

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 70

PRESS

9th October 1928

CORRESPONDENCE

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

The Results of the VI. World Congress of the C. I.

Report by Comrade BUKHARIN to the Party Functionaries of the Moscow Organisation of the C. P. S. U.

I.

General Characterisation of the VI. Congress and its Work.

Comrades. The Congress which has just ended will live in the history of the Communist movement as one of the most important of its congresses. The agenda of the Congress consisted of five points: 1. The international situation and the tasks of the Communist International; 2. Methods of the struggle against the danger of imperialist war; 3. The programme of the Communist International; 4. The colonial question; 5. The situation in the Soviet Union and in the C. P. S. U. Other questions, of lesser importance, included applications from various expelled groups for readmittance into the Comintern, enrolment of new parties, etc. About 500 comrades took part in the work of the Congress. It is interesting to note that the composition of the Congress itself mirrored its really international and revolutionary character. If we compare the composition of the II. International in its best days (the time of the Stuttgart Congress 18th/24th August 1907) with that of the VI. Comintern Congress, we find the following:

Total Number of delegates	Delegates from non-European countries		Delegates from dependent and colonial countries	
	in absolute figures	in percentages	in absolute figures	in percentages
Stuttgart 884	28	3%	5	0.5%
Moscow 515.	100	20%	74	14.4%

The percentage of "non-Europeans" at the Moscow Congress was therefore six times as great as the corresponding percentage at Stuttgart, and the proportion of representatives of colonial and dependent countries in Moscow 28 times as great as the corresponding number at the Stuttgart Congress. If we include in our comparison the Brussels congress of the II. International, we find that the colonial countries were scarcely represented there at all, unless we count those few guests who expressed their indignation at the "work" of the congress in the colonial question.

The work of the Congress lasted a considerable time. The Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung" finds this a suitable opportunity for innuendos gratifying to the international police and elegant fools of imperialist diplomacy. No. 248 of this newspaper publishes an article containing the following gem:

"Six weeks long the Congress of the Communist International has been sitting in Moscow. To be sure, if one has the resources of a great state behind one, it is easy to enjoy the luxury of a lengthy congress, visited by hundreds of delegates."

It is scarcely necessary to reply to what Marx would have called a "bug-bite", or "literary barking". What is essential is the fact that the tasks of the Congress were so complicated and vast that they could not be accomplished in a shorter time. And no Congress has ever achieved such efficient inner work, efficient in the sense that every question has been made the actual subject of collective consultation. A few figures suffice to show this. The discussion on the first point of the agenda (international situation and tasks of the Comintern) was taken part in by over 90 speakers. The programme question was debated more exhaustively than any question has ever before been debated at our Congresses. The Programme Commission was the scene of detailed discussion on the programme, every participant, even those not members of the Congress, being given the opportunity of free expression of opinion. An enormous amount of work has also been done with regard to other important questions: the colonial question, the war question, etc. Much of this work is not even observable from outside, being carried out in special commissions.

When we inquire into the general character of the work of the Congress, we find that the level of principle maintained by the Congress with respect to the questions on its agenda

has been extremely high. Such an important question as that of the programme, indeed, demands a high level of discussions. It is not a transient political question, not a question confronting us today and gone tomorrow, appearing on the political horizon only to vanish without leaving a trace. The manner in which this one question was approached suffices to characterise the Congress. Many comrades expressed the opinion that it would have been better for the Congress to confine its work to the first point of the agenda and to the programme, since these two questions alone represented ample work for a whole congress. Could we have devoted the whole of our time to these two points, it would have been most advantageous. But a considerable period has elapsed since the V. Congress, and we have had to summarise the results of a **great historical period**, filled with events of extreme political importance. We find ourselves in the midst of such important phenomena as the changed character of the general crisis of capitalism; we have witnessed

many magnificent struggles of the working class — the great Chinese revolution; the whole political and economic face of the world is changing, the fundamental relations among the powers of the capitalist world, between them and the colonies, between them and the Soviet Union, are shifting; and at the same time we witness the growth and advancement of the country in which Socialism is being built up. This country is faced by fresh difficulties and fresh tasks; great changes have taken place in the camp of our enemies, both among the imperialists of the “purest water” and among their social-democratic agents. The fact therefore, that the VI. Congress set itself the task of establishing our programme, and the fact that we have had to lay down our tactics on the basis of a summary of the events of a great historical period — these facts impart a peculiarly fundamental character to the work of the VI. Congress.

II.

The Programme of the Communist International.

a) The Form of the Programme.

First of all I should like to speak of the programme. In the discussion on the programme (in the press and at the Congress itself) there was raised the question of the form of the programme: if it should be long or short, if it should be in the form of a manifesto or in the usual form, if it is possible or not for it to be given a popular form in the widest sense of the word. A number of comrades have advanced decidedly categorical demands on these points, which may be formulated as follows: The programme must be as short as possible, only a few pages; it must be expressed in the briefest terms; it must be so popular in form that — to use the words of one comrade — every word can be understood by an Egyptian fellah, that is, by the most backward colonial peasant. The comrades making these demands substantiate them by references to Marx, Engels, and Lenin. But these demands, however attractive and plausible, possess “only” one drawback — they are impossible of execution. Even the most convinced advocates of brevity, popularity, etc., must admit that their actual proposals tend to **lengthen** the programme. The first draft, published in the “Pravda”, emerged from the melting furnace of the Congress with a number of additions, corrections, and re-arrangements of material, **longer** than before, not shorter. The fact is that those comrades who demand from us such excellent things as popularity and brevity, leave out of account the times in which we live, and what special organisation the programme is meant to serve.

Up to the present no Party document has existed formulating the ideological and tactical principles of the totality of all parties belonging to the international revolutionary mass movement. The II. International has never been able to formulate such a document, and is less able than ever at the present time, for the disagreements among its own sections are so great that it dare not even raise the question of a common formulation, but must replace this by empty and lying declamations. At our last two Congresses (IV. and V.), and the present one, therefore, we actually made the **first attempt** to formulate an international programme. It is precisely this circumstance which makes the above-mentioned demands impossible of fulfilment. We must remember what our international programme must represent. We are living under extremely complicated conditions, in an epoch of extraordinarily variegated international and national relations, amidst events causing the world revolution to mature at varying speeds and in different ways in the separate countries, whilst it has already gained the victory in the Soviet Union. The Congress, in drawing up a programme, and not merely a statement of principles, for several dozen Parties could not simply make use of such all-embracing terms as “capitalism” for instance. The capitalism of the United States is in the midst of one stage of development, that of China in quite another, that of Spain or Poland again in another. We must take into account all these varying conditions of development, for our programme today, in the era of the struggle for power, must contain at least the outlines of the

fighting conditions, the aims and the standards of the struggle in countries of different types.

Under these circumstances it is self-evident that the programme of the Communist International cannot be compressed into “six short pages”; nor can it, even when permitted greater dimensions and kept as popular in tone as possible, hope to lay any great claim to actual popularity. It requires suitable explanations, commentary, etc. It requires a whole series of pamphlets, devoted solely to the programme.

b) The International Character of the Programme.

What is the fundamental feature of the accepted programme? The fundamental features of the whole programme is its **international character**. The types of programme to which we have been accustomed, the programmes of the individual “national” Parties, could of course never possess this feature. The international motif is the peculiar characteristic of the Comintern programme, and runs through it from beginning to end, from the introduction to the closing sentences. This is forcibly expressed in its attitude towards world capitalism of today, with which it does not deal in the abstract, but purely in the concrete. It analyses the reciprocal effects of the various parts of present-day world economy; the Soviet Union is subjected to a special analysis, but again in relation to the hostile capitalist countries. When the programme speaks of the revolutionary proletariat, it stresses the **international character** of the revolutionary process and defines it as it really is, that is, not as an entity uniform and simple in every part, not as a process free of all complications, but as a process exceedingly diversified in its parts, **profoundly complicated, and with developments running by no means parallel**. The revolutionary process is multifarious, for it consists of proletarian insurrections, as well as colonial revolts and wars of national emancipation. It is multifarious, it matures here and there at different times, but however different the manifestation or moment of revolutionary advance, from the historically objective standpoint every part of the process goes to form one uniform whole, working towards one end and aim, the destruction of the capitalist order and its substitution by the new socialist order already being built up in the Soviet Union. The international character of our programme is again emphasised in its **definition of our ultimate goal**, the communist state of society. The programme speaks of the **world system of Communism**, of the distribution of productive forces to the various countries, etc. It speaks of the **world dictatorship** of the proletariat, consisting of the dictatorships in the different countries, and of dictatorships which are not actualised all at once: In some countries revolution passes through a number of intermediate stages, developing gradually into proletarian revolution. The programme determines at the same time its “demands”. It provides different stages of development of the revolutionary process for various types of countries. In this the programme achieves a broad survey of the development of

the international revolutionary process from the standpoint of its movement forward in the direction of the world dictatorship of the working class. This international motif of the programme determines at the same time its "demands". It sets different tasks for the colonial countries and for the more developed countries, but this does not by any means signify that these different tasks lead in different directions. On the contrary, they all proceed along the same path, the path to the world dictatorship of the proletariat. In the programme the Congress has also given us a criticism of the anti-communist ideologies which are still only too prevalent among the working masses in different countries. In our International we unite not only the revolutionary section of the European proletariat; the Communist International now sends its message to the uttermost ends of the earth, penetrates into the remotest regions, and leavens the masses of the most backward proletarian and working classes. Therefore, our programme differs from the old programmes, which are adapted chiefly to the needs of the European working class, in dealing with even such currents as Sun-Yat-Senism in China, Ghandiism in India, Garveyism among the Negroes of North America. Our programme is a generalisation of revolutionary experience, not only of that gained by the industrial workers of Europe and America, but by the Chinese proletariat, by the first steps of the Indian labour movement and by those proletarian strata which social-democracy regards as outside the pale of "civilised" workers.

The theoretical organ of Austrian social-democracy, "Der Kampf", publishes in its August issue a leading article to the effect that the social democrats are actually ready to extend their "spiritual friendship" to even the proletariat of the backward colonial countries. This is the standpoint of the European lord who resolves, with some repugnance, to admit these "dirty" folk into his house. Our standpoint is the standpoint of the revolutionist who fully realises that unless the broadest masses of the working class and the toilers of every race and every continent join us in the struggle, we shall never overthrow international imperialism; that our strongest force, the actual guarantee of our final victory, lies in our ability to hurl upon imperialism the irresistible avalanche of the suppressed and humiliated colonial masses.

Therefore, the international motif of our programme is the fundamental principle of the whole programme of the Comintern. The content of our programme makes it the programme of the struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat.

c) Our Programme — the Programme of Struggle for the World Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

There is a story in which a revolutionary sailor is always insisting that things are to be carried out "on an international scale". (Laughter.) In this comical characteristic: "on an international scale", there is nevertheless great revolutionary pathos, the expression of which is already moving great masses of the international working class.

We regard our task of accomplishing the world revolution as a practical task. We are carrying out this task under the conditions given by the general crisis in capitalism, by the fact that a proletarian dictatorship already exists in the Soviet Union, and by the mass movements in the colonial countries. This estimation of the present epoch as an epoch of struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat forms the dividing line separating our programme from the programmes of all reformist socialist parties.

As early as the beginning of the war, at the time when "international" social democracy capitulated so ignominiously and deplorably, a pamphlet was written by one of the greatest social democratic theoreticians, Heinrich Cunow, having for its object the definite rupture with every remnant of the revolutionary "illusions" still cherished by various circles of pre-war social democracy.

In this pamphlet H. Cunow presented the position as follows: All the talk about socialism being imminent is unfounded; capitalism is still at the height of its power; there are many countries in which capitalism has new achievements ahead; we must look things in the face; even the world war does not mean the collapse of world capital; the war brings with it a fresh period of intense capitalist development everywhere; capitalism is just entering the supreme stage of its prosperity and

might. At this juncture there can be no thought of the struggle for power; that is the Utopian delusion of the dreamer.

H. Cunow's theory was eminently adapted to "justify" the despicable retreat of social democracy at the time. It might, however, have been supposed that the whole of the post-war period would have relegated this theory to the lumber heap. But now, after a considerable lapse of time, this theory has been refurbished up again, and not by Cunow, who was and remains a Right social democrat, but by the "Left" social democrats, the Austro-Marxists.

The publication "Der Kampf", which I have already mentioned, has published a number entirely dedicated to the Brussels Congress, and in this Cunow's theory is repeated word for word. Allow me to quote a passage from the leading article, written by Oskar Pollak. He writes:

"Capitalism has overcome the convulsions of the war and post-war periods. The world has become stabilised again since the war.

"In the Far East we see national revolution striding over vast territories. Industrial revolution marches across Asia, overthrowing the ancient civilisations in its path and absorbing these gigantic territories in capitalist economy. Millions of people are passing through bourgeois revolution, are wrestling for national freedom and independence. The proletariat, still confined within the boundaries of the developing bourgeois order, is taking its first tentative steps towards its constitution as a class.

"The whole of the European East, headed by the vast lands of Russia, has experienced a fundamental redistribution of the soil. In a territory inhabited by two-fifths of European humanity, agrarian revolution has shattered feudal land ownership, bourgeois revolution has been consummated in many new states, and the peasantry (a class hitherto without history) awakened to political action.

"In Central Europe the working class has completed the bourgeois revolution begun in 1848, overthrown the compromise between the capitalist bourgeoisie and the feudal monarchy, and created the democratic republic under the pressure of the working class.

