

SPECIAL NUMBER.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8. No. 66

PRESS

25th September 1928

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, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Twenty-fifth Session.

Moscow, 9th August, 1928 (afternoon).

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin on the Draft Programme of the Comintern.

Comrade SIKANDUR (India):

Comrades: It is needless to emphasise that the ultimate aim of the Communist International is the establishment of Communism throughout the world. We find all the pre-requisites for the establishment of Communism in the development of capitalism on an international basis, the formation of the cartels, etc. Capitalism has, through its inherent contradictions, reached that stage when it will be possible to hasten the establishment of Communism throughout the world. The crises revealing the disorganisation of capitalist economy are the symptoms of a chronic disease. The objective conditions, in European countries and especially in Germany, Czechoslovakia, England and France are ripe for the establishment of Communism.

Comrades, the pre-requisite for the establishment of Communism is the capture of political power by the proletariat. In these countries of Europe, the proletarian movement has reached that stage when it can easily capture the political power. It depends upon the resoluteness of the leadership and the determination of the proletarian movement itself to do that.

But the conditions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are quite different. Take for instance, India. The situation in India in 1928 resembles that of Russia under Tsarism in 1914. Russia in 1914 had a good proletariat, she had industries. The same is the case in India. But now the British imperialists, seeing that it was the development of the proletarian movement in Russia which brought about the downfall of Tsarism,

has grown wiser by that experience and is trying to destroy the industries of India and drive the proletariat of India to the villages. The situation differs a bit from Russia of 1914 in that India is a colony and has not got a strong Party that Russia had at that time. This accounts for so many disastrous defeats to the Indian proletarian movement.

Comrades, there is a large proletarian movement in India at present. But at the same time we should not ignore that there is a nationalist movement as well. We are not talking here of the Gandhian pacifist movement, which though dormant, now, may awaken again to our detriment at the time of anti-war activity of the proletarian revolutionary movement and at the outbreak of the next war. This revolutionary nationalist emancipation movement reflected in the formation of the Republican Party can be utilised insofar as it stands for the destruction of British imperialism. Our work is quite different from that in Europe.

Along with our preparations for the establishment of Communism throughout the world, we have to reckon and make preparations for the destruction and defeat of the British and world imperialist forces which are standing against the U. S. S. R.

Comrades, in the fight against imperialism we have to strike the first blow at British imperialism, which is the leader of world imperialism to-day.

In the imperialist countries of Europe there are highly developed industries. This facilitates our task. The struggle will

be sanguinary but only short and will in no time end in the success of our arms. But the circumstances in the colonial countries are quite different. When we capture power in India, Persia and Afghanistan we have to reckon that the industries are not developed to that extent that Communism can be safely established, and the transitional period will be longer there. We have to capture political power at all costs, and for this purpose we must win the forces working against British imperialism. When we find that the radical elements in India or Persia or Afghanistan are making for the overthrow of imperialism we have to utilise them by all means.

Inside the colonial countries and especially in the countries bordering the Soviet Union, we must establish strong disciplined Communist Parties, so that when the long expected crisis comes, it may not find ourselves in confusion. We should not repeat our mistakes of China. We should never dream that these nationalist forces are our full-fledged supporters, to fight against imperialism. But at a time when we are fighting against world imperialism it would be wrong tactics not to utilise such forces. The political movement in 1919 was purely a revolutionary movement for the overthrow of British imperialism. But British imperialism was much wiser. It found its agent in Gandhi. He was the ascribed leader at that time. Owing to his treachery and because there was no strong revolutionary lead at that time, the movement failed.

In 1928 for the first time a revolutionary labour movement began to take shape and to develop as we see it to-day. The movement in 1928 is quite different from the movements of 1919 and 1920. The latter was not a revolutionary phase; it was more like a Tolstoyan movement, nearer to the 1905 movement. The failure of 1905 was the preparation for 1917. The same can be said about India. The failure of the 1920 movement opened the way for a deadly struggle against British imperialism.

Comrades, what I want to emphasise is that, in the colonies and semi-colonies, in addition to the development of strong disciplined Communist Parties, we have to use every movement which makes a stand against imperialism. But that does not mean that we should regard the national bourgeoisie as our allies.

For that reason, it is very important for us to start anti-British and anti-imperialist propaganda in these adjoining countries of Persia and Afghanistan. Persia in 1924 and 1925 had developed a Republican movement, but by Reza Khan's seizure of power it was transformed into a reactionary one.

The main task of the colonial countries is to form strong Communist Parties and to make relentless efforts to capture political power. For this purpose we have to work out different tactics from those of the industrially developed countries.

Comrades RICARDO PARADES

(delegate of the Communist and Socialist Parties of Ecuador):

Comrades, this is the first time that delegates of several proletarian parties of Latin America which were formed in the last years (Social Revolutionary Party of Colombia, Socialist and Communist Party of Ecuador, Communist Party of Paraguay) are participating in a Congress of the Communist International. The ever-increasing participation of Latin America in the Communist movement of the world indicates that the Communist International has taken deep-root throughout the world. Now that the imperialism of North America is paramount in world economics and politics and constitutes the stronghold of the bourgeoisie, the labour movement of Latin America, by its strategical situation assumes considerable importance.

It seems to me that the draft programme brought forward by the Executive Committee of the C. I. is on the whole satisfactory. Nevertheless I think that certain points could be amplified and treated in a less schematic manner.

This draft programme is certainly an enormous improvement on previous programmes. Its form is very dynamic and certain problems which were only outlined in previous programmes are very fully dealt with here. Moreover, it brings forward new questions. The international basis is better than that of former programmes which had the defect that all world problems were treated in a somewhat European fashion. But in spite of this I think that one should give more prominence to the problems of the colonial and semi-colonial countries which occupy the greatest part of the globe.

It seems to me that the introduction of the programme is rather brusque, the problem of imperialism is dealt with before capitalism of the era of free competition has been defined. This form would be acceptable if the programme were addressed only to elements who are already mature ideologically. I also think that a few more lines should be devoted to the problem of world war, and all its consequences for the labour movement and the economics and politics of the world. I think it necessary to amplify a little the historical retrospect of the First and Second Internationals, and also to present the Russian revolution as a new phase for the proletariat of the whole world, because the Russian revolution is given too little emphasis in the draft programme.

The first chapter should contain a more complete exposé of the Marxist doctrine on capitalist development.

The aspect of the development of capitalism in colonial and so-called semi-colonial countries is not sufficiently clear in the programme. These countries supply the world economy to a great extent with foodstuffs and raw material for industry. Moreover, industry which is developing in these colonial and semi-colonial countries produces a considerable amount of articles of consumption not only for these countries but also for export, although the latter is still very small. At the same time the rural districts of these countries are becoming industrialised, especially in the so-called semi-colonial countries, such as Argentina. A characteristic feature of these countries is the form of the distribution of land. Latifundia which is the predominating form of agriculture employ at times thousands of rural proletarians (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina). In Brazil there are latifundia which are as big as Switzerland. Industrialisation is proceeding, although slowly, in these latifundia, which absorb a numerous proletariat. This is a very important fact for the organisation of the workers and for the elaboration of a correct programme of struggle in our countries.

The form which imperialist domination takes in colonial and semi-colonial countries, the manner in which national capitalism develops and its relations with imperialism must be very clearly defined. What is the substance of this policy of the imperialist countries? The United States and Great Britain especially, are tending to create an extraction industry in the colonies; consequently the mining industry is very developed there. As to the manufacturing industry, the imperialists are developing it only on a very small scale, only to an extent which cannot do harm to the industry of the mother country and which will allow a profitable exploitation of the cheaper native labour power.

On the other hand, national capitalism is endeavouring to create a manufacturing industry but the entire economic policy of imperialism is against this. In regard to agriculture, imperialism is endeavouring to profit by the climate in order to create gigantic concerns which grow a restricted quantity of agricultural products required for the mother country, no attention being paid to the requirements of the natives. Consequently, these countries which are compelled to purchase in the mother countries articles of primary necessity which they do not produce themselves, are entirely under the domination of these mother countries. The conditions in these countries justify to a certain extent the statement of the programme in regard to colonial and semi-colonial countries, that "by this relation to industrial countries which are so to speak, the urban agglomeration of the world, they represent the rural districts of the world".

To bring free countries under its domination, imperialism penetrates into them by means of trade and finance capital. Imperialism creates for itself gradually a strong economic position and in most cases it secures parallel with it political positions. Thus, it is colonising Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama and other Latin American Republics. Other countries resist more effectively this economic and political pressure either because they are bigger and more difficult to enslave or because they take advantage of their geographical situation or of the rivalry of the other imperialists. In this position are several Latin American countries, such as Argentina and Brazil, which in spite of the economic penetration of imperialism have not yet become semi-colonies. Mexico is heroically resisting the imperialist penetration. Ecuador is still fairly free of the penetration of foreign capitalists. It has as yet no State loan from the United States, and its investments are very small. Moreover, national capital is bigger than foreign. But owing

to its political weakness the colonisation of this country will be easier than that of Mexico when the imperialists will turn their attention seriously to the exploitation of the wealth of this country. The problems of the proletarian struggle must be considered from a different viewpoint in colonial and semi-colonial countries and in the so-called "dependencies". This distinction must be made because hitherto the general conception of our countries has been that they are the "rural districts of the world", which alters the problems of the struggle in these countries by under-estimating the proletarian forces and over-estimating the peasant question. That is why the slogans of the agrarian, bourgeois-democratic revolution are considered in the programme as the tasks to be accomplished in these countries.

It is clear that one cannot establish a strict classification between so-called semi-colonial countries because there is a considerable number of intermediary forms. Therefore a new category must be accepted. This new group would consist of the "dependencies" which have been penetrated economically by imperialism but which retain a certain political independence either because the economic penetration is not very strong or because they are strong politically.

Imperialism with all its characteristic features of economic penetration, its monopolism, its economic policy, is changing the normal development of capitalism in our countries. For this reason this development assumes a different character from that in Europe during the period of free competition.

Owing to the fact that all these causes are producing a powerful revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the Communist International must pay more attention to them.

In the paragraph which deals with agriculture, point d) when speaking of the form of distribution of the expropriated big landed property it is suggested to distribute this land among the poor and partly also among the middle peasantry, I propose the following amendment:

"Not to give to the peasants the land which belonged formerly to big landowners, but to establish collective agricultural concerns."

Countries with a highly developed capitalism will find it very difficult to solve the land problem at the time of proletarian revolution. In some of these countries, for instance, France, the number of peasants is very great and the parcelisation of land is enormous. Moreover, the highly developed individualism of these peasants does not favour the socialisation of land. Diverse solutions become imperative in the various countries in regard to the distribution of land. Owing to the big peasant population in certain highly developed capitalist countries, an alliance with the peasantry will have to be made. The dictatorship of the proletariat, pure and simple, will be very difficult at first owing to the economic importance of the peasants in that period.

In this respect the industrially backward countries are in a better position as far as the socialisation of land is concerned; their chief obstacle to socialism will be inadequate industrialisation. In many Latin American countries latifundia are the predominant form of land ownership; the wage system and the system of payment in kind predominate there. Where land is held by a few people it will be easy to expropriate and socialise it. On the other hand those countries of Latin America which have a big Indian population are in a better position for the construction of socialism in the rural districts than the countries where this Indian element is lacking (Mexico, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia). There are many communes in Mexico, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia which are now important factors in the struggle against the domination of the feudal lords and which will be, at the moment of the establishment of the proletarian regime, nuclei for socialist co-operation in the countryside. The American Indians are imbued with a remarkably collectivist spirit. They establish agricultural, irrigation and building co-operatives as well as other forms of collective work. These elements must be utilised in the proletarian State for the construction of socialism.

Such communes were the centres of activity in several insurrections of agricultural labourers and peasants in Latin America. In 1926 there was a big movement in Ecuador to claim the restitution of the land which had been stolen by the feudal lords. In the course of that year 4 big insurrections of Indians took place in Ecuador. One of these insurrections

started in a commune. These insurrections have revealed to us the revolutionary strength of the Indians and their collectivist spirit. In Argentina and Uruguay the situation in the rural districts is different because in these latifundia countries most of the agricultural labourers and peasants are half-castes, creoles and European immigrants among whom the individualistic spirit predominates.

The revolutionary problem is linked up with that of the oppressed races such as the Indians of Latin America. In some countries Indians constitute the biggest section of the rural population; they suffer much more than white and half-caste workers from the exploitation of the landed proprietors. Indians who are considered an inferior race are treated more brutally. All these factors have created among the Indian workers and peasants a spirit of solidarity and a class spirit of the exploited. Therefore Indians are very revolutionary elements. I think that this problem of oppressed races must be dealt with in the programme.

Petty bourgeois revolutions is another problem which should be, in my opinion, seriously considered. In Latin America they have an aspect of their own and are of considerable interest to the proletarian cause. In his criticism of the draft programme Comrade Thalheimer gives a wrong estimate of the revolutions in some Latin American countries. The most typical of these revolutions is that in Mexico, which lasted from 1910 to 1917 and which has left a revolutionary situation in the country. This revolution which is of a petty bourgeois character, has certain socialist traits owing to the intervention of the organised working class and the demands of a proletarian character which were brought forward during the revolution. The anti-imperialist character of the Mexican revolution, the hegemony of the petty bourgeoisie, the heroic struggle of the peasants for land under the leadership of their famous chieftain, General Zapata, give a petty bourgeois character to the Mexican revolution. One should study very seriously the Mexican revolution which is very important to the proletarian movement of the world and especially of Latin America.

The petty bourgeois revolution in Ecuador, 1925, was already of a different nature although in some respects it is similar to the Mexican revolution. The revolution of 1925 was directed mainly against the financial plutocracy which had dominated the country 30 years, against the corrupt State officials, the army chiefs and the big landlords. The partly civil, partly military government which was established had a certain Soviet structure. It was based on military councils and delegates of labour organisations (the latter only with a consultative vote). The supreme organ was the Civil Council. The various manifestoes of these military councils as well as the programme of the military league which had made the revolution, spoke always of proletarian demands, struggle against the exploiters and contained also a few proletarian demands. Several private capital monopolies were transferred to the State. Certain radical measures were taken (law for the expropriation of land). The petty bourgeoisie was persecuted and several of their press organs were suppressed, the clergy was persecuted, certain workers' demands were acceded to and in the beginning of the revolution strikes were supported by the army. It is due to the army that the population of Cayambe seized the land. During this period many agricultural labourers' and peasant rebellions took place against the landlords and the authorities. The revolution had also an anti-imperialist character.

I think that the slogan "bourgeois-democratic agrarian revolution" is not correct. It will be perhaps more effective in countries into which imperialism has completely penetrated and where the land question constitutes one of the fundamental levers of the revolution.

One of the causes which could determine a social revolution in our country would be an imperialist war or a war against the U.S.S.R. In this case the problems will have a different aspect in Argentina and in Mexico. In Mexico one could struggle for an anti-imperialist revolution against landlords. As to the co-operation of the nationalist bourgeoisie in this war against imperialism, this is an utterly problematic question. If instead of the petty bourgeoisie, the leader in this revolution will be the proletariat in close alliance with the peasantry which demands land, the big bourgeoisie of Mexico will go openly against the proletariat and the peasantry. Even if the bourgeoisie were to be for a time on the side of the

proletariat, it would betray it even more rapidly than the Chinese bourgeoisie because the demands of the industrial and agricultural proletariat and also those of the peasantry will make the class problem very acute. The national bourgeoisie is well aware that under present conditions a struggle against imperialism with the proletariat organised on a revolutionary programme and the peasants who demand land, as allies, would be fatal to it. The problems of national independence do not appear now to the bourgeoisie in the same light as before, when in the colonial and semi-colonial countries the national forces were only aiming at national independence. At present the proletariat exists as an organised revolutionary class, and this changes the whole situation. In the present epoch when the social problems are very acute, when Communism is spreading through the world and the Communist International is becoming the leader of the revolutionary proletariat, the bourgeoisie cannot take up the same attitude as at the time of the struggle for the independence of the people of Latin America. The colonisation of the peoples of Latin America which is the aim of the imperialists, although it awakens nationalist feelings among the bourgeoisie, cannot be prevented in an effective manner except by the combined forces of the proletariat and the peasantry. The programme says that the proletariat must keep intact its class independence, its combativeness against the exploiters, even if it enters into a temporary alliance with the bourgeoisie. These sentences are absolutely correct. They must appeal to all revolutionists. The slogan "bourgeois-democratic agrarian revolution" has already created enough confusion in some parties of the Communist International which at one time manifested opportunist reformist tendencies. We have already pointed out that hardly in any country of Latin America the landlords differ in any way from the bourgeoisie. Even the bourgeoisie and its various strata are sometimes fused into one single stratum of plutocrats. This monopolist plutocracy is at the same time a loyal ally of American imperialism. Industrial companies have been formed by national and foreign capitalists, as for instance the **Anglo-Ecuadorian Oil Co.** The same happens in other Latin American countries. One can understand that the community of interests between the bourgeoisie and the imperialists must be very strong. I would like to know how we can expropriate imperialist capital and feudal land without also expropriating national capital, considering that it is bound up with the landlords and imperialists. On the other hand, to expropriate only the land of these exploiters leaving them the industries, banks and commerce, namely, the most important economic factor, would be tantamount to the failure of the democratic bourgeois revolution led by the proletariat. The truth is that the national bourgeoisie will prefer to have smaller profits and to keep its property by placing itself at the service of the imperialists.

It is pointed out in the programme that in the colonial and semi-colonial countries the most important industries, banks and also commerce are in the hands of foreign capitalists. If this were true, national capital would be so small at the expropriation of the imperialists that it would be a mistake to leave to our class enemies these last strongholds. If the agrarian revolution is victorious, if it will be able to expropriate the owners of the latifundia, the capital of the imperialists — and this is the most difficult task — if the proletariat and the peasants succeed in constituting themselves as the workers' and peasants' government, it will be also possible to expropriate the capital of the national bourgeoisie without compensation.

For **Argentina** the problem will be slightly different. The slogan of a revolution for the national independence of Argentina would not meet with much success because imperialist oppression there does not assume as serious forms as in Mexico, Cuba and Panama. For Argentina there will be two solutions in case of war: general strike and boycott by the working class or proletarian revolution supported by the peasantry to expropriate national and imperialist capitalists. I do not think that the slogan "Agrarian revolution" is correct for the majority of colonial countries and "dependencies".

Alliance between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie appears in a slightly different light. Artisans who are fairly numerous in some countries, are elements on whom one can rely. But small employers, small trades people who want to become big capitalists are aspiring to hegemony in the revolutionary struggle. Hence they are very dangerous elements. The utilisation of the petty bourgeoisie for the revolutionary cause depends on a correct policy and good organisation on

the part of the proletariat. As to the participation of the proletariat in the struggles instigated by the petty bourgeoisie and directed against the imperialists or the big national bourgeoisie, I think that we must intervene there very energetically, but must at the same time keep our class independence, endeavouring to secure hegemony in the revolutionary struggle and not forgetting for a minute the possible treacheries of the petty bourgeoisie.

Comrade RING (Poland):

Comrades, the minority of the Polish Delegation is of the opinion that the Draft Programme can be accepted as a basis and that the Programme can also be finally decided upon at this Congress.

Our standpoint is that the VI. Congress of the Comintern must give to the Communist vanguard of the proletariat not a manifesto or declaration, but just a programme of the Communist International.

The Polish Communist Party stands in great need of a programme of the Communist International, and for three reasons:

1. We are a party which is developing rapidly. The most diverse elements come to us, join us and we must assimilate them. In this respect the programme of the Communist International will be a great help to us.

2. We are a country which is probably destined to have a revolution sooner than other countries. We require a clear solid programme in the forthcoming revolutionary events. We must know that our revolutionary ideology corresponds to that of the Comintern.

3. Unfortunately we are a Party with many currents. The existence of an official Comintern programme will undoubtedly help us to overcome more rapidly these divergencies of opinion and the fractional struggle which results from them.

I must emphasise that the Draft Programme has important advantages. One of them is its completeness, for it touches on all the main problems which confront the proletariat in its struggle.

Another advantage is that the most important characteristic features of the present epoch, i. e., the epoch of imperialism, are shown up in it with the utmost clearness.

We say that these formulations should not be toned down. Although imperialism is a stage of capitalism it has specific features. Therefore, a programme which is not elaborated anyhow and at any time but precisely in the imperialist epoch, must necessarily depict clearly and in a plastic manner the characteristic features of this epoch.

A series of hints contained in the programme render more easy our struggle against Right opportunist errors.

The introduction which begins with the words: "The epoch of imperialism is the epoch of declining capitalism", brings the question most forcibly to the fore. It is an argument against the false opportunist standpoint that imperialism is the highest development of capitalism. The same may be said also of many other points of the draft Programme, for instance, of the point which says that the free competition of industrial capitalism, which has taken the place of the feudal monopoly and the monopoly of trade capital has itself, become transformed into a monopoly of finance capital. This is a very distinct, clear and at the same time a correct definition of our epoch.

The accentuation and clearer definition of a few formulations which we are proposing, do not interfere with the general character of the draft Programme. Re the chapter on capitalism, I would like to draw attention to one of our amendments which corresponds to a proposal of the German Delegation. The programme says that imperialism is developing the forces of production. We propose a slightly different formulation, namely that the forces of production undergo a further development in the imperialist epoch. At first glance the difference seems very slight, but we think that our formulation is theoretically more exact and politically more expedient. It is more exact theoretically because it corresponds with the fundamental conceptions of Marx and Engels.

I hope that Comrade Bukharin will accept our amendment, as a formulation such as ours is met with also in his book "Theory of Historical Materialism".

Also in regard to Fascism we agree in the main with the standpoint of the draft Programme. It is one of the good points of the draft Programme that Fascism is connected on

the one hand with the epoch of imperialism and on the other hand with the fact of the disintegration of parliamentarism with which it is closely linked up. We declare emphatically that Fascism cannot be connected only with the post-war crisis of capitalism. Its roots go much deeper, and the disintegration of capitalism set in much sooner, already at the beginning of the capitalist epoch. If we propose a slightly different formulation — namely, the corresponding theses of our IV. Party Congress which were elaborated with the participation of the Comintern — we do so because in regard to two points the decisions of our Party Congress are perhaps clearer. These two points, which are of political importance, are as follows:

Firstly, in our Theses it was pointed out that Fascism is not a peculiarity of economically backward countries.

Secondly, it is emphasised in our draft theses that the movement of the petty bourgeois masses, which is no doubt a peculiarity of Fascism, is certainly not independent, that these masses are a tool of the bourgeoisie.

But there is one point with which we cannot unhesitatingly agree, namely the point which deals specifically with Poland and in which a bourgeois-democratic revolution as a stage towards the Socialist revolution is presupposed for Poland and other countries with a medium capitalist development. Contemporary Poland is placed on a par with pre-1917 Russia, i. e. with the Tsarist Russia. But why was the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution possible and necessary for the then Tsarist Russia? The most characteristic feature of this State was the domination of big landowners and the existence of semi-feudal relations in the countryside, with which three political factors corresponded: firstly, the Tsar, who personified a political order which corresponded with the domination of the landowning class; secondly, the antagonism between the semi-feudal landlords and the liberal bourgeoisie; thirdly, the political homogeneity of the countryside (although a certain economic differentiation already existed, the countryside felt the pressure of the landowners and the political order as a uniform whole). The peasantry as a whole could go with the revolution and could give it, to quote Lenin, the character of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Matters are different in contemporary Poland. We have strongly developed capitalist relations in the countryside; although relics of feudalism still exist there, they are not as numerous as in the then Tsarist Russia and they are on the wane.

