

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 5 No. 34

PRESS

17th April 1925

CORRESPONDENCE

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

Meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the C. I.

Second Session. Moscow, 25th, March 1925.

International Prospects and Bolshevisation.

Speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

I. Fundamental Tasks of our Tactics.

The tactical problems of our times are practically a question of dates and ways and means in connection with world revolution.

Comrades, we know that Marxism and especially Leninism, which is the Marxism of our times, has given us the theory of world revolution. This theory has been sufficiently elaborated and can serve as a guide for the entire work of the Communist international. But there are two problems, the solution of which is not contained in the theory itself, for by their very nature these problems can only be solved on the basis of historical experience.

These problems at present form the centre of all Comintern work. Firstly, it is a question of the tempo of the proletarian revolution, of the rapidity of its development generally, of its date. Secondly, it is a question of line of March, of its political geography.

Comrades, it seems to me that these two decisive questions sum up the tactical problems of the recent past, of the present day and probably of the near future.

As to the tempo, the terms of the development of the proletarian revolution, the experience not only of the Comintern, but also of the First International and of the entire work of such people as Marx and Lenin show us how difficult it was not to make any mistakes in this respect. On the strength of the experience which we already possess we have realised how cautious we must deal with the question of the exact dates of the world revolution, and how frequently and easily revolutionists can make mistakes, because of their but too natural impatience when they fix dates. It is no wonder therefore if in this respect not only Lenin but also Marx made mistakes.

And now as to the question of the line of march of the World Proletarian Revolution. I think that in this respect it is only now that we realise for the first time the peculiar difficulties of this problem. Let us take for instance, the socialist revolution in Russia: it was a great "surprise" even to many Marxists that a socialist revolution had taken place just in Russia. There were very few people who believed in such a possibility even among the supporters of the Left wing of the International labour movement. After the victory of the Russian revolution we all agreed that Germany would be the next country to which revolution will spread from

Russia, and that after that it will spread throughout Europe. Only now, ten years after the outbreak of the imperialist war, six years after its conclusion and almost eight years after the revolutionary outbreak in Russia, after all the struggles which took place during these years in Europe, that the question is raised and raised very insistently whether this view was correct of the further line of March of the proletarian revolution, whether it is the only possible way, the only possible geographical extension of the world revolution. Is it absolutely necessary for the revolution to spread to Europe through Germany? Is it not possible that here too we can make mistakes in foreseeing the route? Comrades, it seems to me that with respect to this question we must not cling too closely to our former views for fear of respecting on a larger scale what Brandler did on a small scale when he wanted to begin the German revolution in Saxony at any price. It can happen that the future route will not necessarily be through Germany — in the first instance. We must consider the other possibilities.

Lenin on the Connection between the Russian and the International Revolution.

At the Third Congress of the Comintern, Comrade Lenin expressed the following views on the International situation and the connection between the Russian and International resolution:

"When we, (that is, the Russian-G. Z.) began the international revolution, we did not do it because we were convinced that we could accelerate its development, but because a whole series of circumstances induced us to begin this revolution. We thought: either the International revolution will come to our aid, and then all our victories will be safeguarded, or we will do our own modest revolutionary work with the conviction that in the event of defeat we would after all do a good service to the revolutionary cause, and that other revolutions will profit by our experience. We fully realised that without the support of the International world revolution, a victory of the proletarian revolution is impossible. Already previous to the revolution and also after it we thought: revolution in the other countries, in the capitalist and more developed countries will break out immediately, or at least very soon, otherwise we must perish.

But in reality the movement did not take the straight course which we supposed it would For our Russian Republic we must use this short breathing time to adapt our tactics to this zig-zag line of history" (Lenin's works, vol. XIII, page 320-322 Russian edition).

This means firstly, that as far back as 1921 Lenin said that a certain equilibrium was being established in Europe and that the historical process proceeds on zig-zag lines and does not take the straight course which we at first believed it would take because we were naive or rather because, we lacked historical experience. And secondly, "the breathing space" would appear to be more prolonged than one could have expected.

Thus comrades, we must always bear in mind that the questions of the dates and route of the revolution are always much more complicated than we formerly imagined. Marxism and Leninism give us a great deal, but even they cannot give us what can only be achieved by the historical experience of the revolution itself.

The Policy Adopted by the Fifth Congress has been Vindicated.

Only nine months have passed since our Fifth Congress. In such a short period the general state of affairs has not radically changed. However, many things are much clearer

II. Partial Stabilisation of Capitalist Economy.

What is needed is a calm, truly Bolshevik objective Appreciation of the Situation.

Let us now turn our attention to the world economic situation. It has not materially changed during the last eight or nine months. One meets frequently two types of view in Communist ranks and round about them: the representatives of one of these tendencies could be designated as it were, as the prophets of an immediate "inevitable" catastrophe of capitalism. They are always seeing signs of an "immediate" collapse of capitalism, and when they have recognised their mistake, they go to the other extreme, to talk about the erroneousness of the whole line of conduct. The representatives of the second "tendency" are people who believe with the certainty of fatalists in the 100 % stabilisation of capitalism which is supposed to have already taken place. According to them, this stabilisation is making strides forward almost at express speed, to such a degree are they blinded by some of the outward features of the stabilisation which they find so welcome. The Communist international has no use for either of these extremes. Neither the prophets of imminent catastrophe, nor the fatalists of capitalist stabilisation are right. It is the Fifth Congress which is right, its lines have remained unshaken.

Yes, it is true that the bourgeoisie has been given breathing space. We can see now that this breathing space in proving longer than we expected, although from the viewpoint of history 2-3 years or 5-10 years are a mere trifle. It is true that the economic position of the bourgeoisie has improved in some European countries and elsewhere. In many countries the bourgeoisie has been able to stabilise its valuta. In Germany we do not witness now in this respect what we witnessed in 1923, at the time of inflation. And yet there are considerable exceptions to this rule. Let us take, for instance, France, Italy, Roumania and Japan, where the valuta question is still very acute. In other bourgeois countries it has been possible to re-establish valuta equilibrium. This is of course of the greatest importance for capitalism.

And what do we see? Our "stabilisation fanatics" are beginning to say: look, the bourgeoisie has again hard cash in its hands, the valuta has been stabilised —consequently the policy of the Communist International was not correct, consequently capitalism has been more or less reestablished. But a real Communist will ask himself first of all by what means the bourgeoisie has been able to stabilise the valuta, and at the expense of what sections of the population has this stabilisation taken place. A true Communist sees for instance that in Germany and France two-thirds of the burden

to us now than they were before and I therefore think that the task before the Enlarged Executive of the ECCI, consists in summing up the lessons of the events which have already become more lucid.

In the first instance it is essential for us to review the present political and economic world situation, even if we do it on general lines. We must do this in order to test the correctness of the decisions of the Fifth Congress and to decide: if the policy adopted by the Congress was correct, we will continue to follow it, but if it was found to be erroneous, we should alter it or revise it completely. I want to say most emphatically that the course laid down by the Fifth Congress has been, in my opinion brilliantly vindicated. I want to remind you here of a few of the most important points of the Fifth Congress: the trend and the issue of the "era" of democratic pacifism have borne out, everything we said at the Fifth Congress.

Then let us take the sizing up of Social Democracy as the "third" bourgeois party, the question of the International Unity of the trade unions, the peasant question, the judgment about facism. Has not experience shown that the conclusions of the Fifth Congress were correct?

Events which took place in connection with all these questions after the Fifth Congress are a brilliant vindication of the Comintern view point. Those of our "critics" who have the courage to be impartial would have to admit that it is they who were mistaken, and not the Fifth Congress.

of taxation have been cast entirely on to the shoulders of the workers, and that consequently the valuta has been stabilised at the expense of the working class.

But nevertheless Marxists must take into account the fact of the stabilisation of valuta and the temporary consolidation of the capitalist order.

Side by side with Stabilisation are Undoubted Signs of the Instability of the Situation.

We also witness a certain revival of International credit. There is a tendency to revive International credit, to establish world prices, and generally speaking, to re-establish the so-called unity of the world capitalist economy. America has abandoned its position of financial self-isolation. In some countries there are signs of improvement in the industrial situation. All these are undoubted facts, and due to no fault of Varga.*) For several years Europe has not been in a state of war. In some countries capitalism has partly recovered. As comrade Varga rightly said, in the Autumn of 1924 there was, after many years, a decided and simultaneous change for the better in the conditions of the most important States, such as Great Britain, the U. S. A. France and Germany, whilst in other countries, — Poland, Hungary and others the economic crisis continued.

But how little stability there is in the present conditions is shown by the events which happened quite recently, during the last few weeks when we saw again that the position of the bourgeoisie had become worse. In the U. S. A. there are already the first symptoms of a new depression. A slump is looming in some branches of industry. The British economic press is full of statements concerning the instability of stabilisation in Central Europe and a short life is predicted. In France considerable unemployment is becoming noticeable for the first time in the past ten years. In the other countries there is also more unemployment than last year. In short, there are a number of symptoms which show that stabilisation is going through a series of serious fluctuations.

The Position of the Working Class under Capitalist "Stabilisation".

We as the vanguard of the working class should be first of all interested to know what the economic position of the working class is in the period of this "providential"

*) Comrade E. Varga studied the economic position in the capitalist countries and described in his works the temporary stabilisation of capitalism in some of them.

stabilisation. Unemployment is growing. In Great Britain there are already almost two million unemployed, there is the same number in America, whilst in Germany there are nearly one million. Unemployment reigns supreme also in Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries, and as I already said before it has made its appearance for the first time in France after many years. The decline of real wages has become an incontrovertible fact in almost all the European countries.

We know that in almost every country, the war and its consequences have raised the price of all the necessities of life. This effects workers more than anyone else, as workers wages do not keep pace with the rise in prices. In Great Britain the existence minimum in July 1924 amounted to 170 % of the pre-war minimum, and in December of the same year 181 %. At the same time all official sources, which in such cases are not inclined to minimise, indicate that the wages of British workers in the same period (July—November 1924) decreased.

