

English Edition**Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint****- INTERNATIONAL -**

Vol. 5 No. 38

PRESS24th April 1925**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

Meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the C. I. Concluding Speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

Twelfth Session. — April 4th, 1925.

The Incorrect Conclusions Drawn from our Estimation and the Rejoicings in the Camp of the Enemy.

Comrades, in delivering the report of the Executive Committee, we spoke not only of the **economic stabilisation of the Soviet Union**, but also of the **partial stabilisation of capitalism in certain countries of Europe**. Apparently, the latter part of our statement has caused quite a sensation almost everywhere in Europe, and also among certain circles in Moscow. The phenomenon of a relative, partial stabilisation of capitalism, as you see, is causing miracles to happen. In certain bourgeois circles, and I include here the German Social Democracy, the sensation has been particularly great. Voices of rejoicing are heard: thank god there will be no more revolutions. A leaflet issued by the Social Democrats during the recent presidential elections in Germany commenced with the words: "World Communist revolution is impossible, Zinoviev has admitted this".

The Communist International is confronted by new and rather difficult circumstances.

Certain of our comrades are already inclined to exaggerate and to draw false conclusions from these statements concerning the partial stabilisation of capitalism in certain European countries.

In speaking of a partial revival of capitalism, we do not in the least abandon our general conception, which claims, that, commencing with 1917, we have entered into a **period of world revolution**. Apparently, some are beginning to forget this. Our starting point is the old one. Even now we consider that the present period is a **period of proletarian revolution** which achieved its first victory in 1917.

The Class Struggle of Recent Years is Saturated with the Elements of Civil War.

Already attempts are being made to interpret our statement on the partial consolidation of capitalism in certain European countries as meaning, that revolution has been re-

duced to zero. Those people who love to exaggerate, would do well to take a cold douch. This will enable them to understand that Europe is not the whole world, and Germany is not the whole of Europe. It must not be forgotten, that in speaking of the absence of a direct revolutionary situation in Germany, we have in mind only the present moment. Why do we assert the absence of a direct revolutionary situation in Germany? Because not more than eighteen months ago, a revolutionary situation **did exist** in Germany, but changes have taken place. These have to be calculated. But this does not mean that revolution in Germany has been liquidated.

Even the bourgeoisie would not assert that capitalism has returned to the "normal" pre-war position. But even if it were to admit such an exaggeration, the question would then arise, what was the situation before the war? There were preparations for war, there was a class war, gradually becoming acute to the degree of civil war. At the present moment there is no direct civil war in Europe, but there is unceasing class war; and class war in the post-war epoch is not less acute than in pre-war times. On the contrary, the class war in almost every European country after the war, has become saturated with the elements of civil war. In what way is the class war of 1925 different to the class war of 1910, 1912, 1913. Is it that they are more peaceful in character? In my opinion quite the contrary is the case, the class war of the present day is more saturated with elements of civil war and bears a much more acute character than that of pre-war times.

Imperialism Restrained by Fear of the Comintern.

We will admit for the moment that capitalism has become consolidated to the extent that it has returned to the "normal" pre-war position. Even if this is true, it is not a secret for a Marxist that the class struggle was extremely acute before the war, and that even then, in places, it assumed the character of civil war, echoes of which were long heard all over the world.

Comrades, it is already six years since Europe has ceased fighting. This implies something. We cannot foretell when fresh wars will break out, but the whole capitalist system, even with its temporary stabilisation, is a guarantee that they will break out. The imperialists are a little afraid of the Communist International, the vanguard of the world proletariat. This is seen from the manner in which they and their lackeys, the Social Democrats, reacted to our statement concerning the absence of a direct revolutionary situation in certain countries. Clearly, these gentlemen do not feel very firmly in the saddle. They fear to rouse the demons of war, for they have to ponder very, very deeply over what forces the Communist International can throw into the scale at the outbreak of war; they must think very deeply over the reply the vanguard of the world proletariat is likely to give to the declaration of war. They know that we have now not one Liebknecht, but thousands and thousands of Liebknechts.

Comrades, it may be said that imperialism, which now reigns over the world, is somewhat restrained by fear of the Communist International, of the vanguard of the world proletariat. We shall come across this fact, more than once in the process of the future development of events.

Hence comrades, in order to avoid misunderstanding, I must repeat what I said in my report. If we take, not only Europe, not only one corner of it, say Germany — although this corner is extremely important — if, I say, we take the map of the world as a whole, we will have to regard the position as being objectively revolutionary. In certain parts of the world, the situation is becoming acute with considerable rapidity.

"Stabilisation" in Great Britain and the Pessimism of Lloyd George.

