

BULLETIN

OF THE IV CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

№ 13.

Moscow.

23 November 1922.

Thirteenth Session.

November 17, 1922 opened.

Chairmen: Comrades Kolaroff, Markhlevsky, Zetkin.

Contents:

Report of the Credentials Committee. Wireless Message from Yugo-Slavia. Declaration from the French Delegation. Voting on Report of Credentials Committee. Discussion of the Capitalist Offensive (conclusion). Adoption of Resolution of Protest against Polish Government for the arrest of Communists.

Telegram from Comrade Newbold on his election to Parliament.
Declaration by Comrade Welti, on behalf of the Swiss Delegation.

Appointment of Egyptian Commission.

Speakers. Eberlein, Humbert-Droz, Ravenstein, Stern, Webb, Hoernle, Welti, Rosmer, Radek, Zinoviev.

Chairman Kolaroff:—I declare the session open, and call upon comrade Eberlein to put before you the report of the credentials committee.

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, 350 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 16, 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), Kabalchiev (Bulgaria), Scheffie (Norway), and Gramsci (Italy), were added to the three other comrades.

This Commission examined the creden-

tials 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 num-

ber 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 226,200, 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 twenty-three 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 comrades were invited, and twenty-four have arrived. Twenty-three delegates were recognized as entitled to a decisive vote, and one was granted deliberative vote.

The Italian Party stated its membership to be 24,638. Twenty comrades were invited, and 21 comrades have arrived, all of whom were recognized as entitled to a decisive vote.

The Russian Party stated its membership to be 324,522 in Russia proper. There is a separate membership list for the Ukraina, 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 760,000, and the Profintern were allotted 20 decisive votes each. Each of these organisations has sent 20 delegates. Their credentials were found correct.

The British Party stated its membership to be 5,116, only 2,300 having paid their membership fees, according to information received by us. Twenty delegates were invited, and 7 have arrived.

Their credentials were recognized as correct.

The American Communist Party stated its membership to be 8,000. Ten delegates were invited, 9 have arrived. The Workers Party of America has also sent representatives. It has a membership of 20,000. Three delegates have arrived and were given deliberative vote. Two representatives of the Negro Organisation, with a membership of about 500, 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, 7000 having paid their membership fees. It should be stated that the Polish Party is carrying on an illegal existence. Ten comrades were invited, 20 have arrived and were admitted to the Congress with a decisive vote.

The Ukrainian Communist Party stated its membership to be 80,000, ten comrades were invited, fifteen comrades have arrived, out of whom 10 were given a decisive and 5 a deliberative vote.

The Norwegian Party stated its membership to be 60,000, six comrades were invited, of whom 5 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 had allotted 6 credentials, but only 4 of the appointed comrades have arrived. In their stead, 2 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 deliberative 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 recognized.

The Bulgarian Party has 40,000 members. It was invited to send six delegates, and that number has come. This 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 5000 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 2000 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 1500 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 16,000 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 2,500 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 517 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C. P. of China has 300 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. 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 1000 members on the books, 500 being full paying members. One delegate was invited, two have come. Both have been admitted with the right to vote,

The C. P. of Esthonia 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 1000 members, 500 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 200 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 1,300 members. One delegate was invited, one came and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C. P. of Canada has 4,810 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 500 members. One delegate was invited, one has come, and has been admitted with the right to vote.

The C.P. of Mexico has about 1,500 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 Chiwa. 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 1,500 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 Menshevist 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 150 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 Uigurian 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, 350 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 5 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 5 delegates. Five were sent, and have been admitted with a consultative voice.

The opposition in Czecho-Slovakia was invited to send 3 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, Erossard 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 6 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 17 and 19. One of them left Vienna as early as October 19. On October 22 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 4 duly accredited representatives.

The women's Section of the Eastern Division, represented by their leader Kasparova, 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 Profintern 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 Cooperative Congress, seeing that the question of cooperation 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.

Wireless message from Yugoslavia.

In the name of the 3 Comrades of the Yugoslavian delegation, I have to make the following declaration:

The Presidium has admitted 2 comrades to the Congress with the right to vote. Therein the Presidium has adopted the outlook that these 2 comrades speak in the name of a special group. These comrades and groups do not express their views as such. Indeed, in the session on the Executive when the question of the delegation was under discussion they said that these comrades did not exist as a group. These 2 comrades, according to their own declaration, do not represent any sort of group. If there is any warrant for speaking of such a group, this group is represented by one member of the delegation. For this reason, we take up the position that these 2 comrades cannot properly be recognized by the Congress as members of the delegation. In the event of the Congress adopting such a decision, and with due regard to the consequences in Yugoslavia, the other 3 delegates would be compelled to withdraw from the Congress. I wish to make the foregoing declaration in the name of these 3 comrades.

Humbert-Droz: In order to solve the crisis in the Yugo-Slavian Communist Party, the Executive has found necessary to invite comrades Pavlovitch, Navakovitch and other representatives of the Minority of the Party to come to Moscow to submit and defend their point of view.

The Presidium thinks the moral guarantees for a solution of the differences within the Party would be furnished by giving the comrades Pavlovitch and Navakovitch the opportunity to take part in the work of the Congress, not only with two consultative votes, but also

with two deciding votes in addition to the Yugo-Slavian Delegation.

This mandate has been given to them by the Presidium in the interests of composing the differences within the Party ranks. It should by no means be interpreted as taking a prejudiced position in the controversy, and should not serve as a precedent.

The congress will have to give its decision on the crisis in the Yugo-Slavian Party, after hearing the Report of the Commission.

Radek: Comrades, I do not intend to intervene in the Party controversy in Yugoslavia. I merely wish to say a word or two in answer to the Yugo-Slavian representative. He declared that if these comrades would find them selves compelled to withdraw from the Congress.

This declaration shows that our comrade is far from being in real contact with the spirit and methods of the work of the Communist International. It is the first time that I hear a delegate to declare that if Congress decides against him he would withdraw. These are things that suit only those who are now outside of the Communist International, as for instance the K. A. P. D. Every delegate here should know of the imperative duty to submit to the decisions of this sovereign Congress. For this reason I consider the declaration as absolutely irrelevant and detrimental to the movement.

With regard to the substance of the question, the Presidium has clearly stated the grounds upon which it acted. To this I merely wish to add a few words. The Yugo-Slavian Party is an illegal Party. In such an organisation it is a thousand times easier for differences to arise and a thousand times more difficult to solve them than it is the case in parties which are able to work legally. In such a situation it would be criminal on the part of the Presidium if it did not do the utmost to keep the comrades together. Further I wish to say both comrades have received a great number of votes. The Party has not made use of the whole number of mandates at its disposal. Thus, even formally the decision of the Presidium takes into consideration the relations which prevail within the Yugo-Slavian Party.

Chairman Markhlevsky: The French Delegation has sent in a declaration which I will ask to be read.

Humbert-Droz: The French Delegation wishes to be permitted the right of introducing changes in the distribution of its mandates until the arrival of comrades who are on their way to Moscow.

Chairman Markhlevsky: Taking into consideration the objection made by the Yugo-Slavian Delegation to the decisions of the Credentials Committee, I will take a vote on the question, after which no further objections will be accepted. I will now take the vote, comrades. Those against the decision of the Presidium with regard to the Yugo-Slavian mandate please raise their hand. There being nobody against, I take it that the decision of the Presidium has been adopted unanimously.

We will now take a vote on the report of the Credentials' Committee. Those against the report, raise their hands. The report is carried unanimously.

Now, comrades, we may continue the discussion of the Capitalist Offensive. As the list of speakers is still open, the Presidium proposes that the list be now closed. We have added on the list the names of Comrade Ravenstein—Holland, Stern—Austria, Webb—Great Britain, Hornle—Germany, Katayama—Japan, Hentges—France, and Welti—Switzerland.

The Presidium has also received the intimation that the Yugo-Slavian Delegation bows to the decision of the Presidium. (Cheers).

Now, those in favour of closing the speakers' list, let them raise their hands.

The speakers' list is closed. Comrade Ravenstein has the floor.

