

**THE FOUNDATION
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL**

**By
V. I. LENIN**



**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK**

10 cents

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION—THE THIRD, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	3
THE FIRST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	4
Speech at the Opening of the Congress	4
Theses and Report on Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	5
Resolution on the Report upon Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	22
Concluding Speech at the Closing of the Congress	23
WON AND RECORDED	24
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS PLACE IN HISTORY	26
THE HEROES OF THE BERNE INTERNATIONAL	34
ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	42

Copyrighted, 1934, by
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

THE THIRD, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

IN March of this year, 1919, there took place an international congress of Communists in Moscow. This Congress founded the Third, Communist International, the union of the workers of the whole world striving to establish Soviet power in all countries.

The First International, founded by Marx, existed from 1864 to 1872. The defeat of the heroic Paris workers—the famous Paris Commune—meant the end of this International. It is unforgettable, it is eternal, in the history of the struggle of the workers for their emancipation. It laid the foundation of that building of the World Socialist Republic, which we to-day are happy in building.

The Second International existed from 1889 to 1914, until the war. This period was the period of the quietest and most peaceful development of capitalism, a period without great revolutions. The labour movement grew strong and mature in that period in a number of countries. But the leaders of the workers in the majority of parties, growing accustomed to peaceful times, lost the capacity for revolutionary struggle. When the war—a war which for four years has drenched the earth with blood, a war between the capitalists for the division of profits, for power over the small and weak nations—began in 1914, these Socialists passed over to the side of their governments. They betrayed the workers, they helped to drag out the slaughter, they became enemies of socialism, they passed over to the side of the capitalists. The masses of the workers have turned away from these traitors to socialism. Throughout the world a turn to revolutionary struggle has begun. The war has shown the doom of capitalism. A new order is taking its place. The traitors to socialism have disgraced the old word “socialism.”

Now the workers who have remained faithful to the cause of the overthrow of the yoke of capital call themselves Communists. Throughout the world the Union of Communists is growing. In a number of countries Soviet power has already been victorious.* It will not be long before we see the victory of Communism throughout the world, the foundation of the World Federal Republic of Soviets.

Speech recorded for the gramophone, March, 1919.

* Lenin refers to the Soviet revolutions in Bavaria and Hungary.—*Ed.*

THE FIRST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE CONGRESS

AT the request of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, I am opening the First International Communist Congress. First of all I shall ask all those present to honour the memory of the best representatives of the Third International, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, by standing [*all stand up*].

Comrades! Our meeting has a great world historical importance. It shows the collapse of all the illusions of bourgeois democracy. For not only in Russia, but even in the more developed capitalist countries of Europe, as, for example, Germany, civil war has become a fact.

The bourgeoisie is experiencing wild fear before the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat. It becomes clear, if we take into account that the course of events since the imperialist war is inevitably facilitating the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, that the international world revolution is beginning and increasing in all countries.

The people recognise the greatness and importance of the struggle which is being fought out at the present time. It is only necessary to find that practical form which will allow the proletariat to realise its rule. This form is the Soviet system with the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat!—till now these words were Latin for the masses. Thanks to the spread of the Soviet system throughout the world, this Latin has now been translated into every modern language. The practical form of dictatorship has been found by the working masses. It has become comprehensible to wide masses of workers, thanks to the Soviet power in Russia, thanks to the Spartacists * in Germany and to similar organisations in other countries, as, for example, the Shop Stewards' Committees in England. This all shows that the revolu-

* Members of the Spartacus League founded by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, which became the Communist Party of Germany in November, 1918.—*Ed.*

tionary form of the proletarian dictatorship has been found, that the proletariat is now in a position to make use of its rule in practice.

Comrades! I think that after the events in Russia, after the January struggle in Germany, it is especially important to note that in other countries the latest form of the movement of the proletariat is coming to life and becoming dominant. To-day for example, I read in a certain anti-Socialist newspaper * a telegraphic communication to the effect that the British Government has invited the Birmingham Soviet of Workers' Deputies and expressed its readiness to recognise the Soviet as an economic organisation.** The Soviet system has not only been victorious in backward Russia but even in the most developed country in Europe—in Germany, and also in the oldest capitalist country—in England.

Let the bourgeoisie continue to rage, let it still murder thousands of workers—the victory will be ours, the victory of the world Communist Revolution is certain.

Comrades! Heartily greeting you in the name of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, I suppose that we should now proceed to the election of a Presidium.

THESES AND REPORT ON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT (MARCH 4)

1. The growth of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries has caused convulsive efforts of the bourgeoisie and its agents in the labour organisations to find ideological and political arguments for the defence of the rule of the exploiters. Among these arguments they particularly put forward condemnation of dictatorship and the defence of democracy. The falseness and hypocrisy of such an argument, repeated in thousands of different ways in the capitalist press and at the conference of the yellow International at Berne *** in 1919, are clear for all those who do not wish to change the fundamental laws of socialism.

2. First of all this argument is based on the conception of

* *The Daily Telegraph*.—Ed.

** Lenin is referring to the Shop Stewards' Committee. The reference to Soviets is no doubt a stenographer's error.—Ed.

*** The Conference at which the Second International reconstituted itself after the war.—Ed.

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
NEWFOUNDLAND
LIBRARY

MEMORANDUM
"democracy in general," and of "dictatorship in general," without posing the question as to which class is involved. Such a non-class or super-class, apparently generally national way of putting the question is a direct mockery of the main teachings of socialism, particularly the teaching on the class struggle, which is recognised in words and forgotten in practice by those socialists who have passed over to the side of the bourgeoisie. For there is not a single civilised capitalist country in which "democracy in general," exists, but there exists only bourgeois democracy, and it is not a question of "dictatorship in general," but of the dictatorship of an oppressed class, that is of the proletariat, over the oppressors and exploiters, that is the bourgeoisie, with the aim of overcoming the resistance which the exploiters manifest in the fight for their domination.

3. History teaches that not a single oppressed class has ever come to power or ever could come to power, without living through a period of dictatorship, that is of the conquest of political power, and of the forcible suppression of the most desperate, the most furious resistance which the exploiters have always shown, not hesitating at any crimes. The bourgeoisie, whose rule the Socialists are now defending in talking against "dictatorship in general" and standing up for "democracy in general," has conquered power in the advanced countries at the price of a number of revolts, civil wars, forcible suppression of kings, feudal lords, slave owners and of all their efforts at restoration. The Socialists of all countries have explained to the people thousands of millions of times in their books, in their pamphlets, in the resolutions of their congresses, in their agitational speeches, the class character of these bourgeois revolutions and of this bourgeois dictatorship. Therefore the present defence of bourgeois democracy under the appearance of speeches about "democracy in general" and the present shrieks and cries against the dictatorship of the proletariat in the shape of cries about "dictatorship in general" are a direct betrayal of socialism, in fact mean passing over to the side of the bourgeoisie, denying the right of the proletariat to its own, proletarian revolution, defending bourgeois reformism at the very historical moment when bourgeois reformism throughout the whole world has collapsed and when the war has created a revolutionary situation.

4. All Socialists, in explaining the class character of bourgeois civilisation, of bourgeois democracy, of bourgeois parliamentarianism, have expressed the thought which Marx and Engels spoke out with the greatest scientific exactness when they said that the most democratic bourgeois republic is nothing else but a machine for the suppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie, of the mass of toilers by a handful of capitalists. There is not a single revolutionary, not a single Marxist among those who to-day shout out against dictatorship and for democracy, who would not solemnly declare and swear before the workers that he recognises this fundamental truth of socialism. But now, when the revolutionary proletariat is passing into ferment and movement directed towards the destruction of this machine of oppression and towards the conquest of proletarian dictatorship, these traitors to socialism pretend that the bourgeoisie has presented the toilers with "pure democracy," that the bourgeoisie has renounced resistance and is ready to be obedient to the majority of the toilers, but there was not and is not in the democratic republic any kind of state machine for the suppression of labour by capital.

5. The Paris Commune, which every one who wishes to be considered a Socialist, honours, for they know that the working masses warmly and sincerely sympathise with it, has shown particularly clearly the historically conditioned character and limited value of bourgeois parliamentarianism and of bourgeois democracy—of institutions which are in the highest degree progressive in comparison with the middle ages but which inevitably call for fundamental change in the epoch of proletarian revolution. Marx in particular, who best of all estimated the importance of the Commune, in his analysis of it showed the exploiting character of bourgeois democracy and of bourgeois parliamentarianism, by which the oppressed classes get the right once every few years to decide which representative of the possessing classes shall "represent and suppress" the people in parliament. Particularly to-day, when the Soviet movement, by embracing the whole world, is continuing the work of the Commune before the eyes of all, the traitors to socialism forget the concrete experience and concrete lessons of the Paris Commune when they repeat the old bourgeois rubbish about "democ-

racy in general." The Commune was not a parliamentary institution.

6. The importance of the Commune consists further in the fact that it made an effort to smash and destroy to the foundation the bourgeois state apparatus, its civil service, legal, military and police apparatus, replacing it by the self-administering mass organisation of the workers which recognised no division of legislative and executive power. All modern bourgeois democratic republics, including the German, which the traitors to socialism, deriding the truth, call a proletarian republic, preserve this state apparatus. In this way it is again and again fully and clearly confirmed that the shouts in defence of "democracy in general" are in fact a defence of the bourgeoisie and of its exploiting privileges.

