an early date, and not later than January 10th, 1923.
REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

SESSION HELD, November 17, 1922.

Chairman: Comrade Kolaroff.

Reporter: Comrade Eberlein. Comrades, after the World Congress had been decided upon, the Presidium sent to the various sections of the Communist-International a distribution plan according to which the delegates to the World Congress were to be elected. According to this plan, 850 delegates from 61 countries were invited to the Congress of the Communist International. According to a decision of the Presidium a sub-committee, which was appointed on November 16th, 1922, consisting of Comrades Trilliser, Piatnitsky and Eberlein, was entrusted with the preliminary examination of the credentials. Subsequently the Enlarged Executive appointed a final Commission for the examination of the credentials, and Comrades Thalheimer (Germany), Kabatchiev (Bulgaria), Scheffo (Norway) and Gramsci (Italy) were added to the three other comrades.

This Commission examined the credentials of the comrades who had arrived, and found them to be on the whole correct. The Presidium had previously issued instructions that every delegate was to provide himself with a special credential signed and stamped by the Central Committee of his respective Party. These instructions were in most cases strictly adhered to.

I shall now report to you on the number of delegates who have already arrived, and the number of credentials which have been found correct, and will ask you at the conclusion to endorse the work of the credentials commission. At the same time I will try to give you, as far as this is possible, the number of members of the respective parties. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that not all the parties were able to state the exact number of their members, as a considerable number of parties have been forced to carry on illegal existence, and are therefore unable to produce definite statistics.

Moreover, I should like also to draw your attention to the fact that the number of the invitations was based not merely on the actual membership of the parties. The distribution of credentials also took into account the political importance of the respective parties in the present stage of the revolutionary struggle, the special political and economic situation of the given country, and, finally, the degree of illegality of the Party and the extent of its oppression by the enemy.

Twenty comrades were invited from the German Party, which has at present a membership of 226,030, out of which 102,400 paid their membership dues regularly during the last quarter (according to the lists of contributions). Twenty-three comrades have arrived. The Credentials Commission seated
the 23 comrades with a decisive vote. Their credentials were found to be in proper condition.

The French Party declared their membership to be 78,828. Twenty comrade delegates were invited, and 24 have arrived. Twenty-three delegates were recognised as entitled to a decisive vote, and one was granted deliberative vote.

The Italian Party stated its membership to be 24,688. Twenty comrade delegates were invited, and 21 comrades have arrived, all of whom were recognised as entitled to a decisive vote.

The Russian Party stated its membership to be 324,822 in Russia proper. There is a separate membership list for the Ukraine, White Russia, and the Near and Far East. Seventy-five comrades were invited, all of whom have arrived and were given a decisive vote.

The Czecho-Slovak Party stated its membership to be 170,000; 125,000 members having paid their fees during the last quarter. Twenty comrades were invited, and 17 have arrived and were given a decisive vote.

In addition to these big parties, the Young Communist League, with a membership of 700,000, and the Profatern were allotted 50 decisive votes each. Each of these organisations has sent 20 delegates. Their credentials were found correct.

The British Party stated its membership to be 5,118, only 2,300 having paid their membership fees, according to information received by us. Ten delegates were invited, and seven have arrived. Their credentials were recognised as correct.

The American Communist Party stated its membership to be 8,000. Ten delegates were invited, nine have arrived. The Workers’ Party of America has also sent representatives. It has a membership of 30,000. Three delegates have arrived and were given deliberative vote. Two representatives of the Negro Organisation, with a membership of about 600, have also arrived from America, and were admitted to the Congress with a deliberative vote.

The Polish Party stated its membership to be 10,000, 7,000 having paid their membership fees. It should be stated that the Polish Party is carrying on an illegal existence. Ten comrades were invited, 10 have arrived and were admitted to the Congress with a decisive vote.

The Ukrainian Communist Party stated its membership to be 80,000, 10 comrades were invited, 15 comrades have arrived, out of whom 10 were given a decisive and five a deliberative vote.

The Norwegian Party stated its membership to be 60,000, six comrades were invited, of whom five have arrived and were admitted with a decisive vote.

The Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia claims a membership of 80,000. Six comrades were invited. Considerable difference of opinion has arisen in connection with the distribution of the credentials among these delegates. The Central Committee had allotted six credentials, but only four of the appointed comrades have arrived. In their stead, two other members have
arrived on invitation by the Presidium owing to the fact that the Party differences were to be settled here at the Congress. A Commission for the Yugo-Slavian question was also appointed here. The two comrades, who in their capacity of visitors were admitted to the Congress with a deliberate vote, protest against this, demanding to be admitted with a decisive vote. The credentials Commission refused to comply with their demand. But the comrades claim that at the election by the Central Committee, one of the comrades who has arrived was rejected by 4:4 votes, and the other by 3:5 votes. The credentials Commission, after careful examination of the credentials, has come to the conclusion that the comrades were not elected. However, as this question is of great importance to the Yugo-Slavian Party, and as the Party differences are very acute, the credentials Commissions left the decision of the question to the Presidium. The Presidium decided to give a decisive vote to both of these comrades, with the clear understanding that this decision has no bearing on the Party differences within the Yugo-Slavian Party, which are to be settled by the Political Commission. The comrades were informed of this matter in a special resolution. For the foregoing reasons we ask, therefore, that this comrade's mandate should likewise be recognised.

The Bulgarian Party has 40,000 members. It was invited to send six delegates, and that number has come. These credentials are in order.

The Finnish Party has 25,000 members on the books; of these 20,000 are full paying members, six delegates were asked for, seven have come. Their credentials have been ratified.

The C.P. of Spain has about 6,000 members. Three delegates were invited, four have come. Three have been given mandates with the right to vote, one has been given a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Roumania has about 2,000 members. Four delegates were invited, three have come. These three have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Sweden has 12,143 members on the books. During the last quarter 7,843 members paid full dues. Six delegates were invited and six have come. All have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Latvia has 1,600 members. Six delegates were invited, eight have come. Six have been admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Switzerland has 5,200 members. Three delegates were invited, three have come, and have been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The Austrian Party has about 10,000 members. Three delegates were invited, six came. Four delegates were admitted with the right to vote and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Holland has 2,000 members. One delegate was invited, four have come. One received the right to vote, three admitted with consultative voice.
The C.P. of Belgium has 617 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of China has 800 members, of whom 180 are full paying members. Three delegates were invited, one came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of India cannot represent a definite membership, since its work is entirely illegal. Four delegates were invited, one has come, and has been admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Ireland. Three delegates were invited, four have come. Three admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Azerbaijan. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two admitted with the right to vote, one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Georgia has 18,811 members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two delegates have been admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Lithuania has 1,000 members on the books, 600 being full paying members. One delegate was invited, two have come. Both have been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Estonia has 2,800 members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two were admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Denmark has 1,200 members on the books, of whom 780 are full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. One admitted with the right to vote, two with consultative voice.

The C.P. of Persia has 1,000 members, 600 of these being full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, three have come. Two have been admitted with the right to vote, one with a consultative voice.

In Turkey there are now two Parties, that of Constantinople and that of Angora. The Angora Party has about 300 members; two delegates were invited, six have come. Two have been admitted with the right to vote, two were given visitors' cards, and two were refused admission. The membership of the Constantinople Party cannot be stated. Two delegates were invited, three came; two were admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Australia has 900 members, of whom 750 are full-paying members. Two delegates were invited, four have come. Two were admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Argentina has about 3,500 members. Two delegates were invited, two have come and have been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Africa has 900 members on the books, 100 of these being full-paying members. One delegate was invited,
two have come. One has been admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Java. The exact membership cannot be given, but the Party has probably about 1,800 members. One delegate was invited, one came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Canada has 4,610 members. One delegate was invited, three have come. One delegate was admitted with the right to vote, and two with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Portugal has 2,900 members on the books, 1,702 being full-paying members. One delegate was invited, two have come. One was admitted with the right to vote, and one with a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Chili has about 2,000 members. One delegate was invited. This comrade did not arrive until yesterday evening, and his credentials have not yet been examined.