With the economic there is also a corresponding political difference. Our political order is in harmony with the wishes and demands of the bourgeoisie. Far from homogeneity existing in the countryside, the capitalist landowners are fusing with the urban bourgeoisie. With us the peasantry is not a relatively united body, there is within it considerable differentiation, and not only economic and social, but also political. Not only in future but already now we must carry on in the countryside an energetic struggle against the kulak upper strata of the peasantry. The kulak is one of the chief personages of modern bourgeois Poland. In view of these social-political conditions we think it quite certain that the Socialist revolution in Poland, although its task is the completion of the bourgeois revolution, will have against it from the beginning not only the landlords and the whole bourgeoisie but also the kulak-bourgeois upper strata of the peasantry. There is a definition by Lenin: When the proletariat and the poor peasantry are struggling not only against the landlords but also against the bourgeoisie, including the rural bourgeoisie, we have no longer to do with a bourgeois but with a socialist revolution. It is, of course, possible that the socialist revolution will not lead at once to full proletarian dictatorship, that we will have at first an "honest coalition" with the revolutionary peasant parties. This is not only a possible but even a probable perspective. But with us the revolution will be from its very beginning confronted with the necessity of fighting capitalism and the bourgeoisie, including the rural bourgeoisie, and will be therefore a socialist revolution.

I hope that it will be possible to give at this Congress a final programme to the Communist proletariat, but not final in the sense that it is calculated for 20 to 30 years, for any definite long period. Just as the Communist International is a fighting army, a live and ever-developing organism, the Communist programme, too, which this Congress will give to the proletariat, will live and develop.

Comrade REIMANN (Czechoslovakia):

Comrades, the Czech delegation is of the opinion that the Draft Programme placed before the VI. World Congress is a proper basis for the final draft of the programme of the Communist International.

I would like to deal with a few fairly important questions. Comrade Bukharin has already correctly pointed out that it is impossible to deal with all the questions within the framework of the programme; but I think that one should nevertheless give at least a fair expose of the main questions in the Programme. I will pick out two important questions which have not been dealt with thoroughly enough in the Draft Programme. The questions of nationalities and religion. The national question is dealt with in the Programme mainly as a question of colonies and semi-colonies. The fact that also within the capitalist countries, in capitalist Europe the national question plays a very important role, is not expressed in the Programme. Moreover, the Programme deals with the slogans of the Communists in regard to the national question only in connection with the question of colonial and semi-colonial countries. Therefore, the Czech delegation is of the opinion that a series of addenda will be necessary in this part of the Programme: of course, in keeping with the whole structure of the Draft Programme. First of all, the national question must be analysed in the part which deals with capitalism. But it should be also pointed out that in Europe, through the existence of a series of States with a mixed nationality, the national question plays an important role, that it calls forth contradictions in the capitalist social order which accelerates the collapse of capitalism. Secondly, the national question should be dealt with a little more fully in connection with the problem of the proletarian dictatorship. Above all, the solution of the national question within the framework of proletarian dictatorship should be dealt with in greater detail, because this solution (especially in the Soviet Union) is of particular importance also from the standpoint of the agitation and propaganda of the Communist Parties. It should be pointed out that national contradictions can be solved within the framework of proletarian dictatorship and that thereby the way is paved to the complete disappearance of national antagonisms. Thirdly, the national question should be linked up with the tasks of our strategy.

The second question is that of religion. It is at present of special importance to western workers, because the social democrats and even its most left wing, the Austro-Marxists, have given up the Marxist standpoint in the question of religion. The former standpoint of the social democrats was that in the bourgeois state religion must be declared a private matter, whereas they have come around now to the bourgeois standpoint that for the proletarian parties, too, religion is a private matter.

The third question which has not yet been thoroughly dealt with is a question with which we must deal in connection with the strategy and tactics of the Communist International. In this part a detailed description of the inner Party questions of the Communist Parties is missing. This question is very important and the programme should deal at least in a general form with the questions which are continually cropping up in the Communist Parties. The proposal made by several sections who represent Trotskyism as a tendency in the programme, is not expedient. We have overcome Trotskyism just as we overcame formerly a series of deviations. Trotskyism is no longer an independent force in the ranks of the labour movement. But a general characterisation of currents deviating from Communism and Leninism is necessary. It is a fact that Right and Left deviations still play a big role in all parties, a fact which in all probability will remain with us for some time to come because Right and ultra-Left tendencies have a definite social basis. One should give on a broad basis a social characterisation of deviations in general accompanied by a general political characterisation of these various Right and ultra-Left deviations.

Although we are of the opinion that in a series of questions the Programme is not yet complete, we think that the clarification attained in the Programme Commission and the further discussion which is to take place in the sub-commissions will enable the VI. World Congress to decide definitely on the Programme of the Communist International. This will serve as a guide to the Communist Parties in the revolutionary work which they carry on in future in the interests of world revolution.

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

Comrades, the Presidium has considered the Polish-Lithuanian conflict and proposes that we address a manifesto to the workers of the world.

Thereupon Comrade Thälmann read the manifesto which was already published in the International Press Correspondence of 17th August, 1928, No. 51.

The manifesto was adopted unanimously by the Congress. (Close of Session.)

Twenty-sixth Session.

Moscow, August 13, 1928 (morning).

Continuation of the Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin on the Draft Programme of the Comintern.

Under the chairmanship of Comrade Semard (France) the discussion was continued on the report of Comrade Bukharin on the Draft Programme.

Comrade DENGEL (Germany):

Comrades: the adoption of a programme of the Communist International by the VI. World Congress is of extremely great importance. Through this programme a final determination of our theoretical foundation is given for all the Sections of the Comintern. In the extending and supplementing of Marxism by Lenin we have already had a concrete guiding line for our actions. But we lacked a summary of Marxism-Leninism in a programmatic presentation. Certainly the significance of the programme extends far beyond a necessary summarising orientation for the revolutionary struggle of the Communist Parties; the programme simultaneously makes very much easier for us the task of bearing Marxist-Leninist theory into the masses of the working class of the whole world.

To make the great proletarian masses conscious of their situation and of their historical tasks, remains to this day one of the essential tasks of the Communist Parties. Marxism-Leninism makes possible the solution of this problem in that it proceeds from the given situation, and not only formulates the laws of the present but also simultaneously the laws of change. As soon as the tendency of development is fixed in law, the will of man and of the class that sets the world in motion, takes on direction and aim.

Marxism, by raising socialism from utopia to science, became the pathfinder of the labour movement, for which it created a clear understanding of its road and of its task. Our programme, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, goes beyond the former programmatic formulations of Marxism, by showing to the proletariat quite concretely, quite unequivocally and most sharply, the road of the victorious proletarian revolution.

Is theory really permeating the movement? Is it really gripping the masses? The surety for this is the experience of the masses themselves, passive as well as active, above all the active experience in the innumerable struggles, victories and defeats, in the bloody conflicts with the bourgeoisie. In these struggles the proletariat learns theory: it experiences the betrayal by the reformists; here there takes place the self-exposure of all bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties. In the struggles, victories and defeats, in the battling with reformism for the leadership of the labour movement, the Communist Parties develop to a real comprehension of Marxism-Leninism, and throw off their petty bourgeois slag. This process has by no means been finished, and it will necessarily be a long-drawn one because the ups and downs, the contradictoriness in the movement itself, reacts also on the internal life of the Parties, creating vacillations there and thus constantly making necessary renewed struggles over the correct path. The programme of the C. I. will help the vanguard to accelerate the process of development towards relentlessly hard and revolutionary Parties, and to find their correct path despite inevitable vacillations.

The programme is the banner under which the world proletariat fights its fight for the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship; it also becomes the guide for the whole period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Very properly, therefore, the programme puts its chief weight on the chapter dealing with the transformation period.

The German Party busied itself with the programme question even prior to the publication of the Draft Programme. Especially on one question, the question of the structure of the programme, there was a clash of widely divergent opinions.

Most sharply did Comrade Duncker advocate the view that the programme of the Comintern must be a programme of principles, viz., a programme in which our fundamental principles were to be tabulated in abstract formulations, one after another. The German programme commission, in which Comrade Duncker worked most prominently, did not share this point of view. We are of the opinion that this programme of the Comintern must be not only a programme of principles, but also a guide to action, and consequently that it cannot be divorced from the living present.

Certain comrades were of the opinion that the introduction to this programme was superfluous. I hold the view that it is precisely the introduction that is the best achievement of the whole programme. This introduction fixes the place of the Communist International in the history of the labour movement. It presents the Communist world party as the amalgamation of the will and strength of the proletariat. It reveals the vanguard of the labour movement in its solid and growing organisation, which directs the whole momentum of the class struggle towards the proletarian revolution. And this section contrasts the revolutionary world party to Reformism, this faithful guard of capitalism, this betrayer of the class struggle, this deadly enemy of the revolutionary labour movement. This fixation of the historic place of the Comintern, this setting forth of its central tasks, is undoubtedly necessary by way of introduction.

In the chapter giving a presentation of imperialism, in our opinion, the paragraph dealing with capitalism came out too short. We know that the reformist traitors, who have long since deserted the ground of petty Marxism and who are stuck completely in the swamp of petty bourgeois ideologies, try to discredit the Communist movement as "Asiatic Marxism". We must demonstrate precisely the direct relationship and unity of Marxism and Leninism. Therefore, the basic teachings of Marx concerning capitalism must occupy a broader space in this section. We hold that the presentation of capitalism contained in the programme of the Russian Party no longer suffices today. Since the writing of this programme in 1903 there developed in one of the most revolutionary sections of the West European labour movement theoretical aberrations, which in their final conclusion challenge also the Marxist presentation of the problem of crises. Since these deviations have not yet been completely overcome today in the Comintern, a more precise formulation of the crisis problem in the programme is necessary. I am of the opinion that the formulation given by Comrade Bukharin in the Draft Programme must be adopted, with minor changes.

There was a certain amount of discussion over the proper place for the third chapter dealing with the final aim of the Communist International — world Communism. Some argued that this section should come at the end of the programme. In my opinion, putting the programmatic presentation of the final aim towards the beginning is entirely correct. We know that long before Bernstein had uttered his fateful words: "The movement is everything, the final goal nothing", Marx and Engels protested with greatest vigour against the covering up and deprecating of the importance of propagating the final aim. Furthermore our whole strategy and tactics, as well as the transition measures, are determined by the final aim.

As to the two next chapters, "The Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", and "The Proletarian Dictatorship in the Soviet Union and the International Socialist Revolution", there were likewise differences of opinion. Some comrades held the view that the general presentation of the experiences of the Soviet Union in the programme was sufficient. I consider this opinion wrong. As has already been stated, it is an advantage of the programme that everywhere it proceeds from the present, from what has already been achieved, from the "captured and written down", as Lenin put it. And in the present period there is nothing more important for the labour movement than the victory of the October Revolution and the existence of the Soviet Union. Naturally the general features of the transition period must be described; but these general features are given definitely and concretely, viz. in historic connection with the experiences in the Soviet Union.

The presentation of the evolution and place of the Soviet Union in the world is necessary also because the Soviet Union is the junction point of all the contradictions in present-day development, because, furthermore, the destiny of the Comintern is historically bound up with the origin of the first proletarian state. This great victory and the maintenance of proletarian victory over one-sixth of the surface of the earth, has changed the class struggle throughout the whole world, has raised it to a higher level. The Soviet Union is the heart of the fighting world proletariat, it is the strongest centre of power in the liberation struggle of all the exploited and oppressed of the whole world. For all these reasons an important place must be given in the programme to the development of the Soviet Union and the experiences of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Of course we are in fundamental agreement with the last chapter on the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party. I shall speak further on about the deficiencies of this chapter, about the amendments which we consider necessary.

To sum up, one must say about the architectonic of the Draft Programme that, aside from certain shiftings, shortenings and supplements, the structure and integration is correct and consistent.

First I will speak about certain supplements to the presentation of the present period of imperialism by certain characteristic phenomena, which in our opinion are necessary. In the discussion in the Programme Commission, Comrade Bukharin was right in rejecting a view which conceives of the process of decline, of the decay of capitalism in a mechanical manner. He was correct in opposing the views that capitalism is no longer capable of increasing production, of developing new forces of production. Such a mechanical conception of the collapse of capitalism is utterly erroneous. However, Comrade Bukharin does an injustice to my friend Lenz when he puts such a conception into his mouth. In the discussion in the Programme Commission Comrade Lenz said that monopoly capital to a constantly greater degree becomes a retarding factor in the development of the forces of production. In this connection he correctly pointed to the fact of growing chronic unemployment, and the relative or even absolute decline in the number of industrial workers employed, while production was simultaneously growing. This phenomenon of growing chronic unemployment, this terrific growing contradiction between the increase of the productivity of labour and the insufficient development of markets, which leads to an ever greater chronic unemployment and which in so highly developed a capitalist country as America has already led to an absolute decline in the number of employed industrial workers, is so important, and so highly characteristic of the crisis of imperialism that it absolutely must be mentioned in the programme.

A second phenomenon which has not yet been presented in the programme is the effect of the technical revolution upon the workers. Under monopoly capitalism the position of the worker in production changes to an extraordinary degree. Large sections of the workers lose their free mobility, their free choice of their workplace. This is one phenomenon. Still more important is the change that takes place in the factory: the complete mechanisation of labour through the conveyor system and the "scientific" exploitation of labour-power to such a degree that the worker is no longer able to renew his labour-power at the wages he receives, thereby being used up prematurely and expelled from the process of production as "useless".

A third phenomenon is the permanent offensive against the workers which is bound up with the critical situation of monopoly capitalism. It must be stated that broad strata of the workers in capitalist countries are being impoverished not only relatively but absolutely.

On these questions we feel that a supplement is necessary in the presentation of the present period of imperialism. Thereby the picture of the reformists' treachery, their complete transition to the side of the bourgeoisie, is simultaneously rounded off.

It was characteristic of the discussion in the Programme Commission that the questions of reformism and fascism were subjected to the broadest and liveliest discussion. Here the basic problems of our tactics are most closely related to the basic problems of imperialism. The necessary breadth and sharpness of the formulation of the problems, the necessary treatment of reformism in various parts of the programme, give the programme a polemical character that runs through all questions, and which is only an expression of the necessary sharpness of the hostility of our Sections towards the main obstacle to the development of the proletarian revolution.

The Programme Commission of the German Delegation introduced an amendment on the question of reformism which attempts to deal with the question more systematically, to work out the fundamental theory of present-day reformism more sharply as social imperialism, and to give a more precise designation to the "Left" within reformism. We believe that at the present time the most clearly developed reformist theory is that of the German Social Democracy, which has taken over and worked up the most essential parts of the so-called constructive socialism and guild socialism.

A great shortcoming, which absolutely must be eliminated, is the insufficient presentation of the role of the reformist trade union bureaucracy in the labour movement. It appears to me that precisely on this question the VI. World Congress has thus far not yet alarmed, with the necessary sharpness, especially the West European sections. It is absolutely necessary that greater space be devoted in our programme to a treatment of the role of the trade union bureaucracy and the fighting tasks of our Sections in trade union work and in economic struggles.

We are in full agreement with the description of fascism. But this presentation of fascism gives no answer to the question of the tendency of development in a period of declining capitalism. If it is stated there: "The bourgeoisie knows how to adapt itself to the prevailing political conjuncture, by resorting to both fascist methods and to the method of coalition with the Social Democracy", such a formulation does not reveal the actual dynamics of the development. The programme must reply to the question: What is the tendency of development? And the general role of fascism in the development of monopoly capitalism must be shown up.

In Germany we had a certain amount of discussion over the role of fascism in the process of the further development of monopoly capitalism. There were some comrades who tried to deprecate the role of fascism and of fascist methods, for the immediate as well as for the distant future. These comrades made two mistakes. First, they underestimated the importance of the Fascist organisations (Stahlhelm etc) and their role as a powerful reserve of the bourgeoisie. Their second and bigger mistake was the overestimation of reformism in the further development of monopoly capitalism. There was no dispute over the question that under present conditions in Germany — the same applies to Great Britain, France, etc. — our main striking force must be directed against reformism. There was no dispute either over the question that in these countries at

present reformism constitutes the strongest support of the bourgeoisie against the workers. But the comrades overestimated both the strength and the capacity for manoeuvre, of both reformism and of the bourgeoisie, against the working class. Thus e. g. the interdiction of the Red Front Fighters League by the erstwhile German-Nationalist Home Minister, Keudell, was looked upon in the main from the point of view of an election manoeuvre of the German nationalists. They did not see that this interdict was the expression of a definite tendency, which may be temporarily retarded, but which will force its way through. From this overestimation of the capacity for manoeuvring on the part of reformism and of the bourgeoisie, there result another and somewhat serious error of the German Party. We must admit that despite numerous warning signals presaging the split-offensive of the reformists in the mass organisations of the working class, our comrades were nevertheless rather surprised by it.

This reformist split-offensive, e. g. in Germany and in England, indicates the transition of social imperialism to social fascist methods. The direct integration of reformism with imperialism, with monopoly capitalism, drives it to resort to constantly sharper methods to defend imperialism against the onslaught of the workers. Ideologically the rapprochement of reformism to fascism has long since taken place.

Despite this development of reformism into defence of the interests of monopoly capitalism with terroristic, fascist methods, it does not just simply become fascism. Reformism is the most powerful means of the bourgeoisie to keep down and to oppress the workers democratically. Fascism in one form or another is for the bourgeoisie an instrument for the oppression of the workers under naked dictatorship. While the bourgeois parties under democracy are already going bankrupt as a result of their visible relations with finance capital, the reformists for the time being are still able to fill this gap in the leadership of the mass of the petty bourgeoisie, and are even still able to lead the majority of the working class in the interests of the bourgeoisie. But to the same extent to which it proceeds to the methods of fascism in defending its leading positions among the workers, to the extent that it is forced to give up its sham opposition to trust capital, it is discrediting itself with greater and greater sections of the workers. If the Communists succeed in rallying the masses of workers who have been disillusioned by reformism, if they succeed in playing a leading role in the struggles of the proletariat, above all in the economic struggles, then the importance of reformism as a bulwark against the oncoming workers will very rapidly decline. The role of fascism becomes more essential, and for the bourgeoisie decisive, in the moment of dangerous social crises.

In his concluding speech on this question in the Programme Commission, Comrade Bukharin indicated the importance of fascism also in the highly developed capitalist countries and showed the interrelations between fascism and reformism. It is necessary that these questions be dealt with also in the programme in conformity with their importance.

In Chapter IV there are three questions which above all must be cleared up. The first is the question of the nationalisation of land. In the Draft Programme, as the first measures of the proletarian dictatorship, there is demanded the expropriation and proletarian nationalisation of all big landed property in town and countryside. The nationalisation of all land is to be effected only gradually in the highly developed industrial countries.

We believe that also in the highly developed capitalist countries the nationalisation of all land is among the first measures of the proletarian dictatorship. It is true that in the more developed capitalist states the principle of private ownership has struck deep roots among the peasantry. It is consequently also correct that the drawing of the peasantry of these countries into Socialism will encounter greater difficulties. But can we conceive of establishing the necessary contact between the proletariat and the poor and middle peasantry by leaving to them the appearance of private ownership in land, while simultaneously we take from them the right to dispose of the land, by forbidding the sale and purchase of land? For the poor and middle peasant the nationalisation of land during the period of the building of Socialism, of the new economic policy, is nothing else but the restriction of the right of free disposal by the prohibition of the purchase and sale of land. The alliance with the toiling peasantry can be assured only by

the means of economic aid and the gradual inclusion into collectivisation. These means — supply of machinery, fertilisers, irrigation etc., and on the other hand organisation into collective farms on the basis of electrification and mechanisation, are to a very great extent at the disposal of the proletariat in the more developed capitalist countries. The electrification of the village has to a large extent been carried out already under capitalism, even though on the basis of the individual farms. Organisation into collective farming is relatively easy. A special kind of critical phenomena in the relations between town and countryside, which represents an important factor in the development of Socialism in the Soviet Union and which repeatedly raises anew the question of the alliance between proletariat and middle peasantry, will play only a subordinate role in the more developed capitalist countries. There the temporary economic advantage of the village is far more likely to become a danger and an obstacle in the evolution towards collectivisation. A differentiation between big landlordism and peasant property is certainly necessary. The big estate is confiscated with all its means of production. The peasant farm receives the right of usufruct, and also the right of inheritance of this usufruct. The danger of being driven from the land (by usury, tax-overburdening) is eliminated by the interdict upon the sale and purchase of land. The amortisation and assurance against new debts (ample aid from the socialist state in case of crop failures, etc.), the distribution of new land, is of far higher importance for the poor and for the greater part of the middle peasantry than in the formal maintenance of property rights coupled with their actual abolition.

A second question in which the German programme commission holds a different view from that of the draft programme is the following: Which countries are to be counted as belonging to the type of countries of an intermediate stage of capitalist development, in which the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been completed and in which the proletarian dictatorship can, under certain circumstances, be realised only through the growing of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution? In the draft programme, Poland also is numbered among these countries. It is correct to say that in Poland the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been completed, that there are still remnants of feudalism and that the agrarian revolution has not yet been carried out. On the other hand it must not be forgotten that, first, in present-day Poland there are large territories that were formerly German, in which big landlords are farming on a purely capitalist basis. Secondly, a large section of the Polish proletariat had behind it the experiences of the Russian revolution of 1906. Thirdly, present-day Poland has passed through a democratic phase into fascism. Democracy has been discredited not only among the masses of workers but also among the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. The Polish proletariat and large sections of the petty bourgeoisie see their chief enemy not in feudalism but in the Polish bourgeoisie. Fourthly, we have in Poland a Communist Party, which is already a mass Party, with a firm influence among the workers and a section of the peasantry. For all these reasons we believe that the present situation in Poland cannot be identified with the situation in Russia in 1907. This unquestionably applies to countries such as Roumania and Jugoslavia, for the Latin American countries, etc. We accepted the proposal made by Comrade Bukharin in the Programme Commission that this problem should be handled with greater elasticity.

A further question that must be cleared up is the question of the State type of the proletarian dictatorship. In the programme it is stated: "The form of proletarian State power, most suitable, as a rule, is ... the type of the Soviet State". If there can be any other form of higher proletarian dictatorship than the type of the Soviet State, then it is necessary to delineate the necessary basic relations also for this form of proletarian dictatorship. These basic relations are the relationship of the leading Party, the Communist Party, to the proletariat; the relationship of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie; the relationship of the proletariat to the petty bourgeoisie. Here above all we have as the most important problem: how is it possible to draw the masses of the petty bourgeoisie under the leadership of the proletariat, and to coordinate them step by step with the proletariat itself viz. in the building of socialism. Experiences thus far has shown us the Soviet State as the type in which the absolute hegemony of the proletariat, and the

leadership of the petty bourgeoisie by the proletariat, has been realised. This problem is of extraordinary importance, and it would be necessary to present just this important role of the Soviets in the programme, more precisely and extensively than has thus far been done.

The chapter on Strategy and Tactics requires an essential reworking. In this chapter there are missing entirely several problems that necessarily belong there, such as, e. g. the national question, the attitude of our Party towards parliament. Other questions are quite inadequately dealt with, for example, the question of our trade union tactics, our strike strategy, preparation for decisive struggles, combination of legal with illegal work etc. It would have been well if also in this chapter there had been applied the combination of experiences and concrete actuality with the raising of questions of principle. I do not believe that at this Congress there will be sufficient time to undertake this complete reworking. What is necessary, however, is a more systematic manner of presentation, and a sharper and more definite formulation of such important questions as the united front tactics, partial demands and partial slogans, and transition slogans. That there must be contained no unclarity, in the fundamental principles of our strategy and tactics, that these formulations must be particularly painstakingly clearcut, is shown by the dangers which Communist Parties have to withstand precisely at this under a certain pressure of reformism. Let us take an example. On the basis of the experiences of the German Party, the V. World Congress condemned the opportunistic presentation of the slogan of the workers and peasants government, and described the meaning of this slogan as a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat. This slogan has come into general usage in the Parties, and is really being applied as a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat. It seems, however, that even now there is not perfect clarity on this slogan. In his "Programmatic Questions" submitted to the Programme Commission, Comrade Thalheimer took up also the slogan of the workers and peasants government. While Comrade Thalheimer does go beyond the opportunistic formulations given this slogan by the Leipzig Party Congress, yet he now again denies that the slogan of the workers and peasants government is a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat. For him the slogan of the workers and peasants government is a transition slogan for the soviets in a still imperfect, transitory form. The programme must give an unequivocal reply to such questions. It is impossible that perhaps two Sections with similar structural situations in their country, use the same slogan with an entirely different meaning. Such a situation would be bound to lead to utter confusion.