Comrades, while our debates were taking place here, an extremely interesting debate was taking place in the British House of Commons, in which Lloyd George the other day spoke about stabilisation in Great Britain. What did Lloyd George say: The "Times" of the 27th of March, reports him as follows:

"He (Lloyd George) sees no symptoms of genuine economic restoration. If the Honourable members read the economic supplements of the "Times", "Manchester Guardian" and the "Daily News", three newspapers of radically different characters, they will observe that all three regard the future with extreme pessimism If the situation does not alter in the future, he would not care to say what would happen. He did not think this state of affairs was the result of the capitalist system, but unless a way out is found, the workers will come to the conclusion that it is the result of the capitalist system. He was not a pessimist, but unless a radical change comes about, disaster is inevitable."

This is what Lloyd George said in the debate in the House of Commons on March 26.

Great Britain is the bulwark of capitalism in Europe, and even there we hear statements like this.

The Situation in France, the Balkans and in Poland.

Now take a country like France. Has stabilisation come about in France? Lloyd George has to confess that stabilisation is coming about in England rather slowly, but for France even this cannot be said either in the political or the economic spheres.

Has equilibrium been established in the Balkans? It does not seem like it, comrades. Of course, the fact that the situation in Central Europe has ceased, at the moment, to be directly revolutionary to a certain degree is reflected in the Balkans. But there is no stabilisation in the Balkans. And the Balkans are of enormous significance for Europe. During the world war they played a very important role.

And Poland: has stabilisation come about there? Certainly not. The whole picture of life in Poland is a howling denial of such an assertion.

The Dawes Plan and Temporary Stabilisation in Germany.

As for Germany, I believe we all equally appreciate the significance of the Dawes Plan and the inevitable conse-

quences of its application in Germany. We consider that the symptoms of stabilisation now observed in Germany are passing symptoms, and that there also, a fresh acute situation will arise. To be precise, we should say: stabilisation in Germany commenced in 1924, and now we observe certain results from this, but at the same time we observe a certain revival of and acuteness in the class struggle. Of course, I may be asked, why we did not say in 1924 that the situation in Germany has become stabilised. My reply will be, comrades, that it is impossible to determine dates with precision. It is not surprising that Lenin, right up to 1907 inclusively, insisted that the Second Russian revolution would come very quickly. Now after the event, it is clear that the first Russian revolution ended in December 1905 and that the years 1908, 1909 and 1910 were marked by a certain "stabilisation" of Russian czarism, monarchy and of the classes which served as its mainstays. But the only revolutionary party in Europe — the Bolsheviks — throughout the whole of 1905 and almost the whole of 1907 continued to insist that we were on the eve of a second revolution. The Bolsheviks knew and Lenin stressed this, that not only objective factors determined the situation, but that much depended upon the working class itself, on the working class parties, etc., i. e., on subjective factors. The duty of a revolutionary is to throw into the scale all forces, until it is proved that quantity has become converted into quality, that the enemy has become stabilised, and that other paths must be sought.

History Reveals Acceleration of Revolutionary Development.

How long will the present stabilisation last? What period of time will it embrace in Germany and in other countries? No one can say exactly. We can merely try to probe for an answer by comparing various phenomena. The acceleration of world revolutionary development is much more rapid nowadays than it has been before. This we all see. If we turn to historical revolutionary dates we will see that sixty years separate the great French Revolution of 1789 from the revolution of 1848. Progress was more rapid from that event to the Paris Commune of 1871. A little over 20 years separate the two. A little longer period separates the revolution of 1905 from 1871. The period between 1905 and 1917 is considerably less, and in recent years 1917—1925 the last eight years development is proceeding very rapidly although not as rapidly as we would desire. How long will this twist-revolutionary zone last? From 1917 to what year? No one can give an exact reply. But the general line of progress is clear. The flight of history is becoming more and more accelerated. The rate of historical development generally, the rate of revolutionary development in general is becoming more and more rapid.

What is the general political position of the working class to-day? I had occasion to hear dolorous stories regarding certain countries. On the grounds that a direct revolutionary situation does not exist in certain countries, some declare that the working class is beaten and broken up and that years will be required until it will again rally its forces.

The Working Class in Previous Revolutionary Epochs.

Compare the general position of the working class to-day with its position in previous revolutionary epochs. In the struggle of 1848, the first outbursts of the proletarian movement were so completely drowned in the blood of the workers, that a whole generation was required before the revolutionary movement revived. Then came the Paris Commune. After the defeat of the Paris Commune, it was impossible to find a working class family that was not bereaved. The state of discouragement of the French proletariat was enormous. Nevertheless, hardly a decade passed before the French workers again rose to the struggle. Ten years after the Paris Commune, the French Labour movement had recovered from the blows it had received. Recall the revolution in Russia of 1905. It too, was crushed and drowned in the blood of the workers. A serious crisis arose. The working class of Russia had to meet a stern enemy, but hardly a decade passed and the Russian proletariat was again on its feet and victoriously carrying on the fight.