7. "Freedom of meeting" may be taken as an example of the demand for "pure democracy." Every class-conscious worker who has not broken with his class will understand at once that it would be stupid to promise freedom of meeting to the exploiters at the period and in the circumstances when the exploiters are showing resistance to their overthrow and insisting on their privileges. The bourgeoisie, at the time when it was revolutionary, did not give, either in England in 1649 or in France in 1793, "freedom of meeting" to the monarchists and nobles who had called in foreign armies and were "meeting" for the organisation of attempts at restoration. If the present-day bourgeoisie, which has long since become reactionary, demands of the proletariat that it should guarantee beforehand whatever resistance the capitalists may show to their expropriation, "freedom of meeting" for the exploiters, then the workers will only laugh at the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the workers know quite well that "freedom of meeting" even in the most democratic bourgeois republic is an empty phrase, for the rich have all the best public and private buildings at their disposition, as well as sufficient leisure for meetings and protection by their bourgeois apparatus of power. The proletarians of town and country and the small peasants, that is to say the immense majority of the population, have neither the first, nor the second, nor the third. So long as things are arranged in this way, "equality," that is, "pure democracy," is deception. In order to win real equality, in order to realise in practice democracy

for the toilers, it is necessary in the first place to take away from the exploiters all public and luxurious private buildings, it is necessary in the first place to give leisure to the toilers, it is necessary that the armed workers should protect the freedom of their meetings and not the aristocratic or capitalist officers with their down-trodden soldiers.

Only after such a change can you speak of freedom of meeting, of equality, without mockery of the workers, of the toilers, of the poor. But nobody can carry out such a change save the vanguard of the toilers, the proletariat which overthrows the exploiters, the bourgeoisie.

8. "Freedom of the press" is also one of the chief slogans of "pure democracy." Again, the workers know, and the socialists of all countries have recognised millions of times, that this freedom is deception so long as the best printing works and the largest supplies of paper are seized by the capitalists and so long as the power of capital over the press remains, a power which throughout the world appears the more vividly, the sharper, the more cynically, the greater the development of democracy and of the republican system, as for example, in America. In order to win real equality and real democracy for the toilers, for the workers and the peasants, it was first of all necessary to take away from capital the possibility of hiring writers, of buying publishing houses and bribing newspapers, and for this it is necessary to overthrow the yoke of capital, to suppress their resistance. The capitalists have always called "freedom" the freedom of profit for the rich, the freedom of the workers to die of hunger. The capitalists call the freedom of the press freedom for the rich to buy up the press, freedom to make use of wealth for the manufacture and forging of so-called public opinion. The defenders of "pure democracy" again in practice appear as defenders of the same dirty corrupt system of the rule of the rich over the means for enlightening the masses, appear as the deceivers of the people, distracting them, by means of fair-seeming, fine and thoroughly false phrases, from the concrete historical tasks of liberating the press from its enslavement to capital. Real freedom and equality will be that order which the Communists are building and in which there will be no possibility of growing rich at the expense of others, in which there will be no objective pos-

sibility of either directly or indirectly subjecting the press to the power of money, in which there will be no hindrance to prevent any toiler (or group of toilers of any number) from having and putting into practice an equal right to the utilisation of public printing works and public paper.

9. The history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries showed us even before the war what this renowned "pure democracy" is in practice under capitalism. The Marxists have always said that the more developed and the "purer" democracy becomes, the more naked, sharper, and merciless becomes the class struggle, the "purer" appears the yoke of capital and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The Dreyfus affair in Republican France, the bloody massacres of strikers by hired gangs armed by the capitalists in the free and democratic republic of America—these and thousands of similar facts show that truth which the bourgeoisie in vain tries to hide, that is, that in the most democratic republics terror and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie rule in fact, showing themselves openly every time when it begins to appear to the exploiters that the power of capital is trembling.

10. The imperialist war of 1914-1918 finally exposed even to the backward workers this true character of bourgeois democracy, even in the freest republics, as being the character of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Tens of millions were killed for the sake of enriching the German or the British group of millionaires and the military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie was established in the freest republics. This military dictatorship is being continued in the Entente countries even after the defeat of Germany. It was precisely the war which most of all opened the eyes of the toilers, plucked the false flowers off bourgeois democracy, showed the people all the abyss of speculation and profit during the war and before the war. In the name of "freedom and equality" the bourgeoisie waged this war, in the name of "freedom and equality" the war profiteers grew rich to an unheard-of extent. No efforts of the yellow Berne International can conceal from the masses the exploiting character of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois equality, bourgeois democracy now exposed to the end.

11. In the most developed capitalist country on the Continent of Europe, in Germany, the first month of complete republican free-

dom, brought about by the defeat of imperialist Germany, has shown the German workers and the whole world of what the real class character of the bourgeois-democratic republic consists. The murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg is an event of world historical importance not only because the best people and leaders of the really proletarian Communist International have perished, but also because in an advanced European state—it can be said without exaggeration in one of the most advanced states of the world—the class essence of this state has been laid bare to the end. If people under arrest, that is to say people taken by the state power under its protection, can be killed with impunity by officers and capitalists, under a government of social-patriots, then it follows that the democratic republic in which such a thing was possible is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. People who express their anger at the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg but do not understand this truth thereby only expose either their own stupidity or their own hypocrisy. “Freedom” in one of the most free and advanced republics of the world, in the German Republic, means the freedom to murder unpunished the arrested leaders of the proletariat. And it cannot be otherwise so long as capitalism remains, for the development of democracy does not blunt but sharpens the class struggle, which by force of all the results and influences of the war and its consequences has been brought to boiling point.

Throughout the civilised world the expulsion of Bolsheviks is now taking place, they are being persecuted, imprisoned, as for example in one of the freest bourgeois republics, in Switzerland, while there are pogroms against Bolsheviks in America, etc. From the point of view of “democracy in general” or of “pure democracy,” it is absolutely comic that advanced civilised, democratic countries which are armed to the teeth should be afraid of the presence of a few dozen people from backward, hungry, ruined Russia, which the bourgeois newspapers in tens of millions of copies christen savage, criminal, etc. It is clear that the social atmosphere which can give birth to such a crying contradiction is in fact the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

12. In such circumstances dictatorship of the proletariat is not only completely legitimate as a method of overthrowing the ex-

plotters and suppressing their resistance but it also is absolutely essential for the whole mass of toilers as the only defence against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie which leads to war and the preparing of more wars.

The chief thing which the Socialists do not understand and which comprises their theoretical shortsightedness, their captivity to bourgeois prejudices and their political treachery in regard to the proletariat, is that in capitalist society, with any kind of serious sharpening of the class struggle which lies at its basis, there can be no middle course save the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Any dream about any kind of third way is the reactionary lament of the petty-bourgeois. The experience of more than a hundred years' development of bourgeois democracy and of the labour movement in all advanced countries, and particularly the experience of the last five years, is evidence of this. The whole science of political economy is also evidence of this, the whole content of Marxism which explains the economic inevitability of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in any kind of commodity economy and which no one can change save the class which is developed, multiplied, welded together, strengthened by the very development of capitalism, that is, the class of proletarians.

13. The other theoretical and political mistake of the Socialists consists in their not understanding that the forms of democracy have changed during thousands of years, beginning with its seeds in ancient history, in accordance with the replacing of one ruling class by another. In the ancient republics of Greece, in the cities of the Middle Ages, in the advanced capitalist countries, democracy has different forms and a different degree of application. It would be the greatest stupidity to imagine that the deepest revolution in the history of humanity, the first transfer of power in the world from the minority of exploiters to the majority of exploited can take place within the old frames of old, bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, can take place without the sharpest changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, of new institutions which express the new conditions of its application, etc.

14. The dictatorship of the proletariat has this in common with the dictatorship of other classes: that, like every dictatorship, it is caused by the necessity of suppressing the violent resistance of a

class which has lost its political domination. The fundamental difference of a dictatorship of the proletariat from the dictatorship of other classes—from the dictatorship of the landlords of the Middle Ages, from the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in all civilised capitalist countries—consists in the fact that the dictatorship of the landlords and of the bourgeoisie was the violent suppression of the immense majority of the population, that is to say, of the toilers. On the contrary, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the violent suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, that is of a tiny minority of the population, of the landlords and the capitalists.

Hence it follows in its turn that the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably bring with it, not only a change in the forms and institutions of democracy, speaking generally, but precisely such a change in them as shall bring a widening of the practical utilisation of democracy by those oppressed by capitalism, by the labouring classes, as has never yet been seen in the whole world.

And in fact that form of the dictatorship of the proletariat which has already been worked out practically, that is the Soviet power in Russia, the *Rate-System* * in Germany, the Shop Stewards' Committees and other similar Soviet institutions in other countries all mean and actually carry out for the labouring classes, that is to say for the immense majority of the population, such an actual possibility of making use of democratic rights and freedoms as has never, even approximately, existed in the best and most democratic bourgeois republics.

The essence of Soviet power consists in the fact that the permanent and only basis of all state power, of the whole state apparatus, is the mass organisation of precisely those classes which were oppressed by capitalism, that is, of the workers and semi-proletarians (peasants who do not exploit others' labour and who have to have recourse constantly to the selling, even though only partially, of their own labour power). Precisely these masses, which even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, although they have equal rights according to law, are in practice prevented by thousands of shifts and tricks from participating in political life and from making

* The Soviets of workers and soldiers which spread throughout Germany after the revolution of November, 1918, which overthrew the Kaiser and ended the war.—*Ed.*

use of democratic rights and freedoms, are now being drawn into permanent direct and moreover decisive participation in the democratic administration of the state.

15. That equality between citizens, independent of sex, religion, race, nationality, which bourgeois democracy has always and everywhere promised but has never anywhere carried out, and because of the rule of capitalism could not carry out, Soviet power or the dictatorship of the proletariat realises at once and completely, for only the power of the workers who are not interested in private property over the means of production and in the struggle for their division and re-division, is in a condition to do this.

