

the backward countries who are suffering under the yoke of French imperialism and who would have denounced the misdeeds of so-called civilisation. It required a month for "Humanité" to make up its mind to publish the first open letter of Roy to MacDonald. The information and articles published by the Party press on the imperial and colonial questions are far from adequate.

"Humanité" has scarcely said a word about the Balkan Question, the importance of which has been emphasised by several speakers at the present Congress. Even on the Albanian problem, where we find expressed the conflicts between Turkey, Greece, Italy, and America. "Humanité" confined itself to certain communications from the bourgeois press agencies, and that is all. The French bourgeois press justifies the interests of imperialist France in Syria. France, who obtained a mandate

from the League of Nations, has established in Syria as in Morocco a powerful centralised organisation, and regularly spends enormous sums.

Russia is a marvellous laboratory in every respect. In the vast territories of the U.S.S.R. one can study what the comrades have done in the interests of the proletariat, peasants, as well as in the interest of the population, which has long been backward and oppressed. It is now the revolutionary struggle will extend throughout the backward countries. I express the hope that the workers of the western countries, and especially the French, will study the true meaning of the problems which have been so gloriously solved by the Russian Revolution. The struggle of the proletariat cannot be accomplished without the assistance of the backward and oppressed peoples.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4. No. 51

26th July 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliessfach 29, Vienna VIII.
— Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

The V. World Congress of the Communist International.

Twenty-Second Session.

July 1.

Comrade Gebhardt opened the session and called upon the next speaker, Comrade Sellier (France).

Louis Sellier (France):

In the course of his report Comrade Manuilsky was very emphatic on the French Party's lack of activity in the field of propaganda in the colonies and at home, even in connection with the question of colonial independence. The French Section admits that the efforts made hitherto in this direction by the French Party were not commensurate with its tasks and obligations on this field. But nevertheless I should like to correct some of Comrade Manuilsky's arguments which are somewhat exaggerated. The so-called slavery thesis adopted by the small Algerian section of Sidi-Bel-Abbes did not by any means express the viewpoint of the entire French Party where it raised a storm of protest. The leading organ of the Party would have expelled this section if it had not forestalled this fate by joining the Frossard group which is the right place for it.

Our Party, together with the United General Confederation of Labour (C. C. T. U.) undertook the organisation on trade-union lines of the foreign and native workers in France. We elaborated the system of colonial propaganda with the assistance of native elements resident in France — working-men as well as soldiers. We published three numbers of the "Caserne" in Arabic. The Tunisia Party organ founded by Comrade Louzon, which comes out regularly in Arabic, is frequently prosecuted, but always appears again under a new title. Moreover, at the time of the parliamentary elections, the Algerian paper "La Lutte Sociale" had also Arabic editions in the three provinces of Algiers, Oran, and Constantine.

The Party put forward the candidature of our native comrade, Ben Le Kahl Mahmoud, sent to prison in Mayence for his courageous action in the Ruhr. Our Seine Federation put forward our Arabian comrade, Abd-El-Kader as candidate in Paris, and this candidature had repercussions even in Egypt; the echoes of which reached us in Paris.

The question of colonial independence is part of the French Party's program which reached the eleven millions of French

electors in a special number of "Humanité". We emphasize the importance of this question in all our manifestoes, and the parliamentary Communist group brought up the subject during an interpellation on the question of the bureau of the new Chamber.

This shows that there is a consensus of opinion in the French Party on the necessity to increase our efforts in the colonies. Has anyone here a clear notion of the magnitude of an apparatus capable of reaching a population of 59 1/2 millions scattered throughout Madagascar, West Africa (with Dahomey), Senegal, the Soudan, part of the Congo, the West Indies (with Guadeloupe and Martinique); in Asia, Indo-China; in North Africa—Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco?

We must: 1) unite our efforts with those of our brother parties in Great Britain and Belgium, and 2) build up an apparatus for agitation and propaganda on the model of the apparatus which the International set up for the East and which is to-day one of the most powerful revolutionary levers.

Rossi (Italy):

The program of the communist revolution demands the harmonious co-operation of all nationalities. As the new proletarian social construction develops, the contrasts between the peoples conquered already by the revolution gradually diminish. If conflicts develop between them they would be controlled and resolved by the state organisation which would have been constituted in co-operation with the general economic structure of the new society. The experience which the policy adopted by the Union of Soviet Republics towards other nationalities affords us is typical for this subject.

The theses and resolutions on national and colonial questions are nearly always accepted by all the sections of the Comintern, but as a rule they are applied in too hesitating a manner. Manuilsky has reminded the English and the French parties that they have not developed these problems sufficiently. In our opinion the slogan for this whole subject should be: The struggle of exploited countries in alliance with the proletariat of exploiting countries against world imperialism.

It is obvious that the struggle against capitalistic imperialism should be organised in the territories of the exploited countries; but the Fifth World Congress ought to declare that the chief impulse to this struggle should come from the communist parties

of the colonised countries. This is how confidence in the ultimate success of their struggle would be awakened among the oppressed peoples—that is, by realising that they were supported by the great proletarian mass in the countries of their oppressors.

The Fifth World Congress should lay stress on the necessity for the development among communist parties of sabotaging and defeatist tactics against imperialistic policy.

Communists should combat the reformist and opportunist tendencies which are common in some countries, and especially in England. These tendencies are the expression of the special interests of the aristocracy of labour in conserving their own position, which they do by co-operating in the ends sketched out by the imperialists, and by means of the exploitation of colonial peoples.

The struggle of the various social classes in the oppressed countries, as a part of the world struggle of the proletariat against imperialism, should not prevent the formation in these countries of communist parties which will struggle, not only against world imperialism, but also against the bourgeoisie and the planters in the oppressed countries themselves.

The tendency to declare that the proletarian revolution is a means of solving national and colonial problems is an opportunist tendency used to conceal the desire not to be bothered with these problems.

In supporting the self-determination of nationalities we should be careful to make it clear that this does not justify us in forgetting the common struggle of the proletariat of those countries whose self-determination we demand, and we must not overlook the struggle against capitalism in these countries. Where questions of separatism or irredentism arise, communists should support the proletariat of both the nationalities involved even if the communist party is joining in the agitation for the separation of these nationalities.

Comrade Manuisky is right in thinking that some of the German comrades have a mistaken conception as to how the communistic agitation in the Ruhr should have been conducted. In a country where industry is as strongly developed and where the proletariat is as strongly organised as in the Ruhr, the national question cannot efface the essential features of the class struggle.

Comrade Mann:

In my contribution to the Negro question, I desire to speak exclusively of the natives of the South African Union, which contains a population of 6,000,000 black men, 1½ million white men, of whom half are British and half are Dutch; and 600,000 "coloured persons", that is, persons of mixed origin.