The Working Class is not Defeated.

Turn now to **Germany**. Take the years 1918—1923. The German proletariat in that period fought for revolution. The fight went on not in a steadily rising line, but with interruptions, severe losses and so on. Taking the European labour movement as a whole, the severest losses were suffered by the German proletariat during this time. But what do we observe today in Germany, a country passing through the zone of a certain stabilisation of capitalism. Do we observe in the working class there anything similar to the state of complete discouragement and despair as we observed in 1848 and 1871? Nothing of the kind. Considerable sections of the working class of Germany have retained their courage, have not lost stamina and under most difficult conditions unhesitatingly are following the Communist Party.

And what of other countries — **France, Czechoslovakia and Poland**? Do we see there a defeated and crushed proletariat, which may arise for revolution only after many years? Nothing of the kind, the situation is quite different. The working class has only attempted to bring about revolution, but it has not yet fought the decisive battle. Not in a single country in Europe has the working class been so utterly defeated in battle that we shall have to wait for a new generation to grow up. We see merely that the forces of the working class have not yet matured sufficiently to win a victory over the bourgeoisie, but under no circumstance can it be said that the working class has lost its leaders, has been defeated, crushed and drowned in the waves of white terror. The situation is altogether different in **Hungary or Finland** where White Terror reigned. But — and this is worth mentioning — even in countries like Hungary, Finland and Esthonia, in spite of the terror that has raged, only a few years are needed in order that the workers may rise to the battle again.

Comrades, I say all this in order to warn you against an incorrect estimation of the present political situation and the state of the International labour movement. We may admit that in a country where a year ago the revolutionary cauldron was seething, the situation today has ceased to be revolutionary. But this fact must not serve as an excuse for discouragement in our ranks, it should not lead us to believe that the whole of our generation of the working class has been crushed as was the case in 1848 and in 1871.

The Working Class has a Strong Revolutionary Rear — the USSR.

I have written down seven points describing the peculiar features of the present moment in relation to the question that interests us.

Point 1. The period prior to 1917. The working class in each country fought isolately. Not in a single country during that period was a single more or less decisive victory of the proletariat recorded. What is the position today? Today, the international proletariat has achieved more or less conclusive victory in one country, I mean the USSR, representing a sixth part of the globe. It is of extreme importance that the international working class, that individual sections of the working class fighting against the world bourgeoisie, have a base, have a sort of revolutionary rear. This fact in itself is of world historical significance, and clearly shows that the present situation cannot be compared to the crises which occurred in 1848 and in 1871. Hence the first fact — victory, even if not final — of the working class in one country, is providing a revolutionary rear for the international proletariat.

The Orient Comes to the Aid of the World Proletariat.

Point 2. The second factor is the Orient. The Social Democrats tried to be witty at the expense of the alleged naive people who are now setting out to bring about revolution in China. But the fact is that China has a population of 400,000,000 and this population can and is acquiring world historical importance. World capitalism can no longer hold up this tremendous element which is now setting into motion.

The advanced detachments of the European proletariat who were defeated by General Galifet in Paris and later by

czarism in Russia in 1905 fought alone; they had no direct support from the rest of Europe and the colonies. The awakening of the Orient will put an end to the isolation of the working class. New forces are entering the arena of history and are acquiring enormous significance for the revolutionary movement.

The War has Revolutionised Extremely wide Sections of the Workers and Peasants.

Point 3. We have passed through a world war, and are living in a period of preparations for fresh wars. Everywhere in Europe the mass, including the peasantry, have been roused. The masses after the war are not what they were before the war. The world war has served as a great "political university", for the international proletariat and peasantry. The political experience acquired by the working class in the furnace of suffering through which it passed in the period of the world war, must inevitably serve as an antidote against any ideological crisis that may break out among the proletariat. This striking feature also distinguishes our epoch from past epochs.

The Proletariat is Living in an Atmosphere of Civil War.

Point 4. As I have already said, the class antagonisms of our epoch are saturated with the elements of civil war. Prior to 1907, the European proletariat only talked about civil war, and then not very frequently and not very clearly. Since 1917 to the present day, almost the whole of the European proletariat is living in an atmosphere of civil war. It fears sanguinary battles much less, than formerly. We are all acquainted with the mentality of the masses of the workers that has arisen since the war almost everywhere in Europe.

The Awakening of the Peasantry.