16. Old, that is, bourgeois democracy and parliamentarianism was so organised that it was precisely the masses of toilers who were most of all kept away from the apparatus of administration. Soviet power, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is on the contrary so constructed as to bring the masses of toilers near to the apparatus of administration. This aim is served by the union of legislative and executive power under the Soviet organisation of the state and the substitution of territorial electoral constituencies by productive units, such as the mills and factories.

17. The army was an apparatus of oppression not only under the monarchy. It remained so in all bourgeois republics also, even in the most democratic. Only Soviet power as the permanent state organisation precisely of the classes oppressed by capitalism is in a position to smash the subjection of the army to bourgeois command and really to merge the proletarians with the army, really to carry out the arming of the proletariat and the disarming of the bourgeoisie, without which the victory of socialism is impossible.

18. The Soviet organisation of the state is fitted to the leading rôle of the proletariat as being the class most concentrated and educated by capitalism. The experience of all revolutions and of all movements of the oppressed classes, the experience of the world Socialist movement, teaches us that only the proletariat is in a position to unite and to lead the scattered and backward sections of the toiling and exploited population.

19. Only the Soviet organisation of the state is in a condition really to smash at once and finally to destroy the old, that is the bourgeois, civil service and judicial apparatus which has been pre-

served and inevitably must be preserved under capitalism, even in the most democratic republic, as the greatest obstacle to carrying democracy into life for the workers and toilers. The Paris Commune took the first world historical step along this path, Soviet power the second.

20. The abolishing of state power is the aim which all Socialists have set themselves, Marx first among them. Without the realising of this aim, true democracy, that is, equality and freedom, is unrealisable. But in practice only Soviet or proletarian democracy leads to this aim, for by drawing the mass organisations of the toilers into constant and direct participation in the administration of the state, it immediately begins to prepare for the complete dying away of any kind of state.

21. The complete bankruptcy of the socialists who met at Berne, their complete lack of understanding of the new, that is, proletarian democracy, is particularly clear from the following: On February 10, 1919, Branting opened in Berne the International Conference of the yellow International. On February 11, 1919, in Berlin, in the newspaper of its participators, *Die Freiheit*, an appeal of the party of the "Independents" to the proletariat was printed. In this appeal the bourgeois character of Scheidemann's republic is recognised and he is reproached with wishing to abolish the Soviets which are called the *Trager und Schutzer der Revolution*—the carriers and preservers of the revolution—and the proposal is made to legalise the Soviets, to give them state rights, to give them the right to hold up the decisions of the National Assembly * and to pass questions to the decision of the plebiscite.

Such a proposal is the complete ideological collapse of the theoreticians who defend democracy without understanding its bourgeois character. The comic attempt to unite the system of Soviets, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the National Assembly, that is, with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, completely exposes both the ignorance of thought of the yellow Socialists and Social-Democrats and their political reactionary character as petty-bourgeois, and their cowardly concessions to the unrestrainedly growing force of the new, proletarian democracy.

* The "pre-Parliament" elected to decide on the Constitution of the new republic.—*Ed.*

22. In condemning Bolshevism, the majority of the yellow International at Berne, which did not formally decide to vote a corresponding resolution because of its fear of the working masses, acted correctly from the class point of view. It is precisely this majority which fully agrees with the Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and with the Scheidemanns in Germany. The Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, complaining of persecution by the Bolsheviki, attempt to conceal the fact that these persecutions are caused by the participation of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries in the civil war on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. In exactly the same way the Scheidemanns and their party have already shown in Germany the same participation in civil war on the side of the bourgeoisie against the workers. It is therefore quite natural that the majority of the participators in the Berne Yellow International should be in favour of condemning the Bolsheviki. In this is expressed not the defence of "pure democracy," but the self-defence of a people who know and feel that in the civil war they stand on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

That is why from the class point of view, it is impossible not to recognise that decision of the majority of the Yellow International as being correct. The proletariat must, without fear of the truth, look at it full in the face and draw from this all the political conclusions.

Comrades! I should like to add something further to the last two points. I think that the comrades who are to make us a report about the Berne Conference will tell us about that in more detail.

Throughout the whole Berne Conference not a word was said about the significance of Soviet power. For two years now we have been discussing this question in Russia. At the Party Conference in April 1917 we had already theoretically and politically posed the question: "What is Soviet power, what is its content, what is its historical significance?" For almost two years we have been discussing this question and at our Party Congress we are adopting a resolution on it.

The Berlin *Freiheit* on February 11 published an appeal to the German proletariat which was signed not only by the leaders of the independent Social-Democrats in Germany but also by the lead-

ers of the fraction of the Independents. In August 1918, the most important theoretician of these Independents, Kautsky, wrote in his pamphlet, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, that he is a supporter of democracy and of the Soviet organs, but that the Soviets must have merely an economic significance and in no way be recognised as state organisations. Kautsky repeats this same thing in *Freiheit* for November 11 and January 12. On February 9 there appeared an article by Rudolf Hilferding, who is considered also as being one of the biggest and most authoritative theoreticians in the Second International. He also proposes to unite the system of Soviets with the National Assembly juridically, by means of state legislation. This was on February 9. On February 11, this proposal is adopted by the whole Independent Party and published in the form of an appeal.

In spite of the fact that the National Assembly is already in existence, even after "pure democracy" has been embodied in practice, even after the most important theoreticians of the Independent Social-Democrats have declared that the Soviet organisations must not be state organisations, in spite of all this—hesitation again! This proves that these gentlemen have really understood nothing about the new movement and the conditions of its struggle. But it shows something else also and that is, there must be conditions, causes which call forth such hesitation! After these events, after this now practically two years of victorious revolution in Russia, when they are proposing such resolutions to us as those which were accepted at the Berne Conference in which nothing was said about the Soviets and their importance and at which not a single delegate uttered a single word about this, we have the full right to declare that these gentlemen both as Socialists and as theoreticians are all dead for us.

But practically, from the political point of view, this, comrades, is the proof that a great change is taking place among the masses, since these Independents who were formerly theoretically and in principle against these state organisations, suddenly propose such a stupidity as the "peaceful" unification of the National Assembly with the system of Soviets, that is, the unification of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat. We see how all of them become bankrupt both in the Socialist and theo-

retical respect and what an immense change is taking place among the masses. The backward masses of the German proletariat are coming to us, have come to us! The importance of the Independent Party of the Social-Democrats, of the best part of the Berne Conference from the political and Socialist points of view, is in this way exactly equal to nothing. However, it has a certain importance still and this consists in the fact that these hesitating elements serve us as a sign of the mood of the backward sections of the proletariat. In this, I am convinced, lies the greatest historical significance of this Conference. We passed through something like it in our Revolution. Our Mensheviks passed through almost exactly the same course of development as the theoreticians of the Independents in Germany. At first, when they had the majority in the Soviets, they were for Soviets. At that time you could hear nothing but: "Long Live the Soviets!" "For the Soviets!" "The Soviets are Revolutionary Democracy!" When we, the Bolsheviks, got the majority in the Soviets then they sang quite different songs. The Soviets must not exist alongside the Constituent Assembly; * while various Menshevik theoreticians made almost the same proposals, such as the unification of the system of Soviets with the Constituent Assembly and their inclusion in the state organisation. Here it once again became clear that the general course of the proletarian revolution is the same throughout the world. At first the spontaneous formation of Soviets, then their spreading and development, and finally the appearance in practice of the question: Soviets or National Assembly, or Constituent Assembly or bourgeois parliamentarianism; the completest confusion among the leaders and finally, proletarian revolution. But I propose that after almost two years of revolution we should not put the question in such a way, but that we should bring forward concrete decisions since the spreading of the system of Soviets is for us, and especially for the majority of Western European countries, the most important task.

I should like to quote here only one resolution of the Mensheviks. I asked Comrade Obelensky to translate it into German. He promised to do so, but unfortunately it is not here. I will try to repro-

* The pre-Parliament elected in Russia in the autumn of 1917 in order to decide upon the future Constitution. The October Revolution took place before the Assembly met and it was finally dissolved by the Soviet power.—*Ed.*

duce it from memory since I do not have the complete text of this resolution.

It is very difficult for a foreigner who has heard nothing about Bolshevism to form his own opinion about our disputed questions. All that the Bolsheviks maintain is disputed by the Mensheviks, and on the contrary. Of course in time of struggle it cannot be any other way, and it is therefore very important that the last Conference of the Menshevik Party in December 1918 adopted a long, detailed resolution which was printed in full in the *Menshevik Printers' Paper*. In this resolution the Mensheviks themselves shortly explain the history of the class struggle and of the civil war. In the resolution they state that they condemn those groups of their party who are in alliance with the propertied classes in the Urals, in the South, in the Crimea and in Georgia, and they enumerate all these districts. These groups of the Menshevik Party which, in alliance with the propertied classes, marched against the Soviet power, are now condemned in a resolution, but the last point also condemns those who passed over to the Communists. From this it follows: the Mensheviks are compelled to recognise that there is no unity in their party and that they stand either on the side of the bourgeoisie or on the side of the proletariat. The greater part of the Mensheviks went over to the side of the bourgeoisie and during the civil war fought against us. We, of course, persecute the Mensheviks, we even shoot them, when in war against us they fight against our Red Army and shoot our Red commanders. We have answered the war of the bourgeoisie by the war of the proletariat—there could be no other solution. So from the political point of view all this is only Menshevik hypocrisy. Historically it is incomprehensible how at the Berne Conference people who had not officially been declared lunatics were able at the request of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, to talk about the struggle of the Bolsheviks against them but to remain silent about their struggle in alliance with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

They all bitterly attack us because we are persecuting them. This is true. But they do not say a word about the part that they have taken in the civil war! I think that I shall have to put into the minutes the complete text of the resolution, but I ask the foreign comrades to pay attention to this resolution since it is a historical

document in which the question is correctly put and which gives the best material for judging the dispute of the "Socialist" tendencies in Russia among themselves. Between the bourgeoisie and proletariat there still exists a class of people who incline now to one side, now to the other. It was so in all revolutions and it is absolutely impossible that in capitalist society, where proletariat and bourgeoisie form two hostile camps, there should not exist intermediary sections between them. The existence of these hesitating elements is historically inevitable and, unfortunately, such elements who themselves do not know on whose side they will be fighting tomorrow, will still continue to exist for a fairly long time.