"In the European West, in the countries of the old democracy, where the bourgeois revolution has long since been accomplished and complete political freedom attained, the great war brought no change in the economic or the state order. Capitalism stands as firmly as before; the working class is fighting its way slowly forward to majority and power.

"On the other side of the ocean a new power is growing, gathering force, arming. American imperialism extends its tentacles far beyond its own frontiers, and is preparing to subordinate the world economically and politically to its rule."

At a cursory glance it would seem that all this is true enough: The revolution in the East, the abolition of landownership, the extermination of Tsarism in Russia. But look more closely and see "wherein the meaning of the whole philosophy lies". The meaning of this estimate of our epoch is that **no proletarian dictatorship exists, nor can exist for a long time to come.** The worthy "Kampf" believes that all that has been achieved during and since the war is the **completion of the bourgeois revolution** i. e. of that which the great French revolution accomplished in France more than one hundred years ago and the English revolution accomplished in England as early as the seventeenth century. The post-war period is the period of the completion of bourgeois revolution, and **nothing more.** There is no thought of any proletarian revolution having taken place in the Soviet Union. All that has happened in one-time tsarist Russia is an agrarian revolution overthrowing landownership, carried out by the peasantry, and not involving the working class at all. This same estimate is made of the movements in the East, whose sole task appears to be to clear the path for capitalist development.

In order to bring these opportunist theses in any way in harmony with reality one must obviously do violence to this reality or to its most important facts. And that is just what social democracy — and "left" social democracy, to boot — presents as its theory. The October revolution cannot

be "denied", therefore why not classify it under the heading of bourgeois revolution? The existence of conflicts between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries cannot be "contested". Why not include them under "conflicts between imperialist coalitions?" There is no gainsaying the fact of the influence of the Soviet Union over the colonies, especially over England's greatest colony — why not have the impudence to refer to the policy of the Soviet Union as the "continuation" of tsarist designs on India? And so forth. Here there is a radical and unbridged difference in the whole estimation of the epoch, in the judgment of the rôle being played by capitalism, in the judgment of the Soviet Union; a difference of necessity involving deviating estimates of the tasks of the working class, of the perspectives of development in general and of the colonies in particular!

At the same time it is characteristic that the social democrats, when forming their present estimate of capitalist development, from the capitalist point of view, are much more optimistic than the leading ideologists of the bourgeoisie itself. If I am not mistaken, I quoted at the 15th Party Congress one such leading bourgeois scholar, Sombart, who had said that capitalism is already feeling the effects of old age, that it has "white hair", that it is losing its teeth. Bernhard Harms, a specialist of some note in international economy, is of the opinion that Europe is falling into senility, that it has much in common with classic Rome on the eve of its decline. Professor Mises, whom another equally "first class" German bourgeois economist, Adolf Weber, described as "the most penetrating critic of collective economy" ("Allgemeine Volkswirtschaftslehre"), writes in his work on collective economy: "The world is moving towards Socialism, for the reason that the overwhelming majority of humanity wish it". Professor Schmalenbach (see his article on "Fettered Capitalism", Vossische Zeitung No. 225) observes with regret the enormous spread of monopolist decay, the parasitism, the growing degeneration of the captains of industry.

This whole constellation of bourgeois ideologists of the best imperialist brand deem it their duty to break into lamentations over the crisis of capitalism, whilst the social democratic leaders are beside themselves with joy at the present "flourishing condition" of capitalism and its brilliant prospects. Karl Renner beats every record in this respect (see his article on: "The international economic bases of socialist policy after the war". "Der Kampf. No. 8,9.) He prophesies joyfully:

"It (socialism. N. B.) should not be erected over a heap of ruins, but should fall as overripe fruit of capitalism into the hands of the working class (underlined by the author). Steadily growing wealth, not general impoverishment must bring socialism! It must inherit a paradise from capitalism, not a workhouse".

Capitalism is to develop first into a paradise for the working class, and then depart, leaving socialism to inherit this paradise. Now we comprehend why the birds of paradise of capitalism, ex-minister Renner and his like, are so zealous in building up this capitalist paradise. But it becomes the more incomprehensible why this paradisaical capitalism should make way for socialism.

Our programme here is diametrically opposed to the theoretical principles of social democracy, and sees in the present epoch the epoch of proletarian revolution, of struggle for power, of struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

d) Imperialism, Socialism, and the Perspectives of Colonial Revolutions.

What does the social democratic standpoint signify? It signifies that capitalism still plays a progressive rôle, that it has still much before it, that the working class is still far from the task to break the neck of the capitalist order. Hence the programmatic viewpoint of the II. International in the colonial question. Seen from this viewpoint, it appears simply Utopian, stupid, and absurd, even to raise the question of omitting the capitalist phase of development in the colonies, or of abbreviating it to a minimum.

The thesis of the possibility of the non-capitalist development of the colonies is pure heresy, a Bakunian phantasy, or as Plechanov once said of Lenin's standpoint, a barbaric mixture of dream and farce.

We receive full instruction on this point from Herr Dan, backbone and pillar of all Russian Menshevist wisdom. In his article on the Brussels congress of the II. International ("Soz. Westnik". No. 16/17) Dan estimates the Eastern revolutions as follows:

"Whilst international capital is finding in the beginning industrialisation of these (colonial N. B.) countries a powerful aid for its reinforcement, and for the exercise of pressure on the labour movement in countries with advanced capitalism, the workers of China, India, etc. are taking their first steps towards class formation and class struggle. They are handicapped in these first steps by delusive and misleading illusions, from which the proletariat of Western Europe has only freed itself after decades of hardest historical experience".

Cussow, Renner, & Co., destroy the "illusion" that it is possible for the proletariat to conquer power in the centres of capitalist industry, in the most important junctions of the capitalist system. Dan & Co. then join in the chorus and destroy the "illusion" that there is any possibility for the colonies to break the bounds of capitalism. It is a perversion of truth, a playing with marked cards, to designate us as "Narodniki" or "Bakunists" in this connection. On the contrary, it is we who defend the most orthodox views here. Marx never and nowhere laid down the thesis that every country is absolutely bound to undergo a phase of capitalist development before it is to undertake the task of transition to the social state of society. Marx was a revolutionist, and Marx sought for a historical combination of circumstances enabling the capitalist phase to be "skipped". He was very far from holding the general and universal theory that all nations and countries, whatever their historical environment, are bound to march through history like Prussian soldiers, one and all passing through the fumigating furnace of capitalism before they may enter the socialist paradise. (At that time Mr. Renner's formula of the capitalist paradise was not yet known on our planet). In a word, Marx himself shared those "illusions" on the conquest of power, the overthrow of the capitalist state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc., to which Renner, Cunow, and the rest of the high priests, magicians, and bards of the capitalist "order" so strongly object. According to Marx, a situation is possible in which the special historical conditions, that is, the special historical "environment", can promote the immediate transition of a pre-capitalist social economic state of society to socialism. One of the first of these historical conditions is the aid of the victorious proletariats of other countries. When Russia was on the threshold of its development, Marx and Engels saw it with these eyes. Marx, in his well-known letter to the editors of the "Vaterländische Aufzeichnungen", wrote as follows on the "fate of capitalism in Russia".

"... If Russia is anxious to become a capitalist nation on the pattern of the West European nations — and Russia has shown no little anxiety in this direction during the last few years — it will not accomplish this without first transforming a great part of its peasantry into proletarians; and then, once in the fold of the capitalist order, it will be subject to its inexorable laws like any other profane nation. That is all! But for my critic it is too little. He is determined to convert my outline of the rise of capitalism in Western Europe into a historically philosophical theory of the general course of economic development, into a theory to which every people is inevitably destined to subordinate itself, whatever the historical conditions under which it exists, in order that a form of economy may be reached securing the greatest freedom for the development of the productivity of social labour, and the general development of human beings. But I must ask him to excuse me. This would be too much honour for me, and would at the same time to too much damage".

Friedrich Engels was of the same opinion. On the subject of the discussion on the Russian village community he wrote:

"The Russian village community has long since passed its prime, and is probably in course of dissolution. There exists however an incontestable possibility of its merging into a higher form of community, if it can only hold out until conditions permit of such a transition, and if it proves capable of development in the direction of cultivation of the soil, not by individual peasant farms, but by the whole village community collectively; in this case the Russian

peasant will pass straight on to the higher form, leaping over the intermediate stage of bourgeois small holdings. This is however possible only then if the proletariat of Western Europe has achieved successful revolution before the final decay of the Russian village community, thereby securing the conditions necessary for this transition — above all the economic basis enabling the Russian peasantry to carry out such a fundamental reorganisation of their economic system”.

It would be a somewhat cheap argumentation to “refute” these theses by the “actual course of events”. Neither Marx nor Engels ever asserted the inevitability of a non-capitalist line of development under any circumstances. On the contrary, they stated clearly that the possibility of such development depends on the whole complex of conditions. Russia, on the threshold of its development, emerging from feudalism and serfdom, lacked the requisite conditions. But how can we assert that the conditions are not given today in China, India, Egypt, etc. now, in the midst of the epoch of war and revolution, the epoch in which the dictatorship of the proletariat is already realised in the Soviet Union. It need scarcely be added that, practically, the actual course of events is decided by the fight, and only by the fight. In theory, of course, the other perspective is not excluded, provided that the relations of class forces in the given historical period are advantageous for our perspective. But to renounce the struggle for this reason, and to hide thereby behind allegedly Marxist arguments, is to betray again and again both Marxism and the cause of the proletariat.

In this connection it must not be forgotten that the question of the non-capitalist development (that is, the possibility of socialist development under certain circumstances) of backward countries forms a part of a general question, the question of the possibility of the socialist development of pre-capitalist forms of economy and of the simple commodity economy (that is, petty bourgeois forms of society). The question of peasant undertakings, handicrafts, etc., under the conditions given by the proletarian dictatorship, belongs essentially to this same question.

Our programme, therefore, in taking as its starting point an estimate of our epoch as an epoch of proletarian revolutions, and an estimate of the Soviet Union as the country of proletarian dictatorship, takes at the same time as starting point the possibility of a non-capitalist (that is, socialist) development of the colonies, and imposes thereby on every communist the duty of fighting for this form of development.

e) The Controversial Questions of the Programme.

A few words must be devoted to the controversial questions of the programme, or rather, to speak more exactly, those questions which have raised a considerable amount of discussion at the Congress, and have thereby, on the principle that “truth comes out in a quarrel”, been satisfactorily solved in the accepted programme. It need not be said that there has been no disagreement, nor could there be, in those questions of principle dividing communism from the bloody abyss of socialist treachery. Neither the question of “organised capitalism”, alleged to smooth over all crises by its “systematic” procedures, nor the question of “ultra imperialism”, supposed to do away with imperialist war and to bring peace on earth and goodwill among men with the benevolent assistance of the pious League of Nations or of American presidents, nor the questions of democracy and dictatorship, soviets and “expropriation of the expropriators”, etc., etc. aroused any doubts. The discussion revolved chiefly around partial questions.

The question of financial capital, its definition, its economic nature, the limits of its power as compared with other forms of capital, played an important part in our discussions.

The theory of capitalist crises was again brought up for discussion, showing that this time no serious difference of opinion exists on this question, but that the object of the debate was the formulation of the most exact definition.

The question of imperialism, its development, its multifarious ramifications (special stress being laid on the fact that free competition continues to exist beside the monopolies), was further elaborated, and expressed in a more accurate and complete form.

The question of social democracy, of its rôle, its social roots, and its comparative vitality, belonged to those problems

most hotly discussed both in the Programme Commission and in the plenary session of the Congress itself. Every aspect of this question came under discussion: The roots which social democracy has struck in the petty bourgeoisie insofar as the proletariat itself is recruited from petty bourgeois strata (peasantry, handicraft workers, small traders, etc.), and its social roots which are immediately bound up with imperialist development (labour aristocracy, different situation of the proletariat in different countries, extra profits, corruption of the better paid proletarian strata, etc.); all these aspects were reexamined and reconsidered. The question of super-profits in their character of reserve fund for the bourgeoisie was illuminated and elaborated from all sides (super-profits accruing from colonial robbery, from capital export to countries with a high profit standard, from the exchange of commodities between countries in different stages of technical development, from every description of monopoly, etc.). In this manner it was found possible to solve the problem of the existence of super-profits in countries not possessing colonies of their “own” (Germany, Switzerland, etc.). This broad social basis of social democracy is not yet destroyed, but has merely been shaken by the crisis of capitalism; this explains why the Communists were excluded from the German reformist trade union congress whilst the bourgeois minister Dr. Curtius was applauded; why the English trade union congress passed resolutions on “industrial peace”; and why the armoured cruiser socialists of the Müller type, the imperialists of the Paul Boncour type, and such Fascists as Albert Thomas, can still be in the ranks of the labour movement.

The problem of Fascism was another source of somewhat excited discussion. Some comrades considered every reaction, every pressure on the working class, every symptom of a regime of persecution, to be Fascism; other comrades maintained a diametrically opposite standpoint; every reaction is not Fascism, but solely that reaction which develops in countries without colonial possessions, or in backward agrarian countries, etc. After a thorough exchange of opinions, the correct formulation was found. For Fascism presupposes a number of special, peculiar, and specific features (it attracts the petty bourgeois masses, buys up a part of the petty bourgeoisie, and sometimes even a part of the working class as well). It is, however, incorrect to state that Fascism is impossible in countries possessing colonies, or industrially far advanced; wherever the capitalist order is shaken, wherever the position of the bourgeoisie is undermined, wherever the bourgeoisie cannot rule without the masses, and the elements of civil war are maturing and all this can “happen” even in the most advanced countries, there the bourgeoisie resorts to the methods of Fascism.