In the same chapter of his proposals Comrade Thalheimer says:

"Some comrades, I have learned from rumours, have accused me of a frightful misunderstanding of the meaning of the transition slogans of Marx and Engels. According to the views of Marx and Engels these slogans could be propagated only in an acute revolutionary situation, in the revolutionary transformation itself. In the sense of Marx and Engels by transition slogans are meant such slogans as can be realised only after the conquest of power by the working class."

We assume that Comrade Thalheimer refers in these sentences to the discussion which took place in the German Party over one transition slogan, viz, the slogan of control of production by the workers. The political friends of Comrade Thalheimer certainly committed serious opportunist mistakes in this discussion, not such "mistakes" as Comrade Thalheimer mentions in the above citation, but real opportunist mistakes. Among others, Comrade Brandler — and we assume not altogether without the collaboration and agreement of Comrade Thalheimer — proposed to the German Party a so-called programme of action. Among a series of erroneous formulations it dealt also with the slogan of workers' control of production. But in what manner? Comrade Brandler said that the slogan of workers' control of production is a task of the present day. And as such a task he proposed investigating the accounts, the estimates, the solvency of a factory, the special happenings in a shop, etc. The political friends of Comrades Brandler and Thalheimer in Germany demanded that in the present situation, in a similar conception as Comrade Brandler proposed, the German Party should counterpose the slogan of workers' con-

trol to the deceptive slogan of the reformist trade union bureaucracy for economic democracy; as a slogan of action. The German Party, in full agreement with the Executive of the Comintern, rejected this view as opportunist. Nor has the German Party any need to take lessons from Comrade Thalheimer about transition slogans. If he had taken the trouble to give painstaking study to the thesis of the Essen Party Congress of our Party, he would have found out that in the German Party there has long been complete clarity about the meaning of transition slogans and the necessity for the propagation of certain transition slogans.

In conclusion I should like to say a few words on the question of whether or not the VI. Congress should adopt the programme in its final form. I am convinced that the work on the Draft Programme can be completed up to the end of the Congress only insofar that all questions, without exception, will have their final formulations. The Congress will therefore be in a position to adopt the programme as far as its contents are concerned. The final style, the careful rendering into the various languages, the separation of the chapters into sub-headings, etc. in short the final editing, without any change of contents, must be submitted to a commission charged with completing this task within a fixed period. I do not believe any other way is possible.

But regardless of whether the Congress adopts the programme only as to its contents, or also as to its wording, it must give to the Communist International, and to the revolutionary labour movement of the whole world, the programmatic presentation of the road to Communism. With this a lofty aim has been achieved. It will be utterly wrong to assume that the adoption of the programme signifies nothing more than one more piece of paper. That the VI. World Congress completes and adopts the programme, that it binds up in the programme the sharpness of the theoretical definitions of Marxism-Leninism with the directives for practical action that have grown out of concrete experience — this is also a sign of the growth of the Comintern, ideologically and in organisation and practice, in its position in the liberation struggle of the international proletariat and of all the oppressed.

That the VI. Congress of the Comintern adopts a programme based upon experiences which make possible a concretisation of our strategy and tactics for all the countries of the earth, from the most highly developed capitalist country, to the economically undeveloped oppressed colonial country, and that, based on experiences, it is able to show the concrete road to be travelled in the first stage after the conquest of power, proves the world-embracing and world-significant character of the Comintern; it shows that the Comintern has truly become a world power. The imperialists of the whole world recognise this power, they view its growth with fear and alarm. Therefore, they are concluding alliances, they are trying to push their own differences into the background in order to smash jointly the Soviet Union — the most powerful bulwark in the liberation struggle of the proletariat and of all oppressed. The programme will be our guide in our preparations against the imperialist war, in the rallying and revolutionising of the proletarians of all countries; it will be our guide towards the proletarians' overthrow of the bourgeoisie and for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade SULTAN-ZADE (Persia):

Comrades, on the Programme Commission I spoke against that point in the Draft Programme which defines the present epoch as the epoch of finance-capital. I think it is a great mistake that this epoch is identified with the epoch of imperialism. I want to say that Hilferding's theory of finance-capital is an absolutely false and artificial theory. At all events, it does not express the facts. I am absolutely convinced that there never has been such an epoch as the epoch of finance-capital, and still less does such an epoch exist now, at a time when industry is centralised and concentrated to the highest point. I opposed Hilferding's definition of finance-capital because what Bukharin says and what is stated in the Draft Programme about finance-capital is altogether different from what Hilferding says about it. But of this more anon.

How does Hilferding define his theory? He says:

"An increasing part of industrial capital ceases to belong to the industrialists who employ it. The industria-

lists are able to use this capital through the medium of the banks. Bank capital sunk in industry in this way I call finance-capital!"

This is the definition that Hilferding himself gives of the nature of finance-capital, i. e. bank capital sunk in industry, which he calls finance capital. Throughout the whole course of his book "Finance Capital" Hilferding repeatedly declares that the present stage of development of capitalism is a stage in which the domination of finance-capital and the dependence of industry upon the modern banks has grown to an enormous extent. At the end of his book Hilferding goes so far as to say without qualification that the modern banks have imposed their control upon the principal branches of modern large-scale industry, and that if the German proletariat could manage to seize the six big Berlin Banks, it would by that be able to take control of the principal branches of industry. Hilferding has been Minister for Finance, but he did not think fit to put his theory into practice.

I am of the opinion that neither in theory nor in practice is it possible for the Banks to dominate or control industry. It is impossible from the standpoint of correct banking policy. As you know, the individual elements of reproduction are brilliantly analysed in Marx's "Capital". Marx quite clearly showed what capitalist reproduction is as a whole, where it breaks up into its component parts, where in the process of circulation they assume independent forms, how these elements are entirely subordinated to the laws of development of production, and that while in certain periods of capitalist development one or the other may obtain a certain amount of independence (as money capital, merchant capital, etc.), that these rise and fall in accordance with the rise and fall of industry and are entirely dependent upon its development.

This theory of finance-capital is not only wrong because it contradicts the Marxian theory, but also because it contradicts the practice of elementary banking policy; for no big bank would sink the greater part of its capital in industry. We have had cases in the history of banking where a bank has sunk a large amount of its capital in industry, in company promotion, speculation, etc. But these usually result in serious bankruptcy, as was the case of the "Credit-Mobilier" in France and the "Credito Mobiliere" in Italy. We know also from the history of German banking the collapse of the *Leipziger Bank* in the beginning of the 20th century, resulting from the fact that this bank engaged too much in the business of buying the stock of other industrial enterprises. These bitter experiences do not encourage the modern banks to enter into such adventures, and they would never lock up their own capital, let alone their deposits for long periods or even for a number of years in industry. If a bank were to do that, it would meet with bankruptcy at the very first industrial crisis.

I strongly oppose the assertion that the development of modern capitalism tends towards the transformation of bank capital into finance capital, that the present epoch is the epoch of finance-capital and that the tendency of the development of industry is to become more dependent upon the banks, as Hilferding declares. This is neither technically nor practically possible, particularly so after the war, when enormous industrial enterprises have arisen which themselves can establish big banks like the *Deutsche Bank*, for example.

The steel Trust recently set up in Germany has a capital of 1500 million marks and consists of 407 of the biggest industrial groups in the steel industry. All these capitalist groups are directly or indirectly dependent upon the Trust, which can exercise a perfectly real control — not a quasi-control like the banks — over a combined capital amounting to 4500 million marks. I ask what modern bank is able to control a giant like this?

Take another example, the *American Steel Corporation* with a capital of \$ 1,400,000,000. What New York Bank could impose even partial control over this giant, let alone dominate it, since the biggest bank in New York has not a capital exceeding \$ 200,000,000. It is simply ridiculous to talk of controlling a giant like this.

Hilferding is quite right, however, when he says that the bank cannot sink its capital in a single enterprise, and that in order to lessen its risks it must invest its capital in a number of enterprises. That being the case, the bank must

exercise control not only over one Trust, but over a number. In the present period of monopoly capitalism the absurdity of this is apparent. It is noteworthy that the comrades who have studied the structure of the modern monopolist organisations, even when they are supporters of the Hilferding theory, have to admit that the banks exercise a diminishing influence upon these organisations.

With the growth of the monopolist organisations the influence of the banks must inevitably diminish and tend to restrict themselves to their own peculiar function of accounting apparatus, as the cashiers of the industrial capitalists. Comrades, in the pre-war period of development of capitalism, we had not a single case when an industrial capitalist or big concern openly took up the fight against the big banks.

At the present time, however, we see numerous cases of this kind. We all know the fight that was conducted by the *Stinnes* concern against the Berlin banks, and we know also the unceasing struggle that Ford carries on against the New York and other banks. And I must say that this is a very successful struggle indeed that the industrial capitalists are waging against the banks, because they have at their command colossal material resources obtained from the sphere of production itself. The material resources of the banks are inadequate to impose anything more than a superficial control over these industries.

Comrade Bukharin opposed my point of view in the Plenum and also on the Programme Commission. In reply to my statement that Hilferding was a renegade of Marxism and that his theory must be thrown on the scrap-heap as the workers have thrown him on the scrap heap already, Comrade Bukharin says that there are quite a number of renegades of Marxism, for example, Kautsky who wrote "The Road to Power" from which we have still a great deal to learn, although Kautsky himself has become a traitor to Socialism. In reply to this I must say, however, that Kautsky now repudiates what he wrote formerly, whereas Hilferding does not dream of doing so, although it must be said that Hilferding has undergone a certain process of evolution with his theory.

Comrade Bukharin quoted the example of State capitalism, which he described as the social super-structure of the capitalist system. I quite agree with this. It is true that State capitalism subordinates capitalist society to itself and is capable of doing so. But there is a great distinction between what I said and what Comrade Bukharin said. State capitalism is indeed the social super-structure, but money capital or credit is only one of the elements of the reproduction process. Credit is a small part of the reproducing capital, whereas State capitalism is truly the super-structure. In the same way as the State-organised bourgeoisie represents a super-structure of capitalist relationships and governs the class organisation of the whole of society, so can State capitalism govern the production of capitalist society as a whole. But this is not the point under discussion. I think that credit relations, being part of the reproduction process, cannot govern the whole of the process of production, particularly the basis of this production process, viz., industry.

The next point that Comrade Bukharin made against me was the following: Comrade Bukharin asks how is it possible to belittle the role of finance capital when Germany, for example, was placed on its feet again with the aid of American credit. It seems to me that we simply fail to understand the whole point if we speak of credit in this simple manner. I of course do not deny that the banks invest their capital in foreign loans. I do not deny that the banks play an auxiliary role in modern capitalist economy and that they are an important factor in mobilising the gold reserves of capitalist economy. I do not deny that at a given moment the banks can afford to invest a part of the available capital in those countries where they can obtain higher profits as was the case in Germany. This is simply a matter of discount policy. If to-day the discount rate in a certain country is higher than that in America, it is to the advantage of the American capitalists to invest their available capital in industry, and they will naturally strive to invest their capital where they can get the highest profits. But the money which was given to German industries was not bank money, but the money of the industrial capitalists who had available capital at their disposal and they permitted the banks to invest this as industrial loans to Germany. The banks cannot without the permission of their depositors sink their

capital for long periods in any country in the form of industrial capital.

In the epoch of monopolist capitalism, when the concentration and centralisation of capital has reached a very high stage, the industries would not permit the banks to act so recklessly. The modern trusts, which concentrate enormous amounts of capital in their concerns, are far stronger than they were when industry was broken up into small enterprises. At that time of course the banks could do what they liked with the small enterprises. But the situation changes altogether when big capital, consolidated in trusts, comes into the arena. It is quite natural, therefore, that in the epoch of monopolist economy, the share of surplus value falling to the banks should diminish.

Although Comrade Bukharin described my arguments as childish, I must say, however, that I came to this childish conclusion after four years study of this process. Where did Hilferding get his theory from? I have studied the balance sheets of the big Berlin banks for the period ten years before and ten years after the war, and in none of these balance sheets have I found anything that could justify Hilferding's point of view.

Take the balance sheets of the three biggest Berlin banks. The **Dresdener Bank**, the **Darmstadt Bank** and the **Deutsche Bank**. In vain do we seek for a reply to the question as to what part of these balances were invested by the banks in industry. Some naive people believe that the banks conceal this fact from the public, but that is absurd. In all the balance sheets of the big Berlin banks, there is a special item dealing with "investments of capital" which are called "permanent investments". In addition we have another item called shares in consortiums. This item includes all the sums invested by the bank as a participator in consortiums in industrial stock which was guaranteed by the consortium or invested in various municipal or State loans. Both these items represent a relatively insignificant part of the banks' assets. The following table illustrates this:

Combined balances in millions of marks.

	1913	1927
1. Dresdener Bank	1,538	1,885
a) Permanent investments	39	28
b) Consortium shares	55	14
2. Darmstadter Bank	978	1,772
a) Permanent investments	8	22
b) Consortium shares	45	24
3. Deutsche Bank	2,246	2,320
a) Permanent investments	82	26
b) Consortium shares	53	35

It must be pointed out, however, that in the case of all the banks the permanent investments represent investments in other banks and not in industry. On what does Hilferding base his assertion that a growing share of bank capital is being invested in industry and is being converted into finance capital? I declare that this is a fiction.

The other assertion of Hilferding is also a fiction, namely, that every bank represents a stock-exchange. Hilferding rightly points out that with the development of the latest tendencies of capitalism, the role of the stock-exchange diminishes; but this is not because the banks are transformed into stock-exchanges, but because under monopolist capitalism only a few capitalists come on the stock-exchange, whereas formerly thousands came. Hence, formerly the stock-exchange was the regulator of capitalist economy. Now, however, it has ceased to play this role, not because the banks are playing this role now, but because monopolist capitalism has reduced the stock-exchange to a lower grade in the capitalist machine.

Now a word or two about "finance-capital" as Comrade Bukharin has explained it. I must say that the Draft Programme gives a different definition of finance-capital to that given by Hilferding. In the Draft Programme it says:

"The merging of industrial capital with bank capital and the monopolistic character of this form of capitalism transforms the epoch of industrial capital into the epoch of finance-capital."

Comrade Bukharin said the same thing when he gave his definition of finance-capital. He says that the merging of industrial capital is a fact that cannot be ignored, but from this correct statement an altogether wrong conclusion is drawn concerning the domination of so-called finance-capital. I do not say that there is no domination of finance-capital at all, or

that the banks are becoming transformed into an appendage of industry, but I do say that industrial capital can establish its own banks and that it is in this way that industrial capital and bank capital are becoming merged. This is exactly what is happening. I must say, however, that by his definition, Comrade Bukharin places Hilferding's theory upside down. I can agree with Comrade Bukharin's definition of finance-capital, but with certain reservations. The first is that industrial capital establishes its own banks and thereby finances itself. Secondly, the merging of industrial capital with bank capital takes place under the control of industry and for the purpose of supporting industry, and finally, that the tendency of the development of capitalism is towards the emancipation of industry from the banks and towards the banks being reduced to the accounting apparatus and cashier of the industrial capitalists. Hilferding himself has undergone a process of evolution in this respect.

At the Congress of the German Social Democratic Party in 1927, a programme commission was set up, of which Hilferding and Kautsky were members, at which this question was very heatedly discussed. Finally, a point was introduced into the programme to the effect that the capitalist striving towards monopoly leads to the amalgamation of branches of industry, to the merging of the production stages and to the organisation of industry into cartels and Trusts. This process amalgamates industrial merchant and bank capital into finance capital. Thus, in the opinion of this former Marxist, industrial capital, merchant capital and bank capital together make finance-capital. What then becomes of Hilferding's definition of finance-capital as bank capital invested in industry. What has become of this theory. I think what Hilferding says now is a parody of what he said before, but even this parody is wrong. Such an amalgamation does not take place as a rule. When it does take place, it is exclusively under the control of industrial capital.

Comrades, we know from the history of the development of capitalism how industrial capital step by step overcame merchant capital and how in many branches of industry it compelled the merchant capitalists to become the selling agents of their goods. The gigantic power of the modern syndicates and warehouses proves this conclusively. This evolution springs from the evolution of capitalism itself. In a similar way, the independent banks are becoming transformed into the agents and cashiers of industrial capital, which is the inevitable result of the further development of capitalism.

Very often our editors employ the term finance-capital in a most irresponsible manner, because often they do not know what they are talking about.

I think that we must make this term more precise and that it should be employed in the manner that we understand it. I repeat that Hilferding himself now adopts a different definition of the term finance-capital. The very fact that we have adopted a point in our programme about the merging of industrial capital with merchant capital, shows that we have departed a long way away from Hilferding's theory. Hilferding's theory must be thrown on the scrap-heap of history in the same way as the revolutionary proletariat has flung Hilferding himself on the scrap heap.

Comrade R. ALPHONSO (Indonesia):

Comrades, it seems to me that the author of the draft programme did not want to instruct us with the experience of the Chinese Revolution. This experience was one of the most important lessons for our proletarian movement, especially in the colonies and semi-colonies, for it is a question of the bloc between the proletarian Chinese Communist Party and the petty-bourgeoisie Kuomintang, who, being under the leadership of the big bourgeoisie, succeeded in utilising the revolutionary energies of our Chinese comrades for their benefit.

In the draft programme, instead of giving us the lessons and experiences of the Chinese Communist Party, we read as follows:

"In the colonies and semi-colonies where the working class plays a more or less important role and where the bourgeoisie has already crossed over to the camp of the avowed counter-revolution, or is crossing over because of the development of the mass proletarian and peasant movements, the Communists must steer a course

towards the hegemony of the proletariat and for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry."

That is to say, as long as the bourgeoisie have not crossed over to the camp of the counter-revolution the task of the Communist Party is not to steer a course for the hegemony of the proletariat for conquering of State power, but to compromise with the bourgeoisie and to let the proletariat be utilised by their enemies.

In my opinion it is not a Communist programme, but is really an opportunist programme. This means to instruct the colonial Communist Parties to repeat what has been done in China, that is, to have an alliance with the bourgeoisie until our Party is destroyed and until the best of our leaders have been killed. Our main task is not to do this, but to gain the hegemony of the proletariat not only after the betrayal by the bourgeoisie, but even before it, because our aim is to establish the proletarian State and to overthrow world capitalism.

In connection with this I want to draw attention to another passage in the programme which reads as follows:

"Temporary agreements with the latter (bourgeoisie R. A.) may be made only insofar as they will not hamper the revolutionary organisations of the workers and peasants."

That is to say, to wait until the bourgeoisie have killed our revolutionary comrades and until they tear to pieces our proletarian party, as happened in China. In my opinion, we must not do so. The object of our agreement with the bourgeoisie should be to use their revolutionary energy for our proletarian revolution and not vice versa. The decision of the II. Congress was more correctly worded in regard to this question.

State and finance capital in the mother countries in this period force the colonial bourgeoisie to move closer and closer to each other. Therefore, for the defence of their own class interest the betrayal of the colonial bourgeoisie is inevitable. From this also it follows that it is Utopian to think, at the present time, that the petty or big bourgeoisie of the colonial or semi-colonial countries can accomplish even a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Therefore, in my opinion, to wait until the bourgeoisie destroy and liquidate our party and kill our revolutionary comrades is a foolish instruction.

To avoid this it is the duty of the Communist Party to lead the workers and poor peasants, and any temporary agreement with the petty-bourgeoisie should be used as an instrument for the overthrow of the capitalist State. And when we see that the masses of workers and peasants are with us (which does not mean that the majority of them should be with us), it is our duty to form Soviets. The programme states that in order to form Soviets the situation must be as follows:

- a) when the revolutionary tide is flowing;
- b) when the dominant classes are disorganised;
- c) when the masses are in a state of revolutionary ferment;
- d) when the intermediary strata are inclining toward the proletariat, etc., etc.

In my opinion such instructions are entirely wrong and confuse the real meaning of the Soviets.

We must form Soviets in any struggle of the working class against the capitalist class. Firstly to teach the workers how to form Soviets. Secondly, to defend and lead them in their struggles. At the same time, the Soviets may be a means to overthrow the bourgeois state and to seize power. And this depends upon the situation in that country.

Now I ask you, comrades, why did the Russian proletariat demand All power to the Soviets! in the November Revolution? Was it only because they were in a definite political and economic situation? Was it only because there was a Bolshevik Party?

The Russian proletariat before the October revolution also organised Soviets even in the time of strikes. From these they had learned that the Soviet is an organ for the defence of their own interests and for their own benefit. Therefore, in the struggle of labour against capitalism it is our duty to form Soviets.

And what is our relation to the bourgeoisie before they become traitors to the proletarian movement? The pro-

gramme does not mention; as if there were no experiences of the Chinese and Turkish insurrections. In the colonies and semi-colonies where the bourgeoisie has already gone over to the counter-revolution, the proletariat should not seize the State power but unite with them and let themselves be utilised by the exploiters. Should such directions remain in our programme? The main point is this that the Communist Party is the proletarian Party which is hostile to the bourgeoisie, and our duty is to criticise it, to unmask the Social Democrats and to overthrow the capitalist State, and not to do as the programme said.

In connection with this in the same paragraph we read the following:

"In such countries (where the bourgeoisie already became counter-revolutionary) the Communist Party must concentrate their efforts mainly upon creating broad mass proletarian organisations (trade unions) and revolutionary peasants' unions and upon drawing up demands and slogans which directly affect the working class.."

In India, in Indonesia, in Philippines, etc. where the bourgeoisie did not go over to the counter-revolution as it did in China, our main task in these countries is to create broad mass organisations among the workers and poor peasants. To wait, as the programme declares, that is: a) to concentrate our main efforts to create trade unions after the treachery of the bourgeoisie. b) To create revolutionary peasant unions after the treachery of the bourgeoisie. c) To have slogans which affect the working class after the disorganising of our Party by the bourgeoisie will be a great danger for the proletarian movement.

Another instruction is on page 562.

"1. Of enormous significance also is the winning over of the broad strata of the poorest peasants and the neutralisation of the middle strata of the peasantry."

I think this instruction is wrong. Our practical work in Indonesia taught us that the middle peasantry, which are also exploited by the big landlords and have to pay very high taxes to the State, are revolutionary minded. I think that such conditions are not only in Indonesia but even in Madagascar, in China, in India, in the Philippines, etc. etc. I think that the revolutionary energies of these middle peasants can be utilised for our revolutionary movement against feudalism and the big landlords. Probably our Chinese Communist Party at the present time is working in this direction. Therefore, to neutralise the middle peasantry and not to use their revolutionary energies means weakening our class struggle in the villages, especially if the revolution is an agrarian revolution in the first stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

In some countries the middle peasantry must be neutralised where the majority of the population is composed of peasantry, such as the present colonies and semi-colonial countries including the Balkans, and some parts of Western Europe. This neutralisation can be effected only when the revolution is reaching the second stage, i. e. the social revolution.

But in a country where the majority of the population are composed of workers, such as in England, I think the slogan of neutralisation of the middle peasantry is useless. Besides in this country, the revolution will not be an agrarian one but a social revolution.

Further, in my opinion, after the word hegemony, which is found in many places in the Draft, there should be added "conquer the State power". Not to add this means to instruct the sections of the Comintern to imitate the Mensheviks, Martinov, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who were also for the hegemony of the proletariat in 1917, but not for the conquering of State power.