The Boer is primarily a farmer or a landowner. But owing to the scarcity of land, the young Dutch farmers have been compelled to leave their farms and go into the mines. The gold mines of the Rand belong to the British. The real miners are the natives, of which there are 230,000. These are supervised by 27,000 white men. Apart from the engineers and technical staff, 80% of the white men are Dutch, who have been forced into the mines by economic pressure. Their attitude towards the natives was cultivated on the farms, where the black man was a menial slave, frequently flogged with the shambok by the Boers. Although the British are not so accustomed to flogging the natives, they treat them as pariahs.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the native "boys" regard the whites with complete mistrust. In the industrial disputes that have occurred from time to time, the white men have never shown common cause with the natives. It now never occurs to the black men to expect the sympathy or support of the whites. It is doubtful whether they even desire it.

Most of the natives come from the kraal. But in Cape Town there is a native population, especially engaged in the ports, who have long been living in the towns. These have shown a capacity for organisation. During the war 300 natives demanded a 50% increase on their wage of 4 shillings a day and went on strike when it was refused. The white men either held aloof or definitely sabotaged and the strike was smashed. Nevertheless, within a short time, these 300 had organised a union of 300,000, who this time demanded an increase of 100% on their wages and within three days obtained their full demands. This proves that the black man possesses proletarian courage, sticking power, and organising ability.

Because of my known sympathy with the blacks when I was in South Africa, I was invited to attend the convention of the

Industrial and Commercial Union. The union consists solely of blacks, and is out to organise the port workers, the miners, the domestic workers, and other black workers of both sexes throughout the whole Union.

Only the black men will be able to help the black man, but we white men should do everything in our power to help them organise.

Comrade Brown:

I mount this tribune with some diffidence and only at the request of comrade Zinoviev who said that the Congress was interested in Ireland. I have failed to notice it. The Congress seems interested only with those Parties which have the largest membership. Yet there are other people.

The Irish proletariat rose in 1916, not 1917. They went out as conscious revolutionaries because they had educated themselves for many years as revolutionaries.

In Ireland we created an industrial army of the submerged proletariat and gave it political expression. In 1908 we organised the Irish Citizen Army. In 1914 we sent out a manifesto to the world proletariat to lay down the tools of industry and refuse to march in the name of the kaisers, kings, and presidents.

We must smash imperialism or imperialism will smash us. Comrades, you have got to choose between the empires or the Federated Soviet Republic of the world.

I appeal to you comrades, to turn your eyes to the Irish proletariat. We are not confined to Ireland. We have millions in England, Scotland the United States, Australia, and South Africa. It is the duty of the Communist International to get this great mass, mostly proletarians, interested in the great communist movement.

Nguyen-Ai-Quak (Indo-China):

In order to complete the criticisms of comrade Manuisky, I will content myself with quoting a few figures and mentioning a few facts. The 9 colonising countries—England, France, the U.S.A., Spain, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Portugal, and Holland have together a total of 320,657,000 inhabitants and an area of 11,470,600 square kilometres. These countries exploit colonial dominions with an extent greater than 55,500,000 square kilometres and a population of 560,200,000 people. The colonised countries are therefore five times larger than the colonising countries and the population of the latter is less by three-fifths than that of the former. Figures speak even more eloquently when we come to deal with Great Britain and France. Great Britain has a colonial population 8½ times greater than its home population and colonial territories 232 times as big as its national territory. The colonial lands of France are 19 times larger than its home territory and its colonies have 16,600,000 more inhabitants than has France.

It is therefore absolutely necessary that the British and French Parties should have a more active and energetic colonial policy if they do not wish the phrase "mass action" to remain sterile. Now up to the present they have been inactive with regard to the colonial question and the Party press has not given the important place it deserves to this serious problem.

I am glad to know that the French Party centre has itself recognised this activity, and this leads me to hope that after the Congress it will do all it can to remedy the inactivity of the past. I am venturing to put forward the following proposals—proposals which I believe to be immediately realisable:

1. To have a section for colonial discussion in "Humanité"
2. To intensify propaganda and recruiting among natives
3. To send natives to the Communist University at Moscow
4. To organise the natives working in France.
5. To oblige Party members to take an interest in colonial questions.

Douglas (Great Britain):

The Second Congress laid down our lines of approach to this question and at each British Party Congress since then we have tried to go further forward on these lines. Criticisms of the British Party have been plentiful but not very reasonable. The British Party is one of the weakest sections of the Communist International and it is confronted with one of the mightiest tasks which fall to any section: British Imperialism has circumscribed the globe—how can the British Communist Party link up all these far-distant colonies in one movement? We recognize our responsibility but our reports show the difficulty we have had in carrying out lines of communication even in Great Britain. Manuisky said that we had done nothing about the Bombay strike and the Cawnpore trial but if he had read "The Workers Weekly" he would have seen what steady propaganda we have carried on, showing that the workers were not only oppressed economically by imperialism but were also refused the right to organize themselves in their defence. The British Party defended the workers at the trial in Cawnpore and the Bombay strikers and succeeded in rallying together a large movement among trade unions in its support.

In the opinion of the British delegation Comrade Roy has laid too much stress on the importance of nationalistic movements. It must not be forgotten that in Egypt sections of the workers seized the factories but were ousted by social-democrats.

Brown had stated that Ireland was not considered by the Communist International, but as a matter of fact the Communist International had given great attention to Ireland in conjunction with the British Delegation. Brown had asked the Communist International: "Are you with me?" We ask Brown: "Are you with us?" In 1916, the rebellion in Ireland had not been a failure; it was one of the many attempts of the world proletariat to stand on its own and fight; it was part of the process created by the world imperialistic war. The Communist movement in Ireland has grown out of the world condition, out of greater forces than those which manifested themselves in Ireland in 1916, and it was essential to organise this movement today. The British Party knew as well as Brown that the Irish proletariat was one of the most courageous in the world, and it must be brought into the world proletarian movement.

This was one of the tasks before the British Party, but those who criticised the Party must remember that it was only as yet 3,500 strong and it was asked to reach out towards many countries. Those who criticised it should remember our weaknesses and help us to strengthen our Party in order that it might play its part in the world movement.

Maximos:

Manuisky wants us to believe that the Greek Party is more interested in the frontiers of Greece than in carrying out the resolution of the Balkan Federation and in the Balkan Revolutionary movement.

The Greek bourgeoisie has been at war since 1912. After the Balkan War came the war between Greece and Bulgaria and then the European war. The Greek bourgeoisie has succeeded in extending its frontiers right up to Eastern Thrace near Constantinople.

Since 1921 the Greek Communist Party has directed its efforts not only against the chauvinist war of the Greek bourgeoisie, but also in favour of the right of nationalities. Three quarters of its members have been arrested over the national question.