In the January—June 1924 period the total weekly wages paid to workers in Great Britain amounted to 560,900 pounds sterling, whilst in the period July—November it amounted only to 518,350 pounds sterling. This shows that in addition to their former profits, the employers pocketed another 42,000 pounds sterling weekly. And we must remember that during this period prices of all products were rising.

In France, in Paris the cost of living minimum in July 1924 was 360 % over the pre-war level, in November — 396%, whilst the workers' wages remained the same.

The same is happening in every European country. In the U. S. A., the country of "capitalist prosperity", the cost of living minimum was in June 1924, 171 %, in November of the

same year 180 % and in January 1925, according to latest statistics about 185 % over the pre-war level. There was no rise in wages during the last six months in the U. S. A., with the exception of an insignificant rise in railwaymen's wages. But in many cases (especially in the textile industry) wages decreased from 10 to 15 %. Throughout Europe and even in America, the real wage is decreasing. Russia is the only exception; there wages in some branches of industry are already beginning to exceed the pre-war level. This is how matters stand to-day.

Germany presents now a clearer picture than any other country of the so-called stabilisation. The Dawes Plan has up to now been showing only its favourable side. But there is no doubt whatever that differences will soon become more acute in Germany on a new basis. Class struggles will again break out.

World credit is being revived, the valuta is becoming stabilised and trade is developing. But at the same time another process is beginning which is inevitable in the imperialist epoch of capitalism; the struggle for markets. This struggle is already raging. The time is not far distant when we will be able to see the growing acuteness of differences on a new basis. There is no occasion for us to ignore or to minimise the fact that a certain stabilisation of capitalism has taken place. But nevertheless we are as before confronted by the question; has the world war and the first Bolshevik revolution dealt capitalism a death blow, a very heavy blow, or has it only injured it slightly? We are as before of opinion, that the first Bolshevik revolution and the world war have dealt a very severe blow to capitalism, and that its "recovery" is only temporary and fictitious. But we must nevertheless look the fact of the temporary "revival" of capitalist economy straight in the face.

III. The Main Points In the Present Political Situation.

A number of changes can be noted in the world political situation, particularly those that have taken place within the last nine months. It is quite clear now that we were right. What interests us most in the present state of affairs of course is the world political prospects. Taking it on a world scale, the general situation is as follows, and can be divided into the following twelve points:

1. America—England;
2. Japan;
3. Eastern question;
4. U. S. S. R.;
5. England;
6. England—France;
7. Germany;
8. The Balkans;
9. Poland;
10. Italy;
11. Czechoslovakia;
12. Scandinavia.

Anglo-American Cooperation.

The relations between England and America, to a certain degree form the central point of our discussion. Probably, you remember that several months ago the representatives of the Right Wing of the International tried to give an exaggerated interpretation to the rapprochement between England and America and drew conclusions, which if correct, would have compelled us to change the whole of our tactics. One of the characteristics of opportunism has always been that it sees everything in the enemy's camp through rose-coloured spectacles while everything in its own camp appears dark and gloomy. This deeply influenced the estimation of the relations between England and America.

The fact that America has once again turned its face to Europe is, of course, a matter of world significance. The rapprochement between these two countries is a fact of world historical significance in spite of its temporary and passing character. To assert however, as does Comrade Trotzky, that Europe is being converted into a dominion of America, means very considerably to over-estimate things. To say that

America can place the whole of Europe on rations, means to overestimate the antagonism between America and Europe and within Europe itself. Antagonisms between France and England undoubtedly exist.

Recently we have witnessed a controversy over this question between Pepper and Radek. In my opinion, Pepper is right and Radek is certainly not. We do not in the least deny that the rapprochement between America and England is a fact of historical importance, but at the same time, we must not lose sight of the fact that between imperialist America and imperialist England, antagonisms exist and that they are becoming more acute.

At the present time we have in both England and America, governments which socially, are akin to each other. There is social kinship between the Conservative Government of England and the present government of America. What does this fact imply, from the point of view of a correct estimation of imperialist antagonisms? What will it lead to in the capitalist world?

Is social kinship between two governments equivalent to friendly relations between them? Not in the least. In the beginning of the war of 1914, the reins of government in the countries of Europe were in the hands of governments who were also somewhat akin to each other, from the social standpoint. Nevertheless, this kinship did not prevent them from going to war against each other. The same thing applies to America and England. Imperialism is imperialism. The conflict, the competition continues. This sort of antagonism not only exists, but may become more acute, in spite of the social kinship between the two bourgeois governments.

Anglo-American Antagonisms.

Indeed, the cooperation between America and England is a definite fact. Nevertheless, the antagonisms between England and America are increasing. These antagonisms may be divided approximately into 10 points, and each one of these is sufficient to convince one, that the rapprochement between America and England, must not be exaggerated. The ten points are as follows:

1. The direct struggle for world hegemony. The world's creditor today is not England, but America. The fight between

these two in this sphere is already raging and will continue to rage in the future.

2. Canada. 3. Australia. 4. Mexico. 5. Oil. 6. Markets, 7. The question of armaments. The open rivalry in armaments for the purpose of securing the domination of the seas. 8. Debts. 9. The import and export of raw materials and 10. even on the question of the Dawes Plan, around which the rapprochement has taken place, there are fundamental antagonisms between the two States.

Each of these ten points is sufficient to demonstrate, that parallel with the process of rapprochement, there is the process of growth of antagonisms which, generally, is characteristic of capitalism. I will quote only one illustration which is characteristic of the relations between America and England. I have in mind Canada. In 1913, the amount of capital invested in Canada by England was double that invested by America. In 1923 a complete change is observed: there is about an equal amount of American capital invested in Canada as British, that is to say, about two and a half milliards of dollars. It should be observed also that America's method of investing capital in Canada differs from the method employed by England. America invests her capital directly in Canadian enterprises. The Americanisation of Canada is becoming a fact. Culture in Canada is completely American. Accounts in Canada are kept, not in pounds, but in dollars. The press, the cinema, the theatres, the railways, fashions in clothes are all, not English, but American. In England as well as in America, people quite openly speak of the possibility of the gradual conversion of Canada into a new State of the United States of America. At the present moment, England is trying to find support in the two or three million French Canadians living in Canada, for the English who live there have long ago become Americanised. Only recently, the "Times" spoke openly of the possibility of losing Canada.

The tendency for the British Empire to break up is becoming more and more marked. The London "Times", between the 2nd and 5th of February, published a series of articles entitled, "The Dominions in Foreign Politics". For the first time, the leading organ of British imperialism spoke openly of the ever increasing danger menacing the unity of the British Empire. The "Times" starts out with the failure to convene the Imperial Conference, which was to have been called to obtain the views of the various parts of the Empire upon the Geneva Protocol. This failure was due to the fact that the dominions generally are hostile to all rivalries which may result in imposing fresh burdens upon them, and may give rise to fresh wars. The articles in the "Times" roused the greatest interest all over the world and for weeks were reproduced in the whole of the British press.

The British bourgeoisie is realising that the dominions are slipping through their fingers. Of the ten points, the point of Canada alone is sufficient to prove that the antagonisms between England and America are becoming increasingly acute. The question of the dominions, is assuming more and more an acute and urgent character.

Consequently, to assert that a rapprochement is taking place between England and America is merely to present one side of the picture. On the other side, we see a continuous growth of antagonism, gradually assuming a more and more acute character. At the same time, America is striving to take advantage of the antagonism existing between the various European States. All the characteristic symptoms of imperialism, the proper calculation of which lays at the basis of the Leninist theory of imperialism, are visible at the present time.

Japan on the Eve of a Bourgeois Revolution.

The Japanese situation is pregnant with a bourgeois revolution, which is acquiring enormous significance in connection with the Eastern question. The movement which is developing in Japan calls to mind the period of 1905 in Russia, Demonstrations, the general growth of the peasant movement, the growth of the terrorist movement, all these are characteristic of the Japanese movement. But the working class in Japan is politically weaker than were the workers in Russia in 1905. Numerically perhaps it is about the same as the Russian proletariat was at that time, but politically it is weaker. For all that, bourgeois revolution is knocking at the

gates of Japan and such a revolution, in our epoch must undoubtedly hasten the liberation movement in the East and by that, hasten the world proletarian revolution.

The Orient and its Significance to the World Revolution.

The third is the Eastern question. This is a particularly important question: the Eastern problem is maturing with a rapidity that we could never have imagined before. The Soviet Republic at the present time has a common line of front with China. The growth of Sun-Yat Sen's Party, the Kuomintang, which sympathises with us to a certain extent, is of enormous importance for the Comintern. In China, in Egypt, in the Dutch Indies, everywhere the movement is growing.

In the concluding days of his life, Lenin paid more and more attention to the Orient. He clearly saw that from the East a large reserve army of the revolution was marching and that perhaps the revolution would change its route, and enter by other gates. The Orient, by itself, without the assistance of the Western proletariat, would be impotent. Only the Communist movement in the West — even if it has not yet led the working class to victory — will give to the struggle of the Eastern peoples altogether different weight.

I would like to remind you what Comrade Lenin said concerning the Eastern question before the war. Already in 1911, after the Revolution had taken place in China, Lenin wrote about progressive Asia and backward Europe. To many at that time, this comparison seemed a very strange one. Today, all see that it was prophetic. In a certain sense we have indeed today a progressive Asia and a backward Europe. It must not be forgotten that the East embraces 900,000,000, the majority of the population of the globe.

The enormous significance of the fact that this gigantic mass is beginning to move, must not be forgotten.

Recall what a profound influence the first, second and third Russian revolutions had upon the development of the Orient. If we desire to obtain a general idea of the world situation, we must direct our attention, not only to Europe, but also to the Orient.

The Consolidation of the Soviet Union.