Point 5. The awakening of the peasantry. One of the causes of the defeat of the Paris Commune was the hostility of the peasantry towards the working class. The Russian peasantry in 1905 was defeated primarily because the Russian peasantry went against the working class. In all previous revolutionary battles, the peasantry not only did not occupy a neutral position but frequently was directly hostile to the workers. In our days, however, the peasants are beginning to occupy quite a different position. Every rank and file worker should now feel instinctively that he is not as isolated and alone in the struggle as was the generation before him.

The Revolution is not Defeated.

Point 6. We have not passed through a zone of utterly defeated revolutions. The situation throughout the whole of Europe is that the forces of the working class are not sufficiently mature to carry through a victorious revolution.

Point 7. The revolutionary working class now has its General Staff, the **Communist International**, which embodies the experience of the revolutionary movements and renders powerful aid to the various units of the international proletariat. In former times such a thing did not exist.

The Tactics of Bolshevism after the Revolution of 1905.

Comrades, this then is the objective state of affairs, and I resolutely protest against anybody leaving our meeting under the impression that the consolidation of capital has taken place, that the working class has been defeated, that an ideological crisis prevails, that we must start from the very beginning, the Parties will lose members and the crisis will break out in every country. Comrades, this is far from being the case.

After the defeat of the first Russian revolution in 1905, the Bolsheviks throughout the whole of 1905 argued with the Mensheviks concerning the character of that period. The question was presented as follows: Is the period similar

to that of 1847 or 1849, i. e. are we on the eve of a fresh bourgeois revolution or have we already gone beyond it? The Mensheviks assert that we were in the 1849 period, that czarism had won a decisive victory, that constitutional monarchy will be established, that czarism and a part of the big bourgeoisie have solved the problem of the Russian revolution from above. "From now on" they said, "we must build our Party on the model of the European legal Social Democratic Parties and fight for reforms; the 'ultimate aim' will be achieved after 50 years".

The Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin, was of the opinion that Russia was passing through, not 1849 but 1847. It regarded 1905 merely as a rehearsal; a second revolution was coming for czarism and the big bourgeoisie were incapable of solving the problem of the revolution from above. That is what we said in 1907, in 1908, in 1909, etc. right up to 1917. A little over a decade separated 1906 from 1917. Throughout the whole of this decade the Russian and international Mensheviks simply gloated over us; "Well you said it was not 1849; you said the revolution was coming every day; where is your revolution? There do not appear to be any signs of it." The Social Democrats said to the workers: "The Bolsheviks are dreamers, you had better come into our shop." We said then and we say now; the hour will come when we will throw you over the fence together with the capitalists and you will grind your teeth with envy when you see our victorious red flag flying in the breeze. Those ten or twelve years were years of trial for us. Not everyone was inclined to believe that perhaps after all the Bolsheviks were right; but history proved that we were right.

Of course one cannot draw a complete parallel between the position then and the position now, but we are experiencing something of the kind on an international scale. The Social-Democrats, yes, and a small crowd in our own ranks, assert that the working class is experiencing 1849 on an international scale, and consequently before there is a long epoch of consolidation of capitalism, which will last for a whole generation. We assert, however, that the present situation is similar not to 1849, but to the interval between 1905 and 1917, similar to those twelve years. Of these twelve years, Germany has already been through six. If we calculate that historical development on an international scale will proceed approximately at the same rate as it proceeded on a national scale prior to 1917 in Russia, then we have to wait at most only several years and certainly not a whole epoch during which the international bourgeoisie will celebrate its complete victory. It is true that if it was difficult for the working class to drag through this zone of development in a single country, it will be much more difficult for it to do so on an international scale, where the situation is uneven; for in some countries the bourgeoisie has become stronger than in others. But I consider that the international situation must be defined in the same way as the Bolsheviks defined the position as it existed after the first revolution in Russia, the more so, that, as I have said already, there are a number of factors on a broad international scale that are favourable to our struggle.

The Lessons of the Presidential Elections in Germany.

I must devote a few words particularly to the question of Germany, because Germany has had the doubtful privilege of being regarded as the country in which the consolidation of capitalism has achieved the greatest success, and also because the hottest battles recently were fought out in Germany.

Several comrades have already referred to the Presidential elections, I too, would like to say a word or two about them. We lost rather a large number of votes. This is due partly to the fact that the workers are generally less interested in presidential elections than in Reichstag elections. We observe that both in America and in Finland, many of our supporters abstain from voting at Presidential elections. The Socialist Party of America, when it was still a Socialist Party, experienced the same thing at presidential elections. Fewer people vote at presidential elections than at other elections.

But this explanation is inadequate. There is one factor here which demands considerable attention on our part.