Manuisky puts forward the case of Macedonia and accuses us of following the policy of the Otto Bauer school on this question.

The position of the party on the Macedonian Question is not what Manuisky says it is. Every national minority finds a defender in us, since the struggle of the national minorities is at the same time a struggle against the dominant class.

In Bulgaria the communists, under the leadership of Blagoev, defended the rights of the Greek minorities, while the Bulgarian chauvinists were destroying the Greek minorities. For us the Macedonian question exists until the workers and peasants become their own masters.

It therefore follows that the Greek Communist Party is by no means opposed to the resolutions of the Balkan Federation as Manuisky pretends.

It is true that we sent a letter to the Balkan Federation protesting that in issuing the slogan of the autonomy of Macedonia it failed to take into consideration the conditions of its application to Greece. After the Treaty of Lausanne, all the Turkish inhabitants of Macedonia were obliged to leave, and the Greek bourgeoisie installed 700,000 refugees in their place. The Greek Communist Party opposed, and will continue to oppose this violence and the Treaty of Lausanne. We would be glad if the Turkish comrades did so also. But the fact remains that there are 700,000 Greek refugees in Macedonia.

The workers and peasants of Greece were therefore not prepared to accept the slogan of the autonomy of Macedonia.

Treint:

The French Party agrees with comrade Manuisky's report on the manner in which the decisions of the Second Congress on the colonial question and on the question of nationalities are to be applied in the present situation. I merely wish to observe that in this criticism about the French Party, Comrade Manuisky has gone to some exaggeration. But Comrade Guilbeaux, in the criticisms, has exaggerated the exaggerations of Manuisky.

He pointed out what the Party was to do from the viewpoint of theory, measuring the digression by that which has really been accomplished.

Our friend Guilbeaux has given us an example of the manner in which the Communist International should never be criticised.

Manuisky has spoken of the Jaures tradition, and he was quite right in pointing out that Jaures, from his social democratic point of view, had understood the importance of the colonial questions.

But we must say that the solutions proposed by Jaures were radically wrong. In 1905, he welcomed the Treaty of Algeciras, and in 1911, the Franco-German Treaty over Morocco, as proof of the possibility of conciliating the rival capitalists and avoiding the war.

He approved of them from a pacifist standpoint, failing to see with sufficient clearness the imperialistic nature of the Treaties, which led to the exploitation of Morocco by international capitalism.

By developing the same line of politics, Jaures praised the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance, committing the same error as Kautsky in regard to the possibility of harmonising the capitalist interests and avoiding war under the capitalist régime.

From his standpoint, Jaures was no doubt opposed to any new colonial expeditions. But he could see no other way of liberating the colonial peoples, which were already subjected to French capitalism, than by claiming for the natives the rights of French citizenship.

Very well then, we must say it quite frankly that we are opposed to the Jaures tradition in this respect as in all other respects.

We do not wish to liberate the colonial peoples by making them participate in the bourgeois democracy within the bounds of the modern capitalist states, but by giving our support to the national liberation movements, by the extent of armed insurrection and the proclamation of independence.

By co-ordinating these colonial independence movements with the proletarian struggle in the metropolis, we shall destroy the base of exploitation and of imperialism.

In this manner we will overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie of the big capitalist states, and in this manner shall we prepare and bring about the French revolution and the world revolution.

Vasiliev (Western Ukraine):

Together with the class struggle of the proletariat, one of the conditions for the future revolution in Poland is the national question, and especially the Ukrainian and White Russian questions. The national struggle of the Ukrainian and White Russian masses is closely bound up with the social and economic struggle of the landless and small peasants against the Polish landowners and bureaucrats. The only right position for the Communist Party is to demand the separation of the Ukrainian and White Russian lands from the present Poland and for the restoration of the unity of Soviet Ukraine and Soviet White Russia. It of course must be emphasised that the best way of realising this is by means of the social revolution in Poland.

The Communist Party of West Ukraine at once gave the correct Leninist solution to the national question. Thanks to this, we were able almost completely to smash the petty-bourgeois political groups ideologically and organisationally. Our influence on the toiling peasant masses is very strong, and the attempts at conducting political warfare against us find no response among the masses, which, by the way, is also to be explained by the sympathy of the petty-bourgeois sections with the Soviet Government.

In addition to the campaign for separation and the fight for the schools, the Communist Party of Western Ukraine is fighting for the acceptance into the trade unions of the Ukrainian proletariat, who, thanks to the social-chauvinist policy of the P. P. S., are at present outside the unions. We must also continue our work of inculcating nationalism into the workers of the three nations, drawing the attention of the Polish proletariat to the fact that the union of Western Ukraine to Soviet Ukraine will be a heavy blow to the Polish bourgeoisie and will bring nearer the social revolution in Poland.

Comrade Georgescu:

Roumania is the classical example of a country where the national question can be used by the Communist Party in the interests of revolution. It is true that our Party neglected for many years the national question. But the Sixth Balkan Conference has provided us with a clear programme on the national question. We adopted the slogan of national self-determination with the inclusion of complete separation, and this slogan has been also put into practice by us. That the Party has done good work is shown, among other things, by the violent persecution to which it was subjected after the Vienna conference.

I cannot understand why Comrade Manuilsky omitted to mention the Bessarabian question, and the attitude of the Roumanian Party towards this question. He accused our Party of having failed to adopt a definitive attitude to Hungarian irredentism. I wish to say on behalf of the Roumanian delegation that our attitude to this question was as definite and clear as our attitude to the Bessarabian question.

Comrade Pepper (America):

I agree with comrade Roy that the European and American Parties have not the correct idea of the colonial question. Comrade Brown is also right when he says that the West European parties pay very little attention to the national and colonial question. But I think that this accusation is justified only as far as some sections are concerned, but does not apply to the Comintern as a whole. The Comintern is better than its sections. For it has been the ideological leader of all its sections, including the comrades who came here with complaints. It is the Comintern which provided these comrades with a platform for the airing of their complaints. As to the Irish question, Comrade Lenin mentioned Ireland even during the imperialist war as a country where a revolutionary national war is possible. Comrade Roy went too far in his criticism of the tactics which the Comintern has hitherto applied. He goes too far by applying the standard of his Indian experiences to all other questions. Moreover, I do not think that even the Indian bourgeoisie, in its objective role, is counter revolutionary to the extent of identifying its interests with those of British imperialism. Even if the Indian bourgeoisie persecutes the proletariat of its country, its attitude towards British imperialism will always be objectively revolutionary.