Ravenstein (Holland): Comrades, one could not demand the floor to debate on Comrade Trotzky's report without being suspected of disagreement with the important, as well as forceful, arguments of one of the leading spirits of the Russian Revolution. Nevertheless, comrades, these arguments call for some remarks, not so much on the main part of Trotzky's report, but on the part where he spoke about the prospects of the World Revolution and the probable political developments in Western Europe. Comrade Trotzky drew attention to the danger of reformist and pacifist illusions in the West-

ern Parties. Well, in the light of the experiences of last year, there can be no two opinions on that score. But he went on to say that the political background for such illusions would probably be extremely favourable for some time to come. This view he based on the assumption that the political developments of the Western countries will quite easily lead to a bloc, and consequently to a government of petty bourgeois pacifist elements, a bloc of the Left, so to speak, which would lay claim to the support of the Labour Parties. In such a contingency there would be considerable danger of such a bloc gaining support from Communists, or at least an inclination to such support. He said, for instance, that in England the victory of the Unionists and National Liberals at the forthcoming elections were assured. On the other hand, he pointed out the probability that this coalition would not hold together very long, and that the Labour Party might be called upon to form a government.

Comrade Trotzky was followed by Comrade Radek who dealt with this question at some length, and I gained the impression—I believe in company with many others—that Comrade Radek was not quite at one with Comrade Trotzky in his views upon this subject. I was particularly pleased with that part of Comrade Radek's speech, this I wish particularly to emphasise—where he indicated the danger of extreme reaction, i. e., monarchist or fascist reaction throughout Central Europe. There is indeed, a historic parallel for such danger in the experiences of the French Revolution, such as the movement in the Vendee, and to a certain extent also in the royalist counter-revolution in Spain against the Cortes, and partly also in the rise of Bonapartism in 1852.

Comrade Radek thus indicated the extremist and conspirative nature of the danger of counter-revolution throughout Central Europe, one might say from Sicily to the Elba. This indication seems to me all the more important because in my opinion the German Labour movement, and even the German Communist Party, fails to realise the extreme gravity of this danger. When listening to the representative of the German opposition, who argued against Radek yesterday,

I asked myself: is this comrade aware of the fact that it depends on the will of one man, Prince Rupprecht, whether or not the monarchy should be revived tomorrow in Bavaria, and consequently also in Tyrol, in Austria, in Hungary etc. with the concomitant reemergence of white terror, directed not only against the Communists, but also against the Social-Democrats and the Labour Movement as a whole. Comrades, I am of the opinion that if the German comrade had taken a clear view of this fact, he would perhaps have spoken in a different tone.

Another thing that pleased me in Comrade Radek's remarks was his clear and precise indication of the dangerous political trend observable also in the countries of Western Europe, which have their old bourgeois culture and tradition in contra-distinction to Central Europe. France and England are naturally the leading examples, and what is happening today in England is probably symptomatic of likely developments in other West European countries. Comrade Radek said: political events in England are at first sight misleading. The Unionists went into the election campaign, so to speak, without a program, without ideas, without making any promises, and one has to use a microscope to discern any substantial difference between Mr. Lloyd George and Bonar Law. Quite so! But Bonar Law is a typical representative of reaction among the British middle class. And the British middle class demands the removal of the burden of taxation which oppresses them, they also want retrenchment and the utmost economy of State expenditure.

Similar tendencies are observable in so old a bourgeois country as Holland, which reflects all the ideological currents of the bourgeois world, and in which the bourgeoisie is particularly well informed of everything that Holland is also an imperialist country of great importance. The bourgeois extremists look back fondly to their old liberal ideology in its crudest form smacking of the Manchester school and Cobdenism. There are among them such fanatical and theoretical politicians who would want to do away with all social legislation. Down with all laws protecting labour! This comment has its counterpart, even if not in such extreme

form, almost in all the other bourgeois parties, and even among part of the working class which are still under the influence of the bourgeois parties. This is the dominating factor of present day politics in all the old bourgeois countries, like England, France, Belgium and Holland. It should be borne in mind that particularly in these countries, which have still maintained a stable currency, do 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 knock 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, Herr Colyn, 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 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. The development of France has been well treated in an instructive little book by the well-known ex-Premier Caillaux, entitled "Ou va l'Europe, ou va la France". I regret not having time to speak at greater length upon the subject. At any rate, I think it

is quite clear that there are no signs even in the Western countries for a revival of bourgeois reformism, radicalism and pacifism.

What conclusions are we to draw. Of course, this ought to make us realise the necessity of the United Front, of a vigorous union of all the proletarian elements under the leadership of Communist. I would merely wish to add that at least in the countries which I have mentioned, the so-called pure bourgeois countries, where historically pure bourgeois ideology prevails, the idea and the slogan of Workers' Government is groundless as well as utopian. In imperialist countries with great oversea colonies, like England, France, Belgium and Holland—which together form a type, so to speak, — one would rather expect the influence on political events to emanate from the East. This is in my opinion an absolute fact. The capitalism of these countries is tied up with those oversea colonies like the Siamese twins i. e. in life and death. This union was even strengthened by the war. Every upheaval in the oversea dominions must find its deepest echo in the imperialist ruling country.

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, Troelstras and Viegens 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 term of Workers' Government.

I therefore come to the conclusion that the proletarian United Front is the great tactical line of guidance for 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 proletarian

ariat can the Communist International fight and win throughout the world.

Stern (Austria): Comrades, in considering the question of the capitalist offensive, it seems to me that two questions are of particular importance. Firstly, does this capitalist offensive mean that we are approaching a more or less prolonged period during which world reaction will prove stronger than the world proletariat? Secondly, in what manner can we avoid becoming reformists or be taken for reformists in this struggle for partial demands which was forced on us.

As to the first question—the meaning of the capitalist offensive, it is sufficient for those who might think that the capitalist offensive means the predominance of the opponents of world communism, to turn their attention to Austria. In its development Austria might well serve as a model for other countries which do not realise to-day that a similar development is perhaps in store for them. In Austria one can see quite clearly that the capitalist offensive is nothing but the last desperate attempt to save itself by any means. The bourgeoisie has done its utmost to save itself from destruction. It reduced the real wage of the working class to the lowest possible minimum. In its offensive it used the most cunning means to save itself from destruction, and yet it has only succeeded in hastening the collapse. We have reached the point in Austria when even the cleverest representatives of the bourgeoisie had quite openly to admit the total failure of the bourgeois policy, and the impossibility of undertaking anything in Austria.

The Geneva agreement means that the world bourgeoisie recognised the hopeless position of the Austria bourgeoisie, and is coming to its assistance. The world bourgeoisie is fully aware that the importance of Austria is far greater than is commensurate with the size of its territory, and for that reason is coming to its assistance. It wishes to carry the offensive against the working class still further by a more forcible dictatorship, in order to obtain breathing time.

From this view point the Austrian problem is of international significance, not only strategically, because Austria is the connection link between Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia, between fascist Italy

and Germany and between Hungary and Bavaria, but because we are fully aware in Austria that the bourgeoisie is afraid of the proletariat assuming the counter offensive (in spite of the collapse and the extremely difficult conditions), and because it wants to win for itself a powerful position in the great struggle.

Comrades, I am of the opinion that in connection with the Austrian events our International will be confronted with new tasks in the near future. In a situation such as prevails in Austria International action in the form of the United Front is absolutely necessary. But, there is no one to undertake such action. The Austrian proletariat by itself is too weak to repulse the attack of its bourgeoisie which has the assistance of the world bourgeoisie of other States. The proletarians of the other countries must come to the rescue and I am of the opinion that in this respect it is the duty of the International not only to organise itself as a party, but also to assume a leading role and take action.

In a case like that of Austria, the International must approach the workers and the communist parties of the respective countries, must explain to them the International significance of this particular case and must induce communist parties to take action in the interest of this Austrian proletariat in that of the world proletariat. Of course, I do not mean a putsch, nor action which the proletariat of the respective countries is not capable of undertaking, but action of the nature of the United Front. What I want to say, is—that the parties of the respective countries must call upon the entire proletariat to come forward in the interests of the Austrian proletariat. Just as the French comrades were told here that in order to act in the United Front spirit, they must not wait until they are an ideal party, the International must also say that these parties must not wait until they are a solid world party, by issuing directives for action and by intervening in the general struggle between world capitalism and the world proletariat wherever such actions are required. We see that the struggle is extending internationally, the isolated struggles between capital and labour in each separate country are extending into struggles of groups of

the bourgeoisie of the various countries against the proletariat of those countries. Therefore, the International must look upon this development in the same light and must act accordingly.

