

Special-Number

Session of Enlarged Executive of C.I.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL **PRESS** **CORRESPONDENCE**

Vol. 3 No. 49

12th July 1923

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstraße 225, III. — Postal address Wilhelm-Bartz, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III
for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

The Enlarged Executive **Sixth Day of Session** **Evening**

HOOVER WAR
COLLECTION

June 18, 1923.

Amer (U.S.A.):

The Evening Session was opened at 7.30 p.m. by Comrade Gallagher. The discussion was continued.

Ewert (Germany):

Comrade Ström said that in national questions the Parties must have the right of self-determination, but in the present period of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, there are no purely national and local questions. An erroneous policy in any one country has an influence far beyond the frontiers of that country, and is used in every country to our detriment by our opponents. In his interview, Comrade Tranmael also touched upon the question of the relations between the Party and the Trade Unions. The opinion expressed in this interview, that the Norwegian Party's influence on the trade unions is hampered by its lack of independence, viz. owing to its fulfilment of the decisions on centralism, is contrary to facts. The Communist Party must see to it that the trade unions work for the class interests of the proletariat. We too are familiar with the argument of the "special conditions", which make it impossible for the Norwegian Party to carry out the decisions, for it was urged during the struggle with the wavering elements in the German Party. The fact that the class antagonisms are not yet as acute in Norway as in Central Europe, is only one more incentive to carry on a relentless struggle against any opportunist deviations. The Swedish comrades should make it their task to help the Norwegian Party to carry out the principles of the Communist International. Conditions on the Continent are becoming increasingly difficult, necessitating closer contact with the other brother parties. Therefore, it behoves the Scandinavian brother parties to establish closer relations with us in Germany and with the other parties. In conclusion, I wish to point out the experience of the German Party in connection with the Executive's interference with the so-called internal affairs of the Party. Only quite recently, the Executive pronounced a decision concerning the German Party conflict, which was accepted and carried out by both sides. We can already say that the decision of the Executive was correct. It has contributed to the consolidation of the Party. We are of the opinion that the International must continue on the way to stronger centralisation, and we appeal to the delegates of the Scandinavian parties to do their share in the establishment of a real General Staff of the proletariat. (Applause).

He felt as Bucharin said that the Scandinavian Comrades and Parties seem to think that they are in the era before the war and that they have not been touched by imperialism. We have to ask the Norwegian comrades and the Swedish comrades who support them: What kind of party do they want themselves? We know that the other parties are well organized centralized parties that obey the instructions of the Comintern.

The strange thing is that it is the leaders of the party who come here and say that they do not want a centralised party. It is also strange that the Swedish Party, which is a centralised party based upon individual membership, should support a party that is built upon quite different lines.

As to the imperative mandate, that had been got rid of in America even within the national organisation. Members are sent to the party congress to represent certain tendencies and sentiments of the group they represent, and they go bound to express that viewpoint. The same must be the case with the International Congress; but the representative should be open to be convinced by the greater experience and knowledge of the International. If he is a real leader he can on his return convince his membership of the necessity for his change of view. If not, he is no leader and the membership will be able to deaf with him.

The complaint has been made that the members of the Executive Committee are now elected at the Congress. The Comintern is a unit and should be able to fight as a unit. As Comrade Radek said, the Russians were forced to take the leadership because the comrades in the other parties came to the International merely as liaison agents and refused to assume the responsibilities of leadership.

It has also been complained by the Norwegian comrades that the Communist International interferes in the internal affairs of the Party. It was owing to the interference of the International with a strong hand, after two years of persuasion, that the two American Parties were forced to coalesce, and an end was put to the state of disruption that existed in the American movement. It was also the firm demand of the International which, although the initial steps were taken by the American Party, finally forced it to come out into the open, with the result that in 1923 we have a consolidated Party which is a unit.

Falk seemed to think that the mass party of Norway cannot be transformed into a Communist Party. Why not? No reason was given. It was done in other countries. Why can't it be done in Norway?

A remarkable thing is that Falk did not even demand a fixed period in which to transform the Norwegian Party. We stand for the unity of the movement as we did in 1919. We want a centralised party so that it will be a fighting party.

Every other country has its peculiarities, just as Norway has, and it must adapt itself, as every other party does, to become a part of the unity of the Communist International.

Schüller (Young Communist International):

It seems to me that we have made some progress with the discussion, for the Norwegian comrades have recognised international centralism as a principle. Of course, there is still talk about the possibility of going too far. Of all the parties, the Swedish Party is the least entitled to talk in this fashion. The Communist International has always kept strictly within the bounds of necessity and has always acted with the greatest tactfulness. Our Scandinavian comrades now say: Yes, we are for international centralism, provided the Parties are allowed to regulate all national questions. At this rate we shall soon catch up with the organisational principle of the Second International. There must be no differentiation between national and international questions, as far as we are concerned. All the questions of the various Sections concern also the International. It is almost as if one said, that a Central Committee of a Party need not concern itself with the happenings in the various local groups. Whenever the International intervened in one or other of the Sections, it was always in the sense that it issued the watchword "To the masses". It does so even to-day, as far as the Norwegian Comrades are concerned, by bringing forward the slogan of the Workers' and Peasants' Government. Our Norwegian comrades had much to say on the relations between the Communist Parties and the Young Communist Leagues. It is extremely painful, that comrades who here advocate self-determination, decentralisation, etc., wish in their own country to suppress any kind of political activity of the Youth Leagues. The Fourth Congress expressed itself in the sense that the Young Communist Leagues shall be politically and centrally subordinate to the Parties, viz. that it is not only their right, but their duty to take part in the life of the Party, not only individually, but as Organisations. The Norwegian comrades have asked us if the Comintern wishes the Communist Youth to be in opposition to the Parties. The Norwegian Young Communist League has hitherto never been in actual opposition to the Party. It has merely expressed different opinions on some questions. The Youth will continue to demand the right to freedom of opinion. I wish to protest very energetically against one particular statement made by the Swedish comrades. It was said that the Communist International was inciting the Communist Youth in the Scandinavian countries to act like insurgent bands against the Parties. This military term reminds me very much of Longuet, who spoke of Zinoviev's pistol. To-day, Longuet is one of the most bitter opponents of the Communist International. All I can say is: as long as there is a Communist International and Young Communist Leagues, the latter will be the vanguard of Communism not only in Scandinavia but in all countries. I hope that it will be possible to arrive at an agreement with our Scandinavian comrades. The first premise for this is, the recognition that the Communist International must be a World Party.

Lévi (France):

We often heard people who are no longer in our Party, raise the same objections as the Norwegian comrades raised on this platform. As soon as the decisions of the Fourth Congress became known, the comrades, who since then adopted the name of resisters, left the Party and established a new party in opposition to the International. They adopted an attitude similar to that of some of the Scandinavian delegates. We do not wish to prejudice the attitude which will be taken up by our Norwegian comrades, but it would be painful for the International if the difficulties and the experiences of one of its Sections did not serve as a lesson to another Section.

The speaker further dealt with the chief arguments of the resisters which are analogous to those of the Norwegians—Russian domination of the International. The bourgeois and the democratic press were the first to raise this question. We all know that the Executive frequently asked the Parties to send it their most trusted and most capable members. One must admit that those who made the revolution are entitled to exercise influence in the International. The International is a tool in the hands of the Russian Revolution: Trotsky has already disposed of this poor argument. The Russian Revolution and the International are one, the defeat of the former would be the undoing of the latter, and

vice versa. It has also been said that the International wanted to impose excessive discipline. But our discipline is voluntary and active, it consists in action after a fraternal discussion. National traditions were conjured up, just as during the French crisis. References were made to the delegates' imperative mandate, as if International Congresses would be of any use if delegates arrived with cast iron resolutions. It is only natural that delegates be given general directions by their parties, but they should not be deprived of the advantage of international experience. Like the Norwegians, our resisters alleged that they wanted to rehabilitate the revolutionary policy of the Party which, according to them, was compromised by the decisions of the Fourth Congress. He had no desire to call into question the courage in action shown by our Norwegian comrades in their country. There is one thing, however, which we find rather strange: their paper is still called the **Social-Democrat**.

The Norwegians are repeating to-day the arguments of yesterday of the French adversaries of the International. Our resisters of yesterday quote today the Norwegians. Thus their action goes against the International, even if they had a mind to keep it strictly within the limits of their country. In the present period one can no longer discriminate between national and international.

Our experience must serve as a lesson to the Norwegian comrades. Let them study it. There is still time for them to change their mind and to accept without reserve the directions of the International. This would be in their interest as well as in the interest of the International.

Schello (Norway):

On behalf of the minority of the Norwegian Delegation, I declare that we do not see the danger of a split, mentioned by Comrade Ström. We hope that our faction will be victorious at the next Conference of our Party. Even if it is not, we will not desert the Party. I believe that Comrade Tranmael will make a similar declaration.

Kuusinen (Finland):

In one of his articles Comrade Tranmael reproaches the Communist International with two defects inherited from the Second International—opportunism and centralism. We know the history of the Comintern to be one of relentless crusade against opportunism. We also know that the Second International collapsed because of decentralisation, of which fact comrade Tranmael is well aware. Comrade Tranmael apparently has a different conception of centralism than we have. And this is probably the consequence of his traditions of the fight against the old Trade Union bureaucracy. He is afraid of dualism and of the contrast between the membership and bureaucracy, and he is to a certain extent right when calling attention to the danger. This is provided for in the theses of the Third Congress, where it says: "Even the revolutionary labour movement inevitably inherits this tendency of formalism and bureaucratism from the bourgeois environment, up to a certain point. These contrasts must be combated by the Communist Party by persistent work of political organisation and education, and by many improvements and provisions". By democratic centralism we mean the association of centralism with proletarian democracy, the unification of the struggle. The relative limits of centralisation must be extended as far as required by revolutionary activity. The slogan of the World Party raised by the Fourth Congress, is not a new thing, it is as old as the Communist International itself. This World Party has not yet come, it is our goal, and we may discuss the way to ensure its quickest achievement, but not question the slogan itself. It is a difficult thing to create a World Party. We only have the beginning of it. The history of the formation of this Party has been chiefly the history of intervention in so-called internal affairs of affiliated parties. These interventions have rarely satisfied all concerned, but after the first unavoidable conflicts, there remained something very solid, which enabled all these parties to learn something about the importance of coordination. This gives rise to truly united fighting and to a deep-rooted confidence of the parties in the Executive, which means much more than the mere adherence to the Comintern. It is true that the leadership is still to a great extent, in the hands of Russian comrades, but this is due not only to their Russian, but also to their International experiences.

Let us take the latest intervention in the internal affairs of the American Party. After a few months the two factions, which were hitherto at loggerheads, informed us that at last

they had created a united Party, thanks to the intervention of the Executive. The peculiar circumstances in Scandinavia do not absolve Scandinavian comrades of their duties; they only suggest the starting point, but by no means a different policy. According to reports from the representative of the Executive in Norway, only a small section of the membership is active there. It is therefore a question of arousing them all to greater activity. Comrade Tranmael asks for guarantees against opportunism. The best guarantee is, on the one hand, the actions of the bourgeoisie; and, on the other hand, the Communist preparations for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The situation is more difficult in Sweden, where a small Communist Party is opposed by a great Social-Democratic Party, but I must say that the Communist Party has a large following, particularly in the Trade Unions. Also in that country it is most important to increase the activity of the members. We must particularly criticise the attitude of the leaders of the Swedish Party towards the Youth League. Comrade Hoeglund should remain true to his traditions as the champion of the Communist Youth Movement by creating at the present moment better relations between the Youth and the Party. The criticisms of Comrades Tranmael and Hoeglund put them at the parting of the ways. I conclude with the wish that at this Congress Tranmael and Scheffo will shake hands and resolve to build together our Communist Party in order to lead the working class to victory.

Hoeglund (Sweden):

We did not attempt to force our will upon the Executive, we only gave the facts in justification of our attitude. We are, and we have always been in favour of democratic centralism and bureaucratism. The Executive must deal best with the facts, and how to avoid the danger of super-centralism and bureaucratism. The Executive must deal with the Scandinavian question more carefully than hitherto. I must also protest against the accusation thrown against us by Comrade Bucharin on the basis of an article by a pacifist. With regard to the Swedish-Norwegian complications in 1905, we did raise the slogan of the general strike and the armed insurrection. The same happened in 1916, which can be borne out by Comrade Bucharin who lived in Sweden at the time. We do not represent the standpoint of peaceful evolution, neither does Tranmael in Norway, but we are living in another phase of development, and it would be ludicrous today in Sweden to raise the slogan of arming the proletariat. Increased centralism would make such demands upon the Executive, as it cannot fulfil, and we would reject such increase of centralism.

Koritschoner (Austria):

We have watched the development in the Scandinavian countries with increasing misgivings, for we have evolved out of the left wing of Zimmerwald, whose founders included also the Swedish Youth League. The manner in which Comrade Falk, representative of the Norwegian Party, has spoken here appeared to me to be a direct provocation. The Communist International is a united body which cannot be severed, and to which all of us must cling with determination. Some comrades may seem to find inexpedient some of the things done by the Executive upon one or another occasion. For this reason we must try, so to shape our centralism, that it may become an active weapon of the International. A federative organisation of our International would deprive us of fighting ability as against the concentration of forces, now started by the opportunist opposition. It is necessary to remind the Scandinavian comrades of their duty towards the workers of Central and Western Europe. Every step undertaken by them against the Communist International, every undermining of the edifice of centralism, is a hindrance to us in our hard struggle, in the fight against world capitalism and international reformism. We express the hope that the masses of the Scandinavian workers and their leaders will recognise that they are part of the International Movement, and will fulfil their duties.