Comrade Manuilsky was right in emphasising the revolutionary significance of the self-determination slogan. But I think that he paid too little attention to the other side of the question. The other slogan which we need is the slogan of complete equality between nations and even races. In many countries we are not in a position to separate the various nationalities or races in a way which would not rob the slogan of self-determination of its concrete meaning. This applies to the Negro question in America, or rather to the whole national question of the U. S. A. where the proletarians of 56 nationalities intermingle and cannot properly develop mainly because many of them are deprived of the press in their mother tongue, and are therefore deprived of proper leadership. Engels called a nation which is deprived of its leading sections a "nation without a history". In this sense, we are justified in calling the American proletariat a proletariat without a history. In this case the slogan of absolute equality is a truly revolutionary slogan.

In Australia the racial question is not connected with national self-determination, but rather with immigration facilities for "the coloured races". The same is the case in the Japanese-American conflict. I am therefore of the opinion, that we should issue as a third and auxiliary slogan, the slogan of the right of free emigration and immigration.

Chinwa (China)

said that the Chinese have to fight both foreign imperialists and the militarists inside their own country, who were really the agents of the imperialists. In the last 12 months imperialism had been at its zenith in China, as the following instance showed.

1) An American merchant Carman, who was smuggling 60,000 silver dollars out of the country, fired on the military who attempted to stop him and was killed by their return fire. China had to pay an indemnity of 50,000 dollars. 2) In Hankow 300 Chinese employees of an English cotton mill were dismissed for forming a trade union and 3 of their officials were arrested. Demonstrations followed which were suppressed by British soldiers, and English warship threatened to bombard the town. Thirtythree workers were imprisoned. 3) The French government has succeeded in forcing the Chinese government to pay the huge indemnity owing to the French for the Boxer affair in gold instead of in the depreciated paper franc. 4) Japan has retained the lease on Port Arthur and Dairen. 5) A group of bandits last year raided a train at Linchen and captured 100 Chinese and 20 foreigners. As a result the British, American, Japanese, French, and Italian Ministers demanded and obtained from the Chinese government an indemnity of 18,700 Dollars for each captured foreigner, the organisation of a "railway protection force" (really a railway control force) under foreign commanders, and the dismissal of various high officials. 6) The Chinese government has been forced by the Great Powers to permit the export of cotton. 7) The British-American Tobacco Co., manufacturing cigarettes in China from Chinese tobacco, enjoys complete immunity from taxation, at a loss of 200,000,000 dollars to the Chinese revenue. 8) England sent 20 warship to Canton in an attempt to release the customs' dues collected by Sun-Yat-Sen. 9) England, France, Japan, America, and Italy have planned a naval base on the Yangtse river.

The arrogance of imperialism has led to the growth of the nationalist movement, in which communists are beginning to take the leadership. They have already brought the Koumingtang into contact with the masses and introduced the mass idea. All Party members are instructed to join the Koumingtang and to transform it from an organisation seeking to conquer territory by force of arms into an organisation really representing the masses. Sun-Yat-Sen has actively aided this work. The communists now play an influential part on the Executive and among the membership.

The political programme recently adopted by the Koumingtang demands the abolition of foreign control in China, the abrogation of unjust agreements with foreign powers, the repudiation of the loans made to the irresponsible Peking government, universal suffrage, freedom of speech, of association, and of the press, labour laws, reorganisation of agrarian life, and nationalisation of transport. Foreign powers are to return their concessions; the revenue thus obtained will be used to end banditry.

The Kuomingtang has become powerful enough to provoke the hostility of the Peking government—several communists have been arrested and three have been shot. The Communist Party itself has to work illegally except in the extreme South. It is a small Party with a vast task before it. Its aims are to get the leadership both of the labour movement and of the nationalist movement. In the Kuomingtang it hopes to develop a true revolutionary mass movement.

Amer (America):

Comrades, the Negro question when regarded on a world scale, is not merely a colonial question but also a race question. For the French party, British Party, and others, it is principally a colonial question.

The workers in imperialist countries are not interested in the Negro question. They are living to a great extent on the profits derived by the bourgeoisie from the colonies, and therefore are opposed to movements for the liberation of the colonies or the betterment of the status of colonial people.

The French Party must be criticised for great laxness on this question. I will mention three points. 1) On a certain occasion within the last two years, they excused themselves for not carrying on any direct propaganda against French imperialism on the ground that the French government had adopted a very liberal policy towards the colonies. 2) They have also refused to demand the liberation of the colonies, stating that as they were a part of France, all that could be demanded for them was autonomy.

3) They have ignored the use of black troops by the French Government. Black troops are not only being used in the Ruhr, but are also being trained and used in France. The Government has plans for a black army of 660,000 for use in France and for the protection of French imperialism abroad. They are also constructing a railway from Central Africa to the Mediterranean for the sole purpose of transporting troops without resort to the sea.

Two years ago, the British Government in South Africa used bombs and aeroplanes against a whole village, where the people had protested against attacks which made it impossible for them to live on their land at all. No Negro can leave South Africa unless he leaves it as a sailor or smuggles himself away.

The white trade unions are prejudiced against the black trade unions, and the native unions are very weak, because as soon as they get a capable leader, he is corrupted and bought over by the capitalists. A change will take place in South Africa, however, in the near future, as a law which prevented a native from working in any skilled position, has just been declared invalid. This will affect the status of the white workers and open the way for the admission of the Negro into the white unions.

In the U. S. A. the problem of the Negro is primarily an agrarian problem and not an industrial one alone. The Negro is most often a tenant farmer, and he belongs to the most impoverished class in the U. S. A. In industry they have sometimes been used as strikebreakers, but where they are recognised by the white workers, they stand firmly beside them, as was shown in the steel strike and the miners' strike. There are in the U. S. A. 488 Negro local unions.

The Negroes must make their own demands. They should first organise a general conference, demanding admission to the regular unions. Then the Negroes in Africa and in America must be linked up together by propaganda. The intellectual leadership of the Negroes is in New York, and the movement could be led by the press of the United States. Sailors should take pamphlets, suitably written for the native, to Africa and thus start propaganda there. Wherever Negro troops have been organised by the imperialist powers, these troops should demand to have their own commanders, and, in the African colonies, not to be used outside the colonies, for it must never be forgotten that the main use of black troops in the future will be that of shock troops of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat.

Faplouk (Turkey):

Comrades, the national question in Turkey takes four different forms: 1) the relation of the proletariat to revolutionary nationalism in its positive aspects—political and economic. 2) the relation of the proletariat to revolutionary nationalism in its negative aspects—i. e. the struggles against imperialism for national emancipation and the struggles against medieval and feudal institutions. 3) The relation of the proletariat to imperialistic nationalism. Comrade Manuilsky has criticised us for our tendency to co-operate with the bourgeoisie in the positive sphere. This is unjust, there has been a misunderstanding and we have laid our case before the Program Commission and await the solution of the question. The Turkish proletariat, following its purely proletarian ideology, has collaborated and will collaborate again, only in the negative sphere with revolutionary nationalism—in order to get the capitulations abolished, to overcome imperialist capitalist oppression, and to make every effort for doing away with the Sultinate, the Khalifat religious institutions, etc. but as for co-operating in order to give power to the bourgeoisie, that we shall never do. Only a few of our comrades thought they saw the possibility of State and Municipal socialism within the framework of bourgeois democracy, but to-day that Utopia has also been eliminated.