Comrades, also in another direction, Austria is an example from which we can all learn. We in Austria were able to apply the tactics of the United Front under particularly difficult circumstances. I believe that our experience in Austria has shown that the United Front tactics can be also successfully applied in countries where a small party is confronting a powerful party. The application of the United Front tactics is particularly difficult under such circumstances, because the big party is in the position to give wrong information to the working class, to distort everything and to calumniate the small party. Even when we are not able to get into contact with the masses through the press and by means of meetings, it was proved in Austria that in spite of this the United Front tactics can be successful. We had also seen in Austria the connection between the United Front tactics from above and from below. We have seen that even when a big party is too proud to recognise the small party, it is advisable to approach the leading organisations, in order to increase in this way the pressure of the masses from below. We saw this on the first of May when the social-democratic party wished to push us aside and when the social-democratic workers compelled the leaders of their party (regardless of their watchwords) to hold joint meetings at which communist speakers were allowed to address the masses.

These tactics were particularly successful in the struggle of the tramway workers most of whom were social democrats. The result of our support in the spirit of the United Front tactics was that at the last election of the officials of the tramway workers, when all the social democratic candidates were defeated and the communists and opposition candidates received all the votes. When the social democrats annulled this election and instituted another election, they were again defeated, getting still fewer votes than before. We also applied these tactics with considerable success in connection with the Geneva agreement. When

the latter became known the social-democrats were not ashamed to hint that they would be ready to swallow the agreement. We took up the struggle with the greatest energy, using the tactics of the United Front and pointing out what is at stake if the social democrats are not even willing to defend their much beloved democracy. By this means we compelled the social-democrats to put at least a pretence of a struggle. This sham fight has shown how little reason we have to fear (as some comrades are doing) that by compelling the social-democrats to take part in a struggle, they might appear to the masses as revolutionaries. Whenever we succeed in compelling the reformists to take part in the struggle, it is easier for us to carry out and explain the tactics of the United Front.

For instance, if the Austrian social-democrats had said that the Geneva agreement must be accepted if we are not to die of hunger, many workers would have probably believed them. When however, the Austrian social-democrats are compelled to say that the Geneva agreement is a dishonest agreement and means slavery for us, we say to the workers: draw your conclusions from this and frustrate the agreement; it is easy then for us to make our movement go forward. I venture to say that the tactic of the United Front will be all the more successful the more we succeed in driving the reformists forward under the pressure of the masses. We are not under the illusion that the social-democrats and the reformists will ever be willing to fight. But it does not seem impossible to me that we might under certain conditions succeed in making them fight against their will. Of course, it will not be an honest and a willing fight. It will be a fight which at the decisive moment will be followed by a betrayal. However, even this pressure, this gradual mobilisation of the masses are of great advantage and significance for us. It is also in this sense that the problem of the workers' government must be understood. In the watchword of the workers' government I do not see anything but a part of the communist tactics of the United Front. We did not want the watchword of the workers' government to mean that we demand this as an ideal

form of government. Under certain circumstances this watchword might prove very dangerous. But we had to bring it forward in order to compel the others to adopt watchwords which it would be their duty to adopt if they were honest in their desire to struggle for their own demands, and also as a counter watchword to that of the coalition government, by which the social-democrats wished to evade the struggle.

I think that there are two kinds of coalition governments, according to the period in which they are established. When direct power was possible, the object of the coalition government was to break down the workers' will to fight and to save the power of the bourgeoisie. We were able, wherever it was possible, to bring forward the dictatorship of the proletariat against such a coalition government. There is at present another kind of coalition policy, which simply means that the social-democrats are not even willing to put up a fight for their partial demands. The only way to make this fact known, is to bring forward watchwords showing clearly what must be done in a struggle for the demands of the social-democrats. Such a watchword is the workers' government.

I do not say that we can bring forward this watchword because we know that the social-democrats will not fight, on the contrary, we must bring it forward in spite of the fact that the social-democrats will not fight. We say to them we cannot yet fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but we are willing to fight for your demands if you will seriously stand up for the workers' government. This is not hypocrisy, and it will help to unmask the others, because we are willing in all seriousness to support every honest struggle.

Therefore, I should like to say in conclusion that the present application of the United Front tactics seems to me to be somewhat different from the form which it took before. At first the United Front tactics served to cover the retreat of the proletariat all along the line, now it seems to me they cover the gathering of the Forces and the preparation for the new march forward. It is true that the reactionaries are advancing all along the line. We see this quite plainly in Central

BULLETIN OF THE IV CONGRESS

12

Europe, but the proletariat is also gathering its forces and the United Front tactics enable it to do it under cover, and prevent a premature advance of isolated groups, which would be defeated. It is in fact nothing but the beginning and the preparation of a new attack, which enables us to say now: the capitalist offensive is no longer a one-sided advance of the reactionaries, we can counter the offensive by preparing the world proletariat for an attack. We see the two armies marching against each other. Every move is of importance in the advance of our opponents, the proletariat must fight all along the line and for every separate partial demand, and in this struggle no other tactics can be applied but those of the United Front. (Applause).

Harry 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, 1922, has been more intensified than in any other country in Europe. The status of the working class, the economic conditions of the working class, have been worse during these two years in an unprecedented manner so far as the history of the modern working class in Britain is concerned. In 1921 we had a great coal lockout which was precipitated by the coal owners in Britain working in the closest relationship with the British Government. You know that the Government promised not to decontrol the mines until August 1921. But they decontrolled the mines in the March days of 1921 in order that there should not be the preparation by the organized industrial forces of the working class—to prevent the workers achieving their objective—to divide the miners and the working class generally, so that the latter could not help the miners.

What do we witness during this great struggle of the miners in 1921. We witnessed the failure of the Triple Alliance upon which the workers of Britain had placed great hopes since the armistice was signed. You are aware of the details in the main with regard to the failure

of the Triple Alliance. There is no doubt that had the miners been assisted by the transport workers and railway men in their difficulty, the situation in Britain today would have been radically different and the bettered conditions of the industrial working class of Britain would undoubtedly have had their reactions upon the status of the European proletariat as a whole. During these days 1,500,000 tons of coal were imported into Great Britain (Radek: From America).

The Amsterdam International proved their complete bankruptcy, along with the Second International 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 an issue declared that he himself had personally 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 recognize 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 Labor 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 coordination 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 lockout just as it was reflected in the miners' lockout 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 coordination 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 centralized organization, the most powerful section of the transport workers, movement in Britain is the National Union of Railway men.

In the latter days of 1919, there was a national strike of railway men for two weeks. In that short period they proved to the ruling class of Britain that their forces could be rapidly mobilized, and mobilized in such a way that could measure up to the employers attempt to lower their economic status. In two weeks time the railway men had almost achieved victory over the employing class and the forces of the State when they were betrayed by Mr. J. H. Thomas and others of his type connected with the leadership of the railway men.

Now we find that the spokesmen of the capitalist class, the economists of capitalism, are brutally and frankly telling the working class that the railway men's conditions must come down to the level of the miners and engineers. Instances are cited with remarkable frankness by the capitalist class with regard to the wages paid for rough labor connected with the mines in Lanarkshire and South Wales and they are telling the railway men in spite of the sliding scale agreement in spite of the allegedly wonderful leadership of J. H. Thomas that they cannot expect more for their labor power than what it can competitively demand. This offensive of capitalism in Britain is also reflected in another direction.

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 Labor 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 prewar days. They are making frantic efforts to avert the bourgeoisie to standardize the slavery of the working class upon a lower level.

Comrade Zinoviev and others have characterized 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 even 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. This act was passed prior to the lockout of the Miners in 1921. In the light of the lockout events it is obvious that the ruling class saw the developments that were impending, and they rushed this law through parliament. This law was not opposed by the Labor Party in any way. The regulations of this law are severe enough to meet a situation of civil war. The law enables the government of the ruling class to declare in any acute crisis a state of emergency which entitles them to call up the army reserve, the naval reserve and to organize special defence corps, mobilizing the middle class forces and making 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 in other countries.