Therefore, comrades, as far as I can judge, this Draft Programme is not a Communist programme, but is a programme which in some parts describes the theory of value and exchange of value; on the other hand it is a plan to weaken the proletarian movement which is the latest plan of the Mensheviks of 1928.

Comrade BRANDT (Poland):

Comrades, the Draft Programme which our Congress must adopt stands on the very sound foundation of the theory of revolutionary Marxism, of Leninism.

The Social-Democrats are now compelled to give theoretical formulation to their betrayal of Marxism. They are turning away from Marxism back to craft-unionism and bourgeois Liberalism. What there is new in contemporary Social-Democracy originates from Fascism.

Our Programme is also based on the combined experience of the revolutionary labour movement of the whole world. It will reveal to every comrade the connection that exists between the struggle of the British miners, and of the Chinese coolies and of the workers in the Soviet Union who are building up Socialism.

We declare that imperialism is moribund capitalism. Firstly because it creates the objective pre-requisites for Socialism by the unexampled concentration of production, by creating an apparatus for the social regulation of production and distribution. On the other hand, it creates these pre-requisites by the fact that all the contradictions of capitalism are being developed to their acutest form, the exploitation and oppression of the enormous majority of mankind is being intensified, and because it is furthering the uprising of the enormous majority of mankind against the minority of the exploiters.

The Social-Democrats appraise imperialism as a higher system of organising production. They are the apologists of ultra-imperialism. Hilferding has given a new name to ultra-imperialism, namely, "organised capitalism".

Such an attitude towards ultra-imperialism is impossible in our Communist ranks, but lack of clarity in regard to the possibility of ultra-imperialism is to be observed in our ranks in Poland. Because we concentrate our gaze exclusively upon the fundamental tendency towards the building up of monopolies we come to the erroneous conclusion that this tendency can lead to the complete organisation of the whole world by means of one single mind on the basis of capitalism. We lose sight of the law of the uneven development, which must give rise to increasing conflicts in the capitalist system, inside the cartels for quotas, among the various branches of industry for the share of the total profits, conflicts between the cartelled and un-cartelled industries, conflicts between the national monopoly combines and the world market and finally, the conflicts between the capitalist States for the re-distribution of the world. The contradiction between the growing socialisation of production and private property which is expressed by these struggles, cannot be removed on the basis of capitalism.

Competition under capitalism cannot be eliminated; it has been merely raised to a higher plane. Lenin has pointed out that imperialism cannot radically change the capitalist system because it merely represents a transition to a higher system, that monopoly exists side by side with competition and it is precisely in this that Lenin saw its greatest contradiction.

When, therefore, a comrade from the Polish minority says that we must not refer to the remnants of competition in the Programme and that greatest stress be laid upon the new aspect, namely upon monopoly, he is mistaken. Lenin in his "Imperialism" wrote:

"Monopoly does not eliminate competition from which it sprang, but exists side by side with it and in this way gives rise to more acute and serious contradictions, frictions, and conflicts."

And then he goes on to say that Kautsky has nothing in common with Marxism

"because he evades the most profound and fundamental contradictions of imperialism, namely, the contradiction between monopoly and competition which exists simultaneously with it, between the cartels and trusts on the one hand, and the non-cartelled industries on the other."

Thus, the remnants of free competition cannot be ignored if we desire to have a dialectical and not a schematic idea of imperialism; if we wish to have not an abstract picture of capitalism, but of capitalism with all its contradictions as it really is. And this is exactly what we must have.

We must also recall what Lenin said in the course of the discussion on the Programme of the C. P. S. U. in 1917. He wrote:

"Not pure monopoly, but monopoly existing side by side with exchange, with the market, with competition and crises; — this is the essential feature of imperialism generally."

It is precisely the coupling of these contradictory elements — competition and monopoly that is the essential feature of imperialism and prepares the ground for its collapse, i. e. for the social revolution."

I want to add that Comrade Ring in a theoretical article wrote that imperialism will overcome competition and anarchy. I mention this because this schematic and non-dialectical conception of imperialism as a sort of "organised capitalism" leads to false political conclusions, such as for example that united international capital has decided to agrarianise Poland and that Pilsudski is the executive organ of this collective mind. The comrades of the minority will not admit that the Polish bourgeoisie wish to counter-act the agrarianising tendencies of German capital with the aid of British and American capital or that they can partly develop industry. They deny the possibility that the Polish bourgeoisie can utilise the antagonisms between German, British and American capital.

These false conceptions also lead to a false appraisal of the stabilising process in Poland and of its contradictions.

On these grounds, the impossibility of ultra-imperialism must be made clearer in the programme.

In the main, we are in agreement with the manner in which the Programme deals with Fascism. We want to stress the point that the social aspect is brought to the forefront and that Fascism is described as a specific regime of the crisis of capitalism, as a special form of the general finance-capitalist reaction. In Poland, we have to combat the false conception of Fascism as a normal, adequate political super-structure of monopolist capitalism, — a conception which regards Fascism purely from the economic aspect and cuts it off entirely from the Social Revolution. We have therefore, examined and stressed the peculiar class mechanism of Fascism. We observe tendencies towards Fascism, elements of Fascist development in all other capitalist countries where the crisis of capitalism has become acute. Fascism in its completest form is observed only under special conditions. It would be desirable to enumerate these special conditions in the Programme more precisely, although not too rigidly.

In the Programme an attempt is made to describe the progress of the Revolution in various types of countries, and this is one of the merits of the Programme. But the scheme as far as Poland is concerned, is incorrect. Poland has gone much further in historical development than Russia had reached in 1917. For many years already, political power in Poland is in the hands of the bourgeoisie which is closely linked up with the big landlords. The proletariat has considerable weight in Poland. The revolution that will take place in Poland will be directed against the bourgeoisie, it must strive for Socialist aims, it will be a social and proletarian revolution. In our opinion, the slogan will be: "All Power to the Soviets", and in these Soviets the Party of the proletariat will fight for the leading role. The proletariat will give the whole revolution a Socialist direction. In the Polish Revolution there will be hardly any place whatever for the democratic dictatorship of the workers' and peasants' stage, even if the dictatorship of the proletariat will not be immediately victorious.

The proletarian revolution in Poland will bear a special character because, apart from its Socialist content, it will have an important bourgeois-democratic content just as the October Revolution in Russia had a great bourgeois-democratic content. That is to say: first the overthrow of the Junkers, the liquidation of large landownership, secondly, the liberation of the oppressed nationalities, thirdly, breaking the power of the church, etc. The big tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution will be fulfilled by our Revolution as a by-product.

I do not agree with the view expressed here by the representatives of the Polish minority on the Commission and also on the Plenum. They declared that the remnants of feudalism in Poland have been destroyed. Fascism has destroyed only those remnants of feudalism that hinder capitalist development, but the junker landowners, the social and political power of the junkers remains intact. The patriarchal semi-feudal relations between the junkers and the agricultural

workers, the economic dependence of millions of small allotment peasants upon the big landlords remain intact and in fact have been increased by Fascism.

It is ridiculous to compare the agrarian relations in Poland with those in France, as was done here. Such a view must lead to a complete failure to understand the driving forces of the Polish Revolution. It is a Trotskyist error.

Comrade VARGA:

In the discussion on the first point on the agenda and also in the pamphlet that I wrote for the Congress I pointed out that unemployment in the present period was different from unemployment in pre-war times. It has changed in quantity, in its chronic character and also in the fact that for the first time in the history of capitalism we have a situation in the United States and in England in which the number of workers employed by industrial capital has actually declined. I pointed out that this phenomenon was the result of the fact that the expansion of the markets for manufactured goods, which in the past was brought about by the transition of the peasantry from the system of producing for their own requirements to production for the markets, i. e. the transformation of the peasants into capitalist farmers in England and in America, has come to an end. This means that the expansion of the capitalist markets in these countries can now take place only in proportion to the expansion of the whole system as such. But the transformation of the peasants into farmers that took place in the past cannot be repeated.

I have tried to draw a very sharp distinction between my theory and that of Rosa Luxemburg. My point is not that it is impossible to realise surplus value within the capitalist system generally — there can be no question about that — but that the former expansion of the capitalist markets — which can only take place once in history — in these countries has now been completed. That is why we have a situation in which the workers who have been discharged from industry as a result of the improvement of technique and of rationalisation, cannot find any other employment; their dismissal is final and complete.

I proposed that this phenomenon be incorporated in the political theses. The German delegation proposed to incorporate it in the programme. I do not think, comrades, that it would be desirable to incorporate this point in the programme because, taking the world as a whole, it is possible — it is not probable, but it cannot be rejected absolutely — that the bourgeois regime will become stabilised to some extent, say in China and India. If it does, — considering that these enormous countries represent half the population of the world — there will be such an expansion of the capitalist market that the tendency for the progress of technical development to exceed the possibility of expansion of the market will for a time be neutralised. I think, therefore, that we should refer to this phenomenon in the theses, which we may have to change in the near future, but in the programme we should refer only to the mass character of unemployment without referring especially to its "structural" character.

I come now to the question of war communism. In the original draft of the Programme, reference was made to the possibility of a war Communist policy. I proposed that it should be formulated as follows: War Communism will be the rule, particularly in isolated dictatorships. Comrade Bukharin has said here that he agrees to say that War Communism is probable instead of saying it is possible. Comrades, I can accept this concession, nevertheless I believe that — apart from the formula to be incorporated in the programme — this extraordinarily important question must be discussed at the Plenum here.

First of all I must state that I do not hold the view that we must work for War Communism under all circumstances or even to give it preference. It is not my view that we must in the Programme instruct the Parties to steer for War Communism. My view is that the task of holding power will compel us to introduce measures of a War Communist character; that the classes hostile to the dictatorship will

compel us to adopt War Communism, in the majority of cases at the outset of the proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade Bukharin has expressed the opinion here that the views I express have historical connection with the mistakes we made in Hungary. Comrades, I admit that we committed many serious mistakes in Hungary. We admit that. Our mistakes were: firstly, we did not distribute the land, secondly, we over-stressed the War Communist policy not only for the proper object of defending the dictatorship, but also with the view of immediately introducing planned Socialist economy, and immediate transition from capitalism to a Socialist system without market relationships. What I want to say, however, is the following. Distribution of the land does not contradict War Communism. On the contrary, the distribution of the land is an important element in the system of War Communism, and certainly does not exclude War Communism. Comrades, if we concretely picture to ourselves what the correlation of class-forces will be before the capture of power and after it, we will see the following: the struggle for power is only possible when the governing class is in the state of acute crisis. Under capitalist conditions such a crisis means inflation, and in connection with that, a shortage of goods, a reduction in the real wages of the workers, the impoverishment of the middle classes and general impoverishment of the toiling population. If in such a situation we wish to capture power, then needless to say, we must bring all the discontented impoverished and revolutionary minded masses under our leadership. This means that we must say to them that their situation can be improved only by overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat. We must say to them the dictatorship will give you bread, will give you houses, will give you a shorter working day and better conditions of life.

We must be perfectly clear in our mind that the capture of power in other countries will come about not in the way it did in Hungary or in Russia; it will come about in the form of a sanguinary civil war. Thus we will have captured power by means of a civil war, in the process of the civil war and all the political and economic consequences that follow from this. In this situation, after the capture of power, we will be confronted by the task of improving the conditions of very broad masses of the workers. If we fail to do that then, before we have managed to consolidate our power, we will have to withstand the resistance of a section of the working class itself, who will say to us: you promised to improve our conditions; you must carry out your promise otherwise we must regard you as traitors. If we fail to keep our promise then the conditions will be favourable for successful counter-revolutionary agitation among the ranks of the workers as was the case in Hungary. I declare, therefore, that we will not be in a position to improve the conditions of life of the workers in the beginning of the dictatorship in the ordinary process of production and ordinary market relationships. I want to describe the economic elements that will prevail in the beginning of the dictatorship: we will have command of the principal key positions, the important factories, transport, the banks and perhaps also the big farms. Shall we be able immediately to organise production in these enterprises? No, comrades, we shall not. In the first period of the dictatorship production must decline, primarily because labour discipline is considerably weakened in such a situation. Labour discipline under capitalism is a class discipline: if the class which hitherto managed to maintain an almost military discipline in the factories is politically overthrown, then this form of discipline will relax and it must take some time before the new proletarian form of labour discipline can be established and the normal working of the factories thereby secured. We must have no illusions about this matter.

Secondly, a large section of the working class will be withdrawn from production: the best workers must go into the Red Army, the Red Guard, in the factory councils and in the Soviets, moreover, an interruption takes place in the process of production in the factories for political reasons: demonstrations, meetings, training of factory guards, etc. In the beginning of the dictatorship far less will be produced in the factories, in the nationalised factories than was produced before.

The second part of the economic system is still retained in private hands, — the unnationalised factories. In these production will be carried on much worse than in the nationalised

factories. Why? Because in this stage the capitalist has no stimulus to produce. Labour discipline is very lax, the rate of exploitation is very low, no profits can be obtained. Secondly, inflation prevails and inflation, with the general conditions prevailing, makes it unprofitable to carry on production. Thirdly, the bourgeoisie, for political reasons, will sabotage production in order to embarrass the Soviet government. So that even in this second part — in the as yet non-nationalised section of industry —, still less will be produced than formerly.

What will be the situation in the third section, — the peasantry? Here I must say that the peasant class in capitalist countries differs from the peasant class in Russia. The Russian peasantry produced nearly 80 per cent. of its own requirements. In capitalist countries, however, the peasants produce from 80 to 90 per cent. for the market. Economically and socially they are not so separated from the landlord class and aristocracy, from the governing class as the Russian peasantry was. They are organised in the same co-operative societies and the same political parties as are the big landlords. Needless to say, therefore, the overwhelming majority, for the same reasons that prompt the private capitalists, will send less produce into the towns, firstly for economic reasons, — because of inflation, and secondly for political reasons, — because they will want to starve the proletarian cities. There will be nothing left for us to do but to go and take what we want. Thus, as far as the bourgeoisie is concerned, we must requisition their manufactured goods, i. e., we must confiscate the big stores, clothes, boots, underclothing, etc., and distribute them among the workers. We will have to confiscate the houses of the bourgeoisie and put the workers in them. Whether we like it or not, in the first stage of the dictatorship we will have to abandon the system of market relationships and adopt war Communist measures in order partly at least to satisfy the demands of the workers; for unless we do that we shall lose the power we have captured.

I repeat that distribution of the land does not contradict war Communism. On the contrary, when we distribute the land, when by this means we link up the peasants and the agricultural labourers closely to the dictatorship, we fashion an instrument by which we can far more successfully maintain supplies of produce for the cities. This was shown by the example from Russia. On the other hand, we have the other aspect of this fact, viz., the confiscation of the land from the rich peasants and transferring it to the poor peasants. This still further stimulates the resistance of the rich peasants and compels us to adopt still more stringent war Communist measures against them. I repeat, it is not a matter as to whether we should or should not introduce war Communism, but that the internal mechanism of the class struggle will compel us to adopt the policy of War communism.

How does the matter stand in regard to the urban petty bourgeoisie, with the handicraftsmen, small shop-keepers, etc.? In Hungary, we made the serious mistake of immediately prohibiting private trade and in this way we repelled these sections of the population from us. Such a mistake must not be repeated. War Communism does not mean a hundred per cent. prohibition of private trading. Comrade Bukharin laid down this rule very strictly, and he was right to do so. But I must remind you nevertheless that somewhat later the same mistake was committed here in Russia, and that even small street traders were driven from the streets by the militia when they desired to sell something. But this mistake did not drop somewhere from the skies. It results from the inherent logic of the system which under certain circumstances goes beyond the bounds of rationality, sometimes a bureaucratic machine exceeds rational bounds and sometimes necessity compels it. What I think is important from the practical point of view is that the Communist Parties must not adopt the view that War Communism must be avoided under all circumstances and that N. E. P. must be introduced right from the very beginning. This entails two serious dangers. The first is that an opposition from the Left may arise among the working class. It is quite clear that in the midst of civil war the dictatorship will not be in a position to lay down scientifically and rationally the rules upon which nationalisation is to be carried out. For example, an order may be issued to the effect that all enterprises employing over 50 men shall be nationalised. But it will be

impossible to compel the workers who have fought against the capitalists in the civil war to submit to the capitalists again where the workers have seized small factories and to compel them to go to work for the private capitalists. The experience in Hungary has shown that this is impracticable. I will give you an amusing example.

During the dictatorship in Hungary a delegation of barbers came to me in the People's Commissariat and said to me: "There are big barber shops in Budapest employing 20, 30 and 50 workers. You must nationalise these immediately." I said to them, rightly, I think: "Go to the devil. Do what you like. We have other things to worry about besides nationalising barber shops." And in the next number of the organ of the Barbers' Trade Union strongly worded articles were published containing personal attacks upon me and stating that my family were engaged in the barbers' business and that is why I refused to nationalise barber shops.

I think it is inconceivable at this stage to restore any rights to the capitalists owing to the opposition of the workers. To attempt to do so would mean to rouse a Left opposition among the working class which may even lead to a split in the working class.

The other possible danger is the following:

If the idea of the new economic policy becomes too deeply ingrained in the minds of our Communist Parties and of its leaders there is the danger that the struggle against the bourgeoisie will not be carried out to its end, that a premature peace may be concluded with the capitalists before they as an organised class have been crushed, before the material basis of a counter-revolution has been utterly destroyed.

These two dangers, which I myself have experienced, induce me to revert to this question again and again. Capturing power is not everything because power once captured may be lost again. When Comrade Bukharin reproached us for our wrong policy in Hungary he ought to know that since that time, during the past ten years, we have thought over these mistakes a thousand times and we are fully conscious of the great responsibility we bear for the failure of the dictatorship. We understand better than anyone else here what it would have meant for the world revolution had we managed to retain power in Hungary. I think we can say without exaggeration that the whole face of Europe would have been altogether different from what it is now. We have studied the mistakes we made. Still we cannot say that all the mistakes we made were due to War Communism, and we must not make the unhappy end of the Hungarian dictatorship as an excuse for condemning War Communism. That would be wrong. In my opinion, War Communism will be necessary in most countries as a means for retaining power. Our enemies will compel us to adopt it whether we like it or not, and it is the duty of every serious leader of the Communist Party to bear this possibility and necessity carefully in mind.

Comrade NAJDANOV (Czechoslovakia):

Comrades, the first question that the Programme Commission must decide is whether the draft is to be a manifesto or a programme, or whether we should accept Comrade Dunccker's suggestion that the programme shall merely contain an outline of the principles of Communism. We are of the opinion that the combination of agitational and propaganda points in the Programme is a very happy one. We are also in agreement with the sub-division of the Programme. We propose, however, that the title "Introduction" should be deleted so that the Programme starts immediately with the title "The Programme of the Communist International."

In regard to Comrade Clara Zetkin's proposal to combine the description of social democracy and reformism in one paragraph, I think it is not possible to do that because it would not fit in with the general scheme of sub-division of the Programme.

A few words about imperialism and capitalism:

1. In general we accept the formulation as it is contained in the Draft Programme.

2. In the Draft Programme we read:

"This period was followed in the beginning of the 20th Century by a new period, the period of imperialism, a period of spasmodic and conflicting development of capitalism in which free competition gives way to monopoly."

Several comrades, including Comrade Brandt, pointed out that free competition does not disappear altogether but that it exists side by side with monopoly. Hence, we propose that the phrase "gives way" be substituted by the phrase "will give way".

3. On the question of the uneven development of capitalism. This question has been touched upon more than once here already. In the Programme it says:

"Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. The period of imperialism intensifies this unevenness still more."

This is stated in the part dealing with imperialism but not in the part dealing with capitalism. We propose that reference be made to the uneven development in the first part of the description of capitalism and of its development.

4. The reference in the Draft Programme to the methods of corrupting the labour aristocracy deals only with super-profits, as if it were the only means of corrupting the labour aristocracy. Something must be added to this. Comrade Bukharin developed this idea in the following manner: "The United States have no large colonies but they obtain super-profits. I cannot go into this in detail but I wish to observe that Marx analysed a number of cases in which a big industrial country which occupies an important place in world economy thanks to its superiority of technique, obtains differential profit. These super-profits play a very important role at the present time. Thus it is not only the extra profits that are drained directly from the colonies which serve as the basis for reformism, but there are super-profits also that are obtained from the general world circulation, through capital exports not only to 'own' colonies but to colonies generally." Hence, we propose that Comrade Bukharin's examples be added to that part where reference is made to the methods of corrupting the labour aristocracy.

A few words regarding democratic dictatorship. This point led to a lively controversy among the Polish comrades. In listening to the speeches I recalled Lenin's letter on tactics. Lenin taught us to take facts into consideration. Facts show that the proletarian dictatorship does not always follow immediately after the rule of the bourgeoisie. What is the point here? It is the correlation of classes. I fear that the Polish comrades do not quite understand the question about the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Comrade Brandt apparently believes that the revolutionary peasant movement can skip the agrarian revolution and pass right over into the social revolution.

Another comrade is of the opinion that the stage of democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is inevitable and must be carried to the end. In my opinion this is the same kind of mistake that was made by Comrade Kamenev and which led to a lively discussion between him and Lenin.

What does the Draft Programme say on this? It says: "Cases are possible." Secondly: "Democratic demands are permissible." And thirdly: "Instead of coming about directly, the proletarian dictatorship can, under certain circumstances, come by another way." It does not say that in every case must it be so.

The point, therefore, is not that the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is a necessary and independent stage of revolutionary development which must be carried to its completion, but that it is possible, only in perspective; that it is possible that one stage will develop into the other. The Polish comrades cannot say: Down with Pilsudski; the dictatorship of the proletariat. Nor can they say: Down with Pilsudski; only a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

(Brandt: And what do you want?)

I am of the opinion that what is the Draft Programme is correct.

(Brandt: But what slogan?)

The slogan should be: Down with Pilsudski! The democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry which must grow into the proletarian dictatorship!

Now about the agrarian question, which is very important for Czechoslovakia.

What is the point here? When we speak about the agrarian programme, about the confiscation of all the land, the kernel of the question must be sought in the correlation of classes. Is the peasantry nearer to the bourgeoisie, does it support the bourgeoisie? If it does, then the agrarian question presents itself in a quite other manner than in those countries where the peasantry has not yet undergone a process of differentiation, where the remnants of feudalism are still strong and where large land ownership is still predominant. I want to give you a concrete example. In Czechoslovakia, after the agrarian reforms, we had a big stratum of private landowners, small and middle peasants which now predominate. What should be our attitude towards the agrarian question here? Should we in our programme for Czechoslovakia say: confiscation of the whole of the land? If we do this we shall never be able to neutralise the middle peasants. On the contrary, we will turn them against the Communist Party, convert them into a counter-revolutionary force and into a support of the bourgeoisie. I think that this would apply also to Poland and to other countries where the peasantry are closely bound up with private property.

Comrade Karpinski in an article he wrote said that the peasantry in western European countries no longer have any property instincts. This is not only untrue but ridiculous. Such things should not be written in the theoretical organ of the Communist International. This property instinct is very strong among the peasantry, and particularly in those countries where certain agrarian reforms have been carried out. We are of the opinion, therefore, that the Draft Programme quite properly in regard to European countries speaks, not of confiscating the whole of the land but only of confiscating large landed estates and of prohibiting the sale and purchase of land transferred to the small and middle peasants.

Next comes the national question. We have a national question not only in the colonies and semi-colonies but also in western Europe, — in Czechoslovakia, in the Balkans, and in Poland. The question cannot be presented as Comrades Semard and Micolos presented it. Comrade Micolos went so far as to say that an armed struggle for national self-determination is possible, and in saying this he had national minorities in mind. Something is not clear here. I believe it is not possible.

(Brandt: You think it is not possible?)