The next point characterising the present political situation is that of the economic revival of the **Union of Socialist Soviet Republics**. What is the situation here? The Union has grown stronger. Its economics and political position has become consolidated. In the first place, the economic position of the union has improved. You will remember how happy Comrade Lenin was at the Fourth Congress to report to you that we had accumulated ten million gold roubles and therefore, were in a position to make some progress in restoring the metal industry. Now, ten million roubles is not nearly so important a sum to us. You will remember how some of our friends in our opposition, more or less openly said during the Fifth Congress: Wait until the autumn, "they" (i. e. the Government of the U. S. S. R.) will then have a Budget with a deficit of 400,000,000, and then you will see what a tight corner the Central Committee will be in. But what actually happened? I am not revealing a State Secret, when I say that not only is there no deficit of 400,000,000 roubles, but on the contrary, we have a respectable surplus (applause). If in 1923 ten million roubles obtained from foreign trade, was regarded as an achievement. I think that the surplus which I have just mentioned, will serve as a more striking confirmation of the consolidation of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the wages of the workers in Moscow, Leningrad and other towns, during the last three months, in a number of branches of industry, have exceeded pre-war wages. This is another proof that the economic position of the country is gradually improving.

As you know comrades, our enemies are gradually becoming reconciled to this state of affairs and this has resulted in a number of treaties, recognitions etc. By this I do not wish to say that we are no longer confronted by any dangers. There will still be intense competition on the economic field.

The stronger the Soviet Republic becomes, the more inevitable will be the attempts on the part of the world bourgeoisie directly to attack us. The international proletariat must reckon with this possibility. It is quite possible that a situation will arise when the very progress we are making will compel the bourgeoisie to make aggressive plans against us.

Hence, when we review the political situation, we must not be deceived by the fact that a rapprochement has been established between England and America. We must, to a no less extent, take into our calculations the situation in the Orient and in our Union of Soviet Republics, which to a considerable degree also belongs to the East, or more correctly, is a bridge to the East.

The Situation in England Becoming More Revolutionary.

We come now to the next point, the situation in England. Here certain changes are to be observed. First of all, I will state that the Second International is gradually transferring its attention from Germany to England. This is a fact. With the formation of the first, so-called Labour Government, — the Macdonald Government, — the centre of gravity of the Second International was removed to England. It seems to me comrades, that we are on the threshold of a period in which the centre of gravity of the future development of the world revolution will also gradually commence to shift to England.

The opportunists will ask: do you really think that robust, full-blooded, conservative England has to fear revolution? Those who look upon things superficially are hypnotised by the full-bloodedness of British capitalism. But a pupil of Marx and Engels cannot but see that the power of the British bourgeoisie is seriously threatened from three directions. The first is the dominions. The second is the revolutionary character which the labour movement is assuming and the third is the Orient.

The place of the Conservative government in England can no longer be taken by a Liberal government. There are only two great forces in England today: The Conservatives and the Labour Party. If the Conservatives will have to make way for another party, that party will not be the Liberal Party, but the Labour Party. For that reason the position taken up by the British Labour Party is of enormous importance. The gradual transformation of the Labour Party is obvious. Not less obvious is the growth of its Left Wing. These facts indicate that full-blooded, conservative England is standing on a volcano. The situation in England does not show symptoms of increasing stability, but on the contrary, is continuously becoming more revolutionary.

Antagonisms between England and France.

The sixth point — the relation between England and France. Here too antagonisms exist. A conflict is going on for the domination of Europe. Both States at the present time are, in a certain degree, dependent upon American imperialism, which is striving to play off one against the other, rousing mutual conflicts between them and at the same time rousing conflicts between the two and other States. The situation in France is not in the least stabilised. The Herriot Government, politically, has outlived its time. In order to prolong its life, it must abandon the very sense and content of its life. The French proletariat has increased numerically. The Party of the proletariat has grown also. Work is being commenced in the colonies and among the peasantry.

The Situation in the Balkans.

In several Balkan countries, in Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, there are in my opinion three revolutionising factors: 1. the peasant movement, 2. the national movement and 3. the labour movement. The interaction of these three factors is of extreme importance, and this interaction is visible. Sometimes we are told that the fight is being conducted too half-heartedly; that the counter-revolution in these countries has become stronger. However, the dialectics of history teach us that sometimes, precisely at the moment when the counter-revolution appears to have reached its

culminating point, it turns out that the revolution is near, precisely at such a moment, counter-revolution is substituted by revolution. That the national movement, the peasant movement and the labour movement in these countries bear a mass character there is not the slightest doubt. The Yugoslav government may annul the mandates of from 60 to 80 peasant deputies, and from the "Constitutional" point of view, this may seem a mere bagatelle. But such things cannot be done with impunity: The discontent of the masses is merely driven down deeper. For that reason we communists, in estimating the position in the Balkans, will not allow ourselves to be deceived with what we see on the surface. Superficially, the reaction appears to be omnipotent. At a first glance it may appear that the government in Yugoslavia has crushed the Raditch Movement. If we look deeper, however, we shall be compelled to admit that the position of the Balkan Government is still shaky and is not approaching stability in the least degree.

Germany and the Dawes Plan.

In Germany we see the greatest changes. The tactics of our Party with regard to the Dawes Plan were correct. The International approves these tactics, — although it was clear from the beginning that, even with correct tactics we, for a time, would not be able to achieve considerable successes. We are concerned with adopting a line of tactics which would show to the proletariat that in the perspective of historical development, our point of view is correct.

At the present moment the working class of Germany is in a position in which it sees the "favourable" side of the Dawes' Plan. There has been a revival of industry, an influx of capital, the currency has become stabilised. The exploitation of Germany by the Entente, however, continues. The time will come when antagonisms will become more acute on other grounds. We openly stated in the press, — and I think this created quite a sensation, — that the revolutionary situation which prevailed in Germany in 1923 does not obtain in 1925. I am afraid, comrades, that this assertion may cause considerable misunderstanding. No doubt some comrades will say: So! There is no clearly expressed revolutionary situation? That is exactly what we wish to establish. Consequently, the whole tactics of the Communist International and the German Party are wrong?

We must frankly state the facts. Harboring illusions has never been of any benefit to the revolution. **In Germany at the present moment there is not a direct revolutionary situation;** we recognise and analyse this fact. But this of course, does not imply the cessation of the class struggles in Germany. **The class war in Germany has not ceased, and will not cease.** Recent events confirm this. It is sufficient to recall the shooting down of the workers by the police in Halle. Read the reports in "Rote Fahne" of the demonstrations organised in connection with the events in Halle. We see that the class war is being carried into the streets. A fresh wave of economic strikes is breaking out. Consequently the struggle in Germany is continuing. Moreover, this is not the class struggle that was fought in pre-war days, but the class struggle of the post-war period, i. e. always and invariably bearing the seed of civil war. On the other hand, this struggle is not conducted in the spirit of 1923, but in the spirit of 1925, which has its specific features.

The changes which have taken place in Germany are most striking. Soon, the Dawes' Plan will have caused greater acuteness in the class struggle, which will not become blunted even if it drags on for several years. Again and again it will become acute on continually new grounds.

The Situation in Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia and Scandinavia.

In Poland, the situation is the same as that in the Balkans. Strong peasant movements, strong movements among the national minorities, which represent parts of the peasant movement, and also a strong labour movement. Consequently, in Poland also the combination of these three factors is in operation. A superficial investigation may lead to the conclusion that an improvement has taken place in the position

of the Polish bourgeoisie, but the three factors mentioned above should not be lost sight of.

A word or two more concerning Italy. We have not yet succeeded in overcoming fascism there. Several weeks ago it seemed that Mussolini was approaching his end. It turned out not to be the case. But, the position of Italy is shaky, unstable and pregnant with everything in the world but consolidation.

Now with regard to Czechoslovakia. The position of the bourgeoisie there is such that it can find no constitutional way out of the difficulties in which it is immersed. The coalition is breaking up, and this is becoming more marked as time goes on. Here, as in Poland and in the Balkans, we observe the inter-action of the same three factors. It is true that the peasant movement and the movement of the national minorities also is weaker than in the previously mentioned countries. But on the other hand, the third factor, the labour movement is much stronger in Czechoslovakia than in the other countries.

As for Scandinavia, these "blessed" lands of the petty-bourgeoisie where the reigns of government are still in the hands of social-democrats, it is characteristic that even in these countries, the class struggle is becoming more acute. The idyll has come to an end. The sharp class struggles which we have witnessed in Scandinavia recently, particularly in Norway, and recently also in Sweden and Denmark, testify to the growing acuteness of class antagonisms in the Scandinavian countries.

The Attraction of the International Proletariat towards the U. S. S. R. is Increasing.

Simultaneously with this the power of attraction of the U. S. S. R. is increasing steadily. We must admit that for a little while, particularly in the period of the famine, this power of attraction diminished somewhat. At the present time, however, an opposite tendency is observed. The movement in favour of sending numerous trade union delegations to the U. S. S. R. is only just commencing and will no doubt grow. What attracts representatives of social democratic and non-party workers from other countries to us? An instinct that genuine socialistic construction has commenced in the U. S. S. R. These delegates reason to themselves approximately as follows: We have proceeded by different paths to those followed by Russia; we follow the social democrats. What have we achieved? Economically, our position is very bad. In Russia, the proletariat took what is, indeed, the thorny path, the path of blood and civil war. But, the Russian workers have already achieved much. The consciousness of this is awakening in the minds of the social-democratic workers and from now on will become more fixed.

The World Situation, as before, Remains Objectively Revolutionary.

To sum up, I would say: we must not separate Germany from the general picture, although we for a long time imagined that the revolution there was imminent. We must analyse the world situation as a whole and estimate it at its real value. We are a party of the world revolution, and not of the Russian Revolution, or German revolution. For that reason, our estimation of the situation must embrace the world situation as a whole.

Thus, in summing up, we must say: on certain sectors of the front the fight is no longer raging with the same heat that it raged in 1923. Although there is no armistice nevertheless, as compared with 1923, the fight on certain sections of the front (Germany) has temporarily subsided. Nor is there an acute revolutionary situation in Western and Central Europe. But, with regard to the world position as a whole, as before, it remains revolutionary. The Orient is advancing more determinedly than we supposed. The influence of the Communist International is increasing and the idea of world revolution is becoming more and more popular there. Great Britain is more shaken than it seemed to us up till now. Karl Marx considered that a revolution without Great Britain would be but a storm in a teacup. If we place the position of Great Britain in juxtaposition to the position in Germany, and also take into consideration the progres-

sive awakening of the Orient with its nine hundred million inhabitants, we will see that the factors retarding the revolution and the factors stimulating the revolution, approximately balance each other.