When the Independent Labor Party in England seceded from the Second International, and put a series of questions to the Communist International, the reply of the latter was that we must prepare in Britain for a victory of the proletariat thru a heavy civil war. Not merely a civil war, but heavy civil war, is the opinion of the responsible comrades of the Communist International. While the Black and Tans were waging war on Ireland, forcing the Irish railway men to carry munitions of war and to transport troops for British Imperialism, a deputation asked Lloyd George, whether or not this order had

been countermanded by the Government. Lloyd George replied, "It is not true that it has been countermanded, the reverse is true, and in the last analysis you must remember that force without limit is the sanction of law".

Yet Comrade Zinoviev has said that Lloyd George stood for the pacifist section of the capitalist world. It was Lloyd George that used these words with reference to the subjugation of the Irish people. In 1919, referring to the railway strike again, the Manchester Guardian, speaking of the attitude of the middle class towards the working class, said that a statement had been made "that they must be prepared to smash trade unionism once and for all, and that this was a dangerous political symptom. "The organization of civic guards," said the Guardian, "is equivalent to the organization of White Guards in Russia, and White Guards mean Red Guards."

So, all the indications point to a bitter struggle so far as Britain is concerned.

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 committee of the parties in Western Europe in particular, so that the communist parties of Britain, Germany, France, Italy and Scandinavian countries, can get cooperation, mutual consideration of problems and a real United Front, that will enable the workers to make a real defensive against capitalism. Furthermore, it is necessary that the Communist International should do more to coordinate 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, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Persia and all those regions. It is also essential that the Communist International should pay more attention to the British Communist Party. Truly, we are numerically weak, but the International should consider that Britain is the center of an empire, which is the greatest stumbling block to the advance of the world revolution. The International cannot ignore the British Communist Party and while Germany is very important so far as the next step towards revolution is concerned,

in the event of a strong British Communist Party being established we can attend to the problem of coordinating the movements in those parts of the British Empire which are developing nationalist revolutionary movements. We can also with the assistance of the Communist International, develop contact that will make the United Front a reality instead of a form of words, so far as those parts of the world are concerned.

Another reason why the Communist International should attend to the movements in the near and Far East is because the roots of the social-democracy have not been planted there. The Communist International agrees that social-democracy is the chief stumbling block,—with its opportunism and treachery, to the development of the world revolution. I would urge that the Communist International insist that the elements that are within the Communist parties and which are still on the reformist parliamentary path shall be excluded. I say in the name of the Communist Party of Great Britain that we stand unreservedly for the 21 points. We will strongly oppose any tendency to forego any of the 21 points, therefore we say that the International should declare that there should be no weakening of the 21 points which distinguish the Com. International from the reformist international of the past.

Hoernle (Germany): Comrades, contrary to comrade Urbahns, I would like to state that the majority of the German delegation is in full agreement with the proposals of comrade Radek, also with the analysis of the situation and his practical suggestions for the Party and the Communist International.

Just a few words about the statements of comrade Urbahns. I believe that it is not our task here to discuss strenuously as to whether, in the remarks of comrades Trotsky or Radek, or any other comrade, there is a note or an undertone which one could misrepresent or twist into an opportunist meaning. We have a more important task before us here. But it is typical of the opposition of the German Party and of those who represent a tendency existing perhaps not in the German party alone — to doubt our tactics at every opportunity. They doubted the slogan of the United Front; they

doubted the slogan of the Workers' Government. When it came to the open letter to the reformist organisations, they had scruples. During the conference of the three executives, they scrupled again. The New Economic Policy in Russia, they encountered with misgivings. And they wavered as to the conclusions of the Third World Congress. Everywhere and always, and yet again, they hesitate. (Interruption from German delegates; "Hesitating without thinking"). They always have reservations. They accept our tactics, but with reservation. It is quite clear, and must be said openly that the tactics of the United Front brings with it certain dangers; there are obviously the possibilities of a drift to the Right. I would compare the United Front tactic to the crest of a mountain ridge. The path is slippery and narrow. If we stand still however and only philosophise as to scruples and dangers, we shall never advance. In order to understand the application of the United Front at all we must start applying it. I therefore consider it necessary to say clearly and distinctly, that the methods of the opposition have paralysed or hampered the work of the Party. (Hear, hear).

I would also like to say a few words with regard to Comrade Urbahn's estimate of the present situation in Germany. He thinks it possible to prove that the time has come for a counter-offensive by the proletariat, supporting his statement among other things by a reference to the German Factory Council Movement. Comrade Urbahn, we would all rejoice if we could only see to-day the signs of a revolutionary awakening of the broad masses in Germany. But it must unfortunately be admitted that the German Factory Council movement has not yet secured that hold upon the masses which we would wish it to have and which it one day will have (German interruptions: Hear! hear!). The Factory Council movement in Germany hardly extends beyond the limits of the Party membership except for a certain number of sympathisers. It is true that a certain proportion of the hitherto indifferent workers are with us. But this is only a beginning, and one can hardly speak yet of a real return of the workers from their retreat to an advance. All that can be said is

that the resistance of the proletariat is becoming stronger. But it is not our task to philosophise as to whether we have already entered upon a period of the offensive or are still in the defensive. Our task is to do away with all theorising on offensive and defence and to get down to practical work among the masses in order to organise their resistance. (German delegation: Hear! hear!).

I should like to illustrate this point by examples from German conditions. The offensive of capitalism began in Germany in the spring of 1920, as the period of apparent prosperity came to an end, and the entrepreneurs were compelled to limit their operations and, in some cases close their factories. They endeavoured to break down the workers resistance, although their first attempt at this through the Kapp-Putsch was defeated, the workers failed to take advantage of their success.

In the summer of 1920 the Employers Association declared that they would permit no further increase of wages. At that time the illegal armed organisation of the counter-revolution, the Orgesch, was first set on foot. Then came the great increase in the cost of living. At that time, comrades, we still had no theory of the United Front, but our old Party organisation the Spartacus League, instinctively adopted this method by taking part in the great demonstrations against the high cost of living and in strikes against the ten per cent wage reduction. With regard to this, I will remember the tax strike in Wurttemberg.

Comrades, I cannot now enter into the details of this. But already in the summer of 1920 it became apparent that the political offensive of the Government formed part of the economic offensive of the employers. The Government harassed the workers through the police and, in the agricultural districts, agricultural labour was declared to be a national necessity and their right to strike was limited. Then appeared the lay of compulsory arbitration as an attempt to throttle the workers strike movement.

I further remember, in the winter of 1920—21, when the metal workers of Stuttgart spontaneously presented for or five immediate demands, in the then famous open letter of January 1921. These ap-

proaches to a United Front tactic were interrupted by the March action. The Third World Congress then, developed new tactics. It merely systematised those already existing. It expressed the opinion that previous movements had been unsystematised and of a local character, and for this reason had committed many errors; but that now a systematic presentation of the tactic of the United Front was possible.

It is most instructive to observe how, under the conditions prevailing in Germany, the United Front cannot be adopted as a fixed formula, but assumes new forms in each situation. Sometimes it is carried on by entering the organisations of the aristocratic leaders, sometimes by approaching the masses. We have seen how the German party has become more and more confident in its use of the strategy of the United Front, and how it has learned that difficult art of combining parliamentary action with mass action.

As a result of the capitalist offensive, new factions became active which had not previously functioned in the proletarian struggle. I remember the first movement among the Post Office workers, towards the end of 1920. I can remember the railway strike of the same year, and the first great strike of the apprentices through which large numbers of the working class youth were drawn into the conflict.

We see, therefore, on the one hand, the economic, political and military organisation of capital becoming ever stronger and the capitalist using every subtle method to retain their rule over the proletariat. But on the other hand, through the necessity of resisting this offensive, the proletarian army becomes ever larger and better trained.

Therefore, I wish the previous speakers to take note that our present task is to bring the Communist Parties of the various countries into close relationship with each other. What the French and German parties have so far done, along these lines, must be systematically extended so that the United Front of capital may be opposed not merely by a united front within one nation but by the international united front.

Comrades, we have had yet another striking experience in Germany. I said

just now that the German Party Opposition always doubts. It always fears that opportunism may raise its head, and always demands that measures be taken against the Opportunists. Our experience in Germany have taught us that, if applied, the more thorough is the purification of the Party itself (interruption: Hear! hear!). We have seen this in the autumn of 1921, when the Party, after the Third World Congress, made its first attempts along these lines. When the General Federation of Trade Unions, and when the social democrats endeavoured to oppose this stand by their campaign of lies in which they characterised the Communists as criminal. At that time the party got rid of a large number of opportunistic elements, the K.A.G. at the present time we find a similar situation. In proportion as the Party was becoming stronger, the trade unions started a counter-offensive movement, and with the fusion of the social-democratic Party and the Independents certain wavering elements began to leave the Party. They simply got quietly out of the Party through our tactics and through the Factory Council movement and its consequent developments.