The questions of the economic policy of the proletariat during the period of its dictatorship (N. E. P., war communism) led to even longer discussions, although here the overwhelming majority (all, with the exception of some comrades) were fully agreed from the very beginning with the decisions already accepted. In the N. E. P. question the following problems were discussed: 1. The “essential character” of the New Economic Policy. 2. The general or merely limited validity of its application. 3. Its varieties in the different countries. The extent of the “New Economic Policy”.

In the question of the “essential character” of the New Economic Policy, the Congress came to the unanimous conclusion that this character consists in the existence (an existence justified by adaptation to purpose) of market relations representing a necessary form of the connection between state industry and the small peasant undertaking, so scattered and detached that the objective necessity of market relations is obvious. Hence my definition of the roots of the “New Economic Policy”, at the IV. Congress of the Comintern, which was approved by all comrades present:

“I maintain that the proletariat of any country, having the rudder of political power in its hands, is faced first of all by the supremely important problem of the relations between those forms of production which this proletariat can rationalise, organise, and systematically manage, and those forms of production which it cannot at first rationalise and manage systematically. This is the most important economic problem confronting such a proletariat. Should the proletariat fail to observe the right proportion, that is, should it take too much upon itself, it is bound to

fall into the following situation: The productive forces will not only not develop, but will be hampered. The proletariat is not able to organise everything at once.

Its plans must not supplant the small producer, the small peasant carrying on his individual undertaking. The proletariat will receive nothing in the place of the socially useful functions of this stratum. The process of transition stagnates. This means a further decline of the productive forces, and decline in economic life in general.

Under such circumstances the proletariat finds still another difficulty in its way. If it takes too much upon itself, it is obliged to create a huge administrative apparatus controlling the economic functions of the small producers and peasants, etc.; it must employ innumerable officials and employees. The attempt to have all these small details organised by officials... and they are state officials, civil servants, name them as we like... involves such a colossal apparatus that the expenditure for its maintenance is an incomparably more unproductive outlay than the loss involved by the anarchist condition of small production; in actual fact this form of administration, this economic apparatus of the proletarian state, does not further the development of productive forces, but hinders it. The actual result is precisely the contrary of what is aimed at. Therefore iron necessity compels the proletariat to destroy such an apparatus. Whether this is the result of counter-revolution, the active interference of the petty bourgeoisie, or whether the apparatus is cut down and reorganised by the Party itself, as in the Soviet Union... in any case it is inevitable, and if the proletariat does not do it other forces will overthrow its rule."

It was on these lines that the IV. World Congress combined the questions of the class struggle with those of economic policy, of planned economy, of the proportions to be observed between the various economic spheres. Here it is graphically shown how an incorrect policy and errors in the leadership can influence the class relations to such an extent that from the dictatorship of the proletariat only a skeleton is left. The dangers of bureaucratic over-centralism incapable of life are clearly pointed out, by which all good intentions are inevitably converted into precisely their opposite. We see, therefore, that already at the IV. Congress, during Lenin's lifetime, and under his immediate guidance, the objective necessity for the "New Economic Policy" was laid down. It is comprehensible that the IV. Congress could do no less than accept this fundamental standpoint of Lenin.

The question of the general validity or national conditionality of the new economic policy is actually decided beforehand by the first question. Since the basis of the "N. E. P." lies in the market "method", in the connection between city and village, or, more exactly, between industry and peasant undertakings, then the actual existence of petty bourgeois undertakings in all countries is decisive for the reply to the question. The question of the extent or dimensions of the market relations is another matter (the "extent of the N. E. P."). Here extremely great differences are unavoidable, determined by the differences in the economic social structure, and by the degree of "maturity" of economic relations. Much time is required for a weak industry, and weak key positions, to reorganise 25 million peasant undertakings. Special organisational forms regulating market relations are needed. In such countries the peasant co-operative is a factor of paramount importance. In countries, on the other hand, in which industry is powerful, and the number of peasant undertakings comparatively small, the market relations will be more rapidly liquidated. The process of economic centralisation, the socialisation of labour, and the systematic organisation of economy in proportion to the extent of this centralisation, will be brought about more quickly. The New Economic Policy accelerates its own consummation.

The question of the various types of countries was accorded due attention in the discussion. We classified three types: highly capitalist countries, countries in a medium stage of capitalist development, and finally colonies and dependent countries. Much debate was caused by varying opinions as to the category to which this or that country belonged. We then classified the course of development of countries of the various types, laying this down systematically, not on any arbitrary lines,

but on the basis of our extensive revolutionary experience gathered in these countries, and on the basis of an accurate and concrete analysis of the totality of fundamental economic and political relations peculiar to these countries.

These were the main questions discussed.

f) The Programme of the C. I. as a Whole.

We must now pass on to a concrete characterisation of the programme as a whole.

The whole theoretical structure of the programme is prefaced by the "introduction", which deals with the relations between the I. and II. Internationals on the one hand and the III. International on the other, and with the historical connection of the present revolutionary communist movements with the previous revolutionary movements of the working class in various countries. The "introduction" declares demonstratively that the Comintern stands definitely and completely on the platform of dialectical Marxism, on the platform of Marxism and Leninism.

Then the first chapter follows, dealing with the world system of capitalism, its development, showing the increasing acuteness of its inner contradictions and its inevitable decay. Here an analysis is given of capitalist society in general and of the past period of capitalist development, the epoch of industrial capitalism, in particular. The closing sentences of the first chapter bring us to the second chapter, which elucidates how the general development of the capitalist system leads to the merging of industrial capitalism in financial capitalism; how combines, trusts, and banks develop; how all this is interwoven with the system of financial capital relations; how the monopoly of trustified capital takes the place of free competition; how the capitalist world enters the new imperialist phase of its development; how, in connection with it a change in the relations of forces takes place; how the various strata of the bourgeoisie join hands; how the workers' battalions rally against imperialism; how imperialism again seeks to win over the leaders of the working class, buying up the national bourgeoisie; how the antagonism between the forces of the working class and the forces of imperialism becomes more and more acute, leading finally to the collapse of imperialism. Then follows the chapter on the general crisis of capitalism, and on the first phase of the world revolution.

Here the programme deals with international revolution as it is actually developing; it describes graphically how a whole series of revolutionary struggles have broken out in many countries since the war, suppressed here and there only to flare up somewhere else. The process of the change of form of the general crisis of capitalism is then outlined, and a survey given of the struggle of social forces in this process, the infamous rôle placed by social democracy and Fascism, and the analysis of the stabilisation of capitalism and the growth of its inner contradictions. With this survey the main line of present development is delineated, and the process of international proletarian revolution outlined which in its culmination leads to world communism. The programme then draws with few strokes the general outline of the international communist order as it will be, and shows the characteristic features of the preliminary stage of this society, the first embryonic phase of the socialist method of production.

The "ultimate goal" having been established by the programme, it passes on to the period of transition (fourth chapter). Here the analysis of the objective course of development is made the immediate basis for establishing the tasks of the proletariat and the proletarian dictatorship. The Programme deals here with the problem of the seizure of power, the Soviet form of the proletarian dictatorship the expropriation of the expropriators, the bases of economic policy under the proletarian dictatorship, the classes during this period, the rôle of the mass organisations, the cultural revolution, the various types of countries with their peculiarities, the transitional period, before all in the colonies. In giving a general picture of the different phases of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship in the different countries we had to dedicate a special chapter to the Soviet Union, its rôle in the revolutionary process, its obligations towards the international labour movement, and the obligations of the international working class towards the Soviet Union. In the last chapter the strategic

and tactical main tasks of the Comintern are concretely defined. It begins with an analysis of the various currents among the working class and the toiling masses in general which are still hostile to communism. The different social bases of these currents are analysed: the ideology of reformism and its sub-varieties is systematically defined, and Sun Yat Senism, Ghandi-ism, and Harveyism characterised. This is followed by a survey of the strategic and tactical tasks of the C. I. in its struggle for the proletarian world dictatorship. The pro-

gramme of the C. I. closes with the burning words of the "Communist Manifesto". The adoption of this programme undoubtedly constitutes a remarkable milestone in the history of the Communist movement. And it is undoubtedly a very important event in the life of the C. I. The elaboration of the Programme will determine the physiognomy of the VI. Congress in the further history of our movement. For our movement itself the Programme will play a leading, unifying, and directive role.

III.

The International Situation and the Tasks of the C. I.

a) The Question of Stabilisation of Capitalism.

A certain viewpoint with regard to the estimate to be formed of the present phase of the general crisis of capitalism was already given by the draft of the programme. A more detailed analysis of this phase had to be made the starting point for the determination of the tactical line of the Comintern during the coming period.

The pivot on which the whole problem turns is the estimate of that special form of the general crisis of capitalism which is being expressed in the so-called stabilisation of capitalism. It must be remembered that at the last (V.) Congress of the Comintern, the question of capitalist stabilisation had not yet been raised. But already at the III. Congress Comrade Lenin fully realised — we can recognise this now — that the international situation was changing, that capitalism was beginning to work its way out of the acutest stage of the revolutionary post-war crisis. It was for this reason that Comrade Lenin at that time declared such decisive struggle against the so-called "offensive theory", that he demanded the application of united front tactics, and stressed the imperative necessity of putting up partial demands, slogans, etc. Lenin, with the discernment of his genius, perceived the change taking place in the international situation, that the most acute crisis had passed and capitalism had obtained the possibility to recover for a certain time. And more than this. Already at the II. Congress Lenin could not agree with those who maintained that capitalism had run into a blind alley from which there was no way out; in his opinion no situation was absolutely hopeless for the bourgeoisie, it might find a temporary way out and only the fight could decide this question.

After the V. Congress, the question of stabilisation already compelled attention, and it has since remained for the Comintern the central question of our estimate of the world situation. At the VI. Congress we had to draw the balance of the historical period just past, and to form a correct estimate of the stage now reached by this stabilisation and its inner contradictions. What sense would it have to designate the stabilisation of capitalism as temporary and partial, when we can clearly perceive that capitalist world economy has surpassed the pre-war level, that the advance of the productive forces of capitalism is a fact in a number of important capitalist states, and that the U. S. A. and Germany are able to record technical progress of such significance that the resolution passed by the Congress speaks of a "technical revolution"?

If there is undoubted technical advance, if the growth of productive forces is incontestable, if — on this basis — the process of the trustification of production and of the development of gigantic capitalist monopolies is clearly visible and the tendency towards state capitalism is plainly observable, does this not mean that the post-war crisis of capitalism is simply liquidated? In this way the social democrats decide the question. Some of our comrades, anxious to avoid the snares of social democratic ideology, are inclined to dispute the above facts, and fall thereby into other "traps", if not social democratic ones. What is the right answer? It consists in the recognition that capitalism is inevitably developing along the lines created by the post-war crisis, in forms expressing this crisis and its further course, which extremely aggravate all

antagonisms of capitalist stabilisation. The fact of the existence of the Soviet Union alone, however disagreeable this may be to the social democratic apologists of capitalism, is an expression of the general revolutionary crisis of capitalism. Up to the war capitalism was the general form of ruling economic relations; now world economy is split into two "sectors" fundamentally hostile to one another. Hitherto the colonies have merely been the objects of history, now they have become its subjects. Hitherto Europe and America maintained a certain equilibrium in their mutual relations, but now this balance has been lost, plunging the capitalist sector into a whole heap of contradictions. Hitherto the conflict between the productive forces and the buying powers of the masses has been an accessory to development, but now it has become intensified; the pauperisation of the post-war period has been greatly aggravated by the technical advance and the conflict between the growth of productive forces and the restriction of consumption has found sharp expression. And in this manner all the inner antagonisms of capitalism grow and increase. The hunt for markets brings with it the danger of wars of unheard-of dimensions; the lost equilibrium between Europe and America becomes the basis of a threatening Anglo-American conflict of world dimensions; the rise of the Soviet Union goads the capitalists to prepare for the counter-revolutionary war against it; technical advance and so-called capitalist rationalisation create chronic unemployment on a gigantic scale; class relations are becoming more acute; colonial conflicts assume more decided forms; in short, the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation are growing.

This estimate of the present phase of the general crisis of capitalism is formulated in the thesis on the third period of the development of this crisis. The resolution passed by the C. I. reads:

"The third period is the period in which the economy of capitalism and at the same time the economy of the Soviet Union surpass the pre-war level (the beginning of the "reconstruction period", further growth of the socialist forms of economy on the basis of new technics). For the capitalist world it is a period of rapid technical progress, of accelerated concentration in cartels and trusts, of tendencies to state capitalism, and at the same time a period of the strongest development of the contradictions of world economy which proceeds in forms determined by the whole previous course of the general crisis of capitalism (shrinkage of markets, Soviet Union, colonial movements, growth of the inner contradictions of capitalism). This third period, in which the antagonism between the growth of productive forces and the restriction of markets has greatly intensified, inevitably leads to a fresh epoch of wars among the imperialist states, of wars against the Soviet Union, of national revolutionary wars against imperialism and imperialist intervention, of gigantic class struggles.

This period, in which all international antagonisms (antagonisms between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union, the military occupation of Northern China as the beginning of the dismemberment of China, and the conflicts among the imperialists, etc.) become more acute in which the inner contradictions in the capitalist countries are intensified (the process of radicalisation among the working masses, the intensification of class war, in which movements in

the colonies are released: China, India, Egypt, Syria), leads inevitably to a further development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation, to a subsequent shaking of this stabilisation and to a sharp intensification of the general crisis of capitalism".

b) The War Problem: the Decisive Factor in the Situation.