Consequently, comrades, the general position is that, as hitherto, we must reckon upon a twofold possibility; we must in future construct our tactics on the lines indicated in the resolution of the Fifth International Congress and differentiate them according to the requirements of each country, — taking into consideration the possibility of both a prolonged and an accelerated development of the class struggle: From the point of view of our fundamental aims, there are not the slightest grounds for pessimism.

A Wrong Estimation of the Situation Leads to Anti-Leninist Deviations.

The Comrades who, from a wrong estimation of the rapprochement between England and America, draw pessimistic conclusions are directly faced with the danger of the beginning of a revision of the Leninist theory of imperialism. These comrades, frequently, are prepared to vote for any resolution, and to call themselves Leninists, but, they refuse to understand that when it is necessary to apply Leninism, they frequently commence to revise the most important and fundamental parts of Leninism.

Those who strive to show that the rapprochement between America and England must lead to the conversion of Europe into a dominion of the United States and to the removal of the antagonisms in Europe, by this repeat what Kautsky said in 1915 on the question of ultra-imperialism. I do not wish to make extensive quotations and I refer you to Lenin's article in the collection entitled "Against the Stream" and to his controversy with Kautsky in his book "Imperialism, the Modern Stage of Capitalism". Lenin, in anticipation as it were, replies to the very questions which are now being put by the representatives of the right wing. I will quote merely one passage from the above-mentioned book.

"Of a similarly conservative character, as we have seen above, is Kautsky's notorious theory of "ultra-imperialism".

Indeed, it is sufficient to compare generally known and indisputed facts to become convinced how false is the perspective with which Kautsky is attempting to imbue the German workers and the workers of all countries. Take India, Indo-China, and China. It is known that these three colonial and semi-colonial countries, having a population varying from five hundred to seven hundred millions, are exploited by the finance capital of a few imperialist States: England, France, Japan, United States, etc. Let us assume that these imperialist countries make alliances against each other for the purpose of protecting or expanding their possessions, interests and "spheres of influence" in the Asiatic countries mentioned. These alliances would be "inter-imperialist" alliances. Let us assume that the imperialist States form an alliance for the "peaceful" partition of these Asiatic countries. This would be "the international combination of finance capital". Practical examples of such alliances are to be found in the history of the 20th century, for example in the attitude of the powers towards China. The question arises: is it "conceivable, while preserving the capitalist system (and this is the assumption Kautsky makes) that such alliances can be anything but shortlived? That they could exclude friction, conflicts and struggles in a multitude of forms?

It is sufficient to present the question clearly, to make it impossible for any other reply to be given to this question except in the negative; for under capitalism, no other basis for the partition of spheres of influence, interests, colonies, etc. exists except the calculation of forces of those taking part in the division, viz., economic, financial, military, etc. and the forces of those taking part in the division, do not change equally, for an even rate of development of individual enterprises, trusts, branches of industry and countries under capitalism is impossible. Half a century ago, Germany was insignificant in comparison with the capitalist power of England at that time. The same comparison can be made

between Japan and Russia. Is it conceivable that within the next decade or two, the present relations between the imperialist States will remain unchanged? It is absolutely inconceivable.

Consequently, "inter-imperialistic" or "ultra-imperialistic" alliances, irrespective of the form in which they may be concluded: either the form of the coalition of one group of imperialist powers against the coalition of another group, or in the form of a general alliance of all the imperialist powers, must inevitably be only "respite" between wars.

Peaceful alliances prepare for wars and in their turn grow out of wars. They mutually determine each other, give rise to changes in the peaceful and non-peaceful struggles arising out of one and the same cause of the imperialist ties and inter-relations of world economy and world politics." (V. I. Lenin. Collected Works. Vol. XIII, pp. 328, 329, Russian Edition).

Comrades, we could use the same words today in reply to our "prophets" who so over-estimate the importance of the rapprochement between England and America which in their opinion should almost abolish revolution.

Radek asserts that the democratic pacifist "era" has not yet passed away. It is true that MacDonald has left the stage, but, in the opinion of Radek, pacifism still remains. How does Radek arrive at this conclusion? Simply by regarding every situation in which war is not being actually conducted, as pacifism. But imperialism requires respites between wars during which to prepare for fresh wars. Although war is not actually being conducted at the present

moment, nevertheless, we see masked preparations for future wars. We must have the greatest clarity on this question. In December 1922, Comrade Lenin wrote:

"We must take the present conflicts, even the most insignificant, and use them as illustrations to show how war may break out, any day as a consequence of the differences between England and France concerning some detail in their treaty with Turkey or between America and Japan, concerning some trifling difference, over a Pacific question, or between any large powers over colonial disputes, Customs policy, commercial policy, etc. etc." ("Bolshevik", a journal of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, No. 2, 1924, p. 18).

This is how Lenin estimated the situation even before the end of 1922, when the situation generally seemed perfectly clear. He assumed that fresh wars might arise not only as a consequence of the important antagonisms between England and America, but even over such questions as Customs and commercial policy. This is precisely the character of "pacifist" imperialism as a whole. Fresh wars may break out over most insignificant question. That is why we must resolutely repudiate even the most cautious and masked attempt to revise the Leninist theory of imperialism.

I repeat: The general world situation remains objectively revolutionary, in spite of the fact that in several countries, as for example in Germany, an immediate revolutionary situation no longer exists. The Fifth International Congress, quite correctly estimated the situation. Our former tactics remain in force to this day.

IV. The Democratic Pacifist Era, Fascism and Social Democracy.

The True Character and Significance of the Democratic Pacifist Era.

Comrades, in recent times, all the important differences that have arisen in the ranks of the Communist International, in the final analysis, have centred round the estimation of the democratic pacifist "era". Persons like Newbold, Phillips Price, Höglund, Rosmer, to a certain degree are the casualties of yesterday's democratic "era".

How did these people picture the situation to themselves?

Simply that the revolution has passed and that the world situation had ceased to be revolutionary. They said, since the Soviet Government has not been able, to achieve much improvement in the lives of the workers, in the course of five or six years, then MacDonald should be given as much time. This was said by communists! Höglund judged events of world historical importance from the fact that Newbold was defeated in the parliamentary elections.

The question of the proper method of approach to the democratic-pacifist era has been the central point of our tactics during the last 9 months. Several comrades were labouring under doubt which, however, they feared to express openly. They stated that, on the whole, they were in agreement with the line of policy of the Fifth Congress, but they continued to regard the democratic pacifist episode as a genuine era, as a prolonged period, as a new epoch in world history. They thought that from this logically follows the necessity to change the whole of our tactics in a more or less social-democratic sense. Newbold and Höglund fell victims to this illusion. Others were more cautious and more diplomatic. They only caught one of their fingers in the door, but their astonishment was so great that they lost all desire to put any more of their fingers in it. What do the facts teach us? First of all, with regard to the duration of the notorious "era", the facts show that the democratic-pacifist "era" was nothing more than an episode, as was foretold in the resolution of the Fifth Congress. In a certain sense, it may be said that the "democratic-pacifist" episode was tantamount to the approach to power of the petty bourgeoisie. As a matter of fact, power fell into the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie not entirely, but only within certain

limits. In the period of imperialism and proletarian revolution, (a period which can least of all be described as democratic-pacifist) the petty-bourgeoisie cannot hold power independently. For that reason, it was compelled to play the part of a puppet in the hands of the big bourgeoisie. England and France serve as a brilliant and historical illustration of this situation, for in those countries it was clearly demonstrated, that in the epoch of imperialism, the petty-bourgeoisie cannot govern a country as an independent force.

What do the facts teach us? They teach us that willy-nilly, MacDonald was working for us. A process of differentiation is taking place within the labour movement, and a genuine will to power is growing within it. Frequently, the question was put on a "philosophical" plan: what does the MacDonald Government really represent? Does it represent the last phase of the post-war crisis, or is it the first phase of a new pacifist era? This method of presenting the question appeared to be highly "dialectical". I think that the MacDonald Government was both one and the other. In democratic-pacifism, we have merely a single link in the continuous chain of events which commenced as far back as 1914, i. e. with the outbreak of the war.

The democratic pacifist "era" of 1924 is but an episode in the epoch of imperialist wars and preparations for proletarian revolution. We do not stand in need of "philosophic" definitions. It is sufficient for us to bear in mind: 1. that this period proved to be shortlived; 2. that the petty-bourgeoisie, even as represented by the Labour Party, cannot play an independent role; 3. that at the present time in England, we must count with two decisive factors of social life, viz., the working class and capitalism and 4. that the MacDonald Government with its "constructive socialism" worked for us, communists, for the Comintern.

The Estimation of Fascism and Social Democracy.

The question of the character of democratic pacifism is bound up with the estimation of fascism. You remember comrades, the fight that took place in our ranks over this question. Take the elections in Germany, England and in America. In Germany, the masses of the electors voted

for the social-democrats; in England, for the Labour Party, and in America for the Party of LaFollette. The broad masses, petty-bourgeois as well as proletarian, voted for the group which represented the ideas of democratic-pacifism, even when its star was setting. The "era" passed away, but the conservative sections of the population still clutching at utopias and all kinds of illusions, continued to vote for democratic-pacifist politics. We do not wish to have democratic illusions reigning in the Communist Party, but the conservative masses still cling to them. We had to combat these illusions in the past, and of course, we must continue to do so in the future.

In the democratic-pacifist "era", we must distinguish between two groups of countries. One of these were subjects and the other objects of the "era". England and France were subjects. Germany was an object. In passing, I will say that the successes achieved by our Party in England and France on the one hand, and the difficult position of our German Party on the other hand, arise out of the objective condition of things. Both in Germany and in France, pacifist illusions reign. But, the soil which fosters these illusions, is not the same in Germany as it is France. When a man, rolling on the ground in the agonies of hunger, is roused with the hope of obtaining a mouthful of bread and water, or a drop of milk, naturally hopes and illusions arise in him. This was the position in which Germany found herself. It was precisely upon this that the social-democrats speculated. It is not surprising therefore, that in the countries which have been the subjects of the "era", where the ruling class were not in a position to propose or promise anything to the masses, could promise no improvement in their conditions, our Communist Parties obtained successes with relative ease.