Comrade Radek:

The question of democratic centralism is of far greater importance to the Communist International now than it was during the period of the proletarian offensive. We are now in the stage of transition, and it is therefore much more difficult to create a central international leadership and to apply the principle of rigid centralisation through the whole of our organisations. In all questions where the Executive deemed it

necessary to intervene in the so-called internal Party affairs, it was never a case of insignificant local matters, but always of questions which were of international importance. During my stay in Norway, I arrived at the firm conviction, that the Party there was making good progress. Whether the faction which supports unreservedly the decisions of the International is strong or weak, I feel sure at all events that on the day when we start a campaign under the slogan: "With the International or against it", the fate of our opponents will be sealed. They will be unquestionably defeated. My only anxiety is that in such a campaign we might lose comrades whom we do not care to lose. For instance, Comrade Tranmael is not merely an individual, but a whole chapter in the Norwegian Labor Movement, and this is also the reason of our great forbearance and patience. Nevertheless, not only are we convinced of our ability to arrive at a *modus vivendi* with our Norwegian comrades, but also that they will become convinced that our tactics are right. Furthermore, we will have nothing against the "Mot Dag" group if they will do revolutionary communist work among the intellectuals instead of scaring the Party with the bogey of reformism. With regard to the attitude of the Swedish Party leadership towards the Communist Youth, and also the relations between the Youth and the Party in Norway, the opposition attitude of the Communist Youth is a symptom which merits reflection. In the Communist Youth we have ardent and convinced adherents of Communism, and when they are in opposition to the Party leadership, it is a sign of the weakness and faultiness of its policy. To conclude: there can be no bargaining about the general principles of the Communist International, because bargaining is entirely out of place here. In every individual case there may be ground for concrete agreement as to the application of our principles. There can be no higgling about terms with the Executive, but we must understand with perfect clearness the general requirements of our revolutionary movement and do our utmost to act accordingly.

Urbani (Italy):

Attempts were made to rally the Italian Communists against centralism. These attempts were of course in vain, for the Italian Party and its leader, Bordiga, insisted on the strict and immediate application of the decisions on centralism. The Italian Youth are also opposed to the Scandinavian standpoint. Italy is decidedly for and not against centralisation.

Stewart (England):

The Norwegian comrades had made the declaration that they did not expect to be able to change the attitude of the International on the question of centralisation. That was well; for whatever their expectations had been it was clear that the International had not the faintest intention of abandoning one inch of democratic centralisation.

In the commission, when he (Stewart) asked Comrade Falk just what amount of centralisation the Norwegian Party could stand, his answer was, practically no centralisation.

Every Party which had been opposed to so-called Executive interference in the long run admitted that the interference was beneficial. He spoke on behalf of a Party which expected to get some interference, and some drastic interference.

Did the Norwegian Comrades expect that their bourgeoisie was going to give them a nice little Scandinavian revolution which would conform with the peculiarities of their national situation.

Democratic centralisation was adopted to make good the failure of previous Internationals, and the proof of its beneficial influence was the growth of the power of the Third International as opposed to the declining influence of the other Internationals.

Ström (Sweden):

I have to correct a few of the remarks made during the discussion. We do not all imagine that the class struggle in Scandinavia will be exactly idyllic, and Comrade Bucharin knows this from experience, for has he not spent some time in a Swedish prison? We believe in centralism, but in questions of a purely local nature, we must be allowed freedom of action. It is also incorrect to say that we think there are too many Russians at the head of the Communist International. I say that the contrary is the case: thank God that the Russian comrades have so much influence in the International. In answer to comrade Schüller, I should like to say that we are not at all opposed to freedom of discussion in our Youth Leagues. What we cannot tolerate is—that a Youth

League should develop into a fraction opposed to the Party. Comrade Radek thinks that it is an alarming sign that the Youth League is in opposition to the Party. I should like to know if there is a single Party which has never experienced any opposition from its Youth. But there are many tendencies of which one must beware.

Falk (Norway):

Comrade Stewart had repeated a charge which had often been made, namely that the Norwegian Party did not want any form of centralisation but was out for perfect freedom for the Party, for each local, and for every member. That was not true. They wanted strong centralisation both for the Party and for the members. There was no difference of opinion about that: the question was how to obtain it.

In Sweden and Denmark the parties were small. In Norway the Communist Party contained the mass of the workers. The question was how to maintain the Party as a mass Party. Conditions in Norway were no different from Sweden and Denmark, but they ran the risk of obtaining the same results as in Sweden and Denmark, if they followed the lines of the Parties in those countries.

The Norwegian Party made reservations before entering the Third International in order to retain in the Party the mass of the workers. The mass Party may be destroyed if care is not taken.

Such declarations as that made by Scheffo neither keep a Party together nor split it. It is the day to day acts of the Party that do this. In reply to the declaration of Scheffo, the majority of the Norwegian delegates desire to state that the unanimous resolution adopted at the Norwegian Party Congress on the relations between the International and the Party presupposed that the strife between the two was at an end. The majority had loyally observed the resolution, but the strife has been taken up again at the Congress, and it is impossible to foresee the consequences. The situation, has, at any rate, become far graver than it previously was.

They wished to draw the attention of the Enlarged Executive to the fact that if the Norwegian Party was to be maintained as a mass Party, the authority of the Executive must not be used as it has been used in the past year.

Flyg (Sweden):

Comrade Ström has asserted that the Swedish Party is strongly centralised and that the statutes are also binding for the Youth League, having been drawn up jointly with the Youth representatives. He said that we had already enough disputes in the Party, and that the latter will not allow the Youth League to become a Party within the Party. We fully agree with this. It is quite true that we have had many internal disputes, but what caused them? Only Hoeglund's and Ström's attitude, who always said that they were in favour of the decisions of the Executive, but could not for the moment put them into practice. I believe that this Session of the Enlarged Executive will help us to improve the conditions within the Party, which will allow us in Sweden and throughout Scandinavia to unite all our forces in working for the common cause. I wish to identify myself with Comrade Radek's statement that the Party can depend on the collaboration and support of the Communist Youth, provided it does not oppose the Communist International.

Concluding Speech of Comrade Bucharin:

Comrade Bucharin in closing the debate said: This item of the agenda was to be in the nature of a discussion with the Scandinavian comrades. That it was converted into an attack on the Scandinavian comrades, is not our fault. Comrade Falk said that he would not deal with the theoretical side of this question. This was only natural, for the comrade had no arguments to use against us. At first the Scandinavian comrades took up the offensive. When they noticed that almost the entire International was against them, they went over to the defensive. Comrade Hoeglund said: we have not done anything wrong, we merely asked that a little more attention should be paid to Scandinavian questions. On this point, we are with Comrade Hoeglund, but we must ask the Scandinavian comrades to pay a little more attention to the entire International. In the course of this discussion, the representatives of almost all the Parties testified to the fact that the Executive did always the right thing every time it intervened in national questions. Why were our Scandi-

navian comrades silent on this matter? Even if it could be said that we had made mistakes in connection with the Scandinavian questions, one should take everything into account and draw the balance. The discussion which has taken place here has shown that the Executive of the Communist International was a skilful leader of the movement of the world proletariat, and that is the main thing. Why should our leadership, which was acknowledged to have been good in all the countries, have been bad in Scandinavia? I hardly think that the fault lies with the Executive, but that we must look for it on the other side. Comrade Falk pointed out in his last speech that the Norwegian Party had made reservations at the time of entering the International. I think that these reservations are the cause of the present situation and of the isolation of the Norwegian Party. Comrade Hoeglund is much too fond of manoeuvring, but I cannot say that his manoeuvring is always skilful. Comrade Ström said that he acknowledges the centralist standpoint. Hoeglund, on the other hand, defended the standpoint of the Norwegian comrades, which is in direct opposition to the centralist standpoint. I am reproached with drawing caricatures. But every caricature is the embodiment of the original. I showed up certain opportunist tendencies. Did we hear arguments against it? The comrades talked about the "split" spectre, but who wants the split? We were reproached with wanting to undermine the authority of this or that comrade. The contrary is the case. By their attitude, the comrades are themselves undermining their authority. The comrades have accused me of quoting some paragraphs from an article by Hoeglund without explaining the specific situation at the time when this article was written. A French proverb says: "Tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner". However, this does not apply to us. Comrade Hoeglund also said that it is foolish to carry out the arming of the working class in Norway and Sweden. In arguing with Tranmael, I did not reproach him with not having brought forward this slogan. I merely argued against Tranmael's anti-militarist ideology. Hoeglund refuses to understand this. Ström said, that I must be fully aware that conditions in Sweden are not idyllic, having experienced what prisons in Sweden are. But I maintain, that in comparison with what is going on in Central Europe, in the Ruhr, in Yugo-Slavia, in Italy, in Hungary, and just now in Bulgaria, Scandinavian conditions are idyllic. Comrade Ström asserted that the Swedish Party is in favour of centralism, I daresay they are, but on the Norwegian model, with such strong reservations, that at a critical moment, we might find them supporting another tendency. Comrade Falk in his first speech argued with me that the question now is, whether the various peculiarities of the Norwegian Party should be overcome or should be preserved. In his second speech, however, he said that on this question he heard from us nothing but jeers. Which of the two things is right? The trouble lies in the Norwegian Party's having joined the International with reservations. This is exactly the bad point, which must be overcome. Comrade Falk asserted, that to-days discussion will re-open the fractional struggle in the Norwegian Party. Surely, no one in his senses can protest against the discussion of such questions here in the Executive, for are we not to explain to the Executive and to all other brother Parties the standpoint of the Norwegian and Swedish comrades? Much was said here about the blind obedience of the Russian comrades. I should advise our Scandinavian comrades to study our Party a little more carefully. I do not know whether our Norwegian comrades are acquainted with our factory nuclei. In some factories these nuclei consist of only five or six persons, but even these small units concern themselves with all political questions, and in no other Party is Party life so active as in ours. Discipline with us is not blind obedience, but unity in action.

We cannot say that we never make mistakes, and we do not object to being criticised. On the contrary, wherever we make mistakes, we are anxious to make them good with your assistance. We may say that it is our wish to bring about, as speedily as possible, a reconciliation between the Executive and the Norwegian Party. Therefore, we shall meet these comrades more than half way in the Commission. But we deem it our duty to criticise every serious symptom of deviation from the standpoint of the Communist International. It is our duty to do our utmost in the Commission, in order that we may, after this Session of the Enlarged Executive, close our ranks in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Seventh Day of Session

June 19, 1923.

The Session commenced at 11 a. m. with Com. Gallagher in the chair. Comrade Lozovsky was called upon to report on the Trade Union and Factory Councils Question.

Report of Comrade Lozovsky on the Trade Union Question

The decomposition of reformism has been going on for some time in the international trade union movement. It was aggravated by the constitution of the Communist International. The will of the workers to conduct class war gave rise to the slogan of the united front which was formulated by the Communist International and the Red International Trade Union and which gives concrete expression to the desires of the workers for unity of class action.

The organisers of the Peace Congress of The Hague did not suspect that this great demonstration would discredit them profoundly. But three weeks later the occupation of the Ruhr revealed the impotence and the duplicity of the reformist internationals. When the moment came for putting their resolutions into practice, they turned out to be absolutely impotent. Since then, the working masses have begun to understand the gravity of the international situation better. The Frankfurt Conference held in March already reflected certain definite changes of outlook. There one could observe Social-democratic and independent socialist fractions declaring their preference for a united front with the Communists to a united front with the bourgeoisie. A left tendency began to assert its influence within the Amsterdam International without the leaders perceiving it. The reformist leaders hoped to save the situation at Hamburg. The essential character of the Hamburg Congress is best expressed in the following sentence of the opening speech made by the German Social-Democrat, Wels: "The stronger we are against Communism, the stronger we shall be against reaction".

The Congress had not yet ended before the International Congress of Transport Workers clearly demonstrated the change of outlook that had been taking place amongst the reformists themselves.

If it is true that our tactic of the United Front has made access to the mass organisations possible, it follows that every Communist Party must apply and develop this tactic. The Congress of Transport Workers has already given a practical programme of action for the United Front. It decided to create an international committee of transport workers to fight against Fascism and war and to create commissions at the ports, at the frontier stations, and on the main railways, to control the movement of raw material. It also decided to summon an international congress of transport workers in which all the trade unions concerned should participate. We thus see that the creation of the United Front is the first step leading to the reconstruction of the Trade Union Movement.

When the reformist leaders enter into negotiations with us on the question of a United Front, they impose on us conditions which we cannot accept, notably the demand for the cessation of our polemical attacks—as if we make them for pleasure. In certain communist circles the idea is prevalent that the United Front is equivalent to an armistice with the reformists. Nothing could be more incorrect. It is only an armistice for the purpose of action and when the reformists really serve the cause of the proletariat.

The Transport Workers' Congress showed how an agreement between the revolutionaries and the left wing of Amsterdam was possible. The agreement was reached upon the following program:

1. The defence of Soviet Russia as the centre of the proletarian resistance to world reaction.
2. The fight against the danger of war by means of mass action.
3. The creation of an International Committee of Action consisting of equal representation from both sides, to conduct action and propaganda against war and Facism.
4. The permanent control of transport of raw material.
5. The summoning of a World Congress of Transport Workers for the purpose re-establishing national and international unity.
6. The joint defence of the Transport workers of all countries who have suffered from Fascism. A common fund for giving assistance in such cases.

7. A joint appeal from the International Federation of Transport Workers and the Russian Trade Unions to the railwaymen and seamen of all countries.

8. An incessant propaganda against Fascism as the weapon of the bourgeois class.

9. Utilisation of the parliamentary platform against Fascism.

10. Armed resistance to Fascism.

11. The supervision of the movements of Facisti.

12. Contact and collaboration with all workers' organisations interested in this matter.

13. Educational work amongst Transport Workers to counteract reactionary influences.

14. Recognition of the necessity for re-establishing Trade Union unity. An appeal to all international and national organisations inviting them to follow the example of the Transport Workers.

15. Recognition of the principle that joint action is impossible except on the basis of the class war.

This agreement was made possible because the leaders of the International Federation of Transport Workers had lost faith in their former tactics and themselves decided that there was no issue except in a bloc with the left wing.

Of course, the German reformist leaders are working to destroy the effect of these resolutions. The French delegate, Bidegaray, is doing the same, but is meeting with the resistance of his own followers. Rivellie of the Seamens' Union, in an article entitled "With Fimmen" expressed himself in favour of the Berlin resolutions. Even the Amsterdam International, in an extremely elastic resolution, stated that it was not bound by the Berlin agreements. This moderation is an indication of fear. It feels the blow but fears to attack its right wing. It would like to nullify the decisions of the Transport Workers' Conference, but dares not act openly. In order to achieve the United Front, we have displayed a great spirit of conciliation. The programme of the Transport Workers must now be made to serve for the whole international trade union movement.

We are faced with two forms of resistance: that of the reformist secessionists and that of the revolutionaries who wish to remain in the independent groups which necessity has caused to be created. In our opinion the fight for unity must be engaged in by everybody.

The factory councils are at one and the same time a product and a weapon of revolution. They grow with revolution and fade when the revolution slackens. In the period of intense mass activity which is about to commence, an energetic campaign must be carried on in the Factory Councils, or to create Factory Councils where they do not exist. Certain militants wish to replace the Trade Union by the Factory Council. We, on the contrary, think that the Factory Council will be the basis of the Trade Union. That has been the experience of the Russian Revolution.