The C.P. of Uruguay has about 1,000 members. One delegate was invited, one came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Brazil has about 600 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Mexico has about 1,600 members. One delegate has been invited, one has come, and was admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Armenia. One delegate was invited, two have come. One has been admitted with the right to vote, and the other has been given a consultative voice.

The C.P. of Chita. One delegate was invited, but has not yet arrived.

The C.P. of Bukhara. One delegate was invited. One came, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Mongolia has about 1,600 members. One delegate was invited, one has come. He was admitted with a consultative voice only, for the Mongolian Party has not yet affiliated to the C.I.

The Communist Party of Korea. One delegate was invited, four have come. Since, however, there are fierce party struggles among the Communists in Korea, it is difficult to determine which of these delegates represent a genuine Communist Party. In these circumstances two of the delegates were admitted as visitors, and two were refused admission.

The Communist Party of Iceland has about 4,000 members, but the Party as a whole is still Menshevik in outlook. There is, however, a fraction comprising 450 communists, and this fraction has been admitted to the C.I. One delegate was invited, one came, and his credentials were recognised with the right to vote.

The Communist Party of Fiume has about 160 members on the books. One delegate is on the way to Moscow, and on arrival will be admitted to the Congress with the right to vote.
The Communist Party of Palestine. One delegate was invited, and is now on the way to Moscow.

The C.P. of Greece. One delegate was invited, but has not yet come.

The C.P. of Hungary. Three delegates were invited, seven delegates were appointed by the Presidium of the C.I. and were admitted by the mandate commission with the right to vote, seeing that the C.P. is illegal in Hungary and has not yet been able to become established in that country.

One delegate was invited from Turkestan. He has come, and has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Uighurian Section of the C.P. of Turkestan sent three delegates. One was admitted with a consultative voice; the other two have been given visitors' cards.

The C.P. of Crimea has sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Mountain Republic has sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

The Egyptian Party has also sent one delegate, who has been admitted with a consultative voice.

There have also been admitted with a consultative voice one representative of the Women's International, one representative of the Famine Relief.

This completes the list of the C.P. that were invited to send delegates to the Congress and that have done so.

In all, 300 delegates were invited to the Congress, and 394 have come. Of these 340 have been given the right to vote, and 48 have been given a consultative voice, while five delegates have been given visitors' cards.

In addition, a special invitation was sent by the Presidium of the Congress to the Italian Socialist Party, asking for five delegates. Five were sent, and have been admitted with a consultative voice.

The opposition in Czecho-Slovakia was invited to send three comrades. They have come, and have been admitted with a consultative voice.

Two comrades were invited to the sessions of the Program Commission and were admitted with a consultative voice.

Two comrades, Frossard and Cachin, were invited from France. They have not yet arrived, but according to the latest telegrams they are on the way.

A comrade has also been invited from Norway, but has not yet arrived.

Of these specially invited comrades, 10 have arrived up to now, and have all been admitted with a consultative voice.

There has also come a representative from the U.S.A. to the Agrarian Commission, and he has been admitted with a consultative voice.

Now let me say a few words regarding certain cases in which the Mandate Commission found it necessary to refuse credentials.
Two delegates were sent by the Foreign Bureau of the C.P. of Persia. This F.B. was dissolved by the Comintern more than six months ago. Apparently, however, it continues to exist, since it has sent two delegates to Moscow. The Mandate Commission thought it necessary to refuse credentials.

The recognition of the mandates of the C.P. of Austria entailed difficulties. Three comrades came from Austria with credentials given in Vienna on October 17th and 19th. One of them left Vienna as early as October 19th. On October 22nd we received a telegram from the Executive Committee of the Austrian Party cancelling three credentials, and consolidating all the credentials upon the Austrian representative on the Executive, Comrade Grün. The telegram stated that the Austrian Party could not afford to defray the travelling expenses of the three delegates to Moscow. Notwithstanding this telegram, the three delegates arrived. Thus we had, on the one hand, Comrade Grün with three credentials; and on the other hand the three delegates with what they regarded as valid credentials from the Austrian Executive Committee. The Mandate Commission decided, on the proposal of the four Austrian comrades, to recognise the credentials of the three who had specially come from Vienna, and also to give the right to vote to the fourth comrade. Thus the Austrian Party has four duly accredited representatives.