Germany at the moment, is confronted with the alternative of: bourgeois republic or monarchy. Of course for us communists, the conflict is between proletarian dictatorship and the bourgeois state. This distinguishes the communists from all other parties, and our position on this is unalterable. But a situation may arise in which the alternative "bourgeois republic or monarchy" may revive for a time, and acquire real importance in the eyes of the masses in a certain country. Such is the situation in Germany. In the present phase of its historical development, the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat has only a propagandist significance. The workers of Germany instinctively feel that their country has come up sharply against the question of bourgeois republic or monarchy. Fearing that the horrors of monarchy may be added to the charms of the Dawes' Plan, they seek salvation by voting for the social-democrats. If our Party fails to understand this, and is not able to approach the question in the Bolshevik manner, we stand to lose adherents in the future. It is not a question of losing votes, that is not so bad; the danger lies in becoming isolated from certain sections of the proletariat. We must act in such a manner as to keep as close as possible to the proletariat.

I have heard comrades say, is it not all the same to us whether the black, red and gold banner of the bourgeois republic or the black-red and white banner of monarchism is victorious?

No, it is not all the same. That is not a Marxist way of presenting the question. This method recalls the old controversies between the Marxists and Lasalleists (or more correctly the vulgarisers of the latter).

What conclusion must we draw from the fact that eight million votes were cast for the social democrats? The conclusion is clear: in spite of the accumulated experience, the proletariat still fails to understand that the social-democracy is the "third" party of the bourgeoisie. We must strive to emancipate the working class from the influence of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, we must distinguish between monarchy and republic, because for the class struggle of the proletariat, a bourgeois republic is more favourable than is a monarchy, not because a republic is supposed to be more favourable to civil peace, but because this form of government more clearly than ever, reveals the genuine class character of the bourgeoisie. Now we already know that universal suffrage has become a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie in the class struggle against the proletariat. But we must understand that the proletariat cannot remain indifferent when it is a choice between bourgeois republic and monarchy. If our brother German Party will be able to explain this idea to the proletariat, it will considerably relieve its position in the period of revolutionary stagnation.

I have already received details of the progress of the presidential elections in Germany. The figures show that in certain working class centres we have lost a certain number of votes to the social democrats. Such is the case in Berlin and even in Halle, where formerly, we have had the majority. In Halle, we obtained 20% of the votes and the social democrats 21.4%, and this is in Halle, where only the other day the police shot down the workers gathered at an indoor meeting; in Halle, the citadel of Communism.

It is the great misfortune of the working class that it is still ideologically dependent upon the bourgeoisie and consequently, upon social democracy. But should this discourage us? Must we assume that this is a symptom of a profound moral crisis in the working class, and that the latter for many years yet, perhaps for decades, will bend its back under the yoke of the bourgeoisie? No comrades. It means merely that we must conduct a more protracted and more stubborn fight for the revolution; that large sections of the more progressive of the working class — and I include the German working class among the most progressive — will still have to suffer defeats. It compels us to take into consideration the bourgeois mentality of sections of the working class, in the sense that we must strive to understand it better in order to be able to obliterate it from the minds of the workers. We cannot say: we have 1,800,000 communists, and we will only count on this main column. These 1,800,000 communists represent our fortified positions, our iron battalions, the flower of the working class, the lever of the world revolution. Without these cadres we are nothing. That

is so, but the whole question is, how to win over the remainder of the masses. To do this we must know where the shoe pinches. But this must not be taken to mean that we will drag at the tail and reconcile ourselves to all the defects of the masses of the workers.

What Factors are Accelerating the Revolutionary Progress in Germany.

I believe that this pause in the revolutionary movement, if one may call it that, in a country where great street demonstrations and severe class battles take place so frequently, — will not be a very prolonged one. In Russia, the first revolution was separated from the second revolution by twelve years. This interval was not so long, because the revolutionary process in Russia was accelerated by two factors: 1. a new war was approaching, and 2. the fact that czarism was incapable of solving the agrarian crisis. The peasantry was tending towards the revolution.

In Germany, three important factors are operating:

1. The consequences of the defeat in the world war are still operating. Germany is still the booty of the Entente. A peaceful international solution of the question has not been found.

2. In Germany, the working class is more powerful than in Russia; numerically it is almost three times as large.

3. The German revolution is developing in an environment of international revolutionary struggles and of severe conflicts which must inevitably lead to fresh wars.