I want to make a practical proposal which consists in adopting a resolution in which three points will be specially mentioned.

First: One of the most important tasks for the comrades from Western European countries lies in explaining to the masses the significance, importance and inevitability of the system of Soviets. There is not a sufficiently good understanding to be observed on this question. If Kautsky and Hilferding as theoreticians have become bankrupt, then the last articles in *Freiheit* show nevertheless that they are correctly representing the mood of the backward section of the German proletariat. And the same thing took place with us. During the first eight months of the Russian Revolution, the question of Soviet organisation was much discussed, but it was not clear to the workers what the new system consisted of and whether it was possible to create a state apparatus out of the Soviets. In our Revolution we went forward not in a theoretical way but in a practical way. For example, we did not first of all pose the question of the Constituent Assembly theoretically and we did not say that we do not recognise the Constituent Assembly. Only lately, when Soviet organisations had spread over the whole country and won political power, only then did we decide to dismiss the Constituent Assembly. We now see that in Hungary and in Switzerland the question stands much more sharply. On the one hand this is very good. We draw from this a firm conviction that the Revolution in the Western European states is moving quicker and will bring us great victories. On the other hand there is a definite danger in this, namely that the struggle will be so impetuous that the consciousness of the working masses will not keep up with such a

development. Even now the significance of the system of Soviets is still not clear for great masses of politically educated German workers since they have been brought up in the spirit of parliamentarism and of bourgeois prejudices.

Second: On the spreading of the system of Soviets. When we hear how quickly the idea of Soviets is spreading in Germany and even in England this is a most important proof for us that the proletarian revolution will conquer. Its course can only be held up for a short time. It is another matter when Comrades Albert and Platten tell us that in their countries almost no Soviets exist among the agricultural labourers and small peasantry. I read in *Rote Fahne* an article against peasant Soviets but, perfectly correctly, in favour of Soviets of labourers and village poor. The bourgeoisie and its lackeys such as Scheidemann and Co., have already put out the slogan of peasant Soviets. But we need only Soviets of labourers and village poor. Unfortunately from the reports of Albert and Platten and of others we see that, except in Hungary, very little is being done in the countryside for the spreading of the Soviet system. In this maybe there is still a practical and very great danger for the achievement of real victory by the German proletariat. Victory can only be considered as guaranteed when not only the town workers but also the country proletarians are organised, and moreover not when they are organised as they formerly were, in trade unions and co-operatives—but in Soviets. Our victory was obtained lightly because in November 1917 we went with the peasantry, with the whole of the peasantry. In this sense our revolution then was a bourgeois one. The first step of our proletarian government consisted in recognising in the law published by our government on October 26 (old style), 1917, the day following the Revolution, the old demands of the whole peasantry which had been expressed under Kerensky by the peasant Soviets and village meetings. In this was our strength and it was for this that it was so easy for us to win an overwhelming majority. For the villages, our revolution still continued for a long time to be a bourgeois one, and only later, in six months' time, we were obliged within the frame of the state organisation to lay the beginnings of the class struggle in the villages, to form in every village committees of the poor, of the semi-proletarians, and systematically

to fight against the village bourgeoisie. With us this is inevitable because of the backwardness of Russia. In Western Europe things will go in another way and we should therefore emphasise that the spreading of the system of Soviets among the village population also in corresponding and possibly new forms, is absolutely essential.

Third: We must say that the winning of a Communist majority in the Soviets is the chief task in all countries where Soviet power has not yet been victorious. Our Resolution Commission yesterday discussed this question. Perhaps other comrades will still speak on it but I should like to propose the adoption of these three points as a special resolution. Of course, we are not in a condition to dictate the line of development. It is very likely that in many Western European countries the revolution will come very quickly, but we as the organised section of the working class, in our capacity as a party, are striving and must strive to win a majority in the Soviets. Then our victory is guaranteed and no force will be in a condition to undertake anything against the Communist revolution. Otherwise victory will not be so easily obtained and will not be so lasting. So I should like to propose the adoption of these three points in the form of a special resolution.

RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT UPON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Comrade Lenin's theses which concern the attitude of the Communist International in principle towards the question of bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship are to be handed to the Bureau of the International for the widest distribution.

On the basis of these theses and the reports of the delegates from the different countries the Congress of the Communist International declares that the chief task of the Communist Parties in all countries where Soviet power does not yet exist, consists in the following:

1. The explanation to the wide masses of the working class of the historical significance and of the political and historical inevitability of the new proletarian democracy, which must be put in the place of bourgeois democracy and of parliamentarism.
2. The spreading and organisation of Soviets among the workers in all sections of industry and among the soldiers of army and

fleet, and also among the agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

3. The formation inside the Soviets of a firm Communist majority.

Pravda, March 11, 1919.

CONCLUDING SPEECH AT THE CLOSING OF THE CONGRESS, MARCH 6

If we have managed to meet in spite of all police difficulties and persecutions, if we have managed without serious disagreement to carry important decisions in a short time upon all vital questions of the present revolutionary epoch, then that is because the proletarian masses of the whole world have in practice placed these questions upon the agenda by their actions and have begun to decide them in practice.

Here we have only had to record what the masses have already won in their revolutionary struggle.

Not only in the eastern European, but also in the western European countries, not only in the vanquished countries but in the countries of the conquerors, as for example, in England, the movement in favour of Soviets spreads further and further, and this movement is nothing else but a movement with the aim of creating a new, proletarian democracy—it is the most important step forward towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, towards the complete victory of Communism.

Let the bourgeoisie of the whole world continue to rage, let it expel, put in prison, even murder Spartacists and Bolsheviks, all this will no longer help it. This will only serve to enlighten the masses, to liberate them from the old bourgeois democratic prejudices and to train them in the struggle. The victory of the proletarian revolution throughout the world is guaranteed. The formation of the International Soviet Republic is approaching (stormy applause).

WON AND RECORDED

ONLY that is firm in a revolution which has been won by the masses of the proletariat. It is only worth while recording what has really been firmly won.

The foundation of the Third Communist International in Moscow on March 2, 1919, was a record not only of what the Russians have won, but also of what the Germans, the Austrians, the Hungarians, the Finns, the Swiss—in a word, the international proletarian masses have won.

And precisely because of this the foundation of the Third Communist International is a firm affair.

Only four months ago it would have been impossible to say that Soviet power, the Soviet form of state, is an international conquest. There was something in it, and moreover something essential, which belonged not only to Russia, but also to all capitalist countries. But it was still impossible to say, until it had been tried in practice, what changes, what depth, what importance the further developments of the world revolution would bring.

The German Revolution has given this trial. An advanced capitalist country, immediately after one of the most backward, has shown the whole world in a short period, in some hundred or so days, not only the same main forces of revolution, not only its same main direction, but also the same main form of the new, proletarian democracy—the Soviets.

At the same time in England, in a victorious country, in the country which is richest in colonies, in the country which has been to the greatest extent in and served as an example of “social peace,” in the country of the oldest capitalism, we see a wide, unrestrainable, boiling and powerful growth of Soviets and of new Soviet forms of mass proletarian struggle, the Shop Stewards’ Committees.

In America, in the strongest and youngest capitalist country, there is immense sympathy of the working masses towards the Soviets.

The ice has broken.

The Soviets have conquered throughout the world.

They have conquered first of all and most of all in the respect that they have won for themselves the sympathy of the proletarian masses. This is the chief thing. No savagery of the imperialist bourgeoisie, no persecutions and murders of Bolsheviki are strong enough to take this conquest from the masses. The more the “democratic” bourgeoisie will rage, the firmer will be these conquests in the soul of the proletarian masses, in their moods, in their consciousness, in their heroic readiness to struggle.

The ice has broken.

And it is for this reason that the work of the Moscow International Conference of Communists to found the Third International has gone so easily, so smoothly, with such calm and firm decision.

We have recorded what has already been won. We have put on paper what was already firm in the consciousness of the masses. All knew—but that is little. All saw—felt, touched, each one with the experience of his own country, that here a new proletarian movement was boiling up unheard of in the world for its depth and strength, that it could be contained within no old frame, that it could not be restrained by the great masters of petty politics, nor by the world experience, world cunning of the Lloyd Georges and Wilsons of Anglo-American “democratic” capitalism, nor by the Hendersons, Renaudels, Brantings and all other heroes of social-chauvinism, even though they went through fire, water and brass trumpets.

The new movement is going towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, is going despite all hesitations, despite desperate defeats, despite the unheard of and unbelievable “Russian” chaos (if we judge from the outside—from apart), is going towards *Soviet power* with the force of a tide of millions and tens of millions of proletarians which sweeps everything from its path.

We have recorded this. In our resolutions, theses, reports and speeches we have printed what has already been won. The theory of Marxism, shown up in a vivid light from the new, world-rich experience of the revolutionary workers, has helped us to understand all the laws of what has taken place. It helps the proletariat of the whole world fighting for the overthrow of capitalist wage slavery to understand more clearly the aims of its struggle, to march more firmly along the path already marked out, more confidently and firmly to seize the victory and to consolidate the victory.