With regard to minorities, we oppose every form of national oppression. The question of minorities has been remarkably simplified: the Christian minorities in Turkey are only 5 or 6% of the whole population and the laws now existing give the same citizen-rights to every inhabitant of the Republic.

The most important aspect of the national question is the struggle which is still continuing against French imperialism. After the break-up of the Lausanne Conference, a rebellion against English imperialism was also preparing at Mosul. In supporting these movements we are making ourselves worthy of the heritage bequeathed us by the great Lenin, who recommended the proletariat of the world not to conquer the territory of the East in order to possess it but to conquer the heart of the East by coming to

its side in the struggle against capitalist imperialism, the common enemy of the oppressed East and of the world proletariat.

Comrade Radek, thereupon took the floor on a point of explanation.

Comrade Radek:

I wish to rectify a legend which has been spread here. Comrade Sommer took upon himself the trouble to argue against the Radek standpoint upon the national question in Germany. Now, there is no Radek standpoint, but there is the standpoint of the Communist International, which was stated in the resolution that was published by "Rote Fahne" of the 13th of May. Among other things, the resolution reads: "The German bourgeoisie... is compelled to wage a fight against victorious capital and to repeatedly clutch and tear at the chains of the Treaty of Versailles. Even for the sake of maintaining its sway over the working class, for which purpose it carries on counter-revolutionary politics, the part which it plays will amount in the long run to a policy of revolutionary disruption."

The German bourgeoisie, in view of the hopeless outlook for its compromising aims, is compelled to carry on the revolutionising politics as we described, but it does so without ability, by relying on the masses of the people in its struggle against the Entente; on the contrary, it is doomed by history to repel from itself the masses of the people... For this reason the national and nationalist sentiments let loose by it are bound in the long run to turn against it. It is the duty of the German Communist Party to open the eyes of the masses of the petty bourgeois and the intellectuals to the fact that the working class alone, having won the victory, will be able to protect the German soil, the treasures of German culture, and the future of the German nation. The German working class alone even if temporarily compelled to continue paying tribute to the victorious Entente, will be able to find the forces for the reconstruction of Germany."

This declaration about Schlageter bore the signatures of Comrades Thaelmann, Maslow, and Ruth Fischer.

The Schlageter speech was made at the Enlarged Executive, with the written consent of the Chairman of the Executive. At that meeting I rejected on behalf of the Executive the views that are advocated here by Comrade Sommer, and which were represented by Comrade Neurath at the Enlarged Executive. Furthermore, Comrades Ruth Fischer and Remmele delivered speeches in Germany, in which they expressed the same point of view, but in a much cruder form. The Communist International has the right to change its standpoint if it turns out to be incorrect. But in changing the standpoint there is no need to start the fabrication of legends which purport to represent the standpoint of the Executive as the personal standpoint of a member of the Presidium.

Comrade Sommer (Germany):

Since Comrade Radek has spoken about a legend supposedly spread by me, I must reply. Firstly, the declaration of "Rote Fahne", which was quoted by Comrade Radek, was a perfectly correct Marxian declaration. The Schlageter speech contained merely an implication of the policies which I have criticised. Even today I consider it was a mistake on the part of the Executive to agree to that speech. On the other hand, Comrade Radek must be given credit that for the first time, in an article in "Rote Fahne", he stated that it was not only our duty to carry on clear Communist propaganda among the middle classes, in order to win them over to our side, but also to form an alliance with the section of the middle class who cling to their nationalist ideology, in order to go part of the way with them. I have yet to learn that this kind of attitude has the authority of the Executive.

Comrade Radek:

Comrade Sommer was well in agreement with the Schlageter speech, but not with the Schlageter article. I beg leave to quote Comrade Zinoviev's letter of the 20th of June, that is after the publication of the article, in which he wrote: "Your articles about Schlageter are good and proper". This shows that Comrade Zinoviev was fully in agreement with the whole Schlageter campaign.

Twenty Third Session.

Comrade Wynkoop called upon Comrade Bordiga to deliver his speech on Fascism.

Bordiga:

I presented to the Fourth Congress a report on the question of fascism dealing with a very decisive period of the history of fascism in Italy, that is to say, with the conquest of power by Mussolini. I must deal now with another phase of fascist development which is connected, as you know, with the Matteotti affair.

It has been said that the development of the governmental crisis in Italy represented fascism as the political negation of the period during which the liberal and democratic bourgeoisie of the left was in power in Italy. According to this point of view, fascism came as a reaction against the concession post-war policy of Giolitti, etc. We think on the contrary that there is a dialectic connection between the two periods, and that the attitude which the Italian bourgeoisie adopted at first during the crisis which convulsed the State after the war, was paving the way for fascism.

The attack on the positions of the red proletariat began in Italy in the agricultural districts. But we must not imagine that it is purely a movement in the interest of the agrarian bourgeoisie and of the big landowners. On the contrary, it is a movement which represents also the interests of the big industrial, financial and commercial bourgeoisie. It is an attempt at counter-revolutionary unity of all the forces of the bourgeoisie. At the first glance, fascism by its outward aspect does not seem to be an organisation of the important social classes which we have just named. It rather appears as a movement of the middle classes, of war veterans, of bourgeois intellectuals and of all other sections which the proletariat could not bring over to its side.

Fascism is a movement for the preservation of what exists already, and it does not present us with a new program. It merely brings forward a new factor which was entirely lacking in the old parties, a formidable fighting organisation, both political and military.

Its name alone shows that it is an anti-socialist and therefore an anti-proletarian movement. From beginning to end it appears as the destroyer of even the smallest conquests of the working class. But even if fascism is not the old extreme right reaction with its concomitant of martial law, terror, emergency legislation, and official prohibition of red and revolutionary organisations, it is something more than that. It is a more modern, cunning movement which endeavours at the same time to do propaganda among the masses, and even adopts the principle of trade union organisation. It is self evident that we cannot compare these trade union organisations with the red trade unions. But we must admit that this is a very strong theoretical argument against trade unions and even against revolutionary trade unionism, which maintains that the most effective weapon for the proletarian struggle is economic organisation. Facts have shown us that this weapon can be very well used for counter-revolutionary purposes.

In fact, fascism has merely adopted, but in a new form, the old platform of left bourgeois parties and of the social democrats, namely, class co-operation. Fascism exploits also in the same fashion national and patriotic ideology.

We did not have armed action but a mobilisation of fascism which threatened with a revolutionary seizure of power, and a sort of defensive mobilisation by the State which even declared martial law at a certain moment. But this resistance did not materialise. Armed action did not take place; we have a compromise instead of it.