The armed struggle in the sense that it shall be led by the Polish Communists, the armed struggle for the self-determination of the Ukraine and White Russia which are oppressed by Poland is not possible. The question should not be presented as it is presented by Comrade Micolos. In this case the national struggle is only a part of the sum of tasks, of the struggles which the Communists lead. The situation in China, in Indonesia, and in semi-colonial countries, is different. There it is quite right for the Communists to place themselves at the head of the national revolution. But the Communists in Poland, in Czechoslovakia and in the Balkans cannot do this. This means to have an entirely wrong idea, a wrong conception of the problem.

I think it would be useful here to quote the words of Lenin on this point. He wrote:

"In the national question the proletarian party must first of all advocate the immediate realisation of the complete right of separation from Russia (he was referring to Russia) of all nationalities and peoples that were oppressed by Tsarism and forcibly incorporated in the empire, i. e., annexed. The proletarian party strives to establish as large a state as possible." (I assert that the last words are contained in the Draft Programme.) "For this is to the advantage of the toilers: It strives for a rapprochement between and union of all the nations, but it does not strive to achieve this by violence but exclusively by means of a free and fraternal federation of workers and of toiling masses of all nations."

I think that something can be learned from the discussion between Lenin and the Polish Social Democrats that would help us in solving the problem of the Communists' attitude on the national question. Comrade Lenin said, and it must be emphasised, that the communists and the proletariat advocate the right of self-determination of the oppressed nations including the right of separation, but that the proletariat of the oppressed nations should strive for unity with the proletariat of the oppressing nation. I think that this should be expressed in the Draft Programme.

In regard to fascism, we are in agreement with the formula contained in the Draft Programme.

In conclusion, I would like to say the following. The material which has been accumulated on the Programme question represents an enormous amount of work done. I believe that over one hundred amendments in style and other changes have been suggested. This evidences the enormous interest displayed by the Communist Party in the Programme question. All the parties affiliated to the Comintern are actively participating in the working out of a Programme for all the sections. This is a very significant fact. There is no other international organisation that is capable of drafting a programme that will suit all its affiliated national sections. Six years have passed since the Comintern took the first preparatory steps for drafting a programme. The work was commenced in 1922. In 1924 we had quite a number of draft programmes. On the Programme Commission Comrade Ossinski expressed the view that the Draft Programme before us is not the best work that Comrade Bukharin has done. I hold an opposite view. I think that from an objective point of view the present Draft Programme is the best that has ever been presented to the Comintern Congress.

Comrade WEINSTONE (America):

The American Delegation has approved the Draft Programme, and is also for the adoption of the Programme at the VI. Congress.

With regard to the discussions which occurred on the question of fascism in the Programme Commission, I wish to say a few words. There was a point of view held that fascism develops in countries having no colonies and which are not in a position to bribe the working class. The Draft Programme is correct when it connects fascism, among other factors, with the factors of the post-war crisis and with the development of a declassed strata of the population.

In the United States we have a country which, while it has few colonies, is able to bribe sections of the working class, because of the hegemony which it holds in capitalist world economy. At the same time, we find three tendencies for the development of fascism in the United States. One tendency bases itself upon the petty bourgeoisie, for example, the Ku Klux Klan and the American Legion. These organisations sprang up in the post-war period. The American Legion developed immediately after the war, became a mass organisation in the crisis of 1920-21, and consisted of ex-soldiers who could not find their place again in the process of production.

The modern Ku Klux Klan developed in 1915, during the period of the world war, as an instrument for the suppression of the Negroes who were stirring as a result of the world crisis. The modern Ku Klux Klan developed on the basis of the petty bourgeois poor white of the South, the petty bourgeois of the North, who were being crushed by the development of finance capital, and a section of the intelligentsia.

Another tendency we see in the utilisation by the trade union bureaucracy on an ever larger scale of gangster elements. These gangsters are armed men serving the trade union bureaucracy, and if you examine their social content, you find that there are workers who have dropped out of production, slum proletarian elements that become an armed guard for the suppression of the rank and file.

Another tendency towards fascism is based upon the process of the restriction of parliamentarism in the United States, the classic country of bourgeois democracy. Comrade Bukharin mentioned the development of the caucus system in America

which decided in advance the actions of parliament. But there is an even greater development in the restriction of parliamentarism, the development of the powers of the President, and of the so-called executive arm of the Government, the utilisation of the Supreme Court more and more to nullify the acts of Congress, to establish, in other words, a more open dictatorship in the country. For example, the war upon Nicaragua without consultation of the American Congress. A whole series of acts of the President in vetoing legislation that may be for the moment unfavourable to finance capital. Here we have three tendencies having different social and different class content. The basis of these elements, the Ku Klux Klan and the American Legion, are not broad enough. But we may find that in the case of a crisis of American imperialism, these different tendencies may unite and establish a full-fledged fascist dictatorship in the country.

It is therefore, correct, as the Programme points out, that fascism springs up in the process of the bankruptcy of parliamentarism. And the United States is proof of this fact.

A word regarding the continuation of the polemic by Comrade Sultan Zade, as to whether finance capital exists. As has already been pointed out by Comrade Bukharin, Comrade Sultan Zade makes the situation too simple, and does not see that finance capital is a merging of banking capital and industrial capital. In the United States we have not only a merging of industrial capital and banking capital, but a merging of finance capital with the state power. We have the situation of banks having hegemony over trusts, of trusts having their own banks, of capitalist statesmen becoming the heads of trusts, and of leading finance capitalists becoming ambassadors; as, for example, Mr. Morrow, of the firm of Morgan, being sent as ambassador to Mexico; the case of Mr. Mellon, the head of a powerful Trust and a leading banker in the country, being made Secretary of the Treasury in the present Coolidge administration. It is a more complicated process but it indicates the growing strength of finance capital and the process of merging.

The Programme as a whole has, as its fundamental characteristic, its internationalism. As Comrade Bukharin maintained, that is the only Programme for the Communist International, a Programme of world proletarian dictatorship. As one of the colonial comrades pointed out: "We need a document which contains the principles of Communism, the essence of Marxism and Leninism". America is also one of those countries that needs such a document. America has no tradition of Marxism, less of a tradition of Leninism and little of international tradition. America is a country having great divisions within the working class, white and Negro workers, American and foreign-born workers and has an "international" of its own within the country, of 52 languages. Only an international programme, therefore, connecting the American proletariat with the proletariat on a world scale, can serve as a means of liberation of the proletariat.

In this connection, I wish to refer to an amendment which we made in the programme commission on the race question. The draft programme states that the Communist International opposes chauvinism and imperialist ill-treatment of national and racial groups. It is necessary for the Communist International to state much sharper its position regarding the race question. To put forward much more concrete demands — for example regarding the American Negroes — and to declare for the abolition of all race discrimination and for full social, racial and political equality for the American Negroes.

The international aspect of the Programme is again particularly important for America because of the position of world hegemony in capitalist economy which it holds today. Just because of the power of American imperialism it is necessary to emphasise sharply that the contradictions developing within imperialism will tear to pieces the power of American finance capital, of American imperialism and that in the United States we will have the development of the proletarian dictatorship as a result of these contradictions.

I would also endorse the proposal of Comrade Pepper on the need of elaborating the section on the possibility of non-capitalist development in colonial countries by adding some quotations from Marx and Lenin on this subject.

And here, comrades, on behalf of the American delegation, not directly on the Programme but connected with it. I wish

to propose a resolution to be acted upon after the Programme is adopted in regard to the need of a popular edition of the works of Marx and Engels. Our resolution reads:

"The Sixth Congress of the Communist International welcomes the appearance of the first volume of the great scientific edition of the complete works of Marx and Engels. Only such an edition of the works of the founders of scientific Communism can give the necessary prerequisites for a deeper study of the history of the theory and practice of revolutionary Marxism.

The publication of those hitherto unknown works of Marx and Engels which have been found by the Marx-Engels Institute, or those which have been distorted or suppressed by the Social Democrats, is a mortal blow against all opportunist interpretations of Marxism.

The Sixth Congress deems it necessary at the same time to repeat the decision of the Fifth Congress, that besides the international edition of the complete works, certain selected works of Marx and Engels should be published for the proletariat of the various countries in the most important languages. Every such edition should not only contain all the most important writings of Marx and Engels which are of international significance, but also all of their writings which deal with questions of special interest to the proletariat of the country in question. The Congress calls upon the Executive and all the Sections to take up this task which is imperative for the ideological strengthening of all Communist work, and to complete it within the next two years."

(Close of Session.)

Twenty-seventh Session.

Moscow, 13th August, 1928 (afternoon):

Continuation of the Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin on the Draft Programme of the Comintern.

At the 27th Session of the World Congress the chair was taken first by Comrade Losovsky and then by Comrade Semard (France). The discussion on the Programme was continued.

Comrade RING (Poland):

Comrades, in my speech at the last meeting of the Programme Commission I spoke about the Draft Programme as a weapon and a point of support against the Right Wing deviations. When saying this I refer to no particular group, because when speaking of Right Wing mistakes in the future, it would be wrong to have in mind any definite group at present existing. No one is quite insured against Right Wing mistakes. Nevertheless my words about opportunism have angered Comrade Brandt, a representative of the majority of the Polish Delegation, and this anger was shown in the number of inaccurate statements he has made, and this compels me to take the floor to repudiate those false statements.

Firstly, Comrade Brandt asserted that in my speech about Imperialism I had said that the Programme should not make any allusion to the fact that in the epoch of Imperialism there existed free competition side by side with monopoly.

Comrades, I am going to read the passage in question from the stenographic report. This is what I said: "The free competition of industrial capitalism, having taken the place of feudal monopoly and the place of mercantile capital, became itself converted into a monopoly of mercantile capital." This is a terse and concise yet quite correct definition of the present epoch. The objection might have been raised that in the present epoch, in the epoch of imperialism, there is a whole variety of forms of liberal economic systems, i. e. of economic competition; but in the Programme it is necessary to mention what is characteristic and new for the present epoch.

Secondly, Comrade Brandt said that a similar statement was contained in the article I wrote against his pamphlet. What was after all the subject of the controversy? Comrade Brandt gave in his pamphlet a wrong definition of contemporary capitalism. He described it as a "system of anarchy and competitive struggle." Of course, that was no definition of contemporary Imperialism. It was the definition of a different epoch, of the epoch of free competition. Monopoly capitalism was forgotten here. What did I state in opposition to it? Not my own words, but I quoted from Lenin and Engels the passages relating to the epoch of imperialism and describing it in quite a different light, particularly the period of the approach of imperialism as described by Engels. I mentioned the famous definition of imperialism given by Lenin, in which it was said: "Imperialism constitutes a particular historic stage

of capitalism. This particularity is of threefold character: firstly, imperialism is monopolistic capitalism; secondly, it is parasitic or rotting capitalism; thirdly, it is a moribund capitalism. The substitution of monopoly for free competition is the fundamental trait, the essence of imperialism." Fearing lest this terse and clear definition might nevertheless mislead the reader, or be superficially understood, I added: "Does this mean that under imperialism there is no competition, that monopolistic capitalism does away with competition? Not a bit of it. But it does eliminate 'free competition' and in its place it introduces the tremendous struggle among the powerful capitalist associations, each one carrying on systematic economy in its domain." Thus, the sense of this passage is not at all what was attributed to it by Comrade Brandt. I warn the reader that there can be competition even under monopoly, and that there is a struggle going on among the capitalist associations. Comrade Brandt has taken two or three words from this passage and tried to put into them the very opposite sense from what they really had.

Thirdly, the following has to be repudiated. It was asserted by Comrade Brandt that in our proposed amendment concerning the chapter of the Programme dealing with the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Poland, we had described the survivals of feudalism in Poland as a vanishing quantity. Comrades, in the preamble to our amendments we stated the very opposite:

"In present-day Poland there are no fundamental contradictions between the political system and the requirements of capitalist development, even if there are survivals of semi-feudal relations in agriculture which hinder the development of production." The words "even if there are survivals of semi-feudal relations" were underlined in the original text. Comrade Brandt should least of all attack this particular amendment. Comrade Brandt in his speech repeated the essential points with which we had dealt in our amendment proposals and which we had already stated in our written preamble to the amendments.

As regards the speech made by Comrade Skulski, Comrade Brandt attributed to him again an underestimation of the peasant movement, describing this even as Trotskyism.

Comrade Brandt was denounced at the last International Congress, together with his group, on account of Trotskyism. Now that he comes forward as an accuser on this point, he should be extremely careful. Yet what is the meaning of these charges of Trotskyism, of underestimating the peasantry? As a matter of fact, we had said the very opposite. In the amendments, which express also the views of Comrade Skulski, it was said: "Without an alliance with the main bulk of the

peasantry there can be no thought of a revolution in an agrarian country like Poland." In the same amendment the following sentence was underscored: "A characteristic feature of these countries is, on the one hand, the existence of peasant parties, ... of a peasant movement which aims at the expropriation of the big landowners and the formation of Left groups of the peasantry which virtually recognise the revolutionary hegemony of the proletariat. On the other hand, they are marked by the existence of a strong and politically organised body of wealthy peasants."

Comrade Skulski's speech was impregnated with the realisation of the significance attached to the growth of the agricultural proletariat and the poor peasantry insofar as the revolution in Poland is concerned. Should this constitute Trotskyism? Thus, this statement of Comrade Brandt is also utterly false.

There is yet another point to be repudiated. It was asserted by Comrade Brandt that the minority had stated its view that the only basis of fascism consisted in capitalist monopoly in the restricted sense, or in the cartels, that the minority was dealing with fascism apart from the whole complexity of capitalism that was to be destroyed by the growing revolution, and so on. This attempt was already made by Brandt in the Programme Commission when he referred to a certain article I wrote, which was published in our Party organ about 18 months ago. In the Programme Commission I repudiated his assertions not by quoting from any other of my articles, but precisely from the article in question. I quoted extracts from that article which showed that I spoke about the crisis of capitalism. I have said that fascism could arrive only at a moment of crisis, at a moment of a bourgeois offensive against the proletariat, and so on. In the same article I criticised Comrade Kostrzewa because she considered fascism without connection with the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Comrades, I tried to avoid any polemics with the majority of the Polish Delegation in the course of the Programme discussion, because I thought it improper to introduce the factional controversies of the Polish Party into the discussion at this Congress. If Comrade Brandt is of a different opinion, I believe nevertheless that the method of petty quarreling and misrepresentation will be of no use to the views held by Comrade Brandt, which I consider to be false.

Comrade LOSOVSKY (Communist Fraction of the R. I. L. U.):

Ever since its establishment, the Communist International urged upon all the Communist Parties the task of winning the majority of the working class. In order to win the majority, it was necessary to devote particular attention to the trade union movement, which at the time of the founding of the Comintern was almost entirely in the hands of the Social Democracy. Hence the persistent and stubborn emphasis laid by the Comintern upon the importance of the trade union activities, upon the need of detaching the masses of the workers who are organised in the trade unions from the demoralising influence of Reformism. The fact that the Comintern in the course of nine years repeatedly drew the attention of the Communist Parties to the activity in the trade unions arises quite obviously from the importance of this work and from the role played by the trade unions, particularly in the struggle of the workers for emancipation. Nevertheless this fact has not been sufficiently expressed in the Programme of the Comintern.

Reference to the trade unions is cursorily made in chapters 4 and 6 of the Draft Programme, and what is said there is quite inadequate, unclear, and as we shall see, not quite correct.

First of all, the essential thing said here refers rather to the period after the conquest of power by the proletariat, as if the majority of the Communist Parties are already now concerned over the question of the tasks of the trade unions after the conquest of power. Naturally, this question is highly important, and the rich experience of the Soviet Union is highly instructive, but this does not at present constitute the main thing for the Communist International. The Communist International and all its Sections have to decide upon the role to be played by the trade unions in the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. What is said in the Programme on this subject? In the Programme it is said about the role of the

trade unions under capitalism: "The trade unions are **under capitalism the chief weapon in the course of strikes, and also in the struggle of the masses against trustified capital and its state.**" This formulation is firstly inadequate, and secondly untrue. What trade unions are the chief weapon in the course of strikes? What trade unions are fighting against trustified capital and its state? The reactionary trade unions? Obviously, they are not. Or is it the revolutionary trade unions? But the trade unions that are revolutionary do not engage in this struggle alone. The whole trouble is in the fact that the Draft Programme evades the whole question of the transformation of the apparatus of the reformist trade unions into organs of the bourgeois State, the fact of the fusion of the reformist apparatus into the bourgeois State; the fact that the reformist trade unions obstruct and disrupt strikes, and so on. Therefore, the bare statement that the trade unions are "the chief weapon in the course of strikes" becomes incomprehensible, if no indication is made as to what trade unions are playing this role. If the reference is to the revolutionary trade unions, the statement does not define the substance and the tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement. The revolutionary trade unions are not only "the chief weapon in the course of strikes"; not only do they fight against trustified capital and State, but they also take up the task of overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie. One cannot speak now about the trade unions without saying what these trade unions have to do in the struggle for the conquest of power by the proletariat. One cannot dispose in a couple of lines of the subjects of the role to be played by the trade unions under capitalism without indicating exactly what kind of trade unions one has in mind. Now, is it true that the trade unions are the chief weapon of the strike movement? It is true insofar as the revolutionary unions are concerned. But should our Programme be satisfied with such a statement? What should be the object of this struggle? No reply will be found in the Programme on this point. Furthermore, is it enough to say that the revolutionary trade unions are fighting against trustified capital and its State? Does this cover, for instance, the role of the Russian trade unions in the pre-October period? By no means. On this subject we may find a more exact and clear-cut formulation. In the Theses submitted to the Eleventh Congress of the C. P. S. U. (in 1922), which were written by Lenin, it was said: "The ultimate aim of strike movements under capitalism is the destruction of the state apparatus, the overthrow of the class which holds the power of the state." If we compare this formula with the one contained in the Programme, we ought to admit that Lenin's formula has all the advantages of clearness, definiteness, and of the revolutionary attitude, because Lenin does not speak of the economic struggle to be carried on by the trade unions; but he defines the goal of this economic struggle from the standpoint of the Communists. The "mass struggle", so frequently mentioned in the Programme, yet without stating its aim, is naturally something quite different from the formula of "overthrowing the State power of the bourgeoisie".

In connection with the tasks of the trade unions the attitude of Communists towards the struggle for reforms should be stated more precisely. This question has been very precisely formulated by Lenin, and also in the decisions of previous Congresses of the Comintern. It was repeatedly declared by Lenin that "reforms are a by-product of the revolutionary struggle". In the resolutions on tactics of the Third Congress of the Comintern we read the following:

"Under capitalism there can be no lasting amelioration of the conditions of the proletariat. Only the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the destruction of the capitalist States, will create the possibility to ameliorate the conditions of the working class and to restore the economy which has been ruined by capitalism... Nevertheless this does not mean to say that the proletariat should give up fighting for its vital and urgent interests until the very moment of the achievement of the dictatorship... The Communist International is in favour of the struggle for the concrete demands of the proletariat which, taken together, tend to destroy the power of the bourgeoisie and to organise the proletariat, constituting a stage in the struggle for dictatorship... The revolutionary nature of the present epoch consists precisely in the fact that the modest and moderate demands of the working masses are

incompatible with the existence of capitalist society and that in this manner the struggle for these demands becomes a struggle for Communism."

All these clear and precise definitions as to the role of the partial struggle and the partial strikes in the general class struggle of the proletariat must amplify the section of Chapter VI which deals with partial slogans and partial demands. The distinction between the Communist Party and the Social-Democratic Party is not that we are against reforms, and the reformists are in favour of them. The Communists consider reforms as a "by-product of the revolutionary struggle" (Lenin), whereas the reformists maintain that reforms are the result of class collaboration. The Communists, in struggling for reforms, contemplate besides the immediate practical tasks also the aim of destroying capitalism and of training the working masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, whereas the reformists want to bolster up the capitalist system by means of reforms. It is for this very reason that these questions ought to be fully dealt with in the Programme of the Comintern.

The defect of the chapter on trade unions consists chiefly in that nothing is said about the nature of the reactionary trade unions. In the Theses of all the Congresses of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. there were numerous and proper definitions given on this subject. There were also good passages on this point in the Theses of Comrade Bukharin on the first item of the agenda. Yet in the Programme there is no place at all given to this question. Is it necessary to say in the Programme that the reformist trade unions have grown into organs of the bourgeois State? Is it necessary to say that the fusion of the trade union bureaucrats with the employers' organisations has rendered the trade union apparatus into an instrument for the enslavement of the working class? Is it necessary to say that the reformists have converted the trade unions into a school of class collaboration, into a school of capitalism, and that therefore the reformist trade union apparatus constitutes the extension of the bourgeois state apparatus within the working class? Obviously, all this ought to be stated in the Programme, but unfortunately such is not the case. If we take the American Federation of Labour, the A. D. G. B. in Germany, or the General Council in England, can any difference be found between these leading organs of the trade union movement and any organ of the bourgeois State? Wherein, for instance, is the difference between the A. D. G. B. and any organ of the Hindenburg Republic? Is it in the fact that it is made up of former workers? But this fact, of course, does not determine the political physiognomy of this or that organisation. Ex-workers can also be found at the head of the Catholic, democratic and even fascist trade unions. Or perhaps the difference is in the fact that the trade union bureaucrats are elected officials? But does it signify anything that these bureaucrats were once elected some decades ago? Perhaps they are distinguished from the organs of the bourgeois State by their policies? Hardly so. They constitute the most dangerous, most consistent, and the worst representatives of the bourgeois influence within the working class. The reformist trade union apparatus constitutes the extension of the bourgeois state within the working class. This is precisely the reason why, whilst raising the slogan of "capturing the trade unions", we raise also the demand of ousting the treacherous trade union bureaucrats and of driving them from the ranks of the organised proletariat. This means that we contemplate the task of winning the masses and of substituting the reactionary trade union apparatus by a body of revolutionary workers. Lenin never spoke of "capturing the trade union apparatus", but he always spoke of capturing the trade unions, which meant capturing the organised workers for the class struggle, ousting the treacherous trade union bureaucracy, and replacing the reformist apparatus by a revolutionary one. And in the decisions of the Congresses and of the Executive Committee of the Comintern there will not be found one word about capturing the reformist trade union apparatus. It is not by mere chance that the Right Wing elements in the C. P. of Germany are substituting the capture of the trade unions, i. e. of the working masses, by phrases about capturing the reformist trade union apparatus, while postponing the struggle of the workers against the employers and their reformist lackeys until that happy consummation.

Another drawback in the Programme is the entire absence of the problem: the Party versus the trade unions. The international trade union movement has as yet by no means overcome the theory of neutrality, of self-sufficient trade unionism, etc. There are still many countries in which these questions are of tremendous importance. Is it altogether proper to evade in the programme the question of the bourgeois theory of neutrality which is now preached in Europe and America by the reactionary leaders of the trade unions? Can the Comintern afford to refrain from stating its principles upon this question?

In the Draft Theses on Tactics submitted to the Third Congress of the Comintern by the C. P. S. U. Delegation and bearing the signatures of Lenin, Bukharin, Zinoviev and others, there occurs the following passage concerning the relations between the Parties and the trade unions:

"The strengthening of the contact between the Party and the masses signifies, above all, a closer contact with the trade union organisations. The task does not at all consist in mechanically subordinating the trade unions to the Party; it does not consist in getting the trade unions to give up their autonomy which arise from the very character of their activity; but it consists in that the honest revolutionary elements organised in the Communist Party should, in the work in the trade unions, pursue a tendency which should answer the general interests of the proletariat which is fighting for the conquest of power."

This question was dealt with more elaborately in the Theses of the Fourth Congress of the Communist International on the tasks of Communists in the trade unions. Those Theses contained a separate chapter dealing with "Neutrality and Independence".

I do not propose to take up the precise formulae of the Third and Fourth Congresses for adoption in the Programme. But it is clear at all events that the Programme will not be complete unless it contains a reply to the question of the relations between the Party and the trade unions.