The fundamental principle of the Trade Union Movement is organisation on the basis of class and not on the basis of the nation. We are resolutely opposed to all divisions of the trade unions on a national basis, more so than on a political basis. This gives rise to certain real difficulties.

Our Parties and Trade Unions have done too little for the Trade Unions Movement in the Colonies. While the British Trade Unions and the Labor Party are cleverly instituting themselves into India in order to govern, our British Communist Party is doing nothing of the kind. It is however certain that we shall not be victorious before having to appeal to the activity and the initiative of the British workers.

In Spain there are two parallel confederations, the one reformist and the other revolutionary. The former has excluded the revolutionary groups, and this faces us with an important practical problem. Should those excluded from the Union of Workers go into the National Confederation? Our Spanish comrades of the R.I.L.U. have decided that they should, while our comrades of the Spanish Communist Party have decided for the formation of new autonomous groups. It is necessary to fight for the re-inclusion of the excluded members, but if we are faced with two parallel organisations, the existence of isolated autonomous trade unions is just as rational. In Germany there are, in the free trade unions, powerful bodies of militant members of the R.I.L.U. and of the Communist Party. Here the maintenance of the excluded Trade Unions fighting for

their reinclusion is far more important than their organic fusion with the union of manual and intellectual workers.

In America the struggle between the Trade Union Educational League and the small independent Trade Unions is continuing. The merit of the League is that it has overcome the pernicious custom of parallel Trade Union organisations. The League is performing a great work. The best method would be to create committees of action, or commissions for co-ordinating the action of the different groups. In a word, the important thing is to concentrate the opposition movement everywhere, to put an end to division and to pass from the unity of the revolutionary movement to the unity of the Trade Union movement.

The speaker went on to point out how great was the mistake of those who wished to wind up the R.I.L.U. The successes achieved by the R.I.L.U. are incontestable. He criticised the attitude of the British Communist Party on the Trade Union question. It is paying too little attention to the question and is not assisting the work of the British Bureau of the R.I.L.U. In Norway, the question of affiliating with the R.I.L.U. has been discussed for three years without result. We believed for some time that our Norwegian comrades were in agreement on fundamentals and only postponed formal affiliation for factual reasons. But it appears that this is not the case. They have left Amsterdam, but do not desire to send a delegate, even in the capacity of consultant and reporter, to the forthcoming session of the General Council of the R.I.L.U.

In other words, the Norwegian Labor Party is advancing backwards. We have the greatest concern for unity. When in Holland, as a result of the referendum, the partisans of the R.I.L.U. received 7,300 votes as against 6,400, we advised the Dutch Secretariat not to affiliate to the R.I.L.U. in order to avoid a split. But would the unity of the Norwegian Trade Union Movement suffer if a Norwegian delegate were at the present moment in Moscow? No. The Norwegian Labor Party is committing a great error in not working systematically for the R.I.L.U.

In a word, the R.I.L.U. has become a great force. It must however be recognised that the successes obtained by the Communist Parties in the Trade Union movement are far from corresponding with the realisation of forces within the working class. It may be said in general that the Communist Parties are not sufficiently active inside the trade union movement. Every communist should understand that our most important and immediate task is to conquer the trade unions.

The prospects are excellent. The failure of the reformist Internationals has caused the international working class movements to gravitate towards the Communist International and the R.I.L.U. Many years will not pass before the reformists are dislodged from all their positions. What is necessary is work, work, work!

Walcher (Co-Reporter):

It is true that most Sections of the Communist International have recognised the importance of working in the trade unions, but unfortunately there is a vast difference between recognition and application of these principles. Thus, in Czecho-Slovakia, which has a good Communist Party, there are no fractions in the trade unions. I think there would be no differences among us over the trade unions if we had trade union fractions to serve as a bond between the Party and the unions. The situation is still more serious in Great Britain. The British comrades on various occasions have told us that Communist influence in the unions is considerable, but that it is not lasting. According to our comrades, the explanation for this is—the weakness of the Party. In America where the League headed by Foster has an ideological influence over close on two million workers, the formation of Communist Fractions is very slow, although some progress has been made recently. Reports on Party work are frequent, but one very seldom hears about the work in the trade unions. It is essential that the Communist Parties should exercise more influence than before on the workers in the trade unions from below. The change which is now taking place in the Amsterdam International makes this even more necessary. Communist fractions must be established even where leadership is already in our hands. The fraction will give the necessary support to this leadership. Unfortunately, this is very seldom the case. For the present, our fractions are compelled to act as control organs for these leading organisations. The excuse for the in-

adequacy of fraction work is—the lack of forces. I think, it would be more to the point to say that this work would be the means of recruiting new forces. We must work for the capture of the Trade Unions, not only to get rid of the reformers, but also to acquire the necessary organisational and technical knowledge ourselves.

In Germany, they are beginning to organise the Party, wherever possible, on the Russian model. Factory nuclei are being established which are to make themselves responsible for the political education of the factory workers. These fractions are being co-ordinated locally according to unions. It soon became evident, that this local co-ordination must also be extended to the districts, and on a still larger scale. The Union fractions are co-ordinated into a so-called local cartel, which meets fortnightly, to discuss general questions. This co-ordination extends to the districts and throughout the country. Every district committee must appoint one comrade for the special Communist work in the Trade Unions, for which he must be responsible. Wherever finances permit, one comrade must be appointed for this work. The fractions must not only exist on paper. The Party through them must be able to lead the masses in the trade union struggle. This necessitates supplying the comrades with material, which can be done by means of circular letters, or better still by personal letters to the responsible comrades, also by leaflets or by special trade unionist opposition papers, such as already exist in some countries. The Communist Press must also be persuaded to give space to Trade Union questions. Our comrades must also have regular periodical conferences. The German Party has also appointed a comrade who will give courses of lectures throughout the country for trade union officials. The Party school is devoting a special section of its curriculum to the trade union question.

It is necessary that all the sections of the Comintern shall make it the duty of their respective members to organise themselves along Trade Union lines. We must endeavour to penetrate into all the sub-sections of the Trade Unions, particularly into the Womens' and Youth sections.

To give a picture of the work of the German Party in the Trade Unions, I will only mention the case of two unions. The Builders' Union has approximately 551,000 members in its 749 local branches. In 65 local groups with a total membership of 67,200 we have a communist majority, and in 230 locals with a total of 331,000 members, we have a following equal to Amsterdam. Approximately 260,000 members are under our organisational influence. The Metal Workers' Union has 1,600,000 members in its 750 locals, of which many are quite insignificant and individual charters were given them for the sole reason that they are removed from the large industrial centres. The number of our factions is about 500. In 81 administrative offices we have a communist majority, including such large centres as Stuttgart, Halle, Merzerburg, Jena, Suhl, Essen, Solingen, Remscheid, etc. with a total of 260,000 members. In 26 locals with approximately half a million members, we are as strong as the Amsterdam organisation. We may say that approximately 720,000 members of the German Metal Workers' Union are influenced by us organizationally.

Unfortunately the reformists in Germany are still very strong, and their strength is centred chiefly in the Trade Unions. Nevertheless, there is no ground for pessimism. We must not imagine that the Trade Unions will be captured in a manner that we shall first get the majority districts, then by states, and eventually throughout the Republic. It is more likely to be accomplished by having our factions inside the Trade Unions as supporting points, which will gain the confidence of the masses and be guided by them instead of the reformists. This was already the case in the struggle of the Ruhr. In Dortmund one of the erstwhile citadels of reformism, the reformists were completely routed during that strike. This is characteristic of the change that has come over large elements of the proletariat.

If we shall get our sections to give greater attention than hitherto, to the small work in the Trade Unions, then we shall win the large masses, and delivering the decisive blow to the reformists will lead the proletariat to victory.

The Chairman, Comrade Böttcher, announced that a Trade Union Commission was formed composed of comrades Johnson of America, Rosmer of France, Gramsci of Italy, Babotzki of Czecho-Slovakia, Gallagher of England, Tranmael of Norway, and Schüller of the Youth International.

The Session was then adjourned until the morning.

Eighth Day of Session

June 20, 1923.

Discussion on the Trade Union Question Urbani (Italy):

said that the Transport Workers' Conference in Berlin was the beginning of a new period of action for the Communists. But he deemed it necessary to point out that the agreement arrived at also offers new possibilities to the opportunists.

The Scandinavians have left the Amsterdam International but have not come to Moscow. The opportunists can do worse. They can say: "We have got into contact with Moscow, and the outcome is—the unity of the International Trade Union Movement. There is no need for any workers who desire action to leave Amsterdam. Let them remain there working for future unity and to capture the Amsterdam International from inside." In order to make it impossible for certain opportunists to use these arguments, the Enlarged Executive should issue to all militant Communists in the trade unions the simple watchword: "To Moscow".

Lozovsky has shown us that work in the factory and in the workshop is work appertaining to the period of revolutionary preparation. Italian experience shows that it is also work of the period of reaction. In Italy, although the trade union apparatus has been smashed, the Fascists are always defeated in the factories. During the elections of the factory and workshop committees in March and April they were as a rule in the minority, even in those towns where the proletariat belongs to their unions.

This being so, the Italian Communist Party has been able to draw up a plan of work in the trade unions, which, while providing for the preparatory work of reorganizing the trade unions, is nevertheless directed mainly towards rallying all the proletarians to the factory and workshop organizations, and to co-ordinate the work of the latter on a national scale. In this way, it will be possible to achieve unity, to win over the reformist masses, and even to assume the leadership of the reformist General Confederation of Labor. The Italian Delegation fully endorses Lozovsky's proposals.

Wieser (Switzerland):

The Swiss Delegation is in full agreement with Comrade Lozovsky's and Comrade Walcher's arguments on the significance of Trade Union work. In connection with the Lozovsky-Walcher resolution on the Trade Union question, we are of the opinion that the paragraph on the great revolution in the reformist Trade Union movement is exaggerated. The Walcher-Lozovsky resolution might give rise to illusions among the workers about the real state of affairs. This applies particularly to Switzerland, as the representative of the Managing Committee of the Metal Workers' Union, Ilk, who at the Friedrichshafen Conference together with the representative of the Russian Metal Workers, signed the resolution against split tendencies, is himself one of the most determined split politicians of Switzerland. When we succeeded in appointing an investigation committee for the prevention of splits, and when this committee under our pressure passed anti-split decisions, the refusal to endorse these decisions came from no other than the Metal Workers' Unions under the leadership of Ilk. Therefore we should like a more definite formulation of this paragraph in the resolution. At present, the question of unemployment is very acute in Switzerland, which accounts for the falling off in Trade Union membership. Owing to our clear cut attitude on the unemployment question, we achieved considerable success. In May, 1922, we were as yet a small minority at the Trade Union Congress. In February, 1923, at the Trade Union Conference on unemployment, our resolutions were adopted by a considerable majority. We should also like that part of the resolution dealing with unemployment to be more definitely formulated.

Zapotocky (Czecho-Slovakia):

In Czecho-Slovakia, conditions in the Trade Union Movement are not less complicated than those on the political field. We never had a uniform Trade Union Movement. We had independent Amsterdam trade unions, organized according to nationality, and also nationalist and Christian socialist unions. The rate of progress in revolutionising the trade unions and the Amsterdam trade union central organizations by the Communist Party was different in the Czech Movement and in the German Movement. This explains why two independent Red Textile Workers' sections were formed out of the two Amsterdam Unions. Anticipating this, and to prevent

this happening, efforts were made to unite the two organisations before they left Amsterdam with the intention of taking up the question of affiliation to the Profintern after the fusion was brought about.

The second difficulty was the difference of opinion with regard to the form of organization which was to combine the unions and groups expelled from the Amsterdam organizations. National tendencies had nothing to do with this. The Executive of the Czech Party did not approve of the existence of two Red textile Workers' Unions, but elected to play the role of mediator. It was resolved to leave the final settlement of this question to the Enlarged Executive of the Profintern.

Comrade Lozovsky said that the United Front tactics were not adequately applied. But at the last International Congress it was stated that Czecho-Slovakia ranked high in the application of these tactics. The Executive of the Czech Party never missed a single opportunity for bringing forward the slogan of the United Front, and the Profintern unions never failed to support the actions of the Party on these occasions.

Gallagher (Great Britain):

Said that judging by Comrade Lozovsky's speech, great changes would be taking place in the International Trade Union movement in the near future.

The day of the Amsterdam International is over. It depended upon a contented working class and it was more concerned with what it should not do than with what it should do. But even in Britain, where the trade unions have a tradition of compromise and where the leaders endeavoured to suppress even references to the class war, there was slowly growing amongst the masses a desire for international action. What was wanted was that concrete demands should be put before the working class to attract their attention to the international working class movement.

Lozovsky's review of the situation in Britain was incorrect. The Party did not claim that it should be entrusted with all the work in the trade unions, but that it should control all the work that was being done in the trade unions either by the R.I.L.U. Bureau, or similar bodies. An understanding on this matter had been reached between the R.I.L.U. Bureau and the Party. A Communist nucleus in a trade union branch would be required to secure members for the Party, but as part of a larger trade union formation, it would carry on the work of the Bureau and attempt to bring over masses of the workers to the Profintern. The opinion that the Party was to confine itself to political work only was an absurdity.

He also denied that the change of the name of the Party organ from "The Communist" to the "Workers' Weekly" was an attempt to cut across the work of the Bureau. The change corresponded with a change in the organization of the Party. They wanted the Party to be a Party of the masses and the paper to be a paper of the masses.

Kafayama (Japan):

said that he missed any reference in Comrade Lozovsky's speech to the Far East, although work amongst the workers and peasants of the Far East was of great concern to the revolution. The Chinese workers are amongst the most oppressed in the world, not only by their own, but by foreign capitalists. Yet the Chinese workers who were backward and poorly organized were beginning to take up the struggle against their oppressors. It was specially necessary to organize the Chinese Transport Workers. In Japan the position of the workers' organizations was deplorable. The capitalist offensive was crushing the unions. There was great unemployment, and in addition, the Fascists were helping to break the labor movement. Yet even amongst the peasants, trade unionism was a growing influence.

Johnson (Canada):

Said there were signs of general awakening in the American labor movement and as an example cited the great support being given to the Trade Union Educational League and its campaign for amalgamation. The Yellow Socialist Party was being compelled to enter into an alliance with Samuel Gompers and the other reactionaries. This alliance of Hillquit, Berger, and Gompers, was combatting all radical tendencies including the attempt at amalgamation. Moreover, they were not making the slightest attempt to build up their own shattered unions. Their great fear is a mass movement. There was also no doubt that the Governments of America and Canada would give their

support to this group in its fight against radical tendencies. The speaker instanced the case of Nova Scotia where armed police were being drafted in to provoke the miners to an open clash.