We can laugh heartily when the reptiles of "Vorwaerts" write: "it is all up with the world revolution, the International itself says it." You German friends and comrades, keep your nerves. For 12 years (from 1905 to 1917) we in Russia had such arguments hurled at us. As each Bolshevik was sent to jail, the Mensheviks gloatingly hurled at him the words: "you are going to prison, you have been sentenced to penal servitude, only because the Bolshevik Party is acting stupidly, because it is keeping to romantic tactics. You are going to jail for nothing; there is no revolution, and there will be none, you are sacrificing your life in vain." Our best fighters had these words hurled at them from the Menshevik camp, at every step. But, they remained firm. They said to themselves: "No, it is not all up. We must keep firm; we must not believe these lackeys of the bourgeoisie." Comrades, we can say to the "Vorwaerts": "you wait, the time will come when we will say: it is all up, not with the revolution, but with social democracy." (Prolonged applause.)

The Tactics of Radek, and the Speech of Kreibich.

Comrades, I would like to deal with certain points in the speech of Comrade Kreibich. Comrade Kreibich really, is the representative of Comrade Radek here. This we all understand perfectly. Hence, there are certain specific touches in his speech which strongly recall Comrade Radek: all sorts of tales about "personalities" and differences, guessing as to whether these differences exist or not. Comrade Bukharin has already said in the name of us all that all this is just empty talk. In Comrade Kreibich's speech, we observe the "strategy" of Comrade Radek, which is based on the assumption that the time has come to take certain steps. Certain of the documents read here will enable you best of all to judge the value of this reasoning. I will not dwell on this any more. I entirely associate myself with what Comrade Bukharin has said on the subject. I think you will do the same.

Comrade Kreibich Takes the ABC of Communism for "the Mechanical Catastrophic Theory".

I come now to certain questions of principle touched upon by Kreibich's speech. Both at the Plenum and in the Czech Commission, Kreibich took the liberty, which his friends would not dream of taking, of quite openly saying what he thought. Consequently, he quite frankly threatened a split and made speeches which sounded very much like those delivered in this hall by Crispin and Paul Levi.

Kreibich says: "Zinoviev declares that capitalism is mortally wounded; that means that Zinoviev supports the

'mechanical catastrophic theory'. And what is still worse, this is not only the 'mechanical catastrophic theory', but an 'element of Luxemburgism'." Comrade Kreibich, you must not forget that Rosa Luxemburg has done much good, I must say that one of Rosa Luxemburg's old boots is worth ever so much more than all "Radekism" and "Kreibichism" put together. We criticise a great deal of the theory and practice of the late Rosa Luxemburg, particularly as six or seven years have passed since her death during which time we have had much experience in the Russian and German revolutions. We criticise her mistakes, but that does not blind us to what was great in Rosa Luxemburg.

Kreibich opposes my postulate by another expressed by Comrade Lenin. He says: "At the Second Congress, Lenin said that capitalism was not in a hopeless position, if the proletariat and its Party does not throw it on the scrap heap, i. e. if they do not make a revolution."

Because I did not repeat this, you see, I am a worshipping of the "catastrophic theory". This is stupid and ridiculous. I spoke on the question of Bolshevizing the Party. What does Bolshevizing the Party mean? It means training the vanguard of the proletariat for the proletarian revolution. From this it follows that we perfectly well understand the role of the subjective factor, the significance of the working class and its Party in revolution. Of course, if this vanguard is lacking, or if it remains inactive, the capitalist class CAN find a way out. This is what Lenin emphasised, and this is what we all note. Hence, in what sense can Lenin's postulate be contrasted to mine? Where do I give expression to the "catastrophic theory"? Comrade Kreibich, certain individual communists who have suffered a catastrophe, communists are prone to see the "catastrophic theory" where the ABC of Communism is under discussion (applause).

Comrade Kreibich says further: "Comrade Zinoviev's theses are not bad, but his speech was an attempt to modify them. Zinoviev cannot tell the whole truth; he is too much tied up with his Left, and ABOVE ALL he has made too many concessions to the Left."

You will remember what heated discussions on the trade union question, for example, took place in the ranks of the communists, who of course, can make mistakes. We expressed our opinion to the Left Wing comrades. As we have considerable experience, we proved to be right. Had things been different, we would have admitted that we were wrong. The Communist International exists for the purpose of studying the experience of the work and the struggle, and when necessary to straighten out the line. I think comrades, we must abandon the methods demonstrated here by Comrade Kreibich as speedily as possible.

Kreibich Goes to the Right.

In his speech, Comrade Kreibich dealt with the question of the Right Wing. He related that on the Czech Commission, I asked him to give me the addresses of the Right Wing Comrades, but you see, owing to the terror and the absence of the liberty of free speech, he refused to reveal this secret to me. He refused even to communicate to me their secret addresses. Comrades, Kreibich's speech has given us a clue to the exact addresses. In Czechoslovakia, the address is, Kreibich, Radek & Co., (applause). The International address is: Kreibich, Radek, Brandler, Rosmer, Souvarine & Co., (loud applause). You see therefore, we have very precise addresses.