Comrades, one word on the question of Fascism, I believe that this question must be very seriously dealt with at this Congress. It must be keenly analysed, not merely because there are parallel manifestations of this movement in many countries, as comrade Radek has so rightly shown, but also because these parallel movements go hand in hand and have a certain common plan of attack and because the threads of their various organisations form a network embracing many countries.

In Germany we can distinguish two kinds of Fascism; the South German type, which would try to briefly characterise with the word "Bavarian" and the North German form. In South Germany Fascism is mainly a movement of the petty bourgeoisie and the middle farmers. It is an alliance of monarchist counter-revolutionists with these democratic classes. The North German form of Fascism, especially in the East of the Elbe depends upon quite different sections of society. We find

here sections of agricultural workers, sometimes of considerable numbers, organised in the Yellow Trade Unions and the Agricultural Employers' organisations. With these are the closely organised illegal groups of active fighters, for example, the "Rosbach Organisation", an avowedly Fascist organisation. This whole movement is led, as in Italy, by intellectual classes.

In Germany as in other countries, we have considered the question of the position of the German Party with regard to Fascism, which shows its opposition to the working class through bomb outrages, armed demonstrations, etc. The German Party must inaugurate first of all a strong campaign for the disruption of the "Reichswehr" the counter-revolutionary organisations of the agricultural workers, and so on. Just as soon as the danger becomes apparent to the masses, the Party must deal with the subject of proletarian self-defence. But we must not endeavour to construct artificial self-defence organisations beforehand. But as soon as the danger is really felt by the masses we must place the question of self-defence in the foreground.

I should like to close by pointing out that, at the present moment, having embraced the tactic of the United Front, and having identified itself with the daily demands and interests of the broad masses, the Communist Parties must try to make the Communist International ever firmer and more centralised, to practice strict discipline and to stand before the masses, not merely as participators in the great working class movement, but as leaders from the defensive to the offensive. (Loud Applause).

Zetkin: Comrades, we now propose to close this debate (hear, hear!) because the most important points, dealing with the present situation and showing how its consequences may affect us, have in our opinion, already been expressed. We therefore propose that the speakers still on the list yield the floor to Comrade Radek for his closing remarks.

Welti: (Switzerland): Comrades, I am opposed to this motion. It is not right that, after we have heard an opening speech which lasted for hours and contained many repetitions, the debate should be cut off. The Swiss delegation has yet

a motion to offer on this subject, and we positively demand that we be granted the floor.

Kolaroff: There are still three names on the speakers' list, besides Comrade Rosmer who wishes to read a resolution of protest. Comrade Radek will then conclude the debate. We have only one hour to accomplish all this. What is your pleasure?

Among the speakers on the list there are delegates who have not yet been heard, and who insist that they be allowed to speak. If these comrades do not desist, it will be necessary to limit the time of each speaker. I propose: ten minutes' time limit.

The motion is carried.

Rosmer: Comrades, a telegram from Warsaw states that Comrade Etienne Rybacki, elected to parliament by the vote of 32,000 miners from the Dombrova basin, has just been arrested by the police on the strength of Czarist laws which are being applied to-day in Poland.

Comrade Etienne Krolkowski, elected in Warsaw by 27,000 votes is also in prison. This violation of the will of tens of thousands of working class voters is a new link in the long chain of infamous persecutions which the Communist movement of Poland in the democratic republic of Poland has been suffering.

The Polish Government after its judicial crime against deputy Dombal who had courageously proclaimed his adhesion to Communism, continues its crime against the elected representatives of the revolutionary proletariat, sent to Parliament in spite of the white terror.

The Congress of the Comintern condemns before the working class of the world these acts of barbarism of the Polish Government, the flunkey of International capital, and expresses its admiration of the Polish proletariat, courageously defending the cause of liberty and humanity under such extreme hardships.

Kolaroff: Any objections to this proposition?

Adopted unanimously. Comrade Radek will now reply to the discussion.

Radek. Comrades, the debate on the capitalist offensive has assumed in part the nature of a renewed discussion on the report of the Executive and on our fu-

tary tactics. This was not to be avoided. As I have said in my speech, the most important question of our tactics at present is our attitude towards the capitalist offensive. This is why so many comrades who took part in the debate repeated themselves so frequently, and this is also why in my closing speech I will have to breach again questions which have been exhaustively dealt with by Comrade Zinoviev. In the debate on the character and forms of the capitalist offensive, besides the report of Bordiga on Fascism which demands a longer discussion than I have time for, I would like to give some attention to the speech of Comrade Van Ravenstein, who believed that he could discover a difference of opinion between Trotsky and myself. This is a misunderstanding. When I speak of a movement towards reaction in the bourgeoisie, having in mind the capitalist offensive, and when Comrade Trotsky speaks of a new wave of pacifism and social betrayal, the difference between us is that I look at the present and the immediate future; while Comrade Trotsky deals with the situation in the later future, after the bourgeois offensive will have spent itself.

But to return to the problems of tactics which form the main subject of our discussion. The capitalist offensive has forced us to adopt the policy of the United Front. This policy presents dangers both from the Right and from the Left. During the debate on the report of the Executive, we have said that the danger from the Right is greater than that from the Left, and I adhere to this point of view.

The dangers which menace our struggles and our tactics from the Right are not only that some parts of the Comintern may lose their Communist character in the period between two revolutionary waves. The chief danger is that a large section of the proletariat may remain passive in face of the offensive of capitalism, not only not attacking the enemy, but doing nothing for its own defence. From the point of view of situation of the working class, this lowering of the fighting spirit of a large mass of the proletariat is a very grave danger. Our tactical problem is therefore as follows: How are we to strengthen the fighting will of the proletariat, and what should we

avoid in order not to lessen this fighting spirit? I believe that our general policy must be directed primarily against the apathy of the working mass, against the inability to defend themselves, that is against the Social-Democracy, the Two and a Half International, and against those elements in the Communist Party who do not adapt themselves to the present situation, but submit themselves on one hand only pour water on the other hand of the Centrists (Quite true). Here, I return to Comrade Urbahn's compliment, but unlike Comrade Urbahn I will try to prove my point. In his speech Comrade Urbahn made one mistake which is more important than all he had to say against our policy; he did not appreciate the situation at its true value. He said that my speech had helped the centrists because I exaggerated the strength of the capitalist offensive and because I did not see that the counter-offensive of the proletariat had already begun. As a proof, he pointed to the fight for the maintenance of the eight hour day in France and the Factory Councils movement in Germany. I consider this to be of the utmost importance: to overcome a danger, we must clearly realise it. If it were true, as Comrade Urbahn said, that the proletarian counter-offensive has already begun, then the danger from the Right would not be so great. To shout that the Comintern is becoming corrupted and that the same breath say the working class is rising, this means to block the way to a real view of the situation. I do not know whether we have already passed the climax of the capitalist offensive. When Comrade Urbahn points to the struggle in France, I ask him: What does this actually mean? It represents the first defensive steps of the French proletariat. As to the question of factory councils, I can only repeat what I have already said, that I agree in all points with Comrade Hoernle, who has said that we should not exaggerate the significance of this large movement. Its importance is great, because it will permit us to organise recruiting centres for the struggle. The Factory Councils movement has not yet reached the large masses of the non-Communist workers. But even supposing it had, would this already

the beginning of a proletarian offensive? It would be only a protective measure against the increasing deterioration of the situation of the working class. We would be entitled to speak of an offensive, if the masses in the factory shop councils already had the certain successes, gained control of a certain part of the industries. But the organisation of the defensive struggle has only begun, and already you shout that the counter-offensive is here!

Such an appreciation of the situation brings with it the danger that you may have to suffer a retreat even ten times worse. The retreat of the proletariat has not yet stopped; it is only in a few sections that the workers are beginning to hold their positions, and you speak of the beginning of a counter-offensive. You do not see the dangers of the apathy of the working class. You need only consider the German movement to realise what it means when the miners have been deluded into an overtime agreement. This means that the workers are willing to work longer,—practically to give up the eight hour day. It is not only the Trade Union leaders, but the workers themselves that are surrendering the eight hour day by their willingness to work longer.