The Comintern and the Profintern must be very careful as to the statements it issues as to the relations between the Communists and the Trade Unions and also as regards independent unions and federations. Although the membership of the Trade Union Educational League was over 2,000,000 they were still not strong enough to undertake the fight against the Compers group. The speaker agreed as to the necessity for organization upon industrial lines. He was in favor of a levy for the support of trade union work and of the organization of party uncles in the Trade Unions.

Mascheriakov (Russia):

said that the Amsterdam Trade Union International has allied itself with the Co-operative International which represents the most backward and the most "Right" element of the international working class movement. Foreseeing their decline, the reformist leaders of the Trade Union Movement are looking for support to the right, to the Co-operative movement.

Concluding speech of Comrade Lozovsky

Is there a real change of front within the Amsterdam Organization? Our comrades Wieser and Mascheriakov have warned us not to exaggerate it. That is understood. Wieser referred to Ilk signing a Unity Resolution and then proceeding to expel revolutionary metal workers from his union in Switzerland. That is true, but this is a question of a change of front among the masses which instinctively feel the necessity for new tactics. As to what is going on in the minds of the leaders, it is an altogether different matter. The new tendencies may have a decisive influence if the Amsterdam left wing unites with the revolutionary elements of the International working class movement.

Urbani was right when he showed us that the opportunists might take advantage of the agreements arrived at by the Transport Workers' Conference. It is not at all impossible that these agreements will lead to a certain amount of communist passivity. There is even a tendency in our movement not to consider the Trade Union problem. There is also a tendency which regards it better for trade union unity to join neither Moscow nor Amsterdam. We must fight against these errors, and must put more zest into our work, basing ourselves on the results of the Transport Workers' Conference, for if we do not take advantage of it, our opponents will.

There are reformist leaders who deem it necessary to ally themselves with us, in order to save their organizations and their position. Thus, two different categories of people agree with us: those who are sincere believers in the efficiency of class action, and those who still want to deceive the workers by telling them: "We are with the revolutionaries, and therefore it is not necessary for you to enter into closer contact with them." In order to parry this manoeuvre, we must intensify our efforts after every International Conference, such as that of the Transport Workers.

In answer to Urbani, the speaker dealt with the question of Factory Committees. In France, there were three different plans for the establishment of committees in the mines. 1. Committees consisting only of miners belonging to the C.G.T.U. 2. Of miners belonging to all the organizations and. 3. Of miners of any description. We consider that all the workers must group themselves around the Factory Committees. It will be our business to get our candidates elected. If we do not succeed, it will only show that we do not work well.

The speaker dealt next with the National Question, and pointed out the danger of introducing the National Question in the Trade Union organizations, as this was done in Czecho-Slovakia. Zapotocky has said that the Berlin Bureau of the Profintern had approved the establishment in Czecho-Slovakia of another autonomous Trade Union. If our Central European Bureau has done that, we must repudiate it, and we shall have to give it strict instructions for the future. But the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party has not done anything on its part to correct these errors.

In Great Britain, certain members of our Party who constitute the Profintern Bureau have an erroneous conception of the role of the Parties and of the Trade Unions. Their conception is—that one must do the political work, and the other the economic work.

In Great Britain the work in the Trade Unions must be energetically furthered, and this will strengthen the Party. It would be foolish to wait for the Party to become strong before making a beginning with this urgent task.

In America, where we have to contend with the reactionary traditions of Compers and with the revolutionary traditions of the I.W.W., the struggle against dual-unionism, although excellent, must not be carried to an extreme. When parallel unions exist, one must adapt themselves to working within them.

Katayama wanted to know why the report on the Trade Union question has not dealt with the movement in the Eastern countries. The reason is that we have not presented a general report, but have only concentrated on pressing problems. We must admit that there is a Colonial Problem in the Trade Union movement. What are the French, Dutch and British Communist Parties doing for Trade Union work in the Colonies? Not enough by far. The British Labor Party is of course but a form of imperial influence over the Colonies. We must do more for the colonial movement. It is a vital question for the revolution.

Generally speaking, the Communist Parties are not working enough in the Trade Unions. Our Parties have not made the best of all their possibilities. The masses are recovering their will to action. A little more effort and more energy, and we shall defeat reformism, anarchism and confusionism. What we see in Spain and in France—the existence of working class individualism, of libertarian confusion and a devil may care attitude, show that the work of the Communist Party on the Trade Union field is far from satisfactory.

The speaker said that there are still in France small railwaymen's unions of about 30 members. At a recent Congress of the Eastern system, mention was made of twelve Trade Unions comprising three hundred and sixty six members. Thus, the problem of the industrial unions, settled by the Congress of the Profintern in agreement with the C.G.T.U. has not yet been actually solved in France.

In conclusion, Lozovsky said that the Profintern, which was frequently judged according to its deserts, has become an important factor in the revolutionary movement. Let us extend our activity, let this activity permeate the entire working class movement and let us strengthen our organization!

*

Report of Clara Zetkin on Fascism

The Congress then went on to discuss the next item of the agenda, the question of Fascism. The report on this subject was made by the venerable champion of the German proletariat, Comrade Clara Zetkin, who was given a rousing ovation by the entire assembly as she made her appearance on the platform. Owing to her illness, Comrade Zetkin was compelled to deliver her report seated in an arm-chair, in which she had been carried into the hall.

Comrade Zetkin said:

In Fascism, the proletariat is confronted by an extraordinarily dangerous enemy. Fascism is the concentrated expression of the general offensive undertaken by the world bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Its overthrow is therefore an absolute necessity, nay, it is even a question of the every day existence and of the bread and butter of every ordinary worker. On these grounds the fight against Fascism must be the cause of the whole of the proletariat. It will be much easier for us to defeat Fascism, if we clearly and distinctly study its nature. Hitherto there were extremely vague ideas upon this subject not only among the large masses of the workers, but even among the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and the communists. Hitherto Fascism was put on a level with the White Terror of Horthy in Hungary. Although the methods of both are similar, in essence they are different. The Horthy Terror was established after the victorious, although shortlived, revolution of the proletariat was suppressed, and was the expression of vengeance of the bourgeoisie. The ringleaders of the White Terror were a quite small clique of feudal officers. Fascism, on the contrary, viewed objectively, is not the revenge of the bourgeoisie in retaliation for proletarian aggression against the bourgeoisie, but it is a punishment for the proletariat for failing to carry on the revolution begun in Russia. The fascist leaders are not a small and exclusive caste, but they extend deeply into wide elements of the population.

We have to overcome Fascism not only militarily, but also politically and ideologically. The reformists even today consider Fascism to be nothing else but naked violence, the reaction against the violence begun by the proletariat. To the reformist the Russian Revolution amounts to the same thing as Mother Eve's biting into the apple in the Garden of Eden. The

reformists trace Fascism back to the Russian Revolution and its consequences. Nothing else was meant by Otto Bauer at the Unity Congress at Hamburg, when he declared that a great share of the blame for Fascism rests on the communists, who had weakened the force of the proletariat by continual splits. In saying this he entirely ignored the fact, that the German Independents had made their split long before the demoralizing example was given by the Russian Revolution. Contrary to his own views, Bauer, at Hamburg had to draw the conclusion that the organized violence of Fascism must be met by defence organizations of the proletariat, because no appeal to democracy can avail against direct violence. It is true, he went on to explain that he did not mean such weapons as insurrection or a general strike which did not always lead to success. What he meant was the coordination of parliamentary action with mass action. What was to be the nature of these actions, Otto Bauer did not say, but this is the very point of the question. The only weapon recommended by Bauer for the fight against Fascism was the establishment of an International Bureau of Information on world reaction. The distinguishing feature of this new-old International is its faith in the power and permanence of bourgeois domination, and its mistrust and cowardice towards the proletariat as the strongest factor of the world revolution. They are of the opinion that against the invulnerable force of the bourgeoisie, the proletariat can do nothing else but act with moderation and refrain from teasing the tiger of the bourgeoisie. Fascism, with all its forcefulness in the prosecution of its violent deeds, is indeed nothing else but the expression of the disintegration and decay of capitalist economy, and the symptom of the dissolution of the bourgeois State. This is one of its roots. Symptoms of this decay of capitalism were observed even before the war. The war has shattered capitalist economy to its foundation, resulting not only in the colossal impoverishment of the proletariat, but also in the deep misery of the petty bourgeoisie, the petty peasants, and the intellectuals. All these elements had been promised that the war would bring about an amelioration of their material conditions. But the very opposite has happened. Large numbers of the former middle classes have become proletarians, having entirely lost their economic security. Their ranks were joined by large masses of ex-officers, who are now unemployed. It was among these elements that Fascism recruited quite a considerable contingent. The manner of its composition is also the reason why Fascism in some countries is of an outspoken, monarchist character. The second root of Fascism lies in the retarding of the world revolution by the treacherous attitude of the reformist leaders. Large numbers of the petty bourgeoisie, including even the middle classes, had discarded their wartime psychology for a certain sympathy with reformist socialism, hoping that the latter would bring about a reformation of society, along democratic lines. They were disappointed in their hopes. They can now see that the reformist leaders are in benevolent accord with the bourgeoisie, and the worst of it is that these masses have now lost their faith not only in the reformist leaders, but in socialism itself. These masses of disappointed socialist sympathizers are joined by large circles of the proletariat, of workers who have given up their faith not only in socialism, but also in their own class. Fascism has become a sort of refuge for the politically shelterless. In fairness it ought to be said that the communists, too—except the Russians—bear part of the blame for the desertion of these elements to the Fascist ranks, because our actions at times failed to stir the masses profoundly enough. The aim of the Fascist when gaining support among the various elements of society, must have been, as a matter of course, to try and bridge over the class antagonism in the ranks of their own adherents, and the so-called authoritative State was to serve as a means to this end. Fascism now embraces such elements which must become very dangerous to the bourgeois order. Nevertheless, thus far these elements were invariably overcome by the reactionary elements.

The bourgeoisie had seen the situation clearly from the start. The bourgeoisie wants to reconstruct capitalist economy. Under the present circumstances reconstruction of the bourgeois class domination can be brought about only at the cost of increased exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie is quite aware that the soft preaching reform socialists are fast losing their hold on the proletariat, and that there will be nothing for the bourgeoisie but to resort to violent means against the proletariat. But the means of violence of the bourgeois States are beginning to fail. They therefore need a new organization of violence, and this is offered to them by the hodge-podge conglomeration of Fascism. For this reason the bourgeoisie places all the force at its command at the service of Fascism. Fascism has diverse characteristics in different countries. Nevertheless it has two distinguishing features in all countries, namely the pretence of a revolutionary programme, which is cleverly adapted

to the interests and demands of the large masses, and on the other hand, the application of the most brutal violence. The classic instance is Italian Fascism. Industrial capital in Italy was not strong enough to reconstruct the ruined economy. The State could not and would not intervene to increase the power and the material possibilities of the industrial capital of Northern Italy. The State was giving all its attention to agrarian capital and to petty financial capital. The heavy industries, which had been artificially boosted during the war, collapsed when the war was over, and a wave of unprecedented unemployment had set in. The pledges given to the soldiers could not be redeemed. All these circumstances created an extremely revolutionary situation. This revolutionary situation resulted in the summer of 1920 in the occupation of the factories. Upon that occasion it was shown that the maturity of the revolution makes its first appearance among a small minority of the proletariat. The occupation of the factories was therefore bound to end in a tremendous defeat instead of furthering the revolutionary development. The reformist leaders of the trade unions acted the part of ignominious traitors, but at the same time, it was shown that the proletariat possessed neither the will nor the power to march on towards revolution. Notwithstanding the reformist influence, there were forces at work among the proletariat which could become inconvenient to the bourgeoisie. The municipal elections, in which the social-democrats gained a third of all the councils, were a signal of alarm to the bourgeoisie, which immediately started to seek for a force which could combat the revolutionary proletariat. It was just at that time that Mussolini had gained some importance with Fascism. After the defeat of the proletariat in the occupation of the factories, the number of the Fascist was over 1,000 and great masses of the proletariat joined the Mussolini organization. On the other hand, large masses of the proletariat, had fallen into a state of indifference. The cause of the first success of the Fascist, was that it made its start with a revolutionary gesture. Its pretended aim was to fight to retain the revolutionary conquests of the revolutionary war, and for this reason they demanded a strong State which would be able to protect these revolutionary fruits of victory against the hostile interests of the various classes of society represented by the "old State". Its slogan was directed against all the exploiters, and hence also against the bourgeoisie. Fascism at that time was so radical that it even demanded the execution of Giolitti and the dethronement of the Italian dynasty. But Giolitti carefully refrained from using violence against Fascism, which seemed to him to be the lesser evil. To satisfy these fascist clamours, he dissolved parliament. At that time Mussolini was still pretending to be a republican, and in an interview he declared that the Fascist faction could not participate at the opening of the Italian parliament because of the monarchist ceremony accompanying it. These utterances provoked a crisis in the Fascist Movement, which resulted in its establishment as a party by a merger of the Mussolini adherents and the representatives of the monarchist organization, and the executive of the new party was made up of an even number of members from both factions. The Fascist Party created a double-edged weapon for the corruption and terrorization of the working class. For the corruption of the working class, the Fascist Trade Unions were created, the so called cooperations in which workers and employers were united. To terrorize the working class, the Fascist Party created the militant squads which had grown out of the punitive expeditions. Here it must be emphasized again that the tremendous treason of the Italian reformists during the general strike, which was the cause of the terrible defeat of the Italian proletariat, had given direct encouragement to the Fascists to capture the State. On the other hand, the mistakes of the Communist Party consisted in their regarding Fascism as merely a militarist and terrorist movement without any profound social basis.

Let us now examine what Fascism has done since the conquest of power for the fulfilment of its intended revolutionary program, for the realization of its promise to create a State without class. Fascism held out the promise of a new and better electoral law, and of equal suffrage for women. The new suffrage law of Mussolini is in reality the worst restriction of the suffrage law to favour the Fascist Movement. According to this law, two thirds of all the seats must be given to the strongest party, and all the other parties together shall hold only one third of the seats. Women's franchise has been nearly entirely eliminated. The right to vote is given only to a small group of propertied women and the so-called "war-distinguished" women. There is no longer any mention made of the promise of the economic parliament and National Assembly, nor of the abolition of the Senate which had been pledged so solemnly by the Fascists.