The foundation of the Third, Communist International is the forerunner of the International Republic of Soviets, of the International victory of Communism.

March 5, 1919.

Published in *Pravda*, March 6, 1919.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS PLACE IN HISTORY

THE imperialists of the Entente countries are blockading Russia, endeavouring to cut off the Soviet Republic from the capitalist world, as a centre of infection. These people who boast of the "democracy" of their institutions are so blinded by hatred towards the Soviet Republic that they do not notice how they are making themselves ridiculous. Only think: the most advanced, most civilised and "democratic" countries, armed to the teeth, and enjoying an undivided military supremacy over the world, are frightened as of fire of the *ideological* infection which proceeds from a ruined, hungry, backward, and, as they declare, even a half-savage country!

This contradiction alone opens the eyes of the labouring masses of all countries and helps to expose the hypocrisy of the imperialists Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Wilson, and their governments.

But not only the blind hatred of the capitalists towards the Soviets, but also their squabbles among themselves help us, inciting them to injure one another. They have concluded among themselves a real conspiracy of silence, being frightened more than anything else by the spreading of correct news about the Soviet Republic in general, and by its official documents in particular. However, the chief organ of the French bourgeoisie, *Le Temps*, has printed a communication about the founding in Moscow of the Third, Communist International.

We express our most respectful thanks for this to the chief organ of the French bourgeoisie, to this leader of French chauvinism and imperialism. We are ready to send to the newspaper *Le Temps*, a solemn address expressing our gratitude to it for having so successfully and cleverly assisted us.

From the way the newspaper *Le Temps* made its communication on the basis of our radio message we can see with complete clarity the motive which impelled this organ of the money bags. It wanted

to taunt Wilson, to sting him. Pray, see what kind of people you are allowing negotiations with! These clever fellows who wrote at command of the money bags do not see how their attempt to scare Wilson with the bugbear of Bolshevism is turned in the eyes of the labouring masses into an advertisement for the Bolsheviks. Once again, our respectful thanks to the organ of the French millionaires!

The foundation of the Third International took place in such a world situation that no prohibitions, no petty or wretched tricks of the imperialists of the Entente or of the lackeys of capitalism, such as Scheidemann in Germany, Renner in Austria, could prevent the news of this International from spreading and enlisting sympathy among the working class of the whole world. This situation has been created by the proletarian revolution which is clearly growing everywhere, no longer just daily but hourly. This situation has been created by the *Soviet* movement among the labouring masses, which has already reached such a strength that it has really become *international*.

The First International (1864-1872) laid the foundation of the international organisation of the workers for the preparation of their revolutionary onslaught upon capital. The Second International (1889-1914) was the International organisation of the proletarian movement, whose growth extended widely but was accompanied by a temporary lowering of the revolutionary level, and by a temporary increase in opportunism which finally led to the shameful collapse of this International.

The Third International was founded in 1918 when the many-years' process of struggle against opportunism and social-chauvinism, particularly during the war, has led to the formation of Communist parties in a number of nations. Formally, the Third International was founded at its first Congress in Moscow in March, 1919. And the most characteristic feature of this International, its mission, is to fulfil and bring to life the heritage of Marxism and to realise the century-old ideals of socialism and of the labour movement—this most characteristic feature of the Third International showed itself at once in the fact that the new, Third, "International Working Men's Association" has *already begun now to coincide* to a certain degree, with the *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*.

The First International laid the foundation of proletarian, international struggle for socialism.

The Second International was the epoch of preparing the ground for a widespread mass movement in a number of countries.

The Third International has taken over the fruits of the work of the Second International, cut off its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois filth and *has begun to realise* the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The international union of the parties which are leading the most revolutionary movement in the world, the movement of the proletariat for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, now has beneath it a base of unexampled firmness—several *Soviet Republics* which on an international scale embody in life the dictatorship of the proletariat, its victory over capitalism.

The world historical importance of the Third, Communist International consists in the fact that it has begun to bring to life Marx's greatest slogan, the slogan which sums up the century-old development of socialism and of the labour movement, the slogan which is expressed in the conception: the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This prophecy of genius, this theory of genius is becoming a reality.

These Latin words have now been translated into all the national languages of modern Europe—more than that, into all the languages of the world.

A new epoch in world history has begun.

Humanity is throwing off the last form of slavery, capitalist or wage-slavery.

In emancipating itself from slavery, humanity is for the first time approaching real freedom.

How could it happen that the first country to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat, to organise a Soviet Republic, was one of the most backward European countries? We shall hardly be mistaken in saying that it was precisely this contradiction between the backwardness of Russia and its "leap" to the highest form of democracy, through bourgeois democracy to Soviet or proletarian democracy, it was precisely this contradiction which was one of the reasons (in addition to the load of opportunist habits and philistine prejudices which lay upon the majority of the So-

cialist leaders), which slowed down and rendered it difficult for the western people to understand the rôle of the Soviets.

The working masses throughout the world caught by instinct the importance of the Soviets as weapons of struggle of the proletariat and as the form of the proletarian state. But the "leaders," spoiled by opportunism, continued and still continue to pray to bourgeois democracy, calling it "democracy" in general.

Is it astonishing that the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat has first of all shown the "contradiction" between the backwardness of Russia and its "leap" *through* bourgeois democracy? It would have been astonishing if the realisation of a *new* form of democracy had been given us by history *without* a number of contradictions.

Any Marxist, even any person acquainted with modern science in general, if you asked him: "Is the even, or harmonious and proportional transition, of different capitalist countries to the dictatorship of the proletariat likely?"—would undoubtedly have answered this question in the negative. Neither evenness, nor harmony, nor proportion have ever existed in the world of capitalism or ever could exist. Every country has developed particularly prominently either one side or feature, or group of characteristics of capitalism and of the labour movement. The process of development has gone on unevenly.

When France was going through its great bourgeois revolution, awakening the whole continent of Europe to a historically new life, England was at the head of the counter-revolutionary coalition, although at that time it was much more developed capitalistically than France. Yet the English labour movement at this period anticipated with genius a great deal of future Marxism.

When England gave the world the first wide and really mass, politically crystallised, proletarian revolutionary movement, Chartism, on the European continent in most cases feeble bourgeois revolutions were taking place, but in France there broke out the first great civil war between proletariat and bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie defeated the various national detachments of the proletariat, one by one, differently in different countries.

England served as an example of a country in which, according to Engels, the bourgeoisie, along with an aristocracy become bour-

geois, created the most bourgeois upper section of the proletariat. The advanced capitalist country for some generations was backward in the sense of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. France apparently exhausted the strength of the proletariat in two heroic revolts of the working class against the bourgeoisie in 1848 and 1871, which gave an extraordinary great deal in the world historical sense. The hegemony in the International of the labour movement next passed to Germany from the seventies of the nineteenth century, when Germany was economically behind both England and France. But when Germany surpassed both these countries economically, that is towards the second decade of the twentieth century, then at the head of the Marxist labour party of Germany, which had been an example to the world, appeared a group of arch-scoundrels, of the filthiest swine bought by the capitalists, from Scheidemann and Noske to David and Legien, of the most despicable executioners of the workers in the service of the monarchy and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

World history marches unswervingly towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it marches along paths which are far from smooth, simple or direct.

When Karl Kautsky was still a Marxist, and not the renegade from Marxism he has become in his capacity of fighter for unity with the Scheidemanns and for bourgeois democracy against Soviet or proletarian democracy, at the very beginning of the twentieth century, he wrote an article, "The Slavs and the Revolution." In this article he explained the historical conditions which pointed to the possibility of the passing of the hegemony inside the international revolutionary movement to the Slavs.

It has happened so. For a time—obviously only for a short time—the hegemony in the revolutionary proletarian International has passed to the Russians, as at different periods in the nineteenth century it was held by the English, then by the French, then by the Germans.

As I have had occasion to say more than once, in comparison with the advanced countries it was easier for the Russians to *begin* a great proletarian revolution, but it will be more difficult for them to *continue* it and bring it to final victory, in the sense of the complete organisation of socialist society.

It was easier for us to begin because in the first place, the unusual political backwardness—for twentieth century Europe—of the tsarist monarchy called forth unusual strength in the revolutionary onslaught of the masses. Secondly, the backwardness of Russia merged in an original fashion the proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie with a peasant revolution against the landlords. We started from this in October 1917 and we should not have been so easily victorious if we had not started from this. As far back as 1856, speaking of Prussia, Marx pointed out the possibility of a peculiar correlation of the proletarian revolution with a peasant war. From the beginning of 1905 the Bolsheviks upheld the idea of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Thirdly, the revolution of 1905 did an extraordinary great deal for the political education of the masses of workers and of peasants both in the sense of making the vanguard acquainted with the “last word” in socialism in the West, and also in the sense of the revolutionary *activity* of the masses. Without such a “general rehearsal” as took place in 1905, the revolutions of 1917—both the bourgeois revolution of February and the proletarian revolution of October—would have been impossible. Fourthly, the geographical conditions of Russia allowed it to hold out longer than other countries against the external superiority of the advanced capitalist countries. Fifthly, the peculiar relationship of the proletariat and the peasantry facilitated the transition from the bourgeois to the socialist revolution, facilitated the influence of the proletarians of the towns over the semi-proletarian, poorest sections of the toilers in the country. Sixthly, the long school of strike struggle and the experience of the European mass labour movement facilitated the appearance in a deep and rapidly-sharpening revolutionary situation of such an original form of proletarian revolutionary organisation as the *Soviets*.

This list is, of course, not complete. But we can limit ourselves to it meanwhile.