And if this is the state of things, we must say, to fight effectively against the capitalist offensive we must recognise its actual extent, and see the dangers as they are. There are enough dangers confronting us, we need not imagine any more.

Comrades, we have shown you the offensive of capital in its whole magnitude. It was no easy thing for us to pass from a policy of uninterrupted attacks against the Social Democracy, to the policy of the United Front, which presents a great many dangers. These dangers were dealt with at length in the first theses of Comrade Zinoviev because we believe we must gather the working class for the defence, but we communists must never forget that we are fighting for more than a mere piece of bread. We are still the weaker part of the working class movement. In comparison with the Second and Two and a Half Internationals, we possess only a weak Press, whilst theirs is strong. The dangers of the United

Front are that the weaker Communists may lean too far towards the social democracy, that we may lose our predominance, that we may not be able to cooperate with the Social democratic workers in our struggle against capital, and at the same time to keep before the masses the revolutionary possibilities of our right and lead them further than social democracy is willing to go. We have clearly realised these dangers, and this is why we have brought the question of our tactics in the struggle for the United Front and against the capitalist offensive before the enlarged executives. This is why we discuss it here to-day.

Against these tactics of our fight against the offensive, a number of reproaches have been made by Comrade Urbahn. First of all, he criticised the way the policy had been applied at the meeting of the three Executives. He did not tell us what our mistakes were. He simply said it was a hollow policy. I believe it is a reproach from a hollow head. Either Urbahn should have said: "No negotiations with the leaders", or explained what our mistakes had been in our dealings with the social democrats and the Two and a Half International (Comrade Urbahn breaks in to say that he had criticised the lack of preparation). Then allow me to return the accusation. The Executive published its theses which form the theoretical basis of our actions. The parties knew this, all of them sent their representatives. You knew what we were trying to do. We wanted to force the Social Democracy to fight together with us for the eight hour day, against the danger of a new war, against reduction of wages, against the offensive of capital. All parties know what this means. Well, the negotiations began. In every city, in every country, a great pressure should have been exerted upon the Second and Two and a Half Internationals. Who can exert this pressure? The Executive in Moscow, the delegates at the meeting? The parties must have done this. And now I will say this: the first thing we did when we came to Berlin was to appeal to the organisations. We said, mobilise the masses, send delegations from the factories into the Reichstag, organise meetings. What was the result? Two tobacco workers and three

mere comrades came to the Reichstag and surrounded around the building. I am convinced that our Berlin organisation is one of the best. But when such a thing happens in Berlin, then, dear Comrade Urbahns, address yourself to Berlin, Hamburg, and other organisations who have not been able to mobilise the masses for the occasion. Although our problem was not to hold a conference with the Second and Two and a Half Internationals, but to force the social democrats to the wall and compel them to fight together with us under the pressure of the working masses, very little was done by the organisation. Well, I see Comrade Urbahns has become wholly helpless. And now I come to the second reproach.

He said that our greatest illusion was that the Social Democrats will fight, that their leaders who have acted since 1914 as agents of the bourgeoisie are all of a sudden going to lead this struggle. Comrade Urbahns who has heard for years that they were agents of the bourgeoisie says naturally; How can we fight together with agents of the bourgeoisie? Well, dear comrades, if politics were such an easy thing that after I have said once that they were agents of the bourgeoisie they would be for ever damned, then politics would be very easy.

There is no doubt that as far as leaders of the Social Democracy are concerned, they are consciously against a revolution. But these leaders live in Germany, France and England, not in a vacuum, or just to polemise with Comrade Urbahns and myself. These leaders find support in Germany in a party with a million members and in the many millions who follow the party. These leaders are either openly for the bourgeoisie or attempt to break away from it, depending upon conditions at any given time.

Let me recall to you a very simple incident. On the 5th of November 1918, Scheidemann and Ebert were negotiating with the general staff. They promised to save the Crown Prince and the Monarchy if the Kaiser should abdicate. Then on the 9th of November, Scheidemann jumped up on the tribune of the Reichstag and shouted Long live the Republic! Some say he did it the better to betray us later (interruption Quite true). But since then a small thing has happened which

Comrade Urbahns did not take at all into consideration, namely the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns, the revolution, and the counter-revolution. The Scheidemanns have betrayed us, but before that, the only one who denies this is he who does not want to see or hear anything which is disagreeable to him.

At the meeting of the enlarged Executive and in his speech on tactics, Zinoviev used a very happy phrase: "The social democrats are traitors to the proletariat, but they can also betray the bourgeoisie whenever this becomes necessary for their salvation. Now the second question is to what extent can we rely on this. Comrades, if curses could kill, we would ask Comrade Zinoviev to sign an ukase ordering Scheidemann and company to disappear from the face of the earth. Since this is impossible, we must fight them. The only question when will we be able to destroy them. It is possible that these people are tightly bound to the bourgeoisie that they cannot break away from them, so that we will have to destroy them together with the bourgeoisie. But it is also possible that there will come a time when the coalition with the bourgeoisie has become impossible for them, they will be forced to enter into a coalition with us. In this coalition they will attempt to betray us. We will be able to conquer them only after their actions within the coalition will have discredited them totally and the masses will have gone over to us. He who does not take into account all these possibilities, who is ever repeating, he loves me, he loves me not, will he betray me wholly or only partly, shall I be afraid or shall I not be afraid, reminds me of the girls of whom Heine says that they have nothing else but their virtue. Well, Comrade Urbahns, you have even lost that for you are not against the workers' government on principle, such a depreciated virtue has very little weight in a question of principles.

What does the slogan of the workers' government signify? Comrade Urbahns has hinted at the great differences which exist between Trotsky, Zinoviev and myself on this question. Many times already we have read in the bourgeois press of Europe of how the cavalry of Bukharin

fighting with the infantry of Zinoviev. How one day Trotsky arrested Lenin and on the other day Lenin arrested Trotsky. We are not machines. Our thoughts are not all alike. One person approaches a question from one point of view, the other from another. One looks at things from the point of view of one country, the other from another, which results in different shades of meaning.

The question is whether the Executive favours action among the masses for a workers' government or not? At the present moment in Germany this means that we will declare to the Social Democrats that we are ready to fight with them against the bourgeois coalition, that we will support a workers' government, or even take part in it. Is this the standpoint of the Executive or not? I say it is and this is what matters politically. Comrade Urbahns said that as far as the workers' government is concerned he considers it impossible. Therefore, if the bourgeois coalition fails, Comrade Urbahns will follow this method of agitation;—he will come to the social democratic dock workers in Hamburg and tell them: you are seven times as strong as we are, we put forth the demand for a workers' government and are going to fight for it, but it is impossible. Of course, this is idiotic. Now I should like to say a few words here to Comrade Smeral. His great mistake is that because of his opportunistic policy in the past, he believes that every time he rises to speak, he must cross himself and say "Do not imagine that this is an opportunist standpoint". If you believe it let us argue it out. I agree with Comrade Smeral that in Germany the struggle for the formation of the workers' government may begin shortly, perhaps even in the next few months. Then all at once Comrade Smeral begins to swear at the Left and says: I do not believe in the workers' government, but others believe in it and therefore let us act as if we also believe in it. If this is the way to conduct a political campaign, then I know nothing of politics. To appear before the masses with such a programme at a time when the dollar is worth 10 thousand marks, when wages are being lowered, the coalition broken up because Stinnes is against a stabilisation of the mark is absolute nonsense.

A compromise may be achieved, but in this crisis, in this incapability of the bourgeoisie to stabilise anything, in this chaos, I believe that the Communist Party point the road to salvation. It must say to the masses: you are afraid of the dictatorship of the proletariat and we are for the dictatorship. You think that it can be achieved peacefully, try it. You have the majority in Germany, go and win the proletarian majority. You will have to adopt dictatorship, and we will struggle with you. In such a situation our comrades who maintain that they are more closely connected with the masses than anyone else, will come forward and say: to the devil with the bourgeois coalition, let us have the workers' government, for we are in favour of it. The others say, "we do not think" but you think so! (Laughter). Comrades, try and look pleasant we are going to manoeuvre with you!