The same can be said about the pledges made in the social sphere. The Fascists had inscribed on their programme, the eight-

hour day, but the bill introduced by them provides for so many exceptions that there is to be no eight-hour day in Italy. Nothing came also of the promised guarantee of wages. The destruction of the trade unions has enabled the employers to effect wage reductions of 20-30%, and in some cases of even 50-60%. The Workers were promised the right of technical participation in the administration of the factories. Today there is a law in Italy which proscribes the factory councils completely. The State enterprises are playing into the hands of private capital. The fascist programme had contained a provision for a progressive tax on capital, which was to some extent to act as a form of expropriation. In fact the opposite was done. Various taxes on luxuries were abolished, such as the automobile tax, for the pretended reason that it would restrict national production. The indirect-taxes were increased for the reason that this would curtail the home consumption and thus improve the possibilities for export. The Fascist Government also abrogated the law for the compulsory registration of transfers of securities, thus reintroducing the system of bearer-bonds and opening the door wide to the tax-evader. The schools were handed over to the clergy. By capturing the State, Mussolini demanded a commission to enquire into war profits, of which 85% were to be restored to the State. When this commission had become uncomfortable for his financial backers, the heavy industrialists, he ordered that the commission shall only submit a report to him, and whoever would publish any of the things that transpired in that commission, would be punished with six months imprisonment. Also in military matters Fascism failed to keep its promises. The army was promised to be restricted to territorial defence. In reality, the term of service for the standing army was increased from eight months to eighteen, which meant the increase of the armed forces from 250,000 to 350,000. The Royal Guards were abolished because they were too democratic to suit Mussolini. On the other hand, the carabinieri were increased from 65,000 to 90,000, and all the police troops were doubled. The Fascist Organizations were transformed into a kind of national militia, which by latest accounts, have now reached the number of half a million. But the social differences have introduced an element of political contrast in the militia, which must lead to the eventual collapse of Fascism.

When we compare the Fascist program with its fulfillment, we can foresee already today the complete ideological collapse of Fascism in Italy. Political bankruptcy must inevitably follow in the wake of this ideological bankruptcy. Fascism is unable to keep together the forces which helped it to get into power. A clash of interests in many forms is already making itself felt. Fascism has not yet succeeded in making the old bureaucracy subservient to it. In the army there is also friction between the old officers and the new Fascist leaders. The differences between the various political parties are growing. Resistance against Fascism is increasing throughout the country. Class antagonism begins to permeate even the ranks of the Fascisti. The Fascists are unable to keep the promises, which they made to the workers and to the fascist Trade Unions. Wage reductions and dismissals of workers are the order of the day. Thus it happens that the first protest against the Fascist trade union movement came from the ranks of the Fascists themselves. The Workers will very soon come back to their class interest and class duty. We must not look upon Fascism as a United Force capable of repelling our attack. It is rather a formation, which comprises many antagonistic elements and will be disintegrated from within. But it would be dangerous to assume that the ideological and political disintegration of Fascism in Italy would be immediately followed by military disintegration. On the contrary, we must expect that Fascism will endeavour to keep alive by terrorist methods. Therefore, the revolutionary Italian Workers must be prepared for further serious struggles. It would be a great calamity, if we were satisfied with the role of spectators of this process of disintegration. It is our duty to hasten this process with all the means at our disposal. This is not only the duty of the Italian proletariat, but also the duty of the German proletariat in the face of German Fascism.

After Italy, Fascism is strongest in Germany. As a consequence of the result of the war and of the failure of the revolution, the capitalist economy of Germany is weak, and in no other country is the contrast between the objective ripeness for revo-

lution and the subjective unpreparedness of the working class as great as just now in Germany. In no other country have the reformists so ignominiously failed as in Germany.

I am firmly convinced that neither the Peace Treaties nor the occupation of the Ruhr have given such a fillip to Fascism in Germany as the seizure of power by Mussolini. This has encouraged the German fascists. The collapse of Fascism in Italy would greatly discourage the fascists in Germany. We must not overlook one thing: the prerequisites for the overthrow of Fascism abroad, is the overthrow of Fascism in every single country by the proletariat of the countries. It behoves us to overcome Fascism ideologically and politically. This imposes enormous tasks on us. We must realise that Fascism is a movement of the disappointed and of those whose existence is ruined. Therefore, we must endeavour either to win over or to neutralise those wide masses who are still in the fascist camp. I wish to emphasise that we must realise that we must struggle ideologically, for the possession of the soul of these masses. We must realise that they are not only trying to escape from their present tribulations, but that they are longing for a new philosophy. We must come out of the narrow limits of our present activity. The Third International is, in contradistinction to the old International an International of all races without any distinctions whatever. The Communist Parties must not only be the vanguard of the Proletarian manual Workers, but also the energetic defenders of the interests of the brain Workers. They must be the leaders of all sections of society which are driven into opposition to bourgeois domination because of their interests and their expectations of the future. Therefore, I welcome the proposal of Comrade Zinoviev to take up the struggle for the Workers' and Peasants' Government. I was jubilant when I read about it. This new slogan has a great significance for all countries. We cannot dispense with it in the struggle for the overthrow of Fascism. It means that the salvation of the wide masses of the small peasantry will be achieved through Communism. We must not limit ourselves merely to carrying on a struggle for our political and economic program. We must at the same time familiarise the masses with the ideals of Communism as a philosophy. If we do this, we shall show the way to a new philosophy to all those elements which have lost their bearings during the historic development of recent times. The necessary pre-requisite for this is, that—as we approach these masses, we also become organisationally, as a Party, a firmly welded unit. If we do not do that, we run the risk of falling into opportunism, and of going bankrupt. We must adapt our methods of work to our new tasks. We must speak to the masses in a language which they can understand, without doing prejudice to our ideas. Thus, the struggle against Fascism brings forward a number of new tasks.

It behoves all the parties to carry out this task energetically and in conformity with the situation in their respective countries. However, we must bear in mind that it is not enough to overcome Fascism ideologically and politically. The position of the proletariat as regards Fascism is at present one of self defence. This self defence of the proletariat must take the form of struggle for its existence and its organisation.

The proletariat must have a well organised self defence apparatus. When ever Fascism uses violence, it must be met with proletarian violence. I do not mean by this individual terrorist acts, but the violence of the organised revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat. Germany has made a beginning by organising factory "hundreds". This struggle can only be successful if there is a proletarian united front. The workers must unite for this struggle regardless of party. The self defence of the proletariat is one of the greatest incentives for the establishment of the proletarian united front. Only by instilling class consciousness into the soul of every worker, will we succeed to prepare also the military overthrow of Fascism, which, at this juncture, is absolutely necessary. If we succeed in this, we may be sure that it will be soon up with the capitalist system and with bourgeois power, regardless of any success of the general offensive of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. The signs of disintegration, which are so palpable before our eyes, give us the conviction that the giant proletariat will again join in the revolutionary fray, and that its call to the bourgeois world will be: I am the strength, I am the will, in me you see the future! (loud applause). All present rose and sang the International.

Ninth Day of Session

Discussion on Report of Clara Zetkin on Fascism

June 21, 1923.

The Session was opened shortly after midday by Comrade Amter. The first speaker in the discussion on Fascism was.

Krajevski (Poland):

Externally Polish Fascism does not appear as aggressive as Italian fascism. The Polish bourgeoisie considers it advisable to set the numerous Fascist organisations into motion only from time to time. A strictly centralised Fascist movement on the Italian example at present does not exist. As a result of the financial disorganisation, the frightful increase in the cost of living and the desperation of the landless peasants, a change of outlook has taken place amongst wide masses of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. They are turning away from Pilsudski. The bourgeoisie and the present government occasionally provoke the masses to anti-Semitic excesses and demonstrations against Soviet Russia. But at the same time they fear the elementary mass character of the Fascist movement that unites these masses. The slogans of Polish Fascism are externally less anti-worker than national-chauvinistic. Its advocate is the present Glombinski-Vitosk Government, which prefers to adopt a policy of cunning towards the working class, with the exception of the communists, but naturally only as long as it sits firmly in the saddle. As in all other countries Fascism is preaching the fundamental reform of parliament, advocating that all enemies of the Polish fatherland and all members of foreign nations should be deprived of electoral rights. The notorious bomb outrage in Cracow showed that Fascism, in spite of its externally not very aggressive manner, does not refuse to resort to terrorist methods from time to time. The small and large Fascist organisations in Poland are as follows: The Anti-Bolshevik League of Warsaw; the League for Social Defence—a strike-breaking organisation; the "Development" League; the military leagues of Domber and Haller; the Peasants' Educational League, etc. The full brunt of Polish Fascism is born exclusively by the Communist Party. The Polish Socialist Party, which only recently took up the fight against fascism verbally, is still as formerly in its policy the fore-runner of Fascism. Our proposals for the formation of the united front in town and country between the social-democratic organisations, as the Polish Socialist Party and the Bund, and the revolutionary organisations of the Communist Party and the labor unions, were rejected by the former.

Bölicher (Germany):

No peril requires such quick international actions by the international working class, as the Fascist peril. We are now discussing Comrade Zetkin's political analysis of Fascism.

In Germany, the Fascist organisations have developed into strong national leagues:—The German People's Freedom Party and the National-Socialist Workers' Party. There are various tendencies within German Fascism itself. The struggle of these various tendencies is very acute. From a central viewpoint, the Fascist movement in Germany is now a people's movement. This people's movement has two prominent features, 1. anti-semitism and 2. a pronounced anti-capitalist-demagogic tone. In connection with internal policy, this people's movement concerns itself with propaganda on the so-called debt question. The struggle against the Versailles Treaty is one of the main features of the Fascist movement. Hitler's slogan: Down with the November criminals! is the internal policy of the Fascists in a nutshell. This means of course—fighting the labor movement. In Bavaria, the Fascists apply this slogan even to the social-democrats. Thus, the social-democrats, who helped to bring Fascism into being, are being beaten with their own stick. The German Communist Party issued the watchword: Workers' rule against Fascist rule, proletarian hundreds against fascist hundreds! But the Party soon realised that the Fascist movement was not only a narrow movement of illegal, military fighting leagues, but that it is beginning to get hold of wide masses. As soon as the Party realised this, it took up the struggle against Fascism also on the political—ideological field. The latest phase of Fascism is the struggle for the factories. In the face of this strategy, the Party is now propagating the idea of the establishment of joint factory hundreds, which are the organ of the united front in the struggle against Fascism in the factories, and which must take up the struggle against Fascism on the ideological field. The Commu-

nists showed the way out of all this chaos and misery. In this struggle they rally the masses around them. It is only if we succeed in thus establishing the united front on a broad basis, that it will be possible to disintegrate Fascism politically, and to overcome it militarily.

Frey (Austria):

In Austria Fascism was called forth solely by the policy of the social-democrats. Fascism is today very strong in Austria and is becoming bolder and more insolent from day to day. When, in the early period after the break-up of the Austrian monarchy, the so-called "home guards" were formed, we pointed out the danger they implied. The social-democrats, however, continued to sabotage and not only prevented the arming of the proletariat which we demanded, but also the formation of workers' guards. The Security Police which were then formed, were so organised as to be the reliable guards of Social Democracy against the communists. In my opinion it is our duty to work among the Security Police, for they are a possible instrument of the united front which is worth developing and revolutionising. In Austria, there are two distinct kinds of Fascism; the so-called "Hakenkreuzler" (swastika), who carry on an agitation for a Greater Germany, and the "Frontkämpfer" (front line fighters), who would be content with a Fascist Austria under the Hapsburg Dynasty as a starting point for the restoration of the old monarchy. Experience has shown that both organisations are united in their ruthlessness towards the working class. So far we have rejected the slogan of union with Germany because we did not wish to encourage the illusion amongst the workers that union with Germany could help them. But as the situation is now changing, owing to the increasing activity of the working class, it may become necessary to adopt the slogan of unity in conjunction with the revolutionary fight. In this way, too, we shall have a moral weapon against the Greater Germany fascist movement. The fight against Fascism must be conducted theoretically, militarily, and politically. The Austrian Party will exert every effort in this fight.

Serra (Italy):

Clara Zetkin has made a clear distinction between terrorism and Fascism. The Italian Fascisti always boasted to the bourgeoisie that they prevented a revolution in Italy. From the point of view of history the very contrary was the case: Fascism sprang up owing to the check to the revolution. When the factories were occupied, the Socialist Party found itself faced with a dilemma: participation in the bourgeois government, or immediate revolution. The left wing prevented the entry into the bourgeois government, which indeed the masses did not want. The immediate seizure of power was out of the question and the party was unable to make concrete preparations for it or to indicate the way. Since that time the deceived masses began to hearken to Fascism.

The two ideological phases of Fascism noted by Clara Zetkin, viz. the republican phase and the monarchist phase, are justified on closer examination. Mussolini was at first a republican in order to flatter the old revolutionary and radical elements whom he needed, and in order to cause dissension in military circles. As soon as he succeeded, he abandoned republicanism. Whatever the ideological premises of Fascism were, by developing exclusively in the direction of the suppression of the workers' movement, it must take an orientation to the right.

The immediate problem in Italy is principally that of the relation of forces. We must oppose our ideology to that of Fascism, and do so practically, at the same pointing out the bankruptcy of the latter. Clara Zetkin has done well to lend her authority to this. The Fascist ideology can be summed up briefly: it consists in opposing the "national" to the "international". Mussolini said recently that he would seize the bourgeoisie by the throat in order to compel it to be a true bourgeoisie, and the Socialists, to make them take the consequences of their position. Julian the Apostate in the same way persecuted the Christians to compel them to be true Christians, but we must not allow Fascism to exclude us from the life of the nation. We must present our internationalism in a manner intelligible to all workers and even the sympathetic sections of the middle classes as the only solution to the practical problems of Italian life.

The speaker pointed out the necessity of fighting Fascism from its very commencement. Once it has seized power, it is very difficult to combat it. He considered the boycott of Italy impracticable since it demanded too much preparation and could

not be effective at some decisive moment which was still very far distant. The Italian communists, he said, cherish no illusions. We are only at the very outset of a long period of struggle in which communists from other countries can do little to help us directly. But they will help us greatly if they do their duty in their own countries, that is, if they draw all the necessary lessons from our experiences and from our defeat.