In the Draft there is a very curious and incomprehensible statement which seems to suggest that the trade unions become a school of Communism only after the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. But this contradicts the standpoint of the Comintern in regard to the trade unions. It was already said by Marx that the trade unions were a school for Socialism. Were the Russian trade unions on the eve of the October Revolution a school of Communism? Such was obviously the case. Are at the present time the revolutionary trade unions in China a school of Communism? No doubt they are. Are the revolutionary trade unions in Czechoslovakia schools of Communism? No doubt they are. Why then say in the Programme that the trade unions become schools of Communism after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship? There is obviously here some ambiguity which ought to be eliminated. This ambiguity has arisen because the reformist trade unions have not been characterised as a school of capitalism, because no characterisation has been given of the revolutionary trade unions. Hence this formulation which seems to suggest that only after the conquest of power by the proletariat should the trade unions become a school of Communism.

Upon further examination of the passage dealing with the role and tasks of the trade union after the conquest of power by the proletariat, it will be found that not all the Russian experiences have been embodied, and that the particular aspect was taken which least of all corresponds to the trade union movements of the highly developed capitalist countries after the eventual establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Thus, the sentence about "the struggle against bureaucratic travesties which would inevitably arise owing to the backward cultural development of the masses" is entirely out of place as regards the masses in the highly developed capitalist countries.

An answer must be given here to two questions. The first question has to do with the relations between the trade unions and the Soviet State, and the second question has to deal with the relations between the trade unions and the national economy. After the October Revolution we had to take up these questions very seriously in the U. S. S. R. at our VIII. Party Congress (1919), at our IX. Party Congress (1920), at the X. Party Congress (1921), at the XI. Party Congress (1922), at the First All-Russian Trade Union Congress (1918), and at the Second All-Russian Trade Union Congress (1919). As regards the relations between the trade unions and the Soviet

State, we have had a great many interesting debates and numerous decisions on this subject. The crux of the question was then as follows: can the trade unions take up an independent and neutral attitude towards the Soviet State, or do they constitute a component part of the proletarian dictatorship. At the I. All-Russian Trade Union Congress the question arose for the first time of incorporating the trade unions in the State, i. e. of the fusion of the trade unions with the authority of the State. If a circumspect formulation of this question was taken up at the I. Trade Union Congress, whilst at the II. Congress a direct decision was adopted to the effect that the trade unions should not be made part of the State, nevertheless no one disputed the principle of the inevitable amalgamation of the organs of the Proletarian State with the organs of the trade unions.

In the resolution of the Congresses of the C. P. S. U. on this question, the following formulae will be found: "Under the proletarian dictatorship the trade unions become transformed into the machinery of power for the working class at the helm." (X. Party Congress.) "Under the dictatorship the trade unions take part in the State authority." "The trade unions, to the extent of their growing up to the consciousness of the creative role of the masses, become more and more transformed into auxiliary organs of the Proletarian State." (XI. Party Congress.) In his speech at the II. Trade Union Congress in 1919, Lenin raised the question whether the incorporation of the trade unions in the State should have then been carried out. Lenin's answer was in the negative:

"We shall have yet to accomplish a great many steps before we shall be in a position to say that the trade unions have finally become amalgamated with the apparatus of the State. First of all, this will be the case when the workers will have finally got into their hands the organs of coercion used by one class against another."

Lenin, however, could clearly see the question of the amalgamation and fusion of the trade unions with the proletarian State authority. If he spoke against the incorporation of the trade unions in the State in 1919, it was on account of the slow pace of development of the world revolution, the petty bourgeois environment of the proletariat in their own country, and the difficulties of the transition period.

I should like to add that the formulae then drawn up about the relations between the proletarian State and the trade unions may be now applied to the relations between the bourgeois State and the reformist trade unions. Have not the reformist trade unions now become an apparatus of the bourgeois State? The reformists are fond of boasting of their neutrality, at the same time pointing to the connection existing between the Soviet trade unions and the Soviet State. But the cry of neutrality is mere stuff and nonsense. We have never denied the close connection existing between the Soviet unions and the Soviet State; on the contrary, we can foresee in the future, with the ever growing pace of Socialist construction, an eventual amalgamation of the organs of Soviet economy and the trade unions. We do not conceal the fact; but the reformists are anxious to hide their close collaboration with the bourgeois State. In order to befuddle the minds of the workers, they invent for their benefit the new theories of economic democracy, industrial peace, democratising of economy, etc.

In our programme we must indicate more precisely and clearly that the amalgamation of the organs of proletarian State authority and the trade unions after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship will become inevitable in the course of Socialist construction.

An answer to the question of the role of the trade unions in the building of Socialist economy was already also contained in the programme of the C. P. S. U. which was adopted by the VIII. Party Congress in 1919. In that programme we find a point about the course of development of the trade union movement after the conquest of power by the proletariat which is exceedingly interesting:

"The organisational apparatus of socialist industry must rely in the first place upon the trade unions. They must become more and more emancipated from the narrow craft outlook and develop into gigantic industrial unions which should embrace the majority, and eventually the whole of the workers employed in a given branch of industry. The trade unions, which take part in all the local and central managing organs of the industries on the grounds of the Soviet Constitution and of the existing prac-

tices, must actually reach a stage when they will concentrate in their hands the entire management of the whole of national economy as an economic whole."

If we take the trade union movement of any big capitalist country (Germany, England, etc.) after the victory of the proletarian revolution, it is quite clear that such trade union movements will much more quickly achieve the objective laid down in our Programme than this could be done by the trade union movement in the Soviet Union. Because the technical level of the proletariat is much higher in those countries, because the organisational experiences of the working class are far deeper, and because, finally, the importance of the proletariat in those countries, together with the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, is much greater than it was in our country. All this will afford the possibility of shortening the stages, so that the trade unions will far more quickly be able "actually to reach a stage when they will concentrate in their hands the entire management of the whole of the national economy."

In the course of the discussion in 1920 it was argued by some comrades that this constituted a purely syndicalist attitude on the question. Yet it can be seen quite easily that this has nothing whatever to do with syndicalism, since the syndicalists ask for the transfer of the management of individual branches of industry to the respective trade unions, whereas in the Programme of the C. P. S. U. the talk was about the "management of the national economy as an economic whole". This, of course, is quite a different matter.

The Programme should not only answer the question of what the trade unions were and what they are now. It must also be stated whether the course of trade union development leads. If it be true that the trade unions in the epoch of the proletarian dictatorship become the most important organs for the building up of Socialism — and this is not subject to the least doubt — then it is obvious that the trade unions ought to be changed to the extent that we have reached a more perfect Socialist society. The State then withers away and the organs for accounting production and distribution take up the most important place. All these organs develop out of the economic organs of the Soviet State which have been built up with the help of the trade unions and have become amalgamated with the respective trade unions. The whole domain of the organisation and protection of labour will be transferred to the organs which lead the whole of national economy as an economic whole. As the classes disappear, and consequently the State withers away, there will also disappear the political party of the proletariat. At any rate, the trade unions will exist under the Communist society in a new, modified form, as the organs for accounting production and distribution. Thus, all the organisations which have grown along with capitalism, after passing through a number of changes, become eventually dissolved in the new all-embracing economic organisation of the Communist society.

This prospect of the complete amalgamation of the economic organisations of the proletariat with the organs of Socialist construction, this prospect of the disappearance of all class organisations together with the disappearance of all classes, should be laid down in the Programme. We speak with certainty about the disappearance of the State. Why should we not say with the same certainty that together with the classes there will also disappear the Party and the trade unions? This does not mean to say that the Communist society will not have its own organisations. The Communist society is the highest form of organisation for labouring mankind. A society without rulers does not mean disorganisation, but rather the highest form of socially organised Communist existence, upon whose basis the social and individual Communist consciousness will be gigantically developed.

But in order to reply to all these questions, it is necessary to add a separate chapter about the working class, its evolution, and the inner structure of the organisations created by the working class. Only in this manner will it be possible to concentrate in one place everything that the Comintern has to say and ought to say on the question of the reformist and the revolutionary trade union movement. Only then will it be possible to say everything that ought to be said about the revolutionary trade unions, and which is not said in the Draft Programme. Then it will be possible also to speak about the attitude towards the R. I. L. U., of which there is not a word

in the Programme. Such an amplification of the Programme is absolutely necessary, because the Programme of the Comintern is not being drawn up for one or two years; it is not only a Programme for the leading cadres, not only a Programme for the members of our Party, but also a Programme for the millions of workers who are outside of the Communist movement. In order to win new millions of workers over to our side, in order to educate them in the Communist spirit, it must be stated with full clearness that as against the reformists who have turned the trade unions into a school of capitalism, it is our aim to turn the trade union movement into a school of Communism, into the chief weapon in the struggle for power and for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade SEMARD (France):

Comrades, we have before us a Draft Programme which is going to be of far-reaching importance to the development of the Communist International and its Sections upon the Marxian-Leninist basis. The Theses and resolutions of our past Congresses, as well as of the previous Executive meetings, have outlined the proper way for the Sections of the C. I., constituting the firm basis of their political and tactical conduct, but there was the lack of a general programme for all the Sections by means of which the ideology of our Parties should be rendered clear to the large masses, setting out our aims and attracting them to direct participation in the struggle.

The Draft Theses worked out at the V. World Congress did not meet with sufficient echo even within our own Communist International, whilst the discussion was limited to a fairly narrow circle of functionaries.

The present Draft is generally more complete, and is enriched by the lessons of the big events of recent years: the Chinese Revolution, the colonial movements in India, Indonesia, South America, etc., as well as by the development of Socialism in the U. S. S. R., by the economic and political consolidation of the proletarian State. The Draft contains a thoroughgoing analysis of the monopolist tendencies of capitalism and its technical development in the last 10—15 years; finally, it contains the summary of the revolutionary experiences gained by the different sections of the C. I. in the struggles of the working class which have taken place in the course of the last 10 years.

Comrades, we believe that the Draft should nevertheless be amended and amplified, particularly in regard to the present policy of the Social Democracy in the sphere of politics and in the trade unions, in regard to the national problem, i. e. the national minorities in the different capitalist States, in regard to the role of the women and the working youth in modern society, in regard to the tactics of the united front, in regard to the trade union question, as well as in regard to the question of the Workers' and Peasants' Government which have not been fully thrashed out in the Theses.

On the other hand, a certain clarification is necessary in the analysis of fascism, in order to avoid any mechanical generalisations without undertaking a serious analysis of the different situations and the different methods employed by the capitalist reaction.

The chapter dealing with the question of nationalisation of land and the measures towards this nationalisation during the first period of proletarian dictatorship should be stated more clearly, if not in the Programme itself, at least in a commentary, because of the misinterpretation likely to arise in the minds of those comrades who are inclined to consider such provisional measures, such moderating of the measures of nationalisation, in the light of maintaining the private property of the small peasants. And if we ask for a more forceful and expressive style, it is not in the sense of a shortcoming of the text. The analysis on the changes in the structure, on the tendency of monopolist capitalism, and on the development of imperialism, which appear to us to be absolutely necessary, should therefore not be shortened. We believe that by shortening these points of the analysis, the Programme would be deprived of the necessary clearness, and this would be detrimental both theoretically and from the tactical standpoint.

What is necessary is not to write an ABC of Communism, and not a Manifesto like that of 1848, which reacted to a definite turning point in history. The Communist International must

turnish a comprehensive and concrete programme which takes into account the present epoch of imperialism, as well as the needs of the class struggle and the needs of the various sections of the Communist International, in order to enable them to lead the proletariat to the victorious fight over capitalism. The indispensable clarification of our policies and of our strategy and tactics should not be sacrificed to the desire for presenting our programme in brief form.

To begin with, we believe that the Introduction should be left without any change, because it is indispensable to the clarification of the analysis contained in the following chapters.

As regards chapter 1, the tendencies in the direction of State capitalism cannot be disputed. They were emphasised in the discussion and have been properly analysed in the programme. But these tendencies in the direction of State capitalism are not contradictory to the maintenance of certain State and communal monopolies, like the monopoly of the railways, the arsenals, the State industries, the electric power works, the municipal enterprises, etc. These monopolies exist in spite of the struggle of the capitalist trusts for the absorption of the most productive enterprises. These State monopolies have withstood the onslaught of the great powers of industry and finance. Besides, they render splendid services in the preparation for war, in common with the big capitalist enterprises in the chemical and other industries. The struggle waged by the big powers of industry and finance is none too energetic, because they are now coming ever closer to the domination of the State and to the domination of these monopolies. Moreover, they will succeed in buying them out, at least the more profitable monopolies, so as to accelerate the system of concessions to private enterprise for the construction of railways, and the use of waterfalls, etc. which were hitherto considered as absolutely national enterprises.

From this standpoint the formulation of the international situation is more precise in the theses than it is in the text of the Draft Programme, and we believe that this formulation should be transferred into the Programme. I refer to the following passage:

"There is also to be observed a growth in the tendencies towards State capitalism both in the form of State capitalism in the proper sense of the term (State electrical power stations, municipal enterprises, industrial works and transportation enterprises), as well as in the form of a growing amalgamation of the employers' organisations with the organs of the State authority."

We believe this formulation to be much clearer than the one contained in the Programme.

In regard to Chapter 2, we believe that the revolutionary events of recent years have been enumerated in an altogether too dry fashion; they have been stated more or less in chronological order, without drawing the tactical and strategical conclusions therefrom.

We have already asked in the Programme Commission that the lessons of the revolutionary events should be stated, such as the revolutionary events in Germany in 1918 and 1923, the events in Austria, and the events of the Hungarian Revolution. These events could contribute to the clarification of our policies and tactics as regards the peasantry in the light of the mistakes committed in the Hungarian Revolution, and they might also help us in formulating our slogan of the Workers' and Peasants' Government in the light of the none too splendid experience in Saxony.

In connection with this slogan of the Workers' and Peasants' Government, which should be the expression of this proletarian dictatorship, I have already pointed out that it is not contained in the Programme. In order to clarify this slogan and in order to develop our agitation among the workers and peasant masses, it is essential that we should take up this slogan and properly clarify it, since regardless of the past discussions and the resolutions already passed on this subject — particularly the resolutions of the V. Congress — there are still some comrades who believe that we have to deal here with a slogan of the united front involving an alliance with the Social Democrats in order to bring about the capture of power by means of a coalition government without a dictatorship of the proletariat. It is necessary that this slogan be taken up and fully explained in the Programme of the C. I.

As to the numerous treacheries of the Social Democracy, they are stated in the Draft in a rather declamatory style,

without pointing out the significance of the individual acts of treachery. The attitude of the Social Democracy on the question of war, the role it plays in the military and moral preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. at the present time, its colonial policies, as well as its participation in the capitalist rationalisation, — all this ought to be clearly brought out in the Programme.

It ought to be stated with greater emphasis that the Social Democracy is essentially a party of collaboration with capitalism for the consolidation of the latter. It is also necessary to point out the role played by the "Left Wing Socialists" and their radical phraseology which has but one purpose — to retard the development of the socialist workers in the direction of the Communist Party.

As regards the chapter about fascism, we have already pointed out that it has not been drawn with sufficient precision. On the whole, we are in agreement with the views formulated by the comrades in the Italian Delegation who stated that fascism is not the only form of capitalist reaction to be considered. It is true, comrades, that a laughing stock has been made of parliamentarism, that it has been shifted into the background, that the democracy has been replaced by the more or less open dictatorship of financial capital. Nevertheless this process has not been everywhere uniform with the transformation produced by fascism in Italy. Italian fascism is the type of dictatorship by one party with the support of the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and even a section of the proletariat. Polish fascism resembles Italian fascism neither by its system of government nor by its social composition. The white terror of the Balkan countries, which existed already before the war, is a fascism of a different form and of different social composition. The "masked" fascism which characterises the policy of the big imperialist powers is a kind of governmental fascism which works through the domination of state and parliament by financial capital on the basis of the prevalence of the executive power over the legislative authority, upon the basis of the closest collaboration of social democracy and capitalism. This constitutes quite a different type of fascism. It is far more a direct dictatorship of financial capital which has won the petty bourgeoisie and the social democracy for its class policies through its methods of government. Properly speaking, it is quite wrong to say that capitalism alternately changes from fascist methods to those of coalition with the social democracy; it should rather be said that it also makes use of the collaboration with the social democracy for the purpose of applying its fascist methods.

Why do we need these explanations? We ask for them because we must beware of putting the label of "fascism" upon any situation and any reactionary manifestation of the bourgeois governments and parties, as well as the social democracy, because this would not be clear enough to the working masses, because it cannot yet be demonstrated to the masses who are still behind the social democracy.

We have observed the tendency in the parties and in the sections to neglect the correct analysis of the actual political situation and to be satisfied with mechanical classification, social-fascism, fascist left bloc, fascist government, etc. Everything was put down as fascist. But no notice was taken of the different methods employed by the governments working in the direction of fascism.

It should be explained to the workers that the bourgeoisie maintains only a show of certain legality and of alleged democracy by resorting to fascist methods in order to pursue more efficiently its reactionary and imperialist policies. The terms of "social fascist" or fascist government do not suffice to render clear to the masses of workers and peasants the general tendency of monopoly capitalism and the treacherous policy of social democracy.

If the necessary explanation about fascism, as well as in regard to the employment of fascist methods and tendencies by capitalism, will not be introduced in the draft, such explanations should at least be made in the comments to the programme so as to render clear to the masses of the workers the real policy of their governments.

With regard to chapter IV, we find the question of nationalisation of the land and of the proletarian hegemony to be far too important to be passed over in silence. We must enlighten the masses of the workers, and particular the masses of the peasants about the aims of Communism, and we must also get clearness in the ranks of our own Party.

Comrades, in connection with the question of relaxation of the nationalisation measures, as well as in connection with the question of proletarian hegemony in the revolution, there were differences of opinion in the French Delegation. Our comrade Renaud Jean proposed certain amendments as regards the transitional measures in connection with the nationalisation of the land, as well as with a view to modifying the assertion of the proletarian hegemony.

Comrades, I have already opposed this tendency in the Commission, and I am going to state my reasons here again before the Plenum. We are of the opinion that the assertion of the principle of nationalisation of the whole land, as well as of the large industrial enterprises, is absolutely indispensable in our programme. The provisional measures and the points of relaxation are properly explained, so that the force of the principle is somewhat put back. It is therefore entirely unnecessary to reduce any further the principle of nationalisation of the land. There is no need whatever to follow the suggestion of Comrade Renaud Jean and offer a more or less open guarantee to the small peasants concerning their proprietary rights to the land. I believe it to be sufficient to leave them in the possession of land which they are cultivating, and when the use of the soil is guaranteed to them, in order to secure their neutrality, but we need make no further promises than that. It is clear that the small peasant who possesses the guarantee of enjoying the fruits of the soil that is cultivated by him, will not insist upon the juridical right of private property. The main thing after all is to state clearly our policy in regard to the tens of thousands of smallholders and tenant farmers and the millions of agricultural labourers who are going to play just now a deciding role in the struggle for power in the rural districts. We need these masses of landholders and tenant farmers and agricultural labourers; we need their revolutionary help at least as much as we need the neutrality of the small peasantry. But I repeat, as regards the poor and middle peasants, their co-operation and their neutrality cannot be won by a retreat and by a compromise involving some modifications in the principle of the nationalisation of the land.

Comrade Renaud Jean is also against asserting the principle of the ideological and political hegemony of the proletariat over the other social classes and elements in the revolution. He believes it necessary to modify the passage in the programme which deals with this hegemony. He believes it to be dangerous on the whole to insist on securing political privileges to the workers whilst curbing the political rights of the peasants. The bourgeoisie, he says, has granted certain political rights to the peasants and the proletarian revolution cannot take them away. This, he goes on to say, would be of no practical use, whilst at the same time we run the risk of forfeiting our propagandist opportunities among the peasants. He wanted to delete in the programme the passage which we believe to be essential. It is the passage which speaks of vesting the power in the proletariat without sharing it with anyone. He proposes a formula whereby this hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution might be modified and extinguished. The amendment which he proposes implies not a formal change, but a radical alteration. I have already pointed out in the Commission that by accepting changes in the programme we might go farther back than the theses contained in the Communist Manifesto.

Comrades, these principles must stay in the programme of the C. I. and should neither be modified nor reduced in any shape or form. We believe that even in the discussion which is going to ensue on the comments to the programme, it will be necessary to afford more clearness in regard to those countries where the peasants play an important political role, pointing out the fundamental grounds on which the proletariat should be the predominant class and should have the hegemony in the proletarian revolution. The experiences of the Russian revolution can only strengthen this idea of the proletarian hegemony. I believe that the peasants can be won not by means of more or less artificial forms, but by telling them the real truth about our aims and by proving to them the need for the proletarian dictatorship. The peasants of the big countries with highly developed capitalism possess fairly extensive political knowledge, sometimes as extensive as that possessed by some workers. And they will realise why the proletariat, constituting as it does a concentrated and homogeneous class, is the only determining force in the revolution, as well as in the consolidation of the revolutionary power. They will realise that the sharing

of power during the first period of the proletarian dictatorship would only jeopardise the dictatorship, i. e. the revolution.

We believe that a Communist programme should not be watered down in regard to the fundamental principles and the questions that are essential to the triumph of the proletarian revolution.

Comrades, as regards Chapter V, it would be advantageous to insert a passage dealing with the establishment of Socialism in one single country, even if only to refute the arguments raised by Trotsky. It is not enough to repeat a dozen times that socialism is making progress in the U.S.S.R. — this the whole world knows — but it is necessary also, even if in brief form, to afford a theoretical elucidation of this building of socialism in one country, even in Russia where industry is not highly developed.

In the text of the draft there is one formulation which strikes us as likely to be misunderstood. It is pointed out that it is possible to build "full Socialism". Comrades, the full Socialism — that is, Communism. It has been pointed out in all the past theses and in all the previous discussions that the realisation of full Socialism, i. e. of Communism, presupposes the simultaneous victory of the revolution at least in other industrially developed countries.

If this is no mistake, there should be a discussion about the word "full". Theoretical precision of this kind is necessary in order to knock the bottom out of the Trotsky theory and of the social democracy which predict the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia and the return to bourgeois democracy.

These are the essential points which we wish to raise in connection with the Draft Programme.

There are also fairly important points in Chapter VI, which deals with strategy and tactics. We suggest some amendments in order to define our tactics from the trade unionist point of view, insofar as we cannot put the question of capturing the trade unions and their leaderships, and because the formulation in the draft may be misinterpreted. How can the leadership of the trade unions be captured? Not by the mechanical ousting of those who are now at the head of the organisations, but by efficient work of the Communists in the trade unions, as well as by the activity of the factions to win the confidence of the workers. The leadership of the trade unions should not be won by discipline, by forcing the sympathisers to vote for our candidates, but rather because these candidates should enjoy the confidence of the workers, who should be convinced that they are the best qualified people to carry on the fight for their economic interests.

We also demand a stronger formulation of the passage dealing with the tactics of the united front. It should be stated what are the aims pursued by these tactics, both from the standpoint of winning the large masses of workers for the direct struggle against capitalism, as well as to expose the treacherous role of the social democracy, so as to emancipate the workers from their influence and attract them to the revolutionary movement. On these grounds it is necessary to state, even if in a few sentences, the objects of these tactics, under-scoring these objects in our programme.

We demand also a stronger formulation of the passage dealing with anti-militarist work. The discussions at this Congress on the international theses as well as on the war theses have shown that the anti-militarist work has been very much under-estimated by all the parties. We believe that the formulation of "revolutionary propaganda in the army" is rather vague, that it does not imply anti-militarist propaganda, but simply organisational activity in the army and Navy. Whilst there may be other important suggestions made from the standpoint of the activities of the different parties, we think it necessary, however, to insist that the programme of the C.I. should indicate quite distinctly that it is not only a question of propaganda, but also of revolutionary organisation in the capitalist army. This will contribute to a certain extent towards increasing our revolutionary activity in this domain, which has been rather deficient.