This analysis shows that the problem of the war danger is the decisive factor of the given situation. This does not by any means signify that war is going to break out in the next few months, or even in the next year, but the whole international development proceeds in this direction. The Anglo-American world conflict and its development, the American-Japanese struggle for China and for the leading positions in the Pacific Ocean, the Franco-Italian antagonism, the constant threatening of the Soviet Union by the giants of capitalism, ready to send forth their capitalist janizaries, Roumania and Poland, into the battle; the war of intervention in China, the continuous armaments, the secret agreements, etc., the energetic preparations being carried on in the hinterland, the obstacles thrown in the way of the working class, the terror exercised, the Draconian anti-proletarian laws, the increasingly provocative attacks on the workers' organisations, the adaptation of home politics to foreign politics, which actually is the politics of the preparation for war — all this illustrates the situation plainly enough. In such a situation an underestimation of the war danger, and in accordance therewith an inadequate struggle against war, are the main dangers for the proletariat and its communist vanguard. This is especially true of the present epoch, for at no time in the history of capitalist society has there been a situation in which the evident preparation for war has been masked so cynically and with such a variety of means.

At the present moment there exists no force, no single organisation, with the exception of the **Communist International**, able to unmask these pacifist lies, or sweep away the fogs and poisonous gases of pacifism. It suffices to cast a glance at the division of forces: The greatest international robber, American imperialism, steps forward in the rôle of herald of "peace", and even proposes to "outlaw" war. Every reasonable person is bound to ask: How are we going to reconcile all these frantic preparations for war in the United States, this strangulation of Mexico and Nicaragua by American capital, this sending of American warships to China, etc. with the American proposals to outlaw war? How is it possible to explain the fact that the other imperialist robbers, including Japan, which has seized upon a third part of China and carries on a bloody war there, all sign a piece of paper stating that war is prohibited? Obviously all this is nothing but a **masquerade** concealing the actual course of events. It need not be said that this masquerade is supported by the social democrats. Under these conditions our first duty is to tear this mask ruthlessly away, to show the working class things as they really are, to shake the whole edifice of pacifist talk by means of our sober warnings, to show the working class the necessity of systematic preparation for the struggle against war danger, and to carry on this preparation energetically **day by day**.

Therefore the questions concerning the daily policy of the Sections of the Comintern must be subordinated to the question of the struggle against war, just as imperialism takes every fresh step from the standpoint of preparation for war. The English bourgeoisie, in conjuring up prehistoric days by robbing the trade unions of their political rights, does so to cover its rear. The English, German, American, and all other bourgeoisies, in commissioning their social democratic leaders to preach "industrial peace", and the trade union leaders, in making common cause with the capitalist trusts and the capitalist state, are all contributing to prepare for war. If the bourgeoisie now wishes to exterminate the Communists by means of terror it does it in view of future wars. At the present time bourgeois politics are extremely complicated. The international bourgeoisie is pulling every wire. It has at its disposal a rich selection of instruments of deception and violence, of terror and Christian edification, of cynical bribery and soothing pacifist legends, of diabolical armaments and celestial olive

branches. On one side it forms war alliances, on the other hand it exploits the League of Nations and produces the Kellogg Pact; it applies terrorist methods, yet calls for "industrial peace" and brings the reformist pillars of the trade unions by small concessions to submission; it is not averse to praising the working class of its "own" country so long as it keeps quiet; it skilfully bribes the leaders of the working class in order to carry the split into the proletarian movement, and instructs the social democratic bureaucrats to drive the revolutionary workers from the unions. We are confronted by a complicated system of machinations, all seeing far ahead, and all tending to one end — the preparation for war with the aid of social democracy.

c) The Countenance of Social Democracy today.

The change in the objective situation (the special form of stabilisation, the trustification, the state capitalist tendencies, etc.) has brought the question of social democracy up again. The rôle played by social democracy today is incomparably more shameful than in 1914. Today the leaders of the social democrats are actually the watch dogs of imperialism. They split the workers' organisations to the advantage of capital, they throw the communists and the revolutionary workers out of the trade unions, they preach till they are black in the face peace with the employers, with the most malicious and most greedy capitalist wolves. They hold conferences conjointly with the employers, and fight systematically and determinedly, ideologically and politically, against the Soviet Union. The trade union and social democratic party leaders merge directly and immediately with the leaders of the trusts, with the organs of the capitalist state, and openly advocate the policy of unreservedly supporting the imperialist state, co-operating actively in its interests, and taking part unconditionally in its defence. It is only necessary to recall the "famous" figure of Albert Thomas, this typical ultra-social-democrat. This person, calling himself a socialist, travelled to Italy to lick Mussolini's boots and to sing hymns of praise to the Fascist "liberty". He has a permanent position in the League of Nations, i. e. the league of international imperialist robbers, where he — joking apart — actually manages the "labour department". The newspapers report on a gushing message of brotherly love sent by him to a church synod, based on the idea that the common goal of "the welfare of the whole world" unites the socialists and the Jesuits. This is the type of the social democratic leader of today. Truly, a beautiful spectacle! (Laughter.) Thomas, who already fulfilled his mission in Russia by attempting to persuade the Russian workers to continue the imperialist war; Thomas, who suggested to Kerensky that he should drag the Russian workers, in the name of democracy, to the battle field; this same Thomas continues his work as purveyor of cannon fodder just as Vandervelde, who collaborated not only with the "Provisional Government", but even with the **tzarist government**. Thomas is the most characteristic figure of the II. International, and at the same time its walking caricature.

This attitude of social democracy (its merging with the capitalist organisations, its splitting policy in the trade unions, its support of imperialism, etc.) conditioned the **tactical change** already decided upon by the Executive Committee of the Communist International previous to the Congress, for the Communist Parties of France and England — the turn towards more **energetic fight against social democracy**. For both Parties this change of tactics means the beginning of a new and important epoch in their development. At the VI. Congress it became clear that this tactical change must be **intensified and extended**, because the tendencies of the social democratic parties to split the working class have become a general phenomenon. Our struggle against social democracy must be intensified both in our agitation and our propaganda, in our general daily work and in strike struggles. But this intensification of our struggle against social democracy does not by any means signify that we should abandon our endeavours to win over the social democratic workers. On the contrary, the problem of **winning over the masses**, especially of the masses still following social democracy — and these masses are unfortunately still large — now confronts us urgently. At the last elections in Germany, at which the Communist Party achieved great success and polled 3½ million votes, there were still 9 million votes cast for social democracy. A part of these

votes went to social democracy at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie, but still many millions of workers still vote for the social democrats. This fact we must take into account. We must not cease to fight for these social democratic workers; on the contrary — the more effectually we expose the base and treacherous role of the social democrats, the higher must we hold the banner of class unity of the working class, the more energetically must we mobilise the whole of the forces of the working class against the leaders of social democracy, and the more efficiently must we struggle to win the social democratic workers, seizing every opportunity afforded by partial and daily demands, by strikes, by conflicts with the employers.

d) The Struggle for the Masses and the Unity of the Proletarian Ranks.

The problem of the struggle for the masses, the problem of capturing the masses — is and remains our main tactical problem. Our position has improved, even in the eyes of the backward strata of the proletariat. At the beginning of the war the treachery of the social democrats set us the task of making the breach: We were compelled to break away from the social democratic leaders. Our banner was the banner of schism, although the blame for this schism lay at the door of the social democratic heroes of 4th August. At present there is no communist who would ever dream of collaborating with social democrats; but precisely for the reason that the Communist Parties have so grown in strength and numbers, precisely for the reason that they have become a mass force leading a real struggle against capital, whilst the social democrats split the trade unions and fraternise with Mond, Krupp, Loucheur, Morgan & Co. — precisely for this reason matters have an entirely new aspect. In this new "historical situation" facts appear in a new light. Now there is only one organisation representing international unity in every country, only one organisation which is bearer of the idea of unity between the working class and the colonial peoples. And this is the **Communist International**. It is because the communists are a growing force that they are being turned out of the trade unions. But we are fighting for unity; we are realising it; we unfurl the banner of unity among the workers organised in trade unions, both "nationally" and internationally. But we meet with increasing hostility. We alone realise unity in actual deeds, and we alone can do so. All that the Second and Amsterdam Internationals can show us is a picture of national imperialist quarrels, and the reformist suppression of all honest workers. We are the bearers of the idea of unity with the colonial peoples, whilst the reformists banish these colonial peoples to the servants' rooms, and laugh at them just in the same way as do the slave-holders of the League of Nations.

History has described this dialectic circle. For us the banner of unity is no mere manoeuvre, no toy, no "attraction", nothing of the sort! We are in actual fact the sole organisation standing for the unity of the working class, for the real unity of the proletariat organised in the trade unions — and **against any unity with the capitalists**.

The contradictions of capitalist stabilisation, the pressure put on the working class, the increasing ruthlessness of piratical exploitation, the enormous unemployment in a number of countries, the dread of an impending war with all its horrors and destruction — all this forms the basis for the wholesale "radicalisation of the working class", for the growth of working class sympathy for the Soviet Union, of working class readiness for self-defence, of hunger for unity. **This banner of unity from below, of unity against the capitalists, must not be lowered for one instant by the communists.** The daily struggle, the work in the trade unions, the leadership of strikes, the increased work among young people, among working women, agricultural labourers, and small holders, every description of work tending to reach the masses — this is the conclusion to be drawn from the international situation today.

e) The Struggle against Right Deviations is the Main Inner Party Line.

The situation in which we conduct our struggle under the conditions of stabilisation is extremely complicated; our Parties are confronted by no less difficult tasks. It is therefore easily com-

prehensible that these difficulties find expression in inner Party life, and that even deviations from the Leninist line result. If we generalise a number of facts characteristic of the majority of our Parties, and ask ourselves what is the greatest danger in the Comintern, we come to the final conclusion that this **greatest and most decided danger** in the Comintern at the present time is the **Right danger**.

Now that the Trotskyist opposition has been shattered, and a part of this opposition has gone over to the social democrats, as in Germany, the chief danger left **within** our ranks is the Right danger. Our Parties work side by side with the social democratic parties, — in the trade unions we have to join in their struggles every day. It is obvious that owing to the still considerable strength of social democracy, its influence penetrates into our ranks. Nor must it be forgotten that there are still a number of Parties in the Comintern which have not yet been under fire. Whilst the representatives of some of our Parties literally journeyed from the battlefield to the Congress, and these Parties are developing amidst a cruel regime of White Terror, there are other Parties which have never yet been called upon to stand a serious test. The **Czech Party** may be adduced as an instance; it originated from the social democratic party, has never taken part in a mass struggle, and has never suffered the pressure of bourgeois dictatorship. This Party has not yet been put to the test. And the test which the Party set itself, the so-called "Red Day" which was to mobilise the masses and bring them to demonstrate in the streets, ended disastrously. We have passed a number of resolutions on the Czechoslovakian Communist Party, but we now have obvious signs that the leaders of the Party and of the local organisations have not yet by any means freed themselves of their social democratic past.

In every Party there are Right tendencies of one kind or another.

In **France** they are expressed in the opposition to the change of tactics undertaken by the Party, in the remnants of parliamentary illusions, in the underestimation of the traitorous rôle played by the "Left" wing of the socialists, in the unnecessary subordination to bourgeois legality, etc.

In **England** they are expressed chiefly in the resistance offered to the new tactics against the Labour Party, in the inadequate exposure of the leaders of the Labour Party and the General Council, etc.

In **Germany** the Right deviations are shown in the opposition to the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., in breaches of Party discipline in the name of trade union discipline, in the slogan of "control of production", and in the incorrect estimate formed of the "Left" wing of social democracy.

In the Communist Party of the U. S. A. the Right errors consist mainly in the incorrect policy adopted towards the socialists.

This list might be extended, but these instances suffice. The Congress, in that part of the general theses dealing with the inner Party situation, imposed upon all members of the Communist International the express duty of fighting the **Right danger**, and especially of combating energetically those tendencies within the Communist Parties which underestimate the extent of this danger. There are some Parties in which the chief danger is the "Left". Just recently, for instance, our **Chinese Party**, previously liable to opportunist errors, was threatened with "Left" deviations which might ruin the whole Party. After the revolutionary tide had ebbed in China, after many of the best of our Party had been physically annihilated, and the tide of revolution had not yet begun to rise again, in some districts unpremeditated insurrections were organised which from the outset were condemned to failure. This led to the further annihilation of the cadres of the best communists. We had to guide the energies of the Party into the struggle for the masses, and this we have done. I repeat however: If we take a survey of the whole Communist International, we see that the VI. Congress has been perfectly right in emphasising the Right danger as the **chief danger**.

With reference to inner Party relations, we had to emphasise the **danger of fractional fights**, and the necessity of

the consolidation of the Parties. During the last few years fractional fights have exceeded all bounds in some countries. In the Yugoslavian Party, for instance, fractional fights, not justified by any differences of opinion lasted for about seven years, bringing the Party to the verge of complete ruin. We have helped this Party to return to real work, but could only do so by giving new cadres the opportunity to participate in the leadership, by which an improvement has been achieved. We have a similar situation in the Polish Party, which has a highly responsible position; the political differences of opinion involved are very slight, but the acuteness of the fractional struggle has led to a split in the most important organisation, the Warsaw organisation. We had to adopt special decisions in all these questions, and earnestly hope that success will follow. The question of consolidation concerns every Party. We have set every Party the task of raising the theoretical level of the communists, of concentrating the most important leading forces in our Parties, and of ensuring the participation in the work of leadership of all competent comrades accepting the platform of the Comintern. At the Congress I mentioned the wise words which Lenin wrote to me and Comrade Zinoviev: "If you are going to expel all the not very obedient but clever people, and retain only the obedient fools, you will most assuredly ruin the Party." This rule must be kept in mind, and acted upon. It must not, however, be allowed to degenerate into the needless toleration of deviations. Deviations must be fought and overcome. This goes without saying, is the

alphabet of Bolshevism. But when we have such a state of affairs as in our Parties, with such insufficient leading cadres, then we do well to impress these words of Lenin thoroughly on our minds.