The Women’s Section of the Eastern Division, represented by their leader, Kaspurova, asked for a mandate with the right to vote. The application was refused.

Speaking generally, the distribution of mandates conveying the right to vote and of mandates giving a consultative voice merely (when there were numerous delegates with valid credentials) has been effected on the following principles. As a rule those comrades who have come from their respective countries direct to the Congress have been given the right to vote, whereas these comrades who had been for some time resident in Moscow and were no longer in direct touch with their respective countries, have been given a consultative voice only.

Furthermore, upon the instructions of the Presidium there were admitted to the Congress of the Comintern with a consultative voice all the delegates to the Profintera Congress, and those delegates to the Young Communists Congress who had already arrived in Moscow were given visitors’ cards for the Comintern Congress. Admission with a consultative voice was also granted to two of the delegates to the Co-operative Congress, seeing that the question of co-operation is under discussion at the Comintern Congress and these two comrades had, therefore, to work upon the commission.

This ends the report of the Mandate Commission. I ask you in the name of the Commission to recognise the mandates and to ratify the decisions of the Commission.
ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Neurath (Chairman): We now come to the election of the Executive. A Commission was appointed, on behalf of which Comrade Kolaroff will now report.

Kolaroff: In accordance with the resolution on the organisation of the Executive of the Communist International, the future Executive must be composed of one chairman, 24 members, and 10 substitutes.

Therefore, the Presidium has asked the different delegations to nominate their delegates and to prepare complete lists. Some delegations have handed in complete lists, while others have only designated their own candidates.

The small Commission has had a most difficult problem to solve. As you know, our International is composed of 62 Communist Parties. Each of these Parties would like to be represented on the Executive, which is naturally quite impossible.

Therefore, the Small Commission was forced to make a choice, giving a preference to certain Parties—notably to those parties which, because of their numerical strength and political importance, are of greater importance within the International.

On the other hand, the Small Commission has tried to have the whole world represented on the new Executive. We believe that the Commission has succeeded in solving this problem in a more or less satisfactory manner. In the list which it now presents to you are contained representatives of all continents, all the large Parties, and all those groups of inter-connected parties which are in a more or less identical situation.

The list prepared by the Small Commission has been confirmed by the Presidium with certain modifications, and I am instructed to present it to you. It is as follows:

Chairman—Zinoviev.
France—Two delegates, Frossard, Souvarine; one substitute, Duret.
Germany—Two delegates, Clara Zetkin, Eberlein; one substitute, Boettcher.
Russia—Two delegates, Bukharin, Radek; two substitutes, Lenin, Trotsky.
Czecho-Slovakia—Two delegates, Smeral, Neurath; one substitute, Nuna.
Italy—Two delegates, Generali, Grasci; one substitute, Bordiga.
Young Communist International—Two delegates, Schueller, Schatskin.
England—One delegate, MacManus; one substitute, Newbold.
America—One delegate, Carr; one substitute, Daflon.
Scandinavia—Two delegates, Hugel, Schelfio.
Poland—One delegate, Pruchnjak.
Finland—One delegate, Kuusinen.

Balkan States—One delegate, Kolaroff.

Australia—One delegate, Garden.

South America—One delegate, Suenermer.

South Africa—One delegate, Andrews.

The Orient—Two delegates, Katayama, Safarov; one substitute, Roy.

With regard to the delegates recommended by the Italian Party, the Presidium has decided to move that they be accepted with the reserve that the Italian Party, after its Unity Congress, has the right to propose new representatives, who must, however, be ratified by the Executive.

In the name of the Presidium, I ask you to adopt this list, if possible, unanimously.

Executive elected unanimously.

CONCLUDING SPEECH OF COMRADE ZINOVIY

In winding up the Congress, Comrade Zinoviev said that the task of the Fourth Congress was the study, differentiation and concentration of the questions of the international labour movement. The Congress solved these problems. For the first time the Comintern acted as a really international party with a collective experience, having solved the questions of the internal party life of the French, Czechoslovak, Italian, Norwegian, Spanish and other Communist Parties.