Smeral (Czecho-Slovakia):

Until recently there were no Fascist organisations in Czecho-Slovakia worth mentioning. We feared that the Legionaries who had returned from Siberia might be converted into a Fascist corps, but it soon became evident that this fear was groundless owing to the predominance of the proletarian element in these legions. It is only during the last few weeks that there are symptoms of serious attempts being made to organise Fascism in Czecho-Slovakia. By the way of illustration, I will mention two facts. On June 10th, Dr. Kramarsch the leader of the National-Democratic Party, which is still part of the government coalition, spoke at a public meeting of the possibility of the present bourgeois-socialist coalition government being replaced by another government. He meant of course by a Workers' and Peasants' Government including also German workers and peasants. He said: Those who reject the coalition today, are saddling themselves with an awful responsibility. We do not want to give up our State, and if parliamentary means prove inadequate, we must employ other means. A similar tendency was voiced in an article in the Youth organ of the Kramarsch Party. The Czech social-democrats are to blame for this arrogant and confident attitude of the bourgeoisie. The turn which British policy towards Soviet Russia has taken and events in Bulgaria are also contributing factors in this situation. It is significant that the Fascist movement, in the first phase of its development, is not as yet directed against the communists as a mass Party. On the contrary, in some places the Fascists are positively coquetting with the communist demands. On the other hand, they are decidedly opposed to the Benes-Masaryk policy. The Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party is confronted with responsible tasks. It may happen that the bourgeois and social-democratic elements inimical to Fascism, will invite us to joint action against Fascism. We must make it quite clear that the methods of the opportunists are not good enough for us. The Fascist offensive cannot be overcome by parliamentary means only. It must be met by deeds. We must organise the working masses into a fighting front, and we must arm them in such a way as to make them a real force capable of successfully resisting the armed attack of bourgeois reaction.

In Czecho-Slovakia, national reasons had much more to do with the rise of Fascism than social reasons. The result is that Fascism with us is nationally divided, that we have beside the Czech Fascism, a German and a Hungarian Fascism which to a certain extent paralyse each other. In Slovakia there are Fascist organisations on the model of the "Awakening Hungarians". In the German districts, Fascism is represented by the German National-Socialist Party. Lately, this Party, which hitherto shared the standpoint of the German Majority Socialists, has transferred its sympathies to the Bavarian National Socialists, led by Hitler, and has even entered into a certain organisational alliance with them. It is rather interesting that in Czecho-Slovakia the Fascists, who are followers of Huss, are collaborating with the Clerical People's Party. It is difficult to say as yet if this is purely accidental or not. But it is just possible that an attempt will be made to bring the Catholic States of Central-Europe—Bavaria, Austria, Horthy-Hungary and Poland into line, politically, and that efforts will also be made to incorporate Czecho-Slovakia in this bloc.

Gypner (Germany):

I want to deal with three main points in connection with the fight against Fascism: 1. The proletarian hundreds. 2. Our activities in rural districts. 3. The international fight against Fascism. The communist youth holds the point of view that the working class youth from the age of 17 should be included in the proletarian hundreds, otherwise the danger will arise that they will either form their own organisations—which is not desirable from the point of view of the working class movement—or go where they can find activities, i. e. to the Fascist organisations. In this connection I should like to point out that the party cannot exercise a theoretical influence upon the factory hundreds because the party has no factory nuclei.

Our activities in the country side have hitherto been insufficient. We must develop a much more lively propaganda so as to avoid our experiencing in Germany what was experienced

in Italy, namely, Fascist expeditions upon the towns organised in the country.

As to the international struggle against Fascism, our actions hitherto have been too feeble. We see that Fascism is conducting its fight internationally, yet the proletariat of one country has been unable to count upon the parallel activity of the proletariat of other countries in the fight against Fascism. I hope that just as the activities of the Comintern in the fight against the danger of war have been intensified, so will the struggle against Fascism be intensified. The communist youth will do all in its power to assist the communist parties in their fight against fascism.

The chairman read a declaration from Comrade Koritschoner (Austria) wherein in reply to the criticism of Comrade Frey on the question of the fight against Fascism, the tactic of the Austrian Communist Party was stated to be the only correct one. Frey did not speak as the representative of the Austrian Communist Party.

Comrade Radek

We have just heard the comprehensive and deeply impressive report of Comrade Zetkin on International Fascism, that hammer meant to crush the head of the Proletariat, but which will fall upon the petty bourgeois class who are wielding it in the interests of large capital. I can neither supplement nor complete the speech of our venerable leader. I could not even follow it clearly, because there hovered before my eyes the corpse of German Fascism, our class enemy, which was sentenced to death and shot by the hirelings of French imperialism, that powerful organisation of another section of our class enemy. Throughout the speech of Comrade Zetkin on the contradictions within Fascism, the name of *Schlageter* and his tragic fate was in my head. We should remember him here when we are defining our attitude towards Fascism. The story of this martyr of German nationalism should not be forgotten nor passed over with a mere phrase. It has much to tell us, and much to tell the German people.

We are not sentimental romanticists who forget friendship when its object is dead, nor are we diplomats, who say: By the graveside say nothing but good, or remain silent. *Schlageter*, a courageous soldier of the counter-revolution, deserves to be sincerely honoured by us, the soldiers of the revolution. *Freksa*, who shared his views, published in 1920 a novel in which he described the life of an officer who fell in the fight against Spartacus. *Freksa* named his novel "The Wanderer into the Void".

If those German Fascisti, who honestly thought to serve the German people, failed to understand the significance of *Schlageter's* fate, *Schlageter* died in vain, and on his tombstone should indeed be inscribed: "The Wanderer into the Void".

Germany lay crushed. Only fools believed that the victorious capitalist Entente would treat the German people differently from the way the victorious German capitalists treated the Russian and Roumanian people. Only fools or cowards, who feared to face the truth, could believe in the promises of Wilson, in the declarations that the Kaiser and not the German people would have to pay the price of defeat. In the East a people was at war. Starving, freezing, it fought against the Entente on fourteen fronts. That was Soviet Russia. One of these fronts consisted of German officers and German soldiers. *Schlageter* fought in Medems, Volunteer Corps, which stormed Riga. We do not know whether the young officer understood the significance of his acts. But the then German Commissar, the Social-democrat Winnig, and General Von der Goltz, the Commander of the Baltic troops, knew what they were doing. They sought to gain the friendship of the Entente by performing the work of hirelings against the Russian people. In order that the German bourgeoisie should not pay the victors the indemnities of war, they hired young German blood, which had been spared the bullets of the Great War, to fight against the Russian people. We do not know what *Schlageter* thought at this period. His leader, Medem, later admitted that he marched through the Baltic into the void. Did all the German nationalists understand that? At the funeral of *Schlageter* in Munich, General Ludendorff spoke, the same Ludendorff who even today is offering himself to England and to France as the leader of a crusade against Russia. *Schlageter* was mourned by the Stinnes press. Herr Stinnes was the colleague in the Alpina Montana, of Schneider-Creuzot the armourer, the assassin of *Schlageter*. Against whom did the German people wish to fight: against the Entente capitalists or against the Russian people? With whom did they wish to ally themselves: with the Russian workers and peasants, in order

to throw off the yoke of Entente capital or for the enslavement of the German and Russian peoples?

Schlageter is dead. He cannot supply the answer. His comrades in arms swore to carry on his fight at his graveside. They must supply the answer: against whom and on whose side?

Schlageter went from the Baltic to the Ruhr, not in the year 1923 but in the year 1920. Do you know what that meant? He took part in the attack of German capital upon the Ruhr workers; he fought in the ranks of the troops whose task was to bring the miners of the Ruhr under the heel of the iron and coal kings. The troops of Waters, in whose ranks he fought, fired the same leaden bullets with which General Degoutte quelled the Ruhr workers. We have no reason to believe that it was from selfish motives that Schlageter helped to subdue the starving miners.

The manner in which he chose to die speaks on his behalf, and proves that he was convinced he was serving the German people. But Schlageter thought he was best serving the people by helping to restore the mastery of the class which had hitherto led the German people, and had brought such terrible misfortune upon them. Schlageter regarded the working class as the mob that must be governed. And in this he shared the view of Count Reventlow, who calmly declared that no war against the Entente was possible until the internal enemy has been overcome. The internal enemy for Schlageter was the revolutionary working class. Schlageter could see the profound mistrust of the workers towards the German government and the German bourgeoisie. He could see how the deep cleavage in the nation hampered its defensive power. He could see more. Those who share his views complained of the passivity of the German people. How can a defeated working class be active? How can a working class be active which has been disarmed, and from whom it was demanded that they should allow themselves to be exploited by profiteers and speculators? Or should the activity of the German working masses be replaced by the activity of the German bourgeoisie? Schlageter read in the newspapers how the very people who pretended to be the patrons of the German nationalist movement, sent securities abroad so that they might be enriched and the rich impoverished. Schlageter certainly could have no hope in these parasites, and he was spared reading in the press how the representative of the German bourgeoisie, Dr. Lutterbeck, turned to his executioners with the request that they should permit the iron and steel kings to shoot down sons of Germany, the men who were carrying out the resistance on the Ruhr, with machine guns.

Now, that the German resistance, through the rascally trick of Dr. Lutterbeck, and still more through the economic policy of the possessing classes, has been turned into a farce, we ask the honest, patriotic masses who are anxious to fight against the French imperialist invasion: How will you fight, on whose support will you rely? The struggle against Entente imperialism is a war, even though the guns are silent. There can be no war at the front when there is unrest in the rear. A minority can be kept under in the rear, but not a majority. The majority of the German people are the working men, who must fight against the poverty and want which the German bourgeoisie is bringing upon them. If the patriotic circles of Germany do not make up their minds to make the cause of the majority of the nation their own, and so create a front against both Entente and German capital, then the path of Schlageter was the path into the void, and Germany, in the face of foreign invasion and the perpetual menace of the victors, will be transformed into a field of bloody internal conflict, and it will be easy for the enemy to defeat her and destroy her.

When, after Jena, Gneisenau and Scharnhorst asked themselves how the German people were to be raised from their defeat, they replied: only by making the peasants free. From submission and slavery shall come freedom. Only the free German peasantry can lay the foundations for the emancipation of Germany. What the German peasantry meant for the fate of the German nation at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the German working class means at the beginning of the twentieth century. Only by it can Germany be freed from the fetters of slavery, and not against it.

Schlageter's comrades talked of war at his graveside. They swore to continue the fight. It had to be conducted against an enemy that was armed to the teeth, while Germany was unarmed and beaten. If the talk of war is not to remain an empty phrase, if it is not to consist of bombing columns that blow up bridges, but not the enemy; that derail trains, but cannot check the armoured trains of Entente capital, then a number of conditions must be fulfilled. It demands that the German people should break with those who have not only led it into defeat, but who are perpetuating the defeat and the defencelessness of

the German people by regarding the majority of the German people as the enemy. Only when the German cause becomes the cause of the German people, only when the German cause becomes the fight for the rights of the German people, will the German people win active friends. The most powerful nation cannot endure without friends, all the more so a nation which is defeated and surrounded by enemies. If Germany wants to be in the position to fight it must create a united front of workers, and the brain workers must unite with the hand workers, and form a solid phalanx. The condition of the brain workers cries out for this union. Only old prejudices stand in the way. United into a victorious working people, Germany will be able to draw upon great sources of resisting power which will be able to remove all obstacles. If the cause of the people is made the cause of the nation, then the cause of the nation will become the cause of the people. United into a fighting nation of workers, it will gain the assistance of other people who are also fighting for their existence. Whoever is not prepared to fight in this way is capable of deeds of desperation but not of a serious struggle.

This is what the German Communist Party and the Communist International have to say at Schlageter's graveside. It has nothing to conceal, for only the complete truth can penetrate into the suffering, internally disintegrated masses of Germany. The German Communist Party must declare openly to the nationalist petty bourgeois masses: Whoever is working in the service of the profiteers, the speculators and the iron and coal magnates, to enslave the German people and to drive them into desperate adventures, will meet with the resistance of the German Communist Workers. They will oppose violence by violence. Whoever, from lack of comprehension, allies himself with hirelings of capital, we shall fight with every means in our power. But we believe that the great majority of the nationalist minded masses belong not to the camp of the capitalists but to the camp of the Workers. We want to find, and we shall find, the path to these masses. We shall do all in our power to make men like Schlageter, who are prepared to go to their deaths for a common cause, not wanderers into the void, but wanderers into a better future for the whole of mankind; that they should not spill their hot, unselfish blood for the profit of the coal and iron barons, but in the cause of the great toiling German people, which is a member of the family of peoples fighting for their emancipation. This truth the Communist Party will declare to the great masses of the German people, for it is not a Party fighting for a crust of bread on behalf of the industrial Workers, but a Party of the struggling proletariat, fighting for its emancipation; an emancipation that is identical with the emancipation of the whole people, of all who toil and suffer in Germany. Schlageter himself cannot now hear this declaration, but we are convinced that there are hundreds of Schlageters who will hear it and understand it.

Concluding Speech of Clara Zetkin:

We may look back on this debate with satisfaction. Its level was much higher than that of the Hamburg Congress. There, the question was not dealt with theoretically at all, and practically it ended in a call to fight the communists. The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse's tail, a Bureau that is to collide material. Only the Hungarian, Kunfy, and Wels, one of the foremost assassins of the proletariat, took part in the debate. Their wisdom amounted to this: if there were no communists there would be no Fascism.

The debate has born out my statement that Fascism must be fought and conquered not only militarily but also politically and intellectually. The speakers supplemented my review of the situation. Smeral gave a particularly good analysis of the situation. Radek's speech moved me greatly. Serra expressed the opinion that there was no contradiction between the former attitude of Fascism and its present conduct. This in itself is correct. But in the imagination of the masses, between what was represented to them by Fascism and what Fascism has actually accomplished, there exists a mighty contradiction, and that must be insisted upon. Serra is of the opinion that a boycott of Fascism would be valueless. This demand was put forward by the Frankfurt Conference, and we must adhere to it however great the difficulties are. Italian industry is built up exclusively upon foreign coal and iron. If the boycott has the slightest success, the capitalists will feel the effects. Italy imports a considerable quantity of American cereals. The boycott will in itself not be of much significance. It will however rouse up the workers of the boycotting countries. It must moreover be remarked that this demand was advanced by a conference at which representatives of all parties and industries participated. This conference

was the first success of our united front tactics, and we should therefore be very slow to neglect its demands. The boycott of Horthy's Hungary also did not give the results desired, but it however served to arouse the workers. It appears that, apart from Germany, very little has yet been done practically in the fight against fascism. The best of theory is valueless if it is not accompanied by practice. The standing armies are the hotbeds of Fascism and our agitation must be carried into the armies. We must also win over to our side those elements who sympathise with Fascism in good faith. We, who are not marching into the void, but into a bright future, must reveal this future to the sincere elements amongst the Fascists. We must strive to bring the fight home to every single soul. If we do that, we can confidently cry: Though the world be full of devils, we shall overcome them all! (Enthusiastic applause.)