We miss also in Chapter VI. a paragraph dealing with the national question. It seems that we have forgotten about the defence of the national minorities and the fight of these national minorities which must be waged shoulder to shoulder with the Communist International in order to secure to them the right of self-determination. This gap in the draft ought to be filled.

In conclusion, comrades, I come back to the question of the workers' and peasants' government as an agitational slogan, as a revolutionary slogan and the synonym of the proletarian dictatorship, which would enable us to rally all the working peasants to our side in the decisive struggle against capitalism and for the conquest of power:

Comrade ARNOT (Great Britain):

Comrades, the British delegation have considered the draft programme of the Communist International and are in general agreement with the line of it. We accept also its form as a programme; while we believe that throughout and especially in the beginning and in the ending it should reach the height and tone of a manifesto. For this reason, we welcome the insertion wherever it is most useful of the actual words of Marx, Engels and Lenin. So far from considering the length of the programme to be a disadvantage, the British delegation would gladly see an amplification of certain places where the argument seems to be almost too condensed.

The changes that were made in the programme since the draft submitted to the V. Congress, seem to us no more than necessary. Some comrades have expressed the view that those changes make the programme too Russian; and this is, of course, the sort of criticism we may expect to get from the Social Democrats who will say that the inclusion of a special chapter on "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the U.S.S.R. and the International Socialist Revolution" is an instance of russification. Well, certainly in the programmes of the II. International references to the Russian revolution are conspicuous by their absence. But we are not to be affected by the criticism of Social Democrats in this matter. If Comrade Lenin could refer not once or twice, but again and again to the Commune of Paris and to the experiences gained by the world proletariat from the Commune of Paris which lasted some ten weeks, how much more must the proletariat of the world learn from the experiences of the proletariat in the Soviet Union which has now enriched our struggle with the experience of over ten years.

Thus, the British Delegation defends the line of the programme against criticisms. In the commission we took cognisance of criticisms emanating from enemy quarters. For instance, take the question of Fascism. The British Labour Party have always insisted that Fascism is out of place in England, and that we Communists in our anti-Fascist propaganda and in our efforts to build Workers' Defence Corps in Britain have been like nurses trying to frighten children with non-existent bogies. Against this and against other conceptions of Fascism we defend the line of the programme.

First, the British delegation rejects irrelevant definitions of Fascism, such as those which seek to limit it to countries that have few colonies or none, that have a feeble industrial structure, or where the bourgeois state is not deeply rooted. These are precisely the types of explanations for Fascism which would be found by those most active in denying the possibility of Fascism in Great Britain (I am speaking of the Labour Party criticism). When these criticisms appear in our own ranks they will be found to be linked up with an over-estimation of the prospects of capitalist stabilisation.

Secondly, we cite the example of other countries such as the United States of America, Japan and Britain and show what tendencies towards Fascism can be found in these countries. In particular, Great Britain is actually full of elements that would be found to make up the ranks of Fascism if the need of such desperate remedies began to press upon the British bourgeoisie. Not only are there social strata that are ripe for Fascism, in particular millions of urban petty bourgeois and intelligentsia, a relatively enormous black-coated proletariat outside the ranks of trade unionism, and a section of the proletariat some eight millions strong, described as engaged not in production but in "services"; not only are there these social strata — who have a philistine worship of force and violence that is successful, — not only is there a predisposition to Fascism in certain sections of the government class (Anglo-Indian) whose outlook is based on the tradition of colonial administration where their primary business was to govern without the mask of bourgeois democracy; but in addition, we have witnessed in Britain the

tendency towards Fascism take on definite organisational and ideological shapes. In ideology the indigenous Fascism of the "Daily Mail" has been reinforced by a host of writers ranging from the "Socialist" Bernard Shaw, who has taken on himself to be the apologist for Mussolini, to the writers in the gutter press and to the dregs of literature that sell by millions on the railways bookstalls.

In connection with this growing Fascist ideology, it is noticeable that the leading British capitalist politicians, Churchill and Joynson Hicks, never go out of their way to praise the institutions of the French Republic or the German Reich. It is otherwise with the Fascist State, whose ideology and so-called social ideals are praised both by the rationalisers inside the Cabinet and by those outside, such as Sir Alfred Mond.

In **organisation**, there are three expressions of the Fascist tendency. These tendencies displayed themselves most actively and definitely before the General Strike. In the last months of 1925 and 1926, when there was a rising wave of working class feeling, there was real alarm among the bourgeoisie, for it was not known how far the bureaucracy of the trade unions would be able to keep the trade unions safe for capitalism. And therefore you had three tendencies towards Fascism expressed in three organisational shapes.

First, you had the British Fascisti; secondly, you had the Organisation for the Maintenance of Supplies, the O. M. S. definitely formed for strike-breaking purposes, an unofficial organisation which received the official blessing of the Government; thirdly, you had the legislation known as the Emergency Powers Act which suspended the ordinary process of law and gave completely dictatorial powers into the hands of the government whenever it chose to proclaim a "State of emergency". All these three organisational shapes in which the Fascist tendencies displayed themselves worked together to crush the expected General Strike.

It is precisely in this combination of legal repression with extra-legal methods and even illegal methods, that we may see the typical form which Fascist tendencies may be expected to assume in a country with the traditions of Great Britain: if you will, a tendency to a sort of constitutional Fascism.

After the General Strike, the bourgeoisie could play upon the soft pedal; but although not so much is now heard of either the British Fascisti, the Organisation for the Maintenance of Supplies or the Emergency Powers Act, they all remain in being and can be called forth at any moment. At the same time, the formation of the Spencer Unions amongst the minefields, the particular way in which these yellow unions were formed and the preparation for industrial peace now widely known as "Mondism", — all these things can be unmistakably recognised as Fascist in their tendency; a recognition which Sir Alfred Mond recently underlined by declaring his acceptance of Fascism as his social ideal.

I have taken only the example of Fascism as one point in which the British delegation holds with the Programme as against various criticisms that have been made. But there are others, such as the controversy over the so-called New Economic Policy and War Communism, in which case also the British Delegation supports the line of the programme. In our opinion, the Programme could be improved by certain additions and by certain re-formulations. For instance, in the first chapter, the economic analysis might be expanded so as to show in detail the production of surplus value and the basic contradictions of capital. At the same time also in the first chapter a passage should be added giving the Marxist teaching on the theory of the State in its classic form.

I will not mention details, but in the second chapter in what in the English text in "Inprecorr" is page 553, it seems to us could be written so as to bring out the contradictions between the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism in a more direct and violent form. A reference to the constitution of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics would show that in the constitution there is a passage of much the same purport in which the contradiction is brought out in a more striking way.

Then, in the last paragraph of the 3rd chapter, on "World Communism", the British delegation would suggest the insertion of the phrase of Marx about the end of the prehistoric period

of human history, and the phrase of Engels about the leap from the kingdom of necessity into the kingdom of freedom. These, I believe, have been mentioned also by Comrade Thalheimer in his criticism.

Again in the last chapter, beginning with the words: "In the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the Communist Parties must conduct an able and consistent struggle" — the last sentence of that paragraph reads as follows in the draft: — "Temporary agreements with the latter (that is, with the national bourgeoisie) may be made only in so far as they will not hamper the revolutionary organisation of the workers and peasants and are genuinely fighting against imperialism". The question of this sentence has already been raised, and it was pointed out that these were the actual words of Comrade Lenin in the speech which he delivered on the colonial question at the II. Congress of the Communist International. Nevertheless, it seemed to the British delegation that more authoritative were the words of the colonial thesis of the same Congress, the draft of which, incidentally, was submitted by Comrade Lenin. We therefore propose that, instead of that last sentence in the paragraph there should be inserted the words from the thesis itself on the colonial question. The passage I am quoting appears on page 575 of the English edition of the report of the II. Congress of the Communist International. I will read it now:

"The Communist International must establish temporary relations and, even unions with the revolutionary movements in the colonies and backward countries, without however amalgamating with them, but preserving the independent character of the proletarian movement even though it be still in its embryonic state."

Again, in the beginning of chapter 6, we feel particularly that the opening paragraphs would be improved by certain additions and alterations, on which the delegation is submitting a draft to the bureau of the Programme Commission. And we feel it our duty, as well as our interest, to submit reformulations so as to bring out the characteristic features of these types of reformism of English origin — Fabianism, Guild Socialism — with greater precision and exactitude.

Finally, the English delegation considers that the Draft Programme, subject to these minor alterations, and subject to editorial revision, should be accepted by this Congress. The British Party, for its part, will welcome the programme as a means of overcoming ideological narrowness. The workers, too, in Britain will welcome this Programme as a new and powerful weapon in their struggle against their exploiters. It will stimulate solidarity between the workers of Britain and the toiling masses of India. This programme will bring more workers into the ranks of the Party in Britain, and once in the ranks, will equip them with great knowledge, skill and determination to carry on the fight against the capitalists and the servants of the capitalists. The great days of Chartism were over before Marx gave Britain his powerful help in the struggle of the English working class in those days. But in this respect, at any rate, we are more fortunate than our Chartist forefathers, and the working class of England will be able to make the best use of the Communist Programme in carrying out their historic task of the destruction of imperialism and the establishment of a Communist Society.

Comrade SERRA (Italy):

The Italian Delegation has already contributed to the examination of the Draft Programme by written "observations" and by its interventions in the discussion of the Commission. It nevertheless thinks it useful to sum up before the Plenum the principal remarks made at the conclusion of the big discussions which had taken place. It would have been certainly useful if this draft could have been more carefully discussed in the various parties, and it will be difficult to substitute the advantages which such a preliminary discussion would have given in regard to the examination of the draft and also in regard to the ideological rectification of the various sections of the C.I., by subsequent enlightenment and popularisation, which will be nevertheless very necessary.

We were unanimous in insisting on the draft being endorsed by the Sixth Congress in its final form. A postponement to the Seventh Congress would not help us much, considering

that the immediate and very serious tasks which are in store for our parties will perhaps not allow us to devote, as we have hitherto done, several weeks to conscientious work and collective revision. All the more so, as in the opinion of our delegation it is absolutely necessary for the national sections to begin immediately to draw up their own programme. For this purpose we formally demand that since the programme Commission of the Fourth Congress drew up certain general directions for the programme of the C. I., the present Programme Commission should lay down in a resolution certain general indications which might serve as a guide to the various Parties in the elaboration of their national programme.

As to the form of the programme of the C. I., we have already decided, and the Programme Commission has come to the same decision, that there can be no appeal nor declaration of principle. The programme is and cannot be anything but the political programme of the world party of the proletariat, the instrument of political work on a world scale which considers the concrete problems of the proletarian revolution on the same scale. This work is of a diverse kind, it pursues very complex tasks and the ideological instrument which is being forged to outline its important features can but reproduce in its form and structure this differentiation and complexity. Therefore, we agree that efforts should be made to introduce every possible improvement into the draft without changing, however, the type of programme represented by it.

We have proposed certain structural modifications. In regard to these I refer you to our written proposals and our interventions in the discussion of the Commission. We had emphasised the necessity of supplementing the second chapter, containing the analysis of the various forms of capitalism up to the imperialist stage, by indicating there briefly the whole social evolution which has taken place on the basis of the "constant renewal of the capitalist contradictions", with which are connected the development of the labour movement, class relations, the transformations of the political and ideological super-structure. This exposé should be given after the last but one paragraph of the second chapter, because the last paragraph could be very well placed at the head of the fourth chapter, according to the proposal of the German Delegation with which we associate ourselves. By this exposé we do not by any means want to attenuate the urgency of the advent of socialism which is the foundation of the scientific conception which inspires the draft. We want merely to emphasise that in this objective process a maturing of the class consciousness of the proletariat takes place; that the formation of an "international militant labour association" is not only the product of a material necessity corresponding to the "internationalist" character of imperialism", but a regrouping of forces which, on the basis of an objective necessity, assumes a rhythm, an amplitude and a decisive character as the working class, through the action of its vanguard, its political party, acquires consciousness of its general interests, of what our great teachers were wont to call its "historical mission". In regard to this question our remarks are similar to those made by Comrade Clara Zetkin in the first part of her article published in the "Communist International".

It seems to us that the second chapter (together with the VI.) stands most in need of a thorough recasting. Above all, we believe that the world war which constituted a turning point in the historical period, which ushered in the period of the proletarian revolution, which constituted, so to speak, the giant sieve through which all the ideological and political elements of the seventy years of the labour and socialist movement have been sifted and regrouped, must be given there a place more commensurate with its importance. It is around it that the balance of the former history of the working class was drawn up, it is in its furrow that we find the victorious Russian revolution and the birth of the Third International.

We think that it would be also as well to regroup and supplement the specific characters of the capitalist economy of the post-war epoch by differentiating between the character of the pre-war crises and those of our epoch, above all by asserting that owing to their different character any possibility of improving the standard of living of the workers and other big sections of the population is out of the question, and that this is not a transitory phenomenon but is closely connected with the character of capitalist development. It is this which makes in all the countries revolution and seizure of the power of the working class the order of the day.

One should also give prominence to the general tendency towards "economic nationalism" which is manifesting itself in all countries, even in those which are far removed from the great current of the capitalist development.

We also think that, as conclusion to this chapter, one should lay more stress on the preponderating role of the party of the working class, on which the maturing of the material conditions of Socialism imposes the task of creating on the basis of the objective conditions of the world revolution subjective conditions which ensure development and victory.

In regard to the question of fascism we think — even after the discussion held here on this subject — that it would be useful to represent as the result of the "epoch of imperialism, of the accentuation of the class struggle and of the growth of the elements of civil war" not only the advent of Fascism, but also a more general process of the reactionary transformation of the traditional state apparatus, of which fascism is but the specific expression in the given historical situations and of which we have endeavoured to analyse the most important factors. We are still of the opinion that it is useful to consider fascism as a form of reaction which, in the general reactionary tendency, remains linked up with objective and concrete elements which it is of the utmost importance to study and determine.

A few words on the characteristics of the transition to proletarian dictatorship in countries "with a moderately developed capitalism". It is not the question of making longer or cutting short the list of countries classified under this heading. It is above all the question of defining better the character which the transition from the bourgeois democratic revolution to the socialist revolution takes in these countries. The draft gives as a characteristic element (and consequently as a predominant element) of the situation in these countries, the existence of feudal relics, of a big peasantry for whom arises the problem of an agrarian revolution. We maintain that the existence of these characteristic conditions places before the strategy of the Communist Parties problems different from those in other countries. But in these countries, and especially in Europe, the main thing is a struggle between the capitalist bourgeoisie and the proletariat for the capture of the peasant masses: the bourgeoisie cannot maintain power nor can the proletariat take it away from it without the support of the peasant masses. That is why it is necessary to indicate more clearly that in these countries there will not be a stage of the liquidation of feudal relics and then another stage for the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship; there will be a first stage of struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, both of whom will endeavour to secure the support of the peasantry. But the liquidation of feudal relics cannot be accomplished except by the proletarian revolution as a secondary product of this revolution in accordance with the thought expressed by Lenin in two articles written in November 1921 on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

Comrade Semard has pointed out the necessity of transferring the paragraph which deals with the construction of Socialism in one country to Chapter V. I do not think that this is the right place to deal with this question. The formula with which Comrade Semard dealt, that of "integral Socialism", is a well known formula of Lenin which applies to Russia. It would be, on the contrary, as well to emphasise at the beginning of the IV. Chapter, which deals with the question of the construction of Socialism as a general problem of proletarian dictatorship, certain elements of the problem of this construction, for instance the objective and specific factors which make it possible. Therefore, one will have to deal with the ideological relations between the construction of Socialism and the typically socialist conception of the division of labour between the various groupings of producers and with the relations between the rhythm of development of the construction of Socialism in one country and that of the development of the capitalist forces on a world scale.

For the VI. Chapter we have proposed a remodelling and a more complete formulation of the fundamental principles of strategy and tactic (character of the Party, its relation to the working class character of the trade unions, character of the utilisation of legal possibilities and of the bourgeois regime, parliamentarism, etc. ... and their connection with illegal actions). In this connection I will lay

stress here on the points which will have to be dealt with more fully by drawing them from our report:

1. The political function of the Communist Party as a Party which expresses and embodies the interests and aspirations of the working class as a whole, and which has no other interests but those of the working class. This assertion contains the general justification of the tactic of the united front, of the struggle which we are carrying on for the partial demands of the workers and of its connection with the ultimate aims of the class struggle of the workers.

2. In indicating the demands and partial slogans, the manner in which the struggle for partial political aims is to be conducted is not clearly enough defined. We are, moreover, of the opinion that here one should indicate more clearly how Communists will have to transform the struggle for political "democratic" demands (which can in certain circumstances assume revolutionary value) into a struggle for proletarian democracy and for the proletarian revolution.

3. Finally, we deem it necessary to point out that when the bourgeoisie takes up the offensive against the working class and endeavours to secure solid advantages against the proletariat, it becomes the duty of the Communists to defend any forcible opposition of the working class while at the same time maintaining in this struggle complete freedom of movement, criticism and manoeuvring.

Thus supplemented, the programme will constitute a big advance for our movement. It will then be a great task accomplished by the Sixth Congress, which will in this manner have retrieved a little the long interval between the convocation of the two last world congresses. We think that if the material of the programme becomes flesh and blood of our parties, the present period between two great world wars will also be the period between two great revolutions, one which was victorious in 1917, on the sixth part of the globe, and the other which will deliver the rest of the globe from the rotten and brutal capitalist system.

Comrade KOLAROV (Bulgaria):

Our Delegation is thoroughly in agreement with the division of the countries into three groups, as is made in the draft. Nevertheless if I wish to speak on this question, it is because Comrade Bukharin, in the explanations which he gave on this point on the Commission, did not speak with sufficient clearness, thus leaving room for some misunderstanding.

What I wish to say relates to the following point: to the second group of countries, according to the Draft Programme, belong those countries where a medium stage of development has been reached by capitalism, where the industries offer a sufficient foundation for socialist construction, but certain conditions render unavoidably necessary a transition stage to the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, before the final overthrow of the capitalist bourgeoisie. To the question, what countries are concretely to be classified in that group, the answer is given in the draft: "Tsarist Russia prior to 1917, Poland, etc." What does this "etc." mean? In his concluding speech in the Programme Commission, Comrade Bukharin explained the matter as follows: the country which unquestionably belongs to that group is Bulgaria, next should also be included Roumania and Yugo-Slavia. As to Poland, he left room for some doubt. Comrades, if Comrade Bukharin's explanations were in the light of comments to the draft, this point must be positively dealt with, because it follows from his words that it is not Poland, but Bulgaria which represents a standard type of these second groups of countries. Therefore, I deem it necessary to examine the criterions laid down in the draft whereby the different countries are to be classed among the second group.

The first criterion given in the Draft Programme is that of a medium level of capitalist development; next comes "the presence of considerable survivals of feudalism in agriculture", as well as an "uncompleted bourgeois-democratic revolution", which means the survivals of semi-feudalism in agriculture, yet a sufficient development of capitalism notwithstanding the absence of a complete bourgeois-democratic revolution — these are the three essential criterions of an economic and social-political character which determine the place of a given country among the second group of countries. If the draft refers to Poland, then we all know that not only does Poland possess the minimum of industrial development necessary for socialist

construction, but that there are also survivals of semi-feudalism in agriculture, i. e. an economic basis for a stage of transition to the proletarian dictatorship. But when Comrade Bukharin mentions Bulgaria as a country unquestionably belonging to the second group, one has to say a word or two about Bulgaria. In Bulgaria we have actually a minimum of capitalist development, a minimum of industrial development, necessary for socialist construction. On the other hand, there are no semi-feudal remnants whatever in Bulgarian agriculture. In Bulgaria the agrarian revolution was completed already half a century ago. Also the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Bulgaria has been completed. Neither the agrarian revolution nor the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution are on the order of the day in Bulgaria. How can that country be mentioned as the classic example of the second type of country?

Comrades, although the peasantry forms the overwhelming bulk of the population in Bulgaria, nevertheless the Bulgarian delegation fails to see the need for transition stages to the proletarian dictatorship, the need for a bloc of two parties. Since the agrarian revolution has been completed, it stands to reason that the peasant masses can be mobilised only upon the grounds of their struggle against capitalism, against the capitalist exploitation of which they are the victims. This means that the C. P. of Bulgaria is confronted with the task of winning the peasants, yet not under the slogan of the agrarian revolution, not under the slogan of democratic revolution, but on the grounds of the struggle for the vital interests of these masses who are not exploited by the landowners, — of which there are none — but rather by capitalism, by industrial, mercantile and banking capital. The proletariat and its party are able to fulfil this task. Experience tells us that the C. P. of Bulgaria has gained tremendous influence over the peasantry, not under the banner of agrarian revolution and democratic upheavals, but under the banner of the proletarian dictatorship and Socialism. The experiences of the peasant government in Bulgaria — there was such a one in our country — have likewise shown to the peasants the inability of the petty-bourgeois (peasant) government to solve the essential problems of the peasantry and to realise their chief interests. The peasant government collapsed just because of its inability to fight against big capital, mind you, not against the big landlords, but against the Capitalist bourgeoisie. The Communist Party takes advantage of this experience to widen and deepen its influence over the peasant masses, not by means of the slogan of bourgeois-democratic revolution, but by urging the proletarian, socialist revolution.

To this I should add that the bloc of two parties in Bulgaria is today a social-democratic slogan.

The Communist Party is combating this slogan, raising its own slogan of the revolutionary workers and peasants' government, not for democratic reforms, but for the revolutionary struggle against the dominant bourgeoisie. Our Party maintains the standpoint that this is the only proper attitude to take. Such was hitherto the standpoint of the C. P. of Bulgaria, and largely also of the C. P. of Greece, in working out the tactical line. Now our Delegation is rather upset by the explanation given by Comrade Bukharin, from which it follows that the Bulgarian Party should contemplate the transition stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution before taking up the struggle for the socialist revolution.

Our Party is of the opinion that there should be full clearness on the question of power. It maintains the standpoint that under the actual circumstances, having regard to the peculiar economic condition of the country, to the lessons of the Russian revolution, to the experiment of the peasant government, to the experience of the successful activity of the C. P. among the peasants, in short, having regard to all these experiences, the only feasible form of power for Bulgaria is the proletarian dictatorship in alliance with the toiling peasantry, for the overthrow of the bourgeois domination and for the building of Socialism.

Comrade DUNCKER (Germany):

Substantially I have nothing to add to the remarks made by Comrade Dengel on behalf of the German Delegation. I merely wish to explain personally that in regard to the remarks which I made in the Programme Commission as to the form of the programme, I have been convinced by Comrade

Bukharin that the programme of the International should actually possess a new specific form. Nevertheless I should like to suggest that this peculiar character of the programme should also be indicated in its title, that the programme should be entitled a "Programme-Manifesto", in order to show that on the one hand, it has grown beyond the limits of the old Programme, and on the other hand, it continues the character of the Communist Manifesto.

I should like to propose further that in addition to drawing up this Programme-Manifesto, there should also be drawn up a short declaration of principles upon the basis of this Programme, containing the fundamental principles of Communism in a brief form, so that such a declaration of principles might at least be printed in the membership cards.