The fascists say: we can make this revolution whenever we like. But revolution is not a thing which can be done at will, neither is it at the disposal even of the boldest of political leaders.

Therefore, no revolution took place. There was a change in the leadership of the bourgeois class, but this change does not represent a change of the program of the Italian bourgeoisie neither from the economic and social nor from the home policy point of view.

It is true that there were persecutions against communists, but the legal procedure was the ordinary procedure of the land, and no emergency legislation was introduced. The old laws are very democratic and liberal, and this enabled us to come out of

the trial with flying colours. In this purely political law suit, which was supposed to deal a death blow to the revolutionary general staff, the new situation created by fascism did not make any difference.

(Bordiga reviewed the economic situation in Italy, under the fascist regime and showed that in reality it has become worse, for to day the lira is lower than it ever was before. Mussolini's contention is that it could have fallen lower still, if it had not been for fascism: an utterly worthless argument.)

The fascist government has not kept its promises, and there is great disillusionment in the class on whose support fascism depended, namely the middle class.

I have just told you that our trial showed the inefficacy of the official defensive legal means of the fascist State. But the latter used many other methods against the proletariat, and these methods are very serious for us, for our comrades have been charged as common criminals for actions which were in reality sanguinary encounters between the fascists and the proletariat, especially when the latter was represented by communists.

Fascists enjoy complete immunity even if there is overwhelming evidence against them. But terrible sentences are passed on workers who dared to defend themselves against fascist attacks. There is an amnesty which acquits all those who committed crimes for a national purpose. This amnesty is, of course, extended only to fascists, while revolutionaries are kept in prison and recently are sentenced to 10 and 20 years.

Officially, all guarantees are honoured to the working class. It is allowed to form communist parties and to organise an anarchist movement, etc., but in reality there is coercion of a very formidable nature. Officially, there is freedom of the press, but the provincial prefects can issue the orders at any time to suspend papers.

As to the trade unions, great pressure is exercised by the fascist government which compelled workers to enter into fascist trade-unions by means of violence. The premises of red trade-unions were destroyed. But fascist activities in industrial organisations were not very successful. The fact is that the Italian proletariat is disorganised, instead of being organised, in fascist trade-unions. Sometimes there are workers' demonstrations, under the official leadership of fascist trade-unions, because they are allowed to take action in defence of their demands.

Then Bordiga dealt with the discontent of the middle class and of the small peasantry because of fascist governmental measures. The latter, who do not count as a political factor, are being gradually expropriated by the big peasantry. He then dealt with the conflicts between the extremists and revisionists of fascism. Fascism has not introduced anything new on the field of foreign policy. It is true, we had the de jure recognition of the Soviet Government but the Italian proletariat was not taken in by the machinations of the fascist press. Italian capitalism was interested in an understanding with Russia. The Italian proletariat interpreted this recognition not as a sign of weakness on the part of Soviet Russia but as a sign of weakness on the part of fascism.

Bordiga also spoke of the conditions of the Mussolini election, and explained the positions and the forces of the different parties. And he emphasised the importance of the communist fight during this election and of the success achieved by communist candidates.

Then he dealt with the Matteotti affair and spoke of the conditions under which the socialist defeat took place.

The discontent is great among the middle classes. But one must differentiate between this movement and the state of mind of this class and the state of mind of the working class. It is a pacifist and legal means that the recently formed opposition against fascism hopes to bring about a change. But the proletariat know full well that the excesses of the forces of the right must be met by force and that the situation can be stabilised only by long periods of struggle and by violent means and can be finally settled only by the establishment of proletarian dictatorship.

At the beginning, all the opposition parties, including even the Communist Party took part in parliamentary protests. But since then the Parties have divided. The parliamentary communist fraction dissociated itself from the declarations made by the other Parties. All the other Parties, including even the maximalists, formed a joint committee of parliamentary opposition. The Communist Party proposed the general strike as a protest against the assassination of Matteotti. Strikes had already broken out spontaneously. But all the other Parties were of course opposed to the proposal of the Communist Party, and advocated a 10 minutes' strike. But even fascist and employers' organisations

were in favour of this proposal! Thereby this strike was deprived of all political and class importance. It is self-evident that the communists alone proposed the right form of protest with which the assassination of Matteotti should have been met.

The situation can change much more rapidly than we expected before the Matteotti affair took place. It is clear that the position of the fascists will be much more difficult in the future and that the possibility of anti-fascist action has taken place.

The problem which confronts the revolutionaries is as follows: "How are we to use this situation and what is to be our attitude? The Party must insist on the autonomous role which was assigned to it. It must adopt the slogan of the liquidation of all anti-fascist oppositions, and must replace them by an open and direct action of the communist movement. Since the election and since other manifestations and demonstrations of the activity and vitality of our Party, our adversaries have adopted a different language towards us. The fascist press wants to enter into polemics with us almost daily in connection with the Matteotti affair, and this draws public attention to our Party and to its task which differs from all the other opposition movements.

The Communist Party is the only Party which offers to the masses means of action capable of putting an end to the present situation. We must carry out our task of agitation in opposition to the socialist and maximalist parties. We must naturally not depend only on politics, but must rally and unite the masses. It is only when we shall have achieved this unity of the masses that we shall have found the right foundation for the development of our struggle against fascism.

Other means must be used than an attack led by a terrorist minority! We never had faith in such tactics, and if there is a political movement which by its critical and political attitude endeavours to liquidate the illusion of effective action by terrorist minorities, it is our Party.

We are convinced that revolutionary success can be achieved only by bringing into motion the masses, the working class and allies—the peasants which must be led by the Communist Party the general Staff of the proletariat.

Bordiga spoke also of fascism as an international phenomenon and explained the conditions which gave rise to it. They existed in Italy where fascism had national and religious unity. He said that these conditions were not as developed in other countries, for instance in Germany where fascism can evidently develop but under another form. He said that in Germany fascism will be rather of a petty-bourgeois character and will never achieve complete unity with the big bourgeoisie.

For the struggle against fascism abroad Italian communists do not depend on the hypocritical support of the foreign bourgeoisie, on a moral campaign, but rather on the revolutionary solidarity of the workers of all countries in the struggle against bourgeois reaction and world fascism.

Twenty Fourth Session.

Comrade Wynkoop opened the session, and after some announcements called upon Comrade Freimuth to give his report on Fascism.