The raising of the theoretical level is an important task in almost every Party without exception. It must however be stated that the discussion on the Programme showed the ideology of the Communist Parties to have both broadened and deepened. Still the demands of the movement grow even more rapidly than the means of satisfying them, and work here must be reinforced. The difficulty of the situation, and the complexity of the tasks involved, put great demands on the qualifications of the leaders. Our leaders must combine practical knowledge of the work with political experience and theoretical conviction.

The intensification of the fight against social democracy, the intensified struggle for the masses, the tactics of the united front from below, the increased work in the trade unions, and in all mass organisations of the proletariat, the propaganda for unity in the ranks of the workers, the fight against the Right deviations in the Parties, the consolidation of the Parties, the determined overcoming of fractional fights, the courageous counter-attack against the offensive of capital, the focussing of this counter-attack upon the war danger — these must be our tasks today in the leading capitalist countries. It need not be emphasised that all partial slogans must be subordinate to the leading slogan of the proletarian dictatorship.

IV.

Struggle Against War and the Colonial Question.

In the question of war danger, compared with the resolutions passed by the VIII. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. nothing fundamentally new was brought forward. A detailed resolution was drawn up on the basis of our previous decisions. One part of these resolutions will not be published, as they must not be known to our class enemies. Our work against war is connected with the transition of parts of our Party organisation to illegality, and demands the greater use of illegal forms and methods.

The colonial question, which assumed a leading place in the activities of VI. Congress, was dealt with to a certain extent in the analysis of the programme question. In the programme the Congress laid down our principles in the colonial question. Nevertheless, the Congress placed this question specially on its agenda, and devoted much time to it. It need not be said that the resolutions of the II. Congress, written by Comrade Lenin, remained the foundation of the resolutions of the VI. Congress. Many changes have however taken place since the II. Congress. We have gathered much experience since then, in China and a number of other colonial countries. The tempestuous succession of events in the Chinese revolution have raised and solved many complicated tactical questions, enormously enriching our experience, above all our mass experience. The rising in Indonesia, the fights in Syria, Egypt, and Morocco, the experience gained in the struggles for independence in the countries of South America, and finally the movement in India, — this has supplied us with material for an incomparably better elaborated and clearly defined solution of the "colonial question". The discussions of the Congress took two directions: firstly the question of the part played by imperialism in the colonies, and secondly the estimate to be formed of the part played by the bourgeoisie in national revolutionary revolutions, especially in India. The form of the first question presupposes a certain subdivision of this question. The economically dependent countries of South America, the British dominions on the one hand, India and China on the other, cannot be lumped together. The course of development taken by any colonial country, the rôle played by the capital of the mother country, the international situation (Canada and India) — all these factors differ widely from each other. Therefore any general rules cannot lay claim at the same time to concreteness. The Congress concentrated its attention chiefly upon forming a judgment on the experience gained in China, and above all upon the problem of India.

The Chinese problem is already known to you. Further "experience" now awaits us in India. India is a country of

vast territories, with a colossal population. At the present time there is fermentation everywhere. Referring to the first question the Congress showed the utterly contradictory part played by imperialism in China, and even more in India: Up to a certain point imperialism promotes the development of capitalism in these colonies, but at the same time it retards this development, it retards the development of productive forces, it brings about the pauperisation of the peasantry, it maintains a gigantic number of paupers on tiny tracts of ground, it narrows the industrial home market, it hinders the development of industry, and puts an artificial brake on the development of such branches of production as machine building, the metal and metallurgic industries, etc. The Congress dealt with imperialism in the colonies from this standpoint. In the second question, that of the national bourgeoisie, the Congress pointed out that in some countries, such as India for instance, certain temporary agreements with the bourgeoisie are possible in some cases, but that there can nevertheless be no thought of forming a party in conjunction with the bourgeoisie, or of any lasting agreement with it. The halfheartedness and vacillation of the bourgeoisie, its flirting with imperialism, must be unmasked from the beginning. And from the beginning the working class must be shown the inevitability of the defection of the bourgeoisie into the counter-revolutionary camp. Our main task is the creation of an independent party of the proletariat, accomplishing mass work, winning over the trade unions, organising the peasant leagues, and carrying on the broadest propaganda for the agrarian revolution, for ousting the imperialists, etc.

Although we cannot by any means draw a comparison between the counter-revolutionary Chinese bourgeoisie of today and the Indian bourgeoisie, on the other hand India will never offer such a situation as that which actually existed in China, when the bourgeoisie for a number of years played a revolutionary rôle. Such a state of affairs is impossible in India, for the upsurge of the mass movement raises at once such questions with the greatest sharpness which drive the bourgeoisie into the counter-revolutionary camp.

The Congress devoted considerable attention to the standpoint of the II. International in the colonial question, giving a Marxist criticism of the sordid rôle of the II. International as agent of the imperialist governments and their League of Nations, from whose statutes it has adopted its "standards" for its attitude towards the colonies.

V.

The Soviet Union, the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. and the Question of the International Trotzkyist Groups.

A special item of the agenda was the question of the Soviet Union and the C. P. S. U. The question of the C. P. S. U. and the Soviet Union was approached from the viewpoint of the investigation into the results of the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country, and of the success of our struggle against the Trotzkyist Opposition. This struggle against the Trotzkyist Opposition has been accompanied by a struggle against the corresponding ideological currents in a large number of other countries: Germany, France, Italy. The Bordiga group, which sympathises with Trotzky, sent in a somewhat amusing declaration, making the following proposals: The VI. Congress of the Comintern shall elect L. D. Trotzky as president; the VI. Congress of the Comintern shall expel from the C. P. S. U. all members who voted for the decisions of the XV. Party Conference. (Laughter.) It need scarcely be said that this motion has not been dealt with by either the Congress or by any commission.

The Congress has confirmed the decisions of the XV. Party Congress with rare unanimity, and a number of declarations on behalf of the most important sections of the Comintern emphasised particularly their entire solidarity with the Soviet Union, the C. P. S. U., and the heroic working class of our country.

A number of small oppositional groups — the Sapronov group, the Trotzkyists, the French group around Suzanne Girault, the German Maslov group, etc., — sent in declarations of appeal to the Congress. Some comrades may ask: Have these oppositionals become converted? They have not become converted at all. Their appeals are couched in somewhat milder and politer terms, it is true, — they have learnt this much. But even in this milder form they ask the same questions as before, make the same accusations. Yet will perhaps have heard that the Trotzkyist group sent in a programme of its own as counter-draft to ours. We have however found nothing of serious or practical value in the suggestions received from this quarter. The Trotzkyist criticism is a repetition of what the Trotzkyists have always said: Again the question of building up socialism in one country, of the Anglo-Russian Committee, of China.

With respect to the other documents emanating from Trotzky, I may say that one of these represents the following standpoint: The Plenary Session of the Central Committee, in annulling the emergency measures regarding the collection of grain, almost betrayed the October revolution. (Laughter.) You

will have seen from the resolutions the manner in which the Congress has replied to these declarations. All appeals containing no trace of conversion, or of sincere desire to grasp our standpoint, have been rejected. We have thereby doubtless lost the appellants for a long time, since the Congress is the highest court of appeal. But if we have lost them, we have gained meanwhile seven new parties, including the South American parties, and the exchange thus effected is certainly to our advantage. (Laughter.)

Comrades! Our Congress, the decisions which it has adopted, and above all the Programme, bear witness to our growing powers. The acceptance of new Parties, in the presence of the representatives of the proletariat of all extra-European countries and numerous colonies, shows that our movement reaches to the remotest corners of the world. We are not merely a European power, or a Europa-American power. We have become a world power. Our communist organisation has become an international union of the workers.

As a result of the first period of imperialist wars we have an excellent political organisation, the Communist International, and a powerful state of the proletarian dictatorship, the Soviet Union. This proletarian dictatorship recently celebrated its tenth anniversary. Next year the Communist International will celebrate the first decade of its existence. But of all solemn moments in our history, the most solemn was the moment when the Programme of the Communist International was passed by the VI. Congress. Every delegate, whether from Ecuador or Germany, from China or South America, had the same feeling: Now we have reached that point in our development at which we unite in the joint endeavours, in the common will, and in the uniform system of thought the millions of the most energetic and faithful champion of the proletariat.

Our next task is to carry out the decisions of our Congress, and to carry our programme, which is our banner and our signpost, into the masses. We can look the dangers before us confidently in the face. We have placed at the close of our Programme the words: "Workers of the world unite!" With this slogan, with clearer ideas, with the definite consciousness of our tasks we now go to the masses. In order to win over these masses, gather them around our banner, lead them forward to the decisive battle against social democracy and international imperialism, and win with their aid the final victory. (Prolonged and enthusiastic applause.)

The VI. World Congress and the Fight for Communism.

By W. MOLOTOW.

Report delivered to the Leningrad Functionaries of the C. P. S. U. on the 7th September 1928.

Comrades! The work accomplished by the VI. Congress of the Communist International is of extreme importance for the development of the communist movement. The agenda of the Congress in itself shows this importance. The Congress not only discussed the leading problems of the international situation, and arrived at decisions respecting them, but issued a document determining the extended perspectives of the proletarian struggle — the Programme of the Communist International. Besides this, the Congress has made decisions of the utmost importance in the question of the measures to be taken in the struggle against the danger of imperialist war,

in the questions of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, and, finally, with respect to the situation in the Soviet Union and in the C. P. S. U.

I should like to point out to begin with that a report on the results of the Congress cannot do justice to the most important decisions. I shall have to concentrate my attention on these points affording a general characterisation of the work of the Congress. Special attention must of course be accorded to the programme, and to the resolutions containing our estimate of the present epoch of international development, and determining the political line of the Comintern for the

next stage. But first an outline must be given, if only a rough one, of the general character of the Congress.

The growth of the international Communist movement was mirrored in the composition of the Congress. Whilst at the V. Congress the representatives of 49 Communist Parties were present, this time 9 communist sections more were represented, making a total of 58. It is of equal importance to note that on this occasion the delegates of most of the Communist Parties have taken active part in the work of the Congress. This was seen in the plenary sessions, and even more in the work of the commissions of the Congress. The various nationalities of the Comrades who delivered reports to the Congress served to show the active participation of many Parties in the work of the Congress. Besides Comrade Bucharin, who gave the report on the general questions of the international situation and on the programme of the Comintern, a number of other comrades from leading sections of the Comintern delivered reports or co-reports on two other questions — war and the colonies. Thus on the war question, in addition to the chief reporter, Comrade Bell (England), there spoke Comrades Barbé (France), Schneller (Germany) and Lovestone (U. S. A.). On the colonial question, in addition to the chief reporter, Comrade Kuusinen (Finland), co-reports were delivered by Comrades Ercoli (Italy), Strakhov (China), Sikander (India) and Humbert-Droz (Switzerland). Comrades Varga and Manuilsky reported on the situation in the C. P. S. U. and the U. S. S. R. This list of reporters suffices in itself to show that the experience of the leading Communist parties has been brought to bear on the various problems. The greatly increased participation in the discussion on the reports and in the work of drawing up the resolutions must also be welcomed as a distinguishing feature of this Congress. How collective the

work of the Comintern has become may be illustrated by the fact that the original draft of the programme was supplemented, within a relatively short time, by close on 1000 written suggestions as to corrections and amendments. (Many of these came from members of the Parties, and not from the Congress delegates). These suggestions enabled a number of essential additions and even alterations to be made in the original text of the programme, indubitably tending to its considerable improvement.

At the Congress there took place an extremely lively discussion on a number of important questions. To take only a few big questions, we can mention the following themes which were discussed in connection with the Programme, the rôle of financial capital, the social bases of reformism, the nature of Fascism, the perspectives of bourgeois democratic revolution, the most important types of countries and the possibilities of their transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, the problems of the N. E. P. and War Communism, and so forth. In the debate on the international situation and the tasks confronting the Comintern, special attention was paid to the question of the "3rd period" in the development of post-war capitalism and to the question of the internal and external contradictions existing in the imperialist States and their influence on the war danger. The discussion on the colonial question led to great debates on the theory of "decolonisation" and on the part played by the national bourgeoisie in the colonies. It is not possible here, to go into the details of these discussions. It must, however, be observed that the characteristic feature of the decisions of the VI. Congress has been their unanimity. The work of the Congress lasted 1½ months. The result of this work is unanimous decisions on all questions.

↓

The Programme and the Perspectives of Communism.

1. The Significance of the Acceptance of the Programme.

The chief decisions of the Congress have already been published in the press. Others will be published within the next few days. I shall deal briefly with these decisions. Among them the first place is necessarily occupied by the Programme.

It is the first time that the Communist International adopts a programme. This is an event of extraordinary significance for the whole international labour movement. The programme of the Comintern differs from other Comintern decisions, which determine this or that current task of international Communism, in that it lays down the general and most urgent tasks of the Communist International for the whole epoch of the revolutionary struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat. Up to the adoption of this Programme, the Comintern has confined itself to decisions on the perspectives of the struggle of the proletariat in connection with this or that specific task of proletarian revolution, or determining the general tasks of the coming period. The adoption of the programme signifies the establishment of our most important perspectives for the whole epoch of international socialist revolution.