Comrade Bucharin's Report on the Program Question

It is my duty to report to you on the position of the work on the question of the program of the Comintern. The Fourth Congress did not go very deeply into this question. It simply demanded that the partial demands should be referred to in the first part of the program. Consequently, general lines were lacking on which to base the discussion. The Enlarged Executive is to give directions to all the parties upon which the question should be discussed.

In my opinion, the Executive must decide how the program shall be constructed, whether there should be a compulsory common section for all parties or not. In my opinion it would be advisable that all the parties should have such a common section. That was also the unanimous opinion of the Fourth Congress. This common section was to be the symbol that we are on the way to becoming a world party. This, to a certain degree, is already the case, for the Comintern has already adopted innumerable resolutions and these common to all our parties.

This common section of the program was to consist of an analysis of capitalism, the development of imperialism, a description of our maximum program, a description of our transitional demands, and of the partial demands based on the decision of the Fourth Congress. So far we have three drafts of a program; one which I drew up, another from the German Party, and another from Comrade Varga. Certain rather important theoretical differences exist between these three drafts. The German draft is based on the views of Comrade Luxemburg on the accumulation of capital. They are of the opinion that the scientific exposition of the breakdown of capitalism can only be made with the aid of her theory. I do not share this view. According to whether we share this view or not we shall have to give the introductory common section of our program a specific framework. A lively discussion over this theory has already taken place in the Russian Party. I cannot go into a discussion of this theory because Comrade Thalheimer, the representative of the Luxemburg theory of the accumulation of capital is not here.

Since the Fourth Congress certain incidents have occurred in the life of the Comintern and its Sections which make the introduction of certain special points necessary. One of these questions is the national question to which we must attach greater significance than heretofore. Another, of which we have spoken hardly at all, is the question of philosophy (Weltanschauung). I also regard it as necessary that we should formulate in detail our Marxist materialist standpoint and also indicate our attitude towards religion.

I now come to three questions which are bound up together and which are of a rather delicate nature. These are the so-called red imperialism, the possibility of the alliance of the proletarian States with bourgeois States, and workers' capitalism and workers' imperialism. These questions must be mentioned in the general section of the program. A program must contain directing principles, not only adapted to the present, but also for some fairly long time ahead. The conditions prevailing in Germany are a symptom of further development, and indicate what the future may bring. Strife may arise between bourgeois States, there may arise struggles for national emancipation on the part of defeated bourgeois States, or of colonial peoples, or there may arise struggles of the proletarian and peasant classes against their oppressors. The question of assistance from already existing proletarian States for the revolutionary proletariat of the other States is, as far as the very near future is concerned, only a theoretical question. In the more distant future it will certainly be more than a theoretical question. We have already had such a case arise in Georgia. The problem of alliance between proletarian States and bourgeois States must also be

considered. For instance, Soviet Russia supported Turkey at Lausanne, and no Communist Party thought of criticising her for it. Or take the case of the government of Sun Yat Sen. We are supporting Sun Yat Sen although he will certainly not create a proletarian government, but rather a bourgeois revolutionary government. All these examples give rise to the possibility of various combinations, which must all be considered under the general problem of the strategy of the proletarian state.

We are compelled to widen greatly our point of view. We have already seen this practically in the present assembly over the question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. First we had to build up parties consisting of the best proletarian elements. Then we transformed these parties into mass parties. Now we are trying to win over the followers of the Social-democrats. As time goes on we shall be faced with still wider problems. When the proletarian State comes into being, the question immediately arises, whether or not it is to be the rallying point of all oppressed elements, i. e. not merely the proletariat. As capitalism decays it will become more and more apparent that the already existing proletarian States will become the rallying point of all the oppressed.

I must now turn to a point about which Comrade Treint has written several articles. He says he is in favor of labor imperialism. What is imperialism? Does it not mean expansion? Imperialism has no other end than to extend those conditions which place the whole world under the domination of a clique of finance capitalists. Labor imperialism implies that the working class would undertake the expansion of finance-capitalist relations. This would be absurd. Furthermore, such a terminology is capable of creating considerable confusion in the heads of the Workers. The expansion of Socialism is another matter. I am of the opinion that in the general section of our program, the question of the rising proletarian States as concentration points of all oppressed peoples should be placed under the heading of the Strategy of Proletarian States.

The question of partial demands should also be placed in the program in connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Government. We must make the assertion in our program that a lasting, independent peasant government is impossible. Only the domination of the bourgeoisie or the domination of the proletariat is possible. The fight between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat will, in the long run, become a fight for the leadership of the peasantry.

I now want to make some practical suggestions. The Executive should decide that all the parties of the Communist International should supply the following material: an analysis of the situation in their countries in the present period, not from the standpoint of the immediate state of affairs, but with reference to a fairly long period. All parties should draw up a list of their partial demands, which will of course vary according to country. In relation to the question of the general strategy of the working class, material must be supplied us as to the relations between our parties and other parties. Our campaign for the United Front must be mentioned in the draft program, on the basis of existing facts. The various national Sections of the Comintern should send us the drafts of their national programs, and in addition, should criticise the already existing drafts and any subsequent proposals. I would propose that we should here elect a small commission consisting of three or four comrades to elaborate the material received from all the parties.

This Commission should get into relations with the parties, for which purpose each Section should appoint a comrade to be responsible for this work. I note that drafts for a British and a Japanese program already exist. The British draft will have to be specially considered, while this present meeting cannot decide as to the Japanese draft, since it contains a general section, the adoption of which will depend upon our decisions for the general section of other programs. I therefore propose the following resolution:

The Enlarged Executive Committee considers it necessary that the programs of all the parties should contain a common general section.

Furthermore, the Enlarged Executive Committee regards it as desirable that references should be made in the program to the following subjects: Communist philosophy (Marxian materialism, relations to religions, etc.), the national question, the strategy of proletarian states, Workers' and Peasants' Government.

Every party should collect and place at the disposal of the Executive Committee, material on the following subjects: 1. For an analysis of the contemporary situation in the country. 2. For the drawing up of partial demands. 3. On the relations with other labor parties. 4. Suggestions for the section of the pro-

gram dealing with the national question. 5. Criticism of the already received suggestions for the general section and of such suggestions as may be received in future.

Every party should appoint a comrade to be responsible for this work.

The Enlarged Executive Committee shall appoint a small commission, the work of which shall be:

1. To establish relations with other parties.
2. To initiate and lead the discussion on the program.
3. To draw up a proposal for the general section of the programs for the Fifth Congress upon the basis of the material received, as well as on the basis of the views of our national sections.

The Report was adopted without discussion.

Tenth Day of Session

June 22, 1923.

The Session was opened at 4 p. m. Comrade Böttcher was in the chair. The agenda was: Report of the Commissions.

Sirom (Sweden):

The Danish Commission is of the unanimous opinion that there are no vital differences in Denmark between the two Communist Parties, but mainly a few organisational and personal differences. We think, that the resolutions of the Commissions will meet with the approval of both Parties, and that they will again unite. Notwithstanding the great difficulties in Denmark, the Danish comrades by joining our forces, are sure to be successful in their work. The resolution submitted by the Danish Commission to the Enlarged Executive is as follows:

Resolution on the Danish Question

The Enlarged Executive endorses the decisions of the Fourth Congress which, inter alia, demanded the unification of all the communists in Denmark into one Party.

The Enlarged Executive recognises that the process of rapprochement during the last few months has made progress, but a relatively large number of Danish comrades still stand apart from the Danish section of the Communist International.

In accordance with the proposal of the representatives of the Danish and Swedish sections of the Communist International, and in consideration of the rapprochement already made, and also finally to overcome the split, the Enlarged Executive calls upon the Communist Party of Denmark (section of the Communist International) to call upon the so-called old Party to unite with the Communist International.

In order to facilitate reunion the Enlarged Executive declares that at the time unification takes place the conditions that have been applied to the ex-members Ernst, Christianson and Helberg are to be withdrawn.

The Enlarged Executive instructs the Danish section immediately to proceed with the work of reunification and requests both sides to complete the unification by the 1st September, 1923.

The settlement of the details of organisation is left to the organisations affected. These, however, must be endorsed by the Presidium of the Executive.

The Resolution was put to the vote without discussion and carried unanimously.

Report on the Norwegian Question Ewert (Germany):

The Commission on the limits of centralism, had decided on the following resolution on the Norwegian question, all those present (except the representative of the Swedish Party) voting for it. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution on the Norwegian Question

I.

The Enlarged Executive takes note of the following declaration made by Comrade Radek at the Conference of the Norwegian Party, held on the 5th. and 6th. January, 1923.

"It has never been the aim of the Executive to deprive the Communist Parties of their independence. It has always understood that the International cannot be strong unless the Communist Parties independently, from their own knowledge and with their own will, conduct a correct Communist policy. Unfortunately, the situation in the Communist International is that the Communist Parties of various countries have departed from the correct path towards the right or towards the left. It is consequently necessary that the International Congress, and the Executive Committee elected by it, should interfere and attempt to correct these errors on the basis of the common

experience of the International working class movement. The Executive Committee has never believed that this can be done simply by resolutions of the Executive Committee, but that its resolutions will be put into practice only if the mass of the membership of the Party are convinced of the correctness of the attitude of the Executive Committee.

I therefore declare that any fears that may exist that the decisions of the Fourth Congress represent the beginning of the successive withdrawal of the independence of the national Sections are entirely unfounded. The Norwegian Party, like every other Section of the Communist International, is entitled to arrange and conduct its own affairs independently. Only if events lead the Executive Committee to believe that the decisions of the Norwegian Labor Party are not correct or Communist decisions, has it the right and the duty to intervene. In such cases it will place itself in contact with the Norwegian Party, will go into a thorough examination of the differences of opinion, and will base its decision upon all the material available. The Norwegian Party will then have to adopt these decisions, since if one is to belong to the International its decisions must be carried out. The Norwegian Party can always appeal from the decisions of the Executive Committee to the International Congress, which is the highest authority for all Communists and all Communist Parties. If there is to be an International at all, there can be neither absolute International centralism, nor absolute party independence. The independence of the Sections on the basis and within the framework of the Communist International is essential both in the interests of the Norwegian and the international working class movement".

The Executive Committee endorses this declaration.

The Executive Committee takes note of the following declaration made in the name of its delegation by Comrade Bucharin at the Congress of the Norwegian Party, held on February 23 rd., 1923:

"In the name of the Executive Committee we confirm the declarations made by our Comrade Radek.

We consider it desirable that at the next meeting of the Enlarged Executive, in addition to the members elected by the Fourth Congress, there should be sent another responsible comrade having a consultative vote representing the tendencies of Comrade Tranmael.

We declare that at the next meeting of the Enlarged Executive, as an exceptional measure in view of the severe crisis within the Norwegian Party, that two Norwegian comrades (Scheflo and another responsible comrade representing the Tranmael tendency) should be appointed members of the Executive with one vote between them.

As, in view of the decisions of the World Congress of the Communist International that the Norwegian Party should send two other comrades in addition to Comrade Scheflo to the Enlarged Executive, the Delegation insists that Comrade Tranmael should be delegated to this meeting.

The Delegation of the Communist International is of the opinion that the minority within the Central Committee of the Party as also upon the editorial staff of the Central Party organ should be represented, independently of which fraction obtains a majority at the National Congress".

The Executive Committee ratifies the decisions made by the Presidium on the basis of the above declaration. The Enlarged Executive Committee ratifies the decisions of the Presidium with regard to the representatives of the Communist International, the desirability of previous discussion with the Parties on important questions, with regard to the officials of the Communist International, the correspondence between the Communist International and the Parties, etc. All these decisions will help to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings. The Enlarged Executive approves the policy of the Executive Committee on the question of the Norwegian Party. It approves that the Executive Committee, in pursuance of the principles of organisation of the Communist International, and in view of maintaining a centralised

leadership of the proletarian class war, has kept in view the gradual transformation of the Norwegian Party and its historical peculiarities, and has made concessions to the majority of the Party which will make it clear to every Norwegian worker that the Communist International attaches the greatest importance to maintaining the courageous Norwegian Party within its ranks, in spite of its deviations on organisational and political questions. While approving the conciliatory policy of the Executive Committee, the Enlarged Executive Committee desires to express its firm conviction that the Norwegian Comrades for their part will do all in their power to enable the Norwegian Party to overcome its weaknesses and that it will in its organisation and policy pay full heed to the requirements of the modern class war as embodied in the decisions of the Communist International.

II.

The Enlarged Executive accordingly recommends the following proposals for organisation to the Norwegian Party:

a) The party leadership must take precautionary measures to prevent the "Mot Dag" group from becoming a fractional clique of leaders. To the extent that the "Mot Dag" busies itself with communist propaganda amongst students, it has a right to a separate organisational existence. But many leading comrades have attached themselves to "Mot Dag", who are not students, but who regard it as a club for the discussion of Party matters. The Communist International welcomes every attempt to strengthen the intellectual life of the Communist Parties; but this should not be done by separating the leaders from the Party rank and file in special discussion clubs together with young party intellectuals, and even less by separating one group of leaders from the rest. Discussions within the Party must take place in the general proletarian organisations, so that questions of party practice and questions of Communist philosophy do not become a secret science of a small group within the Party. The transformation of the "Mot Dag" group into a fractional club contains the danger that the other fractions will also form separate organisations involving the whole Party in the danger of disruption.

b) Practical work must be undertaken towards reorganising the Party. The Executive Committee is in complete agreement with the Norwegian Party in the view that the organisation of communists should be based upon the Party nuclei in industries. As to the question whether these nuclei should be local or based upon trade unions, the Enlarged Executive Committee makes the following declaration: As the Communist Party is an organisation for leading the general class war of the proletariat and not for leading the trade union struggle, which is the task of the trade unions themselves, the Executive Committee regards the local coordination of the nuclei as the only possible form of Party organisation. But of course it is understood that it must be left to the Party to decide in what manner and by what means the transition should be made from the present situation to a form of organisation which a Communist Party needs and demands.

c) As regards the question of the relations of the Party to the trade unions, the very separation of the Party organisations from the Trade Union organisations demands that the Norwegian Party should be all the more attentive, earnest and circumspect in its approaches to the Trade Unions. It is the duty of the Communists in the Trade Unions to see that they continue to develop in a Communist spirit. To this end the Communists must work in the Trade Unions under the leadership of the Central Committee of the Party which on its part must make its decisions in full contact with the comrades working in the Trade Unions. It is the duty of the Norwegian Party as well as of the communists in the Trade Unions to endeavour to secure the affiliation of the Norwegian Trade Unions to the Red International of Labour Unions.

d) With regard to the Youth Organisation, the latter, while remaining independent as an organisation, is under the political leadership of the Central Committee of the Party. It is self-understood that the Communist Youth has not only the right but the duty to concern itself earnestly with all questions affecting both the Party and the Communist International; to discuss them and, upon the basis of the conclusions reached, to adopt its policy. The Executive Committee requests the leaders of the Norwegian Party to adopt a sympathetic attitude towards the Youth organisation, which requires a considerable amount of intellectual freedom in order to educate its members.