Kreibich talks about the "commissars" method of approach to the question. I think that when Kreibich was saying this, Paul Levi's ear must have burned. Paul Levi must have had a presentiment that Kreibich will say the same thing as he said years after he said it. At that time, however, they talked about "Turkestans" and now they talk about "commissars". This example clearly shows that Kreibich is morally departing from the Communist International.

We do not just now ask the Czech comrades, whether they are prepared to share our views on the world situation. We merely ask them whether they are prepared in practice to support the Comintern to accept its decisions and carry them out, and refrain from engaging in diplomacy as is done in the Second International and which is not and should not be permitted in the Third International. We are firmly con-

vinced that the overwhelming majority of the Czech comrades and the Czech proletariat will understand this.

I cannot refrain from mentioning the curious fact communicated in the copy of the Reichenberg "Vorwaerts" which I received to-day. "Vorwaerts" reports that Mr. Warmbrun, who was expelled from the Party with Bubnik has published a pamphlet on purging the Party and methods of the Comintern. As an appendix to his pamphlet, he reproduces an article by Kreibich, written prior to the Party Congress. I do not wish to say that Kreibich is formally responsible for this, but politically he is responsible for the fact that a renegade is able to use his writings in his fight against the Comintern. What other warning do you require Comrade Kreibich? You have given the devil only a finger and he has taken almost your whole hand; do not be astonished if he will possess himself of your head.

We must become the only and Powerful Party of the Working Class.

I now conclude. Usually, we pupils of Lenin ask ourselves what Lenin would have said in the present world political situation. He would have said to us what he said at the Fourth Congress, that first of all we must learn and learn. He would have said to us: remain a mass party, but a bolshevik and communist party and not a semi-menshevik party as some are suggesting now. He would have said: fight the right wing, but make no political concessions to the "ultra lefts" who are merely the accessories of the Right Wing. Capitalism is becoming stabilised; what is most important is that we should become stabilised, and our Party and the Comintern; that we should increase our intellectual stock. Under present conditions, Comrade Lenin would have reminded us again of the importance of the subjective factor, — the vanguard of the proletariat and its party.

For the Parties of the Comintern, the present period of relative stagnation opens up two alternative prospects. One of these is gloomy and sad. If we fail to keep up to the necessary level in this period between two revolutions, disappointments, crises, splits, apostasy, and social democratic deviations may arise here and there in our ranks. This is one possibility. The other prospect is that we shall learn correctly to estimate the position, distinguish its various aspects, that we and our Party become hardened under the blows of the counter revolution, that we will be able to take advantage of the respite in order to train ourselves to become a powerful and the only party of the working class. I want to remind you that in the normal period of capitalism before the war, the German Social Democratic Party managed to become the Party of the working class. It is true that already at that time, the seeds of treachery were ripening, which subsequently converted it into a social traitor party. But at one time it was the party of the working class. It is not inevitable, certainly there is no law which says that in this period of a certain stabilisation of capitalism (very ephemeral it should be added) the social democracy must grow and we must become broken up. It is quite possible that in a situation in which the class war, although not having taken the form of civil war is never-

theless saturated with its element, in which the social democracy becomes the "third" bourgeois party, it is possible, in these very years of reaction, for us to become still more a mass party of the working class, the organisation which can and desires to lead the labour movement.

Our theses do not in the least imply what some comrades desire to ascribe to them, that we believe that our Party will not become a mass party, that the epoch of the domination of the social democracy is opening, etc. Under no circumstances should our theses be understood in this sense. Would it be a mistake if we drew an analogy between the position of the Comintern at the present moment and the position in the Bolshevik Party between 1907 and 1917? Not altogether. There is some analogy between them. It was very difficult for this one Party of the Russian working class, led by Lenin, to hold to its revolutionary positions for ten years, while everyday shouts were hurled at us, as the "Vorwaerts" is doing now, about the revolution being "finished". It is equally difficult to hold to our positions now, on an international scale, particularly when we have not Lenin with us. But we must hold on, and in the meantime train the revolutionary Communist Parties and strive not only to consolidate our existing bases, but to extend them and try to become the only Party of the working class.

Why must we now declare that capitalism is beginning to become stabilised here and there? In order to dispense all illusions, in order to proceed by the true path however thorny it may be. We must have no exaggerations, but we must not go down on our knees to "Her Majesty", stabilisation. We must bear in mind that we must stabilise ourselves, i. e., we must bolshevise our parties, hold on to our positions, work and wait for the moment when we shall be able to take the bourgeoisie by the throat and finish it, and then commence to build communism.