Soviet or proletarian democracy was born in Russia. In comparison with the Paris Commune a second world historical step was made. The proletarian-peasant Soviet Republic has become the first stable Socialist Republic in the world. It is already impossible for it to die as a *new type of state*. It is now already not standing alone.

For continuing the work of constructing socialism, in order to bring it to a conclusion, a very great deal is still called for. Soviet republics in more civilised countries, in which the proletariat has greater weight and influence, have every chance of overtaking Russia once they step onto the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The bankrupt Second International is now dying and decaying alive. It is in fact playing the rôle of servant of the international bourgeoisie. It is a real yellow International. Its most important ideological leaders such as Kautsky, are praising *bourgeois* democracy, calling it "democracy" in general or, what is still more crude and stupid, "pure democracy."

Bourgeois democracy has outlived itself, as has the Second International, having done a historically necessary and useful work, when it was a question of the preparation of the working masses within the framework of this bourgeois democracy.

The most democratic bourgeois republic has never been and never could be anything but a machine for the suppression of the toilers by capital, a tool of the political power of capital, or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The democratic bourgeois republic promised power to the majority, proclaimed it, but could never realise it so long as private property in the land and of the means of production existed.

"Freedom" in the bourgeois democratic republic was in practice freedom *for the rich*. The proletarians and labouring peasants could and should use it for preparing their forces for the overthrow of capital, the annihilation of bourgeois democracy, but *in fact* as a general rule the toiling masses under capitalism could not actually enjoy the benefits of democracy under capitalism.

For the first time in the world Soviet or proletarian democracy has created *democracy* for the masses, for the toilers, for the workers and small peasants.

There has never before in the world been such a state power of the *majority* of the population, a power of that majority *in practice*, as is the Soviet power.

It suppresses the "freedom" of the exploiters and their abettors, it takes away from them the "freedom" to exploit, the "freedom" to make profit out of hunger, the "freedom" of struggle to restore the

power of capital, the "freedom" to make agreements with the foreign bourgeoisie against the workers and peasants of their own fatherland.

Let the Kautskys defend such a freedom. To do this they must be renegades from Marxism, renegades from socialism.

The collapse of the ideological leaders of the Second International, such as Hilferding and Kautsky, has in no way been so vividly shown as in their complete incapacity to understand the meaning of Soviet or proletarian democracy, its relation to the Paris Commune, its historical place, its necessity, as the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In number 74 of the newspaper *Die Freiheit*, the organ of the "Independent" (read, petty-bourgeois, philistine, middle-class) German Social-Democracy, in the issue of February 11, 1919, there was published an appeal "To the Revolutionary Proletariat of Germany."

This appeal was signed by the executive committee of the Party and the whole of its fraction in the "National Assembly," in the German "Constituent Assembly."

This appeal accuses the Scheidemanns of trying to get rid of the Soviets and proposes—don't laugh!—to combine the Soviets with the Constituent, to give the Soviet definite state rights, a definite place in the constitution.

To reconcile, to unite the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat! How simple! What a philistine idea of genius!

It is only a pity that the united Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have already tried it in Russia under Kerensky, those petty-bourgeois democrats who call themselves Socialists.

Whoever has not understood when reading Marx that in capitalist society, on every acute occasion, at every serious conflict of classes, it is only possible to have either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, or the dictatorship of the proletariat, has understood nothing of either the economic or the political teaching of Marx.

But the profound-philistine idea of Hilferding, Kautsky and Co. of peacefully merging the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat demands a special examination if we

wish to exhaust the economic and political stupidities crowded into this remarkable and comic appeal of February 11.

We must put this off for another article.

Moscow, April 15, 1919.

First published in No. 1 of the *Communist International*, May 1, 1919.

THE HEROES OF THE BERNE INTERNATIONAL

IN the article, "The Third International and Its Place in History," I pointed out one of the outstanding manifestations of the ideological collapse of the representatives of the old, rotten "Berne" International. This collapse of the theoreticians of the reactionary socialism which does not understand the dictatorship of the proletariat, is expressed in the proposal of the German "Independent" Social-Democrats to combine, unite and join the bourgeois parliament with Soviet power.

The most prominent theoreticians of the old International, Kautsky, Hilferding, Otto Bauer and Company have not understood that they are proposing to join the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat! The people who made a name for themselves and won the sympathy of the workers by preaching the class struggle, by explaining its necessities, at the most decisive moment of the struggle for socialism have not understood that they are completely abandoning all teaching of the class struggle, that they are completely renouncing it and in practice passing into the camp of the bourgeoisie in trying to join the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This sounds unlikely, but it is a fact.

As a rare occurrence we have managed now to get in Moscow a fairly large number of foreign newspapers, though of odd issues, so that it is possible to put together in a little more detail, although, of course, far from fully, the history of the hesitations of the "Independent" gentlemen in the chief theoretical and practical question of our time. This is the question of the relationship of dictatorship (*of the proletariat*) to democracy (*bourgeois*) or of Soviet power to bourgeois parliamentarianism.

In his pamphlet *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Vienna, 1918) Mr. Kautsky wrote that "Soviet organisation is one of the most important phenomena of our times. It promises to obtain decisive importance in the great decisive battles between capital and labour towards which we are marching" (page 33 of Kautsky's pamphlet). And he added that the Bolsheviks had made a mistake in converting the Soviets from "*the militant organisation of one class*" into "*a state organisation,*" thereby "destroying democracy" (the same page).

In my pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* (Petrograd and Moscow, 1918) I have analysed this argument of Kautsky in detail and shown that it is made up of complete forgetfulness of the very foundations of the teaching of Marxism upon the state. For the state (every state, including the most democratic republic) is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another. To call the Soviets the militant organisation of a *class* and to deny them the right of becoming a "state organisation" means in *practice* to renounce the A.B.C. of socialism, to declare or to defend the inviolability of the *bourgeois machine for the suppression of the proletariat* (that is of the bourgeois democratic republic, of the bourgeois state), means in fact going over into the camp of the bourgeoisie.

The stupidity of Kautsky's position is so glaring, the onslaught of the working masses who are calling for Soviet power is so strong, that Kautsky and the Kautskyians have been forced to retreat shamefully, to fall into confusion, for they have not shown themselves able to admit honestly that they were mistaken.

On February 9, 1919, in the newspaper *Freiheit*, the organ of the "Independent" (of Marxism, but completely dependent on petty-bourgeois democracy) Social-Democrats of Germany there appeared an article by Mr. Hilferding which *already* calls for the conversion of the Soviets into state organisations, but *along with* the bourgeois parliament, with the "National Assembly," together with it. On February 11, 1919, in an appeal to the proletariat of Germany the *whole* "Independent" Party (and consequently Mr. Kautsky who has forgotten about the statement he made in the autumn of 1918) adopts this slogan.

This attempt to join the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the

dictatorship of the proletariat is a complete renunciation of Marxism and of socialism in general, it is forgetting the experience of the Russian Mensheviks and "Socialist-Revolutionaries" who from May 6, 1917, to October 25, 1917, (old style) made the "experiment" of combining the Soviets as a "state organisation" with the *bourgeois* state and failed shamefully in this experiment.

At the Party Congress of the "Independents" (at the beginning of March 1919) the whole Party adopted this position of sage combination of the Soviets with bourgeois parliamentarianism. But in No. 178 of *Freiheit*, on April 13, 1919, it is announced that the fraction of the "Independents" at the Second Congress of Soviets has proposed the resolution:

The Second Congress of Soviets is adopting the ground of the Soviet system. In accordance with this the political and economic system of Germany must be based on the organisation of Soviets. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies are the recognised representative of the toiling population in all spheres of political and economic life.

Alongside with this the same fraction proposed to the Congress a project of "directives" (*Richtlinien*), in which we read:

The Congress of Soviets has full political power. The right to elect and to be elected into the Soviets is enjoyed without distinction of sex by those who fulfil socially necessary and useful labour without exploiting other people's labour power.

We see, consequently, how the "Independent" leaders have turned out to be wretched philistines, completely dependent on the philistine prejudices of the most backward section of the proletariat. In the autumn of 1918 these leaders, through the mouth of Kautsky, renounce any conversion of the Soviets into state organisation. In March 1919 they abandon this position, hanging onto the tail of the working masses. In April 1919 they upset the decision of their own Congress, passing over completely to the position of the Communists: "All power to the Soviets!"

Such leaders are not worth much. To be an indication of the mood of the more backward section of the proletariat, going behind and not in front of the advance guard, it is not for this that leaders are needed. And these leaders are worth nothing at all for the complete lack of character with which they change their slogans. It is impossible to feel confidence in them. They will *always* be ballast, a negative quantity in the labour movement.

The most "left" of them, a certain Mr. Däumig, argued as follows at the Party Congress (see *Freiheit* of March 9) :

Däumig declares that nothing divides him from the demand of the Communists: "All power to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies." But he must appeal against the *putschism* in practice carried out by the Communist Party and against the Byzantinism which they assume in regard to the masses instead of educating them. *Putschist* disrupting activity cannot take us forward. . . .

The Germans call *putschism* what old revolutionaries in Russia fifty years ago called "outbreaks," "outbreak-fomenting," the organisation of petty conspiracies, attempts at assassination, uprisings, etc.

In accusing the Communists of "*putschism*," Mr. Däumig only proves thereby his own "Byzantinism," his servile crawling before the philistine prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie. The "leftism" of such a gentleman, which repeats a "fashionable" slogan out of cowardice before the masses, *without understanding the mass revolutionary movement*, is not worth a broken half-penny.

In Germany a powerful wave of spontaneous strike movements is taking place. There is an unheard-of revival and growth of the proletarian struggle, greater, apparently, even than there was in Russia in 1905, when the strike movement reached a height so far unparalleled in the world. To talk of "outbreak-fomenting" in the face of such a movement means that one is a hopeless tout and lackey of philistine prejudices.