Marx stated that the epoch of international proletarian revolution would last for 1½ to 2, or perhaps for even 5 decades ("15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and international wars"). The founding of the Communist International itself signifies that the history of the world has already entered this epoch; it was inaugurated by the October Revolution. The October Revolution again gave the impetus for the development of the revolutionary movement in other countries, and evoked a powerful revolutionary fermentation in the colonies. This epoch, beginning 11 years ago, set the Communist International a fundamental task, that of the scientific generalisation of the experiences gained in the international proletarian revolution begun in October 1917, combined with the general analysis of the development of present day capitalism and of the perspectives of the internal struggle for Communism. The adoption of the programme signifies that from now onwards we bear a brightly burning torch in our hands, or, better said, a searchlight of the highest illuminating power, directing its penetrating rays into every detail of the development and

perspectives of the whole epoch of international proletarian revolution. The fact of the adoption of the programme of the Comintern furnishes fresh proof that we are truly already standing with both feet in that new epoch which is — the epoch of international socialist revolution. The very fact of the approval of the Comintern Programme, which consists of a generalisation of the experiences of the international labour movement and of the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples in the colonies, signifies that Communism has already become an international force which is consciously hewing its pathway, in principle and practice, to complete victory.

In the whole history of mankind, it has never yet happened that a class has possessed a uniform international programme of action. There has never before been a class capable of it. It has been left to the working class, the class inscribing on its banner the abolition of the system of class society, that is, the abolition of classes, to draw up an international programme of action, the international fighting programme for the communist reorganisation of human society. In the past, even in relatively remote times, there have been great minds with great dreams of the reformation of society on "principles of justice", isolated individuals cherishing Utopian dreams of a communist reconstruction of society. The first half of the 19th century witnessed the visions of a constellation of noteworthy socialist Utopians. These men, and the small group of followers gathering round them, had no possibility of creating anything resembling an international programme of action for the realisation of the reorganisation of society. Marx and Engels' "Communist Manifesto", however, laid the first foundation stone of the future programme of the Communist International. But it is only today that the Comintern could undertake the first attempt at a programme of international communism. From now onwards the world proletariat possesses the scientifically grounded programme of the Comintern, and opens a new, and indeed the most important page in the history of its struggle for communism.

It is very characteristic that the II. International not only possesses no programme of its own, but does not even raise the question of a programme. Although the first imperialist great war showed plainly enough that the capitalist system,

despite the profound contradictions inherent in the imperialist system of today, is striving towards the firmer establishment of world relations; although it is plain that the post-war period further confirms the fact of the development of capitalist world economy which increasingly tends to bind the separate capitalist states more and more to one another, whilst on the other hand the development of the class struggle of the proletariat in the various countries sets the international proletariat the task of solving fundamental problems of a world-wide extent — it never occurs to the so-called "socialist" International to draw up an international programme. Whilst the Comintern has been preparing its programme for five years, the II. International has no programme of an international nature at all, nor does it want one. The various constituents of the II. International have, in the national social democratic parties, become so closely bound up with their "own" bourgeoisies, that the II. International does not feel the slightest desire for an international programme. The II. International thereby adds still another proof that it does not represent a proletarian International, but is inextricably entangled in an ideology entirely foreign to the working class, the ideology of the bourgeoisie, of the exploiter; that social democracy today is a "labour party" in name only, but in reality is an out and out bourgeois party. It is therefore easily comprehensible that a "socialist" International of this description, representing in actual fact nothing but the ideological chaff of a decaying capitalist class, does not feel any need for drafting an international fighting programme for socialism.

The fact of the adoption of the Comintern programme means that, in spite of the varied national participation in the communist movement, the conditions making an international communist revolution possible are already maturing; that the proletariat has recognised the chief ways and means of overthrowing capitalism and that the Communist International is the real guide and leader of international proletarian revolution, possessing from this time onwards a scientifically substantiated international programme of action for the whole epoch of struggle for the victory of Communism. The programme which has been adopted is the first attempt in this sphere, but it is at the same time the product of the last few years' work of the Comintern. The programme-question was first taken up at the IV. Congress (1922). The VI. Congress will live in the history of Communism as the Congress first establishing the programme of international Communism. With the publication of this programme international Communism unfurls to its full extent the flag of struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of imperialism, for the abolition of classes, for the abolition of all exploitation of man by man. This programme, incorporating the international experience of the proletariat and the most important achievements of the scientific theory of Communism, will become the base of the communist world movement for the whole epoch of international proletarian revolution.

The Fundamental Idea of the Programme.

What is the fundamental idea of the programme of the Comintern? It is that the programme of the Comintern is the programme of the proletarian world dictatorship.

The programme contains only a relatively short chapter on the final aim — world communism. The programme does not set out to describe in detail what communist society will be like. As consistent Marxists we hold to the science of dialectic materialism, the spirit of which permeates the whole programme, and therefore we cannot occupy ourselves with prophecies and predictions as to the lines on which the future communist order will develop. Our programme, which is hostile to every variety of programme based on the idealist conception of history, throws light solely on the main supporting pillars of the communist system which will replace decaying capitalism.

On the other hand, the programme contains an exhaustive analysis of present-day capitalism and its imperialist epoch. Every essential point is dealt with, both with reference to the roots of present-day capitalism and to the conditions and perspectives of its development. This analysis of the international capitalist system reveals the nature of its present stage of development and its inevitable, approaching decay. Special attention is here devoted to the general crisis of capitalism, to the resultant worsening of the situation of the

working class and the whole proletariat and to the consequent development of the first phase of the world revolution. It is made clear that the history of capitalism in the last decade, especially when viewed in the light of the imperialist world war, demonstrates with all clearness the complete hopelessness of the present general crisis of capitalism. The increasing exploitation of the working class and of the colonial peoples, and the aggravation of the class struggle thereby conditioned, are gradually arousing the mighty forces of international proletarian revolution. The growing contradictions in present day capitalism and the tremendous breach torn in the international imperialist system by the existence of the Soviet Union, place the decisive questions of the struggle of Communism against capitalism on our agenda of practical action.

Especially characteristic of the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism is the rule of Fascism in certain countries and the extension of Fascist methods to others. Fascism, upon whose flag the annihilation of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard is inscribed, reveals by its deeds the nature of the bourgeois dictatorship of modern society in all its nakedness. Fascism, substituting for bourgeois democracy the methods of direct bourgeois dictatorship, reveals the entire hopelessness of the present crisis of capitalism. The logic of the development of the Fascist regime leads not only to a failure to ameliorate the class struggle, but on the contrary drives the struggling classes forcibly and definitely forward to the main problem, the problem of power. In spite of the direct and indirect support received from social democracy, Fascism is not only unable to secure the power of capital, but renders the question of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie more acute than ever. The rule of Fascism in Italy continues to exist only by means of a jail regime towards the revolutionary elements in the working class; Fascism in Poland is treading the same path. The methods of Fascism which are indissolubly bound up with sharper reprisals against the working class can only lead to an intensification of the class struggles which will at a certain time annihilate with elementary force the Fascist hull of the capitalist regime. The Fascist sentences of 20 and 30 years penal servitude for communist leaders only serve to fan the flame of indignation, and cannot but arouse the desire for proletarian vengeance against the regime, which is doomed to perish, of the capitalist exploiters.

Under present day conditions the crisis in capitalism is international in character. Imperialism has converted the capitalist states into one interdependent organism on an international scale. The separate parts of the capitalist system are developing today in intimate communication with the main centres of capitalism. In the capitalist system of today the inner antagonisms in the separate countries are becoming increasingly international in character. There is not one economically developed country which is not dependent on the world's markets, or is not subject to the influence of some great capitalist State.

The antagonisms between the great imperialist states themselves not only show no sign of declining, but are acuter than ever. At the present moment international antagonism is especially concentrated in the conflict between the two capitalist giants, England and the United States. The conditions under which capitalism evolves force more and more into the foreground the problems of the hegemony of the capitalist giants in the imperialist world system. The nature of the present development of the capitalist system, and above all the inevitable intensification of the struggle between world capitalism and the first socialist State, confront the working class with the whole extent of the problem of the world dictatorship of the proletariat. The importance of the programme lies therefore before all in the fact that in it world imperialism, theoretically and practically, is confronted with world communism, which has inscribed on its banner the victory of the proletarian world dictatorship. The programme of the Comintern, which forms the basis of the programmes of the Communist Parties of all countries, is the programme of the world dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the same time the programme had to take into account the fact of the existence of the still isolated socialist state, the U. S. S. R.

The programme which has been adopted differs from earlier drafts in devoting a special chapter to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. Here an analysis of the conditions

and perspectives of the development of the Soviet Union is given, and in connection therewith, the question of the importance of the Soviet Union and its international revolutionary duties, as well as the question of the duties of the international proletariat towards the Soviet Union are elucidated. The fundamental question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one single country is also accorded due attention, so that this question is no longer merely the subject of resolutions in the Communist Parties and in the Comintern, but is clearly dealt with in the programme of the Communist International itself.

Besides this, we find in the programme a very big chapter on the transitional period from capitalism to Socialism; here the main types of revolution in the period of struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat are delineated. These types are classified under certain headings, and examples of the three main types of countries given. The first type is that of the capitalistically highly developed countries (United States, Germany, England), in which the proletariat stands before the immediate struggle for the dictatorship; the second is the colonial or semi-colonial (China, India) and the dependent countries (Argentina, Brazil), in which as a general rule the conditions necessary for independent socialist development do not yet exist. Between these two types is the type of country at an intermediate stage of the development of capitalism (Spain, Portugal, Poland, Hungary, Balkans), in which a certain minimum of the objective prerequisites for socialist development exist, but where the bourgeois democratic transformations are not yet completed, but will probably have to be undergone to a greater or smaller extent. The programme shows the relations of these three main types of countries to the perspectives of the struggle for the world dictatorship of the proletariat. In doing this the programme points out, in a definite if general form, the road to the victorious struggle for world Communism.

3. Communism and "Socialist" Reformism.

The programme, representing as it does a carefully forged theoretical weapon of Communism against capitalism, necessarily accords a leading place to the question of the bitterest ideological enemy of Communism in the working class — the so-called "socialist" reformism. Therefore a confrontation of Communism, as the sole proletarian class ideology, with all and every variation of social reformism, underlies the whole programme. A brief analysis of the history of Socialism is given, followed by an analysis of the degeneration of social democracy into social imperialism, and by a survey of all the main ideologies in the working class hostile to Communism.

The outline given of the numerous ideological currents influencing the working class, beginning with the openly reactionary creeds with their dominantly religious ideology, and showing the intermediate stages to such currents as that of anarchism and "revolutionary" syndicalism, in which ideological subordination to the bourgeoisie is veiled behind Left radical phraseology, enables the programme to expose the ideological and actual hostility of these currents to the revolutionary proletariat. Special attention is drawn to two serious deviations from the proletarian class line — firstly opportunism in all its variations, and secondly, revolutionary adventurism, generally no more than a repetition of this same opportunism, but cloaked with Left phraseology.

The experience gained in our revolution taught us that during periods of abrupt change in the political situation, and especially during periods of temporary but unavoidable retreat, ideas are likely to become rife, even in the ranks of the Communist Parties themselves, which must be classified under Lenin's "Infantile Sickness of Communism". It will be remembered that this was the situation with us during the Brest period, when the group of so-called "Left communists" (not plain communists be it noted, but "Left" communists) was formed in our Party. And we need only recall the extremely difficult period which our revolution passed through, before the transition to the N. E. P., to have a striking example of the rise of such currents of opinion: the group which at that time flatly opposed the Leninist Party line under a specific "workers' flag". Today we are well aware that during those periods in which the revolution must fight its way through the countless

obstacles heaped in its path, especially those obstacles blocking the way to that first and most urgent task of socialist construction, namely the absolutely necessary industrialisation of the country, that during such periods certain ideological vacillations are liable to creep into even the Communist Parties, and even ideas which, although in reality only a repetition of social-democratic opportunism, are wont to appear in a Left garb and seek to hide their Right policy behind sham revolutionary phrases. The programme, taking into account not only the situation as it is today, has therefore devoted some space to the criticism of such ideological departures from the proletarian line and to a warning against possible future waverings in critical situations, in which failure to adhere to the Leninist line may dangerously disorganise the ranks of the proletariat and represents a serious hindrance to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

The chapter on the strategy and tactics of the Communist International furnishes a characterisation of this ideology. At the same time special attention is here drawn to the most dangerous ideological foe of Communism: the social reformism led by the II. International. The programme expressly declares that present-day social democracy is the strongest pillar of imperialism within the working class, and is therefore the chief of Communism among the working masses.

It is characteristic of reformism that it will not show itself to the working class in its true colours. It prefers to hide its Philistine nakedness in attractive garments, and to hang out a "socialist" sign. The programme lays great stress on unmasking that "socialist" reformism which conceals its bourgeois character behind a "workers' flag". This special stress is justified by the fact that the exposure of the theory and practice of social democracy is one of our greatest difficulties in the ideological struggle for the masses. Although social democracy, beginning on that famous 4th August 1914, when the German social democrats voted for the credits to Kaiser Wilhelm to carry on imperialist war, has proceeded steadily on the downward path ever since, and is now not only the ideological support of imperialism, but an actual accomplice of Fascism, the power of bourgeois and petty bourgeois prejudices still exercises much influence over the working class, hence the influence still maintained by social democracy among the working masses.