He expressed the hope that the French Party will overcome the old social-democratic traditions, that the Italian Party will fulfill the will of the Italian proletariat, that the Norwegian Party will rid itself of its federalistic, syndicalistic and reformist tendencies, and, finally, that the opposition minority of the Czechoslovakian Party will find the right path. He expressed his satisfaction with the fact that the majority of the Czechoslovak Party supported the resolution on the Czechoslovak question, notwithstanding the breach of discipline by the Czech opposition.

The minorities of the Parties should take into consideration that the resolutions adopted by the Congress are based on the collective experience of all the Communist Parties.

The Comintern grows. The Comintern is no longer only a symbol, but a united world organisation of the revolutionary proletariat. It is necessary that we systematically carry out the tactic of the United Front, which is the key to the solution of the most important tasks of the proletariat. International discipline consists not only in that different sections carry out decisions with which they are in agreement, but precisely in that they comply with such decisions with which they are not in full accord.

The general situation remains revolutionary. The victory of the Comintern is assured by the entire course of events.
To the WORKING MASSES of TURKEY

THE Fourth Congress of the Third International, held contemporaneously with the fifth anniversary of the great Proletarian Revolution, sends its warmest greetings to the workers and peasants of Turkey, wishing them success in their heroic struggle for independence against Western imperialism.

Comrades of Turkey! you have given a live example of a revolutionary movement of independence to the entire East and to all the Colonial countries subjugated by imperialism.

But the latest events show that the bourgeois nationalist government intends to usurp the fruits of this victory won at the price of your tremendous sacrifices.

The nationalist government of Angora is ready to come to terms with the imperialists at the price of some concessions obtained for the benefit of the big bourgeoisie of Turkey. It inaugurated this new policy by dissolving the Communist Party and suppressing all its organisations, by making wholesale arrests and maltreating our imprisoned comrades in barbarous fashion, and finally by suppressing the Turkish Labourers' Union at Constantinople.

The Turkish Communist Party has always supported the bourgeois nationalist government in the struggle of the toiling masses against imperialism. The Turkish Communist Party consented even, in face of the common enemy, to make temporary concessions in its programme and its ideal.

In view of these facts, the attitude of the government towards the Communist Party demonstrates the desire of the government to banish all the conscious representatives of the working class and the peasantry who will insist on realisation of the democratic reforms which were solemnly pledged in order to obtain your aid, and also in order to make the appearance of a real bourgeois government at the Lausanne Conference.

The bourgeois government of Turkey has the audacity to commit against you and your representatives such crimes that arouse the indignation of the entire world proletariat, led by the Russian proletariat, which grudged no material or moral sacrifice during the most trying period, when all the imperialist and capitalist Powers made common cause for the purpose of strangling the toiling people of Turkey.

The nationalist government, in preparation for an understanding with the imperialists, endeavours to destroy your true representatives and to separate them from their friends abroad.

The Fourth Congress of the Communist International protests vigorously against this barbarous act, and considers it as its duty to solemnly proclaim its readiness to support any
government or political party that will refuse to play the part of the gendarme of imperialism, which will continually fight against imperialism and reaction, and which will realize the democratic reforms for the benefit of the toiling masses of Turkey. To you, the imprisoned comrades, the Third International—the general staff of the world proletariat—affectionately salutes you as the most conscious and most devoted representatives of the toiling masses of Turkey.

Remember, comrades, that the gloom of dungeons has never yet obscured the sun of the revolution.

Remember, comrades, that on the eve of the victory of the revolution, the impotence of the ruling class manifests itself by increased ferocity. This is what we are witnessing now, when capitalism breaks down under the weight of its inherent contradictions, when the shock of imperialist conflicts has reached its highest point, the international bourgeoisie redoubles its persecutions against the heralds and the builders of the new Communist society.

But no white terror ever succeeded in intimidating those who are firm in their faith of the inevitable and final victory of the social revolution. The place of every comrade that is imprisoned or shot is taken by hundreds of comrades arising from the exploited proletarian ranks, who will continue to fight for freedom with increased vigour.

Comrades, the Third International considers as its essential duty to do everything in its power to rescue you from the hands of your hangmen.

Long live the World Revolution!

Long live the faithful Communists of Turkey!

Long live the Third International!

Long live Soviet Russia!
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