Comrade Freimuth:

The essence of fascism was not brought out sufficiently clearly and sharply either in the report of Comrade Bordiga or in printed report which has been presented to you. We have to remember the history of the origin of fascism in order to see what it really is. The war was ended not merely because of and powerful armies defeated others, but because a revolutionary movement had broken out within the belligerent nations. How the cleverest politicians of the bourgeois states then tried to avert the danger of bolshevism by means of pacifist propaganda. The pacifist-democratic governments that came into power after the war were too weak to oppose the onflow of the communist revolutionary wave. Capitalist society, threatened with annihilation, brought tremendous efforts to bear by way of propaganda to reduce the demands of the proletariat to absurdity. Fascism today still feeds upon this propaganda, for the chief foundation of the fascist ideology is the anti-bolshevik propaganda which we were familiar in the revolutionary days from 1917 to 1920. The social democrats took a front place in the counter-revolutionary service. Kautsky, the scientific herald of democracy, wrote pamphlet after pamphlet which were

intended to, and in fact did, divert a large section of the workers from the revolutionary struggle. Nevertheless the democratic-pacifist parties were unable to retain their positions alone and we saw how they then tried to organise the declining social sections of the old army for a bloody war on the workers.

It was the so-called "revolutionary" government of Ebert-Scheidemann-Haase which then called upon their bloodhound Noske to organise the voluntary corps. You remember their fight against the revolutionary proletariat, the battles of the civil war in Berlin, Hamburg, Bremen, Düsseldorf, Munich etc. It was then that the nuclei of fascism were really created in Germany.

Fascism is not an attempt on the part of the petty bourgeoisie to conduct their own policy, as the printed report says. The essential fact of fascism is the fighting organisation which the bourgeoisie have created for the purpose of crushing the revolution in a counter-revolutionary struggle and to secure the existence of capitalist society. Fascism is the weapon of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat. Of course the petty bourgeoisie and the middle class citizens are the material from which the weapon is forged. But it is not important out of which material an instrument is made, but rather the purpose which the instrument is to serve; and fascism serves no other purpose than to maintain and secure the class domination of the bourgeoisie.

We know that fascism as it developed both in Italy and Germany had to fight against the existing state and for its own domination. But this is not a fundamental opposition to the capitalist domination, but rather the fight for another form of this domination. Fascism is the protagonist of the revolutionary proletarian movement, the social revolution, and therefore we have as much to learn from this movement as from the revolutionary movement.

We have noted that German fascism in essence passed through four phases, in each of which it differed essentially and adopted essentially different methods and forms of struggle, before it became what it is today.

The first phase embraces the period from Ebert to Kapp i. e. from the first "revolutionary" government up to the Kapp-putsch. We here see how the first fascist organisations sprang up, which, it is true, did not bear the impress and the features of fascism in its present-day form, but which were nevertheless the organisations which have persisted to there present day and which are led by the same persons. In those days the voluntary corps were created as the first organisations directed against the revolutionary proletariat. Apart from these voluntary corps (Freikorps) there were the Freiwilligenkorps, the Students' Leagues, the League of Ex-Officers, etc. Thirdly, there were created the bourgeois defense organisations, such as Orgesch. They were created in agreement with the then social-democratic-bourgeois government. The workers who were then coming out, not merely in demonstrations and meetings, but in the fight for power and for the workers' councils, were simply mown down by the Freikorps, the counter-revolutionary officers, and the generals of the old army.

But it was soon evident that these counter-revolutionary organisations were not prepared to act as the lackeys of the bourgeois-social-democratic government, but wanted themselves to be the masters of the house.

And so we find that the Freikorps very soon began to attempt to overthrow the democratic-pacifist government.

We now come to the second phase of fascism. The Kapp-putsch had terrified the pacifist-democratic government and the government departments and they were now obliged to take up the fight against the very Freikorps which they themselves had created. They called upon the workers for a general strike, and against the opposition of the working class, the military domination and the dictatorship, which Kapp wanted to establish, foundered. During the second phase all the elements which were active or sympathetic in the Kapp-putsch and whose organisations were destroyed rallied again in new secret organisations. There now took place what has invariably happened in secret organisations at all times. They could arise only during the active struggle against the so-called democratic government. We here find being used the fighting methods common to all secret organisations: putsches, surprise attacks, and all the essential fighting methods of individual terrorism and individual murder. At that time fascism regarded its first duty as being not the fight against the revolutionary proletariat, but the achieving domination for themselves, and then, when this was secured, to attack the proletariat. It was in this period that Erzberger and Rathenau were murdered.

Both murders resulted in a great upheaval of the proletariat. Yes, it must be said to our regret, they produced a greater wave of upheaval and mass-movement than was the case at the time of the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg a year before.

This phase of fascism lasted up to the period when the time had come for German fascism to become a mass-movement.

It is one of the favourite sayings of the fascists that they were the deadly enemies of Marxism. But no movement has justified Marxism more than fascism.

In the third phase we find fascism growing and to this we must give the most serious attention. After the elections to the Reichstag, we heard it said that the end of fascism was at last not far off. I must issue a note of warning against such assertions, especially in view of the fact that this mass-movement had grown up not during the space of the six years glorious existence of the republic, but in a space of 20 months, and nevertheless has achieved the great success we are witnessing.

The fascist movement is beginning to form political parties, the first of them in the south, the Nationalist Labour Party. It is therefore turning first to the workers and hopes to find in them the storm troops of its counter-revolutionary plan.

The second party was set up in the north, the German Nationalists Freedom Party. (Deutschvölkische Freiheitspartei). The movement took the name of Freiheitspartei from the national movement of 1813. Both these parties based their policy on the complete collapse of bourgeois society in Germany. And the very petty bourgeois parties which the fascist political parties are attacking, assisted to bring about the political period of fascism. The political program of fascism shows how it has drawn the best arguments for its policy from the fulfilment policy, and the burden of reparations. As regards foreign policy, fascism and its political organisation demand the non fulfilment of the Versailles Treaty, a war of revenge against France, a war of revenge against England and in fact against all the countries which are oppressing Germany. Their policy is active opposition to the occupation of the Ruhr, as opposed to the policy of passive resistance which was conducted by the Cuno government. The internal policy of fascism is briefly as follows: opposition to Marxism, the Jews, profiteering capitalism and parliamentarism, and for the dictatorship of the Völkische.

The fascists have a labor program, a middle class program, and an agrarian program, in fact programs for all the sections of society necessary to build up a mass-movement. The first point of the labor program is the demand for the eight-hour day. They demand a social insurance far superior to what has been regarded as social insurance hitherto. They demand the abolition of classes. Within fascist society, employers and employed, capitalist and workers, are to belong to one family and are to have the same rights and the same duties within society. They preach phrases regarding the necessity for productive capital, as opposed to Jewish capital and finance capital. They preach the communality of labour, the necessity for unions in which the employer and the factory worker shall be united. Henry Ford, the great American capitalist, is their ideal, and his system of exploitation is to be introduced into Germany. Just as for the working class, fascism in Germany has a program for the middle classes, which are to be just as much protected by social insurance as the working class. Similarly with the agrarian program and the peasant program. In these they preach that every landworker and every peasant must possess his own homestead and be emancipated from servitude to the Jews.