Since the time that Socialism began to degenerate into social imperialism, that is, since the commencement of the imperialist world war, Communism has taken an energetic stand against the International of social betrayal. At first there gathered round the flag of Communist internationalism only individual revolutionary elements and groups from the working class. These first organisers of the Communist International were, however, — beginning with the celebrated international conferences in Zimmerwald and Kienthal during the war — already at that time the only representatives of the real interests of the proletariat. Since that time Communism has become a mighty organisation, the powerful representative of the revolutionary unity of the proletariat, the unity of the proletarian struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. Social democracy still continues its endeavours to fool the workers, declaring the communists to be splitters of the proletarian united front. The programme of the Comintern replies to this infamous lie and base hypocrisy by showing the real nature of the fight for the unity of the working class against the bourgeoisie and against the "socialist" agents of capital. In reality, especially under present conditions, it is precisely social democracy which disrupts and splits the united front of the proletarian struggle against capital and thereby becomes itself the active accomplice of the bourgeoisie. The programme stigmatises these real destroyers of unity in the working class, and shows that "the chief rôle played by social democracy today is to undermine the needful fighting unity of the proletariat in its struggle against imperialism". The real banner of working class unity is unfurled by the Communist International itself in this programme... the banner of unity in the proletarian struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the revolutionary proletariat. The programme proclaims with the unanimous voice of the great proletarian vanguard that this revolutionary class unity of the international proletariat can and must be realised.

In conclusion, mention must be made of the former defects of the programme which the VI. Congress has endeavoured

to eliminate in formulating the final text. As compared with the original drafts, the programme adopted by the Congress has been greatly improved in the sections referring to the development of Europe and America, and of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The removal of the fault of what is known as "Europeanism" from the final draft has been an important point. The programme accords due consideration to the chief factors in the development of China and India today, and to the events in other colonial countries, so important during the present epoch. In connection therewith the programme devotes special attention to such ideological tendencies as Sun-Yat-Senism in China, Ghandiism in India, and Garveyism among the Negroes of America. The unmasking of these and similar bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideologies, which play a leading

reactionary rôle under present conditions, is of enormous importance. The reactionary content of these ideologies is reflected to a certain extent in many strata of the working class, even today. Their influence on the peasant masses and on the masses of petty bourgeois slaves of imperialism is an especially dangerous obstacle to the spread of the revolutionary spirit. It is not possible for the programme of the Comintern to refer in detail to the many variations of these ideologies existing at the present time, the anti-revolutionary rôle of which is still of great importance in the further anti-imperialist struggles of the colonies; nevertheless the programme deals, clearly and definitely with all that is most important for unmasking and fighting against these influences.

II.

The International Situation and the Tasks of the C. I.

1. The Three Periods and the Present Situation.

The VI. Congress has given in the programme a characterisation of the general development of present-day capitalism, and has at the same time characterised in a special resolution the present international situation and the current tasks of the Communist International.

The chief resolution passed by the Congress speaks of three repiods in the history of the post-war development of the capitalist system, and in connection therewith, three corresponding periods in the development of the international labour movement. The first period, culminating in 1921, was a period of acute capitalist crisis, ending on the one hand with the firmer establishment of the position of the first Socialist State, the Soviet Union, and on the other with a number of severe defeats of other sections of the international proletariat. The second period, beginning about the end of 1923, is chiefly distinguished by the partial stabilisation of capitalism on the one hand, and by the rapid economic advance of the Soviet Union on the other. As the beginning of the third period we may take that juncture at which the capitalist system — in so far as it can be spoken of here in its entirety — began to overtake and pass its pre-war level; this period corresponds approximately to the transition to the reconstruction period in the Soviet Union. This third period, whose main features are already clearly distinguishable, does not by any means signify the security or durability of the capitalist development of today. On the contrary, the increasing inner contradictions prevailing in the capitalist countries are becoming more and more interwoven in the ever acuter antagonisms among both the capitalist countries themselves, and these and the Soviet Union. Under the conditions obtaining in this third period, in which the discrepancies between the increase in the productive forces and the insufficient absorbent powers of the market are becoming particularly acute, the fresh epoch of imperialist war approaches ever nearer and already announces itself (Japan and China).

Capitalism is making frantic endeavours to establish its position. For this purpose it perfects its technics, makes desperate efforts in the rationalisation of production, accelerates the process of monopolist organisation, makes greater use of such instruments as social democracy in the interests of its domination, and creates new state forms, such as Fascism. But all this cannot secure the permanent stability of capitalism. The contradictions of capitalism continue to increase inexorably, and will inevitably reach that stage at which the whole capitalist system collapses. The whole burden of the crisis of capitalism, which is spread over a number of stages, falls with ever greater weight upon the shoulders of the working masses, the proletariat, whose conditions of living worsen day by day. Capital redoubles its attack upon labour, wages are cut down still further, working hours lengthened, the army of the unemployed augmented. The rule of financial capital, constituting an amalgamation of banks with industry, leads to the greater centralisation of capital and this again to the amalgamation of the organisation of the exploiting classes with the organs of state authority. Bourgeois democracy is obviously undergoing an ever deepening crisis. The consequence is that the simple economic struggles of the workers for their interests encounter not only the resistance of the employers concerned, but to an increasing

extent come up against the whole system of the political rule of the bourgeoisie. Even the smallest economic strikes are beginning to assume a political character, whilst the great economic conflicts confront one class definitely with another — proletariat and bourgeoisie. This signifies a serious intensification of the class struggle, and finds expression in the growing radicalisation of the broad masses of the workers.

The fight against capital, under present day conditions, is indissolubly bound up with the struggle against social democracy, which is exerting every effort to prolong the life of capitalism, and comes forward with increasing openness as the ally of the capitalist class. Whilst ever fresh attacks are being made on wages, whilst the army of the unemployed increases beyond all measure, whilst the rights of the economic organisations of the proletariat are swept aside — social democracy smugly proclaims "industrial peace" and joins the bourgeoisie in advocating "economic democracy". All this, the whole logic of capitalist development today, urges the workers forward from small economic demands to great political problems, from the defence of their daily needs to the struggle for power. But social democracy, as the faithful agent of imperialism, deems its first duty to be the prevention of strikes, the amelioration of antagonisms, the distraction of the workers' attention from the main tasks of proletarian struggle. The sorry part being played by social democracy has not yet been clearly recognised by millions of workers, but everything goes to show that its policy, which openly amounts to service for capitalism, will lead to its complete collapse, together with the allegedly "socialist" but really petty bourgeois illusions and hopes still to be found among the working class.

These are the main features of the inner development of the capitalist state. These inner contradictions are indissolubly bound up with the inherent contradictions of capitalism in the international arena.

2. The Contradictions of Capitalism and International Politics.

None of the attempts to reorganise the technical basis of capitalism, to carry out capitalist rationalisation, or to attain even more comprehensive forms of capitalist organisation, can prevent the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system from growing and thereby at the same time check the intensification of the class struggle in the capitalist states. The capitalist states are involved in the system of world economy through the agency of the world market. This, on the one hand, makes the transformation of the inner class antagonisms into international antagonisms between proletariat and bourgeoisie inevitable, and, on the other hand, brings with it in proportion as the importance of world economy grows, an increasingly bitter struggle among the capitalist states for world hegemony.

The decisions of the VI. Congress emphasise once more, and more strongly, the fact, since the great war, that the centre of capitalism has shifted from Europe to America. The greatest international antagonism existing today is that between the land of growing American capitalism and Great Britain, which latter country, in spite of all its immense productive forces, is not even in a position to regain its pre-war level. This does

not mean that the antagonisms between the other imperialist states have lessened or lost their importance. Such a conception would unavoidably lead to opportunist conclusions both with regard to the judgment to be formed on the capitalist crisis and with regard to the immediate tasks of the revolutionary proletariat. This was the result of the well known "theory" of Europe put on rations by America, a "theory" which was in reality only the peculiar expression of the depression felt at that time by the Philistines at being pressed against the wall by the power of the imperialist giants. On the other hand, it would be an equally grave error to under-estimate the supreme importance of North America for the development of international imperialism. The resolutions of the V. Congress already pointed this out. Since this Congress the role of American capitalism has increased, especially in Europe. It is not for nothing that German economy is completely under the control of the American Gilbert Parker, plenipotentiary of the international banks and trusts. Nor is it by accident that the control of the financial and economic development of Poland is long since in the hands of the representative of the American creditors, Mr. Dawes.

The days are past when the United States of America did not interfere in the affairs of Europe. America is, on the contrary, now going further and further in its struggle against the countries dominant in capitalist Europe, especially against Great Britain, and obviously aims at the hegemony of world politics. One of the clearest proofs of this is the Kellogg Pact, of which so much has been heard of late. By means of this pact America seeks to attain the hegemony in international politics. Whilst many of the European states which are members of the League of Nations, itself subject to the hegemony of the British bourgeoisie, have signed the Kellogg Pact with anything but friendly feeling, and even with repugnance, America seeks to gain further signatories, not only in Europe, but in other parts of the world. The Soviet Union, too, has decided to sign the Kellogg Pact on the so-called outlawing of war as "an instrument of national policy".

A few words must be devoted to this question.

The motives inducing the Soviet Union to sign the Kellogg Pact are stated for the most part in the declaration made by the Soviet government. The Soviet Union has openly stated its opinion of this document drawn up by the "pacifists" of American imperialism.

To us it is perfectly clear that the unmasking of imperialist pacifism is and remains one of our most important duties towards the international proletariat. Viewed from this standpoint, our signing of the pact is nothing more nor less than the seizing of an additional opportunity of urging upon the signatory powers the all-important question of disarmament, the indispensable pre-requisite for the abolition of war, and therefore incompatible with the system of imperialist rule. When deciding on the question of signing the pact, we were bound to take into account the existence of antagonisms among the imperialist powers. The signing of the pact, in so far as it imposes certain objective obligations on the signatory powers with respect to public opinion, possesses therefore a certain value for the Soviet Union, especially with regard to those powers which are so anxious at the present time for fresh wars, and impatient to make an attack on the Soviet Union. The initiators of the attempt to use the Kellogg Pact as a fresh instrument for the formation of a united front of the bourgeois states against the Soviet Union are thwarted by our timely exposure of this attempt. It has proved not only impossible to ignore the Soviet Union, but on the contrary, the bellicose imperialists have been placed in the eyes of public opinion, and not only among the workers, but among the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie — in an extremely unpleasant position.

America is striving openly for the hegemony of world politics. This increases the friction between the United States and the second greatest imperialist power, Great Britain. The consequent antagonisms increase daily in acuteness. What, for instance, is the meaning of the attempts being made by the American government to establish immediate contact with Egypt and Ireland!

At the same time we see that in the whole world there is not one single capitalist state which is not taking active

part in the world politics. This means that all the nations and peoples of the whole world are being drawn into the conflict of interests being fought in this arena of world politics. The present conflicts between the capitalist powers, however, inevitably lead to the greatest of imperialist world wars.

3. The War Question and the Colonial Question at the Congress. The Fight for the Masses, and the Fight against Social Democracy.

At the present time world capitalism is passing through a period of severe economic depression. This is observable not only in the States of Europe, but even in the land of powerful American capitalism. The prevailing contradiction of capitalism, that is, the contradiction between the growth of productive forces and the deficient capacity of the markets, pushes the question of exchange with the colonies into the foreground. The colonial question is of supreme importance in the development of world economy and world politics. The question is rendered the more urgent at the present time by the fact that various colonies and semi-colonies, such as China, India to an increasing extent, and Egypt in the near future, are proving that, from the standpoint of international relations, they are no longer to be regarded as a bone of contention, since they are making their way to independence. The development of the colonial countries, under present conditions, cannot but pass through a series of acutely revolutionary stages. For instance, the last upsurge of the Chinese revolution is now being followed by a process of preparation for an even more determined uprising in China. In India the revolutionary fermentation is greater than ever, and is pregnant with great revolutionary storms.

This character of the development of the colonial countries is mirrored in the mighty convulsions shaking the capitalist contradictions, these again bringing in their train armed conflicts among the imperialists. The pacifist chatter of the peacemakers of America and Europe today is nothing but a veiled preparation for these imperialist conflicts. It suffices to remember that the pacifists of both Europe and America are steadily increasing their armaments and forming fresh military and diplomatic alliances with one imperialist group against another, and especially against the Soviet Union. One of the best means of unmasking imperialist pacifism is the disarmament proposal of the Soviet Union, first formulated as a general and complete disarmament, and later, as a minimum, demanding the partial disarmament of all States. All this makes the war question the most important question of the whole present epoch.

These are the reasons why the VI. Congress of the Comintern placed the question of war danger and of the methods of combating fresh imperialist wars in the front of its discussions, and why the colonial question was given so conspicuous a place on its agenda.

From what has been said, it will be seen that all Sections of the Comintern must redouble their efforts against social democracy, which forms at the present time the most dangerous influence in the service of imperialism. The VI. Congress has specially emphasised this task. The Congress in pointing out the process of radicalisation taking place among the workers and the growth of the Left current in the proletarian cadres of social democracy, emphasised the necessity of a determined exposure of the "Left" social democratic leaders, who must be shown to the working masses in their true colours as simply more subtle and, therefore, more dangerous pacemakers of bourgeois policy. The slogan of the "fight for the masses" must, under present conditions, when the class struggle of the workers against capital is becoming more acute and the danger of a new imperialist world war is increasing, become an immediate slogan. The tactics of the proletarian united front continue to be of the utmost importance, pursued under present day conditions solely on the lines of the united front from below, and aiding the acceleration of the withdrawal of the working masses from the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. These tactics have always been, and still are, the best means of unmasking social democracy down to the very last "Left" leader, for they gather together the forces of the proletariat in self-defence against the capitalist offensives.