Is it possible to carry on such a campaign? Must we not tell the masses what we want, and that we intend to oppose to the capitalist attack. We must tell the masses that we wish to put against the capitalist attack, as a practical aim, the unity of the working class, which is politically disunited at present. If the party gets into power before the majority of the working class is ready to dare all, we shall be with it during all the stages of the struggle in the full conviction that the struggle will bring them over to our viewpoint.

If all this is opportunism (Urbahns this is an interpretation of dreams!) it does not follow that I am in interpreter of dreams if I explain what I imagine to be our thoughts. If you have no thoughts, I cannot help that.

I shall now say just a few more words to the opposition group in Germany. Comrades, let us take things seriously! Comrade Ruth Fischer spoke on tactics. She criticised some of the tactical methods of the Central Committee, and we told her that she was right! Hers was a criticism which is compatible with the tactics and policy of the Communist International. But Comrade Urbahns comes forward with his repudiation on principle of the tactics of the Communist International, claiming, however, that he did not mean any such repudiation. Comrade Bordiga also wants to repudiate the United

Front, and he likewise says: "I recognise the U. F. in a general way, but I am in disagreement with it on matters of detail. But thank God, we are not in a bourgeois parliament to indulge in such verbal gymnastics. You must either adopt the tactical theses, or you must draw up a platform of your own and lay it before the Congress. This wavering, this yes-and-no-game, this attitude of "I should like to but I can't" may be all right for manoeuvring in the party districts and creating majorities in this or that direction, but it will not do at all for the conduct of proletarian politics.

Comrades, all this wavering must not be taken too lightly. I read to-day an article by Comrade Geschke of the Berlin organisation. I was told that he was a good revolutionary worker. This comrade writes as follows about Thalheimer's program draft:

"Marx wrote in his manifesto of a certain kind of intellectuals advancing theories which bring confusion into the working class ranks, and consciously or unconsciously, assist capitalism to weather the crisis."

He is thus kind enough to admit that Thalheimer with his program draft is unconsciously perhaps helping the capitalists. However he raises a warning finger and says:

"What lends itself most to criticism in this draft program, is the part dealing with the workers' government. By admitting that it is possible for the working class already within the capitalist State to occupy strategic positions and to do proletarian constructive work, we obliterate the clear line which we have hitherto followed and provide the reformist Socialists with a weapon without which they would find it difficult to explain their present attitude."

Thus we are told that they are capturing strategic positions within the capitalist state, we are becoming reformists. The strategic positions within the capitalist State are the Trade Unions, the communist party and the factory committees, if we know how to use them. Occupying strategic positions also means having capable comrades in parliament, who know how to make use of that institution in the interests of the working class. But we are told that to win such positions

within the capitalist system is reformism. It appears that revolutionary policy consists in maintaining our helplessness until capitalism does us the great favour of collapsing.

The comrade also made the following very interesting statement:

The "Rote Fahne" published lately an extract from a speech by Comrade Trotzky, delivered at a meeting of Moscow officials, in which it was stated that after the conquest of power, the working class must not only take over the bourgeois state, but must also for a time continue to conduct it according to the capitalist methods of production, including accounts, exchanges, banking, etc.: The Amsterdamers could not wish for a better justification for the co-operation between employers and employed and the policy of coalition."

When Trotzky says that after the conquest of power, one must calculate and not vaguely flounder in a fog; he provides a very good argument for the social democrats, who are not only in favour of calculations, but also of speculation under capitalist rule.

This was published under the title "Tactics and Organisation" without any editorial comments. What does this mean? If the writer of this article is a good comrade (and he is supposed to be a good revolutionary worker), it only shows that there is still a great deal of confusion in the minds of some of our best revolutionary workers. And you, who are leaders of these workers, instead of clearing up the situation, only create more confusion by your doubts.

The danger of your attitude consists in the fact that your doubts hinder us in creating a clear line of action for the Communist parties against capitalist offensive. If you are going to tell me that the counter offensive of the proletariat has already begun, I will tell you that we cannot even organise the defensive of the proletariat. We had not yet been able to make our own parties, the parties of the Communist International, the centre of the struggle against the capitalist offensive. Our tactics are not being carried out in Italy nor in France. In Germany you have made small beginnings, and even these beginnings you have made by your doubts instead of overcoming

perils in the common struggle, leading the masses into that struggle and conducting it in a Communist spirit.

Comrades, it was said here that my report contained the statement that the working masses as a whole do not yet struggle consciously for power, being convinced that this is premature. It was also said that this was a very dangerous statement. Well, comrades—(interruption by Urbahns: it was quite differently formulated). Perhaps you will say what the actual formulation was. (Urbahns: you have lost faith in the conquest of Power). I accept this formulation. Comrade Urbahns, if the working masses, or at least a large majority of them firmly believe in their capacity to conquer and establish the dictatorship, why have you consented to the party bringing forward the watchword of the workers' government as a solution?

I am of the opinion that nothing would be more dangerous for the Communist International than the failure to recognise that the present phase consists in the masses not being ready to storm the enemy's positions, and it is only by storming these positions that the masses gain faith in the final goal. The Communists are the vanguard of the working class and they believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the non-communist working masses only fight when compelled by circumstances. It is perfectly clear that the majority of the working class is not concerned now with the conquest of political power: whoever denies this is blind and will not be able to change the present mood of the masses in the course of further development such people cannot do anything but run after the party, nagging and criticising because they cannot understand that the party is compelled to act as it does.

Comrades, the mistakes which we must avoid now have already been made before. After the defeat of the Russian revolution in 1906, when the Russian proletariat was in an extremely difficult position, the mensheviks said that the revolution was at an end. They said that capitalism was consolidating itself, and that Russia was following in the wake of the Prussian development. The Bolsheviks, on the contrary said: the bourgeoisie and

Tsarism are not capable of a single fundamental question.

And therefore the revolution has not reached its culmination. One revolutionary wave has passed and the next is not yet upon us. However, disputes arose among the Bolsheviks on what was to be done between these two waves; the Berlin comrades are very displeased when the word "Otsovism" is used. They think it is an opprobrious epithet. They speak about menshevism, and we, who know the Russian language better, throw the word "Otsovism" at their head. "Otsovism" implies that the revolution must come and it will come. It was said, somewhat as the comrade whom I just quoted said in his article, that the revolution was bound to come. Well, the Bolshevik leaders were not mystics, they knew that on the basis of the economic development, history is made by the classes, and that when the advanced ranks of the objectively revolutionary class do not take up the fight for the revolution, the latter may be a long time in coming, although the development is going in the direction of the revolution. It is a question of the existence of a revolutionary class led by a class conscious vanguard, and when the "Otsovisists" say: because the revolution is bound to come it is not necessary to enter parliament or the trade unions or the co-operatives, the Bolsheviks combated such a conception. There were various shades of Otsovisists. Just as there have been and still are semi-mensheviks and semi-centrists, so there were also semi- and quarter-otsovisists who had to be dragged by the hair to a proper appreciation of the situation. Therefore Lenin, Kameneff, and Zinoviev fought against the half and quarter-otsovisists and said: "Yes, revolution on the day after tomorrow, but to-day we must rally the masses for the struggle." Comrades, the danger of otsovist moods and tendencies is a real danger. It is only another form of the passivity of the masses. You wait until the masses come into motion and you want to fill in this pause with something which one only does out of fear. When children are afraid, they sing and shout. These tactics are dangerous and they must be overcome. You must not hold on to the coat sleeve of the Party and hamper it in its activity. In the

"Bolshevik" I was made to say that you hindered the Party. I did not say it. I said that your pusillanimity is going to hinder it, for it is believed that you have a section of the Party behind you (interruption by the German Delegation: When have we done this?) I will tell you presently. It was when the question of property taxation cropped up, the question of the creation of taxation which would tax the bourgeoisie and remove the burden of taxation from the working class. Perhaps you will remember all the speeches about the peril of State capitalism in connection with the question of the workers' government. Perhaps you will also remember your own speeches here during the discussion of the United Front question. On every one of these occasions it was said: this may lead either to betrayal or at any rate to the deception of our comrades. During the Rathenau campaign and the Session of the Commission of Nine, your whole concern was that Bukharin and Radek should not appear as traitors or fools. Such a policy, unless an end is put to it quickly, is likely to ruin the Party. When after the speech of Comrade Ruth Fischer, we hear such a speech from Comrade Urbahn who represents a big German Party organisation, we must say: "Dear comrades, do clear up matters or you will harm the party which you do not want to do because (I will say it quite openly) you represent a large section of the proletariat which must be our support all the more because the peril of passivity makes it necessary to gather around us all the revolutionary forces of the proletariat."