Social Democracy "Defeats" Fascism by Affiliating to it.

In 1924, Radek formulated a resolution on the victory of fascism over social-democracy. Was that resolution correct? How in the present instance should the term "victory" be understood? You know for example, that the German bourgeoisie was "victorious" over Karl Liebknecht. The bourgeoisie killed him. That is one form of victory. Another form of victory was observed in the Russian revolutionary movement in the '80's of the last century. I have in mind the wellknown revolutionary Leo Tikhomirov. He too, was "defeated", but how? He himself went over to the enemy, to the camp of czarism. Liebknecht was "defeated" by the German bourgeoisie; Tikhomirov was "defeated" by Russian czarism. These are two forms of "victory". It was precisely in the latter form that social-democracy was "defeated" by the bourgeoisie, and this on a world scale. The leaders of social-democracy simply turned traitors, followed the example of Tikhomirov, and went over to the side of the bourgeoisie. Radek overlooked this detail. He decided that, as the social-democracy had been "defeated" we ought to

unite with it politically. This is an example of the theory of the "United Front" according to Radek. He lost sight of the fact that the leaders of the social-democracy were "defeated" by the bourgeoisie in the sense that they began to form a wing of the bourgeoisie. It was for that reason, that the theses of the Fifth Congress, which described the social-democracy as the "third" party of the bourgeoisie, were absolutely correct.

In Italy, fascism was a syntheses of the strivings of the capitalist bourgeoisie and of the social-democracy, and the social-democracy became a wing of fascism. The theses and resolutions of the Fifth Congress on this question were correct in so far as it has turned out that social-democracy is becoming stronger in proportion as the bourgeoisie is becoming stronger. The conservativeness of the broad masses and the retarded rate of development of class conflicts will have the same effect of increasing the strength of social-democracy in the future. The whole question is, what should be our attitude to this? Some of the right wing comrades are of the opinion that, in view of the increasing strength of the social-democracy, we must revise all our values! We are of a different opinion, and are convinced that to the extent that the bourgeoisie will increase its strength for a time, the social-democrats will take advantage of this; for in our days the bourgeoisie and the social-democracy are twins. Marx and Engels in their day, quite justly branded venal leaders of the British labour movement. To-day, we must do the same thing on an international scale.

A series of events renders this task easier for us. I will deal only with four of them. 1. The Barmat scandal, the Ebert trial, etc.; 2. the agreement concluded between the Hungarian Social Democrats, and Horthy; 3. the last meeting of the Bureau of the Second International and 4. the funerals of Ebert, Branting and Gompers. Recently, I read an obituary notice on Branting written by Huysmans. Huysmans criticises Branting with having been, in spite of his republican convictions, an old friend and school chum of the king of Sweden. Well said, was it not? Huysmans "buried" Branting a second time.

To sum up: the social-democracy, comrade Radek, was indeed "defeated" by the bourgeoisie and by fascism, but unlike Karl Liebknecht and his followers, it did not fall in battle, but was defeated in the sense that it itself, as represented by its leaders, abandoned the Labour Party and took up a petty-bourgeois position as a wing of bourgeois "democracy". The temporary increase in strength of the bourgeoisie is equal to a certain temporary increase in strength of the social-democracy. The doom of the bourgeoisie will at the same time also be the doom of social-democracy.

Consequently, the tactics of the Communist International were absolutely correct. This is evidenced by the class struggle; this is taught us by the episodes in the civil war, this is testified to by the life and the movement of the masses. The Bolshevist Leninist policy of the Fifth Congress has been completely justified. (Applause).

V. The Fight for Trade Union Unity and the British Labour Movement.

The Slogan of Trade Union Unity put Forward by Comintern.

Nobody, I think, will dispute the correctness of the general policy laid down by the Fifth Congress on this question. It is true that our opponents in the Right Wing of the Comintern considered that the resolution of the Fifth World Congress on the trade union questions was essentially contradictory to the other resolutions adopted by it. They regarded the correctness of our position on this question as an "accident". Events have since proved that the trade union resolution of the Fifth Congress is wholly in accordance with the general tactics of the Comintern. There is no need therefore, at the present moment to discuss this question in principle. What we now need is to draw up practical instructions for our individual fraternal parties.

The most popular of all slogans, the slogan of the fight for international trade union unity, was put forward by the Comintern. With this the Communist International made a great step forward. We must observe that in certain countries the correct policy on the trade union question in the process of being put into effect, may be liable to the same two dangers

to which the tactics of the united front in general are liable. This is particularly evident in France and Czechoslovakia, and to a lesser extent in other countries.

The first danger lies in regarding these tactics as an unimportant manoeuvre, as though the whole affair consisted in writing open letters to social democrats and letting everything else take care of itself. The other danger lies in going to the other extreme and advocating the hurried and unconditional entrance into the reformist trade unions even where just as strong or even stronger revolutionary trade unions exist. That is the other extreme. I have heard that certain comrades in Czechoslovakia even believe that the weaker red revolutionary unions are, the easier it will be to achieve trade union unity. We regard our tactics in an entirely different way. We consider that where revolutionary trade unions exist, we must try to win over every possible worker. And at the same time we must continue the fight for trade union unity. To dissolve with a gesture our red trade union organisations when they represent an important force in comparison with the reformist trade unions, would be a gross mistake.

The Anglo-Russian Committee has not yet been formed,

but the latest reports regarding the preparations for its formations are of a favourable nature. The Right Amsterdamers are apparently rather alarmed at the decisions of the British to summon an official conference in conjunction with the Russian trade unions. We stick to our former policy and shall continue to fight for the unity of the trade union movement without running to either of the extremes. We shall carry on the struggle everywhere, even in those places where we have our revolutionary trade unions.

New Factors in the British Labour Movement.

Historically, our whole trade union campaign arose out of the position which has developed within the British labour movement. The new factors which are making themselves felt in the international labour movement originated in England. The factors facilitating the new movement are briefly as follows: 1) Great Britain is losing her monopolist position in the world market. 2) The colonial power of Britain is being shaken. These two factors alone are of tremendous importance. The second factor, in spite of the fact that is only just becoming apparent, is already making its influence felt upon the whole economic and political position of Great Britain. 3) The class struggle is becoming more acute. 4) The labour aristocracy is losing its privileged position.

It is therefore by no means accidental that a delegation of the British trade unions recently visited Russia and reported comparatively favourable on our revolution. This is by no means to be attributed to the personal qualities of the representatives of the British labour movement in question, to the fact that they are good fellows, but is closely bound up with the four factors above enumerated. A new breeze is blowing in the British labour movement. In my opinion **Max Beer** is right when, in reviewing the British labour movement of the past few years, he says that the situation of the British working class is being affected by the failure of the classic tactics of the trade unionists and by the old fighting method of the Labour Party. The failure of the old trade unionist tactics is also not accidental. It is not due to the defects of the leaders or to the errors they committed, but to the fact that Great Britain is losing her monopolist position in the world market and that her influence and the influence of her colonies is meeting with greater and greater opposition, which is accelerating the pace of the class struggle in Britain and is awakening the masses of the British proletariat to a new life.

To this too, is to be attributed the **trade union minority movement** which has a great future before it. This movement which has rallied 600,000 workers around communist ideas (and is consolidating the official Left Wing of the trade unions) has, more than any other, facilitated the establishment of Anglo-Russian friendship.

The British Labour Party and the Rural Districts.

A tangled situation is developing in Britain. The Labour Party, in its present form, is hardly likely to persist. But its prospects for the immediate future are good. It has designs

on the countryside. At present it is solely an urban party. At the last elections it obtained 52 seats out of 93 in industrial constituencies, and only 38 out of 230 in rural constituencies. I think that we shall be witnessing a two-fold phenomenon in the Labour Party: firstly, the gradual decline of the prestige and influence of its inert leaders in the ranks of the minority movement and even of the Communist Party (especially in working centres and industrial districts), and secondly, the growth of the influence of the Labour Party in the small towns and rural districts.

In the light of historical perspectives, the strengthening of the position of the Labour Party in these districts will objectively be a progressive move. Not so long ago Otto Bauer in Austria, issued the slogan "Into the countryside". The Austrian social democrats have made up their minds to go into the rural districts; they are not averse to tasting a piece of "Leninism". They declare that Lenin was right in insisting upon an alliance with the peasantry. Lenin, of course, regarded that alliance somewhat differently from Otto Bauer. We know the price of the "Leninism" of the Otto Bauer. For the Labour Party it would be objectively a step forward, to turn its face to the countryside, strike a blow at the Conservatives, and push its roots into the rural population.

Comintern has Found the Key to the Problem of the British Labour Movement.

Our trade union campaign is a vital campaign; it has a big future before it, because it is in living, organic contact with the processes which are proceeding within the British labour movement and with the progressive tendencies developing within it.

For many years Engels sought the key to the problem of the British labour movement. Marxism could find no approach to the masses of the British labour movement, because the objective situation at that time did not favour the solution of the problem. Lenin also sought the key. You remember how at the Second Congress a discussion arose as to whether it was advisable to enter the Labour Party or not. That was not a question of organisation; we were seeking the key to the solution of the problem of the British labour movement. The British labour movement was a puzzle not only in the period of Marx and Engels and in the period of the Second International. It seems to me that thanks to Lenin, the Third International has found the key. Before our eyes a new situation is developing in the British labour movement and the conditions will finally be created for transforming our Communist Party into a mass Party. The circulation of the weekly paper which our comrades in England have just begun to issue, has exceeded all our expectations. **The young British Communist Party** is moving forward apace. It is progressing thanks, firstly, to the change in the objective conditions of Britain, and secondly to the fact that the British communists have adopted the right path, along which they will proceed to the conquest of the majority of the British proletariat.

VI. The Task of Bolshevisation and the Road to its Achievement.

The Road to Bolshevisation is the Proper Organisation of the Communist Parties and Their Conduct of a Correct Policy.