In connection with the ever more urgent task of winning over the broadest masses of the workers, the VI. Congress drew special attention to the weaknesses of which various Parties have been guilty in the struggle against social democracy, and particularly to the inadequacy of communist work in the trade unions in the capitalist countries. The question of communist work in the reactionary trade unions continues to be of paramount importance for winning over the masses for Communism.

In the present international situation the intensification of our work in the trade unions has become a particularly pressing problem for the whole Communist International.

The task of working more energetically than ever to win over the broad masses is one which falls also to the Young Communist organisations and to the whole Y.C.I., who, in their future work, must make a definite turn in this direction.

III.

The Comintern and its Political Line.

1. The Unity of the Comintern and the Fight against Trotskyism.

The last question with which we have to deal is the question of the Communist International itself, and of the decisive line pursued by it during the present period.

One of the characteristic features of the VI. Congress was the complete unanimity of its decisions. During the period following the V. Congress we had repeatedly to fight against various oppositional currents which attacked the Leninist line of the C.I., both from the "Right" and from the "Left". But at the VI. Congress the Communist International showed that perfect unanimity of its ranks which it has won in its struggle against so many ideological vacillations, and especially against Trotskyism. Trotskyism arose out of our Soviet conditions, out of the C. P. S. U., nevertheless it represented a system of ideas consisting of Right policy draped in Left whilst attacking the Leninist line of the Comintern. Such an ideology as this naturally acted as a magnet attracting every imaginable opportunist element and group in the Comintern, where these had not fully overcome their social democratic tendencies. Trotskyism became at last the international banner of open, or sometimes concealed, opportunism in the Comintern. This enabled the Comintern to sweep a considerable number of the decaying elements of opportunism out of the Comintern. Of even greater importance than this is the fact that in this struggle against Trotskyism the Comintern has been able to sharpen its ideological weapons, and to carry the ideological banner of Leninism before the broad masses of the international proletariat.

The Congress has shown that Trotskyism has been completely exposed among the ranks of the communists. All Trotsky's attempts to gain the ear of the Congress by a variety of declarations, beginning with the criticism of the programme draft drawn up by the Comintern and fresh attacks on the policy of the C. P. S. U., and proceeding to requests for readmittance into the Comintern, found but little support, for even on this occasion Trotsky has continued in his old errors and has done little more than prove that he has broken once for all with Communism. It is easily comprehensible that the Congress unanimously rejected all appeals made by the Trotskyists against former decisions of the Comintern.

This does not mean that the Comintern is not still liable to encounter this or that relic of Trotskyist tendencies. The C. P. S. U. must be prepared for this under present circumstances, when the necessary acceleration of industrialisation unavoidably brings us up against tremendous difficulties and against the present aggravation of the class struggle. Therefore we are not yet relieved of the duty of a systematic ideological struggle against the remnants and new zigzags of Trotskyism. The decisions of the Congress have set a conclusion to this stage of development in the Comintern, which has been a period, to a great extent, of overcoming the Trotskyist danger in its ranks.

The VI. Congress of the Comintern has witnessed not only its purging from Trotskyist elements, whose influence has as a rule not reached beyond the confines of small groups, but at the same time the affiliation of seven new Sections. Among these we count the Parties of Cuba, Corea, New Zealand, and Paraguay, the Irish Labour League, the Socialist Party of Ecuador, and the revolutionary Socialist Party of Columbia. The affiliation of these new Sections to the Comintern is one of the most striking indications of the advancement of world Communism.

2. The Main Line is the Fight against Right Deviations.

What are now the characteristic features of the political line of the Comintern under present conditions, now that Trotskyism has been annihilated? What is the main line of our ideological struggle during the present and the coming period? What has the Congress of the Comintern decided in this direction?

The chief resolution passed by the Comintern gives a clear and unequivocal reply to this question.

In connection with the fact that under the conditions imposed by the continued partial stabilisation of capitalism, the social democracy, in its different varieties, is bound to influence some strata of the Communist Parties, the VI. Congress emphasised the necessity of intensifying the struggle against the Right danger in the ranks of the Comintern. And indeed we have reason enough not to forget the power still exercised by social democracy in the working class. This power of social democracy is not only seen in the fact that millions of workers still vote for the "socialists" at parliamentary elections. The ideological influence of social democracy frequently penetrates, to a very noticeable extent, the Communist Parties themselves. We must not close our eyes to the fact that many of the leaders of the Communist Parties have been recruited from the ranks of social democracy. This is shown particularly conspicuously in the report published by Comrade Piatnitsky on the mandate commission of the Congress; in this report we read that even at the VI. Congress 30 per cent. of the delegates belonged at one time to social democratic and socialist parties (exclusive of the R. S. D. L. P.). We must specially bear this in mind when dealing with parties that have not passed through any great revolutionary experience. Thus the situation of the strongest Communist Party in Europe, the Czech Party, differs rather considerably in this respect from that of the Communist Party of Germany, which has passed through a number of the greatest revolutionary events in the past decade. This fact must be taken to heart not only by the Communists of the Czechoslovakian Party itself, but by the whole Comintern.

In this connection it is easy to understand that under present conditions the VI. Congress found itself obliged to insist upon an intensified struggle against opportunist deviations as a necessity for practically every Communist Party. The need for more energetic measures against the Right tendencies was referred to with respect to the Communist Parties of France, Great Britain, Italy, and Germany. Here it must be mentioned that the Congress expressed its full approval of the tactics laid down by the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I., which mean a more energetic struggle on the part of the Communists against bourgeois "labour parties", that is, against social democracy. These more energetic tactics are an urgent necessity in France and England, and have already been carried out there, even if not without a certain resistance. It is unnecessary to deal in detail here with the relative parts of the resolution of the Congress. It suffices to cite that part of the concluding paragraph of the chief resolution in which the idea of the fight against the Right deviations is formulated for all Communist Parties. It states:

"At the present time we find that in the Communist Parties — as a result of the partial stabilisation of capitalism and as an immediate consequence of the influence of social democracy — the main line of deviation from the correct political line is to be found to the Right. This is expressed in the remnants of 'legalism', in the exaggerated

respect for the laws, in the 'tail policy', in passivity in strike movements, in wrong relations to social democracy (for instance a certain resistance in France to the decisions of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I.), in a lack of reaction to international events, etc., These Right deviations became particularly dangerous where relatively strong social democratic parties exist; therefore, the fight against these deviations must be placed in the foreground, and this presupposes a systematic struggle against the conciliatory attitude sometimes adopted towards the Right tendencies in the Communist Parties. At the same time 'Left' deviations continue to exist, finding expression in a certain tendency to reject the united front tactics, a lack of comprehension for the enormous importance of trade union work, in the policy of the revolutionary phrase, and — in China — in putschist tendencies." (The emphasis is mine. W. M.)

It will be seen from the above-cited passage that the VI. Congress has pointed out the existence of "Left" tendencies, especially in the Chinese Communist Party. The Congress, however, lays most stress on the importance of the fight against the Right deviations, and upon the necessity of overcoming the conciliatory attitude maintained to Right tendencies in the Communist Parties. This same idea of the fight against the Right tendencies, and against their being tolerated, is again emphasised by the chief resolution of the Congress, especially with reference to the most important European Party, the Communist Party of Germany.

This, then, is the main line laid down by the decisions of the Comintern with respect to inner Party development for the whole of its next stage.

3. The Attitude of the Congress regarding the Soviet Union and the C. P. S. U.

The Comintern and the Slogan of Self-Criticism.

The Comintern expressed its general approval of the results of socialist development in the Soviet Union and recognised the further political perspectives laid down by the Party, especially in the decisions of the 15th Party Congress, as correct. The Congress fully approved the struggle carried on by the C. P. S. U. against the opposition centering around Trotzkyism, and expressed its complete solidarity with the measures, dictated by revolutionary necessity, taken against the leaders of the opposition. Special declarations from groups of Congress delegates, representing the whole of the Parties present at the Congress, enabled the Congress to express as a whole its approval of the policy pursued by our Party. These declarations from the Congress delegations deserve the special interest of the working men and women of the Soviet Union.

And now in conclusion to self-criticism in the Comintern, as shown in the work of the VI. Congress.

The VI. Congress has drawn more express attention than any other to the faults in the work of both the separate Communist Parties and of the Executive Committee itself. During the present period, the period of preparation for the coming great class struggles, the slogan of self-criticism must be practically applied by both the individual Parties and by the Comintern as a whole. During this preparatory period the ideological soundness of the proletarian party must be our greatest care, and therefore the slogan of self-criticism must be an important means for destroying that rust of anti-proletarian and anti-revolutionary influences which attacks our organisation.

The initiative for the development of self-criticism was taken by the German delegation. This initiative was supported enthusiastically by the representatives of other Communist Parties, — that of Italy, the C. P. S. U. and others. It was unanimously decided that in the Executive Committee itself the active participation of the representatives of the largest sections of the Comintern should be increased. The Congress, in deciding on the composition of its new leading organs, proceeded from the standpoint of increasing the influence of the foreign Communist Parties in the leadership of the Comintern.

The Congress, when dealing with some of the faults marring the work of many Communist Parties, called special attention to the interest shown in raising the theoretical level of the Communist Parties in general and of their leading cadres in particular. A characteristic example of this has been given me by Comrade Thälmann, who is here present. Comrade Thälmann observed to me, very rightly, that even in Germany only four volumes of Lenin's work have been translated up to the present. Surely this is an abnormal state of affairs for so advanced a Section as the German Communist Party. And this is only one example of the utterly inadequate interest taken in ideological and theoretical work by the majority of our Sections. But unless we have fully mastered the theoretical wealth of Marxism and Leninism, we cannot produce any really communist leaders.

On the other hand, in some Communist Parties there is a serious lack of participation in the leading organs by proletarians who have passed through the severe school of revolutionary struggle and who are firmly connected with the working masses. Even the Communist Party of such a country as the U. S. A. suffers greatly from this drawback. The Congress drew special attention to the necessity of a decided change in the American Communist Party on this point, advising that every effort be made "to promote workers to the leading positions in the Party". In a number of the largest Communist Parties of Europe, for instance such Sections as those of Great Britain, Germany, and France, we find efficient leaders who are real proletarians. There can be no doubt that we can greatly further our efforts to win over the masses from social democracy if we draw more of our leaders from the ranks of the workers steeled in revolutionary struggle and bound by indissoluble ties to their own class. These leaders, again, must endeavour to perfect their theoretical knowledge.

Here there should be mentioned an important example serving to characterise the situation in some Communist Parties. The Party in question is the Communist Party of Poland. In so far as the references to bellicose Polish Fascism, constituting a danger to peace, especially the peace of the Soviet Union, are not mere idle chatter, the situation of the Polish C. P. is such as to require the special attention of the Comintern. A situation has come about which is absolutely impermissible in the interests of communism. Although no great differences of opinion in matters of principle exist in the Polish C. P., the Party is practically split into two equal parts, fighting obstinately against each other. The Executive Committee of the Comintern only recently adopted decisions confirming the correctness of the line pursued by the leading organs of the Polish C. P., but the disruptive struggle has not only not ceased, but has gone beyond all bounds. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that the political line of the Party has been approved by the Comintern, it is the imperative duty of the Polish C. P. to re-establish, first of all, truly proletarian and truly Bolshevik discipline on the basis of the entire abolition of all fractional activity and of the subordination of every part of the Party to the leading organs. The VI. Congress has commissioned the Executive Committee to ensure a decided change in this direction in the Polish C. P. in the immediate future.

The Communist International, in summing up its work from the point of view of self-criticism, has found still another defect in the general work of the Communist Parties. The fault in question becomes conspicuous at moments when the necessity arises for international demonstrations of the working class. The Congress pointed out that in a number of cases in which the Comintern has been confronted by the task of organising simultaneous international action among the Communist Parties in connection with great events of international importance (for instance, for the struggle against the fresh imperialist war danger, for the defence of the Chinese revolution, for the support of the general strike and the miners' struggle in England, etc.), the resultant international political campaigns have shown the weakness of the Communist Parties in this direction. And yet the whole international situation demands of us just this effective internationalism.

Apart from the fact that the Communist International, especially by its acceptance of the Programme, has set itself the full task of fighting for the world dictatorship of the prole-

tariat, the peculiarities of the present period in the development of international relations, rendering as they do the question of imperialist war danger increasingly urgent, demand that special emphasis be laid on the task of organising international actions of the working class. Taking this fact into account, especially with reference to our task of combating the threat of fresh imperialist wars, the VI. Congress has approved the organisation of what will be known as an **International Red Day**. The Congress, without fixing any definite date for this, emphasised that this International Red Day must be utilised to further the struggle against imperialist war and against the capitalist offensive, the struggle for the defence of the Soviet Union, and the struggle for the emancipation of the colonies. This Red Day must be a demonstration of the workers of all countries, held under the banner of revolutionary proletarian struggle. It is very possible that the International Red Day will be preceded by a number of imposing proletarian demonstrations in the

various groups of countries. Similar international demonstrations of the workers must be of great importance for the preparation for the decisive international revolutionary struggles of the proletariat. There will be no lack of occasions calling for such demonstrations in this epoch of embittered capitalist offensive against the working class, of increased pressure on the colonies, of feverish preparation for an imperialist attack on the Soviet Union. These demonstrations of the workers of various countries must reveal to the broad masses with all clearness the main problems of international working class policy. And from these separate international demonstrations the international proletariat must go forward to the international struggle for the realisation of the Programme of the Communist International, for the realisation of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for the victory of world Communism. (Applause.)

TO OUR READERS!

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

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

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

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

The Business Manager.