Then I should urge that as soon as possible after the publication of the Programme-Manifesto, there should be published also an official commentary on the programme. I believe the publication of such a programme-commentary could be accelerated perhaps if the E. C. C. I. were to appoint a number of comrades to take up collectively the compilation of such a commentary, whilst at the same time distributing the principal chapters of the Programme-Manifesto among different comrades for commenting purposes, so that in this manner the compilation of the necessary commentary might be quickened. As to the drawing up of the Programme-Manifesto, it was already proposed this morning by Comrade Dengel, on the one hand, that the fundamental contents of the Programme should be decided upon by this Congress and that the final stylistic treatment of the Programme should be completed very soon after the Congress. I should like to emphasise this idea. Naturally, we cannot afford to wait for the next world congress to complete this Programme, as we need the Programme very urgently. If Marx said once in the introductory letter to the criticism of the Gotha Programme in 1875: "Each step of real movement is more important than a dozen Programmes", I believe we may say at the present moment that the creation of a programme constitutes the most important step towards a real movement for the Communist International. Why? Because the creation of the programme tends to ensure, and will ensure the unity and solidarity of our world-wide movement. As against the different vague and confused groups, majorities and minorities, theoretical tendencies in the different sections of the C. I. — which I believe it to be unjust to stamp merely as "right" and "left" — as against all such groups, it is essential that we draw up a uniform and solid course for our Communist International. And the Programme is the essential and decisive factor in bringing about the unity and solidarity of our Party. He who is not with us, is against us. He who does not recognise the Programme, must quit our world Party. On the contrary, he who is with us, he who accepts the programme and submits himself to the leadership, discipline and duties of the Party, he is our Party comrade, he belongs to us. This means that henceforth there shall be no separation into groups and categories. For our Party is no class in a school, with its different grades and even separate benches for offenders; our Party should be a mighty and united world party, united by its solidarity and by its determination to triumph over a world of foes. Our Programme should contribute towards this triumph.

Comrade MIKOLOS (C. P. of Ukraine):

I should like to propose a series of amendments upon two or three principal questions. The first question is the definition of the **proletarian dictatorship**. The draft Programme contains in several places numerous definitions of the proletarian dictatorship in various connections. Nevertheless, the draft Programme does not contain the definition of the proletarian dictatorship given by Lenin in regard to the whole complex system of the social relations of the different strata of the non-proletarian working population. Lenin's formula reads as follows:

"The proletarian dictatorship is a special form of the class alliance between the proletariat — the vanguard of the toilers — and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the toilers (petty-bourgeoisie, petty-tradesmen, peasants, intellectuals, etc.) or the majority of them, an alliance against capital, an alliance for the purpose of the complete

overthrow of capitalism, for the complete defeat of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and its attempts at restoration, — an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of Socialism."

If we do not accept the formula just quoted, a simplification of the class relations is obtained, as though the proletarian dictatorship in the transition stage from the proletarian revolution to Socialism had to deal only with three classes: with the destroyed and suppressed bourgeoisie, with the proletariat, and with the peasantry. The other masses of the non-proletarian labouring elements of the population disappear to a certain extent from the Draft's field of vision. Furthermore, it seems to me to be necessary to point out in the first chapter of the Draft Programme dealing with the hard conditions imposed upon the peasantry by the development of capitalism, that also all the other non-proletarian working masses are driven by the continuous development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism into a more and more outspoken and unreserved dependence upon capitalism.

Whilst speaking about the formulae of the proletarian dictatorship, I should like at the same time to point out that the system of the proletarian dictatorship includes not only the proletariat, but also the non-proletarian labouring masses in their different associations, in the different countries, and in the different periods of history. It ought to be said that when we speak of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry as our basis, we have in mind the poor and middle peasants, and not the peasantry as a whole.

Comrades, the second question which I should like to emphasise is the **colonial question** and the **national question**. The fundamental feature which distinguishes the draft Programme before us is its world-embracing character. It is a world-embracing programme also in the sense that it takes into consideration the different mutual relations existing in the different countries, and is based upon a profound analysis of the international experiences of the proletarian revolutionary struggle, the proletarian movement, the national-revolutionary, the colonial and other movements.

The colonial movement, the movement of the masses of the people in the colonies, is under the leadership of the international proletarian movement, under the leadership of the movement in the advanced capitalist countries, under the leadership of the Communist International as a whole. The Communist International as a whole, concentrating as it does the international proletarian experience, is the leader of all the colonial movements, as well as of all the national-revolutionary movements of the large masses of the oppressed in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Comrades, I should like to touch yet upon a third question, which I consider it important to deal with. Already in my speech in the Programme Commission I suggested to change the title of the last, 16th section of the Draft Programme. This section bears the title of "The Strategy and Tactics of the Communist International". I believe the title should be: "The organisation, the tactics and the strategy of the Communist International." It would not be to the point to say that the organisational questions belong to the statutes which deal precisely with such questions. This is quite so. The statutes comprise the organisational theses of the Communist International, but the Programme comprises all the fundamental theoretical theses upon which the whole of the activity of the Communist International is based. Among the latter we Bolsheviks have included already the last quarter of a century — and I believe with reason some of the fundamental organisational theses. Leninism is not only a question of tactics and strategy, as well as of understanding the fighting conditions of the proletariat, but it also comprises at the same time the fundamental theses covering the principles of organising the fighting forces of the proletariat. Therefore, I believe it necessary that these fundamental theses should be included in our Programme. They are only casually mentioned in the section of the Programme dealing with the definition of the Party, and I regret to say that the formula given here is incomplete and inadequate.

The questions relating to the mutual relations between the Party and the class belong to the most essential and fundamental theoretical questions of the Leninist science of organisation. To my mind, the draft Programme should state clearly

and precisely that the Party organises in itself the total current experience of the daily struggle of the proletarian masses, that it takes in this experience and relying upon this mass experience of the struggle, it develops these everyday struggles that are upon the craft, group and national level to the higher level of class-consciousness, to the level of the international struggle. This role of the Party must be stated here clearly and in all its magnitude.

Comrades, we have before us a draft Programme based upon thorough theoretical study, which has been worked out by the different Parties and in the Programme Commission of the Comintern. The combination of all these collective scientific experiences with the wide practical collective experience, as embodied in the whole of the delegation of the Comintern, affords all the guarantees that we have before us a Draft Programme of the Communist International containing all the tasks and the important questions of the Communist movement and of the struggle against imperialism.

On these grounds I trust that the VI. World Congress of the Communist International will crown its work by the final adoption of the Programme of the Communist International. (Cheers.)

Comrade NARAYAN (India):

Comrades, on behalf of the Indian delegation I welcome the programme which has been submitted to Congress. The V. Congress of the Communist International had accepted a draft. Four years have passed since, and the proletarian revolution in China and in the colonies have given us sufficient material for drawing up a programme. As a matter of fact, one of the most characteristic features of the draft programme is the stress laid upon the colonial side of the proletarian revolution. But precisely this colonial aspect of the world revolution as formulated in the Programme confronts us with certain difficulties.

Take for example, that section in the first chapter of the draft programme where we find the statement: "That the colonial movements of the proletariat should march under the leadership of the revolutionary proletarian movement in the imperialist home countries". This means that the proletarian movement in India should march under the leadership of the British Communist Party, or, that the Javanese Communist movement should march under the leadership of the Dutch Communist Party. Nobody will deny that in the organic structure of British Imperialism India and England are closely connected with each other and for the same reason the Communist Parties of India and Britain are also organically linked up with each other for carrying out the Proletarian Revolution in these two countries, but this on no account means the subordination of the colonial party to the leadership of the party of the imperialist home country. I am quite sure that the author of this Draft Programme does not mean this at all. But the formulation forces one to this conclusion and we must correct this. Of course the movements in the colonial countries should not be deprived of the experiences of the world proletarian movement and of the guidance of the Communist International. The only leadership acceptable is the leadership of the Communist International. I think the formulation should be made quite clear and this Section should be differently formulated.

Then take the fourth chapter of the draft Programme. There it is said that in the colonial and semi-colonial countries industry is still in an embryonic stage, sometimes in a fairly well developed stage, but inadequate for independent social construction. I consider this formulation also not to be a very happy one. To lump together different countries of very different industrial development is methodologically wrong and illogical. Take for example India and Morocco and all other similar colonial countries. It is impossible to make a comparison between the industrial development of India and Morocco and other countries of this kind. If we say that in these countries industry is in an embryonic state, it is not true so far as India is concerned. If we say that this development is inadequate for Socialist construction, it is true, but I think this formulation has mixed two different points which must be separated and independently formulated.

Further, it is said that in these countries there exist feudal, mediaeval relations both with regard to the economic as well as the political super-structure. I think so far as India is concerned this is not right. The great development of industries, the penetration of the villages by capitalism, predominance of commodity relationship in the villages, is an established fact. This formulation may be true so far as Morocco is concerned, but it does not fit so far as India is concerned.

Later on it is said that colonies and semi-colonies are of importance in this transitional period for the reason that they represent the world rural districts in relation to the industrial countries which are the world towns. I think that this formulation is also not a very happy one. If we say that the colonies and semi-colonies are world villages it means that there is no capitalist development at all. This is far from being true in India. But the implication is also that if there is any capitalist development it should be hindered and smothered and that the colonies and semi-colonies should be kept to supply raw material to the industrial west. I am quite sure that there is no such intention on the part of the Communist International, but the faulty formulation gives rise to very shady implications. I think that here also the formulation requires a better and more clearer statement.

The 6th chapter of the Draft Programme declares with regard to the Communist parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries:

"Temporary agreements with the national bourgeoisie may be made only in so far as they will not hamper the revolutionary organisation of the workers and peasants and are genuinely fight against imperialism."

I consider this formulation to be fundamentally wrong. After our experience in India, in 1922 when the bourgeoisie betrayed the great mass movement, which shook India from one end to the other, it is high time now to formulate it more clearly to show that the bourgeoisie can never fight imperialism genuinely. The demonstrations which the Indian bourgeoisie has organised all over the country against the Simon Commission has given rise to illusions in the minds of some of the comrades here that the bourgeoisie is still going to play a revolutionary role in India. But if we look for a programme, the concrete steps the bourgeoisie in India are taking for the fulfilment of a revolutionary programme, in order to carry on a genuinely revolutionary struggle against foreign imperialism, we find that there is absolutely no revolutionary programme at all put forward by the Indian bourgeoisie.

It is only a fight which will lead to a compromise on better divisions of the spoils which will be gathered by exploiting the Indian masses. Surely there are contradictions between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the native bourgeoisie as there always will be contradictions between two plunderers for the monopoly of the same spoils. Of course, the Indian Communist Party and the proletarian movement there should take advantage of these differences and utilise them for the purpose of the furtherance of the revolution, but we must not forget that this quarrel among the national and imperialist bourgeoisie is in the nature of a family quarrel between two brothers over property, and that the forces of the rising proletariat in India will be met by a common front of the native and imperialist bourgeoisie, if not today then tomorrow. The Indian bourgeoisie is fighting on the same old constitutional issue, and that is for its own benefits. It is clearly seen in all its programmes and tactics, through every phase of its struggle. Even partial alliance with the bourgeoisie means the abandonment of the slogan of agrarian revolution which means the virtual abandonment of revolutionary struggle in the colonial countries, especially in such a predominately agricultural country as India is. I think that this formulation is not a happy formulation and neither a right one. I emphasise that the bourgeoisie in India has completely gone over to the side of the reaction, if not as yet to the side of open counter-revolution.

On behalf of the Indian Delegation I will present our resolution to the Bureau in due time.

Twenty-eighth Session.

Moscow, 14th August 1928 (Morning).

Speeches of Greeting.

Chairman Comrade Lozovsky in opening the Session announced that a big delegation had arrived from the metal workers and miners of South Russia. The Delegation was made up of workers from 13 big industrial enterprises representing more than 150,000 workers. The Chairman of the delegation was called upon to deliver greetings to the Congress.

Comrade VLASSENKO (A miner from Artemov, Donetz Basin):

Comrades, The organised workers of the Artemovsk district send their greetings and hope that the VI. World Congress of the Communist International will solve all the important problems in the proper and in the Belshevist manner. We trust that when an imperialist war breaks out, it will be the endeavour of the working class throughout the world to turn it into civil war (cheers). The workers of the Artemovsk district request you to visit us, to see our achievements on the front of the Socialist economy and on the front of the Socialist culture.

Long live the representatives of the proletarian revolution!

Long live the World Revolution and its guardian, the Red Army!

Comrade KOZLOV:

The workers of the Artemovsk district have sent me to deliver their greetings to the VI. World Congress. You will surely know what is necessary to do to help us accomplish the revolution. I beg of you comrades to see to it that all the workers and peasants should seize weapons, the same as I did in 1919, to defend and to carry out the revolution throughout the world (cheers).

Comrade MANTCHENKO (miner):

On behalf of the miners of the Donetz Basin, particularly of the Artemovsk district, I deliver greetings to the Presidium of the VI. Congress and a little present in the shape of an inkstand and the portrait of Comrade Lenin. I hope that the Communist International will go on with its work until the complete triumph of Communism.

Long live the Communist International! (cheers).

Comrade BESSONNI (Artemovsk metal worker):

Comrades, permit me, on behalf of the workers of the Artemovsk district to greet the Congress of the C. I., the general staff of the world revolution. I am instructed by the metal workers of my district to assure the VI. Congress that the metal workers do not wish any war, but if the bourgeoisie of Western Europe should have the effrontery to attack our red borders, then the metal workers will rise to a man to defend our proletarian country.

Long live the VI. World Congress of the Communist International!

Long live the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the whole world!

Comrade NEBESSOV (chemical worker):

On behalf of the 16,500 organised trade unionists in the chemical trades I deliver greetings to the VI. World Congress of the Communist International. I have been instructed by the workers to invite the delegates, and particularly the chairman of the Congress, Comrade Bukharin, to come and visit us. I invite you all to come; anyone who does not care stay here

(hilarity), but we are prepared to meet everyone of you with the greatest cordiality of which we are capable (cheers). The workers have given me two sample collections of our chemical products to present, one as a gift to the VI. World Congress, and the other to the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U.

Long live the VI. World Congress of the Communist International!

Comrade BORODIN (Building worker):

On behalf of 23,000 building workers of the Artemovsk district, I deliver greetings to the general staff of the World Revolution. Our building workers know that the imperialists are preparing for a new war against the Soviet Union. Upon a united front with the proletariat, whom you represent, we shall destroy our detested enemy, the bourgeoisie of the whole world! (cheers).

Comrade VINOKUROV (Transport worker):

The transport workers of the Artemovsk district have sent their delegation to greet the VI. World Congress of the Communist International (cheers). The transport workers request you to expose the lie that is spread in your countries to the effect that we, the workers, have destroyed our economy in the course of the civil war. It was the apparatus of imperialism and of world capitalism which has destroyed the wealth created by the working class and the toiling peasantry. Therefore we have destroyed their apparatus and have built up everything anew. Long live the proletarian revolution!

* * *

Chairman Comrade Lozovsky:

I now call on Comrade Kholodovsky to speak on behalf of the "Hands off Bessarabia" Society.

Comrade KHOLODOVSKY:

Comrades, permit me to greet the Communist International on behalf of the thousands of political emigrants and refugees of Bessarabia (cheers). No one knows better than yourselves into what a condition the Roumanian bourgeoisie and French and British imperialism have brought Bessarabia, once such a flourishing country. The Bessarabian workers and peasants have shown by their uninterrupted struggles and by their continuous revolts against the Roumanian occupation that the lessons of the October Revolution have not been lost on them, that they have not thrown away the weapons of the struggle against the Roumanian bourgeoisie. But the Bessarabian peasants and workers, in their unequal fight against the Roumanian imperialists, need the aid of the international proletariat. With its aid they will continue the struggle, and when the hour comes the Bessarabian workers and peasants will be found at their posts, ready to fulfil their duties.

Long live the Communist International!

Long live Soviet Bessarabia, Long live Soviet Roumania!

Long live the World Revolution!

Comrade LOZOVSKY:

The response on behalf of the Presidium will be given by Comrade Tom Bell.

Comrade BELL (Great Britain):

Comrades: The Presidium in the name of the World Congress, accepts the warm congratulations given to us from the workers of the Donetz Basin, in consideration of the tasks which we are assembled here to carry through.

This VI. World Congress appreciates and understands the tremendous problems and difficulties which the proletariat of Russia have to overcome in the building up of socialism in their own country. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Russian proletariat has already accomplished a great work. They have already overcome the devastations of the imperialist war and the subsequent civil war. They are now on the high road to the construction and building up of socialism, and we are sure, that the masses of the working class and the masses of the poor peasantry in Russia are solidly behind the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, their best leader and guide towards their ultimate goal.

Today, in all the leading countries of the world, stretching to the utmost confines and frontiers of the world, in over 50 different countries, there are to be found Communist Parties, who are acting under the ideological leadership and practical guidance of our great leader Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. The bourgeoisie will not be able to lead the masses of the workers to war in 1928 as they did in 1914.

Comrades, the Communist International sees in the Soviet Union the centre of the proletarian revolution, and, therefore, we, the representatives of the Communist International, regard it as our proletarian duty to defend the Soviet Union against the attacks of the imperialists.

At this Congress we are hammering out a programme of action that will guide us in the practical struggles against war. We are reinforcing our programme of alliance between the proletariat of Europe and the peoples throughout the colonies.

I can assure the representatives of the 150,000 workers from the Donetz Basin that we are with them in the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and that we, the representatives of the Communist International, shall do all in our power to live up to the fine heroic traditions of Comrade Lenin and the great Bolshevik Party. I can assure you that the Communist International will do everything in its power to defend the Soviet Union, and to bring about the speedy destruction of the imperialist system; only by this destruction the future peace and welfare of the working peoples of the world will be achieved. (Applause.)

Comrade SANDIFORTH (British Women's Delegation):

Comrades, we, the Women's Anti-War Delegation greet the 6th Congress of the Communist Party in the name of the working women from Britain.

We have been sent here with a very definite purpose. We have been sent here to inquire into the conditions which brought about the Russian disarmament proposals and we have been sent here to tell you that the rank and file of the British workers will never tolerate a war on Soviet Russia. (Applause.)

We regard the Russian workers not only as the guardians of the Russian Revolution but as the vanguard of the revolutionary forces all over the world. (Applause.)

We have seen many of the achievements of the Russian workers. We have seen the magnificent progress made under the leadership of the Communist Party. We have been stirred to the very depths of our being by the wonderful comradeship and kindness that we have received from the comrades here and we assure you of our co-operation and comradeship when we return to capitalist Britain.

We pledge ourselves, we women of the working class, to not only talk of what we have seen, but to work for the co-operation and comradeship of the British and Russian workers in our efforts to eliminate war, — capitalist war.

Long Live the Revolution!

Long Live the Communist International!

(Prolonged Applause.)

Comrade SEMARD (France):

Comrades, This Congress greets the delegation of the English working women, and through them the whole of the English proletariat.

The Communist International is convinced that the working masses of England will struggle in close solidarity with the international proletariat against the war preparations of the bourgeoisie.

I should like to emphasise that at this moment when British imperialism is preparing jointly with the other imperialist powers for an attack upon the U. S. S. R., the working men and women of England, in line with the working men and women of other countries, are determined to defend the U. S. S. R. I feel sure that the working men and women in England cherish no illusions as regards the war preparations now made by the whole of the imperialist powers. It is clear that the imperialists want to wage war against the U. S. S. R., against the great proletarian state which is building Socialism upon one-sixth of the earth's surface, and which is considered by world imperialism as a cancer eating into its very flesh.

It is clear to the workers throughout the world that not only British imperialism, but the imperialists throughout the world are involved in these war preparations. It is clear to them that no hopes can be based upon such things as the Kellogg Pact which wants to "outlaw war" at a moment when the imperialists are carrying their preparations to the utmost limit, that no hopes can be placed upon the pacifist declarations of those who support the imperialists whilst belonging to their respective democratic and Socialist parties. The last Anglo-French Pact has the purpose of lending to the Kellogg Pact the appearance of a desire for peace on the part of the imperialist powers. I believe, comrades, that the working men and women of England, like their fellow workers of other countries, are not going to be deceived by these pacifist projects.

Comrades, the deciding force in the struggle against war is the alliance of the workers of all countries for the defence of the only proletarian state which has really shown its desire for peace.

Comrades, I welcome the fact that the English working women have told us here that the Communist International represents the Red Army of the whole world. That it true, comrades! The Communist International is the vanguard of the international proletariat in the fight against capitalism. The Communist International is the vanguard which will muster the workers for the defence of the great Proletarian State.

Comrades, I believe that the workers' delegations of the U. S. S. R. which have spoken from this very tribune have emphasised the desire of their government for peace; but at the same time they have told us — and this should be realised by the international proletariat, — that if the imperialist war should break loose, they are prepared to defend the proletarian dictatorship with might and main. This should also be the firm resolve of the workers throughout the world, to defend the proletarian State.

Comrades, the working men and women of England, like the workers throughout the world, must range themselves on the side of the Russian workers against the imperialism of their respective countries. This should be particularly true of England, where the class struggle in recent years has shown in unmistakable manner the cruel and relentless methods employed by the capitalists in their struggle against the proletariat. The enemies, the adversaries of the international proletariat are the capitalists who day by day are endeavouring to enslave more and more the wage slaves and to increase their exploitation. The only Fatherland in the world for the working class is the workers' and peasants' republic of Russia, the proletarian State, the proletarian dictatorship which is essential for the triumph of the revolution (cheers).

Comrades, I greet the delegation of the English working women on behalf of the VI. World Congress, on behalf of the Communist International, the revolutionary vanguard of the world proletariat. We call on you, upon your return home, to tell the masses of the working women about the real situation of the workers in the U. S. S. R., about the progress made by the proletarian state towards the establishment of Socialism, and about the policy pursued by the proletarian State to secure peace. At the same time you should bring it home to them that the U. S. S. R. is the only country in the whole wide world which has proposed real and radical measures for disarmament; that those proposals were turned down by the

imperialists and by their Social Democratic supporters, like **Mr. Paul Boncour** who told the Soviet Delegation that their peace proposals could not be taken seriously from the standpoint of disarmament.

Thus, not only the imperialists are actually fighting and making military preparations against the Soviet Union, and also morally preparing the ground for war against the U. S. S. R., but also those who claim to represent the proletariat and who call themselves Social Democrats. Fellow working women of England, you must realise that **MacDonald** in your country and **Paul Boncour** in France, as well as **Hilferding** in Germany, are among those who want to deceive the working class, who deliver pacifist speeches at a time when the imperialists are making their preparations for war.

Comrades, on behalf of the C. I. and the VI. Congress I greet your anti-war alliance, as well as the delegation it has sent to the U. S. S. R., with the following words:

Long live the proletariat of England and of the U. S. S. R.!

Long live the Communist Party of England!

Long live the Communist International, Long live the world revolution! (prolonged cheers).

Comrade **Lozovsky** then called upon Comrade **Bukharin** to deliver his concluding speech on the Programme of the C. I. (Comrade **Bukharin's** speech was published in No. 59 on the 4th September 1928.)

Comrade LOZOVSKY:

The Presidium submits on behalf of the Programme Commission the following resolution:

"Congress accepts the draft programme and instructs the Programme Commission to examine all the amendments and

proposals, and after due editing, to incorporate those which do not digress from the fundamental principles of the draft Programme. The final text is to be submitted to one of the next sessions of the Congress."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Comrade LOZOVSKY:

The Presidium has received the following declaration from the Indonesian Delegation:

"In view of the argument brought forward by Comrade **Alphonso** in his speech yesterday, August 13, we declare here before Congress, on behalf of the Indonesian Delegation, that we have absolutely nothing to do with Comrade **Alphonso's** speech, and that he has made that speech on his own account. The Indonesian Delegation does not in the least agree with the statements he has made, and we emphasise that he has received no instructions from us to speak in that manner.

The Indonesian Delegation."

Further the following declaration was handed in to the Presidium:

"We, the undersigned members of the Greek delegation to the VI. World Congress hereby declare that neither the discussion in the Programme Commission nor the report of Comrade **Bukharin** on the Programme of the Comintern and the subsequent debate have convinced us that Greece and Bulgaria should be put in the second category under the classification of capitalist countries contained in the Programme, despite the fact that the proletarian revolution in these countries has yet to solve a number of bourgeois-democratic tasks.

Two signatures of the Greek Delegation."

(Close of the Session.)

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. A.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.