These, then, are the circumstances in which the work of Bolshevising our Parties commenced. My theses on the question of Bolshevisation are drawn up in sufficient detail, so that all I do need now, is to make just a few supplementary remarks to them.

First of all, I wish to touch upon the theme of "organisation and politics". After the publication of the theses of the Fifth International Congress, many comrades began to interpret the slogan of Bolshevisation as implying, merely the organisational reconstruction of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei. The basis of the theses we present to you now, is the idea, that the fundamental task of Bolshevisation is to draw up and conduct a correct line of policy. Of course, one must not contrast organisation to politics as two opposite

things. A correct policy is impossible without proper organisation, and a good organisation is not worth a farthing, if it does not carry out a correct policy. I repeat, the essence of Bolshevisation is to draw up a correct line of policy; the correct approach to the questions of the trade unions, the peasantry, the colonial question, work among the youth, among women etc. Nor should we minimise the significance of organisation; the reorganisation on the basis of factory nuclei. I would like to warn you against this very strongly, for

in order to conduct a correct policy, it is necessary to have a proper organisation.

The conference which has just been held on the organisation question is of enormous importance. Comrade Piatnicky gave me some of the material of the Conference and what caught my eye was an extract from an article in "Rude Pravo" of the 15th of February*), which is of considerable practical

*) See "Inprecorr" N. 21. Vol. 5. Page 312.

interest from the point of view of the question of the Bolshevisation of the Parties and their reconstruction.

It is not necessary to write long theses, but to start from the most simple things, to follow the prescription of this workingman! first to gather together four men, then another four men and then distribute the work among these. This is Leninism and the practical organisation of the work.

I want to recall to your mind a letter written by Comrade Lenin in 1902, at the time when our movement was still very young. That letter contains a plan of organisation. What Comrade Lenin, more than 20 years ago, recommended to the Russian workers at the time when the proletarian movement in Russia was only just commencing, the workers themselves are doing now, but on a larger scale, under other circumstances, on their own initiative and in countries where the labour movement has existed for many years. That is precisely how we should proceed in the question of organisation: — step by step. We must say to the workers: we do not need communists merely for festivals, we do not require communists merely for parades: every genuine revolutionary must strive to bring over to the Party and enlist into its work new comrades, from among the rank and file workers. This work must be continued unceasingly.

'Live and — Bolshevise'

Reorganisation cannot be brought about mechanically. This has now become perfectly clear. Numerous obstacles are met with on the path of Bolshevisation, partly in the form of social democratic traditions that have not yet been outlived, and partly of a purely objective character. In conducting and developing the campaign for Bolshevisation, **we must transfer the centre of our activity to the factory nuclei.** The best theses in the world are valueless if there is no proper organisation to carry them among the masses and to explain them and make them popular. Simultaneously with conducting a correct policy we must learn to construct a proper organisation.

What does Bolshevisation mean in the conditions in which we now exist? First of all, we must never forget the wise proverb: 'live and learn'. Applied to Bolshevism, this means 'live and Bolshevise'. We should be merely deceiving ourselves if we believed that it is possible to introduce genuine Bolshevisation within a few months, or that it could be done at all in any definite time. The genuine Bolshevisation of the mind of the Party, of the labour movement is a continuous process.

Bolshevisation also Implies the Correct Study of the Experience, Social Classes and Conditions in Every Country.

It must not be lost sight of, that the **mechanical** application of Russian experiences to other countries is impossible. The bourgeoisie, in its way, has also studied the "Lessons of October". This must not be forgotten. We imagined at first, that other countries also will pass through the Kerensky period. Now it is obvious to us that other countries will not pass through this period in the same form. Let us recall the episodes of the civil war, in Hamburg, or Reval, for example. These show that we may expect anything in the world in these countries, but not a repetition of our Kerensky period.

Bolshevism means, to draw from the Russian Revolution, as well as from the struggles in other countries, the most essential lessons and combine them with the concrete conditions and requirements of the given country. First of all, we must study the social classes, and the various strata in the country.

In defining the bases of the dictatorship of the proletariat in various countries, it is necessary, first of all, to study the specific features of the social classes in these countries. It is necessary to know the numerical proportion between the proletariat, the petty-bourgeoisie and the capitalist class, what strata exists among the petty-bourgeoisie etc.

It is first of all necessary to make an elementary social analysis. Not everywhere have we learned to perform even this preliminary work. For example, we imagined that the conditions in this respect were the same in America, Bulgaria and Germany. We must never forget that a cor-

rect policy presupposes the ability to differentiate, to calculate the peculiarities of a given environment on the specific character of a given country. I must say, to our shame, that I have had occasion to meet "leaders" who in reply to the question: how many peasants are there in your country? replied in confusion: I cannot tell you exactly. As you see, some of us cannot reply even to such an elementary, although very important question. In this case, no theses on Bolshevism can be of any assistance. If you do not know the social composition of your own country and the numerical relation of forces in it, it is of no use to pretend to be Bolsheviks. At best, you may be courageous champions of the working class, but to think of leading a revolution, of winning over the peasantry under these conditions, is absurd.

Lenin Taught the Necessity to Fight for Penny-an-hour Increases as well as Ultimate Aims.

We must now discuss, not what is a Bolshevik, but what is a Bolshevik in the concrete conditions of the present period, — the period of the retardation of the whole revolution.

When Lenin wrote his book, "What is to be Done": — this "Bible of Bolshevism", the book which lays down the foundations of Bolshevism, — the Russian labour movement was living through the infancy period of its development. But already at that time, Comrade Lenin covered the complete scope of the work in saying that we must fight equally for penny an hour increases in wages as well as for the achievement of our ultimate aims. Simultaneously with the most minute affairs of everyday work, we must strive to achieve our great aims. That is our task.

Comrades, it must be stated, that at the present time, a number of our Parties are passing through a period in which the study of Bolshevism, particularly of the pre-war period, is especially necessary for them. Several of our Parties are entering that phase of the struggle and development, in which it is particularly important to master the principles of the politics, tactics and organisation of Bolshevism of the period prior to 1917.

Work Among the Peasantry.

We have achieved definite results both in the field of trade unionism and in the field of work among the peasantry and in the colonies. The organisation of the work in the rural districts, it seems to me, is a matter of special importance. We must, however, distinguish between the spontaneous peasant movements on the one hand, and systematic work and Communist initiative in the rural districts on the other. Spontaneous peasant movements are observed in different countries and frequently they arise without the initiative and work of the Communists. The opposite is also the case. There are countries in which beginnings have been made in Communist work among the peasantry, but where there is no spontaneous peasant movement. The Communist International places great hopes in these first efforts towards embracing the peasantry. We can say that, at last the ice is broken. We are passing from words to deeds. I recall to your mind the peasant conferences called by the Communist Party of France. The same was done in Germany; similar preliminary work is being conducted by the Communist Party of Germany. Successes can be recorded in this direction by the Communist Party of Italy. Attempts to commence systematic work among the peasantry are observed also in Czechoslovakia.

The workers of Berlin, Hamburg and other towns, frequently spend their Sundays in the country. They drive to the surrounding villages in motor lorries, distribute Party literature, organise meetings of peasants, etc. This is of enormous importance. We, Russian Bolsheviks did this kind of work. Prior to 1917, the Russian Communist Party was a "town party". Only commencing from 1917, did it begin to penetrate into the country. This was made possible, first of all, by workers sending their delegations to the villages, and the expenses for these trips were covered by collections made among the workers in the factories.

Since such work is now being undertaken, the slogans which summarise it, acquire enormous importance. One such

slogan is "The Workers' and Peasants' Government" as interpreted by the Fifth International Congress. Where this slogan has not yet been issued, it should be issued now, accompanied by extensive propaganda. It would be a mistake to abandon this slogan, simply because Brandler and Radek have discredited it. This circumstance is not an argument against this slogan, for Brandler and Radek tried to discredit all our slogans. In all probability, Brandler has never succeeded in bringing over a single peasant to our side, but he was well able to discredit our slogans. We, however, in working to bring the peasantry over to our side, will strive to popularise this slogan in its revolutionary interpretation.

The Tactics of the United Front.

I come now to the tactics of the united front. These tactics not only do not contradict Bolshevism, but on the contrary, represent an essential part of it. There can be no Bolshevism without these tactics. A Bolshevik, first of all, is a man of the masses, but in order to be a man of the masses he must keep continuous contact with the masses of the workers, including the social democrats and non party masses.

I think comrades, that we are only just beginning to apply the tactics of the united front properly. In the period when great social changes are taking place in England, when one trade union after another is being drawn into the discussion of the question of the united front, the applica-

tion of these tactics must be definite, resolute, revolutionary and Bolshevistic.

The Policy of Partial Demands.

I will deal in a few words with the question of partial demands, which the Parties must advance in carrying out the every day work of leading the struggles of the workers. This question also belongs to the sphere of Bolshevism.

It must not be supposed that we have just entered the period of reform. We understand perfectly well that the period of the retarded development of the revolution is not at all a propitious period for obtaining reforms.

A period such as this does not favour reforms and reformism. We shall get an outbreak of "right sickness", but we see no symptoms of serious reforms.

But this does not mean that, on these grounds, we must abstain from putting forward, partial demands. It is precisely in periods such as the present one, that we must conduct correct, sensible, systematic and carefully thought out tactics of partial demands, without however, departing from the revolutionary struggle, and taking care not to dilute Bolshevism with reformism. We must consistently raise the rank and file worker above the plane of petty questions to the level of the great questions of the day. We must demonstrate to and convince the worker by facts in his own experience that he can never lift himself out of his present poverty by means of petty demands. Precisely at such a moment as this is, partial demands are a definite plan of our tactics.

VII. The Danger of "Right Sickness" in the Comintern.

I foresee, that after our open confession concerning the absence of a direct revolutionary situation in Germany, our genuine views will be subjected to all kinds of distortions and misinterpretations. The Right Wing tendencies will revive. Certain "Communists" who in some cases have not the slightest conception of what Communism is, were of the opinion that the revolution must come within two or three years, and, since it did not come, they think it were better now to join the Social Democrats. These heroes will now say: there you are, we were right! The "ultra-lefts" will now swing over to the right, as has been the case already with Comrade Bordiga.