It was during the period of government from November 1922 to September 1923 that fascism conducted the liveliest and most extensive propaganda and endeavoured to become a mass-movement. But it was not only a period in which fascism won ground among the masses, but in which the revolution took a fresh impetus. This proves better than anything else the thesis which I placed at the beginning of my speech, namely, that fascism was the counter part of revolution, the most important component part of counter revolution, and assumes its greatest expansion during revolutionary epochs and side by side with the revolutionary movement.

What did we communists do in that period when bourgeois society in Germany was threatened with disruption and collapse? It was only after fascism had mobilised itself everywhere that we began an energetic anti-fascist propaganda which culminated in the Anti-Fascist Day at the end of June. It was then proved that fascism was composed only of moods. During this period the fascist organisations did not dare to come out openly, for the

communist movement held a powerful fist in their faces. However, there were all sorts of false ideas prevalent in our Party, which prevented the fruits being derived from the movement connected with the Anti-Fascist Day. In spite of this mistake, Anti-Fascist Day was one of the most brilliant actions of the proletariat against counter-revolution.

After the Anti-Fascist Day it became evident that the communist movement was serving as a rallying point for all those elements who were seeking to save themselves from the declining and disintegrating economic system. We not only neutralised the peasants, but also achieved great successes in seeking to organise them and winning them for the ideology of communism and the idea of the proletarian dictatorship. We note at this time the formation of a large number of peasant organisations. These sections were won not by theoretical or verbal propaganda but in the active revolutionary struggle.

Similar phenomena are to be noted among the middle class of the towns, and the petty bourgeoisie in the large cities especially in Berlin, where for instance when the proletarian control-commissions took measures for controlling the cost of living they were actively supported by the small traders.

The failure to put an end to the struggle in October threw us back considerably in this respect.

The third phase of fascism culminated in the Hitler putsch. I think it is a mistake to speak of a Hitler "putsch". It was rather a great and extensive insurrectionary movement which with some political intelligence might have been led to some definite purpose. For the first time the fascists marched into battle and in one moment the host was laid low. Let us take in contrast the fight which the revolutionary proletariat of Hamburg fought a few days before. For three days and three nights 200 revolutionary fighters held back all the murderous instruments of war, bayonets, machine guns and tanks which were brought out against them. This fight — in contrast to the Hitler rising — proves that the revolutionary fight in Germany has every prospect of success. The revolutionary fight is being carried on by the enthusiasm of the revolutionary proletariat which in spite of defeats is always ready to take up the fight once more. Similar objective circumstances as existed in October and with the resolute leadership of the Communist Party, the task facing the revolutionary proletariat will be fulfilled.

After the Hitler putsch fascism effected a change of front. The anti-parliamentary fascists became the supporters of parliamentarism. Fascism which in its program preaches war on parliamentarism takes part in the Landtag- and the Reichstag-elections. The elections demonstrate the strength of the fascist movement, but they also demonstrate the quicksand upon which the fascist movement as a mass-movement rests. On April 6th the fascist recorded extraordinary success in the Bavarian Landtag elections. But the Reichstag elections a tremendous change had already taken place.

The fascists lost about one-quarter of their votes to the German Nationalists. But what is particularly important for the workers' movement is the fact that fascism won quite considerable successes in a number of highly industrial districts. Bordigh view that fascism will not easily penetrate the working class movement is in my opinion incorrect. In Germany fascism by the use of various methods, by spending a good deal of money, has won over a section of the working class.

In the fight against fascism, our party, like the fraternal parties, has committed errors. During the Kapp Putsch we declared neutrality; we thereby committed the same mistake as our Bulgarian friends in June. But this error was very soon made good by the fighting proletariat. The working class passed from passive resistance of the general strike to active defence against the existence of the old counter-revolutionary social-democratic government. For the first time we heard of a Red Army in Germany, created by the fighting revolutionary proletariat. The fighting which we used during the succeeding uprisings against fascism, as for instance, after the murder of Erzberger in Rathenau, did not possess the revolutionary plan and the revolutionary power which was observed during the Kapp Putsch. The communist movement was then more the tail of the social-democratic opposition to fascism, than its most active and leading force. We did not fight independently in those struggles against fascism as we should have done.

The best known method of propaganda was the Schlag letter and the subsequent campaign. At that time the opinion already existing that we had employed false methods. It is

that fascism and communism are like fire and water, and that an alliance between them is impossible. We now perceive in the tendencies which were expressed in the Schlageter article and in the whole campaign, a deviation from the methods which we should have used in the fight against counter-revolution and that special form of counter-revolution, fascism.

The Communist International has set up a body to fight fascism which has its secretariat in Germany. The whole activity of the secretariat is not in the least way related with the political leadership of the communist movement. Literature is distributed by the secretariat with which we politically disagree. We demand not the abolition of the central anti-fascist body, but its subordination to the leadership of the party central committees of the various countries.

The proposals which we make for the fight against fascism in the future are as follows:

- 1) The exposure of the fascist program in parliament. We must carry on a vigorous propaganda in parliament for the demands which the fascists put forward in their own program, thus placing the fascists in the dilemma of being obliged to carry out their program wherever possible.
- 2) Subordination of the anti-fascist propaganda to the party central committees of the various countries.
- 3) An active propaganda among the small peasants and middle classes within the parties in which these sections are particularly numerous.
- 4) An active fight against the international treaties, reparations, the Experts' Report, etc.
- 5) The creation of fighting organisations against fascism.

6) An active fight and counter-demonstration against the "German Days" and against the monarchist demonstrations of the fascists.

7) Public disputes with the fascists.

8) A determined fight against fascism and for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We are to day fighting much more actively against fascism than hitherto. In Halle, Fürstenwalde and Neu Brandenburg, great fascist "days" took place to which we responded by counter-demonstrations.

We must properly appreciate the political value of the counter-demonstrations. You know that our organisation is prohibited and our press suppressed. But after every one of these fighting days, the bourgeois press is obliged to pay attention to the fight which the communists are conducting against fascism, to admit that a revolutionary fighting body still exists in Germany, and that it is not to be charmed away by police chicanery.

This political influence is of such tremendous importance that from reasons of propaganda, if from no other, we must not abandon these fighting days. It is true that some of our comrades got their heads broken in the fight. There will be many broken heads before we have conquered power. But those who don't want to fight must not say that they know how to carry on a revolutionary fight against counter-revolution. Just as fascism in its essence and tendencies should be a lesson and schooling for the proletariat as to the correct methods of fighting, so also the active armed struggle against fascism must teach us the methods whereby we shall finally overthrow fascism and the whole bourgeois society in order to make possible the emancipation of the proletariat in Germany also (applause).