The philistine gentlemen, led by Däumig, are dreaming probably of the kind of revolution (if in general they have any kind of idea in their heads about revolution) in which the masses would rise all *at once* and *completely organised*.

There are no such revolutions and there cannot be such revolutions. Capitalism would not be capitalism if it did not keep the millions of the masses of toilers, the immense majority, in oppression, down-trodden, in want and in darkness. Capitalism cannot collapse otherwise than by means of revolution which in the course of the struggle will raise masses who were hitherto unaffected. Spontaneous explosions are inevitable with the growth of revolution. Without this there has been no revolution and cannot be a revolution.

That Communists are in favour of spontaneity is a lie of Mr. Däumig, exactly the same sort of lie as we have many times heard

from the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. Communists are *not* in favour of spontaneity, do *not* stand for scattered outbreaks. Communists teach the masses organised, complete, comradely, opportune, mature action. This fact is not refuted by the philistine slanders of Messrs. Däumig, Kautsky and Co.

But the philistines are not capable of understanding that Communists consider—and quite correctly—it is their duty *to be with the struggling masses* of the oppressed and not with the heroes of philistinism who stand on one side in cowardly expectation. When the masses are struggling mistakes are inevitable in the struggle. And the Communists seeing these mistakes, explaining them to the masses, getting the mistakes corrected, unswervingly insisting on the victory of consciousness over spontaneity, *remain with the masses*. It is better to be with the struggling masses who in the course of their struggle gradually free themselves from mistakes, than with the intellectuals, the philistines, the Kautskyians, who wait on one side for “complete victory,” and this is a truth which it is not given to the Mr. Däumigs to understand.

So much the worse for them. They have already passed into the history of world revolution as cowardly philistines, reactionary whimperers, yesterday’s servants of the Scheidemanns, to-day’s preachers of “social peace,” for it is a matter of indifference whether this preaching is hidden under the form of combining a Constituent Assembly with Soviets or under the form of deep-thinking condemnation of “*putschism*.”

Mr. Kautsky has broken the record in the cause of replacing Marxism by reactionary philistine whining. He sticks to one note. He weeps over what has taken place, complains, cries, is horrified, preaches reconciliation! All his life this knight of pitiful shape has *written* about the class struggle and about socialism, but when matters have reached a maximum sharpening of the class struggle and the eve of socialism, our sage is panic-stricken, bursts into tears and appears as a common philistine. In No. 98 of the paper of the Vienna traitors to socialism, the Austerlitzes, the Renners, the Bauers (*Arbeiter Zeitung*, April 9th, 1919, Vienna, morning edition), Kautsky, for the hundredth, if not for the thousandth time brings his lamentations together:

Economic thought and economic understanding—he weeps—have been driven from the heads of all classes. . . . The long war has accustomed wide sections of the proletariat to a complete disregard for economic conditions and to a firm faith in the all-powerfulness of violence.

These are the two “little points” of our “very learned” person! “The cult of violence” and the collapse of production—that is why instead of an analysis of the *real* conditions of the class struggle he has fallen into the accustomed, old, primordial, philistine whining.

We expected—he writes—that the revolution will come as a product of the proletarian class struggle . . . but the revolution has come as a consequence of the military collapse of the ruling system in Russia and in Germany. . . .

In other words this sage “expected” a peaceful revolution! This is excellent!

But Mr. Kautsky has so lost his head that he has forgotten how he himself once wrote, when he was a Marxist, that war, most likely, will be the cause of revolution. Now in place of a calm analysis of what changes in the forms of revolution are *inevitable* as a consequence of the war, our “theoretician” weeps for his broken “expectations”!

“. . . Disregard for economic conditions from wide sections of the proletariat!”

What pitiful nonsense! How well we know that philistine song from the Menshevik newspapers of the epoch of Kerensky!

The economist Kautsky has forgotten that when a country is ruined by war, and brought to the verge of doom, that the chief, main, fundamental, “economic condition” is the *salvation of the worker*. If the working class is to be saved from famine, from downright destruction, then it will be possible to restore ruined production. But in order to save the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, the only means of preventing the burdens and consequences of the war being thrown onto the shoulders of the workers.

The economist Kautsky has “forgotten” that the question of dividing the burdens of defeat is decided by *class struggle* and that the class struggle in the situation of a completely tormented, ruined, starving, dying country *inevitably* changes its form. This is no longer class struggle for a share in production, for carrying on production (for production is at a standstill, there is no coal,

the railways are spoiled, the war has thrown people out of their stride, the machines are worn out and so on and so on), but for *salvation from famine*. Only fools, even though they are very "learned," can in such a situation "condemn" "consumer's, soldiers'" communism and superciliously teach the workers the importance of production.

It is necessary in the first place, above all, in the very first place, to save the worker. The bourgeoisie wishes to preserve its privileges, to throw all the consequences of the war upon the worker, and that means to kill the workers with hunger.

The working class wishes to be saved from hunger and in order to do this it must completely smash the bourgeoisie, *in the first place* guarantee consumption, even though a very meagre one, for otherwise it is *impossible to drag out* a semi-starved existence, it is *impossible to hang on* until production is set going again.

"Think of production!" says the well-fed bourgeois to the starving worker enfeebled by hunger, and Kautsky, repeating these songs of the capitalists in the shape of "economic science" is completely converted into a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

But the worker says: "Let the bourgeoisie also be put on the ration of semi-starvation in order that the toilers may pull themselves together, may not *perish*." "Consumers' communism" is the condition for saving the worker. It is impossible to hesitate before any sacrifices in order to save the worker! Half a pound to the capitalists, a pound to the worker—this is the way it is necessary to get out of the condition of famine, of ruin. The consumption of the starving worker is the foundation and condition for the restoration of production.

Clara Zetkin was quite right in saying to Kautsky that he "is *going over to bourgeois political economy*. Production is for man, not the contrary. . . ."

The independent Mr. Kautsky, weeping over "the cult of violence," has shown exactly the same dependence on petty-bourgeois prejudices. When even in 1914 the Bolshevik Party pointed out that the imperialist war will be turned into a civil war, Mr. Kautsky was silent, while remaining in one party with David and Co., who had declared this forecast (and this slogan) to be "madness." Kautsky absolutely did not understand the inevitability of the con-

version of the imperialist war into a civil war and now throws his lack of understanding onto both of the sides struggling in the civil war! Surely this is an example of reactionary philistine stupidity?

But if in 1914 failure to understand that the imperialist war must inevitably be turned into a civil war was *merely* philistine stupidity, now, in 1919, it is already something worse. It is treachery to the working class. For civil war both in Russia, and in Finland, and in Latvia, and in Germany, and in Hungary, *is a fact*. Hundreds and thousands of times in his former works Kautsky recognised that historical periods occur when the class struggle is inevitably converted into civil war. This has come, and Kautsky has turned out to be in the camp of the hesitating, cowardly petty-bourgeoisie.

The spirit inspiring Spartacus is in essence the spirit of Ludendorff. . . . Spartacus is not only bringing about the doom of its own cause but strengthening the policy of violence of the majority Socialists. Noske is the antithesis of Spartacus. . . .*

These words of Kautsky (from his article in the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*) are so utterly stupid, base and vile that it is sufficient just to point at them. A party which tolerates such leaders is a rotten party. The Berne International, to which Mr. Kautsky belongs, must be judged by us as it deserves, from the point of view of these words of Kautsky, as a yellow International.

As a curiosity we will also mention the argument of Mr. Haase in his article on "The International at Amsterdam" (*Freiheit* May 4, 1919). Mr. Haase boasts that on the colonial question he proposed a resolution by which

a League of Nations, organised according to the proposal of the International . . . will have the task, before the *realisation of socialism* (note this!) . . . of administering the colonies in the first place in the interests of the natives, and afterwards in the interests of all the people united in the League of Nations. . . .

Is not this really a pearl? *Before* the realisation of socialism *the colonies will be administered*, according to the resolution of this sage, not by the bourgeoisie but by some kind, just, sweet "League of Nations"! How is this different in practice from decorat-

* Kautsky refers to the Spartacus League founded by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.—*Ed.*

ing up the vilest capitalist hypocrisy? And these are the "left" members of the Berne International. . . .

In order that the reader may more clearly compare the full stupidity, baseness and vileness of the writings of Haase, Kautsky and Co. with the real situation in Germany, I will bring forward one other quotation.

The famous capitalist Walter Rathenau has published a book, *The New State*. The book is dated March 24, 1919. Its theoretical value is absolutely nil. But as an observer, Walter Rathenau is compelled to recognise the following:

We, a people of poets and thinkers, are philistines by our secondary occupation. . . .

To-day idealism is found only among the extreme Monarchists and the Spartacists.

The bare truth is as follows: we are going towards a dictatorship, either a proletarian or a pretorian one.

This bourgeois evidently imagines himself to be as "independent" of the bourgeoisie as Messrs. Kautsky and Haase imagine themselves to be "independent" of petty-bourgeois philistinism.

But Walter Rathenau is head and shoulders above Karl Kautsky, for the latter whines, hiding himself in cowardly fashion from "the bare truth," while the former recognises it directly.

May 28, 1919.

First published in No. 2 of the *Communist International*, June 1, 1919.

ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL *

COMRADES, we have not succeeded in gathering together at the first Congress of the Communist International the representatives of all the countries where there are true friends of this organisation, where there are workers whole-heartedly sympathising with us. Allow me, therefore, to begin with a small quotation which will show you how in fact we have more friends than we can see or than we know, or than we can gather together here in Moscow,

* Speech at Special United Session of the Moscow Soviet, the Moscow Committee of the R.C.P. and the Moscow Trade Unions and Factory Committees in honour of the opening of the Communist International on March 6, 1919.

despite all the persecutions, despite the complete unification of the bourgeoisie of the whole world which appears all-powerful. These persecutions have gone so far that they have tried to surround us by a Chinese Wall and that they are deporting Bolsheviks in tens and dozens from the freest republics in the world, being absolutely afraid that ten or a dozen Bolsheviks are capable of infecting the whole world—but we know, however, that this fear is comic, for they have already infected the whole world, the struggle of the Russian workers has already caused the working masses of all countries to know that here in Russia the fate of the general world revolution is being decided.

Comrades, here I have in my hands the newspaper *L'Humanité* * a French newspaper whose tendency is rather sympathetic to our Mensheviks or right Socialist-Revolutionaries. During the war this newspaper slandered the people who stood for our point of view in the most merciless way. To-day this newspaper is supporting those who during the war went with the bourgeoisie of "their" country. And here this newspaper in its number of January 13, 1919, relates that in Paris there was, as the newspaper recognises, an immense meeting of workers and members of the party of the Syndicalists of the Seine Federation, that is of the district near to Paris, the centre of the proletarian movement, the centre of the whole political life of France. At this meeting the first speaker was Bracq who throughout the war stood on the point of view of our Mensheviks and right defensists. He held himself now quieter than water, lower than the grass. Not a word did he say about any burning question! He finished by saying he is against the interference of the government of his country in the struggle of the proletariat of other countries. The words were drowned in applause. Later one of his fellow thinkers, a certain Pierre Lavalle, spoke. It was a question of demobilisation, of the most burning question in present-day France, the country which has perhaps suffered the greatest number of victims of any country in this criminal war. And this country now sees that demobilisation is being delayed, is being drawn out, that there is no desire to carry it out, and that a new war is being pre-

* At this time *L'Humanité* was in the hands of the Right Wing of the French Socialist Party. After the defeat of this section at the Congress of Tours in 1920 it became the organ of the Communist Party.—*Ed.*

pared, which will clearly impose fresh victims on the French workers over the question of how much booty the French or English capitalists are still to get. And here this paper declared that the crowd refused to listen to the speaker Pierre Laval, that his statements hostile to Bolshevism called forth such protests, created such disturbance, that the meeting could not continue. After this, citizen Pierre Renaudel could not get the platform and the meeting finished with a short intervention from citizen Periq. He is one of those few representatives of the French labour movement who is in the main in agreement with us. And so the newspaper is forced to admit that the meeting would not allow a speaker to go on as soon as he spoke against the Bolsheviks.

Comrades, at present we were unable to get a single delegate directly from France and only one Frenchman was able to get here with great difficulty—Comrade Guilbaux. He will speak to-day. He has been for months in the prisons of Switzerland, in that free republic, and he was accused of having relations with Lenin and preparing a revolution in Switzerland. He was brought through Germany with an escort of gendarmes and officers who were evidently afraid that he might light a match which would burn up Germany. But Germany is burning without such a match. And in France, as we see, there are sympathisers with the Bolshevik movement. The French masses are, perhaps, one of the most experienced, politically the most educated, the most lively and responsive of masses, they do not allow a speaker at a popular meeting to go upon even one false note, they stop him. In fact it is lucky if, seeing the French temperament, they don't turn him off the platform! Therefore when a newspaper hostile to us recognises what took place at this great meeting, we say: the French proletariat is for us.

I will give one other short quotation from an Italian paper. To such an extent do they try to cut us off from the whole world that we get copies of the Socialist newspapers of other countries only as great rarities. As a rarity a number of the Italian newspaper *Avanti*, has reached us, the organ of the Italian Socialist Party which took part in the Zimmerwald Conference, which fought against the war and which to-day has declared that it refuses to go to the Congress of the yellow Socialists in Berne, to the Congress

of the old International, in which are participating people who with their governments assisted in dragging out this criminal war. Up to now the newspaper called *Avanti* has come out under strict censorship. But here in this number which we have received accidentally, I read a correspondent's message on the party life of some little place called Cavriago—it must be an out of the way place since it is impossible to find it on the map—and it appears that the workers at a meeting there adopted a resolution expressing sympathy to their newspaper for its uncompromising attitude and declaring their approval of the German Spartacists, and further there occur words which, although they are printed in Italian can be understood throughout the world: "*Sovietisti russi*," they greet the "Russian sovietists" and express the desire that the programme of the Russian and German revolutionaries should be adopted throughout the world and serve to lead the struggle against the bourgeoisie and military rule to a conclusion. And here when you read such a resolution from some Italian hamlet, then you can with full justification say to yourself: the Italian masses are for us, the Italian masses have understood what are the Russian "sovietists," what is the programme of the Russian "sovietists" and of the German Spartacists. But at that time they did not have such a programme! We had no common programme with the German Spartacists, but the Italian workers reject everything they have seen in their bourgeois press which, bribed by the millionaires, is spreading slander about us in millions of copies. It did not deceive the Italian workers. The Italian workers understood what are Spartacists and "sovietists" and declared that they sympathised with their programme—even when this programme was still completely non-existent. That is why our task was so easy at this Congress. We only had to write down as a programme what was already imprinted in the consciousness and on the hearts of workers even hidden away in some hamlet, cut off from us by police and military cordons. That is why we were able so easily and with such complete unanimity to come to a unanimous decision on all important questions and we have full confidence that these decisions will encounter a powerful response among the proletariat of all countries.

The Soviet movement, comrades, is that form which was won in Russia, which is now spreading throughout the world, which

by its name alone gives the workers a whole programme. Comrades, I hope that we, who have had the great happiness of developing the Soviet form to victory, that we shall not fall into the position of people of whom it might be said that they have become swell-headed.

Comrades, we know very well that we were the first to take part in a Soviet proletarian revolution not because we alone were prepared, or better prepared than other workers, but because we were worse prepared. It was precisely this circumstance which brought it about that before us there was the most savage, the most rotten enemy, it was precisely this circumstance which caused the outward scale of our Revolution. But we also know that with us the Soviets exist up to the present time, that they are fighting against gigantic difficulties which are caused by an insufficient cultural level and by the burden which has fallen upon us for more than a year of standing at our post alone while we are surrounded on all sides by enemies and while, as you perfectly well know, unbelievable torment, the pains of hunger, and savage sufferings have afflicted us.

Comrades, those people who directly or indirectly are on the side of the bourgeoisie frequently try to appeal to the workers and cause discontent among them by pointing out what heavy sufferings are being inflicted now upon the workers. But we say to them: Yes, these sufferings are heavy, and we do not conceal them from you. We speak in this way to the workers and they know it firmly from their own experience. You see we are fighting not only for the victory of socialism for ourselves, not only that our children may remember the capitalists and landlords as prehistoric monsters—we are fighting in order that the workers of the whole world may be victorious with us.

And this first Congress of the Communist International which declared that throughout the world the Soviets are winning the sympathies of the workers, shows us that the cause of the victory of the international Communist revolution is guaranteed (applause). The bourgeoisie will still rage in a number of countries, the bourgeoisie there is only beginning to prepare the doom of the best people, of the best representatives of socialism, as is shown by the savage murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht by White Guards. Such victims are inevitable. We do not seek an agree-

ment with the bourgeoisie, we are going into the last, decisive fight with it. But we know that, after the torments, sufferings and privations of war, when the masses throughout the world are struggling for demobilisation, they consider themselves deceived, they understand how an unbelievable burden of taxation is being thrown on them by the capitalists who slaughter tens of millions of people to see who should get most profit, we know that the hour of the rule of these robbers has passed!

To-day, when the word "Soviet" has become understood by all, the victory of the Communist revolution is certain. The comrades who are present in this hall saw how the first Soviet Republic was formed. They now see how the Third, Communist International has been formed [applause]. They will all see how the World Federal Republic of Soviets will be formed [applause].

BY AND ABOUT LENIN

LENIN ON THE JEWISH QUESTION, a compilation	\$0.05
LENIN ON THE WOMAN QUESTION, by Clara Zetkin	0.05
MEMORIES OF LENIN, by N. K. Krupskaya. The standard biography of Lenin, in two volumes, each	0.75
DAYS WITH LENIN, by Maxim Gorky	0.25
REMINISCENCES OF LENIN, by Clara Zetkin	0.20
FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM, by Joseph Stalin	0.40
THE COLLECTED WORKS OF V. I. LENIN. The 8 volumes thus far published, containing explanatory notes and ma- terials, have been issued in a special popular edition, at \$11.75 for the whole set.	

THE LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

These volumes contain Lenin's shorter writings as well as selections from his writings dealing with special topics. The little books are well printed and strongly bound.

1. THE TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX\$0.15	10. THE APRIL CONFERENCE ... 0.20
2. THE WAR AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL 0.20	11. THE THREATENING CATAS- TROPHE AND HOW TO FIGHT IT 0.20
3. SOCIALISM AND WAR 0.15	12. WILL THE BOLSHEVIKS RE- TAIN STATE POWER? 0.15
4. WHAT IS TO BE DONE?... 0.50	13. ON THE EVE OF OCTOBER... 0.15
5. THE PARIS COMMUNE 0.20	14. STATE AND REVOLUTION ... 0.30
6. THE REVOLUTION OF 1905.. 0.20	15. IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STATE OF CAPITALISM 0.30
7. RELIGION 0.15	16. LENIN, BY JOSEPH STALIN...0.10
8. LETTERS FROM AFAR 0.15	
9. THE TASKS OF THE PROLE- TARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION 0.15	

Write for free catalog to

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 FOURTH AVENUE NEW YORK