The case of Comrade Bordiga serves as an extremely instructive illustration of what I have said. But, comrades, read what Comrade Bordiga now writes; try to penetrate his "philosophy" and ponder over the question: why this change took place within him. The reason for it lies in Bordiga's inability to understand the role of the Communist Party in the period of retarded revolutionary development, his inability to understand the petty everyday minute, but at the same time, Bolshevist work, which must be carried on in such a period, his failure to see the connections in the tactics of the united front, partial demands, etc., with our activities directed towards the achievement of our ultimate aim. This explains his leap (I hope it will be temporary, I hope he will come back to the position of the Comintern from the ultra-lefts to the right.

An Example of the Failure to Understand the Task of Bolshevism.

But we have among us more dangerous right winners who are already proposing to us to take a sharp turn and adopt "new" tactics. I will take the liberty of quoting an example taken from the experience of the Czechoslovak Party, which shows how Bolshevism should not be understood.

A comrade from Brunn, quite properly, sent us the printed theses on the differences within the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia. There is much in these theses that are of no interest, much that is petty, much concerning personal conflicts, etc.; of this I will speak in another place. Therefore, irrespective of the outcome of the struggle within the Czechoslovak Party, I would like to reveal to you what kind

of communists we still have among us. The comrade from Brunn, in the introduction to his memorandum, refers to the important part played by Brunn, even in the Second International. I would not in the least question the revolutionary past (or present) of the Brunn workers, but I will say this, that the Brunn comrades ought to send some of their leaders to a school of Leninism and only after that to discuss whether they are suitable as leaders or not. In these theses, there is a chapter entitled, "The Revolutionary Course", in which demonstrations against the high cost of living is confused with nothing more nor less than — revolution.

This is what it says:

"The so-called Left demanded from us in Brunn to bring things to a conflict even in those places where we can place against large forces of the police only a couple of hundreds or so of workers, without taking into consideration what these sanguinary sacrifices may entail for us".

Further on it says:

"Some of the so-called Left comrades are of the opinion that we should continuously "make revolution". We, however, are of the opinion that the task of the Communist Party is not to call out a revolutionary movement by some means or other, but to take advantage of an existing revolutionary movement, and to lead it to the end. The theses of the Third Congress of the Comintern are very far from being carried out in Czechoslovakia, and it would be very important for the present Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, even at this late hour to study the theses on tactics passed by the Third Congress. To send agitators among the workers instructed to rouse fresh revolutions every day, belongs as much to the sphere of illusionist tactics to which we have referred above, as to the infantile view, that the stage of revolutionary development in a given epoch may be judged by the number of windows broken in a demonstration. The raiding of shops during a demonstration against the high cost of living by the order of the Central Committee, is something quite different to the raiding of shops by a hungry mass, in spite of the orders of their leaders. In the first case, we have an example of an excess of romanticism,

in the second, we have a true symptom of a revolutionary epoch".

Excellent! I must say. I never knew that breaking windows is an "excess of romanticism".

Here we must say quite frankly comrades, that behind every one of these phrases, can be seen the asses' ears of social democracy. Just think! The poor Brunners are called upon to make "revolutions" every day, and in such a frightful form too! To organise demonstrations against high cost of living and break windows! Indeed, the Brünn workers cannot be congratulated on the wisdom of their leaders. In the foreword to these epistles, we find complaints about the Brünn comrades being compelled to send delegations to Moscow composed exclusively of working-men with the secret intention, it is alleged, "of deliberately keeping out" the theoreticians. The fear is also expressed that the workingmen sent in the delegation would not be able to explain to the International all that was necessary sufficiently clearly and with sufficient theoretical backing. Hence, they honoured us with this memorandum containing these brilliant "theoretical" arguments. (Laughter).

I must confess that I certainly prefer to converse with Brünn workingmen, who, in the opinion of the authors of these theses, have not the training to enter into theoretical discussion with us, than to converse with the "theoretician" authors of these epistles. It would be a sheer waste of effort to enter into a discussion with the authors of this document.

Observe, that the authors of this document do not yet know that we have asserted here the absence at the present time of a direct revolutionary situation in Germany. If they had got wind of this, they would not have contented themselves with merely talking romanticism, but no doubt would begin to talk about the necessity to go over to the Social Democrats. (Laughter).

Precisely at this Time of Retarded Revolutionary Development is it Necessary to Imbue Our Parties with a Spirit of Leninism.

Comrades, we must foresee such "turns" and commence right now to put up a resistance against those comrades who advocate them. It is true, in Western Europe at the present time there is not a direct revolutionary situation. But is this any reason why we must abandon Bolshevism, make concessions to the Social Democrats and place a mark of equality between demonstrations of high cost of living and revolutions. On the contrary. **Precisely because** we have to pass through hard times: when some drop out of the fight, when some are already overcome by weariness, when the Social Democratic Party is beginning to raise its head — it is precisely for this reason that we must imperatively conduct a deliberate, determined, definite policy of our own, that we must imperatively be irreconcilable Bolsheviks. Let this sink deeply into the minds of the Brünn comrades.

Comrades, the path that we have just outlined for our parties, does not in the least imply the slowing down of the rate of Bolshevisation; on the contrary, it implies the acceleration of the process of Bolshevising our brother Parties. A genuine revolutionary, a genuine Bolshevik, reveals his character in difficult situations, when there is no limelight. This is what Comrade Lenin constantly emphasised. As soon as the revolutionary wave rises again, and particularly if it is victorious, crowds of new revolutionaries will rush to us. In 1920, when the situation in Germany appeared to be revolutionary, we had Messrs. Crispin and Dittman here. When the revolution is victorious, numerous people come into our ranks: even bourgeois elements — bourgeois officers join the Red Army etc. This is what happens when the working class is victorious. For us it is important that the Parties become Bolshevistic, now, at the present time: in this relatively dull period, they must become imbued with the spirit of Leninism.

The Problem of Party Leadership.

I want briefly to deal with the problem of Party leadership. Certainly to bring up at a meeting of Party leaders the problem of selecting leaders, is sometimes a very delicate matter. But we are not concerned with the subjective aspect of the subject, not in the appreciation of individuals, but with the objective approach to the problem which also represents a complete chapter of Bolshevisation. In the product of Brünn inventiveness, there is the following passage:

"To achieve victory, it is perhaps necessary that not only should the general be imbued with the will to fight, but principally that the masses be so imbued".

A great discovery! Profound theoretical wisdom! It is indeed a pity that we have not the pleasure of seeing these Brünn "theoreticians" among us here; but we do not lose much by their absence.

But joking apart, after the Fifth Congress, two rather curious articles were written which unfortunately have not been published to this day. One of these was written by Thalheimer and the other by Kreibich. In essentials, the authors of both these articles take up the same position. Both represent a repudiation of the policy of the Fifth Congress. One of the authors, as always, declares his absolute solidarity with the resolutions of the Fifth Congress, but in doing so, loses sight of a mere bagatelle, viz., that his article is directed against the resolutions of the Fifth Congress. I will not deal with the article as a whole, but only with those parts of it which deal with the problem of leadership.

The authors of both these articles charge the Fifth Congress with having devised a new theory and practice of selecting leaders, who are like "blank sheets". In their opinion numerous old leaders have been removed from the leadership of Party organisations and replaced by novices, who represent "blank sheets". These novices, say our authors, simply listen to what they are told from Moscow, do everything they are ordered, are ready to put their names to anything that is dictated to them. You, of course, understand comrades, what this means. The attack is a very malicious one. This controversy is not over a question of principle, but it poisons the political atmosphere.

We must take up this question concretely. The question arises; is it possible that leaders must never be changed, that the leadership must never be refreshed by continually infusing fresh forces obtained from other strata into it? Our reply is — no! Are those right who say that we do not appreciate old leaders who have great political experience? Not in the least. They cannot be regarded as right. Under no circumstances! Almost all our Parties emerged from the womb from the Second International. That was the case with the Russian Party, which up to 1918 called itself the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. We too, were at one time affiliated to the Second International. We know that a social-democrat cannot be converted into a Bolshevik in one night. Every leader passes through a process of more or less prolonged development. We all know that the comrades who come to us from the social-democracy have their weak sides; their strong side frequently is their accumulated political experience. It has never entered the heads of any of us to say that we must get rid of the old leaders. On the contrary, every objective observer must admit that we exhibit considerable tolerance towards them. For example in the French Party, we did all we could in order to keep them among us, and we were always glad when we succeeded in doing so. This applies to other countries also.

Does it follow from this that we, older workers, — and I include myself in this category, — must keep everything in our hands, and tell the youth to wait? Of course not. Nor must we flatter the young leaders. We openly say that politically, they have many defects, that they must study hard and perfect themselves. We always say to them: Become Bolsheviks yourselves, see to your own training; and the young leaders understand us. What we require is a sort of amalgam of the best representatives of the older generation with the most gifted representatives of the younger

generation which has sprung up in the post-war epoch. We are in urgent need of such a combination, but a "sheet" of rusty iron cannot be used for this amalgam. Everybody will agree with this. Comrade Lenin used to say jestingly: "When a man reaches the age of 50, he inevitably becomes an opportunist", and from this he drew the conclusion that a leader who has passed the age of 50 should be placed in the archives, more or less. We sometimes agreed with him, but demanded that he make an exception, — with regard to himself. It may turn out however, that numerous other exceptions will have to be made. Let us hope so, at any rate. Those who have become so ossified that they remain impervious to the new currents of the new epoch, should go away. But the problem of the Party leadership can only be solved by the organic combination of the representatives of two generations for the purposes of leading the Party.

The "blank sheet theory" absolutely distorts the position. The inventor of this theory argues that the selection of new Central Committees is determined by the mood or the arbitrary will of the members of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. Of course it is not so. The reasons for changing leaders are much more profound. They reach back to the moment of the birth of the Communist International. The fact that the Third International emerged from the womb of the Second International had its consequences. This is evident in the struggle which many comrades have to conduct against the social-democratic survivals of their own past. Let those who preach to us the necessity of sparing the old leaders, keep their sermons for their own instruction. To charge us with intolerance towards the old leaders is entirely baseless. If we deserve any reproach at all, it is not for frivolously sweeping away comrades of the old mould. Similarly unfair and totally undeserved is the charge that we have transferred the leadership to those who are ready to sign their names to everything that is put before them.