I think comrades, that those who are trying to fabricate contradictions between the Fifth International Congress and the Enlarged Plenum, are on the wrong road, for they are not interested in seeking the truth. It is true some of the resolutions passed by the First, Second, Third and other Congresses have not been justified, but numerous resolutions and documents have entered into the permanent inventory of the Communist International. The present Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee develops further previous resolutions. This Session is the "Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties Session". We will combat all falacious tendencies like those revealed in today's declaration in the case of Radek, Brandler and Thalheimer. If it is necessary we will act with greater severity. Lenin taught us that at the moment when the bourgeoisie, or the social democracy shows signs of strengthening here and there, everyone who tries to deviate from our fundamental line must meet with the most determined resistance. To all those who strive to drive us into the Social Democratic quagmire we say: if you very much want to go into the quagmire go by all means, but go alone; we do not wish to go, we will remain communists, we will remain the pupils of Comrade Lenin. (Prolonged applause, singing of the International).

Thirteenth Session. Moscow, April 6th, 1925

Chairman: Winterich.

Comrade Marty (France):

In the name of the Commission of the International Red Aid, the organisation for the support of political prisoners, which is neither of a philanthropic nor sentimental character, I wish to submit the following draft resolution.

Draft Resolution on International Red Aid.

The Enlarged Plenum of the ECCI directs the special attention of the Communist Parties and revolutionary organisations of all countries to the immense importance of the IRA in view of the increasing White Terror.

As the struggle in capitalist countries becomes more acute, the Fascist methods of suppressing the revolutionary

movement adopted by the bourgeoisie and the social democratic leaders more and more reveal a tendency to become the basis of internal politics in so-called democratic countries. The white terror is assuming incredibly monstrous and revolting forces.

For that reason the organisation of the resistance of the broad masses of the toilers against the brutality and violence committed by the world bourgeoisie against the working class, the poor peasantry and the colonial slaves, becomes, at the present moment, the most pressing task of the proletariat.

In this direction the IRA has done a great deal. It has successfully conducted a number of campaigns against the white terror particularly the last campaign in connection with the Lantzutsky case in which, with the aid of the powerful pressure of the proletariat, the acquittal of Lantzutsky was secured.

As an army of five million souls, all inspired with unanimous desire to show their brotherly solidarity with the fighters at the front of the world revolution, it created favourable conditions for mobilising the opinion of the workers and peasants at such moments when the White Terror revealed unusually unrestrained malignance and grossness in getting rid of the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry. The IRA. has proved that it stands unwavering at its post.

The Enlarged Executive records that the IRA. has succeeded in obtaining real results in rendering material, moral and legal aid to tens of thousands of the captives of capitalism and their families.

The Enlarged Plenum of the ECCI. calls upon all the Communist Parties, revolutionary and trade union organisations to render every and constant support to the development and strengthening of the IRA. as a genuine social mass organisation.

Calling upon all sections of the ECCI. to fulfil the instructions of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern concerning the IRA., the Enlarged Plenum reminds all the Communist Parties that they must regard the activity of the IRA. as an important factor in attracting to the revolutionary movement extensive non-Party masses and as the elementary school for the training of these masses in the spirit of international proletarian solidarity in the fight between labour and capital.

Comrades! Red Aid is the best means for realising the slogan: proletarians of all countries unite!

In consequence of all the campaigns of the International Red Aid a revolutionary atmosphere was created again wherever it had decreased or showed signs of decreasing.

Red Aid helps in furthering international solidarity and in raising the political education of the working class.

Think for instance, of the tremendous effect a letter from a Parisian or London worker exercises in a prison in Hanoi or Bombay.

A third consequence of the activity of Red Aid is that it hinders the development of Fascism, or at least diminishes it by drawing the middle class away from the influence of fascism.

In order to discredit Soviet Russia, the bourgeoisie is conducting an uninterrupted calumny campaign about the atrocities of the Bolsheviks. How can they admit that, at a time when they are massacring our comrades in Poland, Rumania, Esthonia etc., we do not employ similar means and counteract their crimes which are only but too true. These crimes arouse the hatred of the workers against the capitalist governments in those countries where this cruel oppression takes place and incite further comrades to attack the government and protect those other comrades from death.

The political policy of Red Aid was fully explained in the resolution of the Fifth World Congress.

After the resolution proposed by Comrade Marty was unanimously accepted, Comrade Grieco read the draft resolution of the Peasant Commission, which was also unanimously adopted.

Page 506
of
1925 Inprecor April 24
Vol. 5 No. 38

IS
BLANK

MND sept 2021