Comrade, I want to say a few words about the peril from the Right. The British delegate Webb spoke here and admonished the Executive to keep to the 21 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 12 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 better leave them alone. The Executive has shown in its manifesto 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."

The questions of the United Front and of the offensive will occupy a prominent place in our program not only next year, but for several years to come. It is quite possible that the union of the social-democratic leaders with the bourgeoisie will be of long duration. We trust that we will succeed to bring them into the fighting line through the pressure of the masses, at least at some time or other, and we must expect that the trend of the revolution will be a much slower process than many expected. Misery throughout

the world will probably increase before the masses are brought into the struggle. It is possible that at that juncture we shall have to adopt the tactics of frontal attacks. However, we shall only do so when we are strong enough for it.

The tactics of the Communist International must be adapted to the immediate future although its perspectives embrace the whole period. Not only has our perspective remained the same but the longer the period of the counter-revolution lasts, the more the bourgeoisie is showing its incapacity to consolidate its power. And it is not an agitational tirade, but a deep rooted theoretical conviction, when we say that there is no way out for the bourgeoisie.

It is impossible to decide theoretically what is the anti-chamber and what is the famous fireplace. I do not mind prophesying a few centuries ahead, but I abstain from prophesying for the next year, for the facts are so entangled that only those who do not know much about theory can prophesy. It is most important that the workers should be organised for the fight. If in order to achieve this it should be necessary to negotiate with the social-democrats, we must do so, and we will do it with the full scientific knowledge that this development will render the class conflict more acute. And if this conflict becomes more acute, we shall become the decisive factor.

Nothing is more dangerous during this internal intervening between two great periods of struggle, than this timidity and this parading of principles pure and simple. We must be with the masses in the practical struggles, and must not regard communism as if it were as brittle as porcelain. We are still very weak, and it would be tragic if we did not recognise this. We can be strong only if we make up our minds to do what is required at present. Circumstances are such to-day that we must rally the masses for a struggle for immediate practical aims, which is going to lead eventually to the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Loud applause).

Zinoviev: Comrades, I have just received a telegram from Comrade Walton Newbold of Glasgow, saying that our party has won the elections 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).

Kolaroff: Comrades, please keep your seats, the session is not yet over.

Before we begin the translation of Comrade Radek's speech, there are still some small questions to be settled; we will then translate everything as a whole.

Comrade Welti of Switzerland has a proposition to make, I shall grant him the floor to present his motion.

Welti (Switzerland): Comrades, I should like to preface the motion I am offering on behalf of the Swiss delegation, by a few short remarks. The previous speeches on the tactics and the offensive of capital have not quite satisfied us of the Swiss delegation, and the various speeches on these topics to-day have shown us that there are other speakers who are not satisfied either. It is interesting to see how the attempt is being made here at the Congress to realise the necessity of the United Front among the various communist parties themselves. Interesting is also the attempt of Comrade Zinoviev to re-establish unity in the Hungarian party by declaring that there are not factions.

The question of the United Front tactics in the different countries has taken no small place in our discussion, as Comrade Radek has pointed out in his closing speech. I also would have liked to say a few words on the matter. But the Congress has not given us the floor, and we submit. Even before the Executive gave out its alogan of the United Front we had already applied this policy, with success in many cases. But more of this at some other time and place. We may be able to make use of our time to inform those comrades who are not in Moscow: this thing might interest them.

It was certainly interesting to hear these speeches, with which we agree in the main part, and the descriptions of the

...and program for the future. But we must not lose sight of the opinion that we are not only a federation of Communist Parties, but a Communist International, and that this means the question not only of the tactics of the United Front in the various countries, but what is more interesting to how the United Front may be carried out on an international scale, by the Comintern itself. We have heard very little about this practically nothing of this Congress. I think that this Congress should formulate such a policy, which will hold true in its practical application. What we should clearly state is that every manifestation of resistance in any single country should not be looked upon as the concern of the Communist Party and the proletariat of that country alone, but of the whole International.

Instead of mere descriptions of the situation and prognosis, the Fourth Congress, in this period of intense reaction, should produce a definite program of action. The victory of Fascism in Italy, the development of the German and Czecho-Slovakian situation make this necessary. It seems to me impossible that the Fourth Congress should fail to take any measures in the face of this situation; at the very least it should insist that the parties of Western and Central Europe should form a United Front of the proletarians by co-ordinated action, and build a front against Fascism, by parliamentary and extra-parliamentary means, and give all possible help to the Italian Party in its struggle against this menace.

In reference to this last, we are convinced that the Swiss Party, which seems to be given very little consideration here, and perhaps the Austrian Party will be faced with a great number of practical problems whose solution will be very difficult for these parties, or even impossible, because of their small size. In this case I can and will say no more on the subject. But I make the following proposition in the name of the Swiss delegation:

A commission shall be appointed at once, to consider without any delay all those burning problems which have arisen owing to the victory of Fascism and on the situation in Germany and Czecho-Slovakia and present a report and a proposition to the Executive Committee.

It shall be left to the leading organ of the Congress itself to decide whether this commission shall have a legal or illegal character. Comrades, I close. It has been said here that Fascism is a comedy, but I believe that it would have been better, more credible for its victims, nearer to the truth if we considered Fascism and its effects on the Italian working class, the Communist International and the International proletariat from another standpoint. I believe that if we do this we will realize that resolutions and theories are insufficient, but that we must earnestly consider what action is to be taken in this connection (Applause).

Kolaroff: we must now consider the drafts of the following resolutions on the questions discussed at this congress, namely:

1. The resolution on the report: "Five Years of the Russian Revolution, and the Perspectives of the World Revolution."
2. Resolutions on Report: "The Capitalist Offensive."
3. Resolution on the Theses on Tactics and Open Letter.

The Presidium suggest that the same commission which had drawn up the resolution on the Executive Committee Report be charged with the framing of resolutions on the above questions.

It is understood that delegations have always the right of making changes in the composition of this commission.

Is there any opposition to the proposal?... The proposal is adopted.

With regard to the proposal of Comrade Welti, I should say that the Executive has considered this question. It has been decided that the new Executive be empowered to confer about this matter with the representatives of the Parties concerned.

The Eastern Commission proposes to the Congress that a special commission be formed to examine the situation in Egypt, and the following comrades have been proposed as members of this commission:

- | | |
|----------|-----------|
| Franchi | (Italy) |
| Webb | (England) |
| Beron | (France) |
| Okhran | (Turkey) |
| Katayama | (Japan) |

Ravenstein (Holland) asks if there is any opposition to the proposal?... As there is none, the formation of this commission, and its composition stand approved.

Comrade Humbert-Droz now has the floor to make certain announcements.

Humbert Droz. The following commissions will meet this evening:

At 5.30 p.m. Agrarian Commission in the Ground Floor Hall.

At 5.30 p.m. The Spanish Commission, together with certain comrades of the Italian Delegation.

At 8 p.m. The Educational Commission. The delegations which have not yet nominated their representatives to this commission, are asked to do so before 8 o'clock.

At 8 p.m. The Czecho-Slovakian Commission.

These commissions will meet in the halls on this floor.

Furthermore, the Marx-Engels Institute

inform us that an exhibition has been organized in the Institute Buildings. This exhibition will open next Monday. Those delegates who wish to visit this exhibition are asked to apply to the Information Bureau.

Finally, this evening, at 7 o'clock, the military schools named after the Third International will have a celebration in honour of the delegates to the Fourth Congress. These comrades of the different delegations who are disengaged this evening are asked to attend the service at the Military Academy. All those who desire to attend will please inform Comrade Minkin, from whom they will receive the necessary information.

Kolaroff. The Egyptian Commission, which has just been formed, will hold its first meeting this evening at 7 o'clock.

The next session will take place tomorrow at 11 o'clock sharp. The session will be opened at that time whatever be the number of delegates present.

The session is now adjourned. Adjournment at 5 p.m.