III.

1. The Executive Committee welcomes the growth and consolidation of the Norwegian Party. Its growth, its influence upon the working class, its penetration into the official classes,

and into the so-called free professions, show that the sharpening of the struggle in Norway will enable the Party to extend its influence beyond the purely proletarian elements, i. e. to fulfill the tasks which are required of the proletariat as the leader of all who are oppressed and suffering. The social structure of Norway, the existence of a large population of poor fishermen and of very poor peasants, imposes the duty on the Party to increase their efforts tenfold in order to get these masses away from the influence of the bourgeois parties, who, under the mask of friendship towards the peasants, are conducting a policy in the interests of the large peasants and the banks. The Enlarged Executive is convinced that this penetration into the poor peasantry will facilitate organisation partly in the ranks of the Norwegian Labour Party, partly in the peasant organisations who are prepared to fight in a united front with the Labour Party, and that we are not seeking for any predominance of the working class over the interests of the poor peasantry but together with them desire to represent the toiling and exploited populations of the town and country.

The Executive Committee notes the fear of a majority of the Norwegian Delegation that the slogan of a Workers' and Peasants' Government would not be without certain dangers in Norway. The general resolution of the Executive Committee on the slogan indeed indicates these dangers. The dangers are that the fight for the peasant masses and their permeation and organisation may be replaced by a parliamentary combination with reactionary peasant parties. But the party can easily avoid these dangers if it carries its propaganda into the broad masses of the peasantry, and, by corresponding action in parliament and in the country, compels the bourgeois peasant parties to adopt or reject its proposals made in the interests of a poor peasantry, and to express their attitude on the question of a Workers' and Peasants' Government, which implies a break with the bourgeoisie. In this way the differentiation of the peasant parties and the united front with the masses of the poor peasantry can only be furthered.

In view of the doubts of the representatives of the majority of the Norwegian Comrades about the slogan of the Workers' and Peasants' Government, the Executive Committee declares that although it regards these fears as unfounded, it calls upon the Party to first have this question discussed throughout the broad masses of the country and only after such a discussion, to decide at the Party Congress how the slogan of the Communist International, the Workers' and Peasants' Government, is to be applied.

2. In view of the repeated complaints made by the Party majority, alleging that the Storthing Fraction carries on an opportunistic policy, the Executive Committee suggested to the Norwegian delegation to recall the Storthing Fraction, or part of its members. In this suggestion the Executive Committee was guided by the conviction that however useful to the interests of the development of communism might be the use of the parliamentary tribune, it may be possible under certain conditions to give up for some time the advantage of making use of parliamentarism, in order to ensure the unity of the Party upon revolutionary grounds and thus prepare the future revolutionary use of parliamentarism. The majority of the Norwegian delegation opposed the recall of the entire Storthing fraction, and not only did it see the interest of the party in the existence of a Communist Fraction in the Storthing, but it also added that it considered on the whole the charges against the Storthing Fraction were exaggerated. While the majority of the Fraction proposed to the party executive to recall individual members of the Storthing fraction, it thereby only granted to the Party Executive a privilege which had naturally belonged to the latter already. If indeed there were individual comrades in the Fraction who carried on opportunistic policies, the Executive can only regret that the Party Executive has failed to avail itself of the privilege, and the hope is hereby expressed that, in the future, clear revolutionary instructions will be given the Storthing Fraction, which will not only prevent any possibility of conflict between the Fraction and the Party, but will also bring about the closest association between the work of the Storthing Fraction and the struggle of the masses of the proletariat.

3. The Executive expresses its firm conviction that this solution of the Norwegian question allows the most independent development of the opportunities for the Norwegian Party to adhere firmly and surely to the international front of the communist proletariat, and eventually to become part and parcel of the Communist International, without any reservation whatsoever. The Executive considers it as a matter of course, that the Norwegian comrades will submit any doubts that may still persist, to the Fifth Congress, with the distinct understanding that the idea will be given up once and for all of threatening a withdrawal from the Communist International, as has been the case

with some individual comrades, or any threat of producing a split in the Party, from whichever side it may emanate, and that the Party will develop into a Communist Party which will be allied with the Communist International for life and death.

Ewert (continuing):

This resolution embodies far reaching concessions, without infringing the principles of the Communist International. It also embodies a number of political concessions which will enable the Norwegian Party to adapt the watchwords of the Communist International to the concrete conditions prevailing in its country. We trust that the masses of the Norwegian Party will be satisfied with this resolution that they will get into closer contact with the Communist International and will overcome the opposition in their own ranks. We hope that they will take an active part in the construction of an efficient International. (Applause.)

Siröm (Sweden):

The Swedish Delegation made the following explanations and amendment proposals to the resolution before the Commission, and we intend to support here this explanation and these proposals:

1. We welcome the concessions embodied in the resolution, and the said decisions in connection with certain organisational questions. But we reserve to the Swedish Party the right to support at the World Congress certain amendments to the statutes of the International proposed by the Norwegian Party.

2. In connection with the question of the "Mot Dag", we propose that this affair be considered liquidated by the decision of the Norwegian Party Congress.

3. In connection with the relations between the Youth Leagues and the Parties, we agree that the Youth Leagues are entitled to discuss the affairs of the Party, if such discussion is taking place in the Party. But we demand unconditional acceptance of all Party decisions by the Youth Leagues. The Young Communist International must be forbidden to carry on through the Youth Leagues propaganda directed against Parties or Party leaders, or to support propaganda of such a nature as to convert the Youth Movement into an organised fraction within the Party. In the event of a conflict between a Party and the Executive, efforts must be made to settle such a conflict without interference on the part of the Youth Leagues as an Organisation. The Youth are entitled, as Party members, to work for the popularisation of their conception within the Party organisations.

4. Concerning the attitude of the Norwegian Party to the Red Labour Union International, the Party must work, as hitherto, for adherence of the National Organisations to the Profintern, while keeping in view the necessity for maintaining Trade Union unity. The Party members must act as well disciplined communists in their trade union activities, which must be conducted on a uniform plan. This necessary collaboration between the leaders of the Party and the active trade union comrades, however, must be of such a nature as to remove even the semblance of hectoring on the part of the Party leaders, or of purely mechanical subordination on the other side.

5. We think that the watchword of Workers' and Peasants' Government is, in a political sense, as yet premature in Norway. The Communist Party must first of all conduct a comprehensive agitational and educational campaign among the proletarian sections within the Norwegian Peasant class, in order to capture these sections for the Party and for cooperation with the organised industrial workers, with the object of a joint struggle against bourgeois reaction and capitalist exploitation. The watchword of a Workers' and Peasants' Government must be taken in this sense. Every attempt to use this watchword for a parliamentary rapprochement between any one of the bourgeois parties and the Communist Parliamentary fraction, or for concessions to opportunist tendencies within the Party (which would weaken the revolutionary class struggle), must be most decidedly resisted. Now as before, the main task of the Party must be, with the support of the most important sections of the industrial working class, to rally the entire proletariat, and to organise it as a class for the direct economic and political liberation struggle.

Such are our amendments, which were rejected in the Commission.

We acknowledge that the proposal before us is satisfactory in many respects, but we cannot accept some of its points, especially those of the Youth question and of the "Mot Dag" question. If the voting is to be done en bloc, we must reject the proposal.

Falk (Norway):

He and two other Norwegian delegates, Hafmoe and Tranmael, wished to state that the Norwegian Party reserved itself the right to present proposals for the revision of the statutes of the International to the Fifth World Congress. They admitted that concessions were made but thought they ought to be incorporated in the statutes. The majority of the delegation objected to the principles of the concessions and to several practical proposals made. They would therefore vote against the resolution. They were of the opinion that the slogan of the Workers' and Peasants' Government should not apply to all the Communist Parties. They had, however, no objection to it being discussed in the Norwegian Party and being left to the Party Congress to decide. They also wished to declare that they did not specially criticise the parliamentary group with opportunist tendencies. Such tendencies were everywhere in the Party. The majority of the delegation could not vote for the resolution.

Continuing, the speaker said that Bucharin had criticised the delegation for not taking up a broad discussion of the measures proposed with regard to the Norwegian Party. The reason was that they were invited to discuss the boundary line of centralism and did not expect that definite proposals would be made.

They were aware that they were alone in the Congress, but were assured that they were not alone in the Communist movement and therefore they thought it advantageous for the movement to be given a chance to discuss these questions.

In spite of the accusations of opportunism, their outlook was not less revolutionary than that of the majority.

There was much talk of the danger of a split in the Party. The danger did not proceed from their fraction. It depended far more on the practical policy followed by the E.C. of the Comintern in the next few months and upon the acts of the opposition whether there would be a split or not.

Inkpin (Great Britain):

It is not the desire of the British Delegation to prolong the discussion. They desired to deny the statement by Comrade Falk that the views for which he and his colleagues stand have support in other sections of the International. No section of the International would lend support to these views. There was not a shred of evidence that such opinions were supported by the British Communist Party. The British delegation had instructed him to read the following declaration which had been accepted unanimously by them:

"The British Delegation, whose Party is presently under investigation by the Comintern, places on record its approval of the Executive decision in the case of the Scandinavian Parties. It trusts that the Scandinavian comrades will do their very utmost to put into complete effect these decisions, as the British Party will do in their own case, as there is no other way of cementing the bonds of comradeship throughout the Communist International than by its sections acting in loyal obedience to its decisions and in complete co-operation in its activities."

(Amter U.S.A.):

Comrade Falk had the insolence to state that he believed that he and his colleagues did not stand alone in their ideas in the Communist International. The demonstration from this Conference should convince Comrade Falk that he does stand absolutely alone.

Falk also said that the danger of a break would depend upon the practical acts of the Executive. This was the act of a provocateur who dared to come here with a charge of ill-faith against the Communist International. The Enlarged Executive had made great concessions, more concessions than Falk deserved. This resolution will have the effect of uniting those who are desirous of remaining in the Communist International and bring the workers of Norway under the banner and discipline of the Communist International.

Amter then read a declaration on behalf of the American and Canadian Delegates, approving the decision taken with regard to the Norwegian question and the principle of democratic centralism.

He continued that he was convinced that the Norwegian workers would accept democratic centralism not only as understood by the present Congress but by every section of the Communist International.

Falk (Norway):

Replying to the discussion, said that no threat of a split in the Norwegian Party had come from their side or arose from

anything they had said. The danger of a split arose from the activities of the opposition within the Party as well as from the activities of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Norwegian Delegation was united in this statement.

Stirner (South America):

The Norwegian comrades cannot have taken the possible consequences of their attitude into account. In the South American parties we have just finished debating that very subject of democratic centralism and with great difficulty defeated the anarchist and syndicalist tendencies. If the question of centralism and revision is not decided in the sense of the Communist International then the anarchist and syndicalist elements in the young party will again open the discussion. The South American parties will vote in favor of the Executive's resolution.

Ewert (Germany):

In the name of the Communist Parties of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, Finland, Yugoslavia, Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Poland, and of the Communist International, indignantly repudiated the assertion of Falk that the Norwegian Party did not stand alone in its point of view in the Communist International. These parties saw in the concealed threat of a split made by Falk an act of provocation which the Norwegian working class would most certainly reject. (Great applause).

Comrade Bottcher (Chairman) said:

The debate has shown clearly that Comrade Falk stands alone in his point of view and that no section of the Communist International shares it.

Zinoviev

Although Comrade Falk's last speech makes it difficult for me to make this proposal, I nevertheless suggest that in order to obtain a closer bond with the Scandinavian parties, another Scandinavian comrade be elected to the Presidium. The two Scandinavian representatives will share a vote between them. I would suggest that the Swedish and the Norwegian Parties should alternately send a comrade whose task should be to keep the Executive informed of the actual state of affairs in the Scan-

dinavian parties. I hope that this proposal will be adopted in spite of the provocative speech of Comrade Falk.

The discussion has shown that Comrade Falk stands absolutely alone in his point of view in the Communist International. If he deliberately set out to emphasise his isolation, he has succeeded brilliantly. As to the threat of a split, I must repeat what I had already said more than once in the Commission. We know Comrade Tranmael to be a comrade who has fought for many years in the labour movement and who will remain faithful to the labour movement. Of Comrade Falk we know nothing. But we know from frequent experience that intellectual left-radicals like him end up on the side of the bourgeoisie. I do not know whether Comrade Falk is entitled to make the threat of a split in the name of the Norwegian Party. But we are not so easily intimidated. Many a man who started out to make a similar split is now a political corpse. (Applause). If he is determined to pursue this path, then let us assure him that he may be able to play a part amongst the Social democrats, but not with us. The Norwegian workers will not give him the opportunity to play with the fate of the Party. Long live the unity of the Norwegian Party. (Loud and prolonged applause. The delegates spontaneously strike up the International.)

Furubotn (Norway):

As chairman of the Norwegian Young Communist League stated that the Norwegian youth movement regarded it as its duty to prevent a split and they would do everything in their power to hinder the Party breaking away from the Communist International. The Norwegian Working Class were in favour of intensifying the class war and they would feel the fist of capitalism just as the Workers of other countries do. In such a situation every honest and revolutionary worker, even those that were not in the Young Communist League, would regard it as his duty to prepare, in conjunction with the Communist International, the Workers for the coming struggle and the coming revolution.

The Chairman-Böttcher

hereupon put the resolution on the Norwegian question to the vote in toto. Amidst loud applause it was adopted by the votes of all the delegates against the votes of the Scandinavian Delegates.

After the proposal of Comrade Zinoviev for the appointment of another Scandinavian Comrade to the Presidium was adopted unanimously, and after Comrade Neurath had made certain business announcements, the Session was adjourned.