Consequently, we have nothing to fear at all from presenting the question of the leading cadres of the movement to the masses of the workers. Comrade Lenin never feared to raise this question openly. At the same time, he taught us that without cadres of leaders deliberately aiming at a definite goal, full of determination and discipline, there can be no revolutionary proletarian party. For decades, right to 1917, in all the branches of the Second International, Lenin was charged with having dictatorial propensities. This

was one of the favourite charges brought against Lenin by the bourgeoisie and a considerable section of the Second International. All of them howled at him: You are a dictator. You wish to have obedient subjects; you wish to place your will above the will of the organisation. That was at a time when Lenin was not yet recognised as the leader of the international proletariat. The social-democrats joined in these howls. We however, know, that without centralised disciplined leadership, the revolutionary workers' party could not have been formed.

In our days of retarded revolutionary development, this postulate is more applicable than ever before, and therefore comrades, we do not hesitate for a moment to raise this question. The ECCI has never approached the question in this manner: you have sinned, consequently your sin will be visited upon you and your children to the seventh generation. We say: if you are an opportunist, we will fight you until you admit your error. Frequently, it is made to appear that we wish to humble a comrade, and demand that he beg forgiveness, to cry: "mea culpa". We have never demanded anything of the kind. In his article, Kreibich asks: what sort of a habit is this to demand the self-humiliation of a man who has committed an error? This implied rebuke is sheer nonsense. In the world Party of the proletarian revolution there can be no talk of self-humiliation. Nobody has ever presented the question in this manner.

In our theses on Bolshevising the Parties, we have a passage which emphasises the necessity for internal party democracy. We need this internal party democracy, not for opportunists, not for those who demand "freedom of criticism" in the interests of the bourgeoisie. We will fight such people as avowed enemies. We demand freedom of criticism for those comrades who tread the same path with us in the quest for revolutionary truth.

An article which I wrote on the youth, in Czechoslovakia, if I am not mistaken, was regarded by some as a new theory. We are charged with desiring to obtain leaders only and exclusively from the Young Communist International. We give the Young Communist League all the credit it deserves. It has rendered great service, and in some places has helped to Bolshevise our Parties. Under normal conditions, the Party trains the youth, and not vice-versa. The Party should help the youth to become Bolshevistic. Let those who think that the ECCI desires to "select" the leaders for the Party from the Young Communist International, calm their fears

VIII. Marxism and Leninism.

The Bolshevisation of the Parties must Proceed on the Basis of Leninism.

Comrades! The whole question of Bolshevisation must be treated on the basis of Leninism. What Leninism is and with what fresh conclusions it has enriched the theory of Marxism generally we have set forth in detail in our theses.

I am obliged to admit that not all our comrades correctly understand the relation between Marxism and Leninism. I hold in my hands a statement by a French comrade who, partly in jest, calls himself the only French Marxist. I am referring to Charles Rappaport. It concerns a passage in the speech which he delivered at the last Congress of the French Party. This is how the "Humanité" of January 19 reports this passage:

"Many comrades fail to understand the real meaning of bolshevisation", Rappaport declared. "He expressed regret" the paper went on to say, "that a tendency was to be observed to substitute Marxism by Leninism.

Rappaport complains "that there is a tendency to substitute Marxism by Leninism! In other words "the only French Marxist" believes that we want to replace Marxism by Leninism. We recently heard the same statement from the mouth of Friedrich Adler. Adler says that a tendency is growing up in the Communist International to refer more and more rarely to Marxism and to speak more and more frequently of Leninism. Friedrich Adler regards this as evi-

dence of our renunciation of Marxism. When Adler tells such fables we are very little affected. But it is very sad when they are told by our own comrades. I must, however, frankly state that even in Russia there are certain Marxists who express similar ideas to that of "the only French Marxist", Charles Rappaport.

I think the matter is clear to the Enlarged Executive. The Plenum understands why we lay emphasis on the importance of Lenin. Lenin is unthinkable without Marx. Lenin was Marx's pupil. Leninism is the true undistorted Marxism of our epoch. When the Second International had mutilated Marxism until it was unrecognisable and began to drag his banner in the mire, true Marxism remained living only in Leninism, and that is why the bolshevisation of the parties must be carried out on the basis of Leninism. That is the idea we have given expression to in our theses. We shall carry it further both in theory and in practice. We are far from wishing to renounce the glorious traditions of the First International and the many, truly valuable, traditions even of the Second International. It is unthinkable, for instance, that a French Communist should not know Guesdes and Lafargue, that a Russian Bolshevik should know Plekhanov only as an opportunist, and not know that Plekhanov was once the teacher of Lenin; or that a German communist should forget the valuable contributions made by Social Democracy in the earlier revolutionary period of its activities. We will not surrender to the present social democrats the Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Bebel of the time of the "exceptional law

against the Socialists". That which is truly Marxism in the revolutionary traditions of the old Polish democrats must also be carefully preserved as a valuable historical heritage. The same should be said of the "Spartacus Bund". But it would be a profound error to regard all the Spartacists as finished leaders, whom it is inconvenient for instance to ask how they regard the "Saxon" policy or the event of October 1923. That cannot be allowed, Comrades. We cannot allow every Spartacist a carte blanche on the plea of an old name. But, on the other hand, it becomes nobody to boast that "we, thank God, are no Spartacists". We know how to value the good such what the Left Independents gave us. The Left Independents brought masses into our Party (vice from the body of the hall: "Quite true!") But on the other hand they had such serious weaknesses that they were only able to overcome their defects after a series of crises. We must learn how to unite under the banner of revolutionary Marxism all the valuable things that were given us in their time both by the "Spartacus Bund" and the Left Independents. Every young worker perfectly understands that the Communist movement rose up on the backs of several preceding generations, generations who had both their weak and their strong sides. The Communist International did not appear in the world all of a sudden. It stands upon the foundation constructed by the revolutionaries of former generations. The great pupil of Marx, Lenin, carefully studied the theory and practice of the former generations of revolutionaries and trained the young generation in a spirit of reverence towards the historical exploits which prepared the soil for the Communist International. Lenin always pointed out the lessons which we owe to the successes and the failure of those who fought before us. Communism began not in 1919, not at the moment of the foundation of the Communist International, but much earlier; it has a glorious and spacious past. We must acquaint ourselves with that past, we must study it: that in often neglected by us. In this respect the slowing up of the pace of revolutionary development has its good sides, since we are taking advantage of the breathing space which history is allowing the bourgeoisie. The breathing space will be to the advantage of the working class if it is used for extending our knowledge, even though our universities may for the time being be prisons. Systematic study with the help of lectures, party schools, study circles, etc., are assuming tremendous importance. We are taking advantage of the breathing space not only to perfect the structure of our organisations, but also to study, to perfect ourselves, and to make ourselves true communists such as Comrade Lenin imagined them. That is one of the aims of bolshevisation.

Forward! In Spite of all Difficulties and Obstacles.

Comrades, we were obliged to record a number of not very pleasant facts and were obliged to admit many defeats and faults. We must look the truth in the face. We just admit that the question of the period of the revolution is liable to re-examination. We formerly used to count the time in months; now we are obliged to count in years.

We must definitely say that in certain countries an immediate revolutionary situation is still not existent. We must realise that we are entering upon a phase of protracted and stubborn work in the way of bolshevising our parties. Leninism does not fall from heaven.

We are faced with a serious fight against Right dangers. The slogan of bolshevisation, in fact was advanced in the fight against Right tendencies. And in future too it will mainly be a fight against Right -- and of course against Ultra-Left -- tendencies and against the backsliding, which is making itself felt in many places. It is enough to cite the instance of Brunn. It is possible that similar manifestations are revealing themselves in other countries. That, in view of the slackening down of the pace of revolutionary developments, is now to be expected. In many of our parties the majority consists of the mass which came over to us from the social democratic organisations. That factor and its consequence is making itself particularly felt in Czechoslovakia, where 73% of the party members are former social democrats. The proportion, I think, is the same in the German Party, and in many other parties. Of course we should be proud of the fact that we are breaking up the social democratic parties and we are attracting the workers away from them. We shall continue to sever the workers from the social democrats. But it is not enough to win them over to our side. Those workers must be re-educated, we must make them revolutionaries, true Leninists, Bolsheviks.

The pace of the revolution has slackened. But we must not use it as a justification or explanation of our own faults and defects and of our ideological inertia, or to justify the fact that the social democratic traditions have not yet been extirpated. The workers who have come over from the social democrats to the Communist Party are excellent proletarians. Even in Brunn in all probability, the workers are in 99 cases out of 100 earnestly devoted to communism and to the Communist International. But they are being perverted by men who have in fact remained social democrats and who are confusing window smashing with revolution. We must say that if we are obliged "to break a window pane or two" of these opportunists, we shall do it with pleasure.

In conclusion, comrades, let me say the following: **Our Policy on the whole remains the same, and we ourselves shall remain true to our cause.** To adapt ourselves to a new situation, while remaining true to Marxism, is not opportunism. It is the revolutionary duty of a Communist. The path to victory is a long one. The path to the world revolution is a far one to go. We once thought that in five years or so our aim would be achieved. We set out on our journey, but soon realised that the path was far more stony and thorny than we at first thought. We had to remove the stones and pull out the thorns; we had to overcome obstacle after obstacle and at times to retreat and prepare for a fresh sally. We became convinced that there are still great obstacles to overcome. Well, we shall overcome them. But the direction remains the same: our will remains as unshakable as our aim is great. We shall succeed in removing the stones and the thorns from our path. We shall clear the road and we shall achieve the aim which lends profundity and magnificent purpose to our fight. **We shall achieve communism! (Stormy Applause.)**

Pages 457 & 458
of 1925 Inprecor
Vol. 5 No. 34 April 17

are
BLANK

M.H.D. Sept. 2021

Pages 457 & 458
of 1925 Inprecor
Vol. 5 No. 34 April 17

are
BLANK

M.H.D